

---Is the result of the suggestion which Dr. Buswell made last year and which he repeated a couple of times, ~~and~~ until finally we proceeded to act upon the suggestion he'd made. He suggested that we have a panel course which he and I would conduct together on the subject of Eschatology, and I asked him what procedure which he thought we should take, and he has suggested that we begin with the matter of the millenium, and that I begin with a presentation of Old Testament evidence on the millenium, and that he then follow with the presentation of New Testament evidence on the millenium, and then I suppose we would take up other phases of eschatology if and when we complete our investigation of that particular stage. I think that perhaps a few introductory words would be well as we take this up. Just why are we particularly interested now in studying the matter of the millenium? There is one matter which I like to mention in beginning any study, and that is this: My interest in the Bible is not simply in determining whether it teaches this or that, but it is in determining how much does it teach on a particular subject? How far does it go in this or that direction? You may go to the Bible and try to get an answer to this question, "Are souls individually created by God at the time of birth? or, Do all souls exist before children are born? And then ~~assigned~~ assigned to a particular body or family when a child is born? Or is the soul of a child formed by some natural process from the parents' souls in some way analagous to the formation of the body? Which of these three views is correct, Creationism, Pre-existence, or Traducianism? Now you go to the Bible and you say which is true, and you find a few words looking this way and a few words looking that way, you weigh them, you come to a conclusion, you say, "This is the correct one and the other two are false." Someone else comes to the conclusion, "This is the correct one and these two are false."

The question is, "Has God revealed this particular matter to us?" "Do we have sufficient evidence on which to reach a dogmatic decision at this point?" I think that a great part of the difficulty and descension and trouble in the Christian church could be avoided if we would take that as a primary consideration. Not merely to be interested to determine what is the truth on a particular matter, but to be determined not to go further than the Bible actually goes on the matter. To stop where the Bible stops as far as any dogmatic statement is concerned. When we get beyond that to say, "It looks this way to me, I think that this a profitable interpretation, the evidence seems slightly more in this direction" ~~then~~ then it is very likely that this is one of the matters that God has not revealed to us. I am not interested simply in determining: Does the Bible teach Premilleniumism, or post-milleneumism, or a-milleniumism. I am interest in determining how definite is the teaching of the Bible. What matters are there on which it gives a definite and positive evidence, and what are the matters on which God has not revealed the matter? And consequently we may come into serious error if we try to reach a conclusion on to small evidence. Now why are we particularly interested in the study of the millenium? One reason is because of the general misconseption in a great part of the C hristian world ~~and~~ as to what the great 4 of the Christian is. The general attitude of the popular christian, the man who hasn't studied, who doesn't know much about the Bible. Christianity is a way to get to heaven. When a man becomes a christian his great hope is to go to heaven when he dies and that is the thing he is looking forward to and working for. Well of course there is a large element of truth in that statement, but it is not the hope of the Christian that is expressed and advertised in the Scripture, to go to Heaven when he dies. The Scripture teaches that after death we enter upon an unnatural state. A state of bliss, a glorious state if we are Christians, but not a natural condition, an unnatural condition, one which we long to be clothed upon. The hope of the Christian is the Ressurrection. The hope of the that which God is going to bring about sometime in the future and which we are going to participate in if we have been born again and are followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is to say Eschatology, the Science of the last things, the question of what is way ahead in the Universe, is not merely something of interest and speculation as to what may happen, but it is something that is frightfulⁱⁿ so

far as the Biblical emphasis is concerned. It is stressed in both the old and New testaments, a looking forward to a wonderful thing that God is going to bring to pass at the Resurrection of the body, the wonderful thing that God is going to bring to pass for the whole Universe at some time in the future. It is not just a matter of dying and going to Heaven. Now Dr. Buswell pricked up his ears a little when I began to speak about Heaven. He and I had a little discussion this summer about that and a rather sharp disagreement for a time on a certain phase of it, but later in correspondence I think that we found that although our phraseology differed somewhat, what we actually believed was pretty close on this matter of heaven. There were certain points, some points that we haven't come yet that we will discuss later on, but I don't think that they are so important actually as the matters that we are going to take up in this course. The Christian is interested in Eschatology. He is interested in it because God has promised wonderful things which are the ^{LOT} law of the one who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ and we are interested in to know just what those things are and to know what it is upon which our ultimate hope is to be placed. Now ^{THROUGH} ~~true~~ of the History of the church, a great element of the church has to a large extent forgotten it and consequently the great elements of the church have become a little more centered upon the work of the church in this world and there came into existence a very widespread attitude which looked forward to wonderful things that the church would ^{ACCOMPLISH IN THIS EARTH.} 7 as the great purpose of the church here and there is that thing that we call truly evangelical post-milleniumism. It is believed that the church with the spread of the Gospel is going to reach all of the earth and everyone will come to the knowledge of the truth and you will have a wonderful world and you will all believe in Christ and we will all stand together and ^{FOLLOW HIM} as a result of the widespread preaching of the Gospel. A wonderful hope! A grand thing to look forward to if it is taught in the Scripture. If it is not taught in the scripture, it can be a very harmful thing because it can mislead us as to what our attitude should be in many situations along the way and so it is vital whether

that particular thing is taught in the Scripture or not. But ~~if~~ from that viewpoint there has developed, I don't say you can prove the viewpoint is wrong, but yet there has developed from it an attitude which is characteristic of the greater part of modernism today. The attitude is here to make a good world and all these matters of the supernatural is of little importance, the church is here to transform the world and the great hope to look forward to is that great transformation that the church is going to carry out. I believe that Taylor Matthews, "We're not looking for a man out of the skies, we are looking for an improved world that the church is going to improve." Well of course when you get into that attitude, you are definitely outside of the area of Christianity. And through the ages, there have been little groups of people, sometimes small and sometimes large groups who have felt that the Scripture promised something else as the great hope of the future. They have felt that the Scripture taught us that the Lord Jesus Christ would come back to this earth, and our great hope is in His return, and they have looked forward to ~~it~~ it and longed for it and hoped that it might come in their lifetime, and a great many of those who have held this view have stated that they expected that after Christ came back to this earth that He would set up upon this earth a kingdom of righteousness and Peace. And they did not think that the kingdom would come through the church spreading through the world, but with Christ coming back to establish it and so they named it Pre-millennium, because the return of Christ would come before the millennium, ~~that~~ rather than after the millennium and so we have that fundamental split between the post-millennial viewpoint, the church here to improve the world, to remedy world conditions, to make a wonderful world, whether in an evangelical way directly through the preaching of the Gospel or in a general way through its effect on all the phases of life, but the church here to make a wonderful world. And then the other viewpoint, Jesus Christ is going to come

back and He is going to bring that age of Righteousness that the world is looking forward to, now which of these two viewpoints one has vitally effect one's work, it vitally effects one's ministry, it vitally effects one's life and consequently this becomes an important question, because it is a practical question. It effects out service for the Lord. What is, which ~~is~~ these is characteristic of our attitude. Of course, if the Bible doesn't make clear which of the two is correct, then we shouldn't make it a determinating aspect in our attitude, but if the Bible makes one or the other of these two viewpoints clear as the correct viewpoint;, then it can have a tremendous effect upon our work and consequently it becomes not a question of whether ~~the~~ the soul is given a birth, or pre-exists, but it becomes a question that is vital to our work and it is very vital that we take an attitude. Now there were these two main ~~points~~ (11)

of wide spread postmillennial can it be and the held by a smaller number of people but yet a group ~~that~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~one~~ ~~from~~ ~~which~~ ~~came~~ ~~the~~ ~~overwhelming~~ ~~majority~~ ~~of~~ ~~great~~ ~~evangelists~~ ~~and~~ ~~missionary~~ ~~leaders~~, the group that were looking for the personal return of Christ to bring in the kingdom, there was this division between the two groups and then a third term came into prominence within the last 50 years I guess, and my impression that the term came rather largely through the ~~teaching~~ teaching of Dr. ^{ERHARDUS} ~~12~~ ^{Voss} who was a christian informed background. I believe he taught at Calvin Seminary a few years, and Princeton Seminary where he taught a great many years, was a man who was tremendously impressed with the importance of Eschatology and ^{AS} was over against the Post millennial attitude of making a better world and looking forward ^{FOR} to the world to be completely regenerated by the Gospel, by the activity of the church, ^{Voss} ~~Wales~~ was more impressed by the fact that Scripture doesn't promise something of that kind but it promises the return of Christ as the great hope, and he wrote a great deal and he thought a great deal on the subject of Eschatology and it's

importance, and he felt that this matter of Eschatology, the wonderful things God is going to do was something which should have a place in the church far superior to that which it had held among the group with which he had come in contact. And so Voss tremendously stressed Eschatology. But as Voss found the larger part, the greater number of those who were stressing Eschatology upholding the Premillennial view that Christ would come back before the Kingdom was set up and then to set up His Kingdom upon this earth, Voss stressed in common with them the first part of that, the return of Christ, the Great Hope, the wonderful things that Christ was going to do, and the second part of that, the idea that after His return the Kingdom on this earth here, Voss cast aside, and while ~~at~~ ^{at} some places in his book he speaks of it as very hard to know whether there is to be an earthly kingdom or not, in other places he speaks rather strongly against that idea. But Voss's emphasis was an emphasis on the importance of Eschatology; it was an emphasis on those things which premillennialists had been stressing before. His emphasis as between premillennialism and post-millennialism, his emphasis was ~~in~~ in the premillennial direction very very strongly. Well at this one point he stopped and took issue with a point which the premillennialists had universally held. Now the (end of record)

e 2

A book called ~~Jesus is Coming~~ "Jesus is Coming" by W.E.B., William E. Blackstone, was very widely circulated, and it's one of the books which was perhaps especially influential in spreading premillennialism in this country. Now it's interesting to pick up that book of Blackstone's, in which he has a great deal to say about the return of Christ and its importance, about the resurrection of Christ, about the changes ^{in this earth} to take place when Christ returns, about the differing fate at His return of the saved and the lost, and so on. It's interesting to take up that book and see what he says about a millenium, and you find that he has very little on it. It is hardly much more than touched upon in the book. The premillennialists simply assumed

the millenium, and Christ would come before it. The post-millennialists assumed the millenium, and Christ wouldn't come until after. And so since Voss's work and some others after him, there has come very sharp criticism of the whole question of the millenium: Is there actually to be such a millennial kingdom or not. Now personally I would incline to think that the question per se if whether there is a millenium or not is not actually as important as the question of what the next step is in God's economy. If we are looking forward to a great period of righteousness on this earth before Christ comes, or if we're looking forward to Christ's coming, there's a tremendous difference in our attitude. The difference between ^{about 2} is far greater than the difference between the question of whether after His return He sets ~~up~~ up His Kingdom on this earth, or whether after His return he simply winds up the affairs of this earth. As far as our immediate practical attitude is concerned, there are the two main viewpoints, the premillennial viewpoint and the post-millennial viewpoint. And between them there would seem to be something of a watershed, and it would seem to be rather vital for the Christian to determine whether the Scripture clearly teaches one or other of these views. The question of the millenium just per se might not seem to be so extremely important. The question is, What vitally affects our attitude? However we must say this of course. If the Bible clearly teaches something, then it's vital we stand on it. If the Bible definitely takes a position it's very vital we take that position. If it's not clear what position the Bible takes it's not so ~~vital~~ vital. Then naturally we can ask the question, Is it a matter on which it's important that we take a ~~stand~~ stand. But the matter of our attitude is vital; that is one thing every Christian ought to study and to study very carefully and see just what the Scripture teaches about it. Now of course a matter not directly/ affect-

affect our attitude but it might affect our methods of interpreting Scripture. And from this viewpoint it might assume ^{an importance on} a proportion to its practical relationship. It might be that I would take a certain attitude on the teaching of a part of the Scripture, and that logically the attitude that I take there if carried ~~through~~ out will have tremendous effect on other doctrines in the Scripture. Now if that can be demonstrated to be the case, that magnifies the matter into an importance which it might not have otherwise. Now we don't assume that is the case, but we keep that before us as a possibility. If that is the case then of course it's vital that we notice that. Then as a third matter in this connection, the matter of the millenium has come to discussion to point where it becomes something of a dividing line between Christians. ~~For~~ People ask, "What is your stand on the millenium?" And under these circumstances it is necessary that one, even apart from these other considerations, think the thing through and study ~~the~~ it through and be ready to say, "The Bible doesn't teach clearly on it, and therefore I don't take any position," or for you to say, "The evidence is rather evenly ~~is~~ balanced, but I think it inclines a little this way," or to say, "To my mind the evidence is actually clear in this direction, I feel that it is necessary that I take a stand in this ~~difficult~~ situation as being what the Scripture teaches, even though I recognize that there are good Christians who take this view and it is not something to divide, that is at all to the difference between Christians and unbelievers. When I began ~~to~~ teaching in Westminster Seminary, I found that the attitude, and the attitude which was sincerely taken by the men who founded that Seminary, Dr. Robert Dick Wilson and by Dr. John Gresham Machen, was the attitude that we are here to stand for the great essential principles of the Word of God; we are here to stand for the belief in God, the dependability of His Word, salvation through

the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, the great, outstanding, clearly-taught doctrines, and we're not going to take a stand on the matter of the millenium. We are going to permit freedom in our faculty--premillennial, post-millennial, all the way over. It's up to the individual. We're going to permit freedom in our students; it's a secondary matter. These others are the great vital matters. That was the position which was presented to me when I became a member of the faculty. And it was a position which I tried sincerely to uphold. ~~Through~~ Through a number of years/ I took this attitude: These others are so important, so vital, that we stand for the Word of God, and that we stand for salvation through the blood of Christ, that it's very foolish that we divide up into factions, ~~and~~ disunion over details of the millenium. And consequently let one hold this view, and let the other hold this view on this matter. The vital thing is that we have the clear position on the great essentials ^{doctrines} of ~~the~~ Scripture. I tried to take that position. I understood that was the position ~~the~~ seminary was taking. And even up to the very last year I was there, I was given to understand it was the position which the ~~the~~ seminary was holding. I believe Dr. Wilson and Dr. Machen both very sincerely held that. But I found more and more as time went on that other members of the faculty who in their classes were assiduously devoting their effort to trying to convince the ~~the~~ students that premillennialism was wrong. I found an animosity on the part of some of these men; I found a very strong and determined attitude; I found sometimes in private conversation with them a sneering attitude toward men on account of being premillennialists which convinced me there was an animosity there, there was a hatred, there was an opposition which was not quite in harmony with the attitude of the founders of the seminary and the attitude which was being publicized as being the viewpoint which the seminary was taking and the attitude which I ^{had} ~~was taking~~ taken through those years.

~~And/??/~~

And I found it necessary in the face of that attitude , in the face of that opposition to it, ~~to~~ in the face of that attempt people's belief in premillennialism , I found it necessary to think through the matter much more carefully than I ever had before, and to come to a decision for my self on just how much importance there is in it, how much stress there is on it in the Scripture, how definite is the Scriptural evidence upon it. And I don't think my viewpoint was much altered as the result of that investigation/ ^{but} My feeling of ^{the} emphasis, the importance of it, was very greatly altered, as a result of that investigation. Now I have known post-millennialists, I have known amillennialists, who have seemed to me to be utterly devoted to the spread of the Gospel, and who have seemed to me to be as fine Christians as I've ever known, people with whom I could have the deepest of Christian fellowship. I've known others who have seemed to me to have that hatred against premillennialists, a hatred and a strong feeling on this matter to which I could find no reasonable ground. I mean, supposing that Christ isn't going to reign on this earth. Supposing that I'm a little bit deluded in believing that He is. Well I don't know what great harm my delusion is doing, I don't know how it could interfere with my work, I don't know how it is going to prevent me in ~~being~~ being just as zealous for the salvation of souls as someone else who doesn't have this particular delusion, and I don't quite see why then it would be thought to be a tremendously important thing to try to ~~preve~~ remove that delusion from me, to try, in fact, often to make sharp lies against those who hold this particular view. Of course if one feels that the great hope ^{is} ~~of~~ the return of Christ, if one feels that Christ may come very soon, if one feels that it is vital that He finds ^{us} ~~active~~ active in the concerns of His kingdom when He comes, then that gives us a motive for Christian service, it gives us something that plays such a part in our life that it's quite natural that we would want to spread that joy and that hope to ~~to~~ others, and there's a real motive for wanting to spread that.

but the mode of trying to tear down belief that Christ would rule in an earthly kingdom after He comes back, and the thing that I've never in fact been able to figure out, and yet it is there ⁱⁿ if any individuals and it is strong enough that it makes it necessary that the Christian leaders think this thing through and study it through and determine rather definitely and rather clearly just what his attitude is going to be on the matter. Now Dr. Buswell suggested that we begin with the consideration of the question of the millenium, and so we're going to start not the way one would probably have started fifty years ago, ~~but~~ then you would have said, "Here is the one viewpoint: The church is going to fill up the world; the world will get better and better, all will be converted. Here's the other viewpoint: Christ is going to come back before this world reaches that position. Which of these two viewpoints is correct?" Naturally we'll enter into that. But that's not the view that we're going to start with. We're going to start with this question. First: Is there going to be a period of righteousness upon this earth transcending anything that the world has yet seen? I don't whether that is very clearly expressed. I purposely avoided the word millenium. I do not want the question to involve the length of the period. I don't want it to involve any great amount of detail about it. Perhaps "The Golden Age" would be a better phrase. ~~Is~~ ^{there} Is/going to be a Golden Age upon the earth, something so wonderful that people have been justified for centuries, yes for a millenium, in looking forward to it, and a great golden age that has not yet come to this earth but is definitely promised in the Scripture. Is there going to be such an age? Now such an age is often called "millenium", but since the word "millenium" means "thousand years" let's not prejudge the matter as to how long it is. It doesn't matter much to the argument whether it's a thousand years long, or three hundred years long, or ten thousand years long, but it is a period of some length, not just something like a day or two, a period of substantial length which can be

considered to be a Golden Age, such that people have looked forward to it rightly on the basis of Scripture and that we should still look forward to it. Is there ~~sub~~ to be such a period upon this earth. Now does the Bible teach whether there is or not. I don't say, "Does the Bible teach whether there is or isn't?" Does the Bible teach whether there is or isn't? And if the Bible teaches that there is, how clearly, ^{does it teach} how definitely/ that there is. Now of course is one question. A second question which can not be altogether sharply separated from it would be the question, "What is to be the nature of the Golden Age?" You can't consider evidence as to whether there is or is~~n't~~/ not a Golden Age without having some idea of some of its characteristics, but you can consider it without having your mind made up about a great number of its characteristics. You can first determine is there or is there not going to be such a Golden Age, and then second you can take up the question, ~~if/so/whether/so~~ after you come to a definite idea as to whether the Scripture teaches this, and^{if}/so how definite. Then you can take up the question, "If there is to be such a Golden Age, what are to be its characteristics?" ~~It~~ Is it to be universal, does it cover the entire earth, does it cover ~~it~~ only a portion of the earth? Is it to be a period when all will be converted, or when only most will be converted? Is it to be a period when all will have resurrection bodies, or when some will have resurrection bodies and some not have resurrection bodies. There are many questions which may be raised about it. I can't say they ~~they~~ all can be answered. It stands to reason that you cannot answer every question about anything. God hasn't revealed all of it. One method of argument on this matter which I always think is extremely unfair, is when people start in to try to prove ~~it~~ there can't be such a period ~~it~~ because you don't know the answer to some question about its nature. ~~That~~ then as to anything there are many ~~things~~ questions about the nature

that you don't know the answers. That's not a proper argument. This question is, "Is there to be such a period?" And that if there is to be such a period, then "What can we learn about its nature?" I think that the question can be kept to some extent separate. Wouldn't you think so, Dr. Buswell? That we should not allow ourselves to jump back and forth hastily from one of them to the other. One precedes the other. There's no point in arguing about what its nature's going to be if you're not sure if there is to be such a period. You might be like the colored woman who somebody came to with a complaint. They said her dog had bitten them. They came and made a big complaint to her (end of record)

She said, "He's not vicious, he wouldn't bite anybody," and she said, "In the second place the dog wasn't at home that day you called. In the third place I don't have any dog anyway." Well now whether we had a dog or not should come first-should-come-first before you consider the question of whether the dog is vicious or not. That the most peaceful-appearing on occasion and the matter of the nature of it is a secondary matter. The first question is, is there such a dog or not? Is there to be such a Golden Age or not? That's the first question. And if we have to enter into the question of its nature some, while we're considering this question, let's do it with the feeling that it's only incidental, and avoid getting into that question, but that is the second question, "What is its nature?" The first question is, "Is there to be such an age?" Well now there's a third question which I think cannot be avoided and the third question is, if there is going to be such a golden age, what is the relationship of this Golden Age to other features in God's plan. ~~Now~~ Now this perhaps is also quite secondary to the question whether there is to be such an age. There may ^{be} relationships which we may not fully understand,

which we would not have a background sufficient for us to be able to make a judgment upon it. It is a secondary question. And yet it is one which could conceivably produce arguments or evidences which would cast great doubt upon the original question, whether there was to be such an age or not. It could, but I think it is a secondary question. I think we should say just a word now as to the main aspects entering into this third question. Have them in mind, even though I don't think they are the first thing with which we want to deal. As we look forward to the divine economy the question of the rapture is not a part of the question of the millenium at all. A person can be a premillennialist and can believe in a rapture before the tribulation, before the wrath, after the tribulation, after the wrath, the beginning of the week, the middle of the week, the end of the week, on Tuesday or on Thursday or on Saturday. One can hold any one of these views as a premillennialist, as a post-millennialist, or as an amillennialist. It's an entirely distinct question, has nothing whatever to do with the question that we have. It doesn't enter into one's view on the millenium, because any one of these views of the rapture can be held in connection with any view regarding the millenium. So that is altogether aside from our present discussion. Now, theoretically, any view of the resurrection might conceivably be held in relation to the view of the millenium. Will Christ come back to this earth and set up His kingdom and reign, and then at the end of His reign raise the believers from the dead? Or does He do it at the beginning? Does Christ raise the unbelievers from the dead at the beginning of His reign or does He do it toward the end of His reign. Theoretically, these might be fitted in in any way that you wanted to fit them. But as a practical matter, those who believe in premillennialism base a good bit of their idea not on their being a millenium, but of the relationship of the millenium to other aspects upon the teaching of Revelation 20, and they find it taught in Revelation 20 that in the beginning of the millenium the righteous dead are raised, and then they find

that the wicked dead are not raised until the end of the millenium.. And so premilleialists believe that there are two phases of the resurrection from the dead, that the righteous are raised at the beginning of the millenium, that the wicked are raised at the end of the millenium, and that there is a Golden Age upon the earth in-between these two resurrections in which time Satan is bound, and a time when righteousness covers the earth as the waters cover the sea, and then the great time of judgment of the wicked coming at the end of the resurrection. This is based upon Revelation 20. Theoretically, one could believe ⁱⁿ that premillennialism and hold an entirely different idea of the relationship of the resurrections, but that is the view which premillennialists have accepted on the basis of Revelation 20. Now a great deal of criticism of premillennialism is based upon the attempt to prove that all the ~~deqa~~ dead are raised at once, that there are not two resurrections, but one resurrection, If this were proven that there's one ~~general~~ resurrection, and not two separate resurrections of the righteous and the unrighteous, if this is proven it would prove that premillennialists were incorrect in their interpretation of Revelation 20. I'm not sure that it would prove necessary that premillennialism, per se, is the problem, because theoretically the general resurrection could come either before or after. Theoretically you could have the judgement of all the wicked at the beginning of the millenium, if it weren't for Revelation 20 we wouldn't know (almost 6)

Nevertheless it becomes a point which is much discussed and into which we must look. When is the resurrection of the dead? Are there two resurrections, or is there one? I don't think it's so vital, ^{is} it's vital to proving whether premillennialism is true or not, but it certainly affects premillennialism as generally understood on the basis of Rev. 20. Now I think that ~~ppp~~ presents perhaps the main questions/^{with} which we are

dealing at the ~~stae~~ start of our course. As we go on we may find other questions we may want to deal with after these, or we may even want to interrupt our discussion to take up some other question that seems particularly vital at the time. I think however before we start in on the direct study of one of these questions of Old Testament evidence on it, I'd like to ask Dr. Buswell if he would like to say something in an introductory way, perhaps in supplement to what I said, perhaps in agreement with something I said, or further clarification at any rate.

Dr. Buswell. (abstract 7 1/2)

The question of ~~historical~~-grammatico interpretation is involved, which for all of us is a matter of immense importance, and then, *photo-graphically?* *7 1/2* the question of the relationship of the material world in the great economy of God is somewhat involved. There is a tendency on the ~~part~~ part of those who wish to explain away the Golden Age or the millenium to make things more and more figurative as you get farther along the end of the Testament, so that grammatico-historico interpretation, in place of the temporal tangible world is one aspect of the question that would come out/ just as Dr. MacRae developes his outline.

Dr. MacRae.

I think those two matters Dr. Buswell has mentioned are extremely important matters. They would come ~~indirectly~~ indirectly out of our present subject rather than directly. We will on as we go forward in the subject to see to how great an extent they are concerned in it, but it might easily work out that one or other of these two matters he's mentioned, perhaps both of them, would prove to be of even greater importance than the actual question of the millenium, and if so, we'll want to stop and go into that a bit at length. Dr. Buswell wanted me to go into Old T^{est}am^{ent} evidence as to whether there is to be such a millennial period or not. ~~to do that first.~~ ^{to do that first.} Now there are many statements in the Old

Testament which touch upon this question. There are many points in the Old Testament which ~~at~~ at which there seems to be a looking-forward. There are many points at which one gets the impression that God is going in some way to bring to pass upon this earth a great Golden Age of happiness and joy. There are many passages which seem to have a stress upon ^{an} ultimate, complete victory of God's, upon a putting down of every enemy and establishing of God's will universally. Many of these passages of course would be susceptible by themselves of various interpretations, and while it ~~could~~ be interesting and valuable to look at a great many of these passages, I think for the purpose of the course I would like to confine myself ~~to~~ almost entirely to three passages, simply because I think these three passages would be particularly helpful in examining and seeing if there is definite and inescapable evidence that there is actually to be a Golden Age upon this earth. I'd like to confine myself mostly at present to these three passages. Later on we may look at many others; it might be that we would look at the New Testament picture at first. But I think it is always wise in taking up any ~~course~~ question to ~~try~~ try to get the strongest arguments for it and examine them and see how much weight they hold, and ~~to~~ not to let yourself get lost in the maze of material, and so I'd like to take up three ^{passages} ~~factors~~ and see whether we can draw fairly definitely from them certain conclusions to the question, "Is there to be a Golden Age upon this earth?" Now the material that we take up in connection with these three passages--- I've gone into ~~the~~ it quite extensively in the Prophets course, and- It would seem worth our while dealing just with this question, not with the many side-questions, to take the time to go ~~father~~ fully into these particular passages. I call your attention first to the Book of Micah. We notice that in the Book of Micah we have a section beginning with chapter three in which the prophet is dealing with the wickedness of the leaders of the people of Israel, the people of the kingdom of Judah.

And we find him criticizing the rulers and the prophets and the seers of
J
Judah through chapter three rather at length. And finally he reaches
the point in verse 12 of ch.3 in which he says, "Therefore shall Zion for
your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the
mountain of the house as the high places of the fort. Now of course
theoretically this might be a ~~gt~~ figurative verse. Theoretically this
might simply denote an end to the ideals and aspirations of Judah. It
might indicate an overthrow in the great religious viewpoint of Judaism,
and there might be certain ways of taking the verse figuratively, but
we find as a matter of fact that the verse was fulfilled in a very literal
fashion, and it was understood by the Jews, and it's been understood by
Christians ever since as having been fulfilled in this very literal
thing which occurred which was exactly what was predicted here. Zion of
course doesn't simply mean Jerusalem andy more than ~~12~~ 10 Downing
Street means England. It is the place from which England is ruled, and
it may be used for England, but it means actually one particular place
in it. And Zion here is David's palace, it is David's headquarters.
It's that section of Jerusalem where the kings of Judah lived and ruled.
And he says that this section is going to be plowed as a ~~file--file-~~
field, and we know that when the Babylonians, 150 years after the time
of Micah, conquered Jerusalem, they made it into a great heap of ruins,
and that it became something which was largely devoted to agriculture,
and we know that this section of the city, which is called Zion, even
to the present day remains plowed as a field field. It is outside the
city wall; it is a place which is simply a field and not a city at all

e 4

has visited Jerusalem and has seen the condition of devastation to which
it came after the Babylonian conquest and the many other conquests since,
can see exactly what it means: "Jerusalem shall become heaps."
It was just about five weeks ago that I stood in a section of Jerusalem
and I looked out. I saw right in front of me a big ~~barg-b-~~ barbed wire

entanglement, and then beyond that there were lovely buildings , very fine homes with most of the upper stories gone, ~~just~~ just shot full of holes, whole walls missing, other walls standing, just in a state of ruin, just standing there in that condition, and you could see from the wall an area a block wide stretched for miles this way and that and everthing in it just in ruins. And I stood one evening there and I saw here was a barbed wire right in front of me and ~~here~~ here were the Arab policemaen marching along, here were their guns on their shoulders and watching intently, here was this barbed wire , and behind it little Arab children playing, running back and forth, hollering and having a lot of fun, and then I could see through the barbed wire and through the ruins there , over at the other side I couls see another barbed wire entanglement, and on the other side I could see the little Jewish children playing, throwing their balls back and forth and running around, and here were the Jewish children at play, having a good time, and here were the Arab children ~~at~~ at play, in-between was this this utter devastation and ruins with the barbed wire entanglement on both sides, and practically every week, not where, but somewhere in the length of Palestine, somebody killed through accidentally stubling into the no-man's area and being shot by one side or the te other side. That area of devastation right through the land today. Of course that is not the particular devaxtation here spoken of, bu t it simply brings vividly to one's thought what is described here, as Jerusalem became heaps after the Babylonian conquest and of course it has been devastated time after time since that time. "Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house--" That word "mountain" as you know in Hebrew also means "a Hill," There is no distinction in Hebrew between hill and mountain. "And the mountain of the house " means the hill on which the temple was, the mountain of the house to become like the high place of a ~~fort~~ fort. Just like a height in the midst of a fortg/. A hill there with trees

growing over ~~it~~, left open, such was the situation of the temple of Jerusalem after the Babylonian conquest. Today I am sure that that area seems like that to the Jews even though it doesn't look like it. Because today the Jews, in their area, have their houses and their streets ~~and~~ their crowded area in the great bulk of the city of Jerusalem which they have, and there they are, and they look over here at that high place which they can see, and there is the old site of the temple, ~~the~~ there it stands, the top flattened off, and hardly ~~any~~ anything on it, and here they are crowded; up there is the large open space and the area, and on ~~it~~ a beautiful Mohammedan mosque in the center, another one over here on the side, the Mohammedans walking back and forth upon them, no Jew even allowed to get to the wailing wall any more, to the place where for many centuries they would come and weep at the side of that temple area down below where there were a few of the large stones left from the second temple., They can no longer get near to that area any more, but back there they look and surely to them it seems as if the mountain of the ~~of~~ house is like the high place of the fort. It actually was, of course, after the Babylonian captivity. After the Babylonian devastation of Jerusalem this terrible thing here was very very literally fulfilled, and this Micah said was the result of the sins of the people who should have been following God. And then he goes right on, (and most of this class knows enough not to let a chapter heading interrupt the progress of thought) he goes right on, ~~that/it/is/it/it/it/~~ he says, "but in the last day it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, exalted above the hills, and people shall flow to it," and the next verse ends, "for the law shall go forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." And here ~~of~~ we have three phases just mentioned: the mountain of the house, all three of them ~~mentioned~~ ^{mentioned ~~of~~} ~~there/in~~ reverse order to what they were mentioned in chapter 4. We are

told that for the ^{sin of the} people these three places are to be devastated, are to come to ruin. Then we are told that three places, however, at a later period, are to be exalted. And so we have a wonderful promise of God which is given, a promise which is given, a promise which is brought right into close relationship to the previous about the devastation~~s~~ which has come to these places, a promise which at first sight at least, would seem to mean that these particular, literal earthly places which were then devastated are later to be exalted. Now I don't say that it would be impossible for this juxtaposition of verses to consider that there was a figurative significance rather than a direct significance in these~~s~~ particular place names, but I do say there is a very strong presumption from the arrangement here that those places which have just been spoken of in this very literal fashion as to be devastated and were thus devastated that when he goes on to speak of the exaltation that he is speaking of the same places, and that he is presenting something to refer to the same literal, physical places as what he just finished talking about. Now what does he say about these places? Well the passage runs through four verses, vs. 1-4. Vs. 1-4 are clearly a unit. There is no question that they are presenting a situation. They are describing something which he gives as a wonderful hope for the future, in contradistinction to the terrible fate which is to come first. And this wonderful hope which he gives, I think the clearest^r parts ~~of~~ of it are the last two verses. They are extremely clear. The first two might be susceptible to various interpretations perhaps, if it were not for their connection with the last two verses. Even though there is a presumption in favor of the literal interpretation of the first two verses on account of their relationship to the verse that precedes. Now I don't suppose there's anybody here that takes the first verse literally and I hope ~~they~~ ^{there} isn't because see how you could. I think that the bulk of it is to be taken literally, but

I am sure that ~~of/it/~~that certain elements of it are figurative, are beautiful figures. "The mountain of the house of the Lord will be established in the top (or at the head) of the mountain." The word Ψ^7 , the head, the top, now the head, that means "a position of primacy," "a position of superiority," "a Position of coming first," I think our English word "top" is a little misleading there, it suggests that physical height is purely in mind. It could refer to physical height, but it would ~~do~~ just as well refer to a supremacy, to its being given the first place. "The mountain of the house of the Lord," the temple area of Jerusalem, that is to be established at the head of the mountains; it is to be superior to Mount Olympus, the headquarters of Greek culture, Greek thought, Greek genius, it is to be superior to the seven hills of Rome, the headquarters of human government, the headquarters of political power, the headquarters of great national supremacy. At the head of these, above these, superior to these, is to be established the mountain of the temple of the Lord at Jerusalem. It will be "exalted above the hills" Again the word "exalt" might mean there's going to be a physical lifting of it up until it's thousands of feet high, but it surely would be just as well and just as literally understood to mean it is given a place of supremacy. The place ~~there~~ where there is an element that is not literal is the last phrase in the verse, "People shall flow unto it." People don't flow. People walk, or they ride, they swim, they fly, they drive, but they don't flow. "People flow unto it" sounds as if it were not lifted up but placed down low so that all the streams could flow into it. It suggests a force that brings them up, not altogether their simply desiring to come, but their being brought by a force which is almost irresistible, like water flowing into a certain place. It surely is a figurative term. People "flow" unto it, showing the tremendous attraction the tremendous attractive power that this place is to have brought to it.

Well now, as to what this verse means taken alone, it could have various meanings, of course. It ~~is~~ could refer to a political exaltation of Jerusalem, it ~~is~~ could refer to an exaltation of the religion that comes from there, superior above all other religions and all other cultural forces in the world, the verse alone could be fulfilled in any one of various ways. The second verse, the first part of it is similar. It could be fulfilled ~~at~~ in various ways. Many nations shall ~~come~~ and say, "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the ~~house~~ of the God of Jacob, and He will teach^{us}/of His ways and we will walk in His paths." A ^{desire} ~~desire~~ of the nations to find out what the will of the Lord is which can be learned at the mountain of the ~~Lord~~ Lord, at the temple area. When does this desire come to pass? Where do we ~~is~~ find it? Is there anything which has happened in the world up to the present time which could be thought of as a fulfillment of this second verse? I don't know whether we could possibly say vs. 1, 2 might have been fulfilled in the spread of the Gospel. It might be thought of as having been fulfilled in the great interest which came to ~~an~~ nations all over the world in ~~learning~~ more about Christianity in coming to Him whose Word has come forth from the temple area in Jerusalem. Perhaps the first verse and the first two-thirds of the second verse could refer to something like that. I think however we could rule this~~is~~ out. If there is not a millenium, then I think we can safely say vs. 1 here and the first two-thirds of vs. 2 hardly refer to anything after the return of Christ. What is there in Heaven? What is there in the eternal state? What is there after the return of Christ if there is not a millenium which would be a fulfillment of vs. 1 and the first two-thirds of vs. 2? I do not know what it could be. They might conceivably relate to something ~~entirely~~- in connection with the going-out of the Gospel, the spread of Christianity through the world, they might fit in with a post-millennial interpretation, a world which is paying

homage to Jerusalem, the center from which the Gospel has come, and going to the Bible to find its answer to all problems; it might relate to that, but would they relate to anything which would be after the return of Christ if there's not a millenium? I would hardly think so. Well, now the last part of the verse then, "The law shall go forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Now it seems to me that this probably belongs to the next verse, "The law shall go forth from Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and He shall judge among many people." It would seem rather closely bound with what follows, rather than what precedes, because in the first two-thirds of the verse they're wanting to go up to the mountain of the house of the Lord in order to have Him teach them of His paths, but for the Law to go forth from Zion, the Word of the Lord to go forth from Jerusalem is the opposite direction, not their coming up there to get it but it's going out to where they are, and the next vs refers to something going out from Jerusalem to where the people are. And so it would seem to me that probably this last third of the verse is ^{really} part of verse 30. Well now if this is not a part of vs.

3, if it goes to vs. 2, it could surely conceivably refer to the new-Gospel. The law of God goes forth from Zion, the Word of the Lord goes forth from Jerusalem; perhaps there is here a picture of the Gospel going forth to the ends of the earth starting in Jerusalem, Jerusalem, then Samaria, and to the ends of the earth. But it is hardly a picture of something after the return of Christ if there is not a millenium. ~~If~~ Now if it goes with the following verse, and that seems to me more natural because of the reversion of direction otherwise, from what preceded, the following verse then would give a different idea as to what kind of a law this is. The law shall go forth and the Word of the Lord could mean the law of the Gospel, the Word of salvation, the law of how one can be

(end of record)

But if it goes with what follows, it's a different kind of a law, that which "Law of
 " more usually suggests. One nation conquers another and sends its law into
 it and tells it what to do, rather than-- when we give an opportunity that's not ~~an~~
 the law. After the atomic bomb was dropped in Japan we gave them an opportunity to
 surrender. That was not the law there, that was an opportunity of safety from further
 bombs, and opportunity of surrender, an opportunity of the end of war. In a sense it is
 law, but not in the usual sense. But after they surrendered, then the law of the United
 Nations went to Japan, and General MacArthur went in there and laid down his edicts and
 declared how Japan was to be run after that, that was the law of the United Nations
 coming from the United States over to Japan and governing that ~~N~~ nation from that time
 on. Well now "the law going forth from Zion, the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
 might then describe a situation in the millenium with Christ reigning in Jerusalem.
 It could conceivably by a little bit of a twist, but not too naturally, describe the
 going forth of the Gospel in this age, but I don't think if there's not a millenium
 it can refer to anything after the return of Christ. It has ~~to~~ to be the Gospel ~~going~~
 going back and forth. Now vs 3, if this last part goes with vs 3 or whether it does or
 not, vs. 3 "He shall judge among many ~~pop~~ people, and rebuke strong nations afar off,"
 is that a picture of the Gospel? Is that a description when you send missionaries out
 to Africa, do you say that they go to judge among the people, and to rebuke strong
 nations afar off? I've never heard that terminology used of missionaries (2~~1~~).
 That sounds ~~rather~~ rather like emissaries who go with power to/compel respect to their command.
 It does not sound like the beseeching message of salvation ~~sent~~ sent out with the Gospel
 in this age. "He shall judge among many ~~pedple~~ people and rebuke strong nations afar off."
 It is pretty hard to my notion to take this verse ~~and~~ and in any other way than of a
 compulsive force/ ^{which is} compelling submission to it among those who perhaps, although they are
 strong might not wish to obey. It seems to describe a forceful government of compulsion,
 this particular verse. Now the result of this compulsion here is a result which could
 conceivably come from the spread of the Gospel, for/it is here meant to come from the
 spread of the Gospel, then the first part of the verse is very, very peculiarly spoken.
 I would expect another language if it means people are brought to the Gospel. It

continues, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," and this is of course what the United States resolved in 1945, we resolved not to learn war any more, and so we destroyed our planes, we wrecked our ships, we sent all our men home, we did away with our preparations. It was no longer ^{necessary} to learn war any more; the war was won, and Satlin and Roosevelt had agreed that the world would be safe from now. We decided not to learn war any more. But the last two or three years we've been changing our minds and starting in ~~again~~ again to learn war. We have not yet reached sufficient ~~(4)~~ ^{3 1/2} in the world in which this might be fulfilled. Now ~~Possibly~~ Roosevelt thought that the United Nations could judge among people and rebuke strong nations afar off, and therefore it wouldn't be necessary for us to learn war, because the United Nations would declare what must be done and put an end to all controversies and difficulties. But it hasn't worked out in that way. This is something, "They shall not learn war any more," which so far as I know has never been fulfilled in ~~the~~ ^{the} world. There are nations which have ceased to ~~tl~~ learn war, but usually they have soon reached the situation where they couldn't learn war any more if they wanted, they were swallowed up/ sometime not so very long after they ceased it. In some ways the most peaceful nation in the world is Switzerland. For over a century Switzerland has been involved in no war. ~~Perhaps~~ the most peaceful nation on earth. And yet there is ^{the face of the} no nation ~~on~~ ^{on} earth which has more assiduously learned war than Switzerland, because the Swiss are realists, and they ~~do~~ that in the world as it is today, if you're going to be peaceful you have to learn war. In 1929 I travelled through Switzerland quite a bit, and I remember at that time, after being through Germany, France and other countries, I nowhere had the same impression of people of people interested in war that I had in Switzerland. In 1929 in Germany, very few knew anything about war, and no one wanted to know anything about war. There was very little interest in war in France in 1929, or in England, or in any country in Europe, bu in Switzerland in 1929 I walked across the San Vissar Pass and as I came to the summit of the pass I saw big signs there, and these signs said, "On this day, this day, this day, this day," they named four days, they were three days after the time I walked across it, "On these days people are warned not to walk through

this area, because there will be artillery fire all through this area, and sham battles and practice going through at this time. " Three weeks ago I walked through a section of Switzerland, and I came into a little town for lunch, and I saw a sign ^{there} up, and it said, "Next Tuesday, Thursday and Friday there will be shooting in this certain valley," and they named three or four valleys, "Friday and Saturday there will be artillery fire in certain valleys," they ~~named~~ ^{named} about ten valleys. There was going to be artillery fire and going to be shooting. And I got somebody to go over the list and show me where it was, because I didn't want to wander into it by mistake. The trains in Switzerland at that time and today, you saw men there with uniforms on, carrying guns. Switzerland has assiduously learned war; they have trained their men to it; they have filled their mountains with hidden fortresses and hidden guns, and they have prepared for war so thoroughly that they have not had to fight any for centuries, because they have been constantly ready to defend themselves from any attack. Now that's a wonderful condition of peace which Switzerland has managed to maintain. I don't think they've lost any people as a result of war except when one ~~night~~ United States bomber made a mistake and bombed one Swiss city in 1943, and we paid ~~reparation-~~ reparations in damages to the people. ~~Except~~ Except for that there have been no fatalities when all the countries around them have been having thousands and millions of people killed in a war. It's a wonderful thing but it's ~~th~~ not ~~the~~ thing described in this verse. This verse says, "Neither shall they learn war any more," not that just they'll be peaceful, but they won't have to defend themselves. "They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." That's what we did three years ago; and we're now doing the opposite. "Nation will not lift up a sword against nation." You can say you will not lift up a sword against the other nation, but that's not what this is saying. This is saying ^{that} // "Neither will you lift up against the other nor will the other lift up against you. It is describing a condition in which it is not necessary to prepare, a situation which we have never yet seen on this earth. ^{Pusey} ~~The~~ ~~Chasey~~ (?) almost 8) a very evangelical orthodox writer, in his Commentary on the Minor Prophets, explains this verse in the first place as being fulfilled in the condition of peace which existed in

the world when Christ came to this world and He was born in Bethlehem. He said, "The kingdom of Christ, even as it exerts an influence forward also exerts an influence backward, and the result was that there was peace upon this earth when Christ was born; for the first time in history there was peace upon this earth. And for a century or two after the birth of Christ people could go from Jerusalem clear to Spain, back and forth in absolute safety; there was peace reigning, there was a condition the world had never seen before, it was the fruit of the kingdom of Christ, and it was that which was predicted in this verse. But was that what was predicted in this verse? The peace which existed there was not the result of the birth of Christ; it was the result of the Roman Army having conquered that territory and held it, and the Roman arms were holding it in a condition of peace, and there were Roman soldiers here and there compelling people through that area, and the Romans were very assiduously learning war during that day in order to maintain peace in the world-area, and on the borders of the Roman Empire in Germany, between England and Scotland, and in the east over toward Persia the Romans were constantly fighting during that period, trying to extend their borders, and sometimes being driven back and having their borders their borders lessened. It was a time when there was a big area which had peace, but the peace was not a result of their not learning war, but a result of their learning war, and it was a very limited peace. Pusey's interpretation has the advantage of taking the phrases comparatively literally here, but it has the disadvantage of not taking all the phrases into account, and it does not fit the situation. But Pusey is not alone in that. He quotes from early Christian writers who ^{said,} say; "You question whether Christianity is true? Why Micah predicts there is going to be peace, they're going to beat their swords into plowshares, and look what we've got! Look at the wonderful condition of peace! The world has never seen anything like it." And many/^aChristian (apologist?) gave that wonderful argument. But the trouble was that after two centuries the Roman soldiers ceased to be as good fighters as they'd been before, and the barbarians flooded over the land. And then as Pusey explains, the heathen and the pagan turned the argument against

the Christians, and they said, "Look here, you said Christianity is proved because you had this peace. Well now you don't have it any more. Look at the barbarian armies sweeping over most of the country. Look at Rome being sacked. Look at all these terrible things that are happening. There's war everywhere; you have to learn war to be safe. How can you say Christianity is proved, because Christianity said there wouldn't be war anymore. Christianity said peace, and here Christ came to the earth, you had ~~the~~ the peace, yes, but He didn't bring it, the Roman armies brought it, and now it has come to an end. It proves you're completely wrong, and there's ~~nothing~~ nothing to Christianity." And Pusey would do much better to admit ~~that~~ that the early Christians had misinterpreted the Bible there, and had applied it ^{at a place where it} ~~where-it~~/didn't apply at all, that that wasn't what it applied to, than to give it as a wonderful fulfillment, and then say that then there came the difficulty and it didn't last. And so Pusey said, "Well that wasn't it then. It looks as if it was the fulfillment of it, but it isn't really. Therefore we say that it's fulfilled in the character of the Gospel. Wherever people are ~~converted~~- converted, they cease to be warlike, they're peaceful they're friendly, they're helpful, therefore we can say they are in imagination beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, they're not showing the hostile attitude they did before, they're not lifting up their swords against other individuals, they're not wishing to learn war, even though many of them have to still, and therefore this is the character of the Gospel." Now the last two-thirds of this verse certainly isn't a description of the character of the Gospel. If this is a description of the character of the ~~Gosp~~- Gospel, then you're almost to where you can't be sure what anything means, because it's quite a jump from the sound of these words from the meaning as ^{arranged} ~~arranged~~-here to the character of the Gospel. If the original peace had lasted that would

ground
 have been a much better ground to say (?). But that original ~~g~~ peace
 didn't come from Christ's kingdom; it came from a different source.
 It was not a peace in which they were not learning war, and it didn't last.
 Well then either this is a mistake, it's not true, or else it's something
 that is yet to come. To my mind it is pretty hard to get ~~g~~ away from
 the conclusion that this verse in ~~Micah~~ ^{Micah} here ~~doesn't~~- definitely predicts
 that there is going to be an age of peace upon this earth, an age of peace
 during which there will be such peace that it won't be necessary to learn,
 that you won't have to practice ^{defending yourself,} defense any more, that you'll be safe,
 there'll be nothing to fear. I don't see how you can get away from that
 in verse 3, in this passage. It seems to me to be not only a reasonable
 interpretation, but just about the only reasonable interpretation of the
 verse, and I don't see how you can escape the conclusion here that this
 verse ~~it~~ is closely related to what precedes, and that it is the result of
 what precedes, and so if you want to overlook for the moment the first part
 of verse 3, where He judges and rebukes strong nations, if you want to over-
 look that language, and take verses 1 and 2 as the Gospel going out into
 the world, the Gospel goes into the world, it spreads through the world,
 people say, "Let's learn the law of the Lord; it goes out from Zion,
 we want Him to teach it." It's the Gospel going out. Verses 1 and 2
 could perhaps be interpreted ~~that~~ that way. Now the first part of verse 3
 doesn't sound much like it~~s~~, "to judge among people and rebuke strong
 nations," but let's overlook that. Let's say that this is still the
 progress of the Gospel. If you do, then you go on and say the latter
 part of verse 3 says that the Gospel is going to be so effective that it's
 going to put an end to the war-like activity of all the peoples of the
 earth, that the strong nations will be rebuked through the Gospel, and
 they'll stop ~~building~~ building armaments, they will stop learning war,
 nobody will learn war and consequently nobody will have to learn war,
 and as a result of all the nations accepting the Gospel, you are going to

have universal peace and brotherhood. Well the first part of verse 3 sounds ver, very much against that interpretation, but leaving that aside, you can say that these three verses could be fulfilled with the post-millennial viewpoint, the viewpoint that the Gospel goes out and converts all nations until they all become Christians and they ~~all-become-~~ wouldn't think of hurting anybody else, and then we have a sizable period, for certainly this doesn't describe just a day, in which all the nations of the world (end of record)

And none of them will be interested in learning more, therefore none of them need fear anything, because none of them will have anything to fear. And all ~~of~~ of it the result of the preaching of the Gospel, a wonderful post-millennial picture. A post-millennial interpretation fits these three verses I think quite well except for these two objections, one not a very great ~~objection~~ objection, but a definite one, the seeming literalness of the references to these places in the first two verses as compared with the previous verse, the other a much greater one, the statement in the beginning of verse three about judging among many people and rebuking strong nations which doesn't ~~sound~~ sound like the Gospel, but rather like a strong force that compels submission. But except for those two difficulties this passage could be a description of the Gospel going forth into all the earth and converting all the world to Christ, and as a result having universal peace, and so it could be a prediction of a Golden Age, which is to come before the coming of Christ. But whether it be that or whether it be a Golden Age to be established after the coming of Christ as a result of His power, His presence, it seems to me inescapable that it is a picture of a Golden Age. If it is not a complete picture of victory in the world of the Gospel, prior to the coming of Christ, in which all the nations are converted, I don't see what it can mean after the coming of Christ if there's no millenium. If there's not a millenium I don't know how you can find any relevance of this to the return of Christ

or to anything else, if He simply has the Last Great Judgment at which all the dead are raised and they are ~~sent~~ sent, some to heaven and some to ~~eh~~ hell, than what on earth is this passage? It seems to me that this passage requires either a premillennial interpretation or a post-millennial interpretation. I ~~dem~~- don't see any other way of dealing with this specific passage, although of course we don't want to build the whole thing ~~sp/pt~~ on one passage, but that's the way that this passage impresses me very strongly. Now let's go on to verse 4. Verse 4 is an enlargement of verse 3. "They shall sit every man under vine and under his fig tree." Well, what does that mean. You just naturally go out and sit in the shade, under a vine or a fig tree. Is this an attack on Communism? Is it a ~~denies~~ denial of Socialism, "Every man under his vine and under his ~~g~~ fig tree," to show that private property is going to continue? I don't think that's the purpose of the verse. I don't think it's dealing with the fact that everybody will have a vine of his own to sit under, or a fig tree of his own to sit under. It isn't the sitting that's important in the verse; it isn't the vine and the fig tree that are important ~~that-are-important-in~~ in the verse; it's the next phrase, "and none shall make them afraid." The point of the verse is that people don't need to sit in doors behind heavy bars with strong protection; that they can go out and sit out in the open. Well now of course that doesn't ~~me~~ mean much to us in America, because we have a ~~den~~- condition of comparative safety in this country. We can go out and sit in the open ~~fi~~ field with comparatively danger. That's something that you can't do in Palestine and perhaps in the Roman era you could; I don't know of any other time before or since that you could do it in Palestine. At night you had better be indoors; you had better be where you are safe; you had better be where you have strong protection. In most of the nations of Europe there's been a terrific fear of night, of being out where you didn't have strong protection. They have enemies closer. WE have established a condition of peace through a-very fairly substantial area here. I doubt if you have anything like the same feeling of

safety in Mexico or anywhere in South America that we have here in the United States. And against the background of Palestinian conditions of 1 and conditions in the days of Micah when there were a good many bandits out in the open wilderness, and when there was a good deal of danger in the conflict of the great powers that were fighting at that time, this was a very vivid picture. A man could go right out and sit out there under his vine and under his fig tree without thinking of any danger. No one would make him afraid. He didn't need the protection of the gates and the bars of the strongholds and all that. He was safe. It is a picture of external peace and safety. I don't see any other way to interpret verse 4 than a picture of external peace and safety, freedom from external danger. It is not a picture here of peaceful in your heart in the midst of adversity. That's a wonderful teaching of the Scripture. The Christian may come into a terrible situation, enemies and dangers on every hand, and God can give him peace in the midst of it all. He can have perfect peace because his mind is stayed on Christ; he can know that all things work together for good to them that love the Lord; he can have perfect confidence. He can lie down and sleep in contentment without fear or worry, and a Christian should be able to do that, no matter what happens, because he knows that he's truly a Christian, that God is watching over him, caring for him. That is a wonderful Christian blessing, clearly taught in the Bible, but it is not the teaching of this verse. This is speaking of the time, not when you have peace in your heart, but of the time when you have peace around you. It is talking of a time when there is freedom from external danger. It is talking of a time of external peace and safety. Scripture says that when they shall cry, "Peace and safety!" then cometh sudden destruction upon you. And that shows the condition of the wicked and it shows the situation which to a large extent exists all through this age. But this is a picture of a different situation, a situation which could conceivably be established in this world as a result of the universal spread of the Gospel. -It-is If it were God's will,

if He revealed in the Scripture that it ^{were} His will that everyone on this earth should be converted to the Gospel, then we would certainly have external peace and safety, and there's no reason that anyone should say that the Holy Spirit couldn't do that, and there's no reason, if we say the Holy Spirit isn't going to do it, for someone else to say that we are belittling the power of the Holy Spirit, because it isn't a question of what power the Holy Spirit has, it is a question of what God's will is, and if it is God's will that the Spirit should convert every nation and every individual on this earth, or whether He is here to take out a people for the name of Christ rather than ^{It's a question of what God's will is.} to convert the whole world./ But here is a picture of peace and safety; external peace and safety which is here promised in this passage. Well now here is one passage then which is very ~~clear~~ clear it seems to me--I don't see how you can get any away from it that that is what this particular passage teaches. Perhaps ^{post} millennialism. There are certain difficulties with it. I don't think the difficulties in this passage are sufficient to rule out post-millennialism if we find it taught elsewhere. Perhaps post-millennialism; it seems to me that it clearly describes premillennialism, I mean that it doesn't have the particular difficulties it has with post-millennialism with verse 3, I don't see any difficulties in this passage for that. But it is a Golden Age, and I don't see how we'll get away from it, that this particular passage teaches an external Golden Age of righteousness upon the earth. And if it does, then the questions for us are two: one, what is the nature of this Golden Age. We can't assume anything about it; we must see how much God has revealed. And there will be many things He hasn't revealed, but we'll see what He has revealed. And we can't try to prove it's impossible. We mustn't try to be like the little girl that looked up at the animal in the zoo with the great, long neck. And she looked at the giraffe and she said, "Oh, there isn't any such animal. It just is impossible. How can you have such a long neck on an animal. It's

impossible." There it was. There was a fact. Now there's a fact in the Scripture. This is just one passage. We're not going to build on one passage. But here is a fact/: here is a picture of a Golden Age which Micah here clearly teaches. I don't see any way to get around it. There is either a Golden Age before the coming of ~~Christ~~ Christ produced by the preaching of the Gospel, or it is a Golden Age after the coming of Christ, produced by the going forth of the Word of the Lord from Zion, judging among many people, and rebuking strong nations afar off. I don't see how that could be a picture of heaven. I don't see how that can be a picture of the eternal state. I don't see how that could be a picture of anything ^h after the return of Christ if there is not a millenium after the return of Christ. Now that is one passage which it seems to me.

DR. Buswell: In connection with Micah 5:2, would you put much ~~wi~~-~~weig~~--weight on that as implying the personal presences of Jehovah on earth.

Dr. MacRae: No. I think perhaps it is ~~±~~ an implication, but I wouldn't put much weight on it. He will judge among many people. That is, the "He" could even be ~~teh~~ the Word of the Lord.

Dr. Mae Buswell: The subject could be the Word rather than Jehovah?

Dr. MacRae: I ^wshould think so; yes. The Word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and he will judge and rebuke strong nations. It could be that His Word goes forth and judges the people. I think that if it describes a period after the coming of Christ in which you have Christ on ^{this earth} ~~the-throne~~ judging, then there is the person of Christ here. But I wouldn't want to draw it just from the word "he." I would think that ^{they} ~~it~~ could fit with the post-millennial interpretation quite well, aside from the word "judge" and the word "rebuke" which doesn't seem to (10). Of course the roman C^htholics say we have this fulfilled in the power of the papacy. The pope sends forth his word, he tells the ⁿnations what to do, and if only the nations will obey him you'll have the whole (10+1/4) . In the middle ages they claim they did obey them, but the history of the middle ages there's a

good many exceptions, and there are far more exceptions now even than there were then. So, unless there is quite a change in the future I don't think the papacy is the subject here represented in this passage.

10 1/2
(Question) Well now I would say this: the question is--Now suppose somebody were to say , "There are iron mines in "merica." And somebody else says there isn't. The other person says, "All right. Let's go at it fairly. I want to prove to you that there are no iron mines in America. All right. There's not an iron mine in Delaware. There's not an iron mine (let us say) in Nevada. Now there's not an iron mine in Oregon. Now I've given three examples. Three great states with no iron mines in them. Now there is proof that there are no iron mines in America." You say, "Yes, but there are great iron mines in Wisconsin, there are great iron mines in Pennsylvania, there are great iron mines in Texas." Well, there's three of one and three of the other. You haven't proven anything. It might be that it wouldn't work that way. I depends on what is the nature of the question. If the question is, Are there great iron mines in America? If you can prove any you could be safe. Well now it's- if the question is, "Does the Old Testament teach that there is to be a Golden Age," then if any passage in the Old Testament clearly teaches that, it proves the case. And if you even bring a thousand other passages when there isn't any, why that doesn't prove anything. If you can bring another passage which definitely says there will not be a Golden Age, that of course is something. But I don't think any such passage has even been suggested. It depends always on the nature of the question, what is the method of approach. Now it's a fact that if you'll take up most recent books on archeology they will tell you that of course we know that the Bible is a book of myths and legends, which somehow preserved a certain amount of historical facts in the course of it. And then they'll go through the book and they'll mention the big discussion as to whether this is this way or that is that way, and somewhere in the footnote they'll incidentally mention something

that was found that fits in very strangely with certain Biblical statements, and in another footnote they mention something else that fits in, and if you take all these footnotes and put them together you've got a position. But you see, they put them in the footnotes. Well now, the question isn't, where do you put ~~it~~^{it}, the question is, what are the facts? And let's find them, wherever they are. And so if we find three passages which clearly show a Golden Age, then if you can find another passage which says there isn't one, then you've got a contradiction, and you're in an awful mess. You don't know where you are then. But you can find a thousand other ~~passages~~ passages that don't say anything about a Golden Age, that doesn't prove anything. Well that's why I would say that if a person wants to examine the question, Is there a Golden Age, no one can say you're doing it unfairly if you start anywhere you want to find evidence of it, provided you deal fairly with the evidence you- (13 3/4). Now if I take this evidence out of ~~context~~ context, that's wrong. I've tried to show where it comes from, show the situation here. You can take something out of context, ^{you can} misinterpret, you can misinterpret the Word. I'm trying to speak very fairly, and I'm trying to deal fairly with these passages. If you can prove it on the ~~p~~ basis of any passage in Scripture anywhere, you're entitled to go there provided you deal fairly with the passage. (14 1/4) (Question)

(end of record)

Considerable presumption. I don't think that proves it at all. What do you mean, the whole argument (0). I mentioned I think twenty other ~~things~~ things. (Question). A text without a context is a pretext, and to ~~take~~ take any text out of ~~relation~~ relation to context is wrong. I think we have to take it ~~in~~ in relation to context, and we have to explain how it is related to the twelfth verse. Now I didn't mean to say that the twelfth verse proves that this is to be taken literally. Not at all. But I did mean to say that the twelfth verse creates a

presumption in favor of that, that the relationship is such that the context is in favor of rather than against a literal interpretation. I don't think that that's the thing that proves it at all. I think the thing that proves it is that you have a situation here described which the Lord says is going to come to pass, and what is this that He's describing that's going to come to pass? Well I think that it can fairly well find ~~its~~ its fulfillment in a post-millennial situation, in the Gospel going out to the world, all the nations being converted, and consequently all the nations stopping anymore learning war. I think that ~~was~~ was quite a good fulfillment except two objections, one a slight (~~1/4~~ 1/4) verse 12, another a very great one, these phrases, "we shall judge among many people and judge strong nations afar off." I think those are very definite objections to a post-millennial view, but I don't think they're decisive. If this was the only passage we had in the Bible dealing with the matter at all, I wouldn't be ready to say post-millennialism is wrong. I would say it looks the other way to me, but I'm not going to be dogmatic. This passage could, to some extent, be interpreted in relation to post-millennialism. But I think this passage fits exactly with premillennialism. And I don't see how it fits with anything except premillennialism. I don't see how this can possibly be a picture of heaven. I don't see how it can possibly be a picture of the heart of the Christian in this present age. I don't see how it can possibly be a picture of anything that comes after the return of Christ if there is not a millennium. I'm trying to see how it (2 1/4-1/2) and verse 12 is I think an essential and vital element, but I think your argument would be 95% stronger without this twelfth verse. (Question) That is, I think, the objection to the post-millennial view. The impression you get from this picture here is that comes out from Jerusalem, there goes forth a word which judges among the people, and rebukes the nations with the result that they don't fight. I imagine that some other terminology would be more natural to use if that's what was meant. If all our other teaching in the Scripture were post-millennial,

I would say this is a peculiar way to express it, but not an impossible way. But it is a peculiar enough way to express it that I ~~ya/ya/~~ wouldn't think that it is something on which a post-millennial view could be built. I think it is too much different from what you would expect. You would expect it rather to say, "The Gospel will come, and lives will be changed, and they will be (3 3/4). Something like that. The ~~ya/ya/~~ love of Christ will enter their hearts and they will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. They will all turn to Christ, and they will all beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. But to say, He will judge among many nations and rebuke strong nations afar off sounds more like a central tribunal which declares the situation so there's no point in your fighting, you can't accomplish anything by it anyway, because the central tribunal tells you what going to happen, and what it says happens. It's just exactly the situation in the United States here. In the early days of the United States, before the Constitutional Convention, Pennsylvania wanted one thing and New York wanted another, and they each organized an army and set out to fight out about it and decide what it would be. And today you will find two states here, one has one idea, and the other has another idea, and it goes to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court says what is going to be, and the people in the state may not like it, but they submit to it. They don't submit to it because they're such good people. They submit to it because they know that's the law of the land and it's enforced by the United States Army, and there's no single state or power in this United States today that would have sufficient force to carry through its idea as against the supreme power of the United States, and so we submit to the law that comes forth from Washington whether we like it or not. And this sounds like that. The law goes from Washington here, and the states submit to what it says. And here it says the law goes from Zion, and He judges among many people and rebukes strong nations afar off, and they don't build up armies to

fight one another, because there is no war. Well now that's the picture here. It could be quite a figurative way of describing the spread of the Gospel. It might possibly, but it is rather unnatural, and consequently not a thing on which to build such an argument. There's something which could be fit into that viewpoint if you find that viewpoint clearly taught in Scripture. To me, post-millennialism is in view of this passage not impossible but unlikely. Premillennialism to me fits with this passage exactly, but I don't see how this could possibly be a picture of the Christian situation in the world today, and I don't see how it can possibly be a picture of heaven, or of anything after the return of Christ if there's no millennium. I think it's very important as we look at these passages that we don't take a passage and say, this passage proves that particular thing, that we take a passage and say what are the possibilities of this passage and what doesn't possibly fit with the passage, and then we get the different passages together and see what to stand upon. (Question) 8^{1/2}

I think we have to take the passage and see what they teach. A passage may be highly poetical, and we want to recognize poetical language itself, but it may teach a lesson even if it is and this is not what you would call a poetic passage. This is perfectly straight language, this passage. Now of course that doesn't mean to say that you have to say that these are literal swords, literal plowshares, literal spears and literal pruning hooks. We didn't beat any swords into plowshares in 1945, and we didn't beat any spears into pruning hooks, but we took plenty of jeeps and made them into things for use, and we took plenty of bombers and tried to convert them into cargo ships. It means, taking war things and making them into peace things. They don't have to be swords, they don't have to be spears, but they have to be war instruments, and that is exactly what we did. If we would keep it up as we did in 1946 and 1947, if we would keep it up for the next 30 years, either we would have

heaven on earth and the golden age here or else we would completely disappear one or the other. The time is not ripe for it, but it's here predicted something that never yet has occurred on this earth. It is something which is either must occur as a result of the preaching of the gospel through a full conquest of the world for which describes the millenium after the time of Christ. One or the other. And now I think our time is nearly up, isn't it? This is two hours a week and of course anyone who wants to take for two hours of undergraduate credit will have four hours of work to do with two hours here, if two hours of graduate credit, you would have six hours of study, two hours here, as far as I'm concerned if you want one hour of undergraduate credit, you have one hour study outside or graduate credit 2 hours outside. You can study these passages related to it, we won't have to keep exact track of it, be sure that you put in that amount of time working on it. Now, Dr. Buswell, would you like to say something in closing? You want to give the other two passages you are going to check so that 11

Yes, I was thinking of taking the parrallel passage in Isaiah 2, and 11.1-9 Is. 21-4. I don't think at present that I will go into Is. 9. There are some interesting matters and evidence that will bring in other factors but I think that for the present, I would suggest that we go through these three passages and if you find that these three passages clearly teach that there is going to be a golden age upon this earth, then the question is, is the nature of the earth, and how does it fit in with other things before and after the coming of Christ. The question then is, is there or isn't there going to be. If it is clearly taught, it is clearly taught. You can't get away from it. If there are in minds in three states, there are in minds of the U.S.;, even though there should be none in the other 45 states and I believe that there are many other passages in the OT that refer to the millenium, but if you have three that clearly teach it, that would be 13.

Dr. Buswell --- I was just thinking this passage in the context and thinking 13 together with the figure of the Messiah, who is to come.

I've been reading Albert Schweitzer's work lately and read them in the wrong order.

His "Quest of the ~~Life~~ Life of Jesus" has been reprinted in English. That was the first thing he put out before he wrote the book that we call "The Quest of the Historical Jesus", and he gives the eschatological interpretation of the life of Christ, really the apocalyptic interpretation of the life of Christ. He has a lot of misinformation as well as a lot of stimulating passages in regard to the expected coming of the forerunner of the Messiah and of the Messiah Himself. With that in mind, I bear out my former question: / ^{This passage,} In connection with Micah 5:2, the coming of the one who should be the ruler in Israel, and who would stand and feed his flock like a shepherd, and all of that, I have no doubt you'll bring out the figure of the Messiah ~~of~~ in the Old Testament as related to the Kingdom period.

Dr. M: Interesting, but we won't go into it now. I have been trying at this point simply to take the one question, Is there a Golden AGE? Does the Old Testament teach there is to be a Godlen Age? Now in the New Testament your teaching of the (end of record)

The matter of the relation of the Messiah to the Golden Age is not so much touched upon, but when it is I think made quite clear. In the Old Testament there's much emphasis on the Messiah's coming to earth, but there also are passages like this one in which I don't think that particular aspect is stressed. I think the Old Testament has a great amount of emphasis on the Godlen Age per se, without the direct and immediate stress on the Messiah. So, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, I would suggest taking up the relation to the Messiah, some under Isaiah 11, but mostly either under the question, What is the Nature, or under the question, What is its relation to other things? rather than under this first question, Is there such a Golden Age?

(blank space)

It is perfectly that what you mean is that he fought with bravery and courage, and that would be perfectly obvious to anyone reading that. Now if you go over a passage in which it describes a man and says, "He was a lion in a fight," and you say, "As a matter of fact this man was a power," that's not saying he was brave at all. What this is saying is that this man had a high-pitched voice, it was somewhat like the sound a lion utters, the vocal sound, and this is referring to the character of his fighting; you are twisting the figure which is contrary to the ordinary use of such figures, and the burden of proof would be on you to show that that figure could properly be used in the way which you took it. You would have to bring us 2 illustration elsewhere where it was thus used. Now in the Scripture we do not insist that everything must be taken literally. When it says, "Beat their swords into plowshares it does not necessarily mean either swords or plowshares; it may mean change their tanks into tractors. But it does mean to change instruments of military fighting into instruments of peaceful life. It means that definitely. It is just as clear, just as definite, in that regard as any literal statement you could possibly make; you have no right to ~~change~~^{twist} it around. We don't take it literally, they are figures, symbols for things of this type, of this class, but you must take it for the class which it appears to represent. We have no right simply because a thing is figurative either to cast it aside and ignore it, ~~nor~~ nor do we have any right to twist the figure around to mean something different from that which such a figure would naturally mean. Now there was another question asked last week which I would like to say a word about again, and ~~this~~^{that} is this: What right do we have to begin with these particular passage? If we think that these teach a millenium and we're studying the millenium, what right do we have to begin with these? Maybe somebody else would start with some other passage. Well suppose that you were interested in this question, Was Christ born of a virgin? Where are you going to begin? You will begin with the passages in Scripture that tell you about the virgin birth

of Christ. You have no right to say, "Look at the Gospel of Mark. No mention of any virgin birth. Mark knew nothing about any virgin birth. No mention of it. Look at John; no mention of it. Some people think one verse in John is an allusion to it, but it isn't as it is ordinarily translated. Most people don't take it that way; at least it's highly questionable whether it should be or not aside from that there's no mention of it; no proof that John knew anything about a virgin birth. Look at the big book of Revelation; no teaching about a virgin birth; Ephesians has no teaching about it; Thessalonians has no teaching about the virgin birth; there's no mention of it in Acts." You could go through twenty-five books in the New Testament and say, "No teaching about the virgin birth. Therefore the Bible doesn't teach the virgin birth." You could go through thirty-eight books of the Old Testament and say, "No teaching about the virgin birth." But that doesn't decide whether the virgin birth taught. If one passage in the Scripture clearly says that Christ was born of a virgin, that is the teaching of Scripture. Now you might misinterpret that passage. There might be misunderstanding about it if God only tells/^{us}about the virgin birth in one instance. Perhaps it's not very important. Nevertheless it is ~~not~~ true; we must accept it. But we find two Gospel writers who very clearly and plainly told us of their belief in the virgin birth ~~of~~ of the Lord Jesus. One would be enough to prove it's a fact; when we have two we have not only proof it's a fact, we have proof that it is of importance, and that it is vital that we believe it. Now if we find one clear pasage in the Scripture which teaches that there is to be a Golden Age, that God has promised a Golden Age such ~~as~~ as has not yet occurred, ~~then~~ if one passage clearly teaches that, then if we believe that the Bible is God's Word we must accept it; if two clearly teach it, then there is surely no question about it, ~~but~~ ^{that} it is the teaching of the Scripture. More than that, if two clearly teach it,

then surely it is something that is emphasized, that is stressed, that is of some importance for us to believe. Now we looked in this passage in Micah last time. We saw that the connection with the context with the previous verse, which is telling of a literal destruction of Mount Zion and of the temple, the temple here would suggest that we are speaking of the same literal passage^s ~~as~~ ^{and} what follows. It does not prove it, but suggests it. ~~By~~ The burden that proves it is upon the man who wishes to take the contrary view. It is not hereby proven, but is suggested. It is not a great point, but is a point which must be noticed. But if we go on we find that what is described as a situation ~~as/as/~~ in which the word of the Lord goes forth from Jerusalem and judges among peoples and judges nations afar off and they put an end to war, they don't learn war any more but they sit out under their vine and under their fig tree in perfect safety because no one makes them afraid. There's nothing which they need fear. This is a picture of a time of external safety, of external security, it is not a picture of peace within the heart. It is a picture of an external condition. There is no other fair way to interpret the passage. There are many wonderful teachings in the Scripture of the peace which God gives in the heart in the midst of terrible danger and difficulties, but that is not the teaching of this passage, and we have no right to try to make that be what is here described. One may receive peace in his heart in the midst of adversity and difficulty, through the knowledge with His great power is going to bring a triumph when there is no external danger, in the knowledge that He is going to be triumphant in the end, and therefore we can look forward to what is coming, and this may give us an added ~~reason~~ reason for peace in our heart in the time in-between, in the temporary difficulties that come. But the teaching of this verse is not a promise that there is going to be peace in the heart of the Christian; this is promising that there is to be a time of external peace and safety, a time when there is no ~~external~~ external danger, a time when no nation is learning war because there's no need of it, because there's no other nation which

they need fear, because all of them are subject to the law of God. Now there is as we noticed no way in which this passage may be fairly said to describe something after the return of Christ unless there be a millennial reign of Christ after His return. There is nothing ~~else~~ which we can think of which would come after the return of Christ to which this passage could refer. Now of course this passage might refer to something before the return of Christ instead of something after the return of Christ. And if it refers to something before the return of Christ it does^{not} refer to ~~something~~^{anything} which has yet occurred. It is not a picture of the Roman government establishing peace by Roman force of arms and training soldiers to fight in order to preserve the peace. And the Lord going forth from the Palatine and Aventine (?) hills rather than from the temple built on Mount Zion. It is not a picture of the Roman peace in the early days of our era, nor is it a picture of the papal power, and it is not a picture of the going out of the Gospel. It may ~~be~~^a be a picture of ~~the~~^a time when the Gospel had been completely victorious. The only objection that I see in this passage to it describing a time when the Gospel is completely victorious is the beginning of the third verse, "He shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off sounds like a central, powerful force determining disputes and settling controversies rather than like the peaceful word of the Gospel going forth. I don't think that proves that is not a picture of a millennial reign before the coming of Christ, but I think that it suggests that that is not what is here described. I think there are two altogether fair ways to interpret this passage; one of them that it is a picture of the universal triumph of the Gospel which so completely overcomes all the nations that there is no longer any war, any fighting, ~~and~~^{any} external danger. That is a possible interpretation, although I believe that there are certain phrases in the passage which suggest that that is not the correct interpretation, but do not ~~prove~~ prove that it is not. The other interpretation of the passage is that the Lord Jesus Christ will Himself reign on Mount Zion and will establish this sort of external peace.

And I do not know of any other interpretation of the passage which seems to me a fair way of interpreting the passage, ~~it/it/~~ although it does strike me that either of these fit it fairly well. (Question) I have not considered verse 5 in our treatment of the passage because the first four verses describe a situation which is to come. Now verse 5 goes on and gives an exhortation in view of that description, and it is not very well translated here. That is, the Hebrew tense can ~~is/~~ just as well express an exhortation; one of them can; the other can ~~is/~~ just as well express a preponative (?) the way they do it. For all the people walk. The imperfect doesn't necessarily mean future as you know; it is a continuing condition. All the people walk, everyone in the ~~is/~~ name of his god. This is what you find. The loyalty even to their god, here and there. Now in view of that ~~is/~~ shall not we, who have a god who can make a wonderful promise like this walk in the name of our God. This is not a verse germane to the question of the millenium. If there were another interpretation of verse 5 which would be vital in relation to the question of the millenium, then of course we ought to take that up in this class. But unless there is a suggestion which would affect the interpretation of the millenium, I don't think we need to ~~it/it/~~ take time in this class. (Question)

Dr. B: A little bit smoother reading, "He will judge between many people and will decide concerning strong nations afar off," instead of "rebuke". That verb is a verb which is sometimes translated "rebuke" and sometimes "ajudge" or "decide". It is used in Genesis 24 where it speaks of a maiden whom God has ajudged for Isaac, and it would seem to indicate a determination of what was right or wrong in a dispute, rather than the effect of the Gospel upon the heart. I think it's rather difficult to fit that first part of verse 3 into the idea that this is a description that this is a great victory of the Gospel prior to the return of Christ, for after all, I wouldn't decide the matter simply on this verse^c if this were the only vs. If other other passages seems quite clearly to teach the Gospel is going to ~~it/it/~~

conquer the world and establish a condition of univers^{al}~~s~~ peace and
righteousness, ~~Y~~ we could probably fit this in even though that world
does give us definite difficulty, but I do feel that this still is a'
Golden Age, either as a result of the Gospel, before the coming of Christ,
or after the coming of Christ as the result of His deciding and judging
among the nations. (Question) (end of record)

--three questions separately. First, is there ^{definitely} to be a Golden Age? We're going to take that up as the first separate question, apart from the matter of what the Golden Age is to be like except in so far as we can't help going into that ~~///~~ to some extent. And then our second question., what is it's relation to other prophesied events? And a third question, What is the nature of this Golden Age? Now the question you just asked would seem to go under ^{either} the second or third question rather than under the first and it would be a discussion of a different passage, and it would be dealing with the New Testament passages which Dr. Buswell will discuss later, on which he will give you a view which is ~~id-~~ different than the view which I hold on that particular passage, but that will be his turn rather than mine. He says he doesn't think it will be different. (Question) We are not interested in these passages in our coming to an agreement as what every bit of it means. I don't think that is desirable. I think the desirable thing is to see what is clearly taught, what we must stand on, and that we see the points on which the evidence is not enough for one to have to think this way and one that way, and the more ^{non-decisive} on ~~non-decisive~~ points we develop different points of view, the more likely it is that on some non-decisive points we ~~///~~ come across a view that no one thought of yet that may be better than any that ^{has} ~~///~~ yet been presented. The thing to do is to get the things that are clearly taught first. What I have tried to stress in this passage ~~is~~ is only what was clearly taught. ~~There/are/other/~~ I think there are other details which we could get into and we could squeeze out of them perhaps a good bit more understanding of the relation of this to other events, and also on the question of the nature of the Golden Age, and we might come back to this passage later for that, but right now what I'm interested in is, does the Bible clearly teach the Golden Age/? And I don't see how anyone can get away from this particular passage

here teaching such a Golden Age that is yet future. But that is not saying that it is before or after the return of Christ. It is yet future to us. Now I'd like to call your attention to a passage in the Book of Isaiah. And at first sight somebody may say, "Now what is the use of going over to the passage there and looking at the passage there; it's practically the same as this. Isaiah didn't give us anything new, or at least Micah didn't; they've both given us exactly the same thing. Isaiah 4 and Micah 4 are almost identical. Therefore you've really only got one passage. I heard a man saying not so long ~~ago~~ ago, "You've got the three synoptic Gospels, but there's only one, one and two modifications of it, so you ~~only~~ only have one witness to Christ, not three," and then he said, "That one is a man who lived a hundred years after the time of Christ and used his imagination very broadly, and so all you've got is one man's imagination. ~~I~~ You actually don't have any record to trust." That was the view of a professor in New Testament in a theological seminary not very far from here. And yet for us who believe that this is God's Word, I would say that if the same identical thing is told in Matthew and again in Ruth, it doesn't prove that Christ said it twice, but it does prove that the Holy Spirit thought it important enough to stress by giving us two descriptions. That if we find a thing repeated in the Scripture, even if it's a ~~parallel~~ parallel, it means there's a stress laid on it, there's an emphasis on the part of the Holy Spirit. It's considered important.

Now we turn to Isaiah 2:2-4 with an introductory verse preceding and an exhortation following, parallel to the exhortation we have in the other passage in Micah, we have here three verses which are very, very close to these verses in Micah. And so the problem is raised in many people's minds, did Micah say it first and Isaiah ~~copy~~ copy from him? Did Isaiah say it first and Micah copy from him?

And then they see that in the latter part of Isaiah there are things that go way on long after anything in Micah seems to go, and so they say that Micah must have been Isaiah's younger colleague, and Isaiah must have been an older man, and therefore they say it must be original with Isaiah. Well now, it doesn't seem to me you can tell ^{which} ~~whichever~~ of the men was older and which was younger. Isaiah gave us sixty-six chapters and Micah seven. Isaiah could give sixty-six chapters dealing with as wide an area as he does must have lived a very long time because they cover predictions and prophecies giving many different ^{en at} types and times in history. Micah gave us prophecies dealing with one particular epic. But that isn't proof but what Micah might have lived fifty years before or after that. We just have no evidence. We don't ~~app~~ know. He didn't prophecy as long as Isaiah. Well did his prophecy come after Isaiah or before? I don't know of any proof one way or another. But to my mind the one in Micah seems original rather than the one in Isaiah, for this reason, that it fits into context so exactly. Micah is predicting the destruction of Zion, and he ^{then} goes right on to tell ~~xxx~~ about that which is to come in the future. He uses the same phraseology in chapter 3 that he does in the beginning of chapter 4; it fits right in the context as if it is one continuous record, and that to me suggests, although I would not be dogmatic about it, that Micah wrote first. Well now we have at any rate the same thing said by Micah and Isaiah. Did God use exactly the same words to both of them? ~~W~~ Did He dictate the same words to both of them, both the same? Or did God perhaps give each of them a vision, and Micah describes his vision, and Isaiah describes what he saw, and he describes in almost identical words? Or did Isaiah perhaps have this vision, and being familiar with Micah, used almost the same words that Micah used, having seen almost the same vision? I don't think that we know. They weren't perhaps as particular about literary property in those days, in trying to prove who has the right to this and that. I once wrote a book in

collaboration with two others, and one of ~~the~~ others was very insistent that if in discussion he made any remark on anything and you used it anywhere in the book you must have a footnote that ~~that/that/~~ he had said this, and it made it very inconvenient, because you ~~that~~ couldn't just come in and talk at random with him, discuss all sorts of things and get all sorts of ideas in mind, because who knows but ~~that~~ whether or not you could remember, in order to give him credit at the proper place in the book. It ~~was~~^{is} a terrible ~~of~~ nuisance, and I think the ancients were ^{perhaps} a little more reasonable than us moderns in ~~that~~ this regard. They were interested in the truth, not so much in who happened to say the particular words. And Isaiah had the same truth to give that Micah had. But I think that the first verse in chapter 2 is very interesting verse in this connection. Isaiah begins in chapter 1 with an introduction to the whole book, "The vision which Isaiah, the son of Amos^z, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." And you have that in the beginning of chapter 1, and then you have a chapter , and then chapter 2 begins, "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Why ~~that/that/~~ repeat that when you've just given it? Well to my mind this is an introduction simply to the following four verses and nothing else. ~~that~~ 1:1 an introduction to the whole book; 2:1 an introduction to what follows. He says, "You know Micah's vision; you know what Micah saw. Well now I want to show you what Isaiah sees concerning Jerusalem and Judah." This is a vision Isaiah had. I am setting my authority upon this vision. This is God's message to me. This vision that follows I tell you is the truth. God has revealed it to me. Now if He revealed it to Micah too, fine, but this is a truth He has revealed to Isaiah and Isaiah is putting his signature upon it. He is saying, "I had this vision." I don't think he was going to fight over who framed the particular group of words. The thing was that he had ~~the~~ vision. He

knows this to be true, or false. ~~Thp/Thp~~ And Mainly has three verses which correspond very closely to the first three verses of Micah 4. 1-4. The fourth verse is not repeated here, that is the fourth verse of Micah, but the fifth verse of Micah is the exhortation, "We who walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever," and here we have an exhortation, "Oh house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord." An exhortation very closely paralleling the exhortation in Micah and helping us to prove that it is an exhortation ~~Thp/Thp~~ in Micah. Now the 3 verses in between there are a few slight differences like one says, "Many nations shall flow into it," Isa. says, "All nations shall flow into it," a few slight changes like that and I don't feel that it is necessary for our present purpose, we have compared the two and can see the exact changes here and there. There are comparatively few of them. The picture is identical. It is a picture of a central authority at Jerusalem, and authority from which God's law goes out. An authority to which people come in order that the God of Jacob may teach them His ways so that they may walk in His paths, a center from which an authority goes that judges among the nations and rebukes many peoples and they beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks. Nations shall not lift up sword against nation and neither shall they learn war anymore. External peace and safety, a Golden Age, a time when this world is free from external danger, and Isaiah is setting the seal of his authority upon it, and Micah ends it with, "The mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken." Isaiah begins it with the words, "The vision that ~~Thp/Thp~~ Isaiah saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Eah of them declares, ~~Thp~~ "This is Gods word." Now we have the Holy Spirit then ~~Thp~~ leading two different prophets to give us a picture of the same thing in almost the same words. And that to me is an emphasis that this is something that is vital. Whatever these passages mean, it is vital that we study them, and that we seek to interpret what they are and to find what is there taught.

The Holy Spirit thinks it vital enough to have two different prophets give it, not only give it, but stress that the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken in one case and the other begin it with a special introduction, the vision that Isaiah saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem and who followed with an exhortation to walk in the light of the Lord. So the Holy Spirit considers these two passages to be vital and important, then it is vital and important that we do not neglect them or overlook them but that we fit them into our thinking and that we reach a conclusion as to what they mean. I was at a theological conference one time and a man there told me that he had spoken to another of the men there, privately. He didn't come out to the meetings, but in the private he mentioned this to the other man who was a professor at a theological seminary of systematic theology at a great theological seminary quite a long distance from here, a very orthodox theological seminary and he said to this professor, "What do you do with these passages in the OT. about the Millennium?" and the man answered, "That is not my function, that is the function of the department of Exegesis, who interpret the passages. My function is to systematize, to arrange these into a great system." Well, now, the primary thing certainly is 12

It is vital that we systematize. It is vital to see how it is interrelated, but any systematic theology that is true. 12 1/2 systematic theology is theology that is ready to take in to account anything that is clearly taught in the Scripture and which is ready when an interpretation is 12 1/2 of any passage in the Scripture to go into it and to either say that is right or that is wrong, or that is not certain and therefore it must be held out for the present until we have further light on it, but the exegesis of any passage must be primary to any systematic theology and here we have something which is twice given in the Scripture, which is emphasized by the Holy Spirit, which is thus 13 that is vital, and its introduction and exhortation following, it is something

54

which we must decide what the Holy Spirit is trying to give us ~~there~~. What is the ~~thing~~ that is meant? Well, now as to the interpretation of this, it is almost identical to the other. I think ~~that~~/our conclusion would be the same as the other, we cannot deduce from it its relation to with certainly, other events in the prophetic books. Is it before the return of Christ, or is it after? Well, if the word of the Lord goes forth from Jerusalem as judges among the people, determining their disputes. That to me suggests that the Lord is there reigning in Jerusalem, but does not prove it. There is a certain, I would say, 14 here in the natural interpretation of it, in favor of it's being something that happened after the return of Christ rather than before, but I don't think that you can prove it by this passage any more than the others; but I do think that you can say that these two passages are speaking of a time of universal cessation of war, a time of external peace and safety, a golden age which covers this entire earth and I don't see how you can in any fairer way interpret them as anything else than that. (student question)

q end of record e10

I don't know whether I've thought so much on the particular phraseology there. I think the ~~general~~ general tone of it is something that endures for a ~~while~~ ^{time}, rather than something that ~~passes~~/happens in a day or so, but as to whether you can draw that just from the particular verb form there, I wouldn't think so. But the certainly the implication, "He will judge among many ~~people~~ people, He will decide their differences," they beat their swords into plowshares, they don't lift up sword ~~against~~ against sword, because between 1945 and 1949 there are not going to be any wars, there's going to be universal peace, it certainly means more than that; that would be nonsense. It must describe a period of considerable length to be worth this much emphasis, to be worth this much stress. It must be a period of ~~very~~ very substantial length. Now there was perhaps a

somewhat similar period between 1870 and 1914. The most peaceful time the world has ever seen except for the ~~time~~ of the early Roman Empire, a time when you could travel anywhere in Europe except Russia and Turkey without a passport. A time when it seemed to many as if the Golden Age had come. And in 1914 people thought the Golden Age was here, and many wouldn't believe it when the war came in 1914. ~~But~~ But of course any one who observed things closely could see how everything was building up for that great war between 1870 and 1914. But ~~it~~ during those years premillennialists were regarded by many people as pessimists who didn't recognize the great, glorious situation established and ~~how~~ how there never would be a war, and the premillennialists who said there would be more wars back in 1910 were not basing it upon a close and careful observation of world affairs, thought that should have been sufficient to prove the fallacy of the idea that the Golden Age was here, but they were basing it upon their understanding of the Scripture, and of course the fact that their understanding wasn't proven right that there was another war then, but it certainly does prove that that was not the ~~Golden~~ Golden Age promised, the period from 1870 to 1914. Of course we in the United States had a little war back in ~~the~~ 1890, but compared to the wars in 1870 and 1914 they were a drop in the bucket. This is the second passage then. And the third passage which I think is very vital in this connection is Isaiah 11. Now Isaiah 11 is not a repetition of either the ~~second~~ second chapter or of the passage in Micah. It is a passage which is very different in its general tone; a passage which has different figures used, and which presents a picture which seems very different and has ~~a~~ a personal stress in it which we do not find in either of these other two passages. It is one which is also very vital in connection which we're asking ourselves now: Does the Scripture teach the coming of a Golden Age? Does it teach it? I insist on that wording: Does the Scripture teach it? Not the wording: Does the Scripture teach there will or won't be? I don't think we have any right ~~to~~ to go to Scripture and say is there this or that? I think we ~~must~~ must go to

the Scripture and say, Is there enough Scriptural evidence to show whether it's this or that? And that's our present question. Does the Scripture present the evidence on which we can ~~y~~ say with positiveness that there is to be a Golden Age? Does it present such evidence. Now we look at chapter 11. (Question). Yes, a Golden Age on earth. You mean that if all this were moved over to Venus it wouldn't be a fulfillment of it? (Question) The specific references to ~~Yerusalem~~ Jerusalem and Judah in both these passages would seem to suggest to me that if ~~Yerusalem~~ he was using Judah and Jerusalem as figures for Mars, I still would think that it might be a satisfactory fulfillment of it. A Golden Age promised in which God is going to bring these things to pass and in which our descendents, the continuation of our race, will be living somewhere, and the whole planet on which they live will have these certain (4 3/4) . It is not disembodies spirits floating around. It is a substantial earth. They don't beat their swords into plowshares in a ghostly world. I don't think that the spirits in heaven are beating swords into plowshares. I can't see how that would picture anything that would be an activity of the redeemed after this earth would have been completely destroyed and only the redeemed will have been transferred to another place. I can't see why/^{then} they would beat swords into plowshares. I don't know where they'd get the swords to beat into plowshares, and I don't what the meaning would be, They wouldn't learn war anymore. There would hardly be ~~no~~ much sense in saying that. And what would it mean to say that Christ would ~~be~~ a judge among many nations then? Where would be the nations to a judge among if it were simply all the Christians brought together into one great family. I doesn't seem to be that sort of a picture as far as I can see. (Question.) It does seem to me to be a continuation~~s~~ of the human race as we know it. (Question) "anymore" there is the Hebrew which means "further." They will not continue to learn ~~no~~ war^{That} "anymore" is an English translation. It means that the learning of ~~no~~ war will be an activity which will be cast aside.

Now if there were to be a great period when under a particular situation there would be a temporary interruption to that, it wouldn't interfere with the meaning of the passage.

D.r. B.: The Gog and Magog rebellion at the end of the millenium is not in any sense a war. The Gog and ~~Magog~~ Magog attackers don't get a 7 at first base; they're destroyed by fire and brimstone out of heaven. There isn't any war about it.

Dr. M.: You might say they fight without having learned properly how.

Dr. B.: They speak of combustible weapons that are fuel for seven ~~yr~~ years. It isn't war.

Dr. M.: Is there to be a Golden Age? Is there clearly predicted in Scripture to be a Golden Age which has not yet occurred? We're trying to keep our dealing with it's nature to a minimum at present. We notice that the feature of this, however, which is stressed so far is external peace and safety. It is a time of freedom from external danger. Now as to other aspects, we will notice ~~what~~ we can't help noticing as we go along but we'll leave it for a later question, If there is such an age, what are its characteristics, and also we are interested in the later question, What is the relationship of this to other events?

Now in chapter 11 we have a predic~~tion~~^{again} which/relates/~~to it~~/ right up closely to what precedes, but I don't think that throws much light on the nature of the fulfillment in this particular case. The previous verse describes the destruction I believe of Judah, that God is 9 Judah and Assyria. They're both pictured in the previous passages, and the great empires of the world are going to be destroyed in God's economy. Now here we have the great Assyrian Empire; it is thrust down; it is wrecked. The Assyrian king is humbled, but out of the stem of Jesse there comes forth a rod and a branch grow~~n~~^s out of his roots. The picture is of Jesse, that is, of David, son of Jesse, king of Judah. His kingdom, his empire, having been crushed, till there's just a little stalk there, just a couple of little roots, out of it a branch grows up, and ^{what} follows shows us that this

branch is a human being. It is an individual. It is a man who comes out of the root of this, and I doubt if there's any Christian interpreter who would question that it is the Lord Jesus Christ who is here referred to. And we are told about Him, He is going to come up out of the root of Jesse, and the Spirit of the Lord will rest upon Him. And this word "rest" here, by the way, means simply "to be placed upon." It doesn't mean "sleeping" upon Him, but it means "to be exerting itself through Him." "It shall rest upon Him." The Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of council and might, the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. The description of an individual who is out of the stem of Jesse; He is found in contrast to the ~~fall~~ (?) of the great world empires, He is described as one who is given great insight by the Lord. He is of ~~very~~ quick understanding and fear of the Lord, and He does not judge after the sight of His eyes nor reprove after the hearing of His ears; an interesting parallel with our phrase about judging many nations, and rebuking nations afar off; ^{That does} not necessarily prove a relationship, but it's interesting, the use of similar terminology here. He is to one who judges according to the true, inner nature of things. Now of course you remember was it not Nathaniel who said to Christ, "Whence knowest thou me?" And ^{Jesus} He said, "I ~~did~~ ^{thou wast} When/under the fig tree I saw thee." And he said, "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel." He was overwhelmed at the insight that Christ had, not judging according to the sight of His eyes, but judging according to His inner character. We read that Christ knew man, He needed not that anyone should tell Him what was in man, because He knew already. Christ is one who doesn't judge according to the sight of His eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of His ears; one who has wonderful wisdom and understanding. Now all this, we'll say, is amply fulfilled in Christ's first coming, but when we say fulfilled, we don't mean that that is the end of it, because it is a characteristic of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is shown in Him any time He exerts it. And we find that He had these characteristics in His first coming, and He showed forth in His actions

the characteristics which are here described as belonging to Him. But then in verse 5 we read that with righteousness He will judge the poor. ¶ Well, when a man came to Him and said, "Lord, make my brother divide the inheritance with me; I'm a poor man; he's a rich man; he's taken the inheritance." Christ said, "Who made me a judge among you?" Now it says here, "With righteousness He will judge the poor." Then why didn't He go with him and say, "Brother, you give him this. If half of this belongs to him, divide it up." Well, He doesn't seem to conform to the prediction here: "With righteousness He shall judge the poor." Is this a description of the last judgment? Is this a description of His determining which people are to be saved and which are to be lost. The word "poor" hardly seems in place in that case. He will judge the righteous perhaps, He will judge the wicked; but He will judge the poor/^{with righteousness} seems to mean that those who don't have the power themselves to gain that which they ought to have, He is going to give it to them. It would seem to suggest a ruler dealing in righteousness rather than the judge of souls or the activity of Christ in His earthly coming. I wouldn't build too much on that; I merely say that is the implication which seems to be foremost in this first part of verse 4. And then He will rebuke (Question) If He said the poor in ¶ spirit I certainly would agree with you, and that the poor here might mean the poor in spirit I wouldn't rule out at all. It's a possibility. I just mean that it impresses me leaning in that direction, but not as definitely proof on that. Not at all. And then "reprove with equity for the meek of the earth." I think the situation is the same with that. It leans, it seems to me, in the direction of one who is using justice and equity in determining what is right for the poor and the meek, ~~well/there/who~~ but I think it proves it. I think it is something which might refer to other things. In the Beatitudes it would seem perhaps promising a future ~~pl/~~ (14 1/4) rather than a present picture. Then he continues, "And He will smite the earth with the rod of His power and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked." And there is

a story in the Apocryphal Gospels about how when the Lord Jesus Christ
was a little boy He went to ^{school} ~~A/βββλ~~, and the people asked Him, "What is
A? And He said, "You explain A to me and I'll explain B to you." And
the people said "What are you so dumb about?" "A is" "B is"

at which He was active, ~~by~~ because it was characteristic of His being, of His person. We go on to describe certain acts here ~~which~~ which the first two sentences, the first two clauses, might perhaps be acts done at His first coming, though they sound to be more like something that is to be in the nature of reigning rather than of the activity He did at His first coming, but this would seem clearly to be something which Paul declares to be future to His ^{second} ~~first~~ coming, and something which is different than that which He did at His first coming. Now/^{that} of course proves nothing in itself whether there's a Golden Age or not, but it simply gives a ~~picture~~ certain future color, that is future from our viewpoint to this picture. And it says then that this one here described is going to do this which Paul said is a future thing. We find it said that righteousness will be the girdle of His loins and faithfulness the girdle of His kidneys, against a statement of certain qualities which are characteristic of the righteousness and faithfulness rather than a statement of some ~~thing~~ particular thing He would do, ~~though~~ ^{so} ~~though~~ we wouldn't draw much from them, just a further characterization of Him. Then you come to verse 16, and you say, "What on earth has verse 6 got to do with what precedes, "The wolf will dwell with the lamb, and the leopard will lie down with the kid. The calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them." Is that a brand new chapter with another entirely different subject, and utterly unrelated with what precedes. The good archbishop evidently didn't think so because he didn't make any chapter division here. That of course proves nothing. But I think all interpreters as far as I know consider that the following verses belong with what precedes, and are related to it. And if they are related to it, then surely that which follows is a description of the situation which He is going to bring about. And it may be perhaps a situation which He at His first coming draws up and which still continues at that time, or it may be a description of something which He is going to bring about in

the future. The fact that we have just had in verse 4 a description of things ~~✓~~ He's going to do in the future would suggest that this is something He's going to bring about in the future, but wouldn't prove it. If we find that this is a perfect description of the church during the early days of the Christian church, the first five hundred years, then we may say that this is a description of what Christ did at His first coming. But it is at any rate a description of something that is going to be sometime. Verse 6 and following are a description of the nature of the regime which is going to be brought in or of the condition which is going to be established by the one described in the previous verses at sometime or other, whether it ~~will~~ be something that was to come after the first coming of Christ or something that has come at some period prior to this present, or something which is yet future to us, future to us before His second coming or future to us after His second coming. At any event it is a description of a situation which He is responsible for, which follows as a result of His actions. Well now the situation which is described here, certainly verses 6 and 7 and 8 very clearly belong together; it would seem almost absolutely certain that verse 9 went with 6, 7, and 8 and was a summary of them. At any rate, 6, 7, and 8 undoubtedly go together, and what is pictured in 6, 7, and 8? We have a condition here described. Is this condition literally described here, or are ~~these~~ these figures? We must not be dogmatic on it. We must not try to insist that they must necessarily be literal. We have no right to say that they cannot be literal. We must examine Scripture elsewhere to see whether they are to be taken literally or figuratively. But here we must say: If they are figures they are figures for something which can ~~be~~ be ~~literally~~ reasonably deduced from the literal picture given. You can not just say, "Oh, they are pictures of anything. 'The wolf shall dwell with the lamb and the leopard shall lie down with the kid.' All ~~✓~~ right, the wolf represents France and the lamb England, so "the wolf dwell with the lamb' means England and France are going to be allied. 'The leopard lie down

with the kid' ; the leopard's Hitler and the kid's Mussalini, so that means Italy and Germany will stand together, and 'a little child shall lead them'--maybe that was Roosevelt." That's one way of interpreting figures. But I think a more reasonable way of interpreting figures is to get the sense of the passage and see what sort of a picture is presented, and to try to see what is the fundamental idea that is here given, rather than to say that we must equate some particular thing here with some particular thing there, and this particular thing with some particular thing there, whether there is any reason for equating them or not. If these are figures, we have here a certain type of situation here described. If they are literal, then of course we have a literal condition described. Suppose we have a literal condition--why are we interested in knowing what's going to happen to the cows and the bears and the wolves anyway after the wonderful description of this great rule? Well we are interested if there's clear teaching on that subject, but I would think we would be justified in saying, "If it is literal, it is given not merely to tell us of the literal condition, but to describe the nature of things, at any event. And so, even if it is literal, its primary purpose is to present an idea of a general situation, and if it is figurative, its whole purpose is to present a general situation, and therefore its primary purpose is exactly the same, whether it is literal or figurative. And so the question of whether it is literal or figurative is not half as important as the question, What do the figures represent if they are figurative, and they surely seem to represent some sort of a situation.

Well
~~the situation~~ the situation in verse 6 is an unnatural situation.

"The wolf will dwell with the lamb." Why sure the wolf will dwell with the lamb, provided the lamb's inside of the wolf. That's a rather common situation. But that is not what is meant here. They dwell together. The implication is that they don't dwell together in the normal fashion. "The leopard will lie down with the kid." Well, the leopard might lie down with the kid a few feet away from the kid, and wait for the kid

to be sleeping before jumping on it. That is the normal situation. "The leopard lie down with the kid" means it is not going to injure the kid. It is an unnatural situation according to our present condition of the world. "The calf and the young lion and the fatling together." Well, maybe the young lion will walk along beside the calf and not bother it, but maybe when ~~he gets a~~ ^{you get the} fatling, ~~there,~~ ^{there,} that's more than the lion could resist the temptation of. ~~The~~ ^{Surely you have a} situation here which means that the lion is not going to hurt the fatling. That is surely the thought of this verse. "And a little child shall lead them." You expect the big man with his tommygun to be the one who comes out against the young lion and the leopard and the wolf, not the little child. "A little child shall lead them." "And the cow and the bear shall feed." If he said the cows and the goats will feed, that's nothing strange, but for the cow and the bear to feed together ^{doesn't seem natural.} You ~~wouldn't~~ expect the cow to run if it see the bear. It is not the normal thing for the two of them to feed together. "The lion will eat straw like the ox." You would expect the lion to eat the ox, instead of eating straw like the ox. "The sucking child will play on the hole of the asp." Well, that's simple enough. Any sucking child will play on the ~~the~~ hole of the asp if it gets a chance. "The weaning child will put its hand on the cockatrice's den. " Well, did you ever see a little child that would hesitate to put its hand on the cockatrice den. A little child will go right straight up to it and put its hand there. It isn't afraid. It is not here describing ^{the fact} that a child is so ignorant will go right up to the whole of an asp and put its hand on it. It is not ^{showing} the lack of education of a little child just weaned. It doesn't know the cockatrice's den is a dangerous place to be. That's not the picture. The picture ^{is} that there is nothing wrong with the ~~cockatrice's den~~ child doing these things. It can do it more than ~~one~~ once., that it can do it safely. The essential note in all three verses is identical. It is the note of external safety.

next

of safety from external danger. The point is not here that the lamb, though the wolf is around, has perfect peace in his heart and no fear that the wolf will eat him up. That's not the picture. The picture here is a picture that the wolf will not hurt the lamb. It is a picture of a change from the present abnormal condition of the world in which the animals fight and tear and kill one another to a ~~condition of~~ condition of harmony and of peace among the various things which God has created. If you take it literally, it means the end of the curse on the animal world. If you take it figuratively, it means the end of war and destruction in the world of mankind. And in the context I think we are justified in saying the figurative interpretation is more important than the literal. That is to say, even if ^{it be} ~~the~~ literally true, and going to happen, it is also going to be figuratively true, and in the context that is of greater importance to us than whether it is literally true or not. That we have a picture here of a kind of external safety; we have here a time of an end of external danger; we have ~~a~~ here a time when there is no harm in a ^{suckling} ~~suckling~~ child playing on the hole of an asp, a time when it is not necessary that the parents ~~will~~ watch the suckling child with great care lest it stray in the ~~direction~~ direction of the asp. I was reading just a couple days ago about (Sae? 11 3/4) the great archeologist ~~Maybe~~ Maybe some of you read it. Some years ago Professor Sae from Oxford ~~University~~ University was in Egypt, and they said he is perhaps the only person living who has been bit by the particular type of asp that ~~is~~ killed Cleopatra and lived to tell the tale. They said that he was there on an expedition and he stepped outside the camp for a few minutes one time and as he stepped out there his foot come down and he didn't notice it and he stepped on this big circle, this asp, which is ~~is~~ thought to be the type that Cleopatra used in order to kill herself. ~~He~~ He stepped on it and immediately the thing stung ^{into} ~~his~~ his leg. And everyone else to whom that is known to have happened died. But he was not far from the camp and he rushed right into the camp and he grabbed the red hot tongs

that the cook had right in the fire and he stuck them into his leg and ~~by~~ burned ~~it~~ it right to the bone, and burned it right out there completely and the result was that he had a few ~~weeks of lameness~~ weeks of lameness and then it was all right instead of losing his life. Well now the child will not be afraid ~~of~~ of the asp. Certainly not of the hole of the asp. But if there are creatures like that around in this age the parents are mighty careful to watch the child so that the child does not wander ^{in to} ~~into~~ that situation. And the description here is either of a time when parents need not fear lest their child will stumble into the place where the asps are, or it is a picture, a figure of a situation in the human world in which there is no danger, no external danger which we have to guard against. The perfectly innocent one, like the suckling child, can just wander out into the ~~gangster's~~ ^{gangsters'} land and not fear what was going to happen, because the gangster/s'land is altogether different from what it had been. And so if you take this figuratively, you have a picture of a Golden Age which is different from anything which this world has yet seen, and if you take it literally ~~the~~ you have a picture of a future Golden Age in which the world of mankind is different, but in which in addition to that there is a change in the animal creation. And so whether you take it figuratively or whether you take it literally you have a picture of a ~~the~~ future ~~Golden Age~~ Golden Age, a future which does not in any sense correspond to anything which has yet occurred upon the earth, a picture of a situation which certainly was not true of the world in the time right after the death of Christ. Anyone reading the Book of Acts cannot imagine the situation in which Paul lived and moved is at all similar to this situation either figuratively or literally. Nor at any time in the history of the world since that time in which this can be said to have been fulfilled. Now to say that ~~this~~ this is a picture ~~of~~ of heaven and up in heaven the departed wolves and the departed lambs don't even bother to (15) extreme (laughter) or to say that up in heaven deceased human beings don't even sit around. That's meaningless in the context. (end of record)

wonderful thing is going to come to pass as a result of the great activity of this marvelous one who is here described in the first part of the chapter, it is surely a gold age upon an earth, a situation which has never yet appeared, a situation of the cessation of external danger, a situation which is similar even though 1/2/ to those picture which were given us in Micah 4 and Isa. 3. And so we have a third passage I would say, and if there be ^{other} no passage in the Scripture which deals with the matter of a future Golden age, if there be no other/^{from} which such a teaching can be clearly deduced, we have it stressed these three times then if there should be no other question, we would then have three times in which this idea is very clearly and strongly presented, that there is to be such a golden age, and if this golden age is characterized by that one outstanding feature, the cessation of external danger, external peace and safety, that is going to come upon this earth. Now with this passage here, as with the other two at which we looked, we can ask this question, "Is it something which ~~God~~ while it has not yet come to pass, made conceivably come to pass before the return of Christ?" Well, why not, ~~if~~ if you take it figuratively and if someone wants to take it figuratively, I do not object to such an interpretation. As I have said, I believe that the figurative interpretation is more important than literal. I believe that whethere it ~~is~~ ^{literally} is true or not, it is true in the figurative sense. It is true in the world of human beings though it has little place here in the chapter, whether it is also true in the physical sphere or not. Well, if it is the literal sphere, it is rather hard to conceive of any such change in the animal creation coming before the return of Christ. We can go out with guns and we can kill off the snakes and wolves and leopards, etc, but that would not be in any sense a fulfillment of this passage. It is pretty hard to see how this can literally be fulfilled before the return of Christ, but in a figurative sense it certainly could be fulfilled before the return of Christ. ~~It~~ It is exactly what the Gospel does. The Gospel takes the wolf and makes him into a lamb

The Gospel takes the wicked one into one that is peaceful and helpful. That is what the Gospel does. I do not think that we can say that this is a picture of one man being transformed by the Gospel, or a picture of several men being transformed by the Gospel. This is a picture of a situation in which there is external peace and safety because there are none around who will desire to destroy it. It can come about by the Gospel, if it be the will of God that the Holy Spirit convert all the world through the preaching of the Gospel, so that everyone on this earth is a christian than surely no one would try to hurt anyone, and surely it is conceivable that in such a way that this passage here could be figuratively and yet very truly fulfilled and it might thus describe a wonderful golden age to come prior to the return of Christ, but it is a golden age which is here described. It is a golden age, something which has not yet come to pass, but it may be something then which can come from the preaching of the Gospel if it is clearly taught in the Scripture, that it is God's will that the Gospel go forth into the world and convert all the world and all nations, if God definitely promises that then no matter how bad it looks today, no matter how pessimistic we may become, no matter how impossible it appears to human eye, that should not lead us to lose faith that God will fulfill what he has promised, and if God has elsewhere in the Bible said He is going to convert all nations through the Gospel of Christ then we can believe that word and know it will come to pass and that the golden age can be fulfilled before the return of Christ. But unless we find such elsewhere in the Scripture, we certainly cannot ~~do~~ deduce that from this passage. This passage does not say whether it is going to be before or after the return of Christ, it does say it is going to be sometime, maybe before, maybe after. Now we find in the context one of two things which suggest after. We find that about "with righteousness shall we judge the poor and reprove with equity the meek of the earth" in verse 4, that seems to me to suggest

that what follows is the result of His reprov^{ing} with equity of his judging the poor with righteousness. That it is a condition that is to come about as the result of 5 ~~an~~ in the connection with the second coming of Christ ~~rather~~ than with the present situation or with His first coming. I don't think that it is proven, but I think that there is a certain suggestion there which should be noticed. Then the latter part of the verse, he shall smite the urn with a rod and with the breath of his lips shall He slay the wicked, Paul says that is just future, it is something to happen in connection with the return of Christ, thst to me suggests very strongly that what follows is what comes after He slays the wicked one with the breath~~s~~ of His lips, and so that very strongly suggests to me that this is something that comes after the return of Christ. I am not ready to apply the term fully to that yet, though I think that it goes a pretty long distance in that direction. The however, the passage itself is it figurative or is it literal? If it is literal, whether it is ~~5/3/4~~ a removal of the curse that was laid upon the creation in Gen. 3 and if we find it selsewhere taught, that there is to be a removal of the curse, then it would be reasonable to say that this is a picture of the same thing, but unless we find it clearly taught, I do not think that we should deduce it from this picture. If we take it literally then, it can fit in with the ^{teaching} ~~life~~ if we find such a teaching elsewhere in Scripture that the curse is to be removed from the animal creation, and if we find such a tea ching in Scripture, it is ~~is~~ pretty hard for us to conceive of that as happening simply in the course of this age, that will seem of necessary to be connected with the coming of Christ and so if it is to be taken literally, then it also in a figurative sense is true, it also applies then to the world of mankind, but in that case it describes a golden age after the return of Christ, and so this passage like Ch. Is2 and Mic. 4 would seem to me to be rather definitely showing that God declares that there is to be a golden age, although from these three passages I would not deduce when it is to be. I

would say that all three of them look somewhat in the same direction of it being after the return of Christ, and if this is to be taken literally then it does mean certainly that it is after the return of Christ. This may be taken figuratively, I don't think the evidences in these three are sufficient to prove that it is after the return of Christ, if it be-fore the return of Christ, I do not think it is conceivable, that it oc-curred apart from the result of the universal acceptation to the Gospel, but it is altogether possible if we find it clearly taught elsewhere in Scripture that all nations are to be converted to the Gospel of Christ, that these three passages describe the situation that is to be estab-lished and to continue for a sizable length of time, I won't say how long, It would'nt have to be an eternal situation to fulfill these 3 but it would have to be a situation of a fairly sizable length of time, and it could be thus a description of a golden age upon this earth. I believe that is Warfield's interpretation of these Old Testament pass-ages. It is my impression that I know he taught very clearly that the Gospel is to completely conquer the world. Rev. 20, he insists that is the vital element in Rev. 20. It is the completeness of conquest. Every one is to be converted. ~~That~~ there is no one left on this earth that has not been converted by the gospel of Christ and every single portion of the earth has been affected by the Gospel to the extent that you have this wonderful Golden age and then you might have a falling away ^{at} ~~the~~ end of that age, a bad condition at the very end of it just before the return of Christ, but Warfield taught that we have this wonderful golden age which comes at the end of this present age as a result of the preach-ing of the gospel. Now we have one more verse here to look at vs 9 which is doubtless a summary of the three verses for the idea of it is so closely in line with them= They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my Holy mountain. What is meant by the Holy mountain? It is not explained here. It is an area in which they will not hurt nor destroy.

And the previous discussion which seems to cover a sizable area, certainly is quite contrary to the situation today in Jerusalem where I expect every week there are individual shocks in Palestine today because they stray ~~to~~ too near the borderline that cuts the area right straight in too. When Dr. Harris and I were at Letrune haveing lunch, we heard mortars firing, we heard the shells dropping right near us and we turned to the monk who was searving us and asked what it was and he said that the Jews keep firing for practice to warn people that they mustn't get near that like. Right down in front of the monastery was the line of no mans land and you couldn't get out there, two da~~x~~ys before 4 peasants had been killed because they had tried to harvest their field, the line went through their field and thye got just a little pas t the line and the sharpshooters shot them from the other side. It is not a condition that describes Palestine today nor certainly not the world today. But He said, they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord. The earth, that land refers to the area that will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea and the waters cover the sea from 10 1/2 every square inch of the sea has water above it. It is not a picture of an individual here and there, with whicked people all around them, individual witnesses to the truth of Christ here and there with a wicked world around. It is a picture in which all is subject to the rule of Christ and there is nothing of external danger about because the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. Well now these three Old Testament passages seem to me are to establish the fact that the Bible clearly teaches that there is to be a golden age, and that ~~is~~ a characteristic of that age is freedom from external danger, a condition of external peace and safety. I think that that is clearly established by these passages. We could go on and look at other passages, but I don't think it is necessary for this particular portion of our discussion. Now the second question, what is the relation of the

time of this golden age to the other events in the program of God? This is a question into which these three passages do not particularly go. I think there is an implication in two of them of the personal presence of the king but not a ^{third teaching} 12 and in the third one we just looked at there is an implication that there is result of the personal reign of the king and it suggests that it comes after the event Paul describes ^{as still} ~~12 1/2~~ future in his day and both suggest that it is after the personal return of Christ, but I don't think that you can clearly prove anything as to the relation of these events to others events in the future in the predicted plan of God from these three passages alone and I don't think that you can even find a clear implication of anything except that one sentence ~~that~~ I mentioned and that only an implication. Now the other two questions then, what is the ~~the~~ relation to other events in future ~~the~~ plan and what is the nature of the kingdom, what else can we gather about this whole matter? These are questions that will be very interesting to 13 and perhaps before we do that Dr. Buswell would like to deal with this one question, evidence that there is ~~is~~ to be a golden age and tell us whether he finds anything in the NT that will throw light on it.

Dr. B:
 I'm enjoying Dr. MacRae's lectures and I just ^{pled + urged + begged} 13 1/2 get into this, I can ~~take~~ take that prophets class, ^{I'll} take it in the millenium, that is I haven't been able to arrange my schedule so far and I've missed a good many things that you have had. Romans 8 -- while you are finding that let me say that I no sooner sat down after saying that the Gog and Magog rebellion is not a war then I remembered that it is called a ^{war} definitely called a ~~war~~, and what I should have said is that it is not (end of record) e13

Dr. B.

The eighth chapter of Romans, from verse 12. "Therefore now brethren debtors are we, not to the flesh to live accordingly to the flesh, for if accordingly to the flesh you are living you are going to die, but if by the spirit you are continuously (that is present progressive tense) putting to death the doings of the body you are going to live, for as many as by the Spirit of God are led along, these are the sons of God." Now that verse 14 is a transition. Having discussed the spiritual life, ~~looking~~ looking forward now to the implications of being a son of God, filled with the Spirit. "For you did not receive the spirit of slavery again (εἰς φόβον) into a state of fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship (the fullness of all that it is to be a son of God. " (υἱοθεσίας) something to which we are looking forward and of which we have now the Spirit, to which we ~~have been~~ ^{are} predestinated. "You have received the spirit of sonship. In that we cry "Abba Father", in that we call Father in familiar language, the Spirit Himself is testifying with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs with Christ, if indeed we are suffering it is that we may be glorified together. For I reckon that not on any account (ἀξία, no value)-" In accounting if you have a legacy and Faith Seminary is the thirty-second ^{legatee} 2 1 3/4 Mr. Armes puts it in the book \$1.00, the nominal sum, well this is (οὐκ ἀξία) (don't even put it in the books), "not of any account, not of any value are the sufferings of the present time in view of the coming glory to be revealed in us." Here comes your eschatology of Dr. Grummond, "The coming glory to be revealed in us," or "the hope of the creation." It never dawned on that that word ~~was~~ ^{is} the word for creation until maybe 10 years ago, I had read along there the earnest expectation of the creature. "I wondered what creature ^{it} ~~he~~ was talking about and I just read on and to something more familiar. Why it's the creation, (κτίσις) and then I discovered that

in the Revised Version it is so translated, "the hope of the creation," and he is talking about the created universe. (ἀποκαταβολή) "the ^{fond, forward-looking} hope of the creation awaits the apocalypse of the sons of God."

There you have in a ^{didactic} portion of scripture, not figurative particularly, a statement that the hope of the creation waits for a certain future event which is called "the apocalypse of the sons of God," translated "the manifestation of the sons of God," (ἀποκαλύψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ)

"the hope of this creation waits for the apocalypse of the sons of God."

For into vanity the creation was subjected, not willingly, "now ~~that's~~ Dr. MacRae's discussion of Isa. 11 ^{fits} right into this passage. Paul has in the background the 3 ch of Gen. and the state of nature into which the creation fell subsequent to the fall of man. "The creation was

subjected to vanity, not on its own account, not willingly, but on the part of Him who subjected it, ^{and} I understand that to mean ^{man's} account, and I suggest that Paul means that the ^{curse of} present nature is a disciplinary providence for man's good. That is exegesis, I mean to say that is not stated in so many words, you might call it "Isegesis" but the plain statement is that the creation was subjected to vanity on account of the one who subjected it to vanity, certainly not on God's account. Man is the only other party who could be called one who subjected it, in hope, because ~~is~~ or Westcott ^{is} reads, "in the hope that," it

doesn't make much difference whether it is (ἐπ' ἐλπίδι) or (ἐπ' ἐλπίδι) and here is another simply declarative statement, "the creation itself will be delivered (αὐτῇ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται) future indicative passive. "The creation itself will be delivered ^{from} the slavery of corruption into the liberty of the Glory, that is ^{generative of attribute,} the glorious liberty of the sons of God."

This universe will be delivered from a slavery of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and that hope is alleged to be subsequent to the apolcalypse of the sons of God. ^{It's easy to identify the apocalypse of the sons of God.} It does not appear of God.

what we shall be but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like

who is our life shall appear,

Him for we shall see Him as He is. (I John, Col. 3) "When Christ, ^{with} our ~~6~~ shall appear, we shall appear with Him in Glory. ~~so~~ The

apocalypse of the sons of God ^{" would} which seems to be a precise reference well known to NT people --the hope of the creative world is alleged to be subsequent to the apocalypse of the sons of God and this creative universe will be delivered from ~~the/it~~ its slavery ^{of} and corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Verse 22 --we

know that the whole creation ^{groans} together and pains together until now, ["] and this was written in the middle of the 1st century, ~~and so~~ I

suppose we would say that the whole creation ^{groans} and pains together until now. I haven't seen any signs but that battle snakes are still around. Dr. MacRae goes to the Grand Canyon and knows how to get around with those people there. I'm not as experienced a scout as he is. Certainly the universe, the earth on which we live is in ~~the~~

~~7 1/2~~ ^{distress} that is, the ferocious character of the created world in certain ^{as} respects. The whole creation groans together and pains to-

gether until now. In the English Bible it says "not only they," it's inscrutable ^{where} ~~how~~ they get the "they" from, there isn't any "they" in the context ^{ou' mevov de'} and not only, and if you want to supply a word say

not only ^{"so"} not only ["] what we just said, "get it? (student question --)

Ans: ^{What does Paul mean by saying,} The whole creation groans and pains together until now; I understood that he means nature ^{to the claw; the diseases that pigs have,} 8 1/2 and the lower down you get

in the scale, the more contented they are. A grub worm is better off than a pig, and a rock on the side of a hill is better off than a grub worm, but a horse has lots of trouble, a dog has some worries of his own

^{laughter} I read a little poem one time -- "I wished I were a little rock a settin' on a hill, do nothing all day long but just ~~settin'~~ still. I wouldn't eat, I wouldn't sleep, I wouldn't even wash, but just set still a thousand years and rest myself begosh." ^{Laughter} Well the general

^{disorders} of nature, I don't have any other thought. It's not like the

millenium, the lion and the lamb lie down together as Dr. MacRae says, with the ~~lamb~~ ^{lion} inside the ~~lion~~ ^{lamb}. "Algy met a bear and the bear was bulgy and the bulge was Algy. " ^{Laughter} I know one more -- There was a young lady

from Niger, who smiled as she rode on a tiger, They came back from the ride with the lady inside and a smile on the face of the tiger ---- ^{Laughter} I suppose that's what it means. ^{Laughter}

^{But} "all creation grows together + ^{parts together} until now" unless man protects himself. This thin-skinned animal that we are has a lot of trouble and nature is not harm-

monious, but that is doubtless the reference to the Gen. 3, ^{reflected} it ^{"thorns + thistles shall bring forth to thee,"}

and all the implications that are ^{reflected} reported elsewhere in the Scriptures. Not "Not they" ^{but}

"Not only so, but ~~we~~ ^{we} are called, Paul repeats the first person plural pronoun here with great emphasis, ourselves, having the first fruits of the spirit, we even ourselves grown within ourselves, ⁴ ~~at~~ times, 4 pronouns

emphasizing we, and this includes Paul as he writes the 8th chapter of Romans, certainly a victorious Christian and that grown within ourselves waiting for (νίθησιν) the redemption of the body." Now this

takes, verse 23 would seem to indicate that until the redemption of the body, until we receive the fullness of sonship which includes the redemption of the body, we have not experienced the glory ^{which is to be} that shall

be revealed in us, we have not experienced the apocalypse of the sons of God. When we receive the redemption of the body, (νίθησιν) the full-

ness of all it is to be a son of God, well that is what we are wait-ign for and that would explain the apocalypse of the sons of God in the verse above. That would fit in exactly with what Paul says in Colosians and what John says ^(in his first epistle) so although this passage is

not discussed in prophetic scripture, it seems to me that here you have a very catagorical statement, that this earth is to experience, ^{is} to realize a hope, ^{it is} to enjoy the blessedness of the sons of God, the glor-

ious liberty of the sons of God, ^{it is} to enter into that hope after an event which ^{is called} ~~has caused~~ the apocalypse of the sons of God. " I have never seen this in any literature until 1936,37. I wrote it ~~out~~ up and then came

back an answer, and the only answer to this interpretation ~~that~~ ^{which}

I've ever seen is one which ^{alleges that} the deliverance of ^(αὐτὰ κτίσις) ~~the~~ creation itself, that certainly seems to be faith(?) which ~~is to be~~, which seems to give you identity, the ^{numerical} identity,

that the deliverance ^{of this creation} is to be a better discussion, and ^{that} when Paul says this creation is to be delivered (^{ἐλευθερωθήσεται}) will be delivered ~~from~~ ^{from}

when it's bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. ^{That means that God will utterly blot out, make another one in its place} Well, that interpretation, I have heard

~~went~~ but it doesn't impress me as being valid. ^{Are there} ~~I have~~ a question about this passage? This seems to me very straight-forward, very direct, (Question of student: ~~(not very clear to end of record)~~ Would this seem

e 14 to teach then "the whole creation" here would cause us to conclude that the earth mentioned in the Isaiah passages would have to be more than the land of Palestine? Dr. B.: I think so. () could mean the whole horizon. the other end. This passage doesn't mention ~~it~~ any other heaven and ^(end of record)

earth after this one ^{has} and come to its full realization. This is all affirmative that this created universe is going to have a period of blessing and that period of blessedness will be realized after the

apocalypse of the sons of God. (question) ^{Dr. M: Is there going to be} (the golden age)

Dr. B.: Turn to the 20th Chapter of Revelation and Dr. MacRae will have something to say about Ezekiel, 38,39, how long will this golden age be,

not necessarily in point of ^{actual chronology} ~~of~~ years, but relative to other events. Dr. MacRae hasn't gotten into that yet. But this ^{earth} universe is to have

a period of blessedness after an event which is called an "apocalypse of the sons of God." This then would fit in with the ^{Augsburg} ~~outbreak~~ confession which says, "We repudiate the doctrine of the ^{Ani} ~~anti~~-baptists, who

hold that the saints are to ^{possess} ~~suggest~~ the earth as a kingdom before the resurrection. " The words are taken as they actually stand; ^{that is} a

repudiation of the ^{Munster} ~~most of the~~ ^{Ani} ~~anti~~-baptists, who ^{said they} have the kingdom right here and now, but it would be a repudiation of post-millennialism in the

^{Augsburg} ~~outbreak~~ of confession. This would hold that there is to be a kingdom or a period of blessedness after the resurrection, after the ^{apocalypse}

of the sons of God, but I do think that Romans ~~is~~

eight is one of the key passages for ^{eschatology} 2 even though it is very seldom touched upon in the older works. I haven't seen it anywhere prior to 1935. (student question)

All men and animals have ^{the} stress, but born again people also have this stress in this present age. This book has to be taken in the background of the scripture. Paul was seeped in Old Testament and the third chapter of Genesis is the base of Old Testament theology and referred to constantly in the prophets, or frequently in the prophets, so I don't see how you could (⁷ ^{K 71515}) 3 1/2 ^{then} and just limit it to the world of man in view of all that Isaiah has to say with Gen 3 in the background.

Dr. MacRae---- I ^{imagine} might ~~as~~ well continue with Dr. Buswell next time if some of you would like to read anything that was ^{germaine} to what I'd said today that would be fine, but I think perhaps looking forward to next time he would have some suggestions. Dr. Buswell -- Suppose you read Warfields' discussion of the millenium which he says goes up in smoke, and "Biblical Doctrines" if you can get a hold of it, or ^{you can} ~~read~~ ^{what Hodge} has to say about the literal millenium, either one of those; ^{they're} ~~practically~~ ^{in substance} ~~prospective~~ is the same, Revelation 20, 2 Cor. 15, I doubt if we get much beyond that. (End of class period.)

No question to answer, merely the same questionnaire to fill out, so I'm going to ask Mr. Pote to circulate them and please sign your name on it and fill it in as rapidly as possible and we will collect in a ² ~~few~~ minutes.----- This meeting two hours at a time means that we have a whole weeks work in one day, so I don't like anybody to miss it. If the class meets two or three different days you miss one day it means just one hour, but to miss a whole week it's pretty hard to every make up. Now please turn in the papers.-----Dr. Buswell speaking

sunk in + percolated;

It might be that it may have ~~some~~ ~~7 1/2~~ it may have some further reactions, are there any questions or remarks about that chapter?

(question) ---- That word creation has the same significance throughout this entire passage^{20, 21, 22}. I think ~~it does~~. If you read the passage right straight through it would be ~~xxx~~ very hard to pry to razor blade between and show a different meaning in a different context.

The Revised Version translates ~~the~~ creation throughout, then ~~it was called~~ to our attention that the old English word "creature" might not be clear to everyone. I looked up the usage of the word in the Oxford dictionary.

under The word creature, one of the meanings given was, "the creation" and then the letters obs. which mean obsolete and there was a citation from Wycliffe's translation in 2 Peter 3: 'the beginning of the creature' which obviously means the beginning of the creation, and then the Cranmore version, 'the beginning of ye creature' which obviously means ^u the creation. Then a ^{third citation} ~~9 1/2~~ under the same definition in the Oxford dictionary was this passage in Romans 8: the words 'creature' being used according to the dictionary ^{gives} as the meaning, 'the creation,' so in your old English, creature and creation were interchangeable apparently in 1611 and before, so that when they used the creature and then the creation they didn't intend any change in meaning, only a little variety. There is no difference in the Greek, but of course the lexicography of the word depends upon the usage in Greek and its context. Suter says the word is always used in some action or doing of God and the word (κτῆσις) ~~is~~ isn't found as a reference to creation of man or the doing or deed of man, that's what Suter says, ^{for 95} as the creature or creation meaning any particular created thing, depending on the context, but ^{he already} here where he says (αὐτῶν) ^{κτῆσις}, the creation itself and ^{παρα τῆς κτῆσις} 10 1/2 the entire creation grows together and pains together. Paul was certainly writing with Hebrew Scriptures in the back of his mind;

any Scripture writer had the Old Testament in his cultural background, so I can't see any possibility ^{but} that (κτισις) ~~it~~ refers to the ~~created~~ universe. He says (παρα ^{ἐν} κτισις) ~~from~~ ^{groans} ~~groans~~ the ~~entire~~ creation.

If it were every creature in the ^{creation}, the article would be omitted (παρα) ^{κτισις} would mean "every creature," but (παρα ^{ἐν} κτισις) is "the entire creation,"

used with the ~~article~~ ^{articular} use there. Then we seem to have here a statement that the ~~created world~~ ^{II 3/4} which groans and pains together and ~~would~~ ^{would} ~~would~~ ^{would} suggest that ~~subjected~~ ^{subjected} to vanity on account of ^{him} ~~who~~ ^{who} subjected it, ~~and~~ that this (κτισις) has a hope, this hope awaits a certain future event.

At that future event ~~and~~ ^{or} thereafter this (κτισις) ^{'s} will enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God. That is the substance of the ~~passages~~ ^{12.} Student question --

That is a part of it, I would think. The adoption to which the redemption of our bodies is certainly a part of our future heritage, the word (υιοθεσις) translated by Thayers ^{as} meaning ^{the} fullness of ~~all~~ ^{all} that it is to be a child of God, ["] that is ~~has~~ ^{has} rendering of it.

It's used 4 times ^{in this chapter,} ~~once~~ ^{once} in Ephesians ~~once~~ ^{once} and Gal. 4; ~~is~~ ^{we are} predestinated unto (υιοθεσις), we have the spirit of (υιοθεσις), ^{we are} ~~and~~ ^{we are} going to inherit ^{υιοθεσις}, the redemption of the body. ~~I don't see~~ ^{The} change of our bodies to be like His glorious body is a part of our future inheritance. We have the earnest of our inheritance now. Now the declaration, ^{is} that the (κτισις) itself will enjoy the glorious liberty of the ^{children} sons of God, but will not enjoy ~~them~~ ^{it} until after the apocalypse of the sons of God. It ~~is~~ ^{is} pretty clear pre-millennial thinking that is to say that a definite existence and blessedness ~~is~~ ^{is} or the creation subsequent to the ~~it~~ ^{Lord's} return.

(student question) -- Dr. B. ματαίωσις that which is not (di-os) is empty and vain. That's a pretty good description of sin, anyway. It's not a thorough analysis of sin, but a description. Here is the abuse of some good thing that God has made.

Student question -- Could "glorious liberty of children of God" be equated with vs 22 - adoption/redemption of our bodies? That is a part of it, I would think. The adoption to which the redemption of our bodies is certainly a part of our future heritage, the word (υιοθεσις) translated by Thayers ^{as} meaning ^{the} fullness of ~~all~~ ^{all} that it is to be a child of God, ["] that is ~~has~~ ^{has} rendering of it.

It's used 4 times ^{in this chapter,} ~~once~~ ^{once} in Ephesians ~~once~~ ^{once} and Gal. 4; ~~is~~ ^{we are} predestinated unto (υιοθεσις), we have the spirit of (υιοθεσις), ^{we are} ~~and~~ ^{we are} going to inherit ^{υιοθεσις}, the redemption of the body. ~~I don't see~~ ^{The} change of our bodies to be like His glorious body is a part of our future inheritance. We have the earnest of our inheritance now. Now the declaration, ^{is} that the (κτισις) itself will enjoy the glorious liberty of the ^{children} sons of God, but will not enjoy ~~them~~ ^{it} until after the apocalypse of the sons of God. It ~~is~~ ^{is} pretty clear pre-millennial thinking that is to say that a definite existence and blessedness ~~is~~ ^{is} or the creation subsequent to the ~~it~~ ^{Lord's} return.

(student question) -- Dr. B. ματαίωσις that which is not (di-os) is empty and vain. That's a pretty good description of sin, anyway. It's not a thorough analysis of sin, but a description. Here is the abuse of some good thing that God has made.

Student question -- Could "glorious liberty of children of God" be equated with vs 22 - adoption/redemption of our bodies? That is a part of it, I would think. The adoption to which the redemption of our bodies is certainly a part of our future heritage, the word (υιοθεσις) translated by Thayers ^{as} meaning ^{the} fullness of ~~all~~ ^{all} that it is to be a child of God, ["] that is ~~has~~ ^{has} rendering of it.

It's used 4 times ^{in this chapter,} ~~once~~ ^{once} in Ephesians ~~once~~ ^{once} and Gal. 4; ~~is~~ ^{we are} predestinated unto (υιοθεσις), we have the spirit of (υιοθεσις), ^{we are} ~~and~~ ^{we are} going to inherit ^{υιοθεσις}, the redemption of the body. ~~I don't see~~ ^{The} change of our bodies to be like His glorious body is a part of our future inheritance. We have the earnest of our inheritance now. Now the declaration, ^{is} that the (κτισις) itself will enjoy the glorious liberty of the ^{children} sons of God, but will not enjoy ~~them~~ ^{it} until after the apocalypse of the sons of God. It ~~is~~ ^{is} pretty clear pre-millennial thinking that is to say that a definite existence and blessedness ~~is~~ ^{is} or the creation subsequent to the ~~it~~ ^{Lord's} return.

(student question) -- Dr. B. ματαίωσις that which is not (di-os) is empty and vain. That's a pretty good description of sin, anyway. It's not a thorough analysis of sin, but a description. Here is the abuse of some good thing that God has made.

Student question -- Could "glorious liberty of children of God" be equated with vs 22 - adoption/redemption of our bodies? That is a part of it, I would think. The adoption to which the redemption of our bodies is certainly a part of our future heritage, the word (υιοθεσις) translated by Thayers ^{as} meaning ^{the} fullness of ~~all~~ ^{all} that it is to be a child of God, ["] that is ~~has~~ ^{has} rendering of it.

It's used 4 times ^{in this chapter,} ~~once~~ ^{once} in Ephesians ~~once~~ ^{once} and Gal. 4; ~~is~~ ^{we are} predestinated unto (υιοθεσις), we have the spirit of (υιοθεσις), ^{we are} ~~and~~ ^{we are} going to inherit ^{υιοθεσις}, the redemption of the body. ~~I don't see~~ ^{The} change of our bodies to be like His glorious body is a part of our future inheritance. We have the earnest of our inheritance now. Now the declaration, ^{is} that the (κτισις) itself will enjoy the glorious liberty of the ^{children} sons of God, but will not enjoy ~~them~~ ^{it} until after the apocalypse of the sons of God. It ~~is~~ ^{is} pretty clear pre-millennial thinking that is to say that a definite existence and blessedness ~~is~~ ^{is} or the creation subsequent to the ~~it~~ ^{Lord's} return.

Dr. MacRae speaking --- I don't know how many of you are familiar with this book by Bederwolf called Millenium Bible. It is a book which can be extremely useful because in it he goes through the entire Bible and in it he selects the passages which he thinks of as important in the discussion of matters related to the return of Christ, and he suggests a great many which some people might think ~~had~~ nothing to do with it. That is he tries to make it comprehensive and then in connection with those passages, he tries not so much to present a view as to give you a summary of what different commentators say and he very evidently has examined a great many commentaries. Now just how accurate his summation of the view is, I wouldn't say, that we would want to check into some, but at least there is a ~~valuable~~ valuable guide in suggesting different commentaries that would be interesting to look into on different points. I noticed here in this book on vs. 19, where we first have this mentioned on the creation. He says under the creation on vs. 19, where the A.V. had creature, that the revised creation, he says that this word creation, there is an astonishing variety of answers given to the question as to what the word refers to. He says the word in itself means the totality of creative things, but it very often takes a more restricted meaning according to the context and among the various interpretations are the following: (1) all inanimate creation, he lists about 10 commentaries, and then he says that there is no sufficient reason why animal creation should be excluded. They say inanimate creation, and furthermore the expression is not of its own will, vs. 20, and groaneth and travaileth vs. 22 imply life to the entire universe without limitation. He says but believers here are to be excluded from the expression because in

vs. 23 they are mentioned as forming a class by themselves, excluding believers and he gives here a reference for that (riddle) but unbelievers are also to be excluded for (1) either they are to be converted before the expected time and were in that case be found among the children of God, or (2) if they have not been converted they will not participate even indirectly in the glory in question. I think that is a very good ^{handley} answer to that particular point. (4) Totality ^{of} ~~the~~ creative things except ^{humanity} ~~that~~ ^{is} this in view of ~~that~~ all the statements of the context without doubt, the correct interpretation, and then he gives the names of about different commentators. I thought that was very interesting, and it would be interesting of course, to look up those commentators and see exactly what they say, but the thing that impresses me that is interesting is that he doesn't refer to any of these as taking the word creation as meaning simply the body, the creative part of the believer, as compared ~~by~~ with the soul of the believer, or the spirit of the believer, but in every one of these views that he gives, he takes the creation as the whole thing that God has created, the whole universe, either perhaps everything or just the inanimate part or everything except humanity or everything except believers. He gives the reasons why the great majority of commentators ~~take~~ it as meaning the totality of creative things except humanity and while I'm here, if you'll pardon me I'll refer to one more thing that I noticed here, that only under verse 21, he makes this extremely striking statement. He says that the creation itself shall in a glorious ~~state~~ be delivered into that freedom from debility and decay in which the children of God when raised up in Glory shall $4 \frac{1}{4}$. Now that statement which he just made, would seem to me to be very definitely a statement of a view which would ~~not~~ mean a millennial reign after the resurrection. If you take it in what it seems logical to me, the creation itself shall in

a glorious sense be delivered into that freedom from debility and decay in which the children of God when raised up in glory shall 5 .

Now that would seem to just about what Dr. Buswell was giving you. Now that--Paul says the whole creation ~~is~~ going to be delivered, all these things, animate and inanimate in connection with the resurrection of the body. The creation also participates in it, and if you have that then surely you ~~will~~ have the golden age after the return of Christ.

Now the striking thing to me right there is that he has in parenthesis the names of about 10 commentators and I would be interested to see what the commentators say on this verse and just how exactly he has quoted what they say because I notice his quotations on other things, and therefore it will be interesting to see whether he may have misinterpreted the statement of one of these commentators or possible they may have made a statement in the interpretation of this verse which is inconsistent with the interpretation that they give on other passages or the the Bible as a whole and in which case you would have a ~~definite~~ case where they in their statement on this verse was carried out logically would bring you to a premillennial interpretation.

Now that is very interesting because of the commentators that he mentions. He has these letters, C,B,D,O,H,A,M,ph,Th.O,Bez. Now I don't know how ~~many~~ of you recognized all those as I read them, I didn't recognize any myself, but I looked them up in the back and I saw that by C, he indicates Calvin, by B, Bengel, by D, for ^Deverett, by O, Olshausen; H, Hodge; A-Alfred, ~~M~~-Meyer, PH- P^hilippi, THO- ^{Thompson} _{8/3/4} and by Bez- *Beza*, well now those are outstanding commentators and it would be very interesting to see exactly what they said on this passage because it would seem to me that in the case of a number of them, either he has misinterpreted what they said or they have said something that is inconsistent and of course either is

probable, either of those ~~three~~, ~~and~~ ^{cases in} anyone ~~of~~ particular instance and I thought it would be an interesting thing to look into. Dr. Buswell -

--- Thank you very much. I hadn't looked into Biederwolf and I hadn't been conscious of anything written applying this passage to the millenium until this very recent years. I think I do remember an obscure referance from Calvin that might satisfy what Biederwolf says and yet not any concious elaboration of it. I imagine that ~~Thob~~^{Thob} would be about the same, and Beza. You see when you read this passage, well you well ^{your mind goes} ~~with~~ ~~to~~ back to the third chapter of ~~Genesis~~ and ~~to~~ conclude that therefore there is going to be a milleniel period, well they just don't ~~publish~~ ^{focus} that ^{long} ^{opponent} they go along to the next doctrinal portion

I think that is a very valuable point that Dr. Buswell brought out. You find that Calvin in his institute has of course taken up various doctrines and arranged them in ~~what~~ he considers a systematic arrangement and discuss each in its reation to others, and tremendously and useful work it is, but then Calvin has given us his great series of commentaries and the commentaries consist of quite an extent of popular lectures. We wouldn't call them popular in our day, but yet they are not the sort of thing where a man sits down to write a detailed scholarly exegesis. Calvin interprets that as he studied it to see what it means when he presented in the church not simply as an academic discussion of what this passage means, but by a way of driving home the truth to the hearts and minds of the people who were there, and so you find that Calvin commentaries are just filled with very splendid and devotional material driving home, the truth in the passages and very often there is so much of that that you sort of wonder whether he has paid a great deal attention to just what is the bearing of this particular verse on the whole matter under discussion and yet he does almost try to state at least breifly at least what really is said by these words. Just

what does it teach? Of course, ~~he was~~ ^{he was} not greatly interested in this matter of eschatology. He didn't go into it specifically at any time or any great length, but when he took up these passages, he very often gives you a very clear strong ~~statement~~ statement as to what the particular passage teaches and it would be valuable to draw those together and see how much of an eschatology in addition to what Calvin has given us elsewhere, we could get from these incidental statements in the commentary. Dr. Buswell. -----

As I've been reviewing Calvin's Commentaries in "The Bible Today", I have tried to pay special attention to passages ~~where~~ ^{where} you could ~~find~~ ^{find} in it post-millennarian or pre-millennarian. ^{There are} a great many passages in which you probably would say that this would refer to a millennial reign, and ~~he~~ ^{he} refers it to the church. A great many passages in which he finds, he follows a post-millennial line, as ~~if~~ ^{if} spiritualizing interpretation just applying it to the church ~~as~~ ^{as} Dr. M. says as he goes along lecturing. But I have found ~~several~~ ^{several} passages in which, two or three at least, in ~~which~~ ^{which} Calvin says, "The fulfillment of this must come after the Lord's return." I can't give you the exact references now. I'll try to look them up for next week. There's one place in Ezekiel, one in Isaiah, and here in the sixth (?) ~~chapter~~ // chapter of Romans I was impressed as I read it that what Calvin says is consistent with a premillennial view, and is inconsistent with a post-millennial view. It's much like the Augsburg Confession which is supposed to be the bulkwork of Lutheran post-millennialism, but actually, when you read the words, it says, "We reject the ~~chiliasm~~ ^{chiliasm} (?) of the Anabaptists, who teach that the saints will possess the earth as a kingdom before the resurrection." A rejection of post-millennialism. The majority of Lutherans take that and say, "Ah, you see, the Augsburg Confession rejects ~~chiliasm~~ ^{chiliasm}, there it rejects premillennialism." If there are no

more remarks or questions on Romans 8? (Question) ~~The~~ What elements here drive us to conclude that this refers to the millenium rather than to the eternal---?) There's nothing. The only thing that ties it down to a period of history (?) on this earth rather than to a future state of blessedness after this earth has gone off the scene is $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \eta\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ the creation itself will be delivered $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\omega\ \theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. Now when you say "the creation itself" there is no stronger ~~word~~ ^{word} to say this thing, its identical self, will be delivered, and will enjoy the blessedness, the very blessedness of the sons of God. Dr. M: You're not saying it will be destroyed; you're saying it will be delivered. Dr. B.: Delivered, and it's $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \eta\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$. That's the argument for a period of blessedness on this ^reath. He says, "The hope," the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\alpha$, "the fond, forward-looking hope of the $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, waits for the apokalypsis of the sons of God. ^(Question) /The question about the identity of the new heaven and the new earth. We'll take that up under some subsequent division. I do think that this is one of the passages which is very hard to interpret any other way than that this earth is going to have a period of blessedness when it will be delivered from the curse and enjoy the glorious liberty which the sons of God are going to enjoy when ~~the~~ // their future state~~s~~ is to be. (Question: What is 'that glorious liberty?') If it is as Biederwold says, equal to the state where they'll never be corrupt again, there's something wrong with that because the earth is going to experience that decay," Dr. B. No, I don't think you have any decay. You do have a picture of the heavens and the earth fleeing away, found no place at all for them..."

end of record.

Dr. B: Being then created. But that isn't decay. (Question: That doesn't ~~like~~ liken that to say our condition right now, we're wasting away as we grow older?) Dr. B: In II. Peter 3 you mean and Rev. 20, and Hebrews 1, those passages that refer to the elimination of the heavens and the earth, . "They shall wax old" ~~let's examine it~~ as does a garment." "And they shall be changed." The second law of thermodynamics works right there; the physical universe is running down, but I don't think that you'd call that decay in the sense of the curse. He's talking about the ~~a~~ curse that's pronounced upon the ground~~l~~ in the fifth ~~the~~ chapter of Genesis: "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee." There are implications in Isaiah that in the Messianic Age the ferocious nature of wild beast will be taken away, the venomous serpents eliminated, and ~~the~~ a new heavens and a new earth without any re recurrence of the thought of the curse or degeneracy. (Question) There's no emptiness or vanity left after the enemies ~~of~~ of Christ are conquered (in the aorist). Now there are Bible students who would seek ~~to~~ to show that the passing away of this earth and the creation of a new heavens and a new earth still retain a numerical identity of this earth. That's another matter, another matter of discussion. Some feel quite sure that ---you mean this utter destruction at the end of the millenium that is postulated there, that is described~~l~~ still leaves a numerical identity retained. That we don't need to discuss now. This is $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ or $\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (?) $2\frac{3}{4}$ it is going to be delivered and here Paul just doesn't say what is going to come after. Maybe~~l~~ it will get old after that, maybe He'll throw it ~~l~~ away and make a new one, maybe He'll work it over so that in one sense it's another, and in another sense it's the same. That's another matter. But here you have the deliverance of this earth from it/s vanity, from it/s curse, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God after the apocalypse of the sons of God. (Question: people will be delivered, redeemed the same as

^v
 _____ in vs. 23?) Dr. B. Take vs. 23 for a moment. He says, "ou
 movom de, " There is no "they" in there at all; it's ~~atrocious~~
 atrocious to put a "they" in there. Your King James Version and
 your Revised Version both put "they," and there's no "they" in the
 context. (Dr. M: (/) I don't know what textBiederwolf is putting
 In the R.V.?
 in each chapter, but whatever he has, he says "Not only so.")
 Dr. B: That would be correct , and the word "so" is still supplied.
 "So" ^{is} ~~is~~ much more probable ~~that~~ a substitute. Here's a RW. YOU're
 quite right, "Not only so." (Question: Is this manifestation of the
 sons of God the ----- for (forth?) the time of the millenium and
^{reign}
 having them/with Christ, is that what manifestation?) Well now they
 use it as an identification in exegesis. It/^{is}referred to in two
 different places here, the glory that will be revealed in us, and the
 apocalypse of the sons of God, two different/^{phrases}~~phrases~~/which seem to
 mean the same thing. Now you have in ~~Col~~ Colossians 2 , "You are
 dead and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our
 life shall appear, we shall appear with Him in the glory." And then
 you have I. John, "It does not yet ~~is~~ appear what we shall be, but ~~when~~
 we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall
 see Him as He is." So I think it is entirely probably^e that those
 four phrases all refer to the same thing, the apocalypse of the sons
 of God. I take that in connection with the fact in the present life,
 we who are the first fruits of the Spirit groan within ourselves,
 waiting for uiothesia, the redemption of the body. (Question) The
 resurrection, the rapture, the change in those who are living. Question:
 And then there will be three and a half years after that?) You always
 say after, but you never say the length of time.)(Dr. M.: That's not
 our present point. Later.) (Question: If you call that period of
 blessedness the millenium, then you have to designate what the nature
 of this deliverance will be.) The nature of the deliverance just in
 this immediate passage doesn't depend on whether it's a thousand years

or not. Not at all. AS I said, the nature of this deliverance is that the vanity is gone, that the corruption is gone. (Question: Do you apply that to the millenium?) We'll see when we get to the twentieth chapter of Revelation/ whether that's the case. This period of blessedness is alleged to be after/^{a future event which is called}the apocalypse of the sons of God, "the glory that is to be revealed in us;" "uiothesia, the redemption of the body," it's called by several different phrases. Subsequent to that event the creation will have this period of blessedness. Turn now to I. Corinthians. This is not nearly as clear. Myer's Commentary brings it out, and it is discussed in other Scriptures as a premillennial inference, a passage that lends itself to premillennial inference. That's all we're trying to say here. ~~Wax~~ We're not trying to prove anything as positive assertions. There are degree^s of definiteness. (Dr. M: Dr. B. means that it's clear enough to be ~~wax~~ worth looking at, but not as clear as others.) Dr. B.: Myer holds that the I. Cor. 15 implies a period between the two resurrections. That's as far as we go. It's a passage that's not a major, it's not a (8 3/4) passage, but I think it's ~~wax/wax~~ worth looking ~~at~~ in this connection. Now Paul is talking about the resurrection of Christ in vs. 20, "Now Christ has been raised ~~at~~ from among the dead." Notice in passing that whenever you have ek with the genative plural, the resurrection, ek vekpwv; $9.1/4$ $αλλοις$ (?) the reference is either to the resurrection of Christ or the resurrection of believers. In Phil. 4 there is a strong refer~~ence~~ to there. The ^{ek αναστασις} ~~///α/α/α~~ ek ~~α/α/α/α/α~~ vekpwv, ek with the genative is partative genative, ~~α/α/α~~ implying the resurrection out from among the dead, implying the resurrection not of all the dead at one time. That's just in passg~~ing~~. Christ has been raised, ek vekpwv, the $απαραρχη$ first-fruits of those who slept. Since through man, dia, also through man resurrection of dead people. The $αναστασις νεκρων$

may refer to anybody's resurrection, "The resurrection of dead people," whether just or unjust. When Paul ^{said} ~~spoke~~/before Agrippa, "We believe in the resurrection of the dead, both of the ~~just~~ just and of the unjust," that's avastasis vekpwv, without any specifications, the just and the unjust. "For just as in Adam, all die, so also in Christ all will be made alive." And this is with reference to avastasis vekpwv. "And each one in his own $\tau \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha$, $\epsilon \nu \tau \omega \iota \delta \iota \omega \tau \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \iota$. There are then orders, or classes of resurrection. The word tagma means "class" or "rank" or "order of classification." (See vs. 23 in the Greek, and include $\epsilon \tau \alpha$ of vs. 24). Here you have three words following tagmatif, "each one in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterwards those who are Christ's at His appearing, then the end." Now the inference is that there are ^{three} ~~two~~/resurrections, in which you included Christ. Christ is the first one to arise from the dead to die no more. The resurrection of Lazarus would not be classified here, or the son of the widow of Nain, or the Shulamite woman's son in the Old Testament, or any other case like ~~it~~ that. That was the bringing back to natural life, but Christ is the first one to rise immortal, so He's called the first-fruit; He is the first order of resurrection, and you remember Matthew tells you there were a few others who were raised from the dead at His resurrection. Christ the first-fruit. Afterwards those who are Christ's at His ~~Parousia~~ Parousia, then the end. Now I grant you that the exegesis of the word, "telos" here is quite intricate, but the "telos" includes the destruction of the last enemy which is death. The destruction of death would naturally mean that there are no more dead people/ in this order of dead(?)) Well the outline here is the same as the outline in the Book of Revelation, the two resurrections that are referred to in the 20th Ch., the first resurrection, and the rest of the dead would not come to life until the thousand years were finished. So you have three orders of resurrection suggested, first ~~Christ~~/ Christ, the first order, then those who are Christ's at His

appearing, then the consummation which includes the utter ~~of~~ destruction ~~of~~ of death, so that there are no~~x~~ more dead people. This order of dead people is wiped out. Now as I say, you can't build a house on that, but I do think that taken with other Scriptures it has its implications. Now the 20th ch. of Rev. just to get this passage in chorus: The 19th ch. is continuous. I feel strongly that the chapter division is out-of-place, the first three verses belong with the 19th ch., and the division/^{of}subject matter comes with the fourth verse. The ^{of the} (13 1/2) beast is destroyed and his army are slain, and the beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, the horses and captains are ~~slain~~ slain and the fowls are filled with their flesh. An awful picture of judgment and catastrophe, destroying the wicked who are destroying the earth. The 20th ch. : "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the abyss, and a great chain in his hand.. And he seized the dragon, the ancient ~~serp~~ serpent, who is the devil...." (end of record)

e 17

Dr. B.
He bound him so that he'd stay bound for a thousand years. "And he hurled him into the abyss, and he locked it, and sealed it over him, in order that he should deceive the nations anymore until the thousand years are finished. After these things ^(or after this) ~~he~~ ^{it is necessary for} ~~is~~ ^{him} to be loosed for a little season. And I saw thrones, and persons sat upon them....." And I would make the division here, a new paragraph. The construction of the beast and the ^{false} ~~false~~ prophet and the dragon practically all fits together. Now vs 4 paragraph I would say, "I saw thrones, and they were occupied, persons sat upon them and judgment was ~~is~~ given to them, to these persons; I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the Word of God, and who had not worshipped the beastⁿ or his image, nor received his mark in their foreheads^e or upon their hands, and they came to life, €376av

, aggressive aorist;"I saw the ~~souls~~ ^{souls} of these people who were dead and they came to life adn reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead did not come to life, (the same word in exactly the same form, ε' ζησαυ) the rest of the dead, (ouk ezηsav) ~~adn~~ ^{and} so the thousand years was finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection. Upon such people the second ~~of~~ death has no authority, but they will be priests of God and of Christ, and they will reign with him a thousand years." The next few verses here are in the same passage, but here it would seem~~s~~ that the resurrection of the saints precedes the period of a thousand years in which these saints, risen from the dead, are to ~~reign~~ reign with Christ, adn the rest of the dead are not to rise from the dead until the end of the thousand years. Alford is very strong on this. I remember Dr. M. bringing that out some years ago. Alford says you can reject this portion of the Bible , but you can't believe it and deny the millenial kingdom. "And when the thousand years are finished, Satan will be used from his prison, and he will go out and deceive the nations, those in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to the ~~batle~~ battle, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea/. And they went up over the breadth of the land, ~~adn~~ and they encircled the camp of the saints, and (or"even") the beloved city, and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them. And the devil, who deceiveds them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where are the beast and the ~~the~~ false prophet, and there he will be tormented day and night forever and forever." YOU have this final rebellion at the end of a period of a thousand years in which S_atan is bound, not to deceive the nations. Now Dr. M, what is your suggestion about the (4 1/2) Shall I mention ^{ALTERNATIVE} two differnet interpretations of this passage, or do you have some you care to bring in right now?

(No ~~response from~~ Dr. M)

Dr. B. If you have no other suggestion I shall mention the ~~way~~ way (someone coughed) in his endeavor to make this thing something other ~~than~~ than a literal millenium, a literal period of blessedness. There are some rather important efforts to bring this to some other conclusion, and if you take Hodge and Warfield, Warfield in his "Biblical Doctrines", although Warfield himself would be called a post-millennialist, yet he did not believe that the thousand years spoken of here was to be a literal period of history on this earth. He gets to a certain stage in his argument and he says, "And so the thousand years mentioned in the 20th ch. of Rev. goes up in smoke." He just throws it away. He denies that it ~~is~~ is a literal period of blessedness. Now Warfield there endeavors to interpret this binding of Satan for a thousand years. He says, "But Satan is to be bound a thousand years so as not to deceive the nations really means that Satan is forbidden to disturb the blessed dead in Heaven. Then when he gets to the end of that section he says, "We've not really got to the bottom of this passage. We'll have to take it up again some time," and so far as I know he never did. He leaves it with a conscious confession that he has not got to the bottom of it. I'm a great admirer of Warfield in full range of theology aside from the details of ~~his~~ eschatology on this earth. I have the impression of a very busy and a very burdened man who is dealing with tremendous subjects, and really, you take Warfield's handling of Christology and inspiration--it's perfectly magnificent. You're ~~just~~ just filled with enthusiasm as you read those great works and the way he handled the whole crowd of New Testament Higher Critics. I have the greatest admiration/ for Warfield, but I have the feeling that ~~a~~ a very busy man is just brushing off a mosquito. He just can't be bothered; he just can't get into this question. He wants to handle it; and then he realizes that he hasn't got to the bottom of it, and he brushes it off.

A number of Warfield's students say that he used to say, "You premillennialists are not heretics. If anybody tries to put you out of Presbytery for being ~~a~~ premillennial, you call for me and I'll defend you." He thinks that the premillennial view is a mistake and a literalization of something he felt goes up in smoke, but he confessedly ~~did~~ did not get to the bottom of it any more than Hodge/ did. Now various persons, endeavoring to handle this literally, have come at it from different angles. I was at a meeting in Darby a couple years ago, when Professor Allis was asked from the floor in a discussion if he'd give an exegesis of the 20th Ch of Rev. , and he got up very courteously, and nodded and smiled, and he said, "Brethren, I can't do it. That is one of the most difficult passage. But my find is ~~that~~ that now is the acceptable time. There couldn't be a period of blessedness after the Lord's return on this earth, the flesh and blood people, open to salvation, because now is the acceptable time." I was the next speaker, and knowing that he's not a dispensa^{tion}~~alist~~alist, I opened by saying, "When is the Gospel now?" Dr. Allis believes that the Gospel now included the age of Cain and Abel, the age of Noah, and the age of Abraham, the age of Isaiah and the prophets, ~~and~~ and our age, and it seems to be reasonable that the Gospel now includes all men in flesh and blood, all persons who are in this present ~~a~~ life and in this body, so that it didn't seem to me we got rid of the millenium by saying , "Now is the acceptable time." The Gospel now covers all past ages in ~~which~~ which men/~~have~~ have lived in flesh and blood. Anthropologists are quite excited about the Java man and the man who was found way down before anybody else and had a regular/~~Frenchman's~~ Frenchman's skull in England. I don't remember the datings or the periods, but ~~is~~ very ancient. But whenever and whoever those men were, they/ were open to the Gospel "Now". They were open to the covenant of grace. So that was Allis. Now then I have read another interpretation ~~which~~ which would be the most plausible. The binding of Satan occurred at the time of Christ. In the resurrection of Christ Satan was bound.

The argument runs like this: Christ said, "The Pharisees objection that I cast out demons by Beelzebub the Prince of demons is absurd because if Satan cast out Satan he would fall. No man can bind a strong man's house unless he first binds the strong man." Now Christ was robbing Satan of his property and casting out demons from ~~the~~ a poor human being, saving a man. Inference says that Satan was bound, then, and then the doctrine is that Satan was bound in the death and resurrection of Christ so that Satan could not prevent the Gospel from going to the Gentiles! There is a little degree of plausability. When Christ rose from the dead and then sent out the disciples on the Great Commission. and especially after the day of Pentecost, Satan then was not able to deceive the Gentiles any longer, so that the Gospel went to the Gentiles from that time on. Therefore the thousand years here in which Satan was bound to deceive that nations no more, is that broad sweep of history from the time of Christ on, until the Second Coming, at which the amils, as well as the pmil's, believe there will be a cataclysm and the punishment of the wicked, and the judgment scene. The binding of Satan taking place in the work of Christ, the Gospel going to the Gentiles. I'm trying to make it as reasonable as I can so as to really get it across to you. (Question) That I have seen in Robert Strong's theses. I think it's rather commonly held by Westminster men, I ~~do~~ believe. Some of them, anyway. People are not just cheats and dishonest when they don't believe this is a literal millenium. They have a way of taking it. Now I'll ask you whether I've set aside this passage. We'll have to read it again and just ask ourselves. First it says, "I saw thrones and they were occupied and judgment was given to the people who say upon them. I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony and for the Word of God, and who had not ~~worshipped~~ worshipped the beast nor his image ~~nor~~ nor received his mark in their

^{ea}
 foreheads
 hands or their ~~heads~~, and they came to life and reigned with Christ
 a thousand years," the rest of the dead did not come to life until the
 thousand years were finished. This is the first ⁿavastasis. Blessed
 and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection. upon such the
 second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and His
 Christ and shall reign with Him the thousand years. And when the
 thousand years were finished, Satan will be ~~loos~~ loosed out of his
 prison," and so on. So it is a thousand years in which the saints
 have risen from the dead and they're reigning with Christ. Although
 the binding of Satan is referred to ^{in the} Scripture, ~~where~~ the casting
 out of demons was before the crucifixion of Christ. ~~of~~ Christ had not
 finished His work on the cross when He referred to Satan ~~as~~ as being
 bound in that (13 1/2) in the sense of Satan being bound to the extent
 that he could not prevent the work of grace has always ~~been~~ been,
 my father used to always say, "The Lord has the devil on a dog-chain."
 In the Book of Job, the devil can't go ~~any~~ one inch beyond God's
 permission, and the argument ^{of CHRIST} quite obviously is, "Only by having (14)
 control of the work of the devil could I cast out ~~demons~~ demons." That
 binding of Satat is something that has never ceased to be. He always
 has control over Satan so that He could save poor people out of his
 power. You see the ~~possibility~~ possibility of identifying the millenium
 as the present age of ~~of~~ grace, at least it doesn't stand up with the
 doctrine of the resurrection. (end of record)

e 18

(Question) In the Old Testament you have specific references. You should
 ask your question in such terms. (Question) "If I by Satan cast out
 Satan, by whom do your children cast them out?" I've always thought
 that meant, "Your children can't cast them out ~~at all~~ at all." Just
 as a piece of sarcasm. (Question) That is, the power of Satan. (Question)

The question of demon possession in Old Testament times I've never gone into. It looks to me however that the theory of the binding of Satan took place sometime in the ministry of Christ, this binding of Satan, so he could not deceive the nations for a thousand year; casting him into the abyss and locking him up. Peter says, after that, "Your adversary, the devil, goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." And the devil opposed the work of Paul among the Gentiles. So Satan being bound to deceive the nations no more, I just can't see that Satan has been bound. (Question) If he's on a leash he's bound to the end of that leash. Now the end of the leash is given here: to deceive the nations ϕ no more. It says $\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\kappa\ \eta$, and he's deceived them both as nations and as Gentiles. He's deceived the people of the Gentiles; he's deceived the nations of the Gentiles. He kept Rome in deception for three hundred years, and certainly as you see modern nations, as nations or as individuals. And when the fact that in a thousand years during which the resurrected saints reign on earth, reign with Christ, come to life, and ~~will~~ reign with Christ. (Question): "Who is supposed to be resurrected?" Those referred to in this context are ϕ (those that John saw in this particular vision) are the martyred who had not worshipped the beast. Now I think the almost universal inference is that , though are ~~not~~ mentioned in this vision, Paul says , "We shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," fits in this context, but that this must be the same one that Paul refers to. "The trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised, we all will be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." John then says, "This is the first resurrection." ~~And~~ Paul, in I. Cr. 15, counts Christ as the first-fruits, then those who are Christ's at His appearing, and then ~~the~~ telos. John counts ~~this~~ as the first resurrection, and the rest of the dead didn't

come to life until the end. Then going on with the 11th verse, he sees the Great White Throne and all the dead stand before God, which corresponds to what Paul says: "We believe in the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." So the predicate statement that

there is a thousand years ~~between~~ between two resurrections, in that thousand years Satan is bound. That seems to be the implication.

(Question) The fact that Satan is not going to be able to deceive the nations for a thousand years would fit in with a period of blessedness and further the fact that the resurrection saints are to reign with Christ a thousand years. (Question: Where?) They're to be raised from the dead and to reign with Christ, this in a state of being risen from the dead, ~~is~~ "we shall reign with Him on the earth" is Rev. 5:10, is it?

(Question) It's an earthly scene. Now there is a special study that is a little ~~bit~~ bit complicated, but I feel that it is conclusive: You take all the inferences to our reigning with Christ, reigning and banqueting with Christ, take them all. I have them all collected ~~together~~ together somewhere in that little book on ^{un-}fulfilled prophecies. Paul chides the Corinthians because they're acting like kings. He says, "I wish you were kings, because we'd be reigning with you." And, "If we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him." There's quite a little collection of passages that all will reign with Christ subsequent to the resurrection and during the period of blessedness. But "we shall reign with Him" and the opening of an earthly scene, and ~~it's~~ it's 5:10 that it says "they shall reign with Him." on the earth," those who are redeemed. In the resurrection, in the restoration, when ~~He~~ He comes, we will sit on thrones and reign with Him. (Question: In what sense are we going to reign with Him? If the earth is ~~full~~ full of the followers of the Lord) The 15th ch. of I. Cor says, "He will reign until He has subdued all His enemies." However, there is a change in ~~the~~ man redeemed at the resurrection; it's instantaneous. "In a moment,

in the twinkling of an eye, the dead will be raised incorruptible, we will be changed, so will we ever be with the Lord." The change in us is instantaneous; there is nothing to indicate the change in nature will be instantaneous. But there are many different references that the earlier part of the millenium will be a progressive spread of His righteousness. In Isaiah: "They will ~~xxx~~ take old folks from distant places and bring them in on litters and on mules, and though who know the glorious Gospel go out and proclaim it to those who hadn't understood it, and then in the Cor. passage, "He will reign until.." I can't find anything to indicate the change in nature will be intantan- eous. The passage in Romans 8 is that it will be subsequent to the apocalypse of the sons of God, but He has graciously chosen to use us in His ~~ky~~ kingdom. Now just how he'll use us..of course you can use your imagination. Someone said he would appoint the apostle Paul as General Commissioner of Education, and he would take Isaiah and make him Professor of Cosmology in a Central and~~g~~ get some sense into the minds of these physics teachers and philosophers; Moses would be the headof the Law Department. But certainly it isn't hard to see there will be work for ~~o~~ us to do. (Question) He won't deceive them and he won't be able to deceive them so that they'll make war, but at the end of this time he does deceive them again, and they endeavor to make war upon the most properous center that there is, the beloved city, but that they don't get to first base that time, fire from heaven destroye them. They're taught that lesson. Now we just set before you this passage. There's much in the New Testament that we carry out from here. ^{If} This period of blessedness is subsequent to the Lor's return, then the passages in I. and II. Thees. which^{describe}/theconditions just prior to His return, and the act of destroying sin at His return, that would all fit. And then there are more details in the 15th ch. of I. Cor.; then the eschatolog- ical portions of Matthew, Mark and Luke will go come in here, although they do not all directly describe the period of blessedness, yet ~~theft~~

there being these chapters which point to it, the setting of the passages enriches the whole picture. Now Dr. M, what's your suggestion? Are you ready to go forward with some other phase? I brought out certain passages in the New Testament, especiall Romans 8 and Rev. 20 in which it seems rather clear that a period of blessedness on this earth, or a different order from present blessedness, is contemplated. Now have you some other approach to the subject?

see p. 101

Dr. MacRae--- I tried two weeks ago and last week to discuss a few passages in the Old Testament which seemed to me rather clearly showed that there would be a period, a great period of blessedness, a great golden age yet to come upon this earth. I think that is something that is much stressed in the OT. I don't see how we can get away from it, for the OT very clearly teaches that there is to be such a period and I did ~~13 1/2~~ ^{attempt} to go into the question as to the length of that period, or to go into many details about it. One detail we noticed stressed much the period of external peace and safety, a period where there is no danger from outside, a period when there is no war, but I didn't try to go into the details as to its condition, or ~~prescribed~~ to try to note its relationship to other matters in the scheme of the future, how they fit together, simply that there is ^{such a period definitely} ~~13 1/2~~ ~~predicted~~ ~~and~~ and I don't know how we can possibly interpret those three passages otherwise as we look at them. Now in the NT, you do not have that same stress and future period of blessedness, that is the great hope, the great thing that the OT looks forward to. Now in the NT I think that the great thing that it looks forward to is the personal return of Christ. It ^{stress is} ~~is~~ for the Christian who already knows about Christ, that He is coming back, and we are going to know Him personally. The stress is on the glorious looking forward to His coming. Now I'm just wondering if since we believe the NT is teaching that He is coming, and we find this co-OT teaching of a period of righteousness a period of glory, a golden age upon the earth. Ch. 20 of Revelation seems to combine the 2 and to show how they fit together, but I was just wondering the last few minutes here, whether before we go into

(end of record)

Through the NT looking at some of the declarations about the return of Christ, see what it stresses in connection with them. Of course, the great thing that is stressed then, is our personal fellowship with Him and ~~w/le~~ will be like Him for we shall see Him as He is. Now then, what does it say that He is going to do? What is His purpose in coming? I wonder right here if that wouldn't be the valuable thing to do on the NT emphasis before we go further into these two questions, the nature of the golden age, which of course includes the c 1/2 and ~~of the~~ the question of its relationship. Now another thing then would be to go into this question of the resurrection, under one and two, but I think that would come a bit later. Dr. Buswell

 Dr. B: I. Cor. 15 and Thess. passages. They come in logically now. (Question of Dr. M.: ...What is the great stress, why) I. Cor. ~~15:52~~ 15:52. This is very familiar to most of you. But there are some phases of it that are not ordinarily seen in a quick, superficial reading. Paul is speaking now of the hope of the resurrection; this is the resurrection chapter. Verse 50 ~~w/ll~~ ^{we'll} start with. "This I say, brethren that flesh and blood ~~w/~~ cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption. " Now what are we going to do about those passages that ^s say "we have been translated into the kingdom of His dear Son"? And the 3rd ch. of John, "Except a man be born again he cannot see, or cannot enter, the kingdom of God"? I would suggest that the emphasis in this passage is ^yto be an heir of the kingdom of God, ~~ing~~ inherit the kingdom of God, we are now in the kingdom of God as those who are to inherit it, but we have not entered into our inheritance as being in flesh and blood. We are in His spiritual kingdom, we have been translated into the kingdom of His dear Son, we are ~~w/ll~~ in the kingdom of God in Christ in the spiritual sense, but we have not received our inheritance. Christ said, "Those ~~w/~~ that attain ^{to} the age to come, the

resurrection, were the heirs to the age to come and the resurrection, neither marry nor are given in marriage. It is resurrection people who are ^{to be} the heirs. Flesh and blood cannot be the heirs of the kingdom. This kingdom is something referred to, not described here. There is to be a kingdom of which flesh and blood is not to be the heir. I would infer that it's the same kingdom that Christ referred to when He said "Those who are the heirs of the age to come neither marry nor are given in marriage" in the resurrection." They are as the angels with reference to the marriage relationship. And here you have this statement, flesh and blood is not able to inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. "Look, I'm telling you a secret.." Is that a little too rough and ready? Well, that's ^{exactly} what it is, something that is not easy to understand, not necessarily that it had never been reflected before, but it's something that's obscure. "I'm telling you something that is sometimes, or has been, obscure. We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed in a ~~an~~ moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the ~~last~~ trump. For the trumpet will ~~be~~ sound, the dead will be raised incorruptible, we will be changed. It is indeed necessary for this corruption, this corruptible to put on incorruption and this mortal to put on immortality. When this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this immortality, .." Now what is he talking about there? He is talking not about death and resurrection, but about the change. "We will all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. Now when this corruptible thing puts on" (endusiastai) that's putting on a garment, putting it on over, "puts on incorruption, this mortal puts on immortality, then will come to pass the word that is written, ~~1 Cor 15:54~~ 'Death is swallowed up in victory.' From Isaiah 25:8 we wouldn't know what was contemplated. Paul says, "I'm telling you the secret. It hasn't been ^a ~~revealed~~ revealed in so many words, what about those who are still alive at this cataclysmic event. Resurrection is definitely taught in certain Old Testament passages, but what about those who live

/ to see the great and glorious day? For those who live, their mortality is enveloped and swallowed up in immortality; that is, they don't die and then rise from the dead, becoming disembodied spirits, unclothed spirits, and then being raised from the dead and reunited with their bodies; they are going along in a mortal body, and suddenly they're swallowed up of immortality. That will fulfill what Isaiah/^{really} was talking about. So in the ~~2nd~~^{5th} ch. of ~~2nd~~ II. Cor. he interprets the same passage in Isaiah in the same way. He says he's willing to depart and be with the Lord; it would indeed be far better, but he would ~~not~~ prefer not to become a disembodied spirit, but he would prefer to be clothed-upon with immortality, that is, put on over, so that death might be swallowed up of life. So this is what he is predicating here. At the last trump, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, we will all be changed, and ~~this~~ change in the living will fulfill Isaiah. So "death swallowed up in victory" has no ~~reference~~ reference to resurrection at all, but it is a reference to this change to be experienced by the living. So that in this moment, in this twinkling of an eye, ~~all~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~time~~ ~~we~~ ~~will~~ ~~be~~ ~~changed~~, the dead will be raised, and we will be changed, at the same ^e 7 , at the same . Then of course comes the homological application. ~~1st~~ "Ho, death, is the victory related to you? Where, death, is the sting related to you? In Greek you don't have to decide whether it's the subjective, objective, or possessive genitive ^u till ~~you~~ you get past the context. The sting related to death is ~~the~~ sin, and the strength of sin is the law, which enforce the penalty, but thanks be to ~~the~~ God, the victory related to death is ours. " A victory over death, and not a victory of death. "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ. So then, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not empty, vain, in the Lord." Now that gives just a simple predication of the facts: the dead in Christ will rise, will be raised,

we will not all die, but we must all experience a change to be made immortal, and it will all occur at one instant of time, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. That seems to be just a declaration of what he's saying there. Are there any questions about that? (Question. ♪ Well Dr. M. is the authority on Isaiah, but Paul takes this one phrase and tells what it means. I'll argue that Isaiah's order of ~~of~~ material is hom^oiletical and not generally chronological. I think both Dr. M and Dr. Young will pull my hair out for that, but I don't know. (Dr. M: Well, if you make that as a general statement of the Bible as a whole it would be all right.) There are portions of the Bible ~~where~~ where the purpose^{is}/obviously chronological, that is to say, where 9 1/2 says everyone in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterwards those who are Christ's at His appearing, then the end. That's chronological, I would say. (Dr. M: You have many similar things in Isaiah) Oh yes. But I mean to say that this particular reference is interpreted by Paul as describing, that this stage refers to the experience of the living saints at the ~~of~~ time of the last trumpet wouldn't necessarily prove that that's what the context was about. So if Isaiah can draw an illustration from Moses and from the new heavens and the earth, how he's comfortng his people right ~~of~~ now. And you can't prove this by the order of events unless he's saying something that indicates an order of events. (Dr. M: Wouldn't you say Peter and Paul could do the same ~~of~~ thing?) Certainly. This is rather obvious, isn't it? There is coming a sudden, instantaneous event in which the dead in Christ will rise, and we the living, those who are left (I'm taking words already out of I Thess) will be changed. Now take I. Tess. 4 . I. Thess was written earlier, but it is a little more elaborate, more fully developed, not because it's earlier, but having written I. Thess., he wouldn't need to elaborate it again in writing to the Corinthians. He points out the particular fact of the experience of those who --that they must be changed, they must be made immortal, in order to be the heirs of the kingdom. The flesh and

blood people who live through the time of the wrath of God and populate the earth during the millenium are neither the armies of the beast, who are all killed, nor are they the people who escape at the time of the rapture of the church. They are the subjects of the kingdom, not the heirs of the kingdom, according to this statement that flesh and ~~blood~~ blood does not become heir to the kingdom. Now I. Thess 4 is very familiar. He 12 practices, in a very intimate and practical way, and so he follows up this counsel about the practical conduct of a holy life with the 13th verse: "I do not wish you to be ignorant brethren concerning those who have fallen asleep so that you sorrow not as the rest who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus ~~died~~ died and arose (anest^h, stood up again) so also God, those who sleep, through Jesus will lead along with Him." God will lead along those who sleep, He will lead them through Jesus. It isn't those who sleep in Jesus, but those who sleep, and it applies to those who believe and are dead, God will lead along with Him. It isn't "bring" with Him necessarily, but ~~if~~ if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we believe that believers will have a resurrection. Our resurrection is predicated upon the resurrection of Christ. Do we believe that Jesus died and rose again? This argument is developed in I. Cor. 15. "If the dead rise not, then Christ is not risen." But since as a matter of fact Christ is risen, therefore we have the hope of our resurrection." Now this is a much simpler statement, earlier, we believe that Jesus died and rose again; we believe those who have fallen asleep God will lead with Him; that is, in a resurrection experience. For this we say, in the word of the Lord (Machen points out that this means "I'm now quoting something which Christ said while He was here in the flesh") that we, the living, those who are left (notice that phrase; you talk to some liberal who will say, "Paul said that he was going to live until Jesus came back again, and he was mistaken." And then you ask him ^{where} ~~Paul~~ Paul said that. "Didn't

Paul say, 'We who are alive and remain'?" In English it sounds as if just "we who ~~are~~ are alive and are going to remain." But what he literally said was, "We, the living, those who are left," though, not necessarily, "we" will be the ones who are left (150) the parousia of the Lord will not get ahead of those who sleep because the Lord Himself, with a shout, and the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will arise first..." (end of record)

e 20

Dr. B continues: "Those who are left"--he's not at all insisting, I'm going to be there, but you wouldn't expect him to say, "We ~~the~~ dead," either! would you? He's still alive. It's not for us to know the time. "We the living, ~~the~~ those who are left, together with them, ~~harpag~~ sometha (this is the word for rapture; this and the Latin word raporoe, which means to catch up,) we will be raptured, we will be caught up in the clouds to the meeting of the Lord in the air, and thus forever, with the Lord we will be. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

(Question) He hasn't mentioned the Golden Age here, has he? (Question) He's just talking about the experience of living Christians at the moment of the glorious return of Christ at the sound of the trumpet. Now in Romans 8 we said that the hope of this ktisis had to wait for the apocalypse of the sons of God, and we said from I. John that when He appears we'll be like Him. We tied in a good many Scriptures there. This passage doesn't mention a Golden Age, but it just simply comforts people who have lost loved ones. That's all it does, right here. When you get on into II. Thess, ~~and~~ then you will see certain events that precede or are concurrent with the Lord's return to the scene. The chapter division is awkward here. (Question) There is no ground here for soul sleeping or anything of that kind, but he's talking about the dead bodies, and the people who are alive and remain will be caught up together with them. Evidently the Thessalonians thought that since they were still alive and some of their loved ones had died, just in the short interval since Paul

left Thessalonica, therefore these loved ones would miss something, and they were worried that these people would miss out on the kingdom, Now they/^{had}died before Jesus came back again. And Paul is comforting them on that very point. We won't get ahead of them, not at all; as a matter of fact it will all be in an eye's blink; they will rise first, and we will be caught up together with them, and so well we ever be with the Lord. It's just a message of comfort, and doesn't go beyond that point right here. Now then, ~~the~~ ^{but} concerning the times and the seasons, brethren, you do not have need for me to write to you, for you yourselves know accurately that the day of the Lord (now this day of the Lord, of course, is a big phrase with a lot of usages. You have to take ~~the~~ ^{you} concordance and look it all up) the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night. So it comes. But when they say, "Peace, safety," then sudden destruction comes upon them as birthpains upon a woman about to give birth to a child, and they will not escape." That's ou mⁿ with your aorist subjunctive. VErY storng. They will not escape. "But you, brethren, you are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief. " The Scripture never refers to the seocnd coming of Christ as a thief with reference to saved people, with reference to godly people. I had a student challenge me on that a year or two ago. He said, "If the good man of the house had known which hour the thief was coming," taking the English idiom, goodman, as if it meant good man. The word is 5 , it's simply the boss of the house." It doesn't mean "the good man," but simply "the goodman of the house," the lord of the ^house. There is no reference of His coming for us as a thief. When you come to your loved ones unexpectedly, they may not know when you're coming, and they may be surprised and delighted, but I certainly don't call your coming "like a thief." The reference is to the wicked. Suddenly He will snatch up the redeemed of all ages, and He will take the born¹again people right out of every factory,

factory and railroad, every airplane and every steamship, and they'll be gone. It won't be ~~like~~ a sneakthief/who suddenly blows up a safe, but like a thief who suddenly blows up a safe, he's got the treasures, and he's gone, and it will be a terrific world-wide disaster. It will be sudden destruction. It will be an awful calamity with reference to those who are left. That's what he says here. Sudden destruction comes upon them. "But you are not of the darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief. You are all the children of the light and of the day. We are not of the ~~the~~ night or of the darkness. Therefore now let us not slumber as do the rest, but let us watch and keep sober. Those who slumber slumber by night, those who are drunken are drunken by night. But we, being of the day, let us keep sober, and let us put on the breastplate of faith, and love, and the helmet of salvation, because He has not appointed us for wrath (I think that's one little phrase that indicates that the rapture of the church will take place before the period that is called "the wrath of God" but you can't build a house on this one little phrase. ~~He has not appointed us~~ He has not appointed us unto wrath, but for the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, (and that I think further means that Paul contemplated that he might die. Paul never said, "I will live until the Second Coming of Christ," but on the contrary he said, "Whether we wake or sleep,) we shall live together with Him, wherefore comfort one another and edify one another, as also we do." Now there you have the Second Coming. (Question) I think clearly there is a shift when he gets to verse 10, and he changes figures of speech. I argued this out with Vota(?) one time and he tried to make out that Paul did not change his figure of speech. But whether we are spiritually asleep or awake, we live together with Him. But that seems rather impossible. Clearly, when he is talking about keeping awake and not sleeping, he can't be referring to physical sleep, because we know that Paul had to sleep. Christ Himself took time to sleep. It was appropriate

to do so. So all these references to being of the night can't mean that we never have physical darkness. But then when you come to the reference, "Whether we wake or sleep," I think definitely in verse 10 he's a little distance away there. Christ died for us that whether we wake or sleep, we will live together with Him." That must mean, ^{whether we} /live or die, which is a definitely different figure, that is a little distance away. I can't think of any other way to take that. Vota couldn't go along with that at all. He was quite bitter against that. I think he had clung to the idea that Paul said he was going to live, (9 1/2) and then this verse would destroy his pet peeve against Paul, so he just wouldn't listen to it. (Question: vs. 9 It seems to me that there's a contrast between the wrath and salvation. In the wrath there seems to be condemnation that God has on the wicked.) That's very possible. I think though, you see the word "salvation" is past, present and future. We have been saved ~~from/it/~~ from the guilt of sin, and are being saved from the power of sin, but now is your salvation nearer than when you first believed, and we are going to be saved from the very presence of sin. (Question) It's possible but if you find other Scriptures that ~~refer~~ ^{bear} upon it, this being an eschatological passage, it isn't out of the question that possibly Paul meant, we are not going to go through the period of wrath, but we are to be saved from it. (Question) Very plausible and very possible. (Question) of Mr. Eppert: You remember in I. Thess 1:10 Paul speaks of the ~~from/it/~~ ^{OPXNS} in reference to Jesus Christ who delivers us from the wrath which is to come, not only deliverance from 12 the wrath to come. Some have taken that to refer to the Tribulation.) And so Romans 5, "He will save us from the wrath." There are several references that could be taken simply as referring to being lost in eternal punishment, but might, in the ~~of~~ context, refer to a particular outpouring of wrath. So that the wrath to come--I certainly wouldn't ask you to accept any conclusion on the basis of any evidence presented up to now, and even

when all the evidence is in it's nothing more than a balance of probability. Certainly his interpretation is not at all impossible. (Dr. M: On that version) On this verse. But I think there are a number of places in which Paul refers to the wrath in such a specific way. Here he's talking about the Second Coming of Christ, and our being not the children of darkness. This day will not be a day of disaster to us. Therefore we ought to live as Christians ought to live, because we have this hope of the coming of Christ. He hasn't appointed us unto wrath, but to the attaining of salvation. We know that sometimes salvation means a future consummation of our salvation. It is , up to this present point, just possible that he refers to a period of wrath on this earth and our being saved from it, but certainly there's nothing cogent about it., up to this present time. I had never thought of it until I ~~had~~ asked Ironside one time. I said, "What verse have you to show that the church will not go through the Tribulation?" And he quoted this one. And then I began to see that it ~~could~~ is at least a possible reading, and a possible interpretation of it. (Mr. Eppert: In vs. 8 where Paul speaks of the Hope of salvation, is it reasonable to put that with the other phrase that he uses I think in Titus, the blessed hope?) (end of record)

e 21

That would indicate that it's a picture of salvation that he's talking ~~about~~ about, and well, the blessed hope is the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, ~~Jesus~~ Jesus Christ. (Mr. Eppert) (Student) 0 3/4 I think you can answer that by taking your concordance , taking all the usages of "salvation", especially that phrase, "Now is your salvation nearer than when you believed." And there are a few like that, that would indicate that salvation is sometimes spoken of as future, definitely. That does not exclude the fact that it is sometimes spoken of as past, and sometimes spoken of as present. So that being the case, there being a definite future salvation for which we hope, then the words "the hope of

salvation, would mean future salvation. But there is ~~not~~ nothing compelling about these words just at this time at all. I do think that there are other Scriptures to indicate that there is to be subsequent to the rapture of the church a time of the outpouring ~~of~~ of the wrath of God. Now if that is very ~~clear~~ clear in another Scripture, then it is possible that it is what Paul is talking about here. We'll be safe from that time and we will not undergo His wrath, but I certainly wouldn't argue that there is anything conclusive, only that it would fit in. It's like a jig-saw puzzle. There are some pieces that are straight-edged and you can match the color, and you have to find the angles and corners to see if they really belong there. (Question: Does this phrase, the hope of salvation, fit in with I. John 3 where John says we shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is. Every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth ^hhimself even as He is pure.....) It fits in there, it certainly does. It coincides very beautifully. Now shall we go on with II. Thess? (Dr. M)

See p. 113

Dr. MacRae --- Well then if I'm going to do that I would like to make an assignment. There are two parts to the assignment. I know you'd rather I didn't make an assignment so then you would be free to utilize your desires along the line of your particular interests, but I think perhaps you can spend part of that time in the direction that I suggest that it will help you to increase your understanding of what we do in class, and consequently I would like to suggest two things for next time and if this interrupts particular things that you are working on, why perhaps you can be interrupted 3 1/2

but I would suggest for next time two distinct things, one will relate to what I'm going to do and the other I think a useful survey that we might make together which would open up passages which might give us some interesting, helpful suggestions, helpful hints along these lines.

Survey part first: Take the first five books of the NT and divide them up among the class and to have each of you take a certain section of it and to have you run through it noting every reference to the second coming of Christ, and you can write this out and turn it in; Any reference to the 2nd coming of Christ you find in the passages designated, and then in connection with the reference I would like you to designate an answer to these questions: (1) Why is Christ to return? What is the purpose of His coming? (2) What will He do when He comes back? Well you may think that it is hard to distinguish between the two, but it doesn't matter, do whatever you think wiser, (3) When will He come? (4) What might happen before He comes? or What might precede His coming?

Now these are four questions and you don't have to be absolutely sure that your interpretation of the answer to each of them is final and correct, but if the passage might be interpreted as giving ^{any} the answer to one of these four, why put it down on your paper, If-you and if you want to say, "It looks as though it says so and so, but I think it's

a false interpretation." But I mean to put down anything that you think someone might draw from the passage in answer to one of these four, whether you think it would stand a careful examination or not. (Question). I want each of you to take a certain passage and run through it, and see in this passage any references to the second coming. Well now in your passage you might not find any reference, but if you do find any reference, why list them, and if you do find any reference, ask yourself if ~~it~~ that reference has anything which anyone might interpret as giving an answer to one of these four questions. If it does, note it down; it doesn't mean that you think that's the answer, because you might want a few hours commentary study, but be sure that if you think it's a possible thing that that passage might suggest, put it down for consideration. Now we will divide up the passages.

Abernathy, Agapetus, Anderson Matt. 1-12
 Ashbrook, Atkinson, Bates Matt. 13-20
 Brown, Cater, Chandler Matt. 21-24
 Dayton, Dickerson, Eckelman, Matt. 25-28
 Grames, Gruell, Hamilton, Hayenga Mark 1-10
 Hyle, Hood, Hoogstrate, Mark 11-16
 Hubley, Jones, Johnson, Kay, Luke 1-9
 Kirkwood, Leonard, Lewis, Luke 10-17
 Kunkle, Lin, Leonard, Marshall--Luke 18-24
 McCoy, Oldham, Pote, Potocka, John 1-11
 Pund, Synder, Soltau, ^{John} Luke 10-21
~~Atkinson~~ Uomoto, Warden Matt. 25-28
^{Mark}
 Watson, Wolfe -Luke 16-19
 Yehling Luke 18-24

That's a part of the assignment; the other part relates to the material on Joel, and the question is this: "What does the day of the Lord

115

mean in Joel? Write down the phrase, The day of the Lord, and then write every time you see it in the book of Joel, and state exactly what it means. Is the "day of the Lord" a time for the millenium; is it a time for the outpouring of God's wrath; is it a term for the time of Christ's first coming to this earth? What is it a term for. State opposite each reference in Joel exactly what it is ~~that~~^{if} that passage indicates, and see if you can get an answer to it that fits all the passages, I-think- and then we'll discuss Joel next time. But spend the two hours on Joel. (end of rec)

e 22

So many of the alumni of Faith Seminary are experts at Hebrew and so few are New Testament experts. That's on the other side of the ledger. I would not by the slightest fraction try to diminish the interest in Hebrew. Dr. M: ~~of~~ Hebrew is the easier language. Dr. B. Yes, the syntax is easier, but the vocabulary is harder for me.

II. Peter ³I. Let us contemplate some of the arguments which are sometimes advanced against the idea of a millenium, a period of blessedness on this earth. Just to anticipate the reading of the chapter, the argument runs like this: Many premillennialists say that ^{the} parousia of the Lord is strictly His coming in the clouds for His church at the instant of the rapture (harpag³ sometha, we shall be caught up, that's the Latin word, it's imply rapore, and the Greek word Harpag sometha) at the time of the catching up of the church. That the word parousia applies only to that, with reference to the coming of ~~Christ~~ Christ, and that the word apocolypsis ~~revelation~~ revelation of Christ, applies only to His coming at the beginning of the millennial period to ~~destroy~~ destroy the kingdom of the beast and to establish His kingdom of a thousand years. Now if the premillennialists say that, then Peter says, at the parousia the heavens and the earth will be destroyed. Now if the parousia is that moment, that twinkling of an eye

at the last trump, and if that's the parousia, the heavens and the earth are to be destroyed, have a period of blessedness on this earth, that is, anything beyond ~~that~~ that which might be experienced in the present age, anything which would come after the Lord's return. So goes the argument. Not only is this argument frequently based upon II. Peter 3, but it might as ~~well~~ well be based upon II Thess 2. I haven't actually read it from that passage, but the ^{II} Thess 1:3 [?] "The Lord will render wrath to the people who are bothering the Thessalonian Christians at His parousia." Now according to the premillennial scheme, the wrath upon the wicked people who are alive at the time of Paul's visits to Thessalonica will not come until the end of the millenium, which is a thousand years after this point which is alleged to be the parousia. So if at his parousia He's going to render wrath to these people who are troubling the Thessalonians, then there can't be a thousand years in-between; there can't be a period in-between. So the argument goes. And the answer I think is that the premillennial people could be wrong; I mean to say a good many of them could be ~~well~~ wrong; a prevailing drift of tendency can be wrong even though a movement may be basically right, it may have adhering to it certain expressions which are distinctly wrong. The ~~word~~ word parousia, if you take an exhaustive concordance and look it up wherever it occurs, it means "being present" of course; it's used with referance to the visible presence of Christ; it merely means the time when He's visibly present, and it is precisely interchangeable so far as schedule is concerned with apokalypsis and a good many other of those words. I would make a statement in preliminary here that in New Testament usage any of those words/^{that}refer to the eschatological ~~complex~~ complex, such as the parousia of Christ, the apokalypsis of Jesus Christ, the day of the Lord, that day, the day, any of those phrases/ may designate the whole or any part of the eschatological complex. Now that's just an over-all.

I believe in geshtalt-psychology, Dr. M.; first ~~of~~ ^{of} all you try to give as big a geshtalt as can be absorbed, and then you go on and examine the details.

~~That's~~ That's sometimes good psychology and sometimes sounds like propaganda, but anyway, this is the geshtalt method. I'm giving you the overall, and then let's read II Peter 3 and see what he has to say.

(Question) Parousia, being present. It's the pariciple. The presence of The Lord, and it refers to His visible presence. His visible ~~presence~~ ^{frequently} presence may/be translated, "His coming," if it refers to that, or "the time when He will be visibly present. I remember some years ago when my family were out in Illinois and I was here in Wilmington. We had a long Christmas vacation and I caught myself saying, "When I get home--" "When I get home I'll try to get the boy's bicycle fixed up," "When I get home I'll simonize the car," "When I get home I'll get certain things out of the storehouse." The things that were to happen "when I get home" might happen the first day, the first minute, or the last day, or the last minute. Simply from the Wilmington point-of-view, looking at a trip to Illinois that was two weeks long, "when I get home was not differentiated with reference to the particular scheme within the time at home. I think that is ordinary good usage in any literature. So, the parousia of the Lord and the apokalypsis of the Lord, and the day of the Lord, and that day, and (8) (I'm getting over into Dr. M's territory here); but we might suppose just from the fact that it's written in language, in any language, that phrase is referring to a distant complex of events, you might expect to have overall phrases that would refer to presence, and yet would refer to anything that might happen any time during the ~~of~~ complex of events. Well now, the 3rd chapter. "This second epistle, beloved, I am writing to you, in both of which I am stirring up your sincere minds with a memorandum that you should remember the words spoken of beforehand by the holy prophets, and by your apostles of our Lord and Saviour." The reference to the ^{word of the holy} prophets would be probably

to the Old Testament and to "the apostles of our Lord and Saviour" would be reference to statements such as are found in Paul and elsewhere; "apostles of our Lord and Saviour" is in the plural. Now the closeness between Jude and II Peter is very marked. It is not impossible that Peter might have used the word "apostle" with reference to Jude, but any any rate it would refer to New Testament Scriptures; possibly by this ~~the~~ time some portion of Mark was known to Peter. It is very possible; the reference to the prophets we can dismiss; the reference to the apostles is definitely interesting in the ~~the~~ developement of the New Testament canon. It could be that Peter wrote his first epistle when Paul was in Rome, ~~the~~ when Mark was in Rome, and Luke was in Rome, and he would have had Mark and "proto-Luke", and would have had quite a wide range of reference to the writings of the paostles. Anyway, the literary background is contemplated here as Peter writes this, his second epistle, and refers to the future events. (Dr. M: What do you mean by proto-Luke?) There is a theory --that is "proto-Luke" in quotation marks--advanced by Canon Strater that Luke may have composed practically all the material he had except what is found in Mark before he got to Rome. I think that it is ~~the~~ rather clear that Luke and Mark and Paul and Peter were all in Rome when Paul wrote Colossians and when Peter wrote I. Peter. Now then, that would fall in line with Luke's saying that he had before him, that he knew of written accounts: "Many have taken in hand to draw up an account of those things that have taken place among us." And it would probably place Mark as one of those, and Peter's argument is based on the way that Luke handles the Markan material. Mark's material is interpolated into Luke in large blocks, and you can just imagine Mark saying to Luke, "Well here's what I have. I took it down from Peter's telling a story." And so "proto-Luke" is a ~~the~~ fairly hypothetical status of the Gospel of Luke. (Question of Dr. M: Are you familiar with ~~the~~ Ramsey's view that Peter was not martyred about the time Paul

was, but that he lived in Rome many years later?) I am not very familiar. I read it hastily. I don't know in detail. (Dr. M: I wonder what it's about.) Well, I don't think that would--at the time of Peter's martyrdom-- (Dr. M: I don't expect the date of II Peter (12)) It could effect the date of II Peter, yes. I rather think that I. Peter fits right in with Colossians. I think that there was a definite motive: that Peter wanted to show the church in the same area that included Colossae "that I preach the same Gospel that Paul preaches." And Peter commends Mark, who is about to make a trip, and Paul commends Mark, who is about to make a trip ~~///~~ through this same general area. So I. Peter, being practically contemporary with Colossians, there is a very strong ^{probability} ~~possibility~~, not a certainty. Now then, the date of II Peter ~~is~~ might be postulated, as far as that's concerned. I don't have any light on the martyrdom of Peter, myself. I haven't gone into that at all. But at any rate, Peter refers to the writings of the ~~of~~ apostles, and he undoubtedly knew ^{Paul,} and he very probably knew Luke and Mark, and Mark would be his own substance of writing so the reference ~~is~~ ^{here} to the writings of the apostles of our Lord is not at all obscure, although II Peter might have been considerably later. "Knowing this first of all, that there will come in the last days, mockers walking along in mockery, mockers proceeding in mockery, after their own lusts, and saying, "Where is the promise of His parousia?" Now notice that's the word, promise of His parousia. That's translated, "His visible coming," inserting the word visible, or just "His coming." "Where is the promise of His being present (or His coming)?" for since the fathers fell asleep everything remains so, remains the same. From the beginning of the creation (by the way, there is the word ^{apxns ktisews} ~~arches ktisews~~. Cranmore and Wycliffe translate that "from the beginning of creature". That's just your Old English word, ~~is~~ "From the beginning of creation.") ~~is~~ "This escapes them, they being warned (Sometime make a study of ~~forgetting~~) educational psychology, the psychology of the remembering and

"This they ~~is~~ willingly are ignorant of," it says, "that heavens there were of old, and the earth ek hudatos kai di hudatos." I think that merely means "standing up out of the water and down through under the water." (end of record)

e 23

established, set up in business, by the Word of God. Through which (and the which would refer to the water, but its plural~~s~~, through which now conceived as waters, rather than just water) the world at that time, the then world, being over-flowed by water, was destroyed." I think that's clearly a reference to the flood of Noah. They forget a former cataclysmic destruction upon the whole world of mankind. They are perfectly willing to forget all of that. His argument is cataclysmic and catastrophic. "And the present heavens and the earth (that time the earth being over-flowed by water was destroyed) ~~is~~"The present heavens and the earth by the same Word (that is, by the Word of God which set them up in being) are kept in a treasury and preserved unto the day of judgment and destruction of godless men." Now according to the premillennial view, the day of judgment ~~is~~ and destruction of godless man must be at least a thousand years off, but you don't need to worry that a chain reaction set up by atomic fision will burn thê 1 3/4 for another thousand years. The heavens and the earth are kept and preserved for the day of judgment of godless men, which, according to premillennial view, is at the end of a millennial period into which we have not yet entered. Well now, that's all isogesis. He just simply says that as there was ~~is~~ once a catastrophic flood of waters which ~~is~~ destroyed the earth, so the heavens and the earth are kept and preserved for fire at a future date. "But one thing must not be forgotten. One thing must not be forgotten by you, beloved, namely that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day." Now please don't try to make that chronological or mathematical. Obviously it's rhetorical; and a day is as a thousand

thousand years and a thousand years is as a day. You can't base any calculation, you're not intended to base any calculation, you're intended to interpret that as meaning that God ~~is~~ has plenty of time. Brightman, who teaches a finite God ~~is~~ at Boston University, said, "One thing that makes me sure that God is not omnipotent is that ~~is~~ evolution (he almost groaned as he said "evolution") took so long." He just was pained to think about the various orders of life that came and went and took so long. So therefore God must be finite in His power. But I said, "Dr. Brightman, if God is not omnipotent, the question of time is completely irrelevant." He said, "I never thought of that." (laughter) If God is omnipotent, then to say that He took so long is entirely beside the point. And that's not what Peter is talking about. God is not slack; God is not dilatory. A day or a thousand years, or a thousand years or a day, He has plenty of time. That's what he's leading up to. "God is not dilatory with reference to His promise, as some men count slackness. God is long-suffering toward you, not wishing any to perish, but all to attain to repentance." So there you have an interpretation of the time that intervenes, and of the immanency of the Lord's return. WE're not to count God as slack, we're not to say, "Where ^{is the promise} of His coming," merely because He delays. I've heard ^{Taylor} ~~Spencer~~ Matthews quite exactly fulfill this prophecy. He said almost word for word, without knowing it, ^{He said,} "Where is this promise of ~~this~~ this coming of Jesus Christ?" He used to get hot and red in the face. I heard him in chapel one day say, "Jesus isn't coming back again. If you think he is, you tell me when it's going to be, and I'll meet you there and prove it isn't so." "If it's a thousand years from now, I'll meet you there," he said. RAVING, raving, against the idea of a visual Second Coming of Christ. They say that one time ~~is~~ when James M. Gray was ~~going~~ going about in Bible Conferences, and this was before the division between the out-and-out Modernists/was so sharp Taylor Matthews left his classes and went and the Fundamentalists

around from city to city where Dr. Gray had been to prove that the Second Coming of Christ was not to take place. In a pamphlet, "Will Christ Come Again?" he says, "The early Christians thought He was coming again, ~~the~~ cataclysmically. The New Testament writers thought He was coming again, as an overpowering event to destroy iniquity and establish a kingdom of righteousness. But what they ~~really~~ really meant was that Christian socialism is going to prevail." They thought He was coming, they said He was coming, but what they really meant was Christian socialism. So this, "Where is the promise of His coming," is the import now of this chapter in II Peter up to this point. "But the day of the Lord will come ($\xi\epsilon\iota$, it will come) as a thief in which the heavens with a loud noise will pass away, and the elements, with intense heat, will be destroyed, and the earth, and the things in it will be discovered," not burned up. There is no textual authority for "burned Up." The word is $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, and your marginal readings give you the conjectural emanations. ~~of the~~ ^{The} ~~translation~~ ^{or} reading along thought, "Of course he couldn't have ~~discovered~~ ^{said} "discovered", so of course he must have meant something that sounds like "burned up", because he's talking about things being burned up. But what Peter was talking about was what Paul said in I Cor 3:13 that the works in this earth will be revealed by fire, for the day will declare it. That's just what Peter said: the earth and the things in it will be discovered, will be ~~revealed~~ revealed by fire, will be declared. The hidden things will come to light, and all of this in the day of the Lord. Now I think if you were reading any other book you would conclude that the ~~phrase~~ phrase, "day of the Lord" is simply a variety of expression for "parousia autou" in verse 4. "Where is the promise of His parousia? Peter answers, "The day of the Lord will come." You see, His parousia is His day. He is the Lord. So that I wouldn't build a house on it, yet it does seem ~~relatively~~ relatively clear that "day of the Lord" and "parousia autou" are one and the same thing. His parousia is His coming, and "His day" is the day when He comes. "The day of the

Lord will come as a thief." Notice that in all the New Testament references to His coming as a thief are references to His coming with reference to the wicked, not with reference to the righteous. I had a student last year who said

of the parable in Matthew, if the good man of the house had known, he would have watched, and since he was a good man, he must have been one of the righteous. It's the word

the boss of the house, not the good man of the house. (Dr. M: You mean you ~~do~~ don't think the English version is inspired?) It was inspired in 1611. I don't know. I don't mean inspired either.

(laughter). When it was translated, goodman didn't mean good man at all; it just meant the man, the fellow, the master of the house.

(Dr. M: Up here where it says "burned up" you took it as "discover." Is "burned Up" purely conjecture?) Purely conjecture, from all the data I can get. You have the analysis of it in Nestle's margin, ~~κατακα~~/~~κατα~~ kataκαηsetai instead of heurethηsetai, and afanisthηsontai. Well, there is some manuscript evidence for some of that, but very poor, very remote. All the good evidence is for "will be ~~dis~~ discovered," heurethηsetai, and Nestle puts that in the text. Now, "the day of the Lord will come as a thief and in which this catastrophe will occur." So there you ~~do~~ have a predication that in the day of the Lord the heavens and the earth will be destroyed by fire. (Question) Look up that word "thief." There are people who believe in a secret rapture you know, and Christ will come for us as a thief. Well, it says He will come unexpectedly, in such ~~an~~ an hour as you think not, and we should be ready and watching for His return, but there is no reference as His coming as a thief for us. It ~~will~~ will certainly be like a thief with reference to the wicked of the world, when He snatches out of the world the redeemed people. (Question) (Mr. Egert: I. Thess. 5:4 "But you brethren are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief, ~~for~~ for ye are children of light, the children of the day.") Yes. With reference to us, it's the expected coming of the bridegroom

of the church, suddenly, but not as a thief. When I get home at night after a meeting, my wife may say, "What took you so long," or she may say, "You made good time," but she never says, "Oh, I thought it was a thief." But likening it to a thief seems to me rather appropriate; that is, for a thief to come in, and blow up the house, and take the treasures out of the safe and be ~~off~~ off with them is sudden disaster, and the most ~~valuable~~ valuable people in the world will be snatched out of it at the instantaneous resurrection of the ~~dead~~ dead and the rapture of the living and the dead. There will be a terrific disaster in all this physical world for those who are left, a tremendous time. "These things thus being destroyed, what sort of people ought you to be, in all holy matter of life and piety, looking for and hastening the parousia of the day of." Now we've had thus far three of these phrases, parousia auto, the *ἡμερα Κυρίου*, the parousia of the day of God. I would invariably say all of these mean the same thing, the coming of the day of God, the coming of the Lord, and the day of the Lord. I don't see any ~~ground~~ ground for making them mean different things. "Looking for ~~and~~ and hastening," it looks to me as though the parousia is the direct object of the participle *speudontas*, hastening the parousia of the day of God. 14 1/4 hastening the coming of the day of God. It's translated, "hastening unto" but there isn't any word for "unto" in the text. (Question.) end of record

What does a technical word mean? You have to determine by its usage, and the usage will not support the technical differentiation of these ~~terms~~ terms referring to the eschatological context. Here is one of the examples in which the day of the Lord and the parousia seem to refer to the same thing, and the coming of the day of God seems to mean the same thing. Take your concordance, your Moulton and *GOPEN* and your Greek concordance and you'll find that the technical usage simply is not supported in the New Testament. "Looking for ~~and~~ and hastening the day

of God." How can we hasten the coming of the day of God/? Well, I think there is just one answer that I know of, and that Christ predicted that the gospel would be preached in all the world for a witness of all the nations. He quoted the telos that He was referring to there (we'll get that in context later on) the sign of thy parousia and the ~~/X/X/X/~~ ~~ΑΧΤΡΑ/ΕΡΑΡΟ/ΗΡ/~~ sunteleia tou kosmou, no, sunteleia of the age, it's not kosmou, but aion, the aionas; thy coming and the consummation of the age. The gospel must ^{be} preached in all the world for a witness to all the nations. I would think that the inference is by hastening the missionary program, we, from our human point of view, may be hastening the coming of the day of God; not that God doesn't know, but He has ordained a missionary program that's instrumental to that day, whihc He of course knows. I haven't any other meaning for "hastening the coming of the day of God", except by the evangelisation of the world, we're fulfilling the one thing that Christ said must intervene. And of course, we never will know, from the human point of view, when that prophecy is fulfilled just how much evangelization did He mean when He said, "For a witness to all the Gentiles, to all nations." When He comes then we will know tht it has been fulfilled. But does He mean that each individaul in some given generation, at some future date, would be personally dealt with; or did He mean that some representatives from each one of the nations would ~~he~~ hear the Gospel, as 2 3/4 was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost? I don't think either extreme is probable. (Mr. E: Not in the light of James' speech to the Jerusalem Council.) No. (No.) It's to be a multitude of Gentiles to be called by His name when He comes back again. (Mr. E: It didn't happen at Pentecost in view of what James said.) No. (Acts 15:13-18). James brought out from the Old Testament prophecy that when Christ comes again to restore the tabernacle of David, there will have been a multitude of G_ntilles called by His name. Is that what you mean? (Mr. E: Yes)

I suggest then that "hastening the coming of the day of God" means hastening the evangelization of the world; I don't have any other interpretation ϕ to suggest. That does seem to fit. "di h η n," now that dia with the accusative, "on account of which," it would seem that you would expect "in which," but we have to meet it the way it reads, "On account of which," that is, "on account of the coming of the day of God, the heavens, being on fire, will be destroyed and the elements, with intense heat will melt." (Dr.^M: "On account of which," not "wherein". The A.V. says "wherein.") Is there a variant reading there? There's nothing in Nestle. Does anyone have a Textus Receptus? di h η n. Could you read di h η n, "wherein" χ ? en h η you'd expect, but it isn't that. (Dr. M: The R. V. says, "By reason of which.") Yes, "by reason of which," dia with the accusative. (Dr. M; You would say the A.V. was definitely wrong here?) Yes. That is, I don't know any usage of ~~di~~ dia with the accusative which would justify ~~di~~/~~in~~/ reading "wherein". That seems to be a mistake. "Hastening the coming of the day of God on account of which, (that is, on account of which coming), the heavens, being on fire, will be destroyed, and the ~~elements~~/ elements with intense heat will melt." Let's not be foolish and insist that the "elements" in Peter's language means "chemical elements" in our language. That is certainly taking it out of context; the stoi χ eia^a are the basic principles, and evidently the basic principles of the physical world; that seems clear, but stoi χ eia was sometimes called "the planets." There were some planets called stoi χ eia and worshipped as gods. All that Peter says is that the basic principles of the material universe--I think that at least, was in his mind here, the basic ~~elements~~/ principles, including the planets and all, will melt and be destroyed. But we look for a new heavens and a new earth, according to His promise, in which righteousness dwells. Therefore, beloved, looking for these things, let us be diligent to be found

without spot and without blame in Him in peace. And reckon ye that the longsuffering of the Lord means salvation for that many more people." That is, we should be eager for the Lord's return--"Lord come quickly," is a proper prayer, but we should never be impatient for the Lord's return, if He chooses to ~~wait~~ wait another five hundred years till you children and grandchildren have served and wept and rejoiced and born fruit and had their disappointments and gone on to glory, just say, "All right, then; it just means so many more people are getting saved." We don't know the number of the elect. "The longsuffering of God" means salvation for that many more people, so that's our attitude for the delay. Now, of course, the main homoletical message of the chapter is comfort and delay, but the eschatology is very sharp and clear: this

8 universe is coming to a cataclysmic end. Now then, the particular question, Does this passage rule out a period of blessedness on this earth other than what might be experienced in the ordinary course of things. The answer is, that if we take these so-called technical phrases, parousia and day of the Lord and parousia of the day of God in ~~the~~ the way in which lexicography will support their definition, they refer to the whole eschatological complex. There clearly is a complex of events in the future that is contemplated by Old Testament prophets, and then ~~also~~ contemplated by the New Testament eschatology in its New Testament perspective. And that complex of events can be called the parousia; it can be called the apocalypse, it can be called the day of the Lord, it can be called the parousia of the day of God, it can be called "that day," it can be called by a number of different phrases. They don't all occur here, but here are three of them, and there is nothing in this passage, I would say, to eliminate a period of a thousand years of blessedness ~~or~~ or an indeterminate period of blessedness after the Lord's return. (Dr. M: Would

you say that the terms are ^{necessarily} /absolutely identical?) They are not synonyms any more than "Dr. MacRae" and "Daddy" are synonyms, but they refer to the same man, you see. And so when you're thinking of Jesus, you think of His parousia, when you think of His kingdom you think of the day of the Lord, when you think of cosmic eschatology, you call it "the coming of the day of God," when you're just talking about this day, then you say, "that day." They're not synonyms. (Dr. M: But they ~~are~~ might conceivably be slightly different; that is, they might be approximately the same, but one might extend a little further or have a little different relationship, ^{or} /involve certain ideas the other didn't?) ^{There is a} /Distinction in nouns between the connotation and the denotation, and it would seem to me--of course those two terms are defined differently in medieval times and modern times, ~~is~~ and by British and American, but the literal denotation, so far as chronology is concerned, it seems to me that all of them refer to the eschatological complex, so far as their suggestive meaning is concerned, each one of them emphasizes a certain aspect of the eschatological complex. And there is this too ^{ll} (jeperde) that Gerhardes Voss brings out, that from the Old Testament point of view history is by sectors, it's this time and the age to come. And the age to come begins with the birth of Christ, from the Old Testament point of view. So you find your ^{NEW} Old Testament writers saying, it is the last day, it is the last hour, the hour is already come of eschatological finality. The birth of Jesus, the act of incarnation was an act of finality never to be repeated. It is ^a /part of the resolution of the history of redemption. But then, the New Testament writers (Voss said this) realized the age to come includes an age to come, so that the Old Testament writers, referring to ~~it~~ that day might mean anything from the birth of Christ on down, simply, eschatological events. And now the New Testament writers, if they say, "It is the last hour, and the spirit of ~~the~~ / Anti-christ is already in the world" and "the hour is already come

when the dead shall hear His voice and they that hear His voice shall live." Then you know they are speaking of their own time, and that is quite clear in the context whether they mean the eschatological events from the Old Testament point of view, or the eschatological events from the point of view that Christ is now visibly present and is going to be visibly present. So the extent of any one of these phrases, in the inclusion of events would vary with the context, but they all refer to the eschatological complex. (Mr. Eppert: If the day of God is part of the eschatological, then wouldn't it be reasonable to say this cataclysm would be after the thousand years.) I don't think Peter gives any ground, does he? In the Revelation, clearly the passing away of the heavens and the earth is at the end of a thousand years, and if that passing away is the same as this passing away, then there's nothing to forbid it, to put this at the end of that thousand years. (Do you think that would be reasonable?) Certainly. I find myself, in evangelistic, resorting to ~~the~~ the new heavens and the new earth, and this whole system of life passing away. I don't think ^(Stalin?) 14 ^{it is ALL} consistent with the premillennial view. But when you come to a wicked man who is all wrapped up in earthly security, one thing you can say to smash right through that whole crust, ~~is~~ is to say, "This whole universe is going to pass away," and God is going to make another one wherein dwelleth righteousness." That's Peter's point of view, and I don't think it is at all out of line. (Question: My question is on the new heavens and the new earth as viewed in Isaiah 65 and Rev. 22) Now there's something Dr. M. and I both have to get our heads together on. I don't know whether we agree or not, but I think that the data is capable of a perfectly clear harmonization in the Isaiah passage and the Peter passage and Revelation. (Dr. M: You'll find a pretty good discussion ~~of~~ of that passage which Dr. Buswell edits, "The Bible Today", ~~of~~ ~~it~~ // about two years, an article on Isaiah 65. (end of record)

(Question) Words have their implications as well as their denotations. I remember in our old high school English book, Webster's "High School English", the word "mother"..The word "mother" has a ~~literal~~ literal meaning, but the implications of "mother" are very different for each one of us, the implication, the suggestive meaning. (Question) On account of which--it is on account of the coming of the day of God that --and you would insert "later on", that is, "following," you see there, there are two ~~references~~ references, en h^h and di hⁿ, de h^hmera Kuriou en h^h. The day of the Lord in which the heavens with a loud noise will pass away. At the coming of the great God, di hⁿ, on account of which, and it's both in it ~~of~~ and on ~~the~~ account of it. (Question) Is that appropriate, Dr. M? All I would say is that I don't know the physics and chemistry of it, but now in our generation I can always imagine an atomic ~~explosion~~ conflagration which would just burn up the whole 3 universe. I have heard something mystically about a chain reaction, but that's only human imagination. Do you have a suggestion on that, Dr. M?

See p. 131

(3 1/2) Dr. MacRae speaking ----

That's exactly what I would say, I don't know what's going to happen and I think that we are, I think it is very important as we look forward to the future to see what are the things that ~~definite~~ are definite. God says a certain thing will happen. God says something that may mean this or may mean that. Now we know it is true whatever it is, but we have difficulty in interpreting. We have difficulty in exactly fitting it together. Somebody might read the promise of the thousand year reign of Christ in the time of Christ and someone will say, ' why that describes the period beginning with 1000 A.D.' Someone else would say, " No, that is the period beginning with 2000 A.D." They argue that for years and they couldn't decide ~~which~~ which was true because the ~~Bible~~ Bible doesn't state it. Well, we know now at least that it doesn't begin in 1000 A.D. At least all, except a few post millenialists are agreed on that. It does not begin at 1000 A.D. Now, in this case we are told here that there is going to be a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. And what do we mean by that new heaven and new earth. Do we mean by that a new heaven and earth, as you might mean: you quit this seminary here and you left it and you went over here to some other place and you bought a new building or perhaps you tore this one entirely down and you've built an entirely new building, and that would be a new Seminary? Or if you were to take the building here and to take out practically all that is in it and to give it a very very thorough overhalling and change things around quite a bit, you might say that we have a new Seminary, even though most of it was the same. The question to my mind is, "Can we say that this means a complete change in the elements to the extent that it is an entirely different one, or may it simply be a renewed one?" One that has been greatly changed, from which all the effects of sin have been removed, which has been

cleansed, but which is not necessarily entirely new material, or entirely different arrangement of material. Well, now it strikes me that when you get over there to Revelation, Dr. Buswell just spoke about the destruction of this earth and heaven at the end of the 1000 years. Well now that is the way in which I think most interpret Revelation, but when you look at Revelation 20 you notice that it doesn't actually say that. It says at the end of Revelation 20, about the great white throne judgement, and at the end of vs. 13, "and death and hell delivered up the dead which was in them and they were judged every man according to their works, and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire and this is the second death and ~~the~~ whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire and God destroyed this earth and heaven by fire." It doesn't say that. It starts with the words "and I saw a new heaven and a new earth," and He doesn't say when he saw it, or where it fits in the picture. He doesn't say these things happened, then this happened, then it happened, etc. and then after all this happened I saw that this is what came. That maybe what he means, but he doesn't actually say that. He says "and I saw" and perhaps he is going back to a certain point in the action which he has previously described and telling you of something which he ^{sees in it.} (7) I mean it is a possible interpretation. He doesn't say which happened, this happened, this happened and this happened and then that happened. He says, and I saw a new heaven and a new earth for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away and there was no more sea and I John, saw the Holy City, New Jerusalem coming down out of heaven prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. Well, now the, I always took it for granted that this meant that after the great white throne judgement, there would then be a destruction of this earth and a new earth established then and I believe that is the way that most people interpret it and that may be the correct interpretation.

3

And if that is the correct interpretation of it then back here in II Peter 3, you have at first sight a problem which Dr. Buswell has just now been discussing and at first sight it seems to say, the Lord is going to come as a thief in the night and immediately the heaven and earth will pass away with a great noise and the elements will melt with fervant heat, but he doesn't say immediately and therefore it is not an ~~(8)~~^{insuperable} problem because it may mean the Lord comes as a result of His coming great changes take place and the climax of these great changes does not occur until a thousand years after the actual immediate coming, but during the period of years that - the way Dr. Buswell deals with that, that these great changes here described are changes which take place a thousand years after the beginning of the time of Christ visible return to this earth, Christ's visible presence in this earth. Dr. Buswell ----

Dr. MacRae ---Yes, "I saw a great white throne and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away." You mean that would mean that ~~they~~ they were burned up? Dr. Buswell - -

Dr. MacR. - Yes it is possible that in verse 11 you have a suggestion to of the fact which reference has been made in Ch. 21:1 that at this time there is a tremendous destruction to heaven and earth. Yes, this is possible, but I don't think it is necessary to the correct interpretation. It is altogether possible that He is simply there stressing the nature the terrible nature of the Judge that sits on the throne, that there is no escape ~~if~~ if everything is subdued before him 9 1/2 safety from him and the dead, small and great stand before him. Dr. Buswell ~~over~~

Dr. MacR ---- Yes, that is possible, ^{I'm not saying} it is an incorrect interpretation, it is entirely possible that what happens is that after the thousand year reign, then at the judgement of the great white throne, this heaven and this earth is destroyed and the great white throne

judgement is in empty space and then there is a new heaven and new earth established which falls. It is not at all impossible and I used to assume that it was correct. It is the obvious interpretation, but then I was reading ~~John~~^{ZAHN ?} Zon on the subject, who was as you know one of the greatest journal scholars of the last century and a very orthodox conservative man, a great interpreter of the word of God and I was reading his interpretation of Revelation 20 here and he takes a clearly premillennial interpretation but when he came to chapter 21, he said this is a picture of the millennium. He said that he here is describing a situation during the millennium and in 21 he is then not going on telling what happened after, but going back to an aspect of 20 and as I studied into his interpretation of 21 ~~and his~~^{and his} correlated interpretation of II Peter 3, it struck me as an alternative interpretation, and I feel that we do not have the basis. The Lord has not given us the basis to say which of these two is definitely correct and it is possible that there is a new heaven and new earth, a complete change coming at the time of the great white throne, but I don't think the scripture emphasis is sufficient to ~~conclude~~^{prove} that and I think another comparable interpretation is that there is a regeneration of ~~the earth~~^{the cosmos} which occurs in connection with the removal of ~~this earth~~^{the curse} and that this regeneration of the ~~earth~~^{cosmos} which occurs in connection with the removal of ~~this earth~~^{the curse} could be that which was spoken of as the cleansing by fire, ~~by~~^{whereby} the elements melt with fervent heat, there is a cleansing rather than that there is a complete demolition of this and is subsequent to something else. No I personally incline a little bit towards this view, but not sufficiently so to feel that the fact of the Scripture proves this is correct and the other false. It's one of those things we just don't know which ^{of the two} is correct. I incline just a little toward this view rather than ~~the~~ toward the other ~~one~~ one, although I would be the last one to say that I

felt that the Scripture proved(it there?). (Question: How do you get around the words there: I saw the first heaven and the first earth pass away. How do you get around that to say it refers to a millenium kingdom?) Because he would be looking back at the heaven and the earth at this period described in chapter 20 when the saints were reigning ~~with~~ with Christ for the thousand years, and describing what was there, and saying, this was the situation on a new heaven and a new earth, because all this time it had taken place. (Question) ~~There~~ There is nothing in the Scripture to say. We don't know what the Lord is going to do in the millions and trillions of years that may follow in eternity. We don't know what He's going to do. There would be nothing in the Scripture ~~from~~ from which we could get a precise evidence as to something after the Great White Throne Judgment. There might be a very complete change; there might be a continuation exactly as it was before/~~except~~/ except that the wicked dead would now have gone to their reward. (Question) Well I would say that eternity began millions and millions of years ago and it's still continuing ----(laughter). (Question) I do not find in the Scripture anywhere a state of something of which we would call "heaven in contrast with the millenium." There may be such a thing; I just don't know. ~~Maybe~~ It may be "a new heaven and a new earth" still ^{as} is earth. If there's a new heaven and a new earth it's still new. So that if the end of the earth, the time of the Great White Throne Judgment, whether you believe in a millenium or not, is the time of the end of this earth, it doesn't say/~~and~~// "and then they went to heaven," it says, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth." So there's something we call (14 3/4) at any case. And so that there is a period which we would call "the millenium" and ~~then~~ then a period which we call ~~the~~ "heaven".../

end of record

It definitely is so. That is to say, I would say (bad spot in record) to the return of Christ, there is a period of great Bliss and joy in the resurrected body. How long that period runs, whether it runs through all eternity, I'd say that a thousand years after the return of Christ, there is then the great white throne judgment and the beginning of the eternal state for the wicked. The wicked then pass into eternal suffering which continues forever, but death the righteous death when the wicked are cast into the Lake of Fire and they burn forever, that the righteous are then cast into a lake of happiness and they swim forever, I don't think that the Scripture teaches that. That is I don't know what our state will continue to be, I just don't know. But I'm inclined to think that ~~it would be~~ whatever the Lord had planned for us would be just a joy for the Christian as the Lake of Fire is miserable for the unbeliever and it goes on and on and I see nothing to stop it. We just don't know or perhaps the Lord is going to wind it all up after a certain length of time and start another whole new cycle. The Scripture just doesn't tell us. I know there are those who teach that before and after this present world, this present age, there is something which they call eternity in which there is no time. There is no succession. Everything is absolutely static. It just stops there, and it is static and (1 1/2) just observes with a constant unchangeable attitude which is what we have and that is ~~called~~ eternity. Now there may be something like that. It may be something like a great dream that lasts forever, but not like a dream because there is no action. I find no scriptural evidence for it so I consider it purely a guess on somebodies part. (student question) No, I didn't mean that. The Millennium is on earth. I say ~~that~~ definitely. How much of that is literal and how much is figurative, I don't know. No night there. They used to say about Creed Colorado that there was no night there, It

was true in the sense that they meant it. Well now this is true in the sense it means, but what does it mean? The sun always shines, there is never any rest, it may be, but I wouldn't feel at all sure about that.

Student question---- The description in Revelation of the Heaveanly City is such as conveys little meaning to it. It is a beautiful picture, that is all. We don't know what the picture stands for. It is given in such a way it's to indicate clearly to us that there is something grand and glorious, something of wonderful bliss and joy, but the deatils of it are simply not clear. It is a series of beautiful instances to suggest something which is very wonderful. Now, for instance, just thinking of the streets being paved with God~~d~~ld and the wonderful jewels in the walls and all that sort of thing, all that stands for very wonderful things, but the details of it would be just as hard for him to describe to us as if somebody were to try to tell Julius Caesar about what life would be like in America today, and he would start in to explain the telephone. He would say the telephone rang and he would askswer and somebody was calling from San Franciso and Julius Caesar would say what on earth are you talking about? And when you start in trying to describe a piece of our present life, the wisest man in the world 2000 years ago would be actually at sea and he wouldn't know what on earth you would be talking about and there would be nothing much gained by trying to explain it to him. I think that life in the new heaven and new earth, or that life in the millennium will be just as incomparabel beyond ~~even~~ anything we experienced as our life is in the material way beyond that in the Roman Empire, but I don't think that there is any point in the ^{Lord} ~~wor~~ld trying to explain the details to us. They simply paint us a beautiful picture. (Dr. Buswell question)

I think that is a very important thing in connection with the Scripture, to recognize it, that the Lord has implanted amny truths in the Scrip-
tures which He expects us to discover some time which may not ^{yet} have

been discovered, but I think it's equally important to recognize that there are many things that He doesn't ever expect us to find out, which we simply couldn't understand in this present age. (Question): Do you think this is one of them?) Yes. I think there are thousands of others too. As John said, if he were to tell everything that ~~E~~ Christ did it would take all the books in the world to tell them. Now we know that Christ fed five thousand, and we know that Christ fed four thousand. Did Christ ever ~~fed~~ feed three thousand? We don't know? We don't know what else He did. Nobody can say, "Christ never did that." We can say "This He didn't do." But as for what He didn't do, we don't know. (Mr. Eppert: Many other signs, which are not recorded in the Scriptures.") Yes, many other signs. (Question) I think there are many things doubtless that we can grasp, and of those many things we can grasp, the Lord has given us a few, and there are a great many we just don't know about. But then there are a great many we can't grasp, because we just don't have the data with which to deal. And whether this ^{is} a picture of the millenium, as Zahn has it, and I incline to it, or whether it is a description of something that comes after the ~~Great~~ Great White Throne Judgment, not heaven, but a new heaven and a new earth, then this would be a description of earth, of the new earth. Whether it is that, (which the great bulk of premillennial interpreters accept) I don't know, and I doubt if it's particularly important. If we can find out, it's worth finding out, but I don't think it's particularly ~~p~~ important, because it doesn't affect the great ~~things~~ things that are clear in Scripture either one way or the other. (Question): Does the millenium as we understand it include people who are not saved? Then doesn't Rev. 21:27 exclude that possibility from it (Dr. M: from the new city) ?) Of course the new city wouldn't be the entire earth, would it? Verse 27 would ^{seem} to say, that ~~there~~ there was an earth, at least, which was only for the redeemed. If it said, "into the new earth," why that would certainly seem to prove the matter that

the one interpretation rather than the ~~other~~ other was the correct one, but it doesn't, it says "the city"/, so that I wouldn't feel that that would settle the matter. (Question) I feel myself that the evidence is ~~is~~ very evenly balanced. I feel personally it goes just slightly in this direction. I think that if it were ^{vital,} the Lord would make it clear, as He's made so many things clear, but then there are thousands of things we just don't know, and personally I think this is one of them. (Question: It would seem that Rev. 20:14, where it says that death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, ...the second death...seems to refer to the same thing that Paul speaks of in I. Cor 15 where he says the last enemy to be destroyed is death, and yet down in Rev. 21 it says there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither ~~shall~~ shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away.) Yes, but the difficulty there is that that statement, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death", it seems to me is personifying a material thing. You might say, "The last enemy--(Dr. M breaks off)" Death is not a thing, death is not a person; you don't destroy death as you destroy a person. That is, the phrase is ^{to} some extent figurative in any case, is it not? And so when you say, -It's like the old view of psychology, which held that we have three faculties. Man's mind was ~~made~~ made up of three faculties: there was thought, there was feeling, there was will. You might say, "Now this third of your mind is active, / Thought," "Now this third is active, Feeling," "Now this third is active, Willing." For many years that has been utterly cast aside; they say there is no such thing as a faculty of Thought, or a faculty of Feeling, or a faculty of Willing. The human thinks and he feels and he wills. You can go beyond that and say, he never thinks without feeling at the same time, and to some extent willing, and he never feels without thinking and willing at the same time. They are different aspects, just as you might say, this paper here has got thickness, and it's got area, and it's got whiteness. Well now, ~~it's~~

let's think of ~~it~~ it as just having whiteness without having thickness. It can't be. Just ~~it~~ having thickness without having area can't be. They are different aspects of the one thing. Now death is not a thing, but death is an event. When you say that the last enemy that will be destroyed is death, you mean that of those of whom you are speaking, there is no more death. Now death is the enemy of the Christian. When you speak of ~~the~~ the Christian's enemy being destroyed, you mean that after the Christian is resurrected, as far as he's concerned, there's ~~no~~ no more enemy. But you certainly don't mean, ~~it~~ when you say that, that the unbeliever has no fear of death, because it has nothing to do with the unbeliever. The unbeliever's death is with him all the time. He is cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. The lake of fire is eternal, so the death is eternal. There's no end to it. And so death is not destroyed as far as the unbeliever is concerned. It continues forever. (Question: Yet if you take whatever one, whether it's figurative or whether it isn't, if you interpret it that the death and hell that are cast into the lake of fire in Rev. 20:14, the second death spoken of here in R̄v. 21:4, which says there shall be no more death, speaking of death as a state or event, either one, unless you interpret them on some different basis, making one a figure of one thing and the other a figure of something else, I still think.....) Well, how do you cast death into the lake of fire? How would you cast birth into the lake of fire? (Death and life are two opposite principles. There's not only the event of death, there's the principle of death, a state of death, in which all men....12 ~~is~~ destroyed if they're in sin, they're spiritually dead, if they're disembodied, they're literally dead, and whichever picture or state that's ~~it~~ referring to, it automatically is referring to an end of that state when everyone who was in that state was going to be cast into the lake of fire, so there would be no more death. Whichever one.....there won't be any more in the new heavens and the new earth, or in the millenium or whatever it is referring to.) I doubt

141

if you can get much sense along that line. I incline to think it means, when you "death and hell were ~~it~~ cast into the lake of fire," that those who were dead, those who were in the grave, those people who were held in ~~the~~ death, in the grave, that they are cast into the lake of fire. I wouldn't think that it means the event of death was cast in; I mean I can't visualize what that would be. It seems to me to mean that the sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and hell gave up the dead that were in it, there was judgment according to their works, and then all those who were laying in the grave, who were laying in the grave all the time were all cast in. (Question) Rev. 21:4 is speaking of the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ resurrected Christians, is it not? "God ~~will~~ shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." (Question) I don't think he'd wipe death away from the eyes of heaven and earth. It would be people. (Question: It would be the people on the new heaven and ~~the~~ earth.) It has referance to the former things passing away.) Zahn was one of the greatest students of the Scripture, one of the greatest interpreters, and after a great ~~great~~ deal of thought he came out with the ~~conclusion~~ conclusion that this was the correct interpretation. Now I have not thought that this ~~is~~ was a particularly important matter, I have not gone into it a great deal. AS far as I have gone into it I have felt that this conclusion was the correct one, and

(end of record)

and it might be that I would be convinced, but certainly not -(not clear) (student question) I think that Mr. Lin has called our attention to a ~~very~~ important fact. Whether you consider chapter 21:1-8 as going with ch. 20 or as being separate from it, I think that there is no doubt that between vs. 8 & 9 of ch. 21 there is a rather sharp break. Vs. 2 of 21, I, John saw the Holy city coming down from God out of heaven prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, and then in vs. 9 there came out to me one of the seven angels and said come hither and I will show you the bride, the lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God. Now plainly John didn't in verse 2 see the Holy City coming down and then in vs. 9 and 10 see it all over again. The two seem to be references to the same event, described twice from slightly different aspects, or it may possible be two different events, but there is a very definite division there in this chapter at that point as he points out. Prof. Milligen who of course takes a definite anti-premillennial viewpoint, in his discussion of ch. 20, insists that ch. 1 has nothing ^{to} do with the future whatever, but that 21 is a picture of the church in this age and that we have here a picture of the church as it is in this age. I think that he is wrong in that regard, I don't think that this is a description of this age, but I do think it is a picture of the church. I think he is right to that extent, but it is the bride of Christ that is shown here, the bride adorned for her husband, and this would be a description of the bride of Christ coming down out of heaven and so it seems to me that the time the bride of Christ comes down out of heaven is the beginning of the millennium and therefore it would look to me as if this is altogether possibly a description of the glorified church of God as it comes down from Heaven to reign with Christ (3)

Now I don't know, it may be that it is something after the millenium, but I don't think it is. I certainly don't think it is an issue ^{on} which the emphasis is clear enough to make any divisional. I think the matter of the millenium verses to my mind is many many times clearer than the question of whether chapter ~~20/and~~ 21 is successive to 20 or is simultaneous to 20. Dr. Buswell ---

The continuity of ch 20, Dr. M., I'm not sure that I got your thought there. The chapter division is clearly artificial; John says, "I saw a great White Throne, and sat upon it--before whose ~~face~~ face the earth and the heavens--by the way, kai topos ^{ou} ~~of~~ heurethē, and place was not ~~found~~ found for them." Now, that in the immediate context, "before the face of Him who sat upon the Throne, eugen, they fled away."

Ch 21

Vs. 1 "And I saw a new heavens and a new earth because, or for (ho gar) for the first heaven and the first earth ap^lthon, and the sea was gone, the sea was not longer." Now the reference between their fleeing away and the new one, because the first ones had gone, that's the--

I'm not sure I got your point. In what sense did the first heaven and the first earth flee away, and in what sense is the appearance of a new heavens and a new earth, for the first heavens and earth have gone? That ~~connection~~ connection fo the two ~~passages~~ passages, Zahn or no Zahn (laughter). I have read through that part of Zahn. I have felt that Zahn just didn't quite focus; h is a marvelous scholar, a perfectly tremendous scholar, but I had a feeling that this particular opinion of his was like his opinion that Matthew was written in Aramaic, which I don't believe. That is, I think Zahn was ^{wrong in} some points, great as he was, and here you have it. "The first heaven and the first earth fled away, eugen, and place was not found for them, and I saw a new heaven and a new earth for the first heaven and the first earth were gone, and

the sea was no longer." That relationship there. And then it seems ~~to~~ to tie in so well with what Peter says, "That in the day of the Lord, the heavens being on fire will pass away, and the elements with intense, and the earth and the things in it will be ~~de~~ discovered, and on ~~the~~ account of the coming of the day of God, the heavens being on fire will be destroyed, and the elements with intense heat will melt. But we look for new heavens and a new earth, according to the promise, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And then Hebrews 1: "Our Lord in the beginning did lay the foundations of the ~~the~~ earth. The heavens ^{are} ~~is~~ the work of thy hands --all as himation will wax old, and as a wrapper, or like a tunic will wax old, and like a wrapper you will roll them up, and as a himation they will be changed." Now I'm not at all anxious to argue for the difference of physical substance, ~~but~~ I'm not a physicist, but it does appeal to me as a conceivable thing that the stuff the world is made of materially might be electricity, and electricity seems to be a non-granular fluid. It doesn't seem to be made of atoms, as far as I can gather. It is something that flows, and flows more readily on copper wires, and it seems to be universally present in space, and it is not inconceivable that the proton and nucleus and these various aspects ~~might~~ might be like swerls in electricity. I've asked some physicists what happens when your nuclear fission takes place, and they have said that it is doubtful. Now suppose that the same substance ~~is~~ was retained, and God made a new one out of the old substance. I don't think that would destroy it. The first heavens and the first earth fled away and there were new heavens and a new earth because they had gone, and that the

8 ~~the~~ ~~the~~ universe will melt with intense heat and we look for a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwells righteousness, and so will wax old like a garment, like a vestment you roll up, and they will be

changed. I don't know whether the same material basis, or basis of matter will be kept or not, but the relationship between the ϕ conclusion of the 20th and opening of the 21st chapter would seem to ~~fi~~ connect in that new heaven ~~ad~~ and new earth with what Peter says here. (Question) I you only had to say "fled away" but then if you see in it new ones because they had gone--(Question) we can at least get the data before us that the author of Hebrews contemplates the ~~/sphi/~~ senility of the material universe, and it's being cast aside like a worn-out coat, and God's throne remains forever. (Dr. M: Is the author of Hebrews actually referring there to a cataclysmic change, or is the author of Hebrews speaking in that passage of ~~ix~~ the changelessness of God, as against the material universe, which is constantly changing, and is wearing out like a garment, and God rolls it up, and established ~~as~~ a new situation in one section or another of the world?) What do you do when you wear out a coat? That is, you wear it until it's good and tight, when you put it in the good will barrel. (laughter) (Dr. M: As to whether that particular passage is relevant here I am not at all certain.) I think the II. Peter passage is the sharpest. He compares the future destruction in earth as ⁿcleansing by fire; he says "destruction by fire." He uses the word ^{11 1/4} (cosmic?) for destruction. He compared that to the ξ flood, which was a cosmic casualty. (Question) Well that's ~~sphi~~ a meaning that "kai" just doesn't carry. There is great significance to the word "kai" as used in the various writers, the more Hebraistic using it more like waw conjunctive or waw conversive, either one, but kai just isn't used for first and second and third. "Kai" isn't used to enumerate consecutive things as specifically consecutive. "kai" doesn't tell ~~sphi~~ you whether it is consecutive or not. In the Book of Revelation, if you have recurrences, you go along to a certain point, and then John definitely goes back and brings up the story, and "kai" doesn't tell you whether he's done that or not. "Kai" is meaningful, but that isn't one of its meanings. My only argument is that here in ch. 20 (Rev.) "The

heavens and the earth fled away," and in ch. 21, "he saw a new one because,"

first one had gone---taking that with Peter. I think we can sum up what the data is. Isaiah makes reference to a new heaven and a new earth and Peter ^{clearly} ~~it~~ it seems very/to say that this physical universe is to be destroyed by fire. And then you have that reference in the first ch. of Hebrews, which I would certainly say it fits in with what Peter says, and then you have the reference to Revelation which fits in. But the didactic material is in II. Peter 3. That's where you have statements that the universe is to be destroyed by fire. I don't think that gives us anything as to the theory of cosmic physics. You just don't know. It is conceivable that electricity is the basic substance.,,Of course we all have a monistic tendency in material things. We try to get some one thing out of which everything should be made, and the electric character of matter is just ~~is~~ one of the many theories. Matter, of course, seems to be interchangeable, and that would account for an electric theory of matter. ~~is~~ (end of record)

e 28

The day of the Lord, and the coming of the day of God, as they are used in Scripture, ^{the fact} that the cataclysmic destruction of the physical universe that Peter talks about takes place in and because of the eschatological complex does not eliminate a millenium; it does not rule out the scheme of things that we have in Romans 8 where there is to be a period of blessedness for the world after the Lord's return, and in Rev. 20, where there is to be the reigning with Christ for a thousand years after the resurrection of the righteous. That was the original point of departure. See p. 147

Dr. M: I think that ~~the~~ vital thing that Dr. B has pointed out to indicate that there is in this no reason for saying a millenium is impossible.

That is the vital thing, whether you take II. Peter and read that: "By reason of the coming of the Lord there will be a time a thousand years after His coming, but still in the time of His visible presence, which is what parousia means, when the heavens and the earth will be dissolved with great heat, and replaced by a new heavens and a new earth, or whether you take it

(Dr. MacRae 1) -- I think perhaps we have pretty near used up our time today, ~~maybe~~ you had better leave ^{II}/Thessalonians til week after next. I think it would be useful in this connection, unless you think it better to take that first before we take Joel. I think the vital thing is as Dr. Buswell has pointed out to indicate that there is in this no reason ~~possibly~~ for saying that the millenium is impossible. That is the vital thing. Whether you take II Peter and read 1-1/2 ^{that} By reason of the coming of the Lord, there will be a time a thousand years after ~~this~~ His time, but still in the time of His visible presence, which is what (^{the}) means. When the heavens and the earth will be dissolved with great heat and are replaced by a new heaven and a new earth, or whether you take it as I'm still inclined to think as meaning that at the end of this present age there is in connection with the coming of the Lord then a great cleansing, a great purging, a great purification, coincidental with the removing of the curse which results in the establishing of the heaven and the earth wherein dwells righteousness. Whichever way you take it, there is not in it an evidence against the thousand years millenium reign of Christ coming after the end of this present age, that is coming at the time of Christ return (question) --- Yes, the Book of Revelation, there are many different views on the book as a whole. There are those who think that we have in it anumber of instances in which we have the thing told fully and when you start over again either at the beginning and recapitulate the same thing or you start ^{PART} ~~half~~ way back and you recapitulate up to the end of the same period or maybe beyond, that is you might be for instance, start with lets say, history at the time of Christ up to 100 A.D. and you might go back to 50 A.D. and start in and go through the same period and up to 1050 and go back to 100 then up, that is a very common device in any sort of discussion to recapitulate. I think that in nearly every

class I ever get, I recapitulate at the beginning of the class a little of what I gave the class before and ~~xxx/xx~~ tie it together or perhaps I discuss something ~~xxx~~ one day from one aspect and then I go through and discuss it from another aspect. Now whether there are such recapitulations or not in Revelation and to how great an extent they are there is a matter on which there are various points of view, but the thing that always impresses me is that whatever view you take of the Book of Revelation prior to the middle of the 19th chapter from the middle of the 19th to the end of the 20th seems to be one continuous passage. It seems to be very closely knit together, and the middle of 19 very clearly begins with the return of Christ because he sees Him coming out of heaven with the sign on King of Kings and Lord of Lord. That can be no one but Christ. It is the coming of Christ. It is either His first coming or it is His second coming, one or the other, and it describes His coming followed by the hosts of heaven and defeating the hosts of wickedness, it seems more likely it is the second coming than the first. If that is the second coming, then this passage, whatever you do to the book of Revelation, the rest of it, this passage would seem to be a unite in which the middle of 19 describes His coming and then it tells what comes after that up to the great White throne judgement at the end of 20. Regardless of what you do before or after, you see, that would seem to be the teaching of that section, ~~xxx/xxx~~ that is if the view that one takes of Revelation as a whole of the general structure doesn't to my mind affect the argument as far as the millenium is concerned. There are only two possible ways to interpret the last part of Revelation 19. It is either the 2nd coming of Christ ~~xxxxxxx/xxxx~~ or the first coming. If it is the first coming now there is a recapitulation from the first coming on up to some extent which seem to go to the Great White Throne judgment. If it is the second ~~xxx~~ coming then it is the period between His coming and the great white Throne judgment.

Now then to ~~my~~ mind, we shouldn't decide it on the matter of what is
 our theory here in regards to Revelation, but say what does the last
 half of Ch. 19 teach? If it is the 2nd coming of Christ, ^{THEN} I don't see
 how you can get away from the millenium. If it is the first coming of
 Christ, well let's look at the ^{facts} ~~chapter~~ and see how it fits the first
 coming and there is one particular fact there that I noticed that I
 never have come across references ^{elsewhere} to (6) that seems to me almost
 decisive in that connection, but to me that is the question. Not ~~is~~
 what is the ^{truc} ~~sc~~pture of Revelation? What does the last half of 19
 refer to? A great many questions that people decide by their view-
 points of earlier sections of Revelation, yet I frankly don't know. I
 haven't looked into it enough to have a conclusion on it and I'm not
 ready to accept ^{anyone else's conclusion} it in (6) until I have the time to go into it,
 but I feel convinced of this that the last half of 19 is the 2nd com-
 ing of Christ and that the last half of 19 and 20 forms a unit together.
 And Therefore ^{that that section of a chapter + a half} ~~6-1/2~~ is a section which should be inter-
 preted as a whole. Now a person would say, I don't know what it means,
 I just can't understand it, that of course is a possible answer on any
 passs
 passage of scripture, but we always have the duty of trying to under-
 stand
 and seeing if the evidence is sufficient to reach a conclusion
 on it and I see no other conclusion to reach on that particular
 passage except the millenial reign of Christ. Now I hope to go into
 Revelation 20 more. I think that there is a great deal to be said
 on the passage, I'm glad to have questions raised about it. I don't
 think this question of Revelation 21 is as important as
 the question of Rev. 20 and the argument that Dr. Buswell has pointed
 out ~~is~~ of the fitting together of the two verses is a very interesting
 one and possibly ^rproves it although I'm still inclined to feel myself
 that the other is the better answer, but I don't think it effects only

the basic interpretations, which of the two you take. But for next time for today you have written out ^{what} the day of the Lord is and each occurrence in Joel. Any of you who haven't written it out ^{have it thoroughly in mind} ~~(7-1/2)~~ and then there is the other material that I asked you to write out as to the use of the references to the 2nd Coming of Christ. What His purpose is, What is the connection etc? in certain chapters that I assigned you. Please turn in the papers to me now and then for next time since we will discuss Joel ~~it~~ there is no use of your going over that same material again so I would suggest that you spend quite a bit of your time reading in the Hebrew the 2nd Ch. of Joel. Of course if you want to you can read the whole Book, but all I'll assign for next time is the reading in the Hebrew the 2nd Ch. of Joel, just the 2nd ch. fairly well particularly the tenses of the verbs. Now if you find uncommon words I don't think it is so tremendously important to know the exact difference in the meaning of the different kinds of locusts and some of the rather uncommon nouns, but to know the common words quite readily in the chapter and to be right sure of what the tenses are because after all you can't interpret anything if you don't know the tenses, so please get Joel 2 in fairly good shape and I wish everybody would always bring your Hebrew Bible because after all how can you ^{discuss} ~~9-3/4~~ the Bible is you don't have it in front of you. ~~(end of period)~~

(end of period)

The third day on which Christ comes back to this earth. Does the day of the Lord mean the period of time in which Christ comes back to this earth? Does the Lord mean a particular day in which God judges the nation or a period of time which He does that? What exactly is the day of the Lord? If you say I ^{went to} ~~once at~~ Philadelphia. Well I say, what is Philadelphia? Why it is the place where everybody loves each other. The word means brotherly love, and yet you read of the suicides of bureau chiefs and the upheavels of the gov't of Phila.

in this last week and you wonder just where the brotherly love is
 and why they don't have any more brotherly love in N. Y. and San Fran-
 cisco. Well of course the word Phil. is technical term for a part-
 icular city. It is the name of that city. It doubtless originally
 had a prescriptive meaning. (10) to be a city where all was
 brotherly love and so he chose this name, but now the name is simply
 a technical term to indicate that particular city and any ~~city/~~
 thing you find in that particu ar city goes under the name of Phila.
 Now is the day of the Lord a technical term which points to one part-
 iculat day, whether it be a 24 hr. day or a longer period? One spec-
 ific period which you point to under this title This is the tech-
 nical term for that. Is that what the day of the Lord means and if
 so just what is the technical period that is pointed to by the phrase
 the day of the Lord? Of course it is used a good many different times
 in the course of the Scripture, but no more larger number of cases in
 a few verses anywhere than here in this book of Joel. So we are int-
 erested in the context and what the day of the Lord means here and
 that is ~~the~~ one of the things I'm most interested in in connection
 with this book of Joel is this question about techical terms. I reme-
 mber once we had a big discussion ~~on~~ on some phase on millenialism
 about 14 years ago and one of those who was quite active in the session
 insisted that whenever you find the word "end" in the Scripture that
 the end used absolutely, not in the construct, not the end of the world,
 or the end of the age, or the end of life, or the end of 12
 but simply the end, that means the end of the world which refers to a
 particular cataclism of events at the end of the world so you find the
 judging of the wicked at the end and if you find the judgment of the
 righteous at the end, that proves there is no space between them, they
 have to be at the same time because the end is a technical term which
 points to one particular part and then I ~~wondered~~ wondered when we find

152

an instance or two where the word end had nothing to do with this whatever, he said, "Oh, that technical term is used non-technical." Well the thing is we have a right to assume that a word is a technical term. We use technical terms, but when you take up a manuscript and you look for a technical term in it, you want to be sure that that word is what you have evidence that it is actually a technical term and that ^{isn't} ~~is~~ merely a descriptive part. Well now this term, 'the day of the Lord.' I think that one of the things we must learn ~~to~~ to avoid is assuming that everything is a technical term unless we have proof of it. Now if most people will assume that the day of the Lord is a technical term, most discussions will just take it for granted that is a technical term and wherever we find it it refers to exactly the same day. Well now how does that fit here in this book of Joel? Well we'll begin at the beginning --- "The word of the Lord that came to Joel the son of Pethuel." When did this word come to Joel? We have no way of knowing. We have no evidence as to when Joel lived. There are those who say that the book is a very late book. Most conservative scholars think it is an early book. I do not know of any real evidence on the question aside from this that it is ^{placed} 14 among the first of the minor prophets and while the minor prophets are not arranged in one two three order precisely in the order that they are given, it is true that most of the latter ones are books which were given after the exile. In fact all were given then after the exile. And it is true that the earlier books are books in general which were given ~~quite~~ early and you have seem to have a general arrangement in chronological order of the books here of the minor prophets as you have of course in the major prophets. You have Isaiah first and it comes one hundred years before Jeremiah, Ezekial, etc. Those three come all about the same time, except the book of Danial runs a bit later than the other two books and it is

placed the last of the books. Well now here in the minor prophets

(end of record)

the Book of Joel is doubtless a book that came comparatively ^{early} ~~in record~~ ~~--- a~~ ~~great deal of difference to the~~ ~~thought~~ of the book ^{to} ~~in~~ our interpretation, whether it is early or late. There is nothing else in the Scripture referring to Joel or referring specifically to events described as having occurred in this book so that we can tie it in as we ^{can} ~~come~~ to the book of Johah where we have the Johah mentioned ^{in II Kings} ~~to some extent~~, but ^{the} two approaches to the book which might be ^{before us} ~~3/4~~ ^{one} ~~would~~ be to say here is a book that God gave someone telling him what is going to happen in the future. Well all right let's take this book and ~~see~~ ^{can} see all that is going to happen in the future. Perhaps something of that sort was ^{the idea} ~~in~~ the minds of the translators of the authorized version when they translated; ~~(---)~~ ^{they translated their sense the way they did}

They took the book as a whole as description of future events. It is telling about things that are going to take place and Joel is giving us a wonderful picture of the distant future in the book and Joel just sits down and the word of the Lord comes to Joel and he says 'Joel I want you to write a picture for people to read thousands of years from now and know the wonderful things that shall happen then that I have laid out for them.' History written in advance! Well, that is the approach people have to the prophetic books in general. They assume that prophecy is a prediction of something future and therefore whatever the books says it will ~~be~~ something which is going to be in the future. Isaiah and Jeremiah or Ezekial very much. If you study the first part of Hosea, if you study Joel, Zekeriah, Haggia, Y^ou will find that there is a tremendous amount in these books that relates to the immediate situation. Micah as another example, ^{& what exactly did he do?}

You will find as you trace through the work of the prophets in the Bible that rarely if ever, is a prophet a man who went out on a hill somewhere in order that the Lord could give him something to write down that would satisfy curiosity about events thousand of years future and has nothing to do with the immediate situation. The prophets were men who were interested in the situation in their own day and here I think a great many conservative interpreters have gone off on a tangent that is unfortunate in assuming that prophecy always mean prediction and that the prophet wasn't much interested in his own day and the prophetic writers in the minds of many conservatives have become simply men who wrote something divorced from actual life; simply a revelation of something ^{in the future} future. To many people the modernists' approach to the prophet seems much more natural and much more appealing because the modernists talk a great deal about the ^{great} social reform which these prophets ^{worked} ~~(3)~~ and about the wonderful interest they had in the political and social conditions of their time, and they start quoting verses from the prophets about the political and social conditions rebuking the people for their sins, for their injustice, rebuking them for their selfishness and their greed, and they say what wonderful messages for our day to look at the social problems of our day as these prophets looked at theirs. As you look at the evidence they present it is very easy for a person to say, yes, a modernist is right. The prophets weren't people who are giving us a lot of information about the future they are people who are interested in the problems of their own day. the positive part of that is Well, true, but unfortunately, or fortunately the negative part of it is absolutely false. The prophets were people who were interested in the problems of their own day, but that isn't to say that they were not people who were interested in the future. God gave them wonderful visions of the future, but in most cases the vision of the future had a definite relation to a present situation. The same is true of the proph-

ecy of the NT. It is rare indeed that the NT says, "Now, I'm going to tell you what is going to happen in the future." Instead of that Paul will say, "I don't want you to be sorrowful ~~of~~ over those who are dying as if they aren't going to have a part in the coming of Christ as we are. I want to tell you what's going to happen." And he tells them that to encourage their hearts in the present situation. You will find that in most of the predictive portions of the New Testament, that ~~they~~ they are given not to satisfy curiosity about the future, but to show them what their emotional response or their positive action should be in some immediate situation, and it relates to a future event. "You men of Galilee, why are you standing ~~gazing~~ gazing into heaven." That's not the thing for you to do, just gaze into heaven. The thing for you to do is to think, oh how terrible, Christ is gone. Everything is over. That's not the thing to do. It's a present, immediate relationship to your work for the Lord. "Why stand you gazing into heaven? This same Jesus, who's gone from you, will so come in like manner as you have seen Him go. Here's work for you to do. Here is a situation. Here is ^{hope} is/for you: as you go on in your work, you know He's coming back. It is related to an immediate situation, and so we, in our time, as we read the prophets, as we see similarities between our situation and their's, we see the way they reacted in relation to their situation, is an example for us in relation to ours, but we must not stop there, because if ~~we~~ we do, we're ^{soon} apt ~~to be~~ to be false to the prophetic teaching, that prophets bring ~~in~~ in relation to the present situation insights into the future which give an understanding of God's plan, which give added reasons for following the Lord, for doing his will, which give understanding of His plan, which show you great, important things about the future, but it has a practical purpose as it relates to the actual activity of the people in those days, and to us in our day. Well, now, is this Book of Joel a book in which Joel went off on a hillside, and he said, "Now look here,

I see way off there, thousands of ~~of~~ years in the future. I see the great day of the Lord. And in that day I see armies coming, I see things happening. And I'm going to tell you about it now, and all through the centuries you can know this is ¹going to happen." Is that what he's doing, or does Joel have an immediate situation in which certain things occur, and God gives him revelation in that situation which are vital for dealing with the situation, and also which prepare him for understanding the future, and he uses the present situation as that which makes the future intelligible. Now which is the situation with the book. We begin the book. He says, "Here this you old men, and give ear you inhabitants of the land. Has this been in the old days, or even/ⁱⁿthe days of your fathers? Tell your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation." Is he talking to the people at the very end of the world? when he tells them to tell their children about it, and let ~~let~~ them tell their children, and their children another generation? Is he talking to people at the very end of the world, or is he talking to his own contemporaries? Which is the more natural interpretation of that verse? That which the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten; that which the locust hath left doth the cankerworm eat,^{en} and what the cankerworm hath left hath the caterpillar eaten." There are those who say these represent four different kinds of soul.. This is a description of an army coming. Certainly as it is described, they are insects. They are four types of insects, possibly ~~possibly~~ the same kind of insect, but at four different stages of its growth. At any rate, at ^elast you have here a picture of insects which have eaten things up, and one comes after another. Is he describing a terrible situation that is going to ~~be~~ come sometime in the future, or is he here depicting that which is right in his day. Even though we do not know when the terrific locust plague came, which he described here, the one which was so terrible that they ^hould tell their children and their grandchildren about it, and/^{that}the old

13

157

men could say there had been nothing like it in their days or in the days of their fathers, even though know exactly when it is, is it not the reasonable approach to this to say that ~~this~~ this is a picture of the prophet speaking for God in a specific situation, in a situation of national calamity? First we know that there were great locust plagues in the land of Palestine; we have reference to two of them in the Scripture, and then we know that in recent years there have been locust plagues of greater severity. You have the locust spawn^{ed} in the wilderness, and the women they bring them in in tremendous quantity there. One morning in Trans-Jordan, twenty years ago, I was sleeping just outside the tent. Dr. Albright and Dr. Lee and Professor Yerku were in the tent, and about two in the morning we thought the war had ~~broken~~ broken out. We began to ~~hear~~ hear the noise of explosions, sounds, great excitement, and here were these shots going off, all this excitement, and people yelling. We thought the best thing to do was to lie quietly until it got light, and then see what the situation looked like, and when it got light we got up and looked around, and we find that actually the war was on, but it was the war against locust. There was a great invasion of locusts there that year, in 1929, and the government had provided these Arabs there with guns to fight the locusts that would shoot out flame to burn up the locusts, and there was something of an explosion with the use of it, and they were yelling a lot because they always like to get all the fun out of the excitement that they can, and they ~~start~~ start pretty early and make quite a racket. I took a couple of pictures of them burning up the locusts. But it is a real catastrophe, a terrific locust invasion, and they have a little of it year after year, but here is a description of one which is perhaps far worse than any which the land had seen. Now in the face of this terrific situation, Joel comes forward to bring a message to the people. And his message first is a message of pointing out the terrible nature of the situation. He's calling on the people to realize actually how

bad the situation is in which they find themselves. Verse 5 "Awake you drunkards and weep and howl, you drinkers of wine, because of the new wine, the grape juice, it's cut off from you mouth." There is no more of the grape juice, no more musk, because the grape plants are being chewed up by the insects. ~~Why~~ "Oh" but you say, "This isn't insects, this is an army. Read verse 6: And nations fell upon my land, strong and without number." Well, is it a nation, an army, or a nation of locusts? He goes on, "Whose teeth are the teeth of a lion, he hath the cheek teeth of a great lion." Well, I don't think that the army of the ~~D~~ Edomites or the Syrians had teeth like a lion. If it's used of human beings it's a figurative expression; if it's used of insects it's a figurative expression. But it probably fits the insects better than the human beings, because actually they are fighting with their teeth, the cheek teeth of a lion. He describes them as if these little insects are just devouring as if it were a great lion. "He's laid my vine waste and barked my fig tree." This certainly doesn't sound like an army. This sounds ^{more} like insects. "He has made it clean bare and cast it away; the ~~branches~~ branches thereof are made white." Verse 8: "The meat-offering and the drink-offering is cut off from the house of the Lord." Hardly the thing you'd think of first in the invasion of an army, but certainly a very typical thing in connection with the insects eating up the agricultural products. Vs. 10 again, it's the agriculture: "The field is wasted, the land ~~is~~ mourns for the corn is wasted; the new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth." And vs. 11 is still referring to agriculture, and verse 12 is dealing with all this agriculture. "All the trees of the field." Vs. 13: "Gird and howl, lie all ~~the~~ night in sackcloth, you ministers of my God." Well, what would ~~do~~ you do in a case like that? What does he think the people ought to do? Well verse 14, isn't he giving them advice, calling upon them in verse 14 to act in the proper way in such a situation. "Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the

154

Lord your God and cry unto the Lord." They tell the story out in Ohio: not so long after the founding of Oberlon College. President Finney, who was president of Oberlon was a man who really believed in God. He didn't merely sign a creed. He really believed in God. And there they had a terrific draught. It had not rained for weeks and weeks and the crops were getting all dried up. It looked absolutely hopeless, and they said, "Let's have a prayer-meeting for rain." And they asked President Finney if he would come to the church and lead the prayer-meeting. He agreed to do it. And then on this hot afternoon the people were gathered there for the church service, and the time came for the service to begin, the people were all there already, and they looked and someone saw President Finney walking down the street carrying a big umbrella. And everybody began to howl. Nobody had used an umbrella in weeks in that country, and here was Finney carrying an umbrella. "Why do you carry an umbrella on a parching hot day like this?" "Well," Finney ~~said~~ said, "I thought we were coming to pray for rain." "Well," they said, "we are." "What are you praying for?" he said. "Don't you believe God can answer our prayer.?" And they say that they had a long prayer-meeting ~~in~~ in which Finney led in prayer for rain, and that before the meeting was over the rain was pouring down, and Finney was the only man there who had an umbrella which he brought with him. (end of record)

Praying for rain and the dogma 0 the prayer. He didn't think
 th
 that prayer was magic, that they could force God to answer. He didn't
 feel that the fact that they prayed, most of it was absolutely certain
 they they would have rain, but he said that God being a God of love
 and they being God's children bought with the blood of Christ, that it
 might very well be God's plan and will to answer their prayer and to
 send the rain at that time, and he came pretty close. Well Joel says,
 "Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the
 inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your God, and cry unto
 the Lord." And I don't think anybody would have much difficulty with the
 interpretation I suggested that these 14 verses were it not for vs. 15.
 "Alas for the day" for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruct-
 ion from the Almighty shall it come." Shall it come, ofcourse the imper-
 fect - *description - it is here it is come - It doesn't necessarily mean future*
 (1) "The day of the Lord", It shall come, it can in the future, and here
 we have the day of the Lord. Now what has this got to do with any local
 locust invasion?
 1-1/2? Isn't this the day of the Lord? Now isn't all this,
 all these 14 verses talking about the distant future? And describing
 something that is going to happen somewhere thousands of years after the
 time of Joel. Now if this is the case, what have locusts got to do with
 it anyway? ~~Now~~ Now is there going to be a great locust invasion, or is
 it a picture a picture of armies described by the picture of locust? Well,
 it all depends on what you are going to do with this phrase, the day of
 the Lord. As someone has said this is a picture of locusts that are a
 type of the day of the Lord and it is typical of the day of the Lord.
 Well, does it sound that way here? *Does it sound as if now*
 (2) in the midst of his
 description of locusts, now is he suddenly describing a type of something
 in the future? There certainly is nothing in the language to suggest
 that, that I can see. It seems to be certainly a definite part of the
 thing ~~and~~ under consideration. Vs. 15. If it wasn't for that phrase,
 'the day of the Lord;' I don't think you would have any difficulty with the

interpretation I have given you up to this 14 continuous, but since
 you have 14 verses which look in one direction and then since you have
 a phrase which is a technical term for the end of the age, ^{coming in here} (3)
 looks in the other direction, let's not decide the question immediately,
 but let us say, here are the two ~~possibilities~~ ^{the great mass of} possibilities now, (3) our
 material up to this point looks this way, there is one phrase which is
 a technical phrase looks the other way, ~~add to~~ ^{let's go} on and see what further
 light we ~~throw~~ ^{throw} on it. Is it this way perhaps? Has he been talking
 about an ~~instance~~ insect prey and now all of a sudden he jumps forward
 to the day of the Lord, which transition is not at all uncommon in the
 prophets? Does he now jump forward to the day of the Lord and from now
 on he is going to be telling you about this future day of the Lord? Well,
 how about vs. 17, vs. 16, I mean, "Is not the food cut off before our
 eyes." Of course you know the old english word ~~for~~ meat means food today.
 Whenever you see meat in the a.v., substitute food. ^{about half the time} ~~Whenever~~ you see
 'let,' substitute the opposite. ^{hinder} (4) but half the time keep it "let."
 But when you see meat, it means food here. If they mean meat as we say
 meat, they say ~~it~~ ^{flesh} so he says, "Is not the food cut off before
 our eyes. The seed is rotten under their clods, the garners are laid des-
 olate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered." Still a-
 griculture" Well, that sounds as if he is still talking about the day
 of the Lord, the day of the insect plague, so it sounds as if vs. 15 is
 the day of the Lord which is thousands of years after Joel's time, he has
 jumped forward for one verse and then come back again to the present, or
 else, the whole thing here is future in some way. "How do the beasts groan!
 the herds of cattle are perplexed, " Now are these beasts and herds of
 cattle typical of people who are to live in the time of the day of the Lord?
 Do the beasts ~~of~~ the Jews and the herds of cattle mean the ~~of~~ Arabs,
 or is it the actual animal. "Because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks
 of sheep are made desolate. O Lord, to thee will I cry: for the fire hath
 devoured the pastures of the wilderness, and the flame hath burned all the

162

trees of the field. The beasts of the field cry also unto thee; for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." Now these two verses are a little different from what precedes. They perhaps are less appropriate to be pictures of an army than what preceded. They don't seem to be the insect either. Are these other calamities which occur the same kind? The fire and the draught? or are they perhaps a somewhat figurative presentation. "The fire hath devoured the pastures"; the fire may simply mean calamity perhaps. Perhaps the destructive force. Perhaps it means a forest fire that went along a sometime near the time when the ~~10/10~~ locusts came, or perhaps they mean or perhaps they mean they are simply a figure of the locusts. Neither case they can fit well with it still being a description of the situations in Joels time, but now our next verse ~~11/11~~ has the day of the Lord in it again. "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the earth tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand;" Well, have we now perhaps left chapter 1 and now come into the future, now started right into a picture of the last days of the age with the beginning of chapter two? Well, if the day of the Lord here is specifically that, why isn't it back in verse 15? Isn't it better in such a case to take the whole thing as meaning the future technical day which we are thinking. Well what does he say about this day of the Lord described now in verse 1. "A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness," Well, that is ^a rather generally expressed. "A great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be anymore after it, even to the years of many generations." Well, now that again doesn't sound like the end of the age. After it for many generations there won't be another (7) like this. Is that further stressing the terror of the locust plague which is so much

greater than any before or after, or is it describing the coming of a great army at the very end of the age. If it is, it's a rather strange term to use which looks forward to another long period afterward. "A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them." Well this verse 3 could be a marauding army which finds it a garden and leaves it a desert. It could be that. It also exactly fits what the locust is, so vs. 3 could be either one, but how about verse 4. "The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run." Here is a figure of speech. They are compared to horses and horseman. Well, you can think of locust compared to horses and horseman. The insects coming forward like a marauding army of horses and horseman, but you wouldn't compare an army to an army. You wouldn't say the army was like an army. The appearance of the cavalry is like cavalry, like horses they are. You don't use a figure of speech where you compare something to itself. Vs. 4 doesn't say the horses rush over everything. It says they look like horses and that certainly suggest they figure of speech for locusts rather than it is actually an army described. Vs. 5 - "Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire." If it is an army you would say that there is a noise of chariots, you wouldn't say it is like a noise of chariots. and then; "like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble." How is an army like the noise of a flame of fire, but the locust with their little click, click, click, as they eat up one branch after another can certainly sound like the fire burning this and that. The sound of the crackling of the flames, so it is a very appropriate picture perhaps of the locust invasion. "As a strong people set in battle array." Again a comparison, not it is a strong people, but like a strong people. "Before their face the people shall be much pained: all

faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men; ~~they~~ Not the
 mighty men run, ~~but~~ they run like mighty men. d "They climb the wall like
 men of war; and they shall marbh every one on his ways, and they shall not
 break their ranks:" They don't trust one another, they walk everyone
 in his path. Here it seems again more like a picture of locust/^{than} of an
 army. The next verse perhaps could be either one though it doesn't hardly
 sound like an army. "When they fall on the sword they shall not be wounded."
~~They/they~~ "They run to and fro in the city, they run up on the wall, they
 climb up upon the houses, they enter at the windows like a thief." YOU
 can imagine the locust just going up over everything, coming in the
 windows. It is just about impossible to keep ~~them~~ them out. Everything in
 their way, they eat right up completely. We have insect plagues like
 that in some parts of America. I have heard of the carcass of a horse
 being completely eaten up, not a sign of it left after the great body of
 insects had passed by. They come in through the window, coming in through
 the window like a thief. This was the insects. "The earth shall quake
 before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark,
 and the stars shall withdraw their shining:" Perhaps figurative language
 describing the darkness of the catastrophe, perhaps the great numbers
 of them on the windows, the a great amount of dust rising or something and
 d "The Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very
 great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord
 is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" A general statement
 about the Lord being in it. The Lord doing it, but then the day of the
 Lord is great and very terrible and who can abide it. Well this much be
 the very day of the Lord that is ^{pictured} stated here. So you have your ^{phrase} ~~phrase~~ II 1/2
 "the day of the Lord" referred to three times so far and if it is a technical
 phrase which describes a definite time at the end of this age, then all
 of this must be Joel simply up on a hilltop being given a wonderful picture
 of the future which has little or no connection with his own day, but if

it were not for the problem about that phrase of the day of the Lord in these verses, a natural interpretation simply would be what I have just given, that it is in the midst of a calamity, in the midst of a great agricultural trouble, something which of course would affect the whole life of the people and the disastrous way, but in the midst of this, Joel ~~will~~ comes with a message. Well what is this message in this book. Vs. 12, there fore ~~will/ty/hg~~ also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me, with all your heart, and with fasting and with weeping, and with mourning;" Certainly the proper message in any calamity, and "rend your heart and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil." That will fit any disaster, but now to vs. 14: "Who knoweth if he will return and repent," of course, it doesn't mean repent in the sense of Godly sorrow for sin and turning away from it, that is not the Hebrew at all, "Who knoweth if the Lord will turn and make a change and leave a blessing behind him; even a meat-offering and a drink offering unto the Lord your God?" That is a peculiar phrase to ~~use~~ in connection with the great international upheavels of the day of the Lord at the end of the age, isn't it? But if it is describing still the locust plague, why to leave a food offering to the Lord, which means that everything won't be eaten up. Who knows that there will be something there? And so he is called upon them in verses 12-14 to render hearts and weep and lament before the Lord and then he tells them in verse 15 - "Blow a trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: Gather the people together, Let the priest, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them." Well does that necessarily mean an army coming in that the heathen should rule over them? Nor necessarily if the food is all eaten up. If they have this

requires a narrative verb before it. Now since the verb before it are
 not ^a narrative of something that has occurred, then this can't be either,
 therefore this describes what will happen in the future. I have seen
 that statement in two or three different commentaries and I would like
 to see some evidence on it. None of them that I came across, gave a
 reference in which you have a similar situation. A whole book which
 begins with a (waw) conversive. Let me just hastily glance over here
 at the book of Jonah. The book of Jonah begins with a (waw) conversive
 with the imperfect and it is translated "Now the word of the Lord came
 to Jonah." We don't say there is nothing before it, there is no nar-
 rative, so this is a narrative and the word of the Lord is going to
 come to Jonah. We don't say that. It doesn't have to have a narrative
 verb before to express this idea, but even if it does have to, does
 the narrative verb before it in such a case, have to be expressed. Cer-
 tainly you cannot require in any language that everything must be ex-
 pressed. It is always possible to imply something or to infer something,
 to assume something and in this case if you take this description of vs.
 12-17 as Joel calling upon the people, blow the trumpet, call a solemn
 assembly, lament before the Lord, weep between the porch and altar, pray
 to the Lord to spare his people, it is easy enough to assume that the
 people have followed his request, and that they have done it as he has
 suggested and then if you want to have, if this is narrative, if you have
 gone on a narrative verb before than you can understand ^{and they} ~~it~~ did as Joel
 suggested and then the Lord was jealous for his land and had pity. It
 is not necessary to ^{express} ~~the~~ verb before, it is perfectly natural
 to ^{assume here} assume it, but I don't think it is necessary because it is my observation
^{that waw conversive}
~~it~~ with the imperfect regularly expresses narrative as something
 that has occurred rather than a prediction of series of events in the
 future. Well, this verse then, if it is all a picture of that which is
 going to happen in that technical time in the future, then it is doubt-

less a picture of an army under the figure of local assault through here which is rather hard to fit, it is not very natural way of interpreting it, comparing an army to locusts and in turn compare the locust to an army. An army will come and we describe it as locust and so the locust will feed like an army. That is very very (5) . It's much more natural to say, "An army is going to come," or to say "An army is going to come like locusts," if you want to, or if you're using the locusts for the figure of an army and you want ^{to use} something to compare them, you surely would use something else than the thing you're actually meaning, in figure. I see no warrant for departing from the Hebrew as it stands, and making verses 18, 19 and 21 future. It seems to me that it is much more natural to take them as a picture of something that occurred in Joel's day. At that point perhaps we should interrupt to answer the objection: Somebody said, "I insist that this must relate a verb of narrative before, and there isn't any here, and you have no right to assume there's one. And anyway," he says, "You all simply call on the people to blow the trumpet and to weep. You haven't said they've done it. And therefore what right have you to say the Lord acts as if it happened?" Well, we can find plenty of instance in the Scripture where a command is given, and then it is assumed that it is fulfilled. You turn back to Isaiah 7. And in Isaiah 7 we read in verse 3: "Then said the Lord to Isaiah, 'Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool ..'" vs. 4" and say unto him,..." And you read on what he is to say to Ahaz. Well, did he say it? We're not told he said it; just that God told him to say it. But over in verse 12 we read, "But Ahaz said, 'I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord.'" It's very clear here that He tells Isaiah to do, and then we are to assume that Isaiah did the thing which he was commanded to do. The Scripture often has full, lengthy accounts of a command of the Lord,

and then the whole thing repeated over as we're told what was done. But there are many other instances where a command was given, and then we are to assume that the command was carried out. And so there's no reason why ~~χ~~ Joel should not here call on the people and then show what the Lord's response was to the thing that the people had done. "Then was the Lord jealous for His land and pitied His people." "Yet the Lord answered ~~χ~~ and said to His people," is the way the Hebrew stands. "Behold, I will send you corn and wine and oil and you ~~χ~~ shall be ~~χ~~ satisfied therewith, and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen, but I will remove ~~χ~~ far off from you the northern army," of course, "army" is in italics. It's not in the original unless the italics mean you're to stress it; then of course that proves it must be an army, doesn't it? But the italics does not represent anything in Hebrew. "This from the north I will remove. I will drive them into a land barren and desolate with his face toward the east sea, his hinder part toward the Mediterranean Sea, and his stench shall come up and his savor shall come up because he has done great things." Now that is just what you would expect of a description of the locusts being swept away. (Question: Where does the locust come from; which direction?) They would come from the north and from the east. (Question: I read that they would come from the south.) Yes, I know that that is said sometimes, that they come from the south, but I don't... (Calvin, I believe) yes. Calvin is a very fine authority on many things, but he was not 9 Palestine. In fact I don't think he'd ever been there. (Question: In connection with that yodh there at the end of that word, north he places some significance^C on that, the men of the north, the him of the north.) No the "him" doesn't have to be person. "Him of the north" would refer to the animal or the person, ~~χ~~ either one. But it wouldn't prove which it was. (Dr. B; I would suggest that this doesn't have anything to do with geographical ~~χ~~ direction. The coming of the locusts is described as a dark cloud, and this means, this overshadowing dark cloud that has been

troubling you. It's said in direct respect to this cloud of locusts, no matter what geographical direction they came from.) (Student: Direction is given in verse 4... significance...) the direction that they go to. Of course it says ^{they are going in} /two directions, toward the east and toward the west. (Dr. B: It's not a dry country in those times.) Which? (From the Mediterranean toward the Dead Sea. It was rather fertile. Doesn't that mean, that's where he's now ~~located~~ located? He's located from sea to sea, yet 10 1/2 is the desert.) It might be that. (That wasn't really a dry country the, was it?) Towards the east is pretty dry. Not ~~so~~ completely dry, ~~but~~ but quite dry. You have a flocks through there, a lot of 10 3/4 I got pretty thirsty ^{in that area, a couple months ago} there, ~~there~~. There was very little water. I found a place in a cave at Tecorah, where Ahaz lived. (But to say that He will hurl them into a dry country, and then ~~that~~ they will have their one end in the one sea and their other end in the other sea, doesn't seem to fit. But if from sea to sea was the extent of their devastation, 11 1/2 all over Judea from east to west, then that's how big they are, now just sweep them out.) That's a very excellent suggestion, I'll drive him into a land bare and desolate, him, this one, who is with his face toward the east and his hinder ~~part~~ part toward the Mediterranean. (student question) You face the east, your back to the west. I don't think direction is so tremendously important because (12) wouldn't have to come right straight in one direction, you can go and you can curve around very well. Now of course the Syrian is often spoken of as from the north and that suggests the army from the North, but the Assyrians didn't come from the North, the Syrians came from the east, but they go North and then across West and then South and so they come from the North and then they actually hit the line so that it was often used by the Assyrians, but I don't think that 12 1/2 requires it of ~~the~~ the Assyrians. That is an argument which some have used, ~~that~~ that it is an army, but it does not seem to me to be a particularly (13)

171

And the description ~~of the army~~ as a whole here seems to me to fit the locusts better than the army and certainly the previous fits them much better, the corn and wine and oil and then as you go on, you find that agriculture is still in view. "Fear not, O land; be glad and rejoice: for the Lord will do great things." It is the perfect. Now of course this is not a (^{was conversive with an imperfect} ~~13-1/3~~) this is a regular perfect which is often used to show something in the future which is absolutely certain and therefore you don't complete it. And so it doesn't prove that it is past, it will fit either in with past or future. The Lord has done great things, but it certainly fits in with the idea of its being the response to the prayer. The Lord has done great things, whether ^{they are} ~~their~~ ^{entirely} ~~fulfilled~~ ^{yet} or not. "Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field: for the pastures of the wilderness do spring, for the tree beareth her fruit," it is agriculture again you notice, "Be glad then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God: for he hath given you the former rain moderately and he will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain, and the latter rain in the first month. And the floors shall be full of wheat and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil." Here is the food which is all eaten up by the locust. God intervenes before it is all gone and then God is going to give them rain and make it possible that they soon will get a new crop to replace what is gone. He is bringing the former rain, you ~~have~~ already gotten the evidence of the coming of God's provision and then he is going to send you more rain and vs. 25, "And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar and the palmerworm, my great army which I sent among you." ^{The verb} 14 3/4 might be a figurative expression for what has been lost here in the ^{to fit} ~~here to be~~ very excellently ^{with} ~~worded~~, the whole general context of the locust invasion. "And you shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied," ^{that he began with the locust passage} ~~again~~ the agriculture, and the food, 15. "And praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you: and my people

shall never be ashamed. And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed." (end or record(

It would seem that the most ^{natural} logical way of interpreting the book at that point is in line with the great bulk of the prophets~~###~~. It is a description of a calamity or of a situation of God intervening in the situation and helping the people that it is the ^{prophet} ~~promise~~ coming as God's messenger/^{rather than} up to this point as God's forteller. That he is coming and calling upon the people to turn to the Lord with all their hearts and that the Lord is giving his answer and bringing the blessing and that the predictive portions of the book are those that come after verse 26 and the only objection to that that I can see is the question, 'Isn't the day of the Lord, a technical phrase?' According to one specific ~~part~~ day, and therefore making it necessary that everyone of these three references that we've had to the references to the very end of the age. Well, of course, he does use the term, I think that he uses it again in 2:31, he certainly seems to be using it as a day in the future. "Before the great and terrible day of the Lord shall come." That certainly is referring to a future day of the Lord and in ch. 3.14, 'Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision, for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision.' Here is a picture of a future day of the Lord. These two undoubtedly, but do these two future days require us to say that all the references to the day of the Lord in the books are future predictions, references to one specific day of which is technically described in this way as the day of the Lord. Well immediately the question comes if that isn't what the day of the Lord means, ^{before} ~~if~~ then what can it mean? ~~###~~

And I would say in answer to that, Well, what ~~is/this/part~~ does the phrase mean anyway, the day of the Lord? Well, it seems to me that what the real meaning ^{of the phrase originally} of the day of the Lord is not a technical term, to point

to a specific particular time that is designated by this specific name, but that it is a day when everything human seems to be ~~at~~ at an end. A day when there is no hope except in the Lord. A day when you feel yourself ^{as} in the presence of forces beyond ^{anything} that you can do in the face of it. You might say a 3 like a story I read about a month ago about an airplane which was coming into Denver and a piece of one of the propellers whipped off & came in through the window in the front of the plane. I'm not sure whether the plane was going to Denver or coming straight through to Chicago, but anyway it happened there, not so far from Denver, and this piece of the propeller came in through the window and the propeller was broken and that engine was useless and some of the people in the plane were injured by it and the wind was poring in through that window into the plane and the stewardess with the blood glowing down her face called upon the people, fasten your life belts and in just a few minutes we are going to land at Denver and ~~tried~~ tried to tell them all to be calm, and they went ahead and they reached Denver ~~safely~~ and they landed safely in the runway. Someone said ~~to~~ to the pilot afterwards, "Well, how did you feel in all that?" Well the pilot said, "In a situation like that all you can do is just move over and let God take the controls." I don't know what the full implication was, what the pilot fully meant by it, but it certainly at least this was true. He was in a difficult situation where humanly ~~if~~ you couldn't save the ship. It might be saved, it might not, but it rested on forces superior to you, what was going to happen. It was in God's hands and not in yours. I remember the story about the boat which was in great danger and the captain said now there is nothing we can do, we are now in the Lord's hands, and a woman said, oh, my, has it come to that? We are in the Lord's hands. Well now of course, we should always be in the Lord's hands ^{but} ~~so~~ when you say you are in the Lord's hands, to most people it means you aren't in anybody else's, you are at the end of your rope. And here he says to the people in

Vs. 15, he says, this is just hopeless as far as you are concerned. There is nothing you can do about it. This great locusts plague is beyond any resistance that you are able to put up against it. You are in the day of the Lord, you have come from the Almighty, you are in his hands and it is only he who can do anything for you in this situation. In ch. 2.1 again, "~~L~~et the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is night at hand:" The time is just about here when it is absolutely in the Lord's hands what happens to you. Of course, you are always in the Lord's hands but here you are not to any extent in your own hands. It is in a time when the ~~the~~ great forces seem so great that you just feel helpless before them and vs. 11 the same way, "for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" And so it would seem to me most likely that ~~that~~ ^{actually} we have this phrase, 'the day of the Lord' as used in these three instances here in, I would say, the common ~~use~~ ^{usage of them,} in ordinary expression to show the situation and then Joel ^{goes on,} ~~and~~ and the Lord causes him to use this situation as a touch of the presentation of the Lord's purpose for the future and to destroy that which is ahead and then he refers to another day of the Lord which is coming far beyond the one which they have now experienced in Ch. 2.31. "The sun shall be turned to darkness and the moon into blood before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes." There is a day of the Lord coming ^{of} ~~of~~ which this day of the Lord is only a feeble ^{foretaste} ~~foretaste~~. There is something far greater than this ahead and you should know what is coming, you should prepare for it; you should look to God to enable you to meet ^{it} ~~in~~ His way. And in chapter 3, verse 14, the same thing again, that that day of the Lord which He described then, that is, that is, he doesn't talk just about it, but he's talking about it and other matters related to it, from ch 2 vs. 28 on to the end of the book.. And thus the ^{term} ~~word~~ is used I think in its

31

174

natural way first, and ~~xxxx/xxx/xxx/~~ then here it points forward to another similar day in the future, and then later on, when others used the term, they may be referring back to Joel's original use of it, and taking up the use that he's made of it as looking forward to the future, and ~~xxx~~ looking forward to that type of time which Joel has already (given to this) (Question) Well I think you'll find a good many that would take this, it certainly is what those words clearly say there in those verses 18-20. You notice the Revised Version translates it that way when they did. You mean on the ~~xx~~ term, "day of the Lord." I couldn't say. I hadn't investigated with that in particular^{ly} in mind to try to find out. (Dr. B: The phrase is given its obvious meaning, I think, in most of the commentaries. I was looking Bible Commentary and takenⁱⁿ its natural meaning, well we have the English expression that ~~o~~ comes out of the Bible, "Every dog has his day." That is, it's the day when God is supreme. This is a day of the Lord, and there are other days of the Lord, but then there is this great future, great and terrible day of the Lord in the background^r) I think if you could take the natural meaning of the word, New Testament and Old Testament, you come up with a clear, clear interpretation. But to try to make them always technical is just an extravagance.) Dr. M: I think myself that there is always great danger when we come into this matter of eschatology. We find people of every viewpoint falling into this error of assuming things are technical terms, and I believe we get into all sorts of errors through that error. I don't think we a right to assume something is a technical term unless we have clear proof that that is the case. (Question: In this expression, "the day of the Lord" as you've given^{----- meaning of} it, when you apply that meaning out to say, "The great day of the Lord, etc., do you think it applies?) OH yes, yes. That is the time of all times when it is God's time of which you are most aware, when there's nothing that can face up. (Question: But it is not a time when God's power is the only help, because this time there's not going to be any help.) The locust invasion was the power of God beyond anything--they couldn't bring it,

and they couldn't drive it away. (I had an idea of help in there, God was the only help, like when Pilate said, God is your only help) No, I didn't mean to put the word help in. It was that the forces were beyond us altogether, for good or for ill, that it was in God's hands for good or for ill. (DR. B: Paul refers to "man's day," as if man were going to take charge, humanistically. "I don't stand before the judgment of man's day.") (Student: How can you be sure that the day of the Lord, a future day of the Lord, which if we had in our minds, we might be prejudiced in thinking -----future circumstance, future day--) That's right, but the thing we must avoid as carefully as possible is reading our interpretation into any of these passages, but to gather the ~~data~~ data from different parts of Scripture and to compare Scripture with Scripture, and see what you find taught. It does not alone, of course, give us the full truth, but certain aspects of truth, and we want to look at those aspects. The last part of Joel from 28 on is undoubtedly a picture of ~~the~~ the future, but I think it is a picture of the future which rests back upon a description of a narrative of something that happened, and of how God acted in that situation, rather than that it is all a future picture. I think that is one thing that can lead us astray so much in the prophetic books if we fail to get that distinction. Now then if a future picture begins here in verse 28, "It will come to pass afterwards." Now up to here he has been promising material blessing. "You shall eat ~~in~~ ~~plenty~~ plenty and shall be satisfied." ~~A~~ God is going to bring physical blessing. He is going to restore to you the year (ear) the locust has eaten. But that's not all that God is interested in, and God doesn't want His people to be only interested in that. God intervenes in the material, physical situation, and helps his people, but He wants them to be interested in the spiritual blessing which they should have, and which is most vital. For He says, "Afterward, I ~~will~~ ~~pour~~ will pour my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men ~~shall~~ shall see visions. Now does that pouring of His Spirit

upon all flesh which He describes, meaning one particular thing that is
 going to happen? ~~It's not like that~~ You say, "I will feed them." Does
 that mean you're going to give them one meal and you're done with it, and
 they starve after that? Or does it mean that He's going to continuously
 feed them? It could be either one or the other. The penitentiary, when
 he is released, they give him a suit of clothes. The W. P. A. gives them
 clothes right along. There's the difference: one is a thing that happens
 once, the other is a ~~thing that happens~~ continuous provision. Now, ~~is~~ ⁱⁿ
 this case, "I will pour out my ^{Spirit upon all} flesh," is God promising there will be an
 outpouring of blessing which He will give upon all kinds of people which
 He will give over a period of time? Some now, some then, one time and
 another time more or less, varying perhaps, but over a long period, or
 is He predicting one specific event which is going to happen? Well, the
 words could mean either one. You cannot be dogmatic from the ~~it~~ word there,
 you cannot draw from it, that it must be just one, and when ~~it~~ we give
 them a good meal, we feed them, or that it is continuous, that I'm going
 to go on giving them a good meal. It is possible that you take it either
 way; you have to get further light from other contexts to decide what
 particularly He has in mind here. "And also upon the servants and upon
 the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit." (end of record)

One thing is going to happen whether it is one thing (not clear) or a continuous thing that he does and does again over a period. Now we have other things told in vs. 30. "And I will shew 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." Well then, we have here ~~the~~ between the time of the end of the locusts and the beginning of the wonderful material blessings that God is going to bring and the time of that future great and terrible day of the Lord, there ~~is~~ going to be a great outpouring of God's spirit, and there are going to be various wonders ~~that will happen~~ ^{in the heaven and} which in the earth ~~that~~ God is going to perform prior to the great and terrible day of the Lord. Now that wouldn't say that the outpouring of the spirit and the wonders in the heaven and the earth come at the same time, or at different times, we could not conclude. All we can conclude is that they come between the time that Joel makes the prediction and the time of the great and terrible day of the Lord, and then verse 32 is ~~not~~ a statement of something that is coming next after that, but it is a declaration of something that is coming all through it a "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!" The Lord declares his ^{purpose of} grace here, his purpose of giving salvation and deliverance to those who call upon his name just as he has given it from the locust invasion as described in the previous verses. "For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem," At the time when the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem is reversed. The time when there is an end to the captivity at Judah and Jerusalem. At that time, God says. Now is that time the same time that he has just been talking about? Or is it a different time? Well, he doesn't say. ~~It~~ You cannot say chronologically this will come then this must come and that altho

it would seem most likely that it follows what is told before. But when
 at the time now when he says at the time when I shall bring again the
 captivity, does he mean at the time after he has brought again or if he
 is getting ready to bring again, at the time of the bringing to ~~an~~ an
 end the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem as these perhaps the steps that
 lead up to it. "I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down
 into the valley of Jehoshaphat, ~~the valley of~~ Jehoshaphat, the Lord shall judge,
 or the Lord has judged the valley of Jehoshaphat, into the valley where
 the Lord will judge. About the 3rd century A.D. they began to say this
 valley of Jehosphaphat is the southern end of the Kedron valley which
 is right there at Jerusalem. There is, as far as I know, no evidence to
 the use of the term prior to that time for a specific place in Pales-
 tine and so it may be that it simply is a descriptive term, "the valley
 where the Lord will judge", rather than a technical name of a particular
 place. "I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into
 the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people
 and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the
 nations, and parted my land." And then he goes on to tell of the way the
 nations before that time will have pleaded Israel before the time that
 he regathers them and pleads with them in this way. Some of course would
 take this as proof that the book of Joel is late because it couldn't come
 until after the exile because he says he scattered them among the nations
 part of his land, but I don't think that is necessary, he can be looking
 forward to a time after return from the captivity when he comes for those
 who are scattered so wide. "And they have cast lots for my people, and have
 given a boy for an harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink,
 Yea, and what have ye to do with me, O Tyre, and Zidon, and all the coasts
 of Palestine? will ye render me a recompence? and if ye recompense me,
 swiftly and speedily will I return your recompence upon your own head;"
 There is repudiation to those who have mistreated his people. "Because

ye have taken my silver and my gold, and have carried into your temples my goodly pleasant things:; The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border. Behold, I will raise them out of the place whither ye have sold them, and will return your recompence upon your own head; and I will sell your sons and your daughters into the hand of the children of Judah, and they shall sell them to the Sabeans, to a people far off; for the Lord hath spoken it." I think that most commentators think that this describes something that actually happened at the Maccabean time. That the Israelites did sell into slavery those whom they had captured of the peoples round about them rather than this is something that is at the time when God gathers the nations there to plead with them. But he is pointing out rather here the principle that they that take the sword will fall by the sword and they that sell others into slavery are apt themselves to fall into the same situation, saying that that is the end of it all. And then he probably in the next verse is looking forward to those future days again described in vs. 2. "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up; Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears; let the weak say, I am strong." Reminds you of Brian who said if an enemy should attack America over night a million men would spring to arms and that was the old idea that all that was necessary was the will to defense and you would have it and the picture here would seem to be a picture of people who are rather hurriedly and suddenly getting ready. "Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears; let the weak say, I am strong." Means take what you have got it isn't enough. You can't meet the Lord, you haven't got that capacity to meet him, You haven't got the equipment. You haven't got the training. You couldn't have, but he is calling on them to do what you can and beat your plowshares into swords and your pruninghooks into spears, let the weak say I am strong. Dr. Buswell called my attention to an analogy

I had never thought of before in connection with this phrase here. The story back in I Sam. 13 about the time when the Philistines had all the ^{smiths} ~~7 1/2~~ and so the Israelites didn't have any way of making swords for spears and you remember Saul and Jonathan each has a sword and spear. They were the only ones who had decent armour among the Israelites, and the Philistines let them buy from them, plowshares and pruninghooks and they had a ^{filery there to} ~~8~~ sharpen their plowshares, but the Philistines tried to keep them weak as far as any possibility of war is concerned and the little number of Philistines actually kept a great multitude of Israelites in subjection until after David took the throne and David had lived among the Philistines and understood the ^{smithing trade thoroughly} ~~8 1/3~~ and was able to introduce it into his own land and establish the greater number of Israelites in their great superiority over the Philistines, in fact over all those round about. In this earlier time when they didn't have it in the face of great danger, all they could do was to try to beat their plowshares into swords and their pruning hooks into spears. They had to take what they had and try to utilize it. It is a picture then of a hasty preparation in the face of a sudden catastrophe. "Assemble yourselves and come all ye heathen. Gather yourselves together round about; thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord." And it is interesting in this connection that Joel gives this figure first and then we have Micah and Isaiah reversing the figure later on showing the beating of swords into plowshares and the spears into pruninghooks. But the idea of course is different. It isn't a crisis that makes you have to try to ~~do something~~ make a plowshare ~~it~~ but it is the end of the crisis you don't need the sword anymore. "Thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord. Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about." And then a picture of the great day of Judgment, not the judgment when God judges individuals for their sins and deals with them accordingly but the judgement

when he deals with nations for their wickedness against him and brings an end of organized opposition to God's plan. "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 in the valley of decision." The valley of decision, the peopled gathered together, the people expecting that they are going to put an end to that that they don't like. It is described in the second Psalm. They have lifted up their hands against the Lord and they say, meditate a vain thing, they set themselves against the Lord, against his anointed. Let us break their bonds asunder, cast away their cords from them, he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh. The Lord shall have them in derision. Here we have multitudes in the valley of decision, but he says, the day of the Lord is near 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 Israel." So you see a picture of here without many of the details being given of time or exact situation. You seem to have pictured here a great and terrible day of the Lord. A day of the Lord that is going to come, that is going to be after the various things described before have taken place, the day when the multitudes will come up in order to break his bonds from them, but when the Lord will utter his voice out of Zion and will bring an end of the organized opposition against them. "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 Israel." just as when the Locust plague was absolutely irresistable, God ~~sent~~ simply sent his wind and moved them away and cleared it all up and here he is going to roar from Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem. We remember

38

the phrase which we have in Thessalonians, Isaiah 11, and used again in Revelation 19 where we read about that wicked one who the Lord destroyed with the breath of his mouth. The word of Christ went forth, the Lord roared from Zion, that is his voice, and the heavens and the earth shake and the Lord is the hope of his people. "So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her anymore. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim." You remember the picture we have here we have the picture of ^{the end of} the destruction at the end of the battle and then again as ^{agricultural} ~~13 1/2~~ their prosperity and in Ezekiel we read that great picture at the end of Ezekiel of the great thing that the Lord is going to bring in and the river comes from the sanctuary and waters all the wilderness. (question) I think the spiritual is true in any event. vs. 19, Egypt shall be a desolation and Edom shall be a desolate ^{wilderness.} ~~14 1/4~~ that is the same about Edom that you have in Isaiah 35,36 where you have the picture of the Lord's land in 35 that wonderful picture ^{of prosperity} and it is followed by the picture of the desolation. (question) Well, we don't know the details of ~~what~~ what is going to be. We know certain details of it. We know that the curse is going to be removed, yes, but we know that a number of times the evidence of the curse will be left to remind people of what it was, not ot hurt them, but to remind them of what it was. (end of record)

There will be regions that will be desolate. There is no question about that. (question) No, No, not at all./ You might just as well say is the desolation just for Edom and Egypt. I mean, we don't know just what areas will be desolation and which areas will be pleasant. (Buswell) You mean that you think that 18 is a picture of the millenium and that

18
~~19~~ almost certainly
 19 is an over all summary. I think that ~~18~~ is a picture of the glory following the day of the Lord as described before. (Buswell) ^{1 1/2 I would like} Yes, I ^{19-21 as a historical summary} would think that the suggestion Dr. Buswell has made is an entirely possible one and if you find difficultly in the ~~wother~~ interpretation I see no objection to taking it the way that he suggests. I feel however myself, and taking other passages as a whole, that the interpretation I suggested, I won't say it is right and that one wrong, not at all. But to me it seems just a little more likely of the two although I think that the suggestion he has made may be right and is altogether possible if you find it preferable to the one that I suggested. Now next time Dr. Buswell,
 ---- (end of record)-class period/ (2 3/4)

Dr. M: In order to do that, I am going to review just a little bit of the relationship to that passage of the discussion in the Book of Joel. Before I do that, however, I am going to give out something else here that will relate to our lesson for next time. Here are some pamphlets of which I am giving every one of you a copy. In it, in ~~the~~ ^{of} the form/a sermon, a sermon which took me sixty minutes to give, it is a discussion of the matter of the evidence on the millenium kingdom of Christ dealing largely with matters we have already ~~the~~ covered in class, but there is some material in it which we did not cover in class, and it stresses the material ~~the~~ which I think is basic to the whole subject. And so I am giving these out to you, and I would like to ask you for next tim's lesson to go ~~the~~ through this, and to bring in a report to me on it, and in this reprot point out if you think there are certain matters in it which seem~~s~~ particularly important in it, ~~the~~ mention them, and then if there are statements which you would like to discuss, or on which you would have questions, I wish you would call attention to that in the report that you bring in about it for next time. I think that this is very importatn in this whole matter is to get that which is basic on any partiular problem. If we have it clearly taught in one passage in the Bible that there is a period of universal righteousness, very widespread righteousness and universal

peace upon this earth, a period of some length of time. If that is clearly taught in one place in the Scripture, then surely that is decisive; that is something then on which we can put our foot, and say, "This much we know." We may be uncertain as to when it is; we may be uncertain as to many details about it; there ~~may~~ may be all sorts of questions about it, but if it is clearly taught and unmistakably in one place that there is to be such a period of universal peace and safety upon this earth, then, if we believe God's Word, we must say, "This is the fact." That is true if there is one place that does it. Now if there are three passages, then of course we can be triply ~~sure~~ sure up to that point. Then if we go on and look at other passages, and we find in them various questions raised about it, the various details, we are interested in trying to solve those details. We are interested in anything we can learn as to what life is going to be like in that period. We are interested in how long the period is going to be; we are interested in when the period is going to ~~be~~ come, we are interested in it in its relation to other questions. But no such question should interfere with a solid stand on the first step, if that step is clearly proven in Scripture. And therefore I think it is vital that we stress this primary point, and that we go through this evidence and see whether there is anything questionable about it, and if so, should raise those points. I remember that there were men who said, "I don't believe the story about the terrible concentration camps in Germany." They said, that Julius Striker, who was supposed to be one of the greatest Jew-haters in the whole group, they said, "I know that he has a canary that he's very careful of; he feeds it very carefully, he is very tenderhearted toward his canary, and I don't ~~believe~~ believe that a man like that indulges in these terrible persecutions, and these concentration camps." Now you might bring all sorts of evidence about Striker's canary, you might discuss it pro and con; you might have all sorts of interesting problems; but if you have definite evidence of the existence of the concentration camps and of the people being killed, that particular question is settled. The question ~~of~~ of Striker's amount of complicity in

in, how much he was responsible for it, that might be a separate question. The question as to just how many people were in the concentration camps, the question as to how they were treated, ^{as to} what proportion was killed, all sorts of questions might be raised, but the primary fact of the existence of the camps, that is something which could be settled with a comparatively small amount of good solid evidence. Now if we have one passage (8 1/2), certainly if we ~~had~~ had three which are absolutely clear on this basic question ~~which~~ that there is a period of universal peace and safety upon this earth, such as the world has not ~~yet~~ yet seen, clearly taught in the Word of God, then it is very important to consider what life will be like on it, all kinds of questions, but none of them affect the primary question, they are only further elucidation on it, and further consideration. So that's why I want to get back again to this basic question, now and have you go through the material in this book, of which some was not covered in class and see what questions there might be that would be raised in connection with it. Now in the Book of Joel, we looked at the book and we noticed how it had a description of the situation doubtless in the time of Joel. And then the people called upon to pray to the Lord, and the people praying to Him and asking for help, and then we have from verse 18 on the Lord having pity on His land and helping His people, and sending the latter rain and former rain again, and in verse 25 the promise, "I will restore to you the year the locust has eaten, the cankerworm, the caterpillar the palmerworm, my great army which I sent among you, and you shall eat in plenty and be satisfied." And so through verse 27 of chapter 2 we seem to be dealing with a present, immediate situation in three stages: the terrible catastrophe, the prayer and God's deliverance-- that is, the prayer in which looking to God for help--and then the deliverance which God gives. And then in verse 28, he proceeds to look forward into the future, and to make promises and pictures and declarations of ~~the~~ events that are to come later on. And he begins these ^{future} pictures with a picture of wonderful outpouring of spiritual blessing. He has just been

describing the physical blessing that has come, and the promise of the restoration of physical blessings, looking forward to the immediate future, but then he says, "Afterwards I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions, ~~and~~ and also upon the servants and the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit, and I will show wonders in the heavens and the earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke, the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into the blood, before that great and terrible day of the Lord come." And so when is it going to be that He will pour out His Spirit upon all flesh? Well, we can say it begins after God restoreth the years the locust has eaten. ~~That~~ That would seem then to mean, "This does not come when Joel is speaking, probably ~~not~~ not the next year; it would seem to look forward to a few years of increasing physical prosperity. And then after that physical prosperity, "it will come to pass afterwards I'll do this." When is that (duration?) Is it the next year, is it the year after that? Is ten years after? Is it a century after? Is it a thousand years? Is it ten thousand years? It doesn't say. And we have no right to make any conclusions on that. We just don't know. We just cannot tell. We can say, "This is something that is going to happen after Joel's time. How long after it doesn't say. It just says, "Afterward." And then we read that this will happen, the pouring out of the Spirit, and then He says, "I will show wonders in the heaven and the earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke." Does that mean these wonders are coincidental with the pouring out of the Spirit, or that they come subsequently? We are not told. But it says, these things are to happen before the great and terrible day of the the Lord comes. Therefore we know that there is a great and terrible day of the Lord, a day far beyond ~~the~~ the experience which the people had with Joel there, which is to come. And we know that prior to that time will be these great wonders here described, and prior to that time will be the outpouring of God's Spirit. That

much is clearly shown here. Then we have the beginning, it is not until after the prosperity that follows the great repentance and turning to the Lord here described by Joel. It is after that thought. And we have the end of that time, the great and terrible day of the Lord, and some time in-between comes that which is here described, some time between these two. Now what is this, "Pouring out My Spirit upon all flesh"? Is that one event? "I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh." Here is one instant, here is ~~of~~ one minute, here's one day, that all these wonderful things take place. It doesn't sound ~~like~~ it, does it? "Your sons and daughters will prophecy, your old men will dream dreams, your young men see visions, and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My Spirit," in those days, you notice; not in that day. Does it sound like something that is an instantaneous thing; occurs once? Or does it sound like something ~~like~~ that God is going to do something perhaps continuously over a long period of time? or perhaps in various episodes, some perhaps more outstanding than others? It doesn't make clear which it is. It doesn't sound as if it is just one particular brief thing that is here described. It sounds as if it were more a series of events here described, but we can't be dogmatic on it. But we are told that this is going to happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and it is going to happen after the prosperity that follows the end of the locust invasion. And then he continues with ^{other} pictures of the events which are to come to pass in future days in chapter 3~~7~~, and there is little given to tell exactly when ... (end of record)

e 35

described here, and then much fuller that great and terrible day of the Lord. Now chapter 3, ~~perhaps it~~ perhaps some of it goes beyond the great and terrible day of the Lord, but just how far before there is not much directly in the chapter to make it absolutely ~~clear~~ clear. Now I think that is perhaps what we could say from this chapter. Then we turn

(prev page is 187)

over to the Book of Acts, and we have the quotation by Peter here, a quotation which has been interpreted in many different ways by different interpreters. Perhaps Dr. Buswell can tell us something of different views on it, and something of what he thinks is the correct interpretation of the quotation that Peter makes from Joel here in Acts 2.

Dr. B: Acts 5:16 You are familiar with the earlier part of this chapter. The pouring out of the Spirit upon the disciples with the diversified tongues, and their speaking as the Spirit gave them utterance, in several tongues or languages of the many varieties of Jews who were there, Jews who had been born in different parts of the world. Now Peter stood up and said to those at Jerusalem, "Be this known to you," Then he goes on with this interpretation of the event. Verse 16 "This is the thing spoken of by Joel the prophet." The English reads, "This is that which." The amillennialists have sometimes taken those words, "This is that." They have taken the "that" as though it were not somethingⁿ supplied in the translation, but it is as though it were a demonstrative pronoun in the text, which it isn't, as though you point, "this," "this thing here," "this day of Pentecost event," "this event that is right now taking place within these few minutes, or couple of hours anyway," this is that." And it is as if Peter had just pointed his finger to a certain ~~complex~~ complex, a certain unified that, and said, "This is that." Now, "this is that" is taken in general to be eschatological; Peter is made out to declare that the events of the day of Pentecost fulfilled and complete the accomplishment of the prediction of Joel in this entire passage, this being taken in the ^{limited} ~~literal~~ sense that Dr. M has already indicated, and that being taken also in a sense which includes the entire eschatological complex. Well, obviously, that is imposing a meaning upon the words which the words themselves do not sustain. "This is the thing spoken of in Joel the prophet." Then Peter quotes, and we of course as Bible-believing people are responsible for not only what Joel said, but for the way in which Peter quoted ^{it} ~~him~~, because we recognize the possibility of direct

quotation, the possibility of literary illusion, the possibility of interpretive quotation; ~~we~~ when we refer to any piece of literature, in all perfect honesty and straightforwardness, we don't always quote directly, we sometimes summarize, we sometimes give an interpretative quotation or reference. So how did Peter take it? "It will be in those days, saith the Lord, I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh." Well that is just exactly the same as we have in Joel so far. "And your sons and your daughters will prophecy." ^a That is very close word for word translation of what Joel said. "And your young men will see visions, and your old men will be made to dream dreams." There is not ^{the} a great difference between visions and dreams which you might imagine. Dreams are visions of a kind; visions might be classed as daydreams; they are two different words, but it isn't two classifications of things, but it is a parallelism. I would think it is a synthetic parallelism, not a contrasting antithetic parallel. "Your young men will see visions, your old men will do practically the same thing, will dream dreams." Some have tried to make out that the young people will have clear sharp vision, and the old folks ~~will~~ ^{dreaming and} will be/subject to hallucinations. Which is not in the text, I'm sure. "And upon my servants, and upon my handmaidens, in those days (Dr. M ~~has~~ brought out that plural, and Peter didn't ^(still?) (5 1/2) get it, in those days.) "In those days (plural days) I will pour out of My Spirit, and they will prophecy (that's a repetition, not in Joel) and I will give..." Now stop right there in the 18th verse. This, you see, is a statement of pouring out of the Spirit of God in a demonstrative way, so that there will be visions, dreams, and prophesying by a group of people, both men and women~~s~~, as had taken place right there before them. But the thing that Peter quotes, the "that" that Peter points to, has already described itself as a process which occupies more than one day, and it's wide open to the interpretation that it will be a period of time. I always think--(Question: Here you say that days has to mean day, more than one day. Then when you turn to

other passages where it says "day of judgment", "the day when the just and the unjust will be raised," you have to stick a whole thousand years into that. I think that is inconsistent.) Well, it is the inconsistency of all human languages then, because in any language... (You can read into anything whatever you want, then.) Now I don't mean to say that I know all human languages, but I don't know any language in which the word "day" is used figuratively. (Dr. M: Mr. Hoogstrate says, if when it says "in ~~those~~ those days you take it as plural, and when it says "in that day" it may be one day or many days, then you can make anything mean anything. I think he hasn't gone quite to the end of it ~~there~~. If it says "in those days", it doesn't mean "that day." He says "in those days." That certainly sounds like a period. I couldn't say that the next president will be inaugurated in January 1953, and in those days he will appear before the Supreme Court justice and ~~they~~ take the oath if "that day" is not "those days." That is to say, "those days" is a period. Now "that day" could be either one, one or more. Like when ~~Paul~~ Paul said, "He says, Not seeds, as of many, but seed, as one." Now "seed" may be like the sand of the seashore in multitude; "seed" may be collective; ~~there~~ it's thousands of thousands, millions perhaps. "Seed" on the other hand may be one, one seed, "as to one, which is Christ." But if you said "seeds," that can't be just one. (Question: You don't think "days" could possibly be a singular event?) Oh, a singular event! Certainly, but if he said, "In those days they will do this," that would ~~mean~~ ^{sound} at least as if they keep doing it for more than one day up to which ~~he~~ he was pointing, don't you think so? (Question: My point was that one time you say "day" means any 9 but yet days means day.) Now I would say "day" ~~may~~ may mean anything, but "days" is more than "day", whatever "day" is. I don't think it is inconsistent to say that "days" is plural, but that "day" may be either singular or plural. That's all.)

Dr. B: Its' just a fact of language, that's all. The word "day" like other words, is used figuratively, and in German, French and English you say, "In Luther's day." And the Germans say, " 9 1/4." That certainly didn't mean a period of twenty-four hours. The languages that we are familiar with have a figurative use of the singular "day", and then also, this phrase, "In those days" it is a geshtaltdt concept--it doesn't mean in those scattered days-- that phrase, I mean, just to take the lexicographical usage of the phrase, "in those days" it means, days characterized by certain descriptive context. You never would find "those days" referring to one period of twenty-four hours. You might find the word "day" referring to twenty-four hours, referring to a period of any length, depending on the context, and that's the way language goes. That's no peculiarity of premillennial interpretation or amillennial. (Dr. M; I think ~~perhaps~~ perhaps we also should note the relation of verses ~~of~~ 28 and 29 of Joel. In 28 he says, "It will come to pass, I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh." He names this thing. And then he says, "And also upon the servants and the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit." Well now, that "in those days" would seem to be referring back to the days in which that happened which is described in verse 28. That does not to my mind prove that the event of 29 is something ~~f~~ that takes more than twenty-four hours, but it suggests very strongly that the event in 28 is. If I were to say, for instance, if I were to ~~say~~ ^{have said,} for instance, ten years ago ~~at~~, "There is going to be a great war in Korea, and thousands of American soldiers are going to fight there in Korea,"/and in those days President Truman will fly over to Hawaii," that wouldn't mean that President Truman's flight would necessarily take more than one day, but it would come in the course of the event which I've just been describing, which took days. But if I said ten years ago, "Japan is going to surrender at a big ceremony which is to be held in Tokyo, day in which the representatives of both nations will meet together and turn over the surrender and everything, and then say, 'In those days something will

happen," it just wouldn't be sensible. I'd say, "On that day the United States will suspend all work or something." It relates ~~it~~ back to the previous ~~it~~ such and such.)

Dr. B: The pouring out of the Spirit of God, then, occurs in a significant way, a miraculous way, a demonstrative way on the day of Pentecost, and subsequently at certain junctures in the developement of the New Testament Church. That's another question as to just when the gift of tongues was a sign miracle during the New Testament times. (Question) Any 12 3/4 within the Book of Acts of the Spirit being poured out for prophecy? Well yes, there are a good many; that is to say, when different groups were brought into the church and made apart of the visible church, there was repeated this miracle, the sign miracle of the gift of tongues, the household of Cornelius and the 13 man in Ephesus who had not heard the rest of the story, and you can readily find cases in which different groups gave evidence of this miracle. Now then, the prophecy of course is not necessarily implied in speaking with tongues. I believe that some miracles ceased when the New Testament canon was finished, but that is another question. The giving of the H^ly Spirit for prop^hecy, for speaking to edification, is not/ⁱⁿany way limited or extended in this passage; it simply is something which/^{is}to come in those days. Now then, the rest of this passage has caused some difficulty because of the signs it portends. "And I will give signs in the heavens above and signs upon the earth beneath, blood and fire, and fumes of smoke; the sun will be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before comes the day of the Lord, the great and terrible, and it will be so that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved. " Now that's the end of the quotation. About the signs, I have a feeling that Peter was definitely contemplating the experiences which we quoted in the 27th ch. of Matthew, the darkness for three hours over all the ~~the~~ land is recorded in Matthew 27:45; Mark 15:33, and Luke 23:44. There you read practically word for word identically, and the same darkness.... (end of record)

Now this supernatural manifestation of darkness is directly in line with what Joel had said. I don't mean that we can identify in the immediate context every detail. (Mr. Eppert: How about in Matt. 24:29. Immediately after the Tribulation in those days shall the sun be darkened.) Well the sun is darkened at different ^{times} in the prophetic work, but this is historical. Matt. 24 is prophetic. Many passages of Scripture predict darkness. (Dr. M: Do you think that the Joel 1 3/4 here includes all these different ones or just one particular one?) Joel doesn't specify. Joel simply says that there will be ~~so~~ and so; I believe that the Lord does shake the consciousness of men by cosmic disturbances from time to time. ^{I was going} /To read these two passages together: Matt. 27:51-53. The veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom. That is given in both Matthew and Mark. Then Matthew adds: "There came an earthquake, and the rocks were ~~exist~~^{split}, the rocks were split. The rocks were rent, it's translated, and the tombs were opened and so on. That sign of the opening of the graves at the time of this terrible earthquake, so that there had been, at least, visible ~~experiences~~ experiences of supernatural darkness and significance, that is, in the sense of signs, and earthquake. That still doesn't fulfill every detail that Joel mentions, but I think that in the ~~consciousness~~ consciousness of all who stood there when Peter spoke, these events might have been quite common, the darkness and the earthquake, the that this would satisfy in general what Joel had to say. There is nothing excluded which Joel mentions in the passage which Peter quotes. Now these things Joel says and Peter says are to take place before the great and terrible day of the Lord. The sequence of events in Joel is rather significant. The words "the restoration of the crops and the fertility of the ground" and so on, that is alledged to be at the first, the first thing that ~~the~~ God is going to do is restore the land to its ordinary status. Then verse 28, the "afterward" of verse 28 refers back to the words "at the first" which are given earlier. The first thing God was going to do was restore the land, afterward --and as Dr. M. said, it doesn't say how long afterward-- He's going to give a great manifestation of the Holy Spirit, and there will be terrors in the earth and great signs. This will come before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and there will be an opportunity for many to call upon the name of the Lord, and so to be saved. Chapter 3, which is chapter 4 in Hebrew,

begins, "In those days and in that time," and I'm not quite competent to say in what days and in what time; it may be during those days and during that time when people can ~~be~~ call on the name of the Lord and be saved, or it may be in those days and that time of the great and terrible day of the Lord, but that's another question. Anyway, the pouring out of the Spirit of God and the particular signs ⁱⁿ ~~of~~ the heavens and on the earth were before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and there was to be an opportunity for people to call upon the name of the Lord in order to be saved. Now just to sum it up, what Peter ^{is} said ~~is~~ not, "This limited event, now before your eyes, ^{within a} ~~in a~~ couple of hours is in itself, in its total compass identical ^{with} that total passage of Scripture referred to?" But what Peter said was, "This is what Joel ~~is~~ was talking about." That would be a very accurate rendering, I think, of the words. "This is what Joel was talking about." I was out at Colorado Springs studying this passage of Scripture some years ago, and being (someone coughed) I wanted to climb the mountain. I was bragging about it a couple of weeks to ~~the man who came~~ Montague Goodman; I said, "I climbed the mountain last week." He said, "Oh. Was it a walk or was it a climb?" He's climbed the real mountains where you have to go up by rope and pick-ax. So I quit bragging; I said, "It was a perfectly good mule-trail." But it was something for me; at least it made me puff, and when I got up above 7,000~~0~~ and 12,000 feet I really would have welcomed an undertaker if one had come along. It would have been very comfortable to lie right down ~~in~~ in a wooden box and just close my eyes forever. I could say, "This is Pike's Peak, this is Pike's Peak." You see it had always been an ambition of mine to climb a mountain. I never did such a thing, but I lived in the prairies where the ^{world} ~~land~~ is flat and level the way it ought to be, the regular world. (laughter) So as soon as I struck the trail right near the station at Colorado Springs I said, "This is Pike's Peak, I'm on my way up the mountain. This is that." And it occurred to me that that's the same form of expression, but I found out that this isn't all of that. That the this and the that were both rather extended. So I think that's a fair way to take it: "This is what Joel was talking about." ^{sense to limit} Not in any ~~way/limited~~ to Joel's expression, to the day of Pentecost; in fact the things quoted from Joel, some of them could not all fit in to the day of Pentecost. (Question) The time that Joel is talking about there will be opportunity for people to call on the name of the Lord and be saved, during the time of the outpouring of the Spirit and the

speaking to edification, during that time God will show great and terrible signs. Now in Matth 24:1-14, which I take to be the Lord's negative answer to the question, the things that are not the signs of His coming, the disturbances in the earth, paralleled in Luke also; the cosmic disturbances are said to be recurrent things that are not the sign of His parousia, so that I really believe that God has from time to time allowed earthquakes and disasters and meteoric displays, and I wouldn't be surprised if they increased when nature begins to kick up and shake. Some people turn to the Lord, and some of course don't. There was a cartoon in the Chicago Tribune the day after the San Francisco fire, a cartoon of a man in a tumbling building, and the caption underneath, "Man is a pygmy, better call on the Lord," something like that. Years later when the terrible Japanese earthquake occurred and we sent some aid over there, in one of the New York papers there was an editorial headed, "Ride him, cowboy, ride him!" But that's clearly humanistic, you see, admiring the pluck and courage who were going to "ride him" like a cowboy, and no reference to the Lord. But surely public disasters have recurred and naturally this process of nature may increase toward the end of this age; ~~if~~ they are reminders that man is not the boss of this earth. (Question: The earthquake happened before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. You have the telos reversed in order.) It doesn't seem to me there is any reversal; it seems to me he's enumerating these things all of which ~~do~~ recur. He mentions the outpouring of the Spirit before he mentions the outpouring of the Spirit, that's right, or the darkening of the sun, but they're not given as occurring "first this and then that," but they are given, as I read the passage, as things that will occur before that great and terrible day of the Lord. It is correct that the outpouring of the Spirit is mentioned before the darkness is mentioned.

(Question) That particular sentence, in its own context in Matthew 24, I cannot harmonize with Joel at all, because he says there will be a very particular, worse of all, time of klepsis, and immediately after that particular klepsis there will be a particular darkening of the sun and shaking of the heavenly powers. (Question: That hasn't come yet, has it?) No, neither has that particular worse of all trouble; the worse is yet to come. (Question: Do you think Joel's prophecy would be inclusive of Pentecost, the crucifixion, and all during the ages up to but not including the end?) I wouldn't

argue for the limits of Joel's prophecy, but Joel says, "These particular things will happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord," and as I ~~sent~~ understand that particular sentence in ~~these~~ Matthew, it is within the great and terrible day of the Lord. There are other references to darkness though, that I think in Christ's eschatological discourse....Mr. Eppert, can you...? (Mr. Eppert: I was particularly struck with your reference to Matthew 27 because in my study I could always associate the language that Peter used ~~with~~ in quoting Joel with the language of our Lord in Matthew 24.) In Matthew 24 you have a good deal of material. (And similar natural phenomena.) In Matthew 24 and the parallel in Luke it is declared that there will be cosmic disturbances and the end is not yet; but as I just said, the particular ~~verse~~ verse that you quoted, that particular verse is said to come immediately after the worse tribulation there ever was or ever will be, so that that is a very limited^{REFERENCE} "then". (Mr. E: Would you feel that ~~possibly~~ ^{the prophecy of} Joel had been completely fulfilled at Pentecost?) I would say that what Peter quoted couldn't be fulfilled in any one day of twenty-four hours. As Peter quoted it it couldn't be. The prophecy of Joel I take to be descriptive of the entire present day up to the great and terrible day of the Lord, but not including it. In other words, the expression that Peter uses then, "In the last day," would include the whole period of the Messianic age, and the coming of Christ the first time to the second period?) Yes, "In the last day" is not quoted. (Mr. E: 13 1/2p ...Peter... by way of interpretation...) ~~God~~ Gerhardew Voss gives a very clear statement--he was an ~~anti~~ amillennialist--he said that from the Old Testament point of view, when they talked of eschatology, time is bisected. Voss said 14 the Old Testament, this age and the age to come, and whereas those phrases, "the day of the Lord," and "those days" are just natural phrases, yet taken in their context, and sometimes they refer to some act of God at the time, yet there is the eschatological use of those phrases, and the Old Testament prophets regarded the future age and the present age as bisecting history. Now then, Voss points out, the New Testament writers recognized the Old Testament usage, so John says, "This is the last hour, and you have heard that the antichrist is coming and the spirit of antichrist is already here; the fact is the hour comes and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God," so Peter

was very conscious of the fact that he was in the last days. In the cases in which these phrases are technical, eschatology from the Old Testament point of view begins with the birth of Christ. (Mr. E. 15) That of course is the end of these days in Hebrews. That reference to Hebrew..... (end of record)

e 37

Peter was in "the last days" as he spoke and was conscious of the fact. "These are events which never are going to be repeated, they are acts of finality; these are not rituals to be done from year to year, but the birth and incarnation, the death and resurrection of Christ, and this manifestation of the Holy Spirit, this is a part of finality." That shows, however, that the New Testament writers regarded the age to come as ^{containing} ~~within~~ an age to come. And he draws a diagram like this. So that in Timothy, when Paul says "In the last days," I think the context would indicate that Paul regarded those last days as still future. ~~The~~ It isn't as confusing as it might sound. You can always tell by the context. (Question) It seems to me that in that particular passage in Timothy he's warning him that we are not to expect religious revolution toward the millenium. As a matter of fact, in the last days, in the last days, perilous times will come. Now Paul of course had no knowledge and gives no relation of the extent of this age. Paul hoped and expected to live until the Lord's return during the middle ~~part~~ period of his life at least, and so should all of us. (Question) What he does quote is to say "These things will happen before the great and terrible day." Now as I read the rest of Joel here, the first part of ch. 3 could refer to the restoration in the land or it could refer to the final restoration to their land, and ~~that's not~~ it's not until you come down to verse 9 and verse 14 that you seem to be definitely within the New Testament eschatological complex. There of course you seem to be getting right down to what the New Testament writers regarded as the last age. I don't think it's so specially significant that Peter stopped right where he did. (Mr. Eppert: Some have raised the problem that Peter here quotes the whole context of Joel, and the whole passage of Joel is not entirely fulfilled on the day of Pentecost....the wonders in the heavens above... those things did not happen at Pentecost.) Well there is the possibility that Peter never thought of ~~such~~ such a thing as Joel's passage being fulfilled on that day of twenty-four

hours. Peter didn't say it and he didn't mean it. There is the clear indication that he meant the opposite.. He said, "This is that," but the that that he indicated is a large extensive area. What he quotes here couldn't happen on ~~it~~ that day. But what did happen on that day is what Joel was talking about. (Question) I have already stated that that particular sentence quoted in Matthew 24 is in its immediate context strictly limited to an event, series of events that follow another very specific event, mainly the worse tribulation that the world has ever seen. (Question) Not if you read it as you read a piece of literature. That is to say, this is a book that is given in language; it doesn't talk nonsense. Peter was talking to Peter right there standing before them in a way that made sense, and this that happens now is what Joel was talking about, and there just had been darkness in the sun. I would suggest this, that the mere fact of twist ^(?) in language doesn't prove identity of reference. There have been many times when God has sent earthquakes, many times when he has sent darkness and pestilence. Now, furthermore, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew you have word for word ~~it~~ phrases that are exactly what Christ said when He sent out the twelve. He repeated H⁺msself. In sending out the twelve, and in giving the disciples instructions that were for the days that ~~it~~ were ahead of them. Word for word identity does not mean identity of reference, because the same thing happens repeatedly, and the Matthew 24 (part?) when you come to Luke, Luke says, ~~it~~ "When you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies," and that can mean but one thing, "When you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, then, (and Luke uses some of the identical phrases that Matthew uses, but they couldn't mean the same event, since there is going to be more than once when people have to avoid Jerusalem. (Question): /You say, "this is that," ~~it~~ "those days" refer to the entire eschatological context?) No, no, they cannot refer to the eschatological complex because Joel said, "Before the great and terrible day of the Lord." /Joel hadn't limited his reference, we shouldn't limit it

(Question: How does that 7 1/4 the day of the Lord?) If Peter said, "This is what Joel talking about." Now what was Joel talking about? He was talking about things that were going to happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord. That's just what he said. Don't make it complicated. (Question: The eschatological complex limited only to that part that occurs before the great day.) Peter said, "In the last days," that's true, speaking about now for himself, that is, the day of Pentecost, and he said, "This is what J^oel is talking about," but what Joel was talking about was something that was going to happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord. (Question: How would you say the words were fulfilled which read, "The moon shall be turned to blood"?) Well that isn't mentioned anywhere in the immediate context, is it, in Acts, but whenever there is smoke in the sky the moon is turned into ~~black~~ blood. The sun turned blue here a few weeks ago. And that means there are disasters around, forest fires, for the sun to be dark, and the moon to turn to blood. That isn't mentioned as fulfilled in the context. But if the sun turned black, and if the moon was anywhere around, it probably looked red. (Question: How about in J^ohn^{5:} 28 and 29 where is postulated a thousand-year period?) Read the verse and I think it will answer itself. (And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.) That's right. Seems as though there are two resurrections there, doesn't it? (In the language you wouldn't know that there's any period in-between that comes the verse, would you?) You wouldn't know that there was or that there wasn't? If Christ said, "The hour cometh and now is when they that are in the grave shall ~~hear~~ hear the voice of the Son of Man, and they that shall hear shall live." The hour comes when they that are in the tombs shall His voice and shall come forth, some to the resurrection of ~~life~~ life and some to the resurrection of damnation. Now He doesn't say, there is going to be five minutes between the two resurrections; He doesn't say there isn't going to be five minutes between them. He simply says that

there is coming an hour, and in a sense it already is here, when there will be these resurrections. That is what He said. Now when you find some other Scriptures that there is to be an interval between the resurrections, there is nothing contradictory. Now Mr. Watkins' question was, "Why can't the darkness in Matthew 24 be the same as the darkness in Joel?" Well Joel gives a limiting phrase in ~~place~~ plain English, "This darkness comes before the great and terrible day of the Lord." Matthew gives a limiting phrase to his phrase, it's coming after the worse tribulation the world has ever seen. Because of those various, twisted limiting phrases I don't think they are the same darknesses. (Question: How about Is. 13 where it speaks about the day of the Lord, when the stars ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ the heavens and the constellations thereof shall not give their light.) Now each particular time that you find references to ~~meteoric~~ ^{meteoric} showers or darknesses you have to find out in the context what the author is talking about. (Question: the context here is the day of the Lord.) Yes, ~~but~~ but what does "the day of the Lord" mean? If it is used technically? It means the whole eschatological complex, from the old Testament point of view, and from the New Testament point of view if the context indicates it it means the future eschatological complex. So that in the day of the Lord there ~~are~~ ^{is} going ~~to~~ ^{to} be meteoric showers, darkness and clouds, well then that's just a fact, and you find from what he says about it what he means. Just take it as plain language which says what it means. Don't try to make all cases of darkness the same case of darkness. All cases of sky-showers the same, all earthquakes the same earthquake. It's a very common tendency, though. My mother used to have a program that she used to recite to the children, "If all the trees were one great tree and all the men were one great man, and all the seas were one great sea, and all the actions were one great act (they should rhyme somehow or other) that man could take that act and chop down that tree what a great crash that would be!" You have many references to cosmic disturbances in the Bible, and some of them are so general that you can't prove from the context any ^{thing} more than a general reference. There are a few

then that have specific references attached to them, and you can't discuss those all. I haven't gotten to that darkness of the sixth seal, but if you ask me, there's another thing, still another clearly. (Question: I'm not clear; did Peter think that all these things had been fulfilled by the time at which he spoke?) Not if I can read. Peter stood up and said, "This is what Joel is talking about," and then he quoted what Joel was talking about. Now what was Joel talking about? (Question: Everytime you have mentioned it, you have said, 'Speaking with reference to this particular day;' I mean, up until this time, were any of these things yet future in Peter's mind?) I said it and Peter said it and I'll say it again. Peter said, that these things are going to happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord. (Question: Would you put this then with ~~the~~ the passage in Matthew 24 where the Lord said that nation shall rise against nation, kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famine and pestilence, earthquakes in diverse places?) I would not equate, but I would synchronize. That is to say, as I read Matthew 24, verses 3-14, Christ's negative answer, ~~which~~ ^{what} are not the signs of His coming and of the consummation of the age, and among those things which are not the signs, are the nation against nation, kingdom against kingdom, famines, earthquakes in various places, and the parallel in Luke ~~in which we also find~~ indicates also signs in the heavens, which Matthew just didn't mention, but they must have been right there on the same day, so that I would say, "Yes, that..."

(end of record)

Joel's passage quoted is declared to be before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and I would synchronize those two. They talk about different things that will happen during this age.

(Dr. MacRae) Just a word at this time. It seems to me that one thing to remember is that Peter did not invite some people together and say I want to explain to you what Joel means. Peter, here, is in a situation. They have the disciples there speaking with tongues and being understood by everyone in their own language and then they have others saying, 'what is this?' 'These people are full of new wine.' In that situation Peter wants to get the attention of the crowd in order to preach the gospel to them. If he had talked for three or four hours giving a full exposition of Joel, probably there would be a few very interested people listening but he wouldn't have had the three thousand converts which was the purpose of the talk. He starts in to try to make a bridge between what the people see and ~~what~~ the message of salvation through Christ that they want to get, so he takes the passage in Joel and there are two features in Joel that are particularly important for his present purpose. One of them is that there is the wonderful promise of pouring out the Spirit upon all flesh and that of course is to say to them; 'Now you are all excited what this is, now this is nothign that is queer and strange or fantastic, etc. This is a thing which is to make you become interested in the wrod of God, because Joel has promised.' And ~~when~~ he is interested in vs. 21; 'it will come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.' This is a situation that would lead you to take advantage of the opportunity of falling on the Lord to be saved. Now somebody asks: "Why should he stop there and not go one?" There is a significance here Well I don't think that Peter at that point was interested in explaining the meaning of the next few verses of Joel. That wasn't his purpose. His purpose here was to preadch the gospel of salvation that whosoever should call on the name of the Lord will be saved and to attract their attention by showing that Joel predicted the outpouring of the Spirit and so he quotes from Joel that which starts with the spirit and which ends with the promise of salvation and those are the two things that he is trying to bring out.

And in bringing out the two, he quotes the verses that are in between. And then ^{as to} ~~after~~ the significance of the verses in between, he doesn't go into it here either at that moment or at any time during his sermon. Therefore we are left to wonder just what Peter thought of the interpretation of those verses, but even if Peter didn't think about that subject, it didn't affect what he was doing. We must say this that the gospel call and the declaration of the promise of the coming of the Spirit were two matters which Peter connects and Peter speaking under the ~~inspiration~~ inspiration of the Spirit quotes Joel to show these two and therefore we must say that Peter is correct in his claim that these two are connected. I believe that our belief in inspiration will hold that. If Peter is correct in holding that these two are connected in Joel. Now Joel is not talking about two unrelated things, but he is talking about these two things and they are connected. Now as to what is in between, conceivably what is inbetween might go off to discuss a different subject and come back to the tone he started with, that would be possible or it might be discussing what preceded it or it might be discussing what was to follow in the distant future. Peter doesn't refer to it except to connect up the two passages to show that they are together in Joel. Now if we interpret it and take the passage as a whole and try to see what those verses in between mean, I think then we find that we are told ~~by~~ of them that they are going to happen afterwards, that is after Joel's situation - and it's going to happen before the great and notable day of the Lord comes and as far as what is between is concerned it is not said that it precedes the coming of the Spirit or whether it comes at the same time or if it comes shortly after or whether it will come a long time after. It is altogether possible that as Peter reads these words that the people first see what is happening before them, "Why this is just - here is a discription from Joel that seems to fit what we see here, maybe these men aren't drunk. Maybe this is the fulfillment of prophecy." And then as he goes on it is possible that as they hear about these wonders

they say, "My, just last week we had these earthquakes, and we had these darkneses. That fits together with it." Maybe that is a special reason for thinking that this really is a fulfillment of Joel. It is possible is that. I never thought about that until this afternoon, until Dr. Buswell presented it. It seems a very good suggestion. It is altogether possible, but if so, it is something that is so obvious to their minds that Peter didn't have to go on about it later, he doesn't go back to it, or say anything about it. He just calls their attention to the fact. Now if we did not have those references in Matt. 27 ^{to these things having to happen} ~~5 1/2~~ then I would say, if we have no reason to think that these things happened, then I would say probably these refer to things that are going to happen ^{sometime} after that time before the great and notable day of the Lord shall come. The only reason that they are particularly applicable here is perhaps as an added warning to the people. You see this wonderful act of God, it is time to do something about it. There are going to be terrific things ahead. You had better not wait until these things come. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." As far as the passage along is concerned, anyone of these various interpretations would be possible to those middle verses. They don't affect Peter's purpose. The fact that Dr. Buswell had brought out of their having ^{happened just} before seems to suggest that there was an added purpose in quoting them to ~~call~~ ^{call to} people's minds something that is obvious and thus to be a very real factor in the fact that three thousand men were converted at that time. (Dr. Buswell:) 6 1/2

Dr. B: That's about all I have to say on Acts 2. (Dr. M: Would you like to take up some other discussion topic now?) Just as you say. Your're not ready to take Acts 15 until they have read this pamphlet? (Dr. M: I'd rather leave that.) I wonder if it would be profitable to glance at Matthew 24. It's much better to have a harmony. Thessalonians now. Next week Acts 15. Week after next, suppose you all bring harmonies. The eschatology of the teachings of the Lord is really of tremendous importance in the whole

context of interpreting Scripture. II. Thessalonians. I think we have pretty clearly in mind what I. Thessalonians has said. The hope of the coming of ~~the~~ the Lord renders it true that Christians will not ~~sorrow~~ sorrow like others who have no hope; we have sorrow, but it is not like a ~~hopeless~~ hopeless sorrow. The coming of the Lord, with a shout, the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, the ~~raising~~ raising of the dead in Christ, and the change of the living, the change that is mentioned in I. Cor. 15, but it marvelously dovetails I. Cor. 15 with I. Thess. 4; and so shall we ever be with the Lord, together with our loved ones, wherefore comfort one another with these things, and then the reference, "You do not need that we should write unto you of the times and seasons, for you know that with reference to the wicked it will be like the coming of a thief in the night, but you are not of the night that it should overtake you as a thief. Therefore watch and be sober, and whether you wake or sleep, that is, whether we live or die, we shall live together with Him." Now then, II. Thess. indicates a further development of the situation. It seems that there had been a forged letter probably, that is, David Smith, gives that conjecture that somebody had forged a letter or claimed to have a letter or claimed to have a word from Paul saying, Paul doesn't mean ~~that~~ just this. Dr. M probably could give you many illustrations as I could of people who tell other people what I think. Sometimes I have had to announce to a whole group of my friends, "If anyone wants to know what I think, please ask me, don't ask my grandfather." People will do that, will come to your children and say, "Now what does your father think about so and so?" And the children will do the best they can. Or some people who are not so thoroughly friendly and loyal will tell people what you think. Anyway, Paul felt it necessary to correct the idea that there might have been a word or a letter or something that had come from him, and it seems evident from the 1st part of the epistle that some people had taken the immancy of the Lord's return to mean that He was certainly going to come

so very soon that they wouldn't have to work and earn a living. And some of them had learned to be busy-bodies and gossips. Now then, with that in mind, let's read back from about verse 6 of the chapter to get the connection. (Mr. E: That's a very interesting conjecture regarding the forged letter, and it seems to have support from II. Thess. 3:17 where Paul, in giving the greeting and salutation says, "In my ~~own~~ own hand.") Yes, and he gives a sign, a password, grace, with the salutation, "With my own hand, which is my sign in every letter. So I write, grace be with you." (Dr. M: Does that mean he wrote just verse 18?) Verse 17 ~~is~~ is introducing the salutation in his own hand, so he writes verse 18, do you think?) Why, the salutation he writes in his own hand, I would imagine he would write the rest of it. (Dr. M: Verse 18. That is the salutation.) "Which is my sign in every epistle, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." It is a significant fact that whereas the papyri letters frequently ~~begin~~ begin with "Xaris," "John Doe to Timothy Smith, Xaris, grace, Xarein sometimes with Xaris very frequently, and it doesn't mean any more than "dear sir:" it may go on, "You're a scoundrel, you're a hypocrite," yet Paul begins every letter with Xaris and concludes every letter with Xaris. There is always some reference to grace at the beginning and at the end of every one of Paul's letters. He seems to remind them here, as Mr. E. says, he took the 12 1/4 and wrote with his own hand, his own salutation, "So I write, grace," The phrases vary, but there is always the reference to grace, beginning and end. He wanted them to know that that was his sign, so it was an indication of the genuineness of the Pauline letters, Verse ⁴ 5, the ~~troubles~~ ^{thli⁴ Yesin} the troubles that you have on ^{ane⁴ esthe} (you keep them stored up in the ice-box, troubles, tribulations hand, these are an indication of the righteous judgment of God, who has made you worthy of the kingdom of God through the thing which you have suffered, which is an indication of God's righteous judgment, this indeed is just with God, to render, antapodounai, to render, to those who are troubling you, trouble. G⁴t that word trouble and tribulation. A friend of my mother's had a maid who was always rather sorrowful, and one time she

said to her, "Now you are a Christian woman. Why do you go around weeping and mourning all the time, and so sad?" The maid said to her, "Mistress, I reckon when the Lord sends tribulation He 'spects me to tribulate." (laughter) So these tribulations which you have on hand are an enigma, an evidence of the ~~g~~ righteous judgment of God. V. 6, "If it is right with God to render those troubling you trouble, and to render to you, those who are being troubled rest, anesin." God will render to those troubling you, trouble, and God will render to you who are being troubled, rest, along with us. Now when is this rendering to take place? In the apocolypse of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven. Int the apocolypse of Christ from heaven, those who are troubling you will get trouble, and you are ~~xxx~~ being troubled (end of record.)

e 39

Such phrases as apokalipsis Christou, and parousia autou, Many different phrases like that refer to the whole complex of events, the visible presence of Christ. I took that up in connection with II. Peter 3. In the thing which is called "apokalipsis of Jesus Christ those who are now troubling you will get trouble, and you will get rest. (Question) No. That is to say, if you agree with some people that the apocalypse of Jesus Christ is merely the one single event of H's coming at the end of the tribulation period to destroy the antichrist, then, in that one single event, these people ~~x~~ who were then alive on earth and who were troubling the Thessalonians would get their trouble, ~~xxxx/xxxx~~ and the Thessalonian Christians would get their rest. But I think it's very clear that the apocalypse of Jesus Christ refers to the whole time of His presence, and in the visible presence of Jesus Christ, without any specification to when it comes, ~~xx~~ two things will happen, these people will get trouble and you will get rest. Now then, some of the premillennial teaching has come from the (understanding (?)) of the millenium. The rest comes to the believers at the first resurrection, and the trouble comes to the wicked dead at the second resurrection, but that comes from other Scripture, simply in the apocalypse of Jesus Christ,

these two things are going to happen. Paul is speaking now for their comfort, don't you see; that's his purpose. (Question) The apocalypse is the unveiling, the visible presence. Were you here the day I talked about the phrase, "When I get Home?" That's the illustration, and I think it's very important. We can not limit the parousia of Jesus Christ to the instant of the rapture. You can not limit the apoclypsis to the particular event in which He comes to destroy the beast and bind Satan. The ~~apoclypsis~~ apocolypsis is far bigger than that; it's the whole visible presence of Christ, and so it includes any and all 2 1/2

. It seems as we go along that the apocolypsis is interchangeable with ~~parousia~~ the parousia. Note that. Paul says that in the apocolypsis of Jesus Christ ~~two~~ two things will happen: trouble for the troublers and rest for the troubled, at the apocolypse of Jesus Christ from heaven, with His mighty angels, His angels of power, in a flame of fire, giving ~~ekdikēsin~~ , giving vengeance to those not knowing God, and to those not obeying the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of course ~~he~~ elaborates the phrase, ~~thlipsis~~ to those troubling you. Who will receive justice, or punishment." A lawyer wired to his client, "Justice has prevailed." And the client wired back at once, "Appeal at once." (laughter) Another story ~~goes~~ goes with that. A woman said, "This photograph doesn't do me justice." And the photographer said, "You don't want justice, you want mercy." (laughter) "Who will get justice, eternal destruction, from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His strength, when He comes. $\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\lambda\theta\eta\ \epsilon\nu\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, in His saints." "When He comes," is an extended reference, just like the phrase, "When I get home." It could refer to any time within two and ^ahalf weeks. "When He comes." You see that will usher in a new day, and within that time this rendering of justice will come; He will come to be glorified by His saints and to ~~be~~ marvelled at by all those who believe. And then Paul gives this comforting word: "Because our testimony was believed by you." That's parenthetical.

And then the phrase, "ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ" in that day," now there you see you have an Old Testament phrase, "that day". So then how many different phrases have we referring to the Lord's return. You have His akopolipsis, you have have hotan elthῆ, elthῆ, when He comes, to be glorified, and you have "that day." So that these different phrases referring to the eschatological complex may refer to ~~it~~ it all or to any part of it, depending on what is indicated in the context. "For which purpose also we pray at all times for you so that you may be made worthy of God's calling, and you may be filled with all thanksgiving and goodness, ~~of~~ and work of faith and in power." Now this is your homoletical exhortation and consolation for the Thessalonian people according to the grace of ^{our} God and our Lord Jesus Christ. Now chapter II. "I beseech you brethren--" Now you see there is a background here. They need comfort; they have been in trouble; they have been persecuted. Paul had to leave, and they had been quite faithful under the distress. Paul was down in Corinth by this time, probably He had left Athens, and these poor people, Paul's heart bled for them; he wanted to get back and to ~~help~~ help them and to encourage them. "I ^a entreat you brethren, huper," that is, over, or about or concerning, "I'm talking about" I think would be the meaning there, but literally, "over the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now see there you have, "I'm talking about the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ and our ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπὶ αὐτόν, gathering together unto Him." Now the parousia of the Lord and our ἐπισυναγωγῆς to Him, well now the ἐπισυναγωγῆς could only mean what He had written about in the previous letter, the shout of the trumpet, the ~~of~~ dead in Christ ~~of~~ will be raised first and together with them, we'll be caught up to meet the Lord in the clouds. The hapag sometha, we will be caught up, to the meeting of the Lord in the clouds, certainly that's the ἐπισυναγωγῆς. I beseech you as touching or concerning the parousia of the Lord and our gathering together unto Him-- now notice that ~~it~~ he includes in this general topic as we go on, that you be not suddenly shaken out of your mind, or troubled, neither through an

angel, neither through a word, nor through an epistle as written by us, as from us. (Dr. M: You translated huper in verse 1 as "concerning") Well, literally, "over." ~~That~~ That is, the heading under which we are now talking." (Dr. M: The Authorized 8 3/4 ~~Y~~. We beseech you brethren by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.) Now when he says, "I entreat you brethren, by the mercies of God," how does he say that in romans 12; that is a very different expression. dia. Not huper. It certainly isn't by the parousia of the ~~Y~~ Lord. Our English word, we're talking over this subject. That is, the thing we have under our surveillance is this particular subject. The meaning of huper is quite clear, but we don't just use that in English. "The parousia of our Lord and the gathering together to Him, not to be suddenly shaken by a spirit or by a letter as from us," that makes us think there is a forged letter or a claim of a letter, "as that enest[\]ken, the day of the Lord." So you can have many arguments (someone coughed) enest[\]ken; I don't think we need to settle them. Some people get quite hot ~~about~~ about it. "The day of the Lord has already set in and is now going on, and therefore why have we missed out." Or, "the day of the Lord has come, and is just on the doorsteps." I incline to the latter view, but I won't argue with anybody about it. Dr. M comes up to speak to us in New York, and he might say, "I come." Or he might get on the subway and someone might see him at the corner and call back, "Dr. M's come." Or somebody might ~~be~~ ^{see him} coming in the door and say, "He's come." Or he might register at the desk and go upstairs and call down from his room and say, "I have come." Or he might walk into my study and say, "I have come." "I have come" is the translation, and I don't think you can prove whether they thought it had already come and now was going on, has come and is now in progress, or that it had ~~been~~ come in the sense that it is at the threshold. (Dr. M: But whichever way you take it, you would think "^{has}~~had~~ come" is better than "is at hand.") Oh yes, "has come" that's literal. It's present perfect, and in English day that has come is present perfect. (Dr. M: "The day of the Lord has

come, then.) Yes, has come. And then it leaves it open whether it means has come in the sense that it is ready to walk in, which I think is the meaning. "Do not let any one deceive you ~~by~~ any means because ~~/pp/~~ ---that long phrase in italics which you have there. Perfectly inexcusable. Why not just say comma dash, Why put in such a long interpretative phrase?/ Paul didn't finish it; neither should we! How easy to conclude. And then he goes on, "Unless--" Now what does that amount to? "Do not be disturbed, don't be all excited and bothered, as if the day of the Lord has come; don't let anyone deceive you by any means because ---unfinished---the apostasia ~~proton~~ has come, and the revelation of the man of sin." I put in there the word "elth η ", unless has come first the apostasia and the revelation of the man of sin. I think that the inference is that if the things referred to ~~at~~ ^{are} present, the revelation of the man of sin, well than you had better be ~~at~~ scared, then you had better be excited. If you see that take place, then there is some ground for anxiety. That unless. Now that just gives you a literal reading. "Don't let anybody deceive you by any means; don't be frightened, don't be frightened, don't be scared, because unless the apostasia has come and the man of sin is revealed. If the man of sin is revealed, there is abundant reason to be frightened, and to be desperately 14 . The words, "that day will not come," are just not in ~~the~~ the text. They are endeavoring to say what Paul didn't say. Now we don't need to ^{SETTLE} 14 1/4 this word apostasia at this point. (Dr. M: Would you say the same thing about the first part of the phrase? You just said, if the man of sin has been ~~revealed~~ revealed then we have reason to get excited about it. Would you say that if the falling away has come, then ~~/pp/~~ there is reason to get excited?) There I would have to go into our family argument. Dr. M and I always come out on the same end when we have an argument. I have the opinion that this word apostasia could be translated "rebellion," and that it is one and the same thing. (Dr. M: Would you guess that, whatever apostasia means, would you say, "Don't get excited because the apostasia isn't here, but if you the apostasia, then it is time to get excited.")

end of records

Throughout all your lifetime, because there has been apostasy here since Paul's time. (Dr. M: You don't think it means apostasy there?) ~~It~~ I don't think ~~it~~ refers to any particular departure from the faith in ~~the~~ the history of the church. (Dr. M: It would say, "You," as a man wrote to me, "You not only give up Greek, but also English there." (laughter))

Dr. B: There is a $0\ 1/2$ apostasy to anybody who studies church history, a particular sign for immediate fear. It certainly is ~~caused~~ cause for great concern and weeping and sorrow and labor night and day, with tears, but no ground for terror in the sense that it isn't constant. Paul could never ~~say~~ have said to the Thessalonians, "Don't be troubled until you see apostasy," because there was apostasy in Thessalonica. (Question) The article with an abstract noun is just the way it would stress an abstraction. You see, there wouldn't be any particular reference, because the noun is never used in the New Testament ^(?) apostasy, they ~~shall~~ shall depart from the faith. That, of course, is very clear: they will depart from the faith, that goes with "they departed from." But the idea is, "They will rebel from the faith." And that, of course, has recurred. (Mr. E: I gather then that you disagree with the interpreters and commentators $1\ 1/2$.) Why the article is of very great importance, but the article with an abstract noun frequently means the abstraction; $1\ 3/4$ is glory. I don't mean to say that it always means just that. But if apostasia means rebellion here, as it does frequently, you could say "the rebellion," or "rebellion," if ~~the~~ ~~not~~ 2 not interpreted(?) I wouldn't say that you could build a house on the article in that case. (Question) It's a possibility. There is always the possibility of the improbable. (Dr. M: How do you tell it is an abstract noun?) The noun "rebellion," "a rebellion," is strictly an historical event, but you could take it as an abstract noun. You could take it as a concrete event, if you take the article that way. I was only saying that the article with a ~~noun~~ ^{noun that} can be taken as an abstract may be an abstraction, and that's the way to take "when the apostasy;" it should be "when apostasy."

I wouldn't build a house on that, ~~either~~ --- "the
 Certainly the word "rebellion" can't ~~mean~~ "rebellion" or "a rebellion"
 is a concrete event. "Rebellion" as such might be used with the article,
 but I think it means, "Until the rebellion comes, mainly the man of sin
 being revealed." (Question) It ~~can't~~ ^{grammatically} ~~mean~~ /could. There is no Scripture
 to indicate that ^{the revelation of} /the man of sin will be a culmination of apostasy, theolog-
 ical apostasy. (Question) I would read it, "Unless the rebellion is come
 first and the man of sin is revealed." The rebellion being the man of sin
 taking the place of God. That of course will stand right there as very
 clear grammatically, and that would check in exactly with what Christ said,
 "When you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet
 standing in the Holy Place, then is the time to run immediately and get
 out of Jerusalem and hide. Now this man of sin seated in the temple of
 God, exploiting himself as God, which is an act of rebellion against God,
 and that particular thing is the time when Christ said--that is, if I'm
 correct in identifying the two--is when Christ said, "Run and hide."
 So, don't run and ~~hide~~, don't let anybody say that the day of the Lord
 has come ~~and~~ in the sense that you should run and hide, unless this has
 taken place." So that gives you a clear reference. (Question: Would you
 connect this man of sin used here with possibly the alternate reading of
 "the man of lawlessness"?) Well, it's anomias, that kind of sin; that's
 not an alternate reading--yes, there is an alternate reading, hamarias,
 but anomias stands in the text in Nestle. So "anomia, the man of sin, the
 man of lawlessness, the lawless man, the son of destruction, who opposes
 and exalts himself against everything that is called "God", or that is,
 an object of worship, so that he, in the temple of God, seats himself,
 displays himself, that he is God. Do you not remember that when I was yet
 with you, I told you these things." I wish we had been there. If we had
 only had a Soundsciber ^{when} / Paul was preaching in Thessalonica and could pass
 that on down to us. We don't remember, because we weren't there. But
 thank the Lord for what we do have. ^(Paul) He had told them. "And now, / To

ΚΑΤ'ΕΨΟΝ οἶδατε ~~τὸ~~ ^{the} (neuter) thing which holds back you know, with a view to his (masculine) being revealed in his time, in his occasion or season, you know the thing which holds back so that he is to be revealed in his proper time." Purposive clause, "eis to apokalupthēnai, with a view his being." (Dr. M: Goes back to the { being revealing) Yes. It is purposive; the R.V. brings that out. "You know what holds back so that he will be revealed in his proper time." That's no brought out in the King James Version. "But you know the thing (neuter gender) holds back with a view to his being revealed in his proper time." "Eis" with the infinitive, and the neuter article. (Dr. M: That would sound as if the purpose were the restraining, which ^{too} causes to be revealed.) Yes; that is one of the purposes at least, and the purpose referred to here, the purpose of the thing holding back is so that it will be revealed at the proper time.

"The mystery of iniquity indeed already works," that wickedness is going on, "only He holds back," then it switches from the neuter to the masculine. I have one suggestion; of course there are thousands of them, at least a score of them. Some would say, "It's hopeless because we weren't there, and we don't know what is that thing which holds back, and he who holds back. We can't imagine why he should switch from the neuter to the masculine and then my suggestion is that this--only as a suggestion-- we know what governs all such events, as Christians we know that ^{it} is the sovereign power of God that governs all such events. And that suggestion would take it out of the realm of the obscure, which the Thessalonians alone knew, and put it in the realm of common Christian knowledge. We know what it is ^{to} that holds back and governs any such event. (Dr. M 9 1/3) That would explain the switch from the neuter to the masculine. The sovereign power of God holds back, and He is holding back, which is a very natural switch from neuter to masculine. (Question) It isn't to ~~τὸ~~ counterfly(?) The power of God upholds all things by His powerful word constantly. (Question How could God possibly hold something back?) His power holds it back, His

arm holds it back. Scripture constantly speaks of the sovereign power of God in many different words, doing things, withholding things. (Question) If you can't right off the bat think of a dozen cases where the power of God does things, I'll give you a list of them. His ~~power~~ purpose, according to the purpose of His will, all these different references to His power accomplishing things or restraining things. You know what it is that governs all such events, God's sovereignty, God's ~~power~~ power, God's will. That's ~~it~~ looking at the first chapter of Ephesians, His will doing things. (Question) Well then the auton would be meaningfully eis to apokalupthēnai auton. "You know the (neuter) holding back," and that could refer to the man of sin. Then you would have two things holding back. You would have one thing holding back so that the man of sin would be revealed in his proper time, and then you would have a person holding back without any notice of a change in the thought. (Question) You have two genders, and I don't know of any ~~instances~~ interpretation that you could claim for two genders, unless you think of the will of God holding back and God holding back, the power of God holding back and God holding back. (Question) I do not know as a Christian/^{Specifically} that it is the power of the Holy Spirit who restrains and governs all such events. That is, the Triune God mediates common grace by the H^oly Spirit, but (Dr. M: That fits, so far as gender is concerned.) Oh, as far as gender is concerned, but I can't see any reason for ascribing such actions to the Holy Spirit, holding back the man of sin is never an activity of the H^oly Spirit, and I can't seem to reason for putting the Holy Spirit. The ~~only~~ only thing all Christians know is that God's sovereign power governs all such events. §Dr. M: Sir Clyde, you know, in the Berkeley Version has a foot-note that says it is the Roman Empire.) Well yes. That of course would mean that Paul was mistaken. Or else that the Roman Empire is still here, because ~~if~~ something is going to hold back, and it's going to get out of the way, which seems to mean that God is withdrawing His hand and allowing things to commence. Dr. Harris, do you have a suggestion? The end of conjecture is not yet. There is one more hint in the context, and we had

better read that. V. 7 "O^ly, he who withholds (the active participle) up to the present time (and you would translate that as a finite verb) only he is withholding ~~ar~~¹ until he gets out of the way (mesou gen^htai) My interpretation, he getting out of the way would mean God withholding His hand and permitting this awful man of sin/^{to}be revealed. Now there is a suggestion that these things which we know, He's going to get out of the picture, is the church when it is raptured, and so therefore that the thing which is holding back is the church, and this is going to be taken/^{out}of the way. Now some would say it is the H^oly Spirit in the church. I can't see that the Holy Spirit is never going to 14 1/2 beyond the present, but God does frequently does ~~step~~ aside and let sin take its course. In that sense God permits sin. (Question) No. ek mesou gen^htai . I know there is a group of people who take the etymological fallacy and apply it to every word in this little phrase, and ~~for~~^{they} get the most phantastic thing. What you get out of the picture is what ek mesou gen^htai means. To get out of the way. Over and over again, "He took our sins," ek mesou, and nailed them to His cross. It just doesn't mean to get out of the way/.....(end of record)

e 41

But translating it as it is usually taken, the thing that gets is ek mesou. "To get" 1 mesou , means "to be thrown out," always. (Question) "To get out of the way" means to get out of the ~~picture~~ picture. genomai ek mesou always means "to get out of the picture," "to be removed," "to be taken away," taken out on the ash^{heap} or anywhere, or step aside, ~~but~~ but anyway to get out of the way. You would undermine many different ~~doctrines~~ doctrines in the New Testament if you didn't translate that, "get out of the way," "get out of the midst," "remove." To become a mushroom that has suddenly grown up in the meadow is/^{utterly}impossible. The meaning of the word ek mesou--ek means "out of", not "developing in." (Question) No. The milyear, to get out of the milyear in which we are. I know there is a group of people ~~who~~ that is very determined to make "out of the meadow" mean "up into the meadow." It's just as fantastic as that. Impossible for ek mesou to mean anything but "get out of this milyear." And

it could, I think, refer to God withholding His hand and not anymore stopping the antichrist; and it could refer to the church getting out of the picture. (end of lecture) 3

Write out for me a discussion 3 1/2 and also to raise any questions in particular that you think would be important for us to go into. Suppose we ask right now, does somebody have some question on it that you would like to have us discuss a little right now? (question) Psm 2. I dealt with Psalm 2 rather incidentally, ^{in the pamphlet} you mean that was something that the pamphlet suggested to your mind? Or was it something that was directly in the pamphlet? Where is that? Yes. Page 2nd and 3rd page of written material. I say first let us note the certainty of the king/d om. The heading is certainly of the millennial kingdom, but what I'm actually seeing there is the certainty of the kingdom. The 2nd Ps. brings this idea out very clearly. The kings of the earth are pictured as declaring their determination to break asunder the bands of the Lord. In answer he declares the decree. The Lord ~~he~~ said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. That doesn't sound to me as if he says, ask of me and I will destroy the heathen and send them to Hell. I will take the uttermost parts of the earth and let them. It seems as if he is giving them to them, doesn't it? (question) 5 1/2 Then when he says to the ~~the~~ son, ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession, you question whether that means that the son will ask and get it, you mean if the son should ask for this, then the father would give it to him and therefore you ~~think~~ ^{don't think} this should be taken as the proof that there is going to be such a kingdom, simply a proof if the son wants such a kingdom, he can have it. I think that that is well taken. There seems to me to be possibly a suggestion that when the Lord speaks this way, it actually is going to be. I would agree with you that it certainly is not a proof. I wouldn't base it so much on that perhaps as on other passages. I think

that that is a proof that it can be if he wants it, and it would seem to me that when he says that I will declare a decree, the Lord has said to me, ask me and I will give thee this. It seems to me as if he is saying that I'm going to have it. I shouldn't put too much emphasis (question) The one that has the heading the Earthly Kingdom? (question) 7 Neither swords nor plowshears can be. ---- (discussion) ---- Well, perhaps when I say can be thought of, perhaps it would be more accurately expressed to say, it does not impress me as terminology that would be used of heaven. ~~It~~ It seems to definitely an earthly terminology beating swords into plowshears. Now that is a matter of my own ^{impression} ~~impression~~. I would think that most people would be impressed that way, but perhaps it is something of a subjective statement. (question 8) I have plenty of it, but they are home, of course. Does anybody know whether there are any here in the building? Does anybody have an extra one here? How about for the present, I imagine someone of you here could spread out that we would have enough for today. As a matter of fact, I borrowed Dr. Buswells myself, so if some of you could share --- (question 9) Now there is a question. Now when to think of heaven as a place where people are fighting, and when they quit using their swords and start beating them into plowshears, to my mind hardly seems natural. It doesn't fit with the general feeling about Heaven that I've had all my life. Well, now maybe that is the wrong feeling. I have never had the feeling that Heaven is a place where we have fighting and conflict and we bring it to an end and we beat our ~~swords~~ swords into plowshears. But as to how something would be on this earth. Whether everyone here on the earth would have a redeemed body, I mean it is not necessarily congruous with earth that you have redeemed bodies. It seems natural with earth to have unredeemed bodies. That is what we have now. Well, now the Scripture says that we are going to have a resurrection and so there will be redeemed bodies here. Well, now whether everyone is to have a redeemed body or only a

Portion are to have redeemed bodies, would seem to me strictly a matter of investigation to see what the evidence is. That is I don't see why we would have reason to say that either all have to have or none have. I don't see what logic would require that. It would be a matter of what are the facts. (question 10 1/2) Well, now just a minute. I think you have two statements together there, you say incongruous in relation to other scripture --(discussion)---Well, that is a matter of bringing Scripture evidence. That is to say, that there is no reason as far as, It is pretty difficult for us to see our redeemed body on this earth, but we read in the Scripture that Jesus Christ was here as a redeemed body on this earth so there we have a redeemed body in the midst of unredeemed bodies. Now the Scripture says that we are going to be raised incorruptible. There fore we can believe that there could be an earth people with redeemed bodies. Now if we can believe that, I can't see why anybody would hav e any difficulty in thinking of the possibility that there ~~should~~ should be some redeemed and some unredeemed. Then the question simply is; what does the Scripture teach? Well, now that is a matter of gathering the evidence to see what it teaches and that I thought of as a part of the question, what other characteristics are there in the millenium, other than the present question; is there to be a millenium? And if someone has Scripture evidence to show that it would be impossible for the redeemed and the unredeemed to live together then we say that is evidence that they are all redeemed, but I haven't heard any evidence presented as yet, one side or the other on that. I don't think that is the question of what is congruous or not, or what is evil or not, it is simply a matter of what is the Scripture evidence and we haven't got any thus far. It is an argument which is frequently given. You can't have a millenium on this earth because there are passaged which sound as if there are going to be unredeemed bodies on this earth in the millenium and you can't have unredeemed and redeemed bodies together. I

think that is an argument which rests purely upon an assumption. I see no evidence in it. (question 12 1/2) The creation waits for the time of the resurrection, at which time there is the removal of the curse ~~and~~ ^{from} the body of the redeemed and there is the removal of the curse from the whole creation and there would certainly not under such condition be bodies that were subject to the same condition of decay that we are subject to today. That is to say if you were to go through this U.S. and take all the germs, all the diseased germs, and remove them from this place, you would have no more of many of our leading diseases, and that might be you might say, the removal of the curse, but that wouldn't apply necessarily giving us a resurrection body. For the giving of the resurrection body involves a great change in the body. Whether it will be given to everyone on the earth or not is a matter of study 14 , but I don't think it's required (question 14 1/4) --- How would you answer that Dr. Buswell? (Dr. Buswell - the removal of the christian creation is not an instantaneous process. There are quite a number of Scriptures which indicate that the 14 1/2 will take some time. Now the change in our bodies, redeemed, is instantaneous, so that the last enemy that is to be destroyed is dead. Now that comes at the very end of the millenium, when every last just person is alive and probably the last thing just before that is the destruction of the Gog and Magog, so the very last thing) (end of record)

(question
There will be a progressive dominion of the earth gradually acquired by Christ?) Where did you get that. (discussion0) No, that describes the whole period of the Kingdom, before the end of, that is to say - here is the time which we speak of at the end of the millenium kingdom, well now I think there that, I say that before this time at the end of the kingdom, there is to be a time, an era, in which the kingdom is universal.

It is before this time which is the end. I can see how the lines there lend itself to misinterpretation. (question 1 1/2) I mean that such a period comes which is the end of the kingdom and the era is the whole thing. (question) Just how gradual, I don't know. That is to say, as I understood Dr. Buswell, he meant that the Scripture does not say that there is going to be one instance when everything is going to be changed into the final condition, but that there is a great change which takes place immediately and then he would think that there would be other changes which would take place over a period of time. Well, I'm not sure whether my interpretation would be that way or not. I never faced that situation. Just off hand I incline to think that there would be great changes here which changes would include what we might say is the taking off of the curse and which would include the complete redemption of the body ~~and~~ into the redeemed and then that there would be another change in that change at this point that wouldn't be what you would call the removal of the curse, but which would involve changing certain features of it. Now that is a rather off handed opinion. I hadn't particularly thought of this matter before. Dr. Buswell, I understood to mean that some of this here would be more gradual. I am not sure that there is evidence one way or another on it, I don't know. Either one is perfectly conceivable. ^{(Dr. Buswell starts speaking here ---} /There are references to the early use of the millenium as being a great evangelistic campaign to bring the people from their remote places on litters and on mules. It would take some time for a mule to get there, not too long, but the early years of the millenium seem to be a clearing up process. On the 2nd Psalm, Dr. Mac Rae, the New Testament passages ~~are~~ based on it make it positive, for instance Rev. 19 ---"He shall rule with a rod of iron" there are a number of places that the ruling of Christ with a rod of iron is taken as a thing that is going to be.) Thank you, Dr. Buswell, that is very interesting. I haven't been aware of that before, at least, I hadn't

put it together that the New Testament explicitly teaches that, that where ~~the~~ the Psalmist says "ask of me and I will give thee" it will be given. He is going to rule them with a rod of iron, not to destroy them with a rod, but rule them with a rod. (Dr. Buswell -- Mr. Hamlin one time pointed out to me that ruling with a rod of iron might mean protecting them. A shepherd uses a heavy club with iron peices in it to protect his sheep.) At least there is something in the physical sphere, something in the sphere of safety, and it is not what is occurring at the present but is something still future. (Question 4 1/2) Very great, very greatly. I'm not sure, but I think it gives a clear understanding as to how large a proportion of undegenerate mankind will continue to exist on this earth in the millenium, whether it is those who have not taken an over position in to Christ before, more or less have taken an indifferent attitude, or whether it will be a fairly large group or a fairly small group of people, or whether it is almost none. That is I'm not sure that there is Scriptural evidence at the very beginning of time in this regard. Of course, as the millenium goes on, naturally with the removal of the diseased conditions and the accidents and trouble that we have today, naturally people would increase ^{very rapidly} ~~the~~. Y₀ would have a very large number of people born after the millenium ~~and~~/probably. The Scripture is not very specific on this. (question 6) (Dr. Buswell ---Ultimately, but the curse will be removed from nature. Nature will realize it's hope after the apocalypse of the sons of God.) Well, the Scripture shows that it would be. The scripture would show one way or the other. (question) 6 1/4 But at the same, there is Scriptural evidence clearly of this that the Rom. ~~21/8~~ 8.21, the creation itself is going to be delivered from the bondage of corruption. We know that it is going to be delivered and ^{earnest} that then we know that the ~~the~~/s/expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. Now what is the wait for?

be

Does it wait for that time at which it will ~~instantaneously~~ entirely
redeemed from the bonds of corruption or does it wait for that time
at which it will begin being redeemed from the bonds of corruption and
begin that which will end in a complete redemption? It doesn't say,
so it seems to me we can say it one or the other, but we can't tell
which from this passage. We can say this that it is certainly coming,
and we can say this, that it doesn't begin to come until the resur-
rection of the body of the redeemed or whether/^{it is instantaneous} it is spread over a
period, we are just not told. (Dr. Buswell --- I believe that there are
attributes in the Old Testament that indicate that the process of time
for clearing up, the last chapter of Isaian seems to indicate that
under the direct rule of the Messiah as King, that there will be a
time process, perhaps a very rapid time process. You see, the argu-
ment is brought up by John Murray years ago that there couldn't be
a millenium because of the fact that He shall reign until, those
words indicate a contrast there. Well, I answered that there are a
good many other words that indicate a contrast during the millenium,
perhaps a rapid process.)^{9 1/2}(Question) But he was talking about earth.
The A didn't so far as we know just sit down to write a book
on Eschatology to tell us everything that he thought on the subject,
but in the course of his discussion, he gives us evidence of certain
of his views and those views which he gives us express the main body
of what we would call the millenium and I think most of the scholars,
everyone that I know of prior to 200 A.D. who writes on the subject
at all, presents the same view, though some touch on one aspect, some
touch on another aspect, but the thing I have been trying to stress
so far is that the Scripture teaches that there is to be a sometime
upon this earth, a period in which there will be universal peace and
safety. A period in which there will be no war, nor murders, burglars,
or anything like that and no reason to fear them, a time when the rule
of Christ will be an actual fact upon this earth universally. And I

haven't gone particularly into the question whether this comes before or after the return of Christ. After is premillenium, before is post, and it is true that I have brought out passages stressing the fact that there will be a removal of the curse, but it is rather hard to see any possibility of that prior to the resurrection of the body of the redeemed. Especially as Romans 8 ties it right ~~up~~ with the removal of the corruption of the bodies of the redeemed and so that I think is the

11 thing that we've looked at so far, after the return of Christ, rather than before, but as to the length of it, we haven't gone into that. I don't personally think it is extremely vital how long the time is. Whether a thousand years is a figurative expression ~~for~~ ~~for~~ a hundred years or a figure of expression for ten million years, it doesn't seem to me to be vital, but my personal guess is that when it says a thousand, it means a literal thousand, but I wouldn't be dogmatic on that, if it should be a hundred million instead of ~~th~~ a thousand, it could be four hundred instead of a thousand, I wouldn't feel that I had been deceived, I would feel that I had simply been mistaken in taking something a little more literally than it was, but I do think that, I insist on this, that it is a period of time, it is a period of time, of rather long duration. That is clear and if it said that it would last ~~xxx~~ 975 years, that is a specific number, but when it says a thousand years it is a round number and can very well mean simply a long period of time. I wouldn't insist on anything more but I am inclined to think that it means an actual 1000 years. (question 12 1/2) I think he is bringing out that there is an end to this period and a change at that time and as to whether it is a thousand years specifically or a little more or less or many times as much, my guess is that it is about 1000 years, but it could mean that as a round number. (question 13) Yes, in Isaiah 11.9, I didn't mean to quote that as proving that the entire globe is covered, I meant to use that as proving

that whatever area is covered is completely covered, as the waters cover the sea, that is whether it was good. If it was a ~~an~~ America that we were speaking of, it would mean that anyone in America would know the Lord, that not that there would be a few people ~~where~~ and there who believed in the Lord and around them all sorts of gangsters and murderers and thieves, but that ~~it~~ would be subject to the Lord to the Lord's commands and overruling direction, the whole of the area spoken of. By universal, I was speaking there/of the ~~account~~ ^{not extent} of ~~the~~ it, but of the fact that within it it is complete. You notice right below, there it says, as the waters cover the sea; I say that there is not a square inch at the bottom of the ~~earth~~ ^{ocean} which does not have water above it, that is that such area is covered is completely covered. I don't think no-one has suggested anytime that it ~~is~~ a millenium which is confined to Palestine or confined to U.S., or confined to one continent, but there are many who hold that it is a period in which we have Christians scattered here and there surrounded by a hostile world and if you have a millenium that Christ rules in our hearts, like Heisenberg, the German post-milleniellist, ~~said~~ a great and orthodox commentator, says that with the conversion of the German nation under Charlemagne, the conversion of the Saxons, that was the beginning of the Millenium in about 1800 A.D. It was then that the millenium began and he said that already in his time in 1800 you could see signs of the ^{beginning of} unrest and turmoil, the beginning of that probably the end of the millenium (end of record)

but he took it as a literal thousand years from 800 to 1800 A.D.
 (question) I think it teaches that, but I didn't ~~that~~ think that
 (question) I would use this ~~verse~~ verse to prove that whatever it is over, it will be over all, that is what I mean by universality.(question) Yes, but I wasn't particularly facing that problem because I never have heard anybody who says that there will be a millenium that will be just in one country. That is, people have said that there is

a millenium, but it is in the hearts of the individual Christians scattered here and there. (question 1) Well, do you mean that the animals in Palestine would be changed and not in the rest of the world? (discussion) and a certain child will play in the ^{HOLE} of an ^{ASS} in Palestine, but you had better not do it in the U.S.? I don't think that seems ^a reasonable interpretation of it. (question 1 1/2) No I don't think so. 150 years after Isaiah's time, when the northern kingdom was depopulated and the people were taken into exile, there were so comparatively few people left that the animals increased and began to be a real menace in the city, but there is no evidence of any such thing in Isaiah's time. I have never heard that suggestion before, but it doesn't impress me as a logical thing. There is nothing in Isaiah to suggest that there was real danger from animals at this time anymore than there would be today, for instance. (question 2) Yes, I think there are three ways of taking anything, there is the natural way, the unnatural way and the super-natural way. Now the natural way is what is the plain sense of the word, what does that teach? The unnatural way is twisting the words around to mean something that would never occur to anybody, and the supernatural way is the way the devil leads one in guiding away from God's truth in misinterpretation. (question 3 1/2) I would say that the Holy Spirit leads us to use common sense. The Holy Spirit never goes contrary to common sense. (question 3 3/4) It takes Scripture in its natural sense. No, I would say that God has given us a book ~~in~~ written in plain language and if you take it in its natural sense you get what it means, if you twist it around to something unnatural, you don't get what it means, now I think that it is true that Mr. _____ has a very important point there, that the natural man receiveth not the things of God and you can take the most clear natural evidence on the deity of Christ and on the atonement and on the facts of sins and the great facts of the

Scripture and you can present it to people and they simply won't take it because Satan leads them away from it and the power of Satan is so great that it requires a divine intervention of the Holy Spirit to move the veil from our eyes and to lead us see things in their natural sense. I think that is actually true, and I think Mr. Wolfe has a real point there. I don't think that we advance God simply by argument, I think we need to pray that the Holy Spirit will illumine people's minds and that He will give us facilities in expressing words to show the true natural and correct interpretation here. I think he has a very point there. (Dr. Buswell ---You mean the natural interpretation of the Bible, is a different use of the word "natural" than the natural man.) Nature grows to be released from the curse, but it will still be nature. you might say it is unnatural the condition now, when we are under the reigns of sin, it is unnatural and the God of this world blinds our eyes so that we don't see the clear teaching of Scripture (question 5 1/2) Yes, I think the scripture teaches that. (question) Yes, the fact of the millennium, I don't think means that there is no desolation anywhere in the world,, I don't think it means that, I think what it means is that there is no area in the world where there are burglars and thieves and murderers, where there are, Well, now you take today, you go into Switzerland, in the travel book, it says that Switzerland and Denmark are two countries where you could take a gold coin and put it down on the Public Square somewhere and when you come back 5 years later, you would find it there, because nobody would think of taking it. They would figure it wasn't theirs and they wouldn't touch it. The book said that the only thing that would be apt to happen to it would be that the government might have a policeman stand beside it to guard it less some foreigner might take it. Well, now, that is the situation in those countries with their great Christian inheritance and you don't have a situation like that in the U.S. You leave something of value in one of our public

squares and if you happen to look the other way, it will be gone, but if you cross over the border from Switzerland into Italy, you don't want to let your experience of safety in Switzerland mislead you, you want to keep your hand on your grippe all the time for if you glance the other way for a second, it may disappear. Well, now, this is not, the Scripture is not saying that when it says the millenium is universal it is into saying that every square inch of this world is going to have a beautiful garden around it and wonderful sky scrapers and splendid hotels everywhere you go, but what it says is that there is not going to be anywhere danger of theivery and robbery and of stealing and of deceit, and of that which is outwardly and overly contrary to God's law. That is going to be removed. But to remove the curse in the negative side, rather than the positive side. It removes the evil things, it doesn't mean that every inch of it is covered with those beautiful things. It would be a terribly tiresome, boresom world. It doesn't say it will be like that. It is as if you were to listen to beautiful symphony every minute of the day and night. You would soon get so sick of it you wouldn't want to hear it anymore. A pleasant world is a world of reality and we are explicitly told in the Scripture repeatedly that at all times there is always to be that which will remind us of the terrible effect of sin and which will show us what it has done and let us see the terrible things that ~~it~~ has caused and that it will no longer be a living force that we need to fear. I am glad that you raised that question because I think that it is very valuable to go into that, but I don't think that; we must get this clearly in mind, but it doesn't mean that there will be no desolation on the earth, because the Scripture clearly teaches that there will remain desolation. Now when this last war ended, Hitler and all his force was utterly destroyed. There is no longer a striking force of the German Army or of the Nazi party, but you go through London and you see plenty of

broken down buildings. There is plenty of remains of destruction, but there is not that active force producing that destruction today. (question) I said that if one clear passage in the Scripture taught, if one passage clearly taught that there was going to be a great period of universal peace and safety upon this earth, that would be sufficient to establish it, but if we have three passages which teach it, then that certainly is something, I should think that would make it definite fact. That is not to say that it is the fact of anything like the importance of the atonement of Christ, or of his deity, or of the fall of man, or of any other of many scriptural doctrines, but there are at least these three passages which teach it very clearly ~~and then~~ there are other passages that refer to, I would not say a tremendous amount, but a sizable amount. In fact, it seems to me that, well, I was interested to pick up the book "Jesus is Coming" by W.E.B., which has been considered one of the great books in spreading pre-millennialism, more widespread than any other. Out of two hundred pages he has one page on the millennium; that is to say, the thing he was looking forward to was the coming of Christ to set up His Kingdom. Now the things he was interested in ~~the~~ ^{the} manner of the coming, the time of the coming, the details connected with the coming, and the fact that after the coming there is going to be this great period of righteousness and peace, but he laid comparatively little stress on details of it, and he more or less in the rest of the book took it for granted; and just this one page on that particular thing. The only reason that I am stressing the millennium particularly is--there are two: one is that within the last twenty years it has been very greatly questioned, much more than before. The second reason is that ⁱⁿ these particular passages the methods which have been used in order to question the millennium have seemed to me to be such that carried out consistently, they would rob ⁴⁵ of most of our

great doctrines in Scripture, and for that reason, not so much for the ~~the~~ question of what happens after Christ's return--you might say that is a matter of curiosity, God will bring to back what He wants to after His return--not so much for the matter of curiosity regarding that as for the matter of the importance of sound methods of interpretation that I am particularly interested in it. I wouldn't want you to quote me as putting great emphasis on the millenium; I wouldn't do that. It's merely in response to the present situation. (Student:...emphasis on it....American Council...everything in the last six months led to the millenium....if there is such a lot of the millenium in the Bible, we've always been accustomed to saying, "I'm going to heaven when I die." Now do you think ~~that~~ is a statement which is devoid of meaning, or what does it mean, or should we stop saying it?) That is one point where Dr. Buswell and I disagree. (Dr. B said this morning in S.T. something about going to heaven.) I'll say that too. (Do you agree?) We may not mean the same thing, however. (laughter) (Dr. B:...depart to be with the Lord.) That's right. Paul says when he dies he will go to be with the Lord which is far better, but he says, "Not that I desire to be unclothed." He clearly teaches that the state which we come into after death is not that to which we look ~~forward~~ forward as our great hope; that is a state of being unclothed, and the spirit, while it is a time of great bliss to be with the Lord, they are longing for the time when they will be clothed upon, when they will ~~not~~ have their resurrected bodies, when they will be in their normal state of a body and a spirit together, and not a disembodied spirit; it something unnatural; it is not something which is stressed as desirable in the Scripture; only to be with the Lord is far better to be in this world of sin, but the great hope of the Scripture is not to die and go to heaven; the great hope is to be Christ's at the resurrection, and in the intermediate time prior to the resurrection, we have a period of

bliss because we with Christ, but it is not the great hope of the Christian. I think on that I would be dogmatic; that whether there is a millenium or not--I think that is much more important than whether there is a millenium or ~~not~~. It is clearly taught in the Scripture that the state of the soul after death is not the final state, and is not the great thing to which we look forward; it is the resurrection....

(end of record)

e 44

(Question) Well now, that's just the question: What does "heaven" mean. Dr. B and I agree that when we die we go to be with the Lord, but where do you mean by "being with the Lord"? (Student) Where is His Fa_{th}er? His Father is everywhere, isn't He? God the Fa_{th}er is a Spirit. A spirit is not localized. You can not say that a spirit is in one particu~~lar~~ place, at least not the Spirit of God. He is in all places. He is everywhere. He is just as much here as He is in the fute~~st~~ galaxy away from the one that our sun is part of.

(Student) I don't think that He meant that He went and got some bricks and built them up into a building. I don't think that it is a tangible physical thing as similar to anything that we know. I think that it has a similarity to it such as this could be used as a figure of it. I think that what Christ means is that He, by H_is death on Calvary's cross, destroyed the power of Satan, and out of His death on the cross comes all the blessings that ~~He~~ He has for us. It means that He goes from this e~~arth~~--He is not localized on one spot on this e~~arth~~--He's everywhere here, and still H_is body is somewhere else, but for us in the spirit to be with His body wouldn't be any particula~~r~~ thing--you can't put a spirit and a body together, have one spirit and another body--what it means is that after death there is an intimacy with Christ, superior to anything we have had on earth here, but I don't think it can be represented in physical terms, because we will be disemb~~odied~~

then; I think it simply is a figurative way of saying there will be a wonderful fellowship with Christ after death, but the thing that the New Testament teaches ~~is~~^{as} the great hope of the Christian is the great hope of the resurrection; it is the resurrection of the body which God has promised to the Christian; that is the great hope, not what happens when you die. (Student) I don't think our intimacy is with His body. I mean it couldn't be. I don't think you use the term "see" with regard to spirits. "See" requires eyes, body. (Student) But it won't be similar to "seeing" or "hearing" or anything like that; that requires a body. You can't put it in spacial terms. It's a spirit; it is not in spacial terms. You can't say "the spirit here or there," you can't close it up in a box. A spirit is ~~is~~ different. (Student: ...~~is~~^{at} relation between departure, death, and the millenium, and then the 3 1/2). Well as to the relation between it and what follows that, I doubt if the Scripture has revealed much; perhpas nothing certainly not much. But as to relation between --leave the millenium out of it for the moment--as to the rdation between the situation of the soul after death and the soul after the return of Christ, regardless of your view--pre, post-, whatever it may be--this is clear in the Scripture, that the condition of the departed soul is altogether different after the return of Christ than it is before, and that it is the condition after the ~~is~~ return of Christ that is the great hope to which the Christian looks forward, the great hope of the Bible, and that is there spoken of as the resurrection, it is not spoken of as heaven, over and over we read, "In hope of the resurrection." We do not read anywhere that I know of, "In hope of heaven." (Student: "here's one: Col. 1:5." "For the hope that is laid up for you in heaven.") The hope is laid in heaven, yes. What is the next phrase there? ("Whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel.") (Dr. B: The connection there, there is some ...^{4.3/4} we look for, there is something of that/~~kind~~ kind)

Dr. M: That's Christ coming back from heaven, isn't it? Col. 1:5, "The hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel; which is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit..." He's hearing of their faith and of their hope, the hope that is laid up for them in heaven, that is, our wonderful ~~hope~~ hope of future things which Christ is going to give us. (Dr. B: in the third chapter of Colossians he goes on to say, "We expect this hope to ~~come~~ come from heaven when Christ comes." Col. 3:4 "When Christ who is our life shall appear, ^e then shall ye also appear with him in glory.") Yes. 3:1 , "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are ~~above~~, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." ~~That~~ That doesn't mean "seek to die and go to heaven." That means, "Seek the qualities that Christ wants you to have;" the qualities that are above, not the qualities that are beneath. The heavenly qualities of your life and character. (Student:...figurative term, reality, or what?) Well, in the beginning God created heaven and earth. That's a reality; that's a specific thing. That's heaven; God created heaven and earth. (Student:used in an evangelistic sense there.) As a matter of fact, I think that it is true that most of us build our theology on what we hear in evangelistic services, and what we were taught in Sunday School, and such things, rather than what we read in the Scripture, and the great bulk of what we have heard in evangelistic services and what we have been taught in Sunday School is undoubtedly correct, but a great deal of it has been given in ~~picture~~ pictorial language, and a great deal of it has been put in simple ways in order to get great truths ~~across~~ across to people, and the trouble is that we are apt to get these matters of expression and to build our teaching upon that, instead of upon the Scriptural truth that they ~~were~~ ~~trying~~ ~~to~~ ~~convey~~, and often the evangelist or Sunday School teacher himself has not been a close student of the

word, but as I ~~say~~ study the word I am more and more impressed that the resurrection is the great hope of the Christian, and that "heaven" has come in~~y~~ recent years to be used in the English-speaking world in a way which I doubt is the Scriptural use. I'm not at all you'll find it used in early Christian writers in that sense in which we use~~/~~ it, as if heaven is the specific thing which is our hope; ~~I~~ our hope is the resurrection. God created the heaven and the earth, and God will destroy the heavens and the earth in His own time. (Student: What did Jesus mean when He said, "Our Father which is in heaven"~~?~~ in the Lord's Prayer?) Now that is an interesting question in view of the fact that the ~~Father~~ Father is a spirit and is everywhere. He is everywhere. You have heard me tell of _____ at Cornell University last spring, where he said that there was an old religio~~s~~ picture which showed earth ¹⁸⁷⁴ as center. He said, "This is the ~~old~~ conception people used to have. Here was the earth. And there was the sun going around the earth, and then he said, there were the stars around that, and around that they said, God. Well now," he said, "science has proven that we have the earth and we have the sun and we have the whole galaxy, and then they go on, and then there are other stars and other stars--as far out as you get there are stars and there is no room for God anymore. So you see we do away with God." Well in the course of it, before the thing had ~~been~~ interested me was how in the beginning of his message he said they showed God up here. "Of course they thought of God as a spirit," he said, "they were merely representing it that way." And then he went on and forgot he had said that, or at least ignored it, and went on to say, "And now we know that as far as the telescope pierces, there are still stars. So there is no room for God." And so he had done away with this old medieval concept of God. But the medieval concept was not of God being outside the universe. Here is the earth. And somewhere out there in heaven there is God.

Well now, that is not the Bible teaching. The Bible teaching is that God is everywhere. I would think that when we say, "Our Father who is in heaven" we are perhaps referring ^{to} the fact that God is not only in the earth here, but that He is also in the rest of the universe, He is everywhere. God is in all things, and He is not tied down by earthly circumstances. God has control not only over the earth but over heaven; He has control over everything. That expresses the universality of God. But it certainly does not mean, "Here is the universe now, and they were wrong in putting God in all these places. Here is the universe, and here is the earth, but only we put the sun in the middle. Down here is heaven, and that is where God is." It doesn't mean that at all. God is everywhere. (Student: But what of the passage in Scripture of the cherubims and seraphims ~~behold~~ beholding the holiness of the Lord. ~~Would~~ Would you say, "That means the holiness of Jesus Christ"? No. The holiness of the Lord is not a thing like a house or a locomotive. It's not a specific thing that you see with your eyes. The holiness of the Lord is all of the majesty of God. You see the ~~holiness~~ holiness of the Lord when you see a wonderful character. When you see the death of one of the saints you see the holiness of the Lord. But the cherubim and the seraphim can see all of this together in its totality. They can see far more than any of us can of these ~~things~~ things which reveal the holiness of the Lord. It doesn't mean that they see like I see this desk here, they see the holiness of the Lord. It doesn't mean that. (Student: It says, "They have to veil their faces." They cannot actually see ~~Him~~ Him. There must be a place in the universe where God the Father is as a place, besides His being everywhere in the universe.) I don't think Scripture teaches that. But that is getting away from the millenium now. I had down here a list of possible things to discuss on this unit of time, and one which I have near the end of the ^{list} ~~lecture~~, which I was not sure

whether we had discussed or not. I was going to discuss with Dr. B whether he thought it wise or not to take up the question of heaven, and if so, go ~~tho~~ through the Scripture and look at the uses of the word "heaven" and see what is the Scriptural concept of it. He and I had a rather heated discussion one evening out in Minnesota last summer, but I didn't know that needed to enter into this class particularly. But I do think that this is ~~very~~ vital--he and I ~~do~~ agree on it-- at death we go to be with the Lord, and the great hope of the Christian is not something that you get at death. That is superior to this life, yes. But the great hope of the Scripture is the resurrection of the body. (Student: By resurrection do you include the rapture--is it a broad term which includes the resurrection of believers?) No. "The resurrection is a matter which applies to a particular individual, the time when that individual's spirit is reunited with his glorified body. That time, and what comes after that. But as to ~~when it happens~~ when it happens doesn't enter ~~it~~ into that particular discussion at all. Whether it be ~~it~~ seven years earlier or later doesn't enter it at all. (St: How about the length of time that the rapture of the church takes?) "The rapture of the church" is a term that Matthew ~~the~~ Henry used to describe the time when the saints are caught up or raptured from the church. Well now, the hope isn't being caught up; the hope is being resurrected. I mean that's an incidental feature. (St: You don't have the extent of time in I. Thess. 4 and I. Cor. 15/~~it~~/?) Yes,--I think they occur at the same time. (St: We wouldn't get our glorified bodies yet--) At that time, yes. (St: That would be our hope.) The hope is the resurrection. The rapture is merely a revelation of certain details connected with it that come at ~~that~~ time. The hope isn't the rapture. But the resurrection comes at the time of the rapture, ~~that~~ is, the resurrection of the great body of Christians. That is not when the resurrection of Enoch occurred. (St) We agree on the hope of the Christian. The only thing is, our question was as to the use of the

term "heaven", and that is a matter for an inductive study of the use of the term in Scripture, and I don't think either of us made that; we were simply speaking--I think everything I've said this afternoon Dr. B will agree with, but it's a matter simply of the use of a particular term, and that is a matter for an inductive examination which I think it would be very interesting to do sometime, but neither one of us has done that. We might do it in connection with the class, I don't know. I think there are much more important things which are to come first. (end of record)

e 45

It is somewhat away from this earth. I think everything away from this earth is called heaven. God created the heavens and the earth. What does that mean? He created the whole universe, which is composed of this earth, and the rest of the universe. (St) After He made the heavens? You might say, "God created the dry land after He created the earth, yes. That is, He took elements of this earth and separated the water and the dry land. It was already there. Now as to whether the creation of the heavens was an instantaneous thing, as to whether He first made the matter and then caused it to assume different shapes, or as to whether He first made the great bulk of it and then made certain added features later, Scripture does not reveal. ~~But~~ Either one is possible. It is altogether possible that on the fourth day the sun and moon were not then created, but were then made visible from the earth, and if that were so, then doubtless this applied to the stars too. But we can't be dogmatic on it one way or the other. (St) "I ascend to my Father"? He also said, "I and the Father are one; he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." What did He mean by that? (St: If we are going to be reigning right on this same earth that we are now living on, it seems to me that that were a very strong incentive for us to make the most of our time here,

... rapture.... training for something that we are going to be doing later on.) I think it has a strong incentive, but I think there are other incentives that are even stronger. (St) What do you mean by "spiritualization"? Here on the next to the last page I say, "It is not merely a matter of taking figurative language as figurative. Most language contains figurative expressions. It is a matter of taking an entire framework of a passage figuratively, and passing ~~by~~^{beyond} the bounds of any sane use of figures whatever." You see, I insist that terms are frequently used figuratively in Scripture. It is a common thing in Scripture; but I say that you can't take everything in a passage as figurative. That is what is sometimes called spiritualization. There is nothing spiritual about it. "Allegorization" is another term sometimes used for it. An allegory is a proper method of teaching. And all language has figures of speech in it. But ~~is~~ the question is as I say here, taking the entire framework of a passage figuratively, and passing beyond the bounds of any sane use of figures whatever. A pinch of salt/a ⁱⁿ dish of soup is good. If one pours a pocket of salt into a quart of soup, the result is disagreeable, and dangerous to health. Spiritualization is everytime the Old Testament speaks of the Kingdom, saying it means the church. And everytime it speaks of a conquest, saying that it means conversion, and taking all sorts of ~~terms~~ ~~terms~~ in the Bible that have nothing to do with these things, and making them mean that. Now there are two wrong methods of studying the Scripture. I know a great many people, who everytime they find anything whatever in the Bible that is good will say, "This is a description of Christian people in this age." And everything they find ~~is~~ anything that is bad, they leave that with the Jews in the old age.

A.V., look at your heading. It will say, ~~An~~ ⁱⁿ the Prophets, "Take even your Curses upon Israel. God to punish Israel for its sins. The Future Glory of the Church. God to bless the church." All the blessing they

give to the church; all the curses they give to Israel. Well that is a mistake. God has punishment for Israel. He also has blessing for Israel. God has punishment for the church; He also has blessing for the church. Now I find that there is another mistake, and that is, there are people who find the millenium taught in Scripture--and I think it is clearly taught in Scripture--and then finding it clearly taught in Scripture, they think that is all the Scripture talks about. And ~~by~~ every time they find anything good taught in Scripture, they say, That is the millenium. I haven't gone over these lessons Mr. H. spoke of; I don't know whether the writers ~~of~~ fell into that danger at all or not. But it is a danger which is easily done every time I give the Prophets course. The passages in the Old ~~Testament~~ Testament which clearly teach the glory of the church in this age, some people in the class are horrified. "Why," they say, "that is the millenium!" What for? It has nothing in the world to do with the millenium. You can't say that every~~thing~~ thing glorious in the Scripture is the millenium, or everything glorious in the Scripture is the church. You must take a passage and see what it is talking about. And it may use literal terms, it may use figurative terms, but the ~~of~~ question is, "What is it speaking of, and in these passages which we looked at specifically in the Old Testament, it is taught that there is to be a time of external peace and safety. That is the simple thought of those passages. And that is clearly taught there, I would say. Now you can teach it in figurative language; you can teach it in literal language. But the question is, what are you teaching. The child can put its hand on the ~~whole~~ whole of the asp and not be hurt, and when it says the wolf and the lion will lie down together, to take that as meaning that a Christian in the midst of a wicked world has peace in his soul is not simply not taking a thing figuratively; it may be figurative; but it is taking it as something of which that could never

possibly be a figure. It is spiritualizing in the bad sense of the word "spiritualize". (St) I would say that any verse, any word, anywhere in Scripture may be used figuratively. Any word anywhere; but I would say that when you take any verse and make every word of it a figure, you are reducing it to nonsense. (St) I would say that Rev. 20 rather clearly teaches, it very clearly teaches, that after the return of Christ there is going to be a period in which Satan is ~~bound~~ bound. To twist that around to mean something before the return of Christ requires a lot of twisting. It is presented very clearly/ ^{as something else.} And when it says that Satan is bound so that he will deceive the nations no more, that that means that Satan can't hurt the redeemed saints up in heaven at this present time, is certainly twisting way away from what any natural use of the word would possibly suggest. I think personally that the word "heaven" is a very/^{literal,} specific, ~~definite~~ definite thing; that it is the whole universe outside of this earth. I don't think that "heaven" is the planet Mars or Jupiter, or some other place like it, which is some little spot way off in the corner of the universe where God is; God is everywhere. (St) Of course all I dealt with in this class this year was the three passages in the Old Testament, and Dr. B. very briefly went into Rev. 20. I think you are very right, it would be very worthwhile for us to go more into detail into Rev. 20, don't you think so, Dr. B? (Dr. B.: When the time comes.) (St)(St:.... Three heavens...) That is building a lot of ~~theory~~ theory on a couple of words, isn't it? People have built all sorts of theories on a little bits of evidence. (St....in the body or out of the body....) Does that mean that the body of Paul was lifted up past the stars, that is, past the ones that the new two hundred inch telescope has discovered, way on to something beyond them, like the assumption of the virgin Mary, lifted right up there? (St.) We don't know. One guess is good as another, but the trouble is that when you get through

with it and find the reality, usually none of your guesses correspond, you get something entirely different ~~than~~ ^{than} many of your guesses will be.

(St) 23:1 Now is that a description of the throne of God? It is not a description. Chapter 4 in Rev. What does it ~~say~~ ^{look} say about the ~~books~~ ^{looks} of the throne. I read about the One who is on the throne, I read about who is round about the throne, I read about what comes out of the throne, I read about what is before the throne, but I don't read any description of the ~~type~~ throne. Ch. 22:4 I don't think that has anything to do with heaven. I think that this is a picture of the earth. We certainly will see the face of Christ. The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; they shall see His face, and His name shall be in their foreheads. Certainly we will see Christ in the new ~~earth~~ earth. (ST) God could work that out a thousand ways if He wanted to; it could be literal or figurative; I don't know. St) Well I'm not inferring. I'm simply taking the words as they stand. I don't know what it means. But I do know this: that it doesn't mean this, that God the Father appears before us as you appear as a specific body of which I see the face. The Scripture clearly teaches everywhere that there is no such thing as that. (ST) We know that Christ is coming back to this earth in bodily fashion, and "every eye shall see Him, and they shall look upon Him whom they have pierced." That is clear, specific, definite, literal. Everybody believes it, regardless of their ~~view~~ view on the millenium. That doesn't even enter into it.

(St.) I can say that America stretches from the North Pole to the South Pole, almost. (St) You mean that it is expressing a situation in which a ~~million~~ million people or ten million people are all going to see one individual face to face at one time. Is that what you mean? (St) Do you think that Christ is going to stay/^{fixed} in one particular spot, day and night forever, that if anybody who goes to that particular spot and looks at it, or do you think that He is going to be active and

moving, and people will see Him. It doesn't mean they will see Him at the same instant, or that they will see Him in the same position, and ~~of~~ even the throne, what reason do we have to think that God sits on a literal chair. Maybe He does; maybe as He moves around directing....

(end of record)

St) No, there are a great many things we can say we don't...(Dr. B: What he is talking about is definitely said to be on the new earth.) Yes. Dr. B. says that the passage which you are referring to specifically says it is on the new earth; it has nothing to do with heaven anyway. (St: Where does it say...?) (Dr. B: "The new Jerusalem came down out of heaven to the ~~new~~/earth," and then he goes on to describe, "His servants shall serve Him.....") Yes, so that is a description of the earth with the throne of Christ on it, and some people think it will be television, wherewith every eye shall see H,m. We don't know. Maybe it will be television; I don't know. Certainly it is true that ~~the~~ today President Truman could speak in Washington and half the people in the United States could hear him all at once, and ~~that~~ Americans as far away as Germany and Italy could hear President ^{Roosevelt} ~~Truman~~ speaking. We all heard him at one instant. How could it happen? And yet it did happen, that they all at that one instant heard President Roosexvelt speak. Now if it says that all the people at one instant, well there are a million ways that God could bring it about, and I don't know what they are. Whatever the Scripture says is true, and I am not going to try to explain any of it away, but neither am I going to insist that it must be one particular type of fulfillment, because I don't know. (St) Certainly, come down out of heaven, ---and Pres. Truman's plane came out of the heavens to Washington when he came back from Washington. He came down out of the heavens on to this earth. And I don't see the difficulxy there. When it says, "came down out of

heaven," all that means is that it ~~is~~ came down out of the sky. You wouldn't think it meant anything more than that, would you, Dr. B? By "the new Jerusalem came down out of heaven", it just meant it came down out of the ~~skies~~ skies, wouldn't you? (ST) It means that He is going to prepare a future existence for us. As to what the details of it are, He has not revealed, and He couldn't reveal, because there would be many factors of it which we don't know anything about, and He couldn't explain it. He wouldn't have words to describe it. When it says, speaking of the unsearchable ~~riches~~ riches of Christ, it doesn't mean it isn't real; it means that it has in it much that we couldn't possibly search out. We don't have the facts; we don't have the understanding, we don't have the materials. You ask Julius Caesar, What makes the blood go through his veins? He wouldn't know anything about it. It was William Harvey, ~~centuries~~ centuries later, who discovered the circulation of the blood. There are a great many things Julius Caesar never heard of, and you couldn't describe them to him. They are absolutely outside of his realm. You say to a person a hundred years ago that everybody, that millions of people in many parts of the earth would hear Pres. Roosevelt speak at the same time, they would put you in a lunatic asylum. They would say, "It's absolutely impossible." Thirty years ago you would go into Child's restaurant in New York, and on the menu they tell you how many calories in everything you buy to eat in all the food, so that you can get just the right ~~amount~~ amount of calories and the right amount of proteins and carbohydrates, and you'd have a perfect diet. Today we know that vitamins are ten times as important as calories or proteins or carbohydrates. You try to explain vitamins to somebody twenty years ago, and they'd laugh at you. They would say, "What kind of a crazy thing is this that you are talking about?" The world is full of principles, full of things that we don't know anything about. (St)4 1/3.....the negro is under a curse, and if you

believe
 believe the Bible, you must/the negro is under a curse. You say, "All right, where does it say in the Bible?" They'll say, "Oh, it tells you in Genesis, how God cursed the negro." Well, where is it? You look it up. They say, "Oh, but the negro is Ham, and God put a curse on Ham." Well, in the first place, there is nothing in the world to connect the negro with the Ham (laughter) with Ham, and in the second place, there is record anyplace of God putting any curse on Ham. So when God never cursed Ham, and Ham isn't a negro, why to say that God cursed the negro and to base it on that passage--I mean, I don't see how any intelligent person could ever say such a thing, if they'd bother to look at the passage and see what it says. But there are thousands of the finest Christian people you'd ever ~~want~~ want to meet, who have heard some Sunday School teacher say that, and have assumed it is true without ever having bothered to look it up in the Bible and notice the fact that the Bible nowhere never connects Ham with negroes, and nowhere puts any curse on Ham. And two things that aren't true don't make a third thing that is true. It is just the same way with thousands of ideas which we have in our minds that aren't based on the Scripture, and the question is, what does the Scripture teach? And it is true that everyone of us, as a little child, somebody said, "Now if you're good, you'll go to heaven. You be a good boy." And so we get the idea that the great, important thing is to be a good boy and then when you ~~die~~ die you go to heaven. And then you look ~~through~~ through the Scripture and to try to find out if the Scripture presents the great hope of the Christian is to die and go to heaven, and there is no such thing in the Scripture. The great hope of the Scripture is the great blessing which Christ is going to bring at H's appearing. It is the hope of H's appearing; it is the hope of the resurrection; and there is an intermediate state prior to the resurrection, which is a state of bliss, which is nowhere put as the hope of the Christian,

or something we long for, but it is merely an intermediate waiting period, a waiting period in the state of bliss, but very definitely inferior to what comes after, and that is altogether apart from what we may think about the millenium, one way or the other. (St) Yes--great is their reward in heaven--does that mean--what does it mean? It surely means though you suffer persecution on this earth, this earth is not all that matters. There is much in the universe beyond this earth; and God has wonderful blessings for you apart from your physical experiences of suffering on this earth. In the first place, He has heavenly experiences for you right here, if you have communion with Him. The Christian in the midst of tribulation and suffering may have joy superior to anything the wordling ever experiences, because he is ~~is~~ living in the heavenlies with Christ, even while he is right here, and then, in addition to that, the Christian has bliss through his association with Christ after death, but then he has the great hope, I don't say the only hope, but his great hope is the hope of the resurrection, to which he looks forward. (Dr. B: There are a good many passages that refer to our reward being "built up in heaven, from whence it will come." I think this could be similiated to that.) The rewards stored up for you in heaven, over and over again-- (St) We don't know; the rewards are stored up somewhere. Well now, how are they stored up. If these rewards are a ~~is~~ bale of hay, or bricks or diamonds, there must be a storehouse somewhere where they are kept, and that storehouse would be somewhere away from this earth, probably. But if they are not, if the rewards we get are not diamonds, ~~is~~ or pieces of coal, or bales of hay, but if they are great glory, or great blessings of some sort God gives us, why then, they are stored in God, they are stored in His person, they are part of His eternal will, not stored in any physical, tangible way, and consequently they are not ~~is~~ stored in any specific, tangible place. But as to just what the

nature of them is, we are not told. I think there are a great many concepts which we get as children from the elementary teaching which is given to us, which are fundamentally sound and good, but from which we draw a lot of ~~specific~~ specific, concrete teaching which isn't in the Scripture. As we try to interpret the Word, we shouldn't let ourselves be controlled by that, but see, What does the Scripture teach, and whatever it teaches is true. But you cannot take the words, the specific words of the Scripture as meaning exactly what that specific word means to you now, because you can get the fundamental/word now, but the exact reference of the word may vary from time to time. When you speak of, "In the old days they rode in chariots," well a chariot was something drawn by a horse at one time. Today the chariot might be pushed by gasoline engines, the next generation it might be carried on ~~planes~~ planes, on wings, there are all sorts of methods, but fundamentally, it is something that ~~it~~ transports you from one place to another; that is the fundamental idea. And if you spiritualize it, it means you change it around to be something in a different sphere of thought, instead of something that expresses the same fundamental idea in perhaps a different relationship. (St) The fundamental idea in the word place depends on whether you are talking in terms of position--a man's place in history, for instance, is his importance. What was the place of Gen. Grant in history? It is not a physical seat that Gen. Grant sat on; it is the importance he had in determining events. (St: J_ohn 14) Yes, I go to prepare a place for you. Well now, ^{that} the Father who is ~~not~~/a Spirit is not a body has a specific ~~ll~~ which leans to a certain side, I do not think...ll 1/4 . (St) That's right; He is using natural ~~terms~~ terms to express a situation. Now perhaps there He is describing the situation He is preparing for the millenium. That's just what He means. Perhaps He is going to prepare the houses in which we will live in the millenium. If that is what He means, then

Edh

they are probably specifically physical houses. But I have always thought rather it means He is preparing the fellow~~ship~~/ship which we will have with Him during the intermediate ~~state~~ state when we are out of the body. Maybe I'm wrong in that. Maybe He does mean houses in the millenium. I don't know. (ST) He can be, yew, but does the Scripture anywhere say that He is. (St) Here am I in the midst of them. And here we have a thousand gatherings of two or three. Christ is in the midst of everyone of those gatherings. Now where is the one place He is? (St) You might say, "I am here and I am here," ~~///~~ but if I lift this foot I am manifesting myself here far more than I am here. God can exert His activity in one place....(ST: Most people when they think of God...most likely a local manifestation.) That is right; it is a manifestation, it's not a presence. It's just like the Holy Spirit. The H⁰ly Spirit is everywhere. There is not a square inch or a tenth of a square inch anywhere in the universe where the Holy Spirit is not. He is everywh^e. Well then, how can the H_oly Spirit come into a person. He's in you already; He's in everybody, in every unbeliever. He's in every building; He's in every chair'; He's in every stone; He is in everything. Well then, what do you mean, the H^uly Spirit comes into you. You mean He manifests H_s power in you, that He manifests Hⁱmself through you. He fills you with His Spirit. That doesn't mean that the Spirit ~~it~~ crowds Himself into your brain. It doesn't mean a place, that the Holy Spirit, which is a spirit, comes into a place; it means that He manifests H_smself, that He exerts an influence, it ~~it~~ means that He takes over a control. (St)Rev. 4:5, yes.

(end of record)

e 47

...John to see many things in symbolic form, things of God's character, of God's presence. Then He enabled John to have pictures of many things

that are to happen in the future. Now some of those pictures are given in very physical, literal language; some of them are given in figurative language; but in every case you can tell what is the general idea of the thing that occurs. Now when you read that one came on a white horse-- you read in chapter 19 that he saw heaven open, and one came forth on a white horse. Well now, that one who came on a white horse, you say, what is that, ~~pl~~ pestilance? Pestilance we think of as a rider on a white horse. Is it famine? Famine is a rider on a white horse. Is it Napoleon? Napoleon had probably ridden on a white horse. It could be any one of a thousand things, one on a white horse. But as you read a little further, you read, "On Him is a sign that says, 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords.'" Now you know that could truly be said of no one but the Lord Jesus Christ. So then you know that that is the Lord Jesus Christ who comes forth from heaven. Now then you have no question that this is a picture of a coming 1 1/4 . You read on and you find what happens, and you find that He does certain things which Isaiah predicted He would do. And then you find certain things happen after that. Well now, there are figurative elements, but the general framework of it is perfectly clear. It is easy to see what is meant by it in general. (St) Why don't we picture Him on a horse? John pictured Him on a horse. (St) It may be a horse; it may be an automobile; it may be an airplane; it may be a cloud. We don't know. All that it means is that it means transportation. The horse means transportation. It pictures His coming--He is coming with power and with force. The horse there doesn't mean He is someone on a white horse. You might say, white stands for purity, and you might say a horse--well, a horse shakes its head. Does this indicate something shaking its head at something that is very pure? No, that is not the context. The context is a picture of transportation; a picture of one

coming, so you get what is the fundamental idea in the passage. And that is what you have to do with any of it. (St) Yes. When he says that Satan is bound so that he deceives the nations no more. Some say that that means that Satan cannot hurt the saints in heaven during this period. Well now ~~why~~ can you call the deceased saints in heaven "the nation"? That is going directly contrary to what it says here. "Nations" may not mean the specific nations we have today, but it ~~it~~ must stand for something in some way similar; there must be some relevance to it. (St) Well a spirit is something you think of as bright, vivid and active...3 3/4. (St) To deceive the nations no more would not be to deceive the whole nation of believers. (St) Does that mean in the beginning God created this earth here, and six billions miles away from here there is another little earth He created; or does it mean that God created the whole universe, which is made up of heaven and earth? It's just a question of what these terms mean in Scripture. (St)

Dr. B: The nature of heaven is more or less irrelevant, but I think we should all follow Dr. MacRae's suggestion of taking a concordance, looking up the word heaven, and seeing what the Bible has to say about it. The study of the word has been done very well in Hodge. He has long discussion of the intermediate state. The Westminster fathers didn't neglect it; they put it right there in the catechism, the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, the hope being the blessed hope of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. You find this word heaven used in three different senses in Scripture, taking just a plain concordance study. In the first place you have the Genesis 1 usage which comes many times--the heavens, earth, ~~sky~~ star. Everything that isn't ~~on~~ on earth is in heaven physically and spacially. Then you have a number of different Scriptures that refer to heaven as departing like a scroll, and the earth goes right along. Now that reference to the heavens can be simulated to a certain idea. It doesn't

nothing; it was given in the language of the time. And then you have the reference, "Today you shall be with me in Paradise," and the reference to Paul's being caught up; he didn't know if he was in the body or not, to the third heaven, which is Paradise. Now Paul calls it the third heaven. There you have the usage of the Bible; it can be very well classified under three different headings. The word "heaven" doesn't always mean the same thing; you have to take your context. If you find a passage, and I'm sure you won't, in which heaven can't be put under one of these three headings, well then you'll have to restudy your classification. But those three headings are used of the word "heaven" in Scripture, and are quite well established in literature. Now it doesn't matter where the Paradise of God is; I suggested before Dr. and I had our very interesting discussion; I think I had misunderstood him to almost eliminate the fact of the intermediate stage in fellowship with Christ, and then I barely came to understand what he meant by that. Really, actually, when we depart from this life we are going to be with the Lord, and that will be far better than this earth, and yet it is not our hope at all. But I insisted when we had our argument that as far as I can see the place of the Paradise of God might not be measurably distant from this ~~earth~~ earth. You have your radio and your television, and what is it to be with a person? It's going to be a place; you can't think of anything that isn't somewhere, if it is a substantive entity. Your mind is ~~constituted~~ constituted that way. But where it is? Certainly not outside of this (cyderial?) universe. To be with the Lord, and it will be Paradise. The Scriptural language is given against the background of Semetic and Greek usage. In the Greek ~~of~~ eschatology you had Hades, which is divided in two parts, Tarturis and Euligium. Now the New Testament writers took over those words, Hades, same as Sheol in the Old Testament, simply meaning "the place where the dead wherever."

No specifications as to where it is. But they are substantive entities; they haven't gone out of existence; they are somewhere. The New Testament writers keep the word "Tarturis" definitely as the place of the wicked dead. They keep the word "Hades"; they do not keep the word "Elysium", but they substitute the word Paradise which simply means, "a beautiful place." Now where this place is makes no difference; it's the place of waiting; it is not the hope, but it is a place of blessedness with the Lord. (Question) Dante. I should. That is one of the ^{great} books I'll read some day. As I understand it, from references to it, he uses his imagination quite vividly and goes into details. As Goodspeed said of the Apocalypse of Peter, he hellinizes hell. He puts in a lot of picture language/^{which is} intended I think in Dante to be symbolical, not to deny that the place of the punishment of the wicked is a real place, and it is a real torture, a real torment in this place, as Dives says, but I don't think Dante ~~intended~~ intended his details to be ~~filled~~ ^{filled} up; it is just a real, awful place of torment. (St)

I would take that as Dr. M. does, it's purely a matter of his imagination. I know one writer who said heaven is eight minutes away by angel flight, and he ~~figured~~ ^{figured} it out this way: that when Daniel started to pray, it takes eight minutes to read that prayer, and the angel said, I started when you started to pray. (laughter) I don't think heaven is eight minutes away. I don't think it is any distance away. It ~~is~~ might be simply wave-lengths, so far as I am concerned. I ~~do~~ rather think that as far as space-distance is concerned, the engineering problem of getting the soul of a departed one to heaven is not a matter of distant transportation, but nevertheless, it is a place of real blessedness with the Lord. (Dr. M: What do you mean by different wave-lengths?) Here we are, and we know ^{that} in this room there are any number of orchestra concerts, and there is a lot of jazz, and it is all representable in physical terms in this room, which is a definite place in the cyderial

universe. Now as you eeme- tune into a certain wave-length, you have a certain orchestra concert. Now you have one sense. Then with television you have two senses, sight and hearing. If you can get the other ~~g~~ three senses tuned in, and you have touch and taste and smell, you could go to a banquet, and physically..¹²(laughter) There is nothing intangible or not anything ¹² at all. When you are with the Lord you are having an experience with the Lord, you are a substantive entity; He is an actual being, not a creature of imagination; you really are with the Lord somewhere, but it doesn't matter where. (Dr. MacRae: What do you think, Dr. Buswell, we ought to do next time, do you think we should go into Rev. 20, or take Amos 9 and Acts 15. Which do you think...right now?) Dr. B: It is immaterial to me. I think Rev. 20 certainly needs another going over. Fine. (Dr. M:/ Would you like to take Rev., the last half of 19 and 20, and go more into detail on it next time?) Dr. B: Very good.

think

Dr. M: R^{ad} anything that you/would be helpful in that connection. (St) I enjoyed very much reading this article of yours, and I think it would be very good if you and Dr. B ~~W/P/A/G/P/L//~~ prepared lectures one week after another on 13 .Possibly Dr. B could give one on the two resurrections.....) Dr. M: Well, there are the two approaches, taking a passage and seeing what's in it, and then there is the gathering together from the different passages, and I think there is great value in both of them, and I think that it is fine that we should take up both methods at different times. (Dr. B: The two resurrections come right into Rev. 20, and we could gather together the other 13 1/2) (St) Dr. ~~R//~~ M: R^v. 20 introduces that subject very nicely, the question of one or two resurrections. (end of record) (end of lecture)

....question that you had about my pamphlet, but the last hour, I think, we were away ~~fp~~ from the pamphlet on a matter which merely grew out of a discussion on the pamphlet, the question as to whether the word "heaven" in the Bible was a specific place, and we noticed that the word "heaven" in most places means the sky, or it means the rest of the universe apart from this earth. And whether ³there is a particular one spot in which the deceased souls of the righteous go in the intermediate period, would be a matter that would not come out of the use of the word "heaven" but for which we would look for evidence in other sources. And if there is such a place, we have no evidence as to where it ~~might be~~, but we do have definite statements that there will be a resurrection upon this is earth, a ~~rais~~ing of the dead. And now today we are going to ~~la~~/ look into Rev. 19, the last half, and 20 with it, and we are going to hear from Dr. B.

Dr. B: Rev. 19 starts off with the proclamation, a marvelous choral antithesis of the sovereignty of God, and the discussion of the wicked system of the world. Beginning with the eleventh verse you have a vision of the coming of Christ. I believe the choruses, the responses of the first part of the nineteenth chapter are intended to give the setting, both in mode of feeling and in general interpretation for the narrative description that begins in verse 11. It seems reasonable to take it that way. I remember Goodspeed commenting on ~~it/that~~ the musical value of the Book of Revelation. He had been on a committee to select a text to be painted on the wall over the pulpit in one of their modernistic churches there, the Hyde Park Baptist Church in Chicago, ⁿⁿconnected with or more or less associated with the Divinity School of the University. And he told us with some enthusiasm that they had made their selection from the choruses in the Book of Revelation, and they had ~~chosen~~ ^{chosen} this text, ~~that~~ "Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." Well of course, if they would only stick to that text it would be a great

thing. But back there in that church, at that time, the doctrines of H. G. Wells, the finite God, were proclaiming by different popular speakers. It is very dangerous to take the poetry of the Bible and forget that it means anything. It sounds nice; it is elevating; the words are musical to our ears as we read them. But this is a definite part of the nineteenth chapter, shouting and singing and in great triumph for the sovereignty of God in His victory over wickedness. And in verse 11, "And I saw the heavens standing open (that's perfect passive participle might be so translated, "the heavens opened") and see, a white horse, and Him who sat upon him, with whom is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness He judges and He makes war, and His eyes are as a flame of fire, and upon His head are many diadems, and He has a name written which no one knows but Himself, and He is clothed in a garment that 4 1/2 with blood, and His name is called, The Logos of God." This picture of course is the continuation of the musical and poetical feeling that you have prior to the beginning of the paragraph, but this is a picture of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Heavens, how He comes as the man of war--(St) Well, the root is the same. The ~~1/2~~^{1/20} verbs are simply reiterated, bapto and baptizo are practically interchangeable-- (Dr. M: Does that make much sense, "the garments dipped in blood"? Wouldn't it be "sprinkled in blood"?) Well, it is a picture of the warrior-king whose garments are soaked in blood--(Dr. M: It is not that you take the garment off and dip it--) No, No. (Blood sprinkled suggests it--) It's His own blood^d that is spattered all over the garment. ~~1/2~~^{visible} Christ's last/appearance to the unsaved people of the world^{was} ~~1/2~~ His blood-spattered body on the cross. I isn't dipped in the sense of "submerged". You see what I mean? This is the word which is used in the Septuagint when the living bird and the hyssop and the wood¹ and the wood for the fire are all dipped in the blood of the one bird that had been killed. It doesn't mean "to be submerged", but anyway, ~~this is~~

"His garments were bloodstained".. That is obviously the meaning there. Here is a marginal reference in Nestle to Isaiah 63, which I believe is the passage, "Who is this who cometh with dyed garments from Bozrah," ---"trodden the winepress alone", that is, anyone who would tread a winepress would doubtless have his garments spattered with wine, and that is the picture here. Here is this blood-stained warrior, Christ, coming, riding upon a white horse, and the glory and color of His appearance. (St: Is this reality or a vision? Is Christ to come on a horse out of heaven?) For John, of course, it is a vision. John saw this vision. He gave the interpretations from time to time, just enough to make it perfectly clear that he is describing in vision form things to come in the future. That is John's style in the Apocalypse. (St: What is the point of the horse?) For a person of John's time, a conquering ~~no~~ warrior on a horse leading an army would have quite a significance, whether he actually sat on a horse or not. Now here is the expression, "men on horseback", which has come right down through our common law. You know that if it's still so, the reason why you can cross the street in Philadelphia against the red lights is because of Dr. Machen. At least it was so, and I guess it's still so. The city was about to pass an ordinance forbidding pedestrians to cross against the traffic lights. Dr. Machen studied the old common law, the pedestrian as over against the men on horseback. He went and appeared before the city council and pled the cause, and at least at that time they didn't pass the law. He was for liberty in the true sense of the word. The man on horseback can go ahead. The same is true in Boston the last time I was there. I saw a couple of women acrossing against the lights, and the policeman whistled at them, and the woman stood, turned right around in the middle of the traffic, and ~~she said~~ "You know I've got a right to stand here." And he said,

"All right, lady, but please move along." (laughter) That comes from the old thought of a man on horseback. Now French law is directly to the contrary--if you impede the traffic, you get arrested for being in the way of the man on horseback, or the man in the automobile. So the picture of the conquering captain riding on a white horse and leading his army is very clear, and the question of whether it be a physical horse or not is immaterial. I've been told that those who have attended services conducted by rather ignorant people among the colored people, that the horse is one of the favorite themes. They get worked up into a great lather of eloquence about this horse--how big he is, how they can hear him neigh clear across the sky. They love to dwell upon things that are irrelevant, or things that make the picture magnificent. John sees the vision, and there is enough of direct interpretation, direct didactic material in all these visions to make it clear, Now this is the vision of what is going to be, but not in such detail as to demand that the horse shall be shod with iron hooves, and shop-shod, or smoothe-shod, or any of those details. I hope he'll be sharp shod. I had a ride on Mr Berkfield's little palomino, a beautiful little horse, a nice ride, and then the horse slipped on the wet grass, and fell down on my foot. The stirrup was here and the horse was here, and my leg was in-between, and no cocks at all on his shoes--just slipped on the wet grass. It wasn't her fault or my fault. So I hope the Lord is sharp-shod. But I don't think those details are intended in a literary masterpiece like this where you have tremendous figures, and events of cosmic significance, the horse does definitely give atmosphere to the picture. I would think that obviously it is not intended to be interpreted in terms of the details of just what the horse was going to be. "And the armies, which are in heaven, followed Him upon white horses." Now this is not the question of the (Dr. M: They're not dipped in blood...their clothes) "They are clothed in

fine linen, white and clean, which is the righteousness of the saints." You see, He shed His blood for our sins, and we are clad in fine linen, white and clean. He died for us, and we do not bear the penalty for our sins. That is quite a picture. So He comes with His ~~saints~~ here. These are ^o obviously the redeemed, that is to say in this righteousness of His, which is imputed and imparted to us. I think this ~~is a picture of His coming to the final destruction of the beast at the end of the time that is called the wrath of God. I think that the resurrection and the catching up of the same has taken place some little time before, and that this is the end of the time of the wrath of God.~~ ~~is-a-picture-~~ But that gets into detail which we haven't got hold of in our discussion so far. But to read on, He leads these armies upon white horses, clothed in white linen, white and clean, "and from His lips there proceed forth a sword, a sharp one, so that with it He smites the nations." en auto. If you want to get into a question of Greek, Robertson would insist that "en auto" means locative, and not instrumental--"in the sword He smites the nations." But most of us would say, "by it He smites the nations." "And He shepherds them with a rod of iron--" Mr. Hamilton brought out the suggestion that the rod of iron is for the protection of the sheep, not for beating the sheep, but for against the world, of course, it is for beating off the wolves. "An Oriental shepherd," so he said, "would have a ^{heavy} club with iron spikes in it, and that would be used to beat off anything that might attack the sheep. So the nations-- this is not merely for the protection of the sheep, but you have the statement there that with this sword which proceeds from His lips He smites the nations, and He rules them with the rod of iron. He's taking the sheath and smiting down all that is wicked. And He treads the winepress of the wine of the wrath of God. There you have both the words thumos and orgē. Thumos is "outward wrath"; orgē is "steady settled attitude of wrath". This ~~is~~ "treading the winepress" would

suggest that the passage in Isaiah of treading the winepress in the background of John's mind. And He has, upon His garments, and upon His thighs, a name written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Now Warfield's book says that this passage means the beginning of the Gospel Age. There is one point which he thinks... (end of record)

...and since the sword is called "The Word of God", ^{or} and the Word of God is called a sword, therefore in this case it must be the Word of God; therefore this whole vision must go back to the beginning of the Christian era and describe the work of Christ down through all the years in spreading the gospel throughout all the nations. But you know that figures of speech do not always have the same interpretation in all contexts. So that there are so many points that will not fit. ~~But~~ He brings the armies of heaven with Him, and He comes surely this time in wrath, and not in evangelism. It does seem quite preposterous to follow Warfield's suggestion. Then verse 17, "I saw an angel standing in the sun, and he cried with a great voice saying--(Question: Are you bringing together in that the beginning of the set-up of the millenium and the rule of Christ with a rod of iron with the treading of the winepress of the wrath of God? Would you say those two are final things?) The beginning of the millenium, yes. The pouring out of His wrath on the wicked people who are destroying the earth is one of the first events of His kingdom period. The second trumpet announces the beginning of His wrath, the outpouring of His wrath, and then aside from explanatory material, it is followed by the pouring out of seven bowls full of wrath on the people of this earth. I picture this vision of the coming of Christ as the climax of the wrath of God with reference to the wicked; His final destruction of the beast and the false prophet, and His binding Satan for the thousand years. So this picture surely leads right straight up to the binding of Satan. (Question: What general view of Revelation are you taking, or are you assuming that--) I am not

assuming a thing, I hope. That is, I have such a different view from any other that you could classify, that I always try to go with no assumptions until we build up our assumptions--no particular assumptions. This passage as it stands surely seems to be a ~~1/2~~ literary unit through verse 3 of chapter 20. (Question) Well, you can unless there is something to the ~~1/2~~ contrary. That is, someone is always 3 interpreted to challenging in saying, "You have left out part of the relevant context." If you find any relevant context that would forbid us to begin with chapter 19 and read straight through to verse 3 of chapter 20, and then look at it as a geshtalt, well then, we should examine the objection. (Question) Well that is an old figure that comes from back in Isaiah, "by the breath of His mouth will He slay the wicked." I think that this passage leads right up to the casting of the beast into the Lake of Fire, and the false prophet, and the binding of Satan. That is the climax of this particular paragraph in which we are. Now then, "the sword proceeding from His lips" fits in with a good many different references to His word of wrath that is His power to destroy the wicked. Matthew 25, "When He comes He will slay the wicked: "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and His angels." That which proceeds from His lips is not only the word of grace, but also the word of wrath in a good many different Scriptures. To take that one figure and say it must mean "the word of grace" and ignore all the rest of the passages is really what Warfield does. I am a great admirer of Warfield. I had a great, great blessing just recently, in the past six months, in reading all through his Christology and "The Lord of Glory" and quite a number of other works in his Christology. And knowing him as well as I think I do, at least I feel that I admire him very keenly, but when I get into his eschatology I always feel that he is a very busy man and he just can't take time to focus on the subject; he tries so hard to brush it off. He just snaps ~~1/2~~ it off and dismisses it and get back to other great doctrines in which he is perfectly magnificent. He really

doesn't focus on eschatology. He used to say that he hadn't made much of a study of it. And when he gets through with this passage he frankly says, "We'll have to come back to it. I haven't got at the bottom of the interpretation." That is characteristic of his eschatology. And so, the sword of His lips, meaning His wrath against the wicked, is a familiar Scriptural illustration. Now this angel standing in the sun, and crying out with a great voice resembling-- and assembling the birds of prey to feast upon the flesh of horses and captains and all of that, that is simply indicates the terror of the devastation, the awful carnage that is going to be spread over the world at the destruction of the kingdom of the beast. (Student: You don't think that would mean the conversion of the Catholics?) Well--"come feast on their flesh"--I don't know what kind of a bird would feast on the flesh of a man if flying meant his conversion. It is certainly not said at all, and you have so many, many Scriptures about the wrath of God against the wicked connected with the second coming of Christ. Now verse 19. (St: 19:3-20?) I would take the whole passage, 19:1 to 23 as one section, but I do think that there is a paragraph division after verse 10, because up to verse 10 there is no progressive narrative, it is simply an outburst of praise and ex- antiphones, and psalms--- psalms. There are great ejaculatory phrases there up to verse 10. With verse 11 narrative progress begins, so I would make the paragraph division there. But the whole chapter 19 is involved. 19:19 "And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth and their armies gathered together to make war with Him who sat upon the horse and with His armies. That, of course, must be tied in with what goes before--the beast had gathered the armies of the earth to a place called Armageddon. I suppose that means the plateau of Megiddo, the hill country of Megiddo, and here they are gathered together, not for an international war, but to fight against Him who sat upon the horse and against His armies. (Question) Yes; there is so much Scripture that all converges upon the assemblage of the armies of the nations to fight

against Christ at His Second Coming. This all fits together so consistently that I think that just as Herod, in the time of the birth of Jesus, sought to put Him to death, so this world dictator thinks that by military power he can prevent Him from seizing Jerusalem. (ST: How do they know that Christ is coming?) Just as in the case of Herod, he got the Bible students to tell him, and so, a lot of people of the world, who, though they don't accept the Lord, they are superstitious enough to believe in Bible prophecy, and Herod was going to kill the baby Jesus. You know that Mussalini's march into Ethiopia may have been caused partly by what I consider a misinterpretation of passages in Daniel I heard Ralph Norton tell how he had called on Mussalini, and Ralph Norton said that he told him that Bible prophecy indicated that the Roman Empire would be restored in its widest historical boundaries. And Mussalini was much impressed by what Norton said, as Norton told the story. Well, sure enough, pretty soon they actually put up maps of the widest historical extent of the Roman Empire in the plazas there in Rome, and Mussalini said, "Let's conquer the world." And he did what he could of it. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if what Norton said had something to do in a remote way, with, I suppose, many other factors involved. (Question) Oh yes. The 10 1/2 of Scriptures in the Old Testament, looking forward to His sitting upon the throne of David and reigning in Jerusalem. (Student:... No man knows when He is coming back.) Well, as I understand the situation, the rapture of the church ~~is~~ has taken place, and as I see it, there is no ground for any secret rapture, but it is the most attended sign that the wicked world has ever seen. He just snatches out all the born-again people suddenly, in an instant of time, from all the intricate organizations of this world. And I believe it will be visible, and ~~is~~ audible; at least if it isn't visible and audible to the wicked people, they'll know that something has happened, and just ^{as} when these wise men appeared in Jerusalem, and they said, "Where is the Messiah? We have been

studying the heavens, we have been studying, and where is He that is to be born?" Herod looked, and asked the Bible students, and they told him, "In Bethlehem." And so that Christ will reign on the throne of David is so commonly understood in the prophecies, that after Christ has taken His own to be with Himself, and the beast feels that he can prevent the second coming of Christ to--that is, seizing Jerusalem. Armageddon isn't a battle at all in any portion of Scripture, it is a military cantonnement. The battle seems to be in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and a very widely extended affair. The prophecy is that Christ will come, and His feet will stand upon the Mount of Olives, so if the beast can fortify the Valley of Jehoshaphat, he can prevent Christ from taking Jerusalem. (Question) I have been thinking of an illustration with which to set forth a certain important principle--Some passages of Scripture are close-ups of details; other passages are what you might call wide-lens snapshots. I was reading about the telescopes out there in California, the 200-inch. I read that if they try to photograph the heavens with that 200-inch, it would take about 2000 years. What they did--they have a very remarkable wide-lens telescope, that is almost as remarkable a device as the 200-inch. With this wide-lens they photograph a considerable area, and they expect within a reasonable time to have a photographic survey of all the heavens with that wide-lens. And then, as they progress, they focus the 200-inch on the details within the wide photograph. Now I would say that I. Thess. 2 is a wide-lens photograph, which includes this particular close-up. I think that is a fair way to put it when you say, "Is it the same event?" (Question) In Joel, you remember the "day of the Lord" is first used with reference to temporal events, to temporal judgment, and then he 14 1/2 to what seems to be the eschatological portions, and was a time of conflict and judgment upon the wicked. (Dr. M: I don't think you should ^{ever}/~~have~~ said, "the day of the Lord comes"....) (St: I. Thess.) But that comes with reference to the wicked. In I. Peter 3, "the day of God" comes with reference to the wicked as a thief. And then, "the day of the Lord".. (end 6) recd

...and extended passage. It comes as an unexpected event for the wicked, but within it there are a great many complex events. Does that cover your point? (St: No. In the first place, the "day of the Lord" shall come as a thief in the night. Isn't that in regard to the wicked...this in Rev. in regard to the wicked?) Now as I understand it, the day of the Lord in the eschatological sense would refer to the whole eschatological complex, and its initiation is as a thief in the night. I believe that the first thing that will wake up the wicked is the fact that eschatology is upon them may be the rapture of the church. So, it comes suddenly and unexpectedly. I believe that the rapture of the church occurs, and then God begins to pour out bowls full of wrath. I don't believe they are literal bowls, either, but pour out His wrath upon the earth, and this beast is given about three and a half years to carry on, and as he carried on, it becomes more and more apparant to him that Christ is in the heavens about to take possession of this earth, visibly. So, at the sixth bowl full of wrath, he gathers the armies of the world to a place called Armageddon, and now, following the seventh bowl full of wrath, he gathers his armies--I suppose he marches them down--to Jerusalem, and prepares to fight against the Lord, to prevent His taking the earth. (Question) Two weapons, the sword that proceeds from His lips and the rod of iron. But you are quite right that He does all the fighting. It is supernatural warfare. He doesn't use any ^{HUMAN} weapons in His destruction of the beast. It is supernatural overwhelming. (Question) I am not a cartographer, but you look at the back of your Bible; Megiddo is up there to the north and a little to the west, and Jehoshaphat is the valley a little to the east of Jerusalem; the Mount of Olives is east of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, just overlooking the temple. So if a military power controlled the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and the Mount of Olives--he evidently tries to surround Jerusalem. Many things converge to indicate a hostile, wicked Gentile power endeavoring to capture and destroy Jerusalem. Zechariah 14 is one of the most vivid descriptions of what I think is the same event.

(Question) Who will destroy it physically? The beast wants to prevent the coming of Christ, and Zechariah says that he will probably destroy Jerusalem in doing that. (St: Will these outpourings of the wrath of God have decreased the number of people on the earth...some idea of the size of this army...) The vial that breaks out between the four angels which I think are figures of speech for four military powers, at the sixth trumpet, are said to destroy the third part of the human race, and I do think that in the outline of Revelation it is clear that the vials of wrath are subsequent to the seven trumpets, so that you can draw an inference that a third part of the human ~~///~~ race has been killed off, but still there will be, I believe, a lot of people here. The population of the world is a great deal larger now than it was a thousand years ago; far larger, and we are just as wicked as we were then. If you killed a third of the people of the world now, I think the population wouldn't be as small as it was in the First Century A. D., probably. (Dr. M: It would be much larger.) Anyway, there is great ^{DEVASTATION} 5 1/2. But if you did a thing at the sixth trumpet, the numbers of the soldiers, the number of soldiers given, 200,000,000 fighting strength--I heard somebody say that if you get all the ^{forces} ~~herds~~ of the world today, the various nations might muster 200,000,000 military personnel. Now whether that is a round number or not, nobody knows. This endeavor to surround and retain Jerusalem is focused upon by so many different Scriptures, and so much in line with Herod tried to do at the time of the birth of Christ, that it seems to me that it is a literal event. (Of ^{? 6 1/4} course it describes) many figures of speech connected with it, but the actual fighting against the Lord. The Second Psalm pictures "the kings of the earth set themselves, the rulers take council together against the Lord, and against His anointed. 'Let us break their bands asunder, let us cast away their cords from us.' He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." Somebody stand up and sing that tenor solo, "I Will Dash Them In Pieces As a Potter's Vessel". Many different

passages seem to look toward an actual endeavor of the kingdom of the beast to prevent Christ from taking possession of this earth. The conclusion of the battle is that the beast is taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles in his presence, and these were cast alive into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. The armies of the beast, who had received his mark, they were slain with the sword that proceeds from his mouth. Now there you see what the sword does. The people who had committed themselves to the beast in the sense of being ^{willing to} worship him, the Scripture declares that they will suffer eternal punishment; those are the people who are slain by the sword from His mouth, so that the sword from His mouth couldn't be evangelism. That would deny the doctrine of eternal security, among other things. The people who have the mark of the beast are slain with His mouth. (Student) Well that of course is prior in the picture. I think personally, to anticipate, that the beast is the same as the man of sin in II. Thess. 2, and that the false prophet is a counterfeit--you see, there is a counterfeit trinity here. The beast is the antichrist. He claims to be God in the flesh-- Christ is God in the flesh. The ~~1147/1147~~ false prophet compels men to worship the beast. The Holy Spirit of God persuades men to Christ. And then the dragon, of course, is the other figure in the counterfeit. So this person is the beast, who is here presented as a world dictator who has political, religious, and economical authority over the whole world. (St: Do you think the lake of fire here mentioned is a literal place?) It is a literal place, so far as the word place goes. Now just what "burning sulphur" signifies is another question. It certainly signifies the wrath of God, it certainly signifies awful torment. You ~~do~~ look up sometime the use of sulphur in (ancient ritual?). I think Hastings' Bible Dictionary has an article on sulphur, and the burning of sulphur has a symbolical significance. Certainly the lake burning in sulphur is literal torment of the resurrected wicked. Now just what is the chemistry of it-- that is beyond us. I don't what ^{is} the chemistry of eternal burning sulphur.

I don't know the chemistry of pure gold, as it were transparent glass. I just don't know that kind of chemistry. But I do know that the latter is something very wonderful and beautiful, and that the former ^{is something} of unspeakable terror. (St: Are only the beast and the false prophet cast into the lake of fire? Are they the only inhabitants of it at this time...) There is no mention of anyone else being cast into the lake of fire at the beginning of the millenium. They are cast alive. You see in the Bible, two persons seem to have been translated into immortality without death, Enoch and Elijah. Then we believe that those who live until the Second Coming of Christ will be so translated, that is, Christians. Now then, here you have two persons who seem to be translated into eternal punishment without having died. They are simply cast alive into eternal doom. The rest of ~~the~~ the dead do not come alive until the end of the thousand years; Satan is not cast into the lake of fire until the end of a thousand years. (Question) Now those who come with Christ have been raised from the dead. I believe ^{there is a} that ~~the~~ definite paragraph division beginning with verse 4 in chapter 20 and that verse 4 of ch. 20 goes back to the resurrection which has been previously mentioned in the seventh trumpet. Therefore I make a definite break at the end of verse 3. And I believe that this goes back to the time of the rapture. (Question) That, of course, gets 12 1/2 details and I think I have all the details, but we don't have the time--. These plan that men shall worship the beast, and it is a command that comes, I think, just prior to the rapture of the church. We get into a lot of ~~detail~~ detail there. But Christ spoke of a tribulation, a thlipsis, not orgn, but a tribulation, which would be the worse tribulation that will ever be seen before or after, and it is not the time of His wrath, but a tribulation. It will be very short. I think that there is plenty of detail to show that before the rapture of the church, before the seventh trumpet, before the pouring out of the vials of wrath, there will be a world dictator who will demand world worship. He ~~won't~~ ^{will} have power enough to ~~stamp~~ ^{stamp}

stamp

down his authority, and to put to death a great many people who won't worship him. He wa'n't enforce it a hundred per cent--but I believe that will be a very short period. And then I believe the rapture of the church will mark the beginning of the pouring out of the wrath of God, and then all the born-again people are gone. Now then, if people get saved after the resurrection, right after the first resurrection, there will be few in numbers there for a while, and the beast will endeavor to put them to death. The mark of the beast has a great tribulation for the Lord's people, I think just preceeds the rapture of the church. That is quite contrary to your training, isn't it. Let's put that on ice for a while. That is getting quite a ways away. (Question) The false prophet--he forms the counterfeit assumption analagous to the Holy Spirit. It is his job to get people to worhip the beast, as it is the work of the Holy Spirit to get people to worhip Christ. By the way, when I was a pastor in Brooklyn in 1923-25, I wrote a little pamphlet on the Book of Revelation. I have always ~~hoped~~ to revise it and bring it up to date/.....(end of record)

e 51

...just as it was, with a few ink notes in it, and you can have it for a quarter. I am afraid that I can't/~~///~~ give it away, as Dr. M gives away his. If you want that old pamphlet that I worked out in about 1924 "An Outline of the Revelation", send a quarter and my secretary will send a copy. I have some views, you know, that are quite detailed, and ~~A~~ not fundamental. I think I can boast that I've never quoted anybody's argument, atleast on my side, because...^(these are?)... fundamentals that are interesting and of some value. But what we're trying to get here now in this 19th ch and the 20 ch. is God's perspective of the millenium, and then we are leading on toward the two resurrections/ which are described in the 20th ch. The armies of the beast, then, are slain. Those who have received the mark of the beast are slain with the sword of the Lord. It proceeds from His lips. Now the Twentieth Chapter. I don't think there

should be a break there because the beast and the ~~the~~ false prophet and his armies and Satan are all destroyed here. "And I saw an angel coming down ~~out~~ out of heaven, having the key of the abyss, and a great chain in its hand." I have read this through in class, but let's go over it a couple of times. "The beast seized the dragon, the ancient serpent, who is the devil and Satan (there is plenty of identification there--all of his aliases...) and he bound him a thousand years (that is, he bound him so that he would stay bound for a thousand years) then he hurled him into the abyss, and he locked it and sealed it over him, so he should deceive the nations no longer, no more, until the thousand years are finished. After these things it is necessary to loose him--(that is, for him to be loosed(-passive) a little season. (Question, Dr. M: Do you think the thousand years and the little season are the same time viewed from different viewpoints?) It says "after"/--it couldn't be "the same time." He is ^{to} bound a thousand years, and ~~after~~ after the thousand years --meta tauta. And the tauta has to refer to nearest thing in the context-- "after these things it is necessary for him to be loosed a little season." So The "little season" is clearly described later. (St) Not an iron chain with a material, physical lock on it, no. You see, a spirit is in space. If you follow my philosophy, anyway. Space is just room. And God operates in space. God is not limited by space relationships, everything is immediately in His presence, but God is operative in space. And the devil operates in space, even though he is non-physical. You see, race extensa, according to your Critision view, race extensa is material object, but race cogitan, nevertheless has a locality. Race cogitans is not extended, but your non-material being is local, in the body, as long as you live in this body, so a place, but certainly no metallurgy is involved in the study ~~of~~ of the chain, and no blacksmith's art in the key and the lock and the seal. He is confined and limited. (St: I have heard the argument raised that no ordinary angel could bind Satan, because he is more ~~powerful~~ powerful than they, and therefore this angel must be the presence of the

ARGUMENT FOR THE BINDING IN THE GOSPEL AGE
 Lord Jesus Christ, according to verse 20) I am inclined to think that this angel who binds Satan is a picture of Christ, but I can't see that that would show that Christ bound him in this sense in the Gospel Age. You see, Christ indicates that Satan was always bound, at all times, in all dispensations--Satan has never been off a chain. My father was preaching on Job, and he used to say, "God has the devil on a dog-chain," and he would use the illustration that the devil couldn't go any farther than the Lord's permissive will. And the angels that kept not their first estate are kept in darkness and caverns of darkness (in Peter and Jude, you know), awaiting their judgment, and yet they roam about this world, if you identify the fallen angels with the demons, which I do. They are bound, and their destiny ~~is~~ is predicted, but they are not prevented from deceiving the nations, so that the binding of Satan, in this particular sense, is something future. The binding of Satan in the sense that God can deliver a lost soul was something that surely did not take place temporarily when Christ came. That had always been the picture during the time of Joel. And Christ made that remark about binding the strong man before the cross, and subsequent to His casting out demons. The fact that Christ, before He died and rose again, could cast out demons proves that Satan was always within the sovereign power of God. So the reference to the binding of the strong man, in the words of Christ, is prior to the cross, and so it applies to the time prior to the cross, but this is a different kind of a binding. It is specified, "to deceive the nations no more" for a period of time. (Question) That of course is what Warfield said. Deceive the nations no more until the thousand years are finished, and after that, it is necessary for him to be loosed a little season. Warfield gets to that point, and then he gives up. (St: The devil did actually have power under the law, and it had to be until Christ died until the cross and conquered him from having dominion over us, over this lost world...?) Well, the exercise of Satan's power over

a wicked man is relatively the same in all dispensations. Otherwise God couldn't have saved anybody in the Old Testament. God saved people from S_atan's power in the Old Testament. (St) My, my, as a whole. I wonder if there are any more, in percentage, born-again people now than there were in Isaiah's time; I hope so, but I am not at all sure. Look at the mediaval period, when the gospel almost died out, and that is subsequent to the time of Christ. In our generation, our fathers lived through a marvelous missionary period, the like of which the world has never seen before, a marvelous time of world evangelism which we hope hasn't stopped. But up to the beginning of the Eighteenth Century there were remarkable missions, but the world ~~lieth~~ lieth in the lap of the wicked one now, and in his hand. I can't see any difference between the power of S_atan, with reference to sinners before Christ and after Christ chronologically. Of course, any man who ever got saved in the Old Testament time was saved because of the blood of Christ, and it was just as certain before it took place as it is now after ~~it~~ it took place, so God always had complete power over the devil. A lot of people, especially those who incline toward post-millennialism, have a sort of (radio geshicht) idea, religious evolution, but God is gradually getting the world into His hands. Finally, when He gets control, He'll never let go again. That, of course, is a very spurious argument. God never lost control of this world. He permitted sin, He still permits sin--"the passing over of sins done aforetime", and there's the passing^{over}/of sins done now, because there is a provision for the putting away of sin, and He ~~is~~ is going to have a climax at which He will not tolerate sin anymore on this earth, and you have the kingdom of righteousness. Then He is going to withdraw His hand ~~once~~ once more, and show by a final fling of Satan the nature of evil, and the nature of righteousness. He is the same sovereign God all the way through. The binding of Satan not to deceive the nations until the thousand years are finished, and then he must be loosed for a little season.

Now I would put a paragraph sign there. It seems to me that John now goes back to the ^{rapture,} and he describes again the resurrection. I ^{think,} ~~think,~~ and a good many people think, that the first resurrection takes place, or took place, in stages. There is one group of people raised at the seventh trumpet, and then successive resurrections all along through the time of the wrath of God, and then a final section of the resurrection ~~is~~ just at the end of the time of wrath. I cannot hold that view any longer. For one reason, Paul says, "We shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, ~~at~~ the last trump. The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we ~~shall~~ shall be changed." The resurrection of the redeemed at the appearing of Christ seems to be clearly described as an instantaneous event, a moment, a twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. So I think it is ...12 1/2... that this is a paragraph division, and you go back now, and John describes the vision of the resurrection. At the ^{seventh} ~~seventh~~ trumpet he describes a reward for the righteous dead. "Now is the time for rewards of thy ^vserants the prophets and all those who fear thy name, the small and the great." That seems to correlate. Now you see these "thrones, and persons sat upon them, judgment was given to them, and I saw the sould of those who had been beheaded on account of the testimony of Jesus, and ~~for~~ on account of the Word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast nor his image." That is to say, the hoitines is an "and who". You do not have to ascribe all the characteristics of this group to each individual in the group, grammatically. This group includes those who have been beheaded for the word of God, and this group includes all those who were not members of the kingdom of the beast, and "they came to life--that is ^esan. Alford is very strong on that. Dr. M brought this out some years ago. They ~~have~~ not received his mark in their foreheads, neither in their ~~had~~ hands, and they came to life, and reigned with Christ for a thousand years. The article is used there in some texts, not in all texts. It isn't important. They reigned with Christ a thousand years. (St) Where did the angel come down to bind the devil? ~~(St)~~

(St) The last thing you had was on this earth and, there is no reason to think the "they came to life" has taken place anywhere but on this earth. Verse 8q he went out to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth. Rev. 5:17,.....(end of record)

It's the reign of Christ on the earth, the place of the reigning with Christ on this earth in 5:10. (St)It's on this earth; "they shall reign with Christ on the earth" in 5:10. (St) In 20:4, you certainly haven't come to the new heavens and the new earth yet, and John sees the resurrection of the righteous dead. (St) I don't know where to put him. (St) Well, I'll tell you what my imagination tells me, if you are interested in my psychology. I ~~should~~ ^{just} think of the actual government of Christ over this physical earth as being locatged in the clouds. Now that is very fanciful, but I think of it that way. (Dr. M: James Orr, in one of his books, says ^{he thinks} that during the millenium there will be transit back and forth between heaven and earth on the part of ~~the~~ ^{the saints} ~~the~~...) "We shall reign with Him th epi/g^s, upon the earth" in 5:10. That is "on the earth", but it doesn't matter, it's just geography, where you put it. I would just ^{as soon} ~~assume~~ that the Lord was stationed in the ~~the~~ ^{n. y. c.} ~~3/4~~ on 55th St., ~~and I would like~~ to get that place straightened out. (St) Well, there is not the slightest evidence that it is in heaven, but there is a good deal of evidence that we will reign with Christ on the earth. (Dr. M; You don't mean to say, Dr. B, that you think the whole section of verse 3 and this starts a brand new thought... 2 1/2) True, yes--(Because in verse ^{2 and} 3 you have the thousand years ~~referred to~~ ^{referred to} several times, and in 4 and 5 it refers again~~x~~ to the thousand years, tying them very closely together.) Verse 4, I think, goes ~~back~~ in the chronology, and brings up, from the point of the resurrection right until the same time. You know, you have to do that in a narrative. You can't tell everything at once. One of the best illustrations ~~of~~ ^{of} narrative discourse is "Ivanhoe" by Walter Scott. He brings up 3

people, and 3 , the old castle, and then he brings up another group of people, and another group of people, and then in the battle he has the fat old Saxon go through the palace dressed like a priest, and saying, "...3 1/3 ..." to the different people, and then he brings up another group, and has to synch/ronize the story in that way. Now each particular unit of the narrative sets/^{the picture}for the next unit that is coming in. Some people call it "the law of recurrences"; it isn't a law, it is simply a fact that in telling a narrative you have to go back and bring up details, and all that I think is that verse 4, having introduced the fact of the thousand years, when Satan is bound so that he cannot deceive the nations, that John now goes back and brings up the resurrection of the saints just to show that they are reigning during this thousand years. (St) They are going to judge the world, and Paul even says, "We're going to judge angels." We are going to have rulership over so many cities in one of the parables. The resurrection people will be related to the flesh and blood people of the earth, as Christ was related to His apostles during the forty days. He went in and en/ out with them and had fellowship with them, and there was nothing uncanny about it, but He was in a different order of physics, a different order of physical being from theirs. Now the resurrection people neither marry nor are given in marriage. The flesh and people, who are not members of the army of the beast, and who hadn't received the mark of the beast, they simply were indeterminate, they go on into the millenium, and it simply says that the resurrection people, the immortal people, they are going to rule with Christ. They'll sit down with Him in His throne as He sat down in His Father's throne. (St) Use your imagination. Mine is tired. I don't mean that sarcastically. All~~x~~ that the Scripture says is that we are going to sit down with Him in H,s throne, and we are going to judge the earth. (Dr. M: I think that the difficulty is that our word "judge"^{when}-/we think of the Last Judgment, we think of a deciding whether a man is to be convicted or not. This is more like the

judges in the Old Testament days, they decided cases, and they settled problems, they direct affairs in general, rather than giving a final crisis decision. Isn't that it?) Yes. They give advice/ ^{and guide the people.} (St:...

In the resurrection they would sit on twelve thrones judging...) Yes, that is another one. It fits right in there. I made a study one time of all the references to our reigning with Christ, and all the references to our feasting and banqueting with Him in His kingdom. I think I got all the passages of Scripture--I'm just giving you a summary now--it's in a little book which you can't get because it is out of print--never are the saints said to be reigning with Christ in this life, on this earth, but always reigning with Christ in the future, subsequent to the resurrection, and ^{the} feasting and banqueting with Him comes at the restoration, the 7 . And Paul rebukes the Corinthians for acting like kings, and he says, "I wish you really were kings, reigning, because if you were reigning, we would be reigning too." And the inference is, we are certainly not reigning now. "If we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him."

I can only make a suggestion, because I don't have all those notes, but you can look it up for yourself. Our reigning with Christ is future, but it is a definite reigning with Christ. I sympathize with your question, because I took quite a bit of political science in school, and I was always interested in it, and I always thought that if your Republican party would elect me as their candidate, maybe I would make a good president, or something like that. I had a course one time in Government of American Cities. Monroe is a great textbook on that field. I'm interested in it to such an extent that I realize that we can't fill in the details. Now I heard a Modernist give an illustration one time on something like this. It was Willert of Chicago. He was speaking over in France during the First World War, and he was speaking ~~about~~ about immortality. He believed in immortality. And he mentioned the soldiers who had ridiculed the notion of a future life, and he said, "We can't answer all the questions about

immortality any more than we could explain to ~~a~~/~~n~~/~~y~~/born child the nature of the world in which it is about to come. Now there is an unborn child whose lungs are collapsed, he has never inhaled the atmosphere. And he has lungs. He has never felt the ground, and yet he has limbs. He has never seen the light, and yet he has eyes. He has never taken in food through his mouth, and yet he has a mouth. And imagine trying to explain to ~~an~~/~~y~~/ unborn child the kind of a world he is going to come into. That is Willert's illustration. I thought that was pretty good. There are a lot of things about the engineering and the physical science of the millenium that we just don't know. But we do know this is a sketch of a picture. Reigning with Him, we will exercise sovereignty along with Him, and we'll be related to the people of this earth in a way that is not uncanny, although we'll not be their order of flesh and blood in the millenium. (St) You cooperated with my wife on that. She doesn't like my idea about the throne in the clouds. She says "on the earth" has to be "resting on the ground". I say that if it is in the tenth ϕ floor of a building, it still is on the earth. I would only say that $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$, when I am in an airplane, I'm on the earth--(Dr. M: But you are in heaven). No, I'm here. (St) The phrase constantly recurs in the New Testament, $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ "in the hea^vens, and on earth"/; it is synonymous with (Hebrew) , the very first verse of Genesis, "in heaven and on earth. $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$, "in this earthly realm of being". I always insist that when I am in an airplane I am still on earth. My wife doesn't think so. I had it all figured ϕ out, you know, how that hte Lord's throne could be located in the air, and He could send His messengers quickly from one place to another. Anyway, the Lord will reign on the earth; it will be an earthly reign. That's clear. (Qu.) Well, the souls that are subject to~~a~~ the verb $\psi\epsilon\lambda\gamma\sigma\alpha\iota$. They came to life. I have always felt it is like saying, "I saw a man early in the morning in his pajamas, it was 50 below zero, and somebody close by, and he hustled into his clothes, and put on his fur overcoat, and ran outdoors,". And then somebody would

tell that story and say, "The man ran out doors in his pajamas." You see what I mean? I saw these souls, and they came to life and reigned with Christ. (St) It is the same context. It is the first main verb after the description of the ~~pl~~ people; it is grammatically in the same sentence. I saw thrones; ~~pl~~ they were occupied, and judgment was given to them. And I saw the ~~pl~~ souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the Word of God, and who had ~~not pl/pl~~ worshipped the beast, nor his image, nor received his mark in their foreheads or in their hands, and they came to life. You see, it is the first main verb after the souls. (St):Where do the Jews come into this verse?) You got the point of "they came to life"? These souls came to life and reigned with Christ.

14 . Now what about the Jews? I didn't see any right here. (St) Well you certainly haven't worshipped the beast. You don't belong to the kingdom of the beast. It is the truth-lover that didn't belong to the kingdom of the beast. It doesn't mention every possible classification, but--(St) Yes; all the people who didn't belong to the kingdom of ~~pl~~ the beast, including the martyrs, and all of these, they ~~pl~~ came to life and reigned a thousand years. Now some-- from other Scripture you know that though we do not all sleep, we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. The/resurrection of the righteous dead, and the change of the righteous living, and the snatching up to meet with the Lord, all comes in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. (St)

(End of record)

There is a second death; there are two idfferent orders of death. That is described not in the word 0 but in the context. Alford speaks quite radically. He says ~~ez~~san means they came to life, and it is used in exactly the same form, the rest of the dead didn't ~~ez~~san, until the end of the thousand years, the two terms being correlative in the way that they are used. Alfor says, "You can deny the Scriptures; but you can't believe the Scripture and deny two resurrections." That is how strong he puts it.

So, the souls came to life, and reigned a thousand years with Christ. (St: To take this passage literally is to explain away all the other passages. There seems to be one general resurrection.) We haven't got that far yet. I have a lot of material on the two resurrections. (St) The heads cut off some of them. (St) There's the blessed dead in heaven, the martyred dead, and they say, "Lord, how long?" And they are told that they will have to rest ~~awhile~~ awhile. Other people are going to seal their testimony with their blood. So that is a vision of the blessed dead in heaven, not resurrected, but told that they will have to wait. You believe that Christians who die go to be with the Lord in a conscious state? (St) And Paul said, To depart and be with Christ is far better? Isn't that clear? It is so simple and clear that all born-again people who die go to be with the Lord in a conscious state. Souls don't pass out of consciousness. (St) The dead are alive with the Lord. That is no contradiction, either, but they are going to come to life, in the sense that it is called "the first resurrection". (St) The ~~word~~ ^{word} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ this passage, in both groups, before and after the millenium, ~~it~~ ^{it} refers to the resurrection of the body. But the soul of the blessed is happy with the Lord, and the soul isn't dead when you die. (St) I didn't make the trumps figurative. ton 4 1/2 has a very clear ~~word~~ meaning, "to occupy a throne", "to exercise a certain lordship, a certain jurisdiction". These people have, each of them, a particular jurisdiction. I don't think there is anything especially figurative about that. (St) They came to life; this is the first resurrection. Read the 15th ch of I. Cor. I wonder if we aren't clear about the resurrection of the dead. Maybe we ~~should~~ ^{ought} to take a little time if you don't believe in the resurrection of the dead. (St):souls..and making them physical entities.) All that you've got, and it's all the Lord is going to give you out of this chapter, as far as that is concerned, "I saw souls. They came to life. This is the resurrection." (Dr. M: Ask Mr. Jones what he

means, "They came to life," if it isn't that.) What kind of a coming to life, which is a resurrection, what would it be? (St: The same sense in which Christ said, "I am the resurrection and the life"; in which Paul could say, "You were once dead, but now you are alive.") Well now I wonder maybe if the whole doctrine of the resurrection of the body is very obscure. Maybe we had just better go over that. Because when Christ said to Mary, "I am the resurrection and the life," He did not mean the same thing that Paul meant when he said, "You have a new life ~~in~~ in Christ." (St:...He that believeth in me...shall live...isn't that the same thing?) No. "He that believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and he who lives will never die." He is talking about the resurrection there. It is just as plain as can be, and all the great theologians hold it that way. "I am the resurrection. He that believeth in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and he who lives is never going to die again." Now that is not the new life in Christ. That is the resurrection. That is tremendously important, and has nothing to do with pre-mil or post-mil. That is just your plain resurrection teaching. (St: 6th verse seems to be a commentary on the 4th verse. "Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection.") That resurrection, the coming to life of souls, is as plain as the Lord ought to give it to us, I think. Souls come to life, which is a resurrection, ^{that} after all, you have in the Scripture about resurrection. (St: You make that to be 7 1/2) I don't make it anything. (Dr. M: All interpret it ~~in~~ that way. You take the new Revised Standard Version: "And they came to life" in both those cases. That they live here means that there will be something, and then something happens which can be spoken of as a change from one condition to another. And I believe, that regardless of viewpoint, practically all commentators take ~~it~~ it that way.) You wouldn't have any other meaning (Dr. M: And especially when, as Mr. J. said, vs 6 says, This is the first resurrection. It isn't "remain" in the resurrection; it is a change from something to something else.

(St: Isn't the word "soul" used with bodily resurrection....) That is your figure of mythonomy, but if you find any passage in any literature, in any language, where a soul ~~s~~ comes to life, which is a resurrection, and it means other than those words, then you tell me about it. That is just how plain it is. "I saw the souls of people who had had their heads cut off, and those who had not worshipped the beast, and they came to life." This is a picture of the resurrection. That is how simple and direct it is. So let's read on. "They reigned with Christ a thousand years, and the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years was finished. /See, Alford rubs it in ^{YOU} about the two resurrections here. The rest did not come to life, did not live. Now, if you take "they lived" in the sense that a soul is not extinct, but the rest of the dead were extinct then, /^{which}would be very violent. The souls of the dead are not extinct. The record of Divies and Lazarus is clear. Divies was not extinct. He was in a flame of torment. But Divies is going to come to life some day, in the sense of the second resurrection, and he stands before the great white throne. Now the rest of the dead, never having been extinct, nevertheless, they did not come to life until the thousand years were finished. "This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he who has a part in the first resurrection. Upon such people, the second death has no authority. But they will be priests of God, and of Christ, and they will reign with Him a thousand years. And when the thousand years were finished, Satan will be loosed out of his prison." This, ~~of~~ of course, is the thing that gripes the people who try to get rid of the literal millenium. The idea of another catastrophe, afterwards. And we would have to look into Ezekiel 37, 38, and 39. Myer and Alford and Zahn all identify this Gog and Magog rebellion here with the Gog and Magog rebellion in Ezekiel, and all interpret the Ezekiel Gog and Magog rebellion as coming after a definite period of the reign of the Messiah on the earth. The period of blessedness, and then the Lord once more withdraws His hand from Satan, and the final rebellion comes.

They don't get to first base. I'll never forget how Machen spoke one time. This was in a general assembly, the Second General Assembly of the P. C. A. He said, the great difficulty for him was the idea that after he sees the face of Christ, there is ever going to be any more trouble. ~~He said~~. I said, "I can understand how those who read the 38th and 39th chapters of Ezekiel feel that after an age of Messianic reign and peace and blessedness, there is a rebellion, but," he said, "I think that passage is capable of another interpretation." And then he really waxed warm and eloquent, and he said, "I like to think," those were just his words, "I like to think that when I see my blessed Lord, face to face, that that is the end of all trouble." And I am afraid that it is a "like to think". This Gog and Magog business isn't put in here by human imagination. It's here. And it is after a particular thousand years, in which the saints reign with Christ. In Ezekiel it comes after a period of peace and blessedness. Israel is dwelling under its King, its Messiah, and here Gog and Magog are destroyed by supernatural power, and do not hurt the people of God; it is all in Ezekiel, although there is a great deal more detail given in Ezekiel: the pouring out of supernatural power, and the "little season", in which Satan goes out to deceive the nations. As Ezekiel says, they take an evil thought, they devise an evil-^{device}eevee, and so on. They compass about the breadth of the earth or the land, they circle the camp of the saints and the beloved city, "and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them. And the devil, the one deceiving them, was cast into the Lake of Fire, where the beast and the false prophet are. And they will be tormented day and night, forever and forever. (St) The whole picture seems to indicate that after the Second Coming of Christ, for His own people, and the wrath against the wicked, the beast, the false prophet, and those who had actually received his mark, or had been members of his army, they are all killed.

The beast and the ~~fi~~a- false prophet are thrown into the Lake of Fire. But there is evidently a vast number of indeterminate people. If you take a cross-section of history of any point in time, you will find a considerable number of ^{the} elect who have not yet accepted the Lord, and of the non-elect who have not yet committed themselves to the kingdom of the beast. So there will evidently be a vast number of people, enough to populate the earth, who just haven't made up their minds yet. Also, I think it is true that a great number of Jews will be saved after the rapture of the church. There is a lot of Scripture that converges on this.

(end of record)

And they will be saved. But they have missed the rapture, you see. They will be flesh and blood people to populate the earth. So now, for a thousand years, Christ reigns, and I suppose in a relatively short time He destroys the curse of nature; He holds wickedness in restraint. For a thousand years the earth is ~~prep~~- prosperous and blessed. You can just imagine the multiplication of the population, and the vast ~~na~~- number of ~~peple~~- people who will ^{maybe} just accept the Lord as a matter of course; they will ~~have-the~~-- be like Adam--no--they will have the Adamic nature. The presence of Christ will counteract the Adamic nature, and any outbreking sins ~~senee~~; that will be somewhat analagous to Adam before the fall. There will be no outbreking sin. They haven't committed themselves to the Lord by taking the tree of life, that is, as Adam might have done. They simply have lived under His benign reign. Now then, just as soon as Satan goes out history repeats itself, and the Lord shows at the end of His millenial kingdom, ethically and spirituall, exactly the same thing that happened before. It is a vindication of God's redemptive program at the end, to show His righteousness as at the beginning. And ~~that~~- a vast number of people now go out after Satan, the same as Adam did, a number as the sand of the sea, and then comes this rebellion. That seems to be the picture exactly. (St: Will you say one more word about how they got

the millenium here? You said they/^{just} hadn't made up their minds about--?)
The Scripture says that all those who actually received the mark of the
beast or were members of his army were killed. I take that literally.
They were put to death, physically, at the Second Coming of Christ.
(St: I always felt that you were either in or you were out--you either
had the mark of the beast or) Well, that is true. The Scripture
does say that he decrees that everyone ϕ who won't worship him must be
put to death. But it is a human government, and it has a very short time
to last, and the evidence seems to be that he can't completely enforce it.
(Dr. M: After a thousand years...an increase of population.) Yes, even
though he should kill off a vast number of people, still there would be
enough to populate the earth, who won't be put to death by the beast, and
who will χ not have accepted Christ before the rapture. (St) There will
be people in flesh and blood during the millenium, begetting children
and populating the earth. (St) Don't make it too gradual. It will take
time, evidently, but I imagine that the Lord will do it relatively rapidly.
So, in a blessed earth, you have the intent of this $3\ 3/4$. Now
these people, Satan can't deceive them. Christ is there--they still have
the Adamic nature, but Christ rules over all this earth, so it is not
^{/although}
the same as Adam before the fall, there is a certain analogy to Adam before
the fall. They are people in flesh and blood, as Adam was. They see the
glory of the Lord, and they know Christ, and doubtless many of them will
commit themselves to Him, ξ trust Him, have faith, but there will be an
innumerable number of people who won't. (St: Is there any Scripture of
passage that indicates that there will be sin in the millenium?) Why
get into Isaiah. I think there are passages that indicate that there will
be sin, and sin a hundred years/^{old} will be condemned--that is just a phrase
that indicates that there will be such a thing. There are many Scriptures
that ~~indicate~~ indicate that it will not be allowed to break out, won't
~~be~~ allowed to mar the general picture of things. (St: Is that the only
~~one~~....
that one about sin a hundred years old?) I don't think it is the

only one. I think if you look around you find other indications. You don't ^{(St:}
~~not~~-have a great deal of Scripture on that ~~pek--~~ point. (I take it that
the false prophet and the beast ...conscious..are they still alive in
the Lake of Fire?) They will be tormented forever and ever. The devil
is cast in there, and then you have the plural verb, "they". Now
you can't be tormented if you are ee- unconscious. (St: They are still
alive.) What do you mean by alive? (St: They still have consciousness
within the Lake of Fire.) Yes. In the Bible, the words "life" and
"death"--those words mean relative states of existence. The dead ~~of~~
are alive to God in blessedness; they are not alive to this earth. And
those who are dead in trespasses and ~~sins~~- sins are alive to themselves.
Those who have died with Christ unto sin are alive unto God in their
spiritual life. "Death" and "life" never mean "Non-existence"; they
mean relative states of existence. So the beast and the false prophet,
I would only suggest that they must have been made immortal on the analogy
of Enoch and Elijah, and the raptured saints who live till the coming
of Christ, they are made immortal 6 1/2 , and this beast and the
false prophet are doubtless made immortal. Now the rest of the dead, you
see, are raised at the end of the millenium, and that is the great
White Throne Judgment. And they are all cast into the Lake of Fire,
whosoever was not found written in the Lamb's Book of Life, the same was
cast into the Lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. (St: What
happens then to the people who that ~~were~~ were saved during the millenium and
died before the second resurrection.) There is no answer to that in the
Scripture. I can't find it, but you can argue by analogy. In the Old
Testament there was no answer to, What happens to the people who live
when Messiah comes to reign? And Paul says, "I am going to tell you a
secret. We're not all going to die; but we are all going to be ~~changed~~."
And that was really what Isamah was talking about when he said, "Death
will be swallowed up in victory." At the sudden envelopement in immortal-
ity of those who live. So not until Paul revealed it was it clear what
was going to happen to the righteous who lived until the coming of the

Messiah and His kingdom. Now, it is not revealed anywhere that I can find what is going to happen to the righteous who are going to die subsequent to the rapture, but you can draw an inference. At ~~the~~ the Great White Throne, whoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the Lake of Fire. I think that would suggest that there are some who are found written in the Lamb's Book of Life at the Great White Throne, and I would suppose, by my imagination, which isn't the Bible, that they would be given immortality. (St: You don't think that our bodies might be changed during the millenium, when we'll be conquerors--?) No, I think that would contradict a lot that we have about the millenium. You see the millenium is to be a time of earthly people blessedly inhabiting the earth, ~~the~~ tilling the soil, begetting children, cultivating their crops and going on. (St: They are not glorified, are they?) Not immortal people. Flesh and blood people. They will be the subjects of the kingdom, not the heirs of the kingdom. The heirs of the kingdom neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels. The subjects of the kingdom do marry and are given in marriage, till the soil, carry on flesh and blood life. (St) Isaiah has certain references that would indicate that if a person dies at the age of a hundred he will be considered a mere child. Something to that effect. (St: What agency is used to bring about the salvation of those who are saved after the rapture?) There is quite a lot about it. There is the written Word of God, and there are definite angelic messengers that fly through the air and announce messages. Then there is the tremendous testimony in the fact of the church-being taken out. Lots of facts that will lead people to be saved. (Dr. M: Are you through or do you need a little more on the Rev. passages?) There is a lot more to say here, but--

Dr. Mackay: Maybe we should continue on Rev. 20 a little, but it seems to me that our course is not simply the millenium, it is an eschatology, and the matter of the resurrection of the dead is a very vital feature of eschatology, and a much more important matter than whether there is a

much more important matter than when there is a millenium. I mean, Christians differ about the millenium, whether there is or there isn't. But the fact that the great hope of the Christian being the resurrection of the dead, and that all Christians are going to be raised from the dead--their souls are living, but they are raised from the dead in the sense that they receive their resurrection body, and that in fact, all people are going to be raised from the dead, is, I think, part of the teaching of Scripture which all orthodox Christians, from the time of Christ have agreed. There have been, of course, various sects which have held other views, such as the Russelites, and the Seventh Day Adventists and other groups, but I think that ^{orthodox Christians of} all denominations and of all eschatological views have agreed on, and yet the thing is very well known in the Christian church. I think the ordinary idea of the mass of the people in the church just isn't, "If you become a Christian, that means when you die you go to heaven." And they don't know anything about a resurrection of the dead. And yet there are about ten references to it to one to dying and going to heaven in the Scripture. It is the great hope of the Christian. So I wonder, Dr. Buswell, if you wouldn't like to assign special passages, and go into this next week. Make a good study of I. ^{Cor.} ~~Thess.~~ 15 or whatever else you think is vital as to just what is the resurrection from the dead, and is there such a thing, anyway. (Dr. Buswell: If they'd read Hodge's chapter, section, on the resurrection, as the hope of the Scripture--it is an excellent study. He brings together systematically from the ~~of~~ Old Testament and the New Testament the definite fact that our hope is not a ghostly heaven, but a definite resurrection of the body.) (Dr. M: Hodge's chapter then, on the resurrection of the dead, in vm 3 of Hodge. And then look over I. Cor. 15, because in I. Cor. 15 Paul goes into it very specially, and then next week, I think, Dr. B could lead lecture and discussion on this subject particularly, and possibly finishing up on Rev. 20. It is much more important that there is to be a resurrection than whether it is in one

part or two. The big fact that there is resurrection for all people, is something so extremely vital. Maybe we'll deal with that next week, and the two resurrections the week after. (end of record)

We have noticed that the usual idea among Christians is that what Christianity amounts to is, if you're saved, you go to heaven when you ~~die~~ die, and that is the big outstanding feature of Christianity, to be saved and go to heaven when you die. And so we are interested in finding out whether the Bible teaches that there is anything else to the future hope of the Christian. Does the Bible teach that there is ~~not~~ actually to be a resurrection of the ~~body~~ ^{body?} If so, is it an ~~obscure~~ obscure teaching that we find buried away in some unusual chapter, with perhaps one or two references from which we infer it, or is it something that is stressed in the Scripture? Just what is the Scriptural attitude toward the resurrection of the body? We are interested in that subject; it is a tremendously important part of eschatology; it is a far more important question than the question as to whether there is to be a millennial reign of Christ or not, because it is something on which all the creeds of all the churches all through the ages have taken certain definite attitudes, ~~and~~ and therefore it is ~~a~~ matter that is very very vital. And so today we are going to go into this matter. Dr. Buswell is going to lead your discussion and consideration of this topic, and then after we have considered this matter of the resurrection of the ~~Bible~~ body, then he is going to take up the question, Are all bodies resurrected at once? Is there one general resurrection? Where in the Scripture does it say there is a general resurrection? Or is there a Scriptural teaching that people are raised up all at the same time, but at more ~~than~~ ^{than} one occasion, and some at another. And in connection with that, he may go into Rev. 20 some more.

Dr. Buswell: In a way that is a large order; in another way of course, that is very

familiar ground, and shouldn't take too much time. Perhaps we will come out somewhere in the middle if we just begin and go in all directions and work our way toward a reasonable conclusion. You heard about the man who jumped on his horse and galloped off in all directions? You see, if we were starting with a vacuum, with people who had never heard of the subject before, we would map out a systematic outline, and then piece by piece we would feed it out. But one very prominent factor in teaching in a school like Faith Seminary is that everybody knows lots before you start. (Dr. M: I think though it ~~is~~ would be good to give something of an idea how they'd go about it when they dealt with someone with no background.) There you would have to settle whether you'd go at it in the John Dewey way, or the Socrates way, or Reed's system. The way that you would deal, I think that is a very fruitful suggestion just for a moment to start ~~it~~ with: How would you get this across when you'll be called upon to minister to those whose loved ones have died, or those who are about to die, and to conduct funeral services. That is right where it will be thrust upon you, week after week in your ministry, and you'll have to say sound words of comfort that won't be merely imaginal poems, something that ^{really} will lead into the great system of doctrine taught in the Scripture, and go on. I'll never forget an experience I had in repeating a phrase--I don't know where in the world it came from, but I heard it somewhere ~~it~~ -- "This is only his body. ~~He~~ He is not here. He is with the Lord." And the widow of this godly man said, "Yes, but it is his body." And of course I realized my council was with the wrong emphasis. It was perfectly correct, and it is a comforting thought, that it isn't the person we put into the ground, it is his body, but it is his body, and that widow gave me a little talk right there, broken-hearted as ~~she~~ she was, on the hope of the resurrection. This was an elderly person who had lots of experience, and had comforted many more people than I ^{ever} had. The Christian hope is the resurrection. To be taken out of his body is not the Christian hope. Now just briefly, Hodge gives you an excellent section, beginning on page 771, his chapter on the resurrection. The bodies of men are to be raised. It is not a ghostly immortality which constitutes the Christian hope. Hodge goes into extended detail on the questions that have been involved. It isn't necessary for us to go into those unless some of these particular questions trouble you. He takes up, for instance, the Swedenborgian view; in an

earlier section he takes up the question of soul sleeping, which isn't exactly the same as the question of the resurrection. He goes into the Old Testament and shows that the hope of the Old Testament saints was the resurrection, not a ghostly immortality. A very excellent discussion of the reasons why Moses doesn't give you more about the resurrection-- coming so recently out of Egypt, their elaborate superstitious doctrine of the future life of the dead, and their embalming, which was definitely connected with the notion of the resurrection of the body, but he shows even there the hope is not the ghostly propitiety of the individual, but the hope is the resurrection. Then in the prophets, and of course particularly in Daniel, the resurrection of the dead in the Old Testament time. The question of the material of the resurrection. Hodge goes considerable beyond I. Cor. 15 in answering objections just what matter will be in the resurrection body, just what substance, if this body is buried, and you'll always have people in Sunday School ask you this: "Suppose the missionary is put to death and eaten by a cannibal, and then, before the missionary is all digested, the cannibal is converted, and then the cannibal dies, what will happen to the atoms? Will they have to quarrel between the different bodies that they may have belonged to in the process of life? There are many other phases of the story. Some will get the person swallowed by a shark, and others will get the person buried in a cemetery, all different ways of getting the atoms in different bodies. I think the only answer is, It's a miracle. We can't begin to explain the material substance of the resurrection body, but there is this, and as Hodge brings it out, the numerical identity-- now does anybody not know what numerical identity means as distinguished from identity of fellowship, or identity of loyalty? What is numerical identity. (Student: identity. (It's one and the same thing.) Yes. It isn't simply an equality, or a unity of fellowship, but it is A is A. If you say,

that

you identify yourself with the church. That is not/^anumerical identity. If you are identified with the Lord in His death and resurrection, that is not a numerical identity. That is a representative identity. But numerical identity is a phrase that comes out in philosophy, and it must be distinguished from the other forms of the word "identity". The doctrine of atonement, there is a lot of confusion now about how we are identified with Christ. The numerical identity is the same in the resurrection. That is as far as I think we have any right to go. This thing that is this body is raised from the dead. It does not involve the identity of the particle, and that is illustrated quite readily/^{by the fact}that I am not only in the body with which I was born over fifty-five years ago, and yet not one single atom of my present body is here, unless it be the bones in my head--you know they are very thick and substantial--but it might be. There might be numerical identity with those little bones, but otherwise, the body, being numerically identical~~/~~ with itself, is nevertheless constantly going through change so far as its physical ^{particles.} (~~substance~~ ~~enough~~) is concerned. Our bodies are changing. You go out and take a lot of exercise--we have a man up in New York who is a weight-lifter. His shoulders are big as an elephant's trunk. You get out and ~~/~~ build up all your muscles. That is your body. Then you neglect it for a couple of months, and your muscles get flabby, and they have different proportions. Nevertheless, it is the same body, the same body that had a broken leg, the same body that had pneumonia. It is your body. The numerical identity is not changed, even though~~/~~ the physical particles are changed. So ~~/~~ since numerical identity does not depend upon physical substance, we can simply accept ~~/~~ by faith what the Bible says about the resurrection of the body: It is sown a natural body; it (Hodge brings out the pronoun here-)it is the same it which is ~~/~~ raised a spiritual body. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. Another illustration of numerical identity and change of

particles: I saw at one time "Old Ironside", the ship 11 1/2 in Constitution. It was in southern Boston, undergoing repairs. Quite a number of years before I saw it, my father had been in Boston, and had had some sight-seeing trips around, and he brought home a little block of oak wood, very very deeply ^{seamed (?)} ~~seamed~~ with age, and cracks--it was all up in varnish and polished, but these cracks and evidences of age were there. This was a block of oak planking from the deck of the old ship "Constitution". Well, how could you get this when the ~~ship~~ ship was still there? Well, they put in new planking. Some time back the ship had been renovated. The old planking rots away, and they saw it up for souvenirs; they put in new planking, and that is a part of that ship. Well, when I saw it quite a number of years later, it was going through another renovation, but it was still the same ship. It has the registry number, it still has the same registry--that is still the same ship. So these bodies, numerically identical, completely disregardless of the physics and the chemistry of it, these bodies are to be raised from the grave. The great analogy, of course, is the resurrection of Christ. His body was so markedly that He came through the doors, the doors being shut. He vanished out of their sight. He appeared in different places, and yet He said, "See me. Take hold of me." See the scars in my hands and in my side." He ate with them and had intimate fellowship with them, without anything uncanny, spooky about it for the space of forty days after His resurrection. He rose from the dead in the same body in which He suffered, in the sense that His body ~~is~~ was recognizable, and the grave was empty. And, of course, the grave ~~is~~ clothes, wrapped by themselves--that in itself would be a miracle. Take the body out of the grave wrappings, and leave the wrappings there, as the account seems to indicate. Paul tells us in the Phil~~ippian~~ippian epistles that we shall be like His glorious body in the resurrection. Now taking up a few of the Scriptures, I think we can turn to I. Cor. 15 first of all. Suppose we

take one Old Testament passage, Daniel 12:2 just briefly. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and ^{shame and} some to/everlasting contempt." Yes. Now that, in itself, just standing as a verse, is not all we have for the resurrection, but it is quite a clear verse. From the New Testament, one would say that "many" should be taken to mean the hoi poloi, the crowd. Now you know that in the Scriptures.... (end of record)

...and not always does the "many" mean "everybody", but the thought in Scripture, I think we are entitled to say, most probably what Daniel intended to convey was that "the whole crowd," though we cannot build that on just this one passage, "shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Now that verse in itself does not say that the resurrection to everlasting life will be at one time, and that the resurrection to everlasting contempt will be at another time. It doesn't say that it will be and it doesn't say that it won't be, but at least from this ~~and~~ and other passages you have an indication ~~of~~ of resurrection as the hope of the Old Testament. (St: How about Job 19:26..)Yes. I was in class one time. Mr. Shunk was giving a class paper, a report on the doctrine of immortality in Job, and Samuael Hamilton, who is a thorough-going Modernist--well Shunk went into the question of the translation. "From my body"--does that mean "apart from my body"? or "from the point of view of my body"? "from my flesh" "Though worms destroy this body, yet from my flesh--" Now the old interpretation is, "yet IN my flesh I will see God" even though worms destroy this body. That is, "looking out of my flesh I will see God," even though worms destroy this body. But your liberals come along and they say, "That doesn't mean ~~'~~ 'in my flesh', but ~~it~~ it means 'apart from my flesh'. And the preposition is _____, and the syntax is not so that you can absolutely drive a stake in it and pin it down. At least I haven't found

the argument. Dr. M has more light there. In the discussion, when Shunk presented his evidence, it seemed to me his evidence was overwhelming, Hamilton went on then to show that there wasn't any evidence of immortality in Job, ~~why~~ Wellm ~~is~~ in the textbook we were using, which was Brightman's "Philosophy of Religion", Brightman had even referred to some evidence that I have heard Dr. M bring out, indicating that the people before the time of Job, or at least the people--in connection with the tomb of King Tut, there was the monotheism connected with the worship of the solar disc, and clearly some hope of resurrection. Well, we asked Hamilton, "how come, then, if the heathen around Israel believed in resurrection, and if this seems to talk about a resurrection, you are making this something unique^q which is contrary to the principles of literary criticism?" Well, Hamilton was completely floored by that. An utterly isolated piece of literature in the midst of a world that believed in a resurrection. At least the evidence is, the probability is, that when Job said, "Yet from my flesh will I see God," he is talking about a resurrection. Daniel so understood it. (St: In Hosea 13:14 and also Ez. 37 it speaks about a resurrection in Israel. Now is that a literal physical resurrection, or does it just refer to the fact that the remnant shall be brought back to the land as a revived people?) The Ez. 37 passage refers not to a resurrection, but to a national restoration. In that passage, for instance, the process is gradual. First the bones are assembled, and then the sinews, and then the skin, and then the flesh, and then they stand on their feet, indicating a gradual process; and then Ezekiel interprets it definitely as a restoration^a of Israel. So I don't take that to be/literal resurrection at all. (St: Hosea said, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. Oh death, I will be the plagues; Oh grave, I will be thy destruction. Repentance shall be hid from mine eyes....") Now that is interpreted by Paul in the New Testament as with reference to

resurrection. So, I think, there is your answer. Scripture interprets Scripture. You could take the reference in John 5. Here I am dallying along before we start on the main passage, which is I. Cor. 15. Let's read John 5:21, 25, 28, and 29. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the ~~Son~~ Son of God: and they that hear shall live." "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, ~~unto~~ unto the resurrection of damnation." There you have several factors in eschatology. You have a promise of resurrection; people coming out of their graves; hearing the voice of the Son of God. And you have, "The hour cometh" twice, but once you have a very strange phrase, "And now is." "But don't marvel at this, for the hour is coming.." I think it is quite reasonable to read that whole passage through connectedly with the thought that first of all the Lord takes him, from the point of view of Old Testament eschatology, in which John says, "This is the last hour." Old Testament eschatology began with the birth of Jesus. But the hour is coming, and now has begun, the hour of finality, the hour to include the resurrection. And don't be surprised at this, for (this is a little close-up, you see) the hour is coming when they that are in the graves will come forth..." He doesn't say the two resurrections will be at two different times; but He does not say that they will not be at two different times. All that are in the tombs will hear the voice of the Son of God and will come forth. The apostle Paul refers to the resurrection of the dead in Acts 24:15 and 21. "We believe there will be a resurrection of the dead, ~~both~~ both of the just and of the unjust, for the hope of the resurrection of the dead I am called in question." (St: Re. Jn. 5:25)

I don't think there is anything there that could be said for a resurrection at present, ~~or~~ even in Jesus' time, or those spiritually dead being

raised....) Now of course, there are the commentaries that take the first one as a spiritual resurrection, and the second one as figurative. I can't see the slightest ^{ground} ~~ground~~ for it myself, ~~and-these-herar--hda-hearing-will-live-~~ "When the dead will hear the voice of hte Son of God, and those hearing will live." (St: Couldn't it even refer to those raised from the dead by Jesus in His earthly life?) Resurrection, in the sense of resuscitation to a physical life is nothing new, so why would He say that "the hour cometh and now is--" That is to say, it always was true that God occasionally raised a dead person in the Old Testament, as well as in the New Testament. So if you make it refer to those whom Christ brought back from the dead in His earthly life, I think to say, "The hour cometh and now is," would have no meaning. If you take it to mean~~d~~ that those who are spiritually dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live, that would not back up this particular miracle that has just taken place. ~~De~~ there had done a miracle, a fine miracle, and Christ says, with reference to this ^{ea} ~~great~~ sign, "Don't be surprised. The Father has given the Son power to raise the dead. The hour cometh and now is." So He is plainly talking about a sign miracle, and the conspicuous sign miracle is resurrection. (St: ^{If} ~~Do~~ v. 21 and 25 refer to the bodily resurrection at the ~~the~~ consummation of the age, why did Jesus interject v. 24?) He is explaining and teaching and reiterating--it seems to me that v. 24 rather implies that He talking about what is coming at the end of this age. He is speaking of the principle of judgment, and the fact that the Father has committed judgment to Him. The Father has given to the Son power to raise the dead. That is, God the Father is not the person of the Trinity who raises the dead. That is a particular function of the Son. He is not the one who is going to judge at the Last Day of the resurrection. (St: Would you say that just as when we accept Christ now,

instantly we are passed from death unto life, so when He comes, we shall be passed from death unto life in the sense that we shall receive immortal bodies?) I don't think so. No. That is to say, when we accept Christ we pass out of ~~it~~ that which is called "being dead in trespasses^s and sins." Judicially, the death of Christ applies to us. We have died so far as our sins are concerned. Therefore we are alive unto God. We are not saved from physical death. We are free then from the future penalty of the Second Death. There are two kinds of death which came in because of man's sin. There is the physical death and spiritual death, and then the second death. The physical death began with Adam's sin. He ~~was~~ became dead in trespasses and sins in the sense that he is alienated from God right there at that point, and he became ~~it~~ liable to second death. Now when we accept the Lord, that is, as soon as ~~it~~^{it} becomes true of us individually that He has died for our sins. Chronologically that happened in the year ~~30~~ 30 A. D. We accepted it when we accepted the Lord. Now we are no longer alienated from God, we are dead to sin but alive to God, but we are still subject to physical death. We definitely are released from the penalty of the Second Death. If you follow the rule of taking the thing literally unless there is some real strong reason for taking it figuratively you come out with a lot more harmonious view. When He says, "raise the dead" well, He means "raise the dead." (St: It looks like v. 24 is telling^{us} how we can prepare for the advent of Christ-in v. 28 and 29 where He says that if we accept Him we have everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation- that ties in with the statement that some will arise unto life and some unto condemnation.....) Yes, He is following a miracle with telling about the future resurrection. Paul says He is declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection of dead people, and ^{here} he calls- goes on to be very specific about the future resurrection. (ST: It seems to me that in v. 21 there is an analogy. The Father raises the dead, the Son quickeneth whom He will. What does it mean, "the Son quickeneth whom He will"? You can't have an analogy where both parts of the analogy mean exactly

the same thing.) I think you do. The Father has the power to raise the dead. He raised His Son from the dead. He gave the Son power to raise the dead. As the Father has the power of resurrection, so the Son has the power of resurrection. The Father does not judge anyone. He has given judgment to the Son. He has the power of resurrection, of course. (St: You would apply to the Father, then, only ~~ht~~ the resurrection of Christ. Is that it? Just ~~like~~ the Father has the power to raise Christ, so Christ has the power to raise us?) I wouldn't speak quite so limited, because it is in the plural. As the Father again⁷ tous 15, that is, the Father has the power to raise the dead, and in the Old Testament there is no reason specifically to limit the resurrections exhibited in the Old Testament to merely the Son, but now.....(end of record)

e 57

Paul says, "In Christ all will be made alive." The Father has delegated this particular function of deity to the Son, and He has delegated all judgment to the Son. It seems a lot ~~p~~ better ~~sense~~ sense to me to take it as literal resurrection all the way through. Now certainly we are not excluding the fact that we are given a new life, we are spiritually renewed, now we are alive to God and dead to sin. Before we were alive to ourselves and dead towards God. The spiritual life in Christ is, of course, a very real doctrine, but I don't think there is any use to make this figurative; rather to make it literal. (St) From the Old Testament point of view, eschatology begins at the birth of Christ. The last hour began when Jesus ~~was~~ was born, as Gerhardes Voss brings it out, very effectively, I think, that in the Old Testament there is this age and the age to come. Now the age to come is referred to as "that day", "the day of the Lord" in quite a number of complexes, and the context makes it ~~clear~~ clear whether it is truly eschatological, or merely a normal phrase referring to the then coming, but from the Old Testament point of view, we are in the eschatological period. We are in the end time. But from the

(space)

New Testament point of view, as Voss says, you can take certain parts of this passage figuratively and certain parts literally, and see that there are two literal resurrections in the picture, but I really think though that the thing has to do with literal resurrection. He has just worked a great miracle, and now He says there are greater miracles to come, resurrection and judgment; it is the hour of finality, and there is coming this hour of finality. (St: V. 26) "Just as the Father has life in Himself, so also to the Son He has given life to have in Himself." I think that refers to the function of the Son during the time of His incarnation, during the time of His humiliation. There is no reference to the eternal state of the Son. The Son is just as truly Deity as the Father and as the Spirit, but now in the days of His flesh, He said, "I can in myself I can do nothing." ^{It} ~~Why~~ shows voluntarily and moment by moment to act in the power of the Father and of the Spirit during the days of His flesh. "I by the Spirit of God cast out demons." "I by the finger of God do these things" and so on. So in the days of His flesh He was operating voluntarily and consciously, without ceasing to be Himself, He was operating by the power of the Father in His status. The Father has given Him to have life in Himself. And He has given Him authority to make judgment. (St) No. I think Christ was very conscious of the fact, as Gerhardes Vos brought out--these people were Jews. From the Old Testament point of view, it was all, "When the Messiah comes;" and they didn't sharply distinguish the First and Second Coming. "When the Messiah comes, that will be the hour of finality. That is the coming time. Then will be the resurrection. Then will be the restitution. Then will be peace. When the Messiah comes Well, the Messiah has come, and Christ was teaching them, and leading them deeper into the understanding of the thing when He said, "Yes, the hour is coming, and now is, from one point of view; the hour that will include resurrection. " And He goes on to explain that now in the days of His flesh He has the power of life, and He has authority of judgment.

those

Now the hour is coming when ~~both~~-people who are in their graves are going to hear the voice of the Son of God and will come forth. It seems to me a ~~bea~~utifully unified passage of teaching, leading out and leading out and developing this great doctrine of futre resurrection and judgment.

(St)"Resurrection" is pretty carefully safeguarded in the New Testament, and a pretty sharp word against those who say the resurrection is past.

No New Testament writer blunders into any such thing as saying that ~~the~~ the resurrection is past. Now 6 , which is the ~~fullness~~ fullness of all it is to be the Son of God, you now have the spirit of it,

we are now waiting for it, to ^{wit,} have the redemption of the body, we are

predestinated unto it. So it is ~~used~~ used in Romans 8 twice and ^{once} in Ephesians 1 but resurrection, ~~resurrection~~-isn't a doctrine. (St: Perhaps just

as it begins now with our spiritual resurrection, it is accompanied in our physical resurrection) Where do you find ever any spiritual resurrection?

Paul does say, that as Christ was raised from the dead, so we should walk in renewed life, but he never calls that a spiritual resurrection.

(St: .. We have been raised sith Christ.) We ~~shall~~ shall be raised. In Romans 6 we have this new life ~~with~~ with Christ, if we began in the acceptance of His

death. We shall be in the ~~likeness~~ likeness of His resurrection. Just how does that phrase come in there? If the ~~is~~ germination of our spiritual life was

in the likeness of His death, we will be in the likeness of His resurrection, that is, if the phrase, "in the likeness", is understood there.

esometha ~~the~~ ^{ti}s anastase^{ws}, and it implies ~~the~~ ^{ti} homoi^wmati from the previous phrase. Now, we didn't literally die when Christ died, but we did

representatively. I have died ^{to sin} in the person of Christ in the year 30 A.D. I have a new life. I have a resurrection life, which we say, a renewed

life. I am definitely going to be raised from the dead because Christ is my guarantee. Those who sleep in Jesus God will lead along with Him in

this experience of resurrection. But I don't recall any New Testament ground for such a phrase as "spiritual resurrection" as such. We have a

new life, and that new life is based upon the fact of ~~his~~ ^{the} resurrection,

and we are sure ~~of~~ of resurrection, but the resurrection is a future fact. (St: What does Paul mean in Eph. 3:6 when he says, "and raised us up in Christ"? That is, we are in the heavenly places. The Ephesian aorist mode, n t ~~of~~ tense, but mode--"We are predestinated unto--" Eph. 2:5,6 "He has raised you up and seated you in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus." Now then, that aorist, that aorist phrase altogether, should be taken "He has raised you up and seated you in the heavenlies." It isn't chronologically true. It is judic~~ially~~ally true, and it is absolutely certain in the future, but I don't think that particular thing refers to our present day experience of a renewed life. (St: Our warfare is in the heavenlies, though, isn't it? Surely that is a present day experience.) Our warfare is in the heavenlies. (Eph. 6, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood...") But against the spiritual things of wickedness in among the heavenly things. That is literally the way that reads. The spiritual things of wickedness have come in among the heavenly things. I suggest that you look further and see if there is any passage that would warrant anything that ~~could~~ would even sound like saying the resurrection is past. That word resurrection. There are many strong phrases indicating our new life, our renewed/ life: "Though the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day." (St) What I mean is, that phrase is so sharp, and this future resurrection as the hope of the believer in God is so clear, that I don't think that you would find any phrase in the New Testament that would lend itself to such an interpretation. (St: Re the phrase, "is passed frm death to life.") That refers to the fact that we are not dead to God and alive unto sin, namely, dead in trespasses and sin, but we are alive toward God and dead toward sin. (St: Is that a spiritual resurrection in a sense?) We can call it a resurrectinn if we want to. I don't think the New Testament writers would ever do that. I think, as Dr. M has brought out, that the Christian Church, more tradition-ally has ~~put~~ put the ~~emphasis~~ emphasis on heaven, and forgotten the resurrection to some extent. We etherialize and spiritualize, and make-figures-live--
figurative a lot

of references that the Bible writers wouldn't do. Suppose we let that passage in John go for a while. I would say that one might very well cling to the notion of a spiritual resurrection in the earlier verses ~~of~~ of that passage, and yet see very clearly the prediction of two resurrections in the future. Now in I. Cor. 15. I don't think there is the slightest possibility of but one interpretation. Paul starts off by reminding them of what he had preached: Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture, He was buried, He rose again the third day according to the Scripture, and then he mentions the various resurrections appearances. V. 12 If Christ be preached that ek nekron egertai, He has been raised from among the dead, how do some people say that there is no~~x~~ anastasis nekron. There you have anastasis nekron without either apo or ek. Let me just anticipate a summary of that study. Last week I brought my Moughton...Concordance along. I meant to read passages which bring out resurrection/^{out}from among the ~~of~~ dead and resurrection of the dead. I looked for anastasis and I found about three columns there, and years ~~ago~~ ago I went through and made a little symbol beside each passage where you have anastasis ~~to~~ nekron without a preposition, and with different symbols those which had ek nekron, or apo nekron, or apo ~~to~~ nekron, and then I looked under Mc _____ and found that I had done the same thing in two columns of fine print. The summary of it is that ~~where~~- wherever you have resurrection from the dead, either apo or ek, never do you have resurrection of the wicked. Or to put it to you ^{di} differently, the resurrection of the wicked is never referred to as a resurrection ek nekron or ek ~~to~~ nekron or apo ~~to~~ nekron or apo nekron. Where you have resurrection out of , that is, wherever /^{the word} death is in the partitive genative, it is either ek or apo, it is the resurrection of somebody who leaves the rest of the dead there. The resurrection of Christ--one striking passage ~~where~~ where it says, "It is John ~~the~~ Baptist risen from the dead," that is apo t n nekron. Obviously he didn't think that all of the dead had been ~~raised~~ raised...(end of record)

bodies raised, raised from the dead, or the resurrection of Christ, or the resurrection of the saints at the coming of Christ. Never is it the resurrection of the wicked, or a resurrection which includes the wicked. The resurrection, ~~ton nekron~~, is noncommittal. Paul says, "We believe in the resurrection of the dead, both the just and the unjust," in Acts 24. The resurrection of the dead, that is noncommittal, and he specifies both the just and the unjust. So in I. Cor.^{15:}21 there is a resurrection of the dead, and then he goes on to mention the different orders of the resurrection. I don't have all the data here, but one of the very striking passages is Phil. 3:11 where Paul says, "That I may know H,m, /and the fellowship of H,s suffering, that I may attain to the resurrection out from among the dead." It is definitely connected "to know Him, H's death and resurrection, that I may attain to the ek anastasis ek nekron, and Paul didn't have to attain to a resurrection of the dead, because he believes that everybody is going to be raised, but he expected to attain to the resurrection, the ek anastasis ek nekron, the resurrection out from among the dead. Well you can do that/just for yourself as well from a concordance, and it will develop very clearly as you go along. I. Cor 15:12 "If Christ be preached that He rose from among the dead, how do some people state that there is no resurrection of dead people?" That is just anastasis nekron. "If there isn't any resurrection of dead people, neither has Christ been raised, and if Christ has not been raised, vain is our preaching, and vain is your faith. Yes, we are found to be false testifiers against God--we are found false witnesses against God, because we have testified of God that He raised up Jesus, whom He did not raise if indeed the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither was Christ raised, and if Christ was not raised, vain is your faith; you are yet in your sins. Those also who sleep in Jesus have perished, if in this life only we are hope--or we have hoped in Christ, we are most miserable of all men." That is a great ~~preaching~~ preaching text. Some people in the church occasionally

will be willing to believe in some kind of ghostly immortality, or the immortality of the choir invisible, or some poetical kind of immortality, but when it comes to resurrection of the dead, they draw back. Paul says it is an important doctrine ~~of~~ for Christian ethics. Bad homeletics produces ethics. That's what he says a little later: "Evil communications corrupt good manners." "But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of ~~of~~ those that slept. Since by man death, also by man, anastasis nekron." Resurrection of dead people. "But every one in his own order." Then he goes on to give this order of resurrection. "Just as in Adam all die, so also in Christ will all be made alive."

ἐωπαύθη θήσονται. Notice how "resurrection" and "being made alive" are interchangeable and synonymous. For a ~~ad~~ dead person to be made alive is for a dead person to come to life. I translated ἐξήσαν "came to life" last week as an ingressive aorist. Someone said, "How do you know it is an ingressive aorist?" Well, it is an aorist, it is not an imperfect. Paul doesn't say, "I saw dead people in heaven, and they were alive. I saw these dead people, and ἐξήσαν," which is an aorist, and the only aorist which will fit there is an ingressive aorist. They were dead; they had their heads cut off, and ἐξήσαν, and this isn't anastasis. And they reigned with Christ a thousand years. (St:) The rest of the dead did not come to life until a thousand years were finished. It is just as plain as it can be. Read the whole thing clear through several times. He is talking about a resurrection. I have read this passage which gives the orders of the resurrection. ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός, Christ the firstfruit, afterwards those who are Christ's at His parousia, then the end, and as we studied that, the end includes the final destruction of death, when death itself will be emptied out. Now verse 35: "But/^{somebody}is going to say, 'How are the dead raised, and with what kind of a body do they come forth.' " Hodge gives an excellent discussion of this. It is the same thing which is put ~~ti-~~ into the grave in weakness and corruption, which is brought out of the grave

in power and incorruption and honor. V. 44, "If there is a ^{psychic} ~~ψυχικὸν~~ body--" now the ~~εὐρέ~~ word ^{"psychic"} ~~ψυχικὸν~~ is very bad because "psychic" in English doesn't mean that. The best we can do is to say "a natural body," and ~~ψυχικὸν~~ doesn't mean ^{nature} ~~ψυχικὸν~~ at all. But our English ~~has~~ has been impoverished by the spiritists, who go psychic, so we have lost a good word that we might have. "If there is a natural body, there is a spiritual body." Now some people have tried to make out that ~~it~~ this is a different "it", but as Hodge shows, it does violence to the whole passage. We have ^{now} a body which was adapted for life in this world, for contacts with things in this earth. We are going to have the kind of body which is adapted for resurrection life. Different people have different kinds of bodies. This body ~~ψυχικὸν~~ ^{ψυχικὸν} and this body pneumatikon --some people have a body ~~καρδιακόν~~ ^{καρδιακόν}, a hearty body. Others have a body not edikon. I admire these nice slim people who can always keep away from studying. They never eat too much and go to ~~sleep~~ sleep. Different kinds of bodies. Some people have ~~ψυχικὰ~~ bodies well-adapted to the intellect. Others have too much below the ears, and not enough above the ears. So a body adapted for (serk^h) in this earth, a body adapted for suma, which is the same thing, but related in a new life; certainly reading the whole context you cannot support the notion of two different bodies numerically different. Numerical identity is maintained all the way through. Then this discussion of the natural life, the earthy coming first, and the spiritual life coming in the consummation. Then comes of course this passage that has to do with the resurrection. "This I say, brother, that flesh and ~~καρμὰ~~ ^{καρμὰ} blood does not inherit the kingdom of God, neither is corruption able to ~~inherit~~ inherit incorruption. Look, I tell you a secret, all of ~~us~~ us will not sleep, but all will be changed, in a moment in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. The trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised incorruptible, and we will be changed. It is necessary for this corruptible thing to put on endusasthai," put on as you put on an overcoat, "incorruption, and so

this mortal to put on endusasthai, immortality." Now he is talking about ~~the~~ the experience of those who do not die. In the 5th ch of II Cor he speaks of this. Incorruption, ep endusasthai, being put right on over. And you'll see that this draws into II. Cor 5. Paul's hope is not to die and go to heaven. There are moments in his life when he'd like to die and go to heaven, it would be far better. I guess we all have those moments. But that is not his hope. And he explains that he would much prefer to ~~live~~ live until the moment of the rapture, and to be clothed upon, not to have to die and be a disembodied spirit, but to live and to suddenly ^{to} be ~~en~~ enveloped in immortality. ~~A~~ So he is saying right here, we are not ~~only~~ ^{all going} to die, but ~~this mortal~~ this mortal, in those mortal, in the case of those who are not going to die, has to ~~put~~ put on immortality. This corruptible has to put on incorruption. So then when this corruptible endusasthai, shall put on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality, then will come to pass the word that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory." Isaiah 25:8. You never would know just from reading Is. 25:8 just what Isaiah was talking about, but Paul explains it. He says, that was intended, and of course it was very cryptic. It was intended not to describe resurrection. "Death is swallowed up in victory." That is intended to describe the experience of those who ~~are~~ go to pass instantaneously from a state of death and corruptibility into a state of immortality. So this, being clothed with immortality. Then will be brought to ~~pass~~ pass the saying of Isaiah, death is swallowed ~~up~~ up in victory; "Where, death, is the victory of you? Where, death, is the sting of you?" Now that "of" ~~is~~, that genative, is something interesting. "Where, death, is your victory?" I dnn't think is possessive, but in Greek it can remain noncommittal, and so you get the interpretation. We would have to expand it. "Where, death, is the victory related to you? Where, death, is the sting related to you?" "The sting of death is sin." That is where the sting comes in. "The strength of sin is the holy law of God. But thanks be to God--Ours is

the victory. The victory of death of death is an objective genitive, it proves to be, death itself is conquered. Death is not the conqueror. "Gives us the victory through our Lord, Jesus Christ. So then, brethren, beloved, be ye steadfast, not shaken around not moved around, immovable, always abounding in the work of ~~the~~ the Lord, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." There you have the great resurrection chapter in which Paul bases our resurrection upon the resurrection of believers. Let us review briefly ~~I~~ I. Thess. 4, because it is the same doctrine, and it will throw light upon I. Cor. 15. "I do not wish you to be ignorant brethren concerning those who are asleep, that you sorrow not as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and ~~and~~ ^{arose}, rose again, " why certainly that is basic to the whole ~~the~~ gospel--He died and He arose from the dead--well then, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also, God those having fallen asleep through Jesus will lead along with Him." God will bring through Jesus those who have fallen asleep. That is, the dead will be brought to life by the power of Jesus. Now ~~incidentally~~ incidentally, this fits in perfectly with the John 5 passage--John has the power of resurrection; He has the power of life, and He chose to exercise it through Jesus. So ~~the~~ fact of the death and resurrection of Christ is a guarantee of the resurrection of those believers who have fallen asleep. Through Jesus God will lead them with Jesus. That is, He will raise them from the dead. (end of record)

e 59

In I. Thess. 4 you have the same teaching that you have in I. Cor 15. Now are ~~we~~ ready for II. Cor 5. Syntax is difficult. The argument is figurative and somewhat involved, so take a deep breath now. This is a difficult passage and we need to sharpen our wits come right down to it. There are some very peculiar doctrines connected with this chapter. There is a doctrine of an intermediate body which seems to me is utterly unsupported, but they go on and on about it. II. Cor. 5:

"We know that if our earthly house," and here is a genative in apposition
 "be-destroyed---"namely,"mainly"this tent be destroyed," "our earthly house,
 namely this tent." We read in English, "the earthly house of this
 tabernacle," and you look for a house with a tabernacle beside it,
 which of course isn't the meaning at all. "If our earthly house, this
 tent." You see, it is the genative of apposition. "--Be destroyed,
 a house from God we have, eternal in the heaven." And there people
 get right off the train and go and build a whole city on that little
 phrase taken ~~off~~ out of its context, as if there were two different
 bodies, and that would be just exactly the pagan heathen notion, that
 is, it would be of the heathen ~~and~~ notions, that this body is nothing
 at all, as the Corinthian gnostic said, "for ^{meat} ~~the~~ body and the body
 for ^{meat} ~~the~~. Both are going to be destroyed, so what is the difference? Eat
 and drink, for tomorrow we die." We have a spiritual ~~and~~ difference,
 so what is the difference what you do with this body? Eat and drink
 for tomorrow we die. The body is corrupt anyway." That sort of nonsense.
 And Paul says, "Evil communications corrupt good manners." No, it isn't
 another, but in kind, not numerical difference, but a different kind,
 and this will be eternal, and it will be related to the heavenly things.
 That is, it will be adapted for this future life. It becomes more clear
 as you go along. "And indeed, in this we groan, looking forward to,"
 or "earnestly desiring our dwelling which is from heaven." That is,
 we earnestly desire immortal bodies. "If, being clothed upon we shall
 not be found naked." Gerhardes Voss has given a very extensive study of
 this passage. I think he is perfectly correct in interpreting it. Paul
 says, "We would like to have this immortal body so that we would not
 have to become disembodied spirits." Now ~~just~~ just at least entertain
 that as a hypothesis, if any of you have had contrary ideas. I am sure
 it will be corroborated as you go along, and any other view will be
 driven out. To "become ^{naked} naked" here means to be disembodied spirits,

and to get this eternal house from heaven means to be made immortal. So, "we earnestly desire a house which is from heaven, so that we shall not be found naked. And those being in this tent," or "while we are in this tabernacle(in this tent), we groan, being burdened." You people aren't old enough to groan for stiff joints and old age and decrepitude. I don't think Dr. M is quite old enough to groan for that, but I've begun to groan. I get stiff joints and I have to go out and get some exercise. We groan, being burdened. Not that we wish to be endusasthai, to be unclothed." I don't want to die. I put off my funeral several times. I used to be quite ready to die and go to heaven when I got to be fifty. I put it off to eighty, and I've just postponed it now to ninety-five. /I-dont-wnt--- I don't want to die. There have been moments in my life when I wanted to die. I know when I was almost to the top of Pike's Peak and looked at my watch and thought I was going to miss the train going down again, an undertaker would have been a very welcome sight. In general, it isn't that we wish to die, but to be clothed. Here is this infinitive, endusasthai. Our desire, as we groan in this body. And people groan. I heard Dr. Lambie tell one time about a patient in the hospital who was so sorry for himself, and whenever he would see the doctor coming down the hall, he would call, "Oh doctor, poor me." I've thought of that many times when I have felt sorry for myself. It kinds of tears you up. "Oh doctor, poor me." Look at all my ous and my aches and my pains. But our desire is not to become a disembodied spirit. Later on he says it would be far better, but that is not what we want, but to be clothed upon in order that death or the immortal katapothē $\chi\rho\upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma\ \xi\omega\eta\varsigma$, might be swallowed up of life. Now there again he identifies Isaiah 25:8 and gives his interpretation, not to become a disembodied spirit but to be swallowed up of immortality but this sudden experience of being changed, namely the experience of those who don't die, but live until the Lord's return.

7 1/2

That death might be swallowed up of life. And then he goes on to say, "He who works in us is God, who gives to us the earnest of ~~the~~ the Spirit." That is a ~~em-~~ ^{8 1/4} comfort for the present time; we do not ~~not~~ have our full inheritance, but we have the arrabon of the Spirit. He gives us ~~ton~~ arrabona, the earnest of the Spirit at the present time, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the guarantee or the earnest of our inheritance, of our future glorious life. That word arrabon is a very interesting--the German ^{8 1/4} uhlingsgelt. That is a Scotch phrase too. It is a guarantee money; it is a part of the principal. We now have a part of our eternal inheritance; ~~not~~ not the full infinitude of it, but we now have the earnest of our inheritance, which is the presence of the Spirit in our life. "We are content, therefore, at all times, knowing that ~~not~~ dwelling in (in the body) we are dwelling out from the Lord." Are you living in or are you living out? As you travel for the Lord, you spend certain nights away from home, certain nights at home. Dwelling in the body, you are dwelling out from the Lord. That is, as to His visible presence, though ~~not~~ by faith we walk and ~~not~~ not by sight. We are content then, and we think it well rather to dwell out from the body and to dwell in with the Lord." That is, a Christian is not afraid to die, to just leave this body and go to be with the Lord is indeed a pleasant prospect. "Wherefore also we are ambitious." Mr. Bennett told me the other day, "The Bible doesn't tell us to be ambitious," but I contradicted him. If I can get ahead of Mr. B I'm doing pretty well. We are lovers of honor. That is to say, it is our earnest desire whether living in or living out--you see how very sharp that contrast is--to be well pleasing to Him, and you all shall be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that we may obtain, each one, the things don in the body, what we have done, whether it be good or ~~not~~ evil." That little passage in itself, although it is difficult, and the translation is difficult, and the figures of speech are not so easy, I think Gerhardes Voss is absolutely right in that the general understanding of competent interpreters

right down through the years, that Paul is imply saying there, "I don't want ~~to~~ to die, though I would be perfectly willing to die--it would be far better--but what I desire is to live in be changed and be made immortal at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ." So to die and go to heaven and be a spirit is not the ^{Christian} hope. The blessed dead in heaven should be thought of as happy and blessed and peaceful and in the presence of the Lord, but they have not received the fullness of their state of being. Their hope will be fulfilled at the resurrection. ~~So~~ Shall we look at that passage on the fifth seal for just a minute? John has a vision of the blessed dead in heaven. Before the 20th/Rev. Rev. 6:9 "And when he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the alter the souls of those who had been slain on account of the Word of God and on account of the testimony which they had." That is, he sees the souls of dead people who have been faithful to the Lord. These are the blessed dead. "And they cried with a great voice, saying, "How long, oh Lord," and this is the word that is 12 1/4 , oh Absolute Ruler, Holy and True, do you not judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell upon the earth? " It isn't ~~to~~ sin/say "how long?" It is a sin to doubt the wisdom of God in His choosing of His own time, but the blessed dead/say "how long?" So if you ever get impatient, you can say, "How long?" but don't criticise the Lord for His taking a time. He is not dilatory with references to His promises. "And there was given to each one of them a white robe, and it was said to them that they should rest, they should rest up, for yet a little time, until should be fulfilled also their fellow servants and their brethren who are going to be slain as they were." That is the vision of martyred dead in heaven, eager for the ^cconsummation and establishment of righteousness, the vindication of their testimony, and they are told, ~~that~~ they are comforted, they are happy in the presence of the Lord, but they are told they will have to wait a ~~while~~ while; other martyrs must seal their testimony with their blood. Whatever your context,

whatever your outline of the Book of Revelation, that thing in itself has to be a vision of the blessed dead, anterior to the resurrection, and before the end of this present age. So John has this vision of them. (St) What is the judgment of the tenth verse? "How long do you not judge and avenge our blood?" (St) "We shall all appear the judgment seat of Christ." In the Corinthian letters, you know, Paul has quite a lot to say about our reward, building on the foundation, building wood, hay, straw, it will be burned up. Building gold, silver, precious stones, we will receive a reward. We'll all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. (St) I can tell you just exactly where it comes, you know. It comes at the seventh trumpet. At the seventh trumpet is the time of rewards for the righteous dead. That's what it says. (end of record)

e 60

It's all on the basis of the grace of God. That is to say, if you take a naughty child and clean him up and scrub him up there, and offer him a reward if he eats his spinach, it is all of grace, but nevertheless it is a reward. So that anything that the Lord gives to us is of grace, but He has chosen beyond His grace to give rewards for faithful service, all on the basis--there is no reward for anything done as of the flesh--that is true. (St) ...a little different grounds... grace of God... but God chooses to give us rewards on the basis of His faith. That is, there is no reward for anything in the energy of the flesh. (St: I think Dr. Harris was speaking against rewards as motives for service...) He is a good Kantian, -because-the-verbs- the rewards should not be a motive. The love of Christ should be your motive. That is very true. Personally, I don't exclude rewards as a motive, although I know Kant does, and some others who--certainly the love of Christ is the supreme reward. "Jewels in my crown." I hope to have something to show for even these threescore years and ten. That is an interesting argument

though, and I can see now what he means. It is all of the grace of God, and all for the love of Christ. I'd like to say that I think that is a summary of the doctrine of resurrection. (St: Luke 24...flesh and blood...) It does seem that the principal of metabloism will be different. What is metabloism in these bodies? It all depends on the blood. The ~~the~~ nourishment of the various tissues ~~is~~ has to be taken up by the blood, and carried to the ~~the~~ tissues, and then the waste products have to be cleared away by the blood, and that is anabloism and catablolism and you mix up your metabolism to keep this old 3 going. That is the way the Lord has kept it ~~until~~ ^{until} now, in this life; the principal of life-- I don't like the word "principal", but I don't have anything to put in its place--the system of life will not depend upon blood metabolism. Paul says, "Flesh and block cannot inherit the kingdom." (St) 4. That is to say, we can't answer that. I don't think we have ~~any~~ any data with which to answer that. Certainly the life is in hte blood, and that is ~~every~~ every obvious. The whole vital process is in the blood, and for a person to shed his blood is to give his life, to die, to expire. The most vivid way of death is by the shedding of blood, and when your blood is gone, your life is gone. Now, beyond that, flesh and blood doesn't inherit thekingdom, corruption doesn't inherit incorruption, but nevertheless, the identity, the numerical identity of the risen glorified body will somehow be retained. (St: How was it that the same body that went through a material wall could be handled and touched and still have solidity?) I don't know, but I dont understand the radio. Television is eyond me. ~~At~~ At least it is not contradiction. We used to sometimes say that two material bodies can't occupy the same space at the same time, and we used to illustrate the logical law of contradictions that way. It is a very bad illustration, because it just isn't so. Two physical substances, whatever they are, can most certainly occupy the same space at the same time. We know now the inter-moecular spaces in anything we

call solid are vast. So for one physical substance to right through another physical substance and then another time not to go through but to be tangible is at least not contradictory. It certainly is mysterious. ~~It is~~ I think it is just beyond us. (St: Is it necessary to hold that Christ went right through the door into the presence of His disciples?) "He came in, the doors being shut." Now that is all you have ~~as~~ as data. ~~The~~ inference is that He didn't ~~come~~ come in through a window. I think it is clear that He is not subject to these physical limitations. I dislike to say, "The physical resurrection" myself, just because--I don't object to it, but I don't spontaneously say "physical," I say "bodily," and I emphasize numerical identity. I don't know the physics of the resurrection. I don't know ~~much~~ much physics anyway. I know just enough to know that I don't know. Physics is a tremendously interesting subject in these days, and more and more you have quite clear evidence that energy and matter are interchangeable. How I don't know. Whatever the physics of the resurrection body is, I know that ^{it} ~~that~~ is beyond me. That doesn't mean but what numerical identity is there, and it is not a ghostly existence; it is a tangible existence. (St: Hodge says that it is necessary that there should be a continuousness of memory, or else we would have an existence that had no historical attitude; that we still remember when we get to heaven, but yet we won't be the same person; and yet how retaining our memory shall be possible for7 1/2...all of those things pass away....different personality) I think that is quite answerable. You will doubtless ^{in your} ~~inherit~~-experience ~~that-had-~~ have certain memories, of course for a time very sad, but then as you go on with the Lord, the compensation is such-as-to- that the total picture is not sad. The sin that you have committed, with the race of the Lord and the way He led you out, the total picture is glorious, so the grace of Christ begin- being so abundant in the resurrection, there are memories of all that He has done for us.8 1/4 to tell the angels what it means to us that He has scars in His hands. They can't

understand that from experience. They can understand it, but they haven't had sins to be forgiven. I think H^udge is quite right there, they we must incur a ~~continuity~~- continuity of memory from many different Scriptures to converse with the Lord, and to be in fellowship with Him. These blessed dead in heaven, remember that they were wicked people on earth who had put them to death; they wanted God's cause vindicated, as it came to be destroyed. That of course is the sorrow of it, it isn't that these blessed dead want to get even. If you look b ck on someone who has injured the Lord's cause in you, you don't want to get even with that personally, ^{really you} ~~merely~~-to get away from all that, but you don't want the Lord's cause to look as though it were a failure. You want His cause vindicated. And so these blessed dead remember the whole thing, talk to the Lord about it, He says "Wait a while until the others come along," and yet they are happy with the Lord. (St: "...I am the resurrection and the l fe.." Figurative use, isn't it?) I don't think so. H^udge interprets this. V 25, 26 "I am the resurrection and the life." Now of course, that doesn't mean numerical identity, "I am nothing but the abstraction, the resurrection and the life." But "I mean to you resurrection and life." "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me, if He die, -He- he will live, and everyone who lives and believes in me will not die." Now that is a cryptic saying, but a person who believes in Christ, though he die he will live, and those who live at 10 3/4 will never die," so He is speaking of the future time. And she says, "Yes, Lord, I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, the one who is coming into the world; you are the One/^{who}is coming." "Thy brother shall rise again," that was H^u's first word. Now I think the Lord very definit^ely wanted her to commit herself to the hope of resurrection. "Thy brother shall rise." "I know that he will rise in the resurrection, in the last day." She was sad at the loss of her brother, and she was perfectly confident in the future resurrection, and Christ ~~enf~~- confirms that faith,

and then He goes away and performs this special miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead, which was something she had no reason to expect unless Christ chose to do it as a special act. (St) I think we see the Gospel in the light of eschatology constantly. Christ is the one who is going to raise the dead at the last day. If you believe in Christ, if you die, He will raise you from the dead, and having been raised you will never die. Now then, believe in Him now. (St: Rom 8 :11, Hodge.) I think that is a future tense, Romans 8:11, and I think it definitely refers to the resurrection. I had an argument with Dr. McCookin on time on that. "If ~~the~~ the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from among the dead dwells in you, He who raised up from among the dead Christ Jesus will make ~~the~~ alive your mortal bodies through ~~the~~ His indwelling Spirit that is in you." That is, the hope of the resurrection, I am sure, is what Hodge is talking about. He will make alive. McC thought that meant, "He will impart strength to us from day to day." But I'm just simple. I said, "I like to take it in the most literal possible manner, unless there is some strong reason for making it figurative." I think it is the resurrection. "He will make alive." The resurrection of the bodies of believers is in the hands of the Holy Spirit. (St! Make alive in a different sense than we are alive now...) He'll make alive our mortal bodies. And Paul says in Rom. 8:23, "Waiting for the redemption of the body." Are bodies are not yet redeemed. They are guaranteed redemption, but these bodies of ours are not yet redeemed. They are going to be. That's whenever the future resurrection is. Now Rev. 20 considered with all this in the background. A new section, a new paragraph begins with v. 4: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them (that is, people sat upon them) and judgment was given to them. I saw the souls that had been beheaded on account of the testimony of Jesus and on account of the Word of God...." (end of record)

...And they lived (in the aorist tense. Now nobody can wiggle out of that. They lived. They have had their heads cut off, and they included the people who had not worshipped the beast, and I think there is just one way to read that, they ~~did~~ came to life) and reigned with Christ a thousand years, but the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were finished." You have $\epsilon\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ repeated there twice together, in two different groups, and one rises in the beginning of the thousand years, and the other not until after the thousand years. "This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he who has a portion, he who has a part, in the anastasis of the first one. (Dr. M: ~~This~~ one word right there. I notice ~~that~~ that the suggestion might be made from the English which I don't think would work out. The translators of the A.V. thought that this meant, "He saw the souls of those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the Word of God, who had not worshipped the beast and so on, and these souls were spiritually alive. They lived; they ~~did~~ were living, they were spiritually alive, and they were reigning with Christ. That is, ~~that~~ that was their joy and fellowship with Him. They were living and reigning with Him. They were living and reigning with Him a thousand years. And the rest of them were not spiritually living during these thousand years. But you notice that the way the A.V. translation is, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until a thousand years were finished." When they say "lived again" they very evidently don't mean they were not spiritually living, but they mean "they did not exist".

2 It is very/^{evidently}the "again" makes it an act, a change, not merely a continuing situation. I think the "again" makes it very ~~clear~~ clear that the Authorized translators understand it to mean these souls he ~~did~~ ^{/whom} saw who had been killed, and who had died, they came to life, but the rest did not come to life, did not live again.) Thank you. I think that is very clear. The translators of the A.V. would have been tremendously surprised to have it mean

to have it mean anything but "they came to life", "they lived" in the Old English way of expressing it, they lived. Just as in translating John 11, "He who lives" means "he who comes to life." "If anyone believes ~~in~~ in me, though he die, yet will he ~~not~~ live. And he who lives (that is, comes to life) --that was there way of expressing "come to life") they who hear will live." (Dr. M: (I think I mentioned once before that the R.S.V. translates it, "Come to life." ...the Modern English...3 1/4 .)

Yes. In Old English you would say, "He died and he lived." And that means "he came to life." In Modern English we'd say, "Came to life."

This 20th ch of Rev. then indicates a period of a thousand years subsequent to the resurrection of the saints, in which the saints reign with Christ. It is not the only passage in which a period of blessed is predicted very didactically, subsequent to the resurrection of the saints, because as we have read in Romans 8, this created world has a hope. "The hope of the ktisis waits for the apocalypse of the sons of God." This creation 4 , will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty glorious/of the children of God. Now we in this present time groan within ourselves, waiting for the fullness of sonship, the redemption of the body, so in Rom 8 and in Rev 20 you have very very clear didactic statements about the ~~resurrection~~ ^{period of blessedness following the resurrection} of the saints. It is very interesting that the Augsburg ^{Confession} so understands it. You talk to a Lutheran now, and he'll say, "My creed condemns premillennialism." But what the Augsburg Confession contains is the kiliasm of the Munster-Anabaptis, /but it doesn't mention Munster; the kiliasm of the Anabaptists who claim that the saints will inherit the earth as a kingdom before the resurrection. That is specifically what the Augsburg Confession condemnsⁿ. Otherwise it condemns post-millennialism, and it leaves it wide open to believe that the saints will possess the earth as a kingdom, subsequent to the resurrection, that this earth is going to have a period of blessedness after the resurrection, after the apocalypse of the sons of God, after the redemption of the body, after we are glorified to be like the Lord.

Dr. M:

-317- a

e 61

Let's open up the subject for next ^{week} Maybe it would be good next time to take Acts 15 and Amos 9.. That is a little off the present, the immediate field of discussion, but related to it. I call your attention now to Acts 15 as preparatory to next week's discussion. In Acts 15 we find that there was a discussion in the church as to whether the new Gentile converts need to be circumcised. And they had considerable discussion about this matter: "Is ~~it~~ it necessary to circumcise Gantiles who have become Christians?" Then we find a statement made here by James in summing up the discussion and giving the conclusion, and he bases it upon a verse in Amos~~x~~. And he is discussing now what is going to be done now in the Christian Church. and he quotes a verse from Amos which speaks about building again the tabernacle of David which has fallen down, "And the tabernacle of D_avid which has fallen down will be built up and the ruins thereof will be built up, and I will set it up." and so here is something about a kingdom in the Old Testament, about D_avid's tabernacle being set up, and the ruins being built up, and the breaches being built together, and it sounds like a kingdom, and yet here James here discusses it in connection with the Christian Church, a qu~~est~~ion of whether the new people who come ~~into~~ into the Christian Chruch need to be circumcised or not. and if he can do that, is it not then permissible any time the Old Testament talks about a kingdom to say, he is talking about the church? Does not that then prove that we should spiritualize statements in the Old Testament about an earthly kingdom, or th kingdom of D_avid, anything of that kind, that they really refer to the Christian Church, and are not to be interpreted as referring to any kind of an earthly kingdom. I remember when I was a senior in seminary, there ~~was~~ was a young student there, a graduate of a college. This man was a premillennialists through seminary, he came to the last month of seminary, I remember one day his saying, "This passage here in Acts 15 is the leading passage on which premillennialism is based. Just plain exegesis shows it is not an earthly

he is talking about at all, but it is the church. And so premillennialism is definitely wrong," and then he became an amillennialist and remained that way two weeks, and then became a postmillennialist. I believe he has been that ever since. Well now, he referred to the Scofield Bible where there is a statement/^{something}like this: "Dispensational. This is the most important verse in the New Testament," or some such statement; that may be a little stronger than it was. At the time it impressed me that even if the Scofield Bible did say that dispensational, this is a very important verse, that didn't by any means mean that premillennialism was built on this verse alone. I ~~felt~~ felt that you could leave Acts 15 out of the Bible altogether and there was still abundant evidence for premillennialism, and so it seemed to me very silly for him, on his interpretation of this passage to make such a sharp change in his view. But in subsequent years, I remember others who, on the basis of this passage, decided that premillennialism was wrong, and that wherever the Old Testament speaks of a kingdom, it means the church. They say, "James here spiritualized because Amos~~x~~ says there~~x~~, in Amos 9, at the end of that chapter, he says, "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and build up the breaches that are fallen, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old that they may possess the remnant of Edom, of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this." A kingdom, a conquest, an overwhelming of the remnant of Edom. "Close up the tabernacle of David which has fallen." A picture of conquest, a picture of an earthly kingdom, and here is James-^{using}speaking-about the development and upbuilding of the church. Therefore are we not at liberty to take any passage of the Bible that speaks of an earthly kingdom and say it really doesn't mean anything about conquest or about an earthly kingdom; it means the upbuilding of the Christian Church. Well, there is one difficulty with that. This passage here says, James says, "After this agree the words of the prophet, as it is written, "After this I will return and build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen." and someone has said, "Yes,

'I will return and build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen,' but "return" doesn't necessarily mean the return of Christ. That is just an Old Testament idiom. Very often ⁱⁿ the Old Testament you have the word return, meaning "to do again." "I'll return and do this" sometimes, "I'll do it again" He will return and do this means that He will do it over again." Well, that is what it is here," he says.

And this has nothing to do with the return of Christ. Well now our lesson for next time is to read Acts 15 and see what they're talking about here. Get an idea; what is the argument? What is the discussion about here? What is James concerned about? What is he trying to prove by this passage? Get that well in mind. And then, if this is an ~~idm~~ idiom, what is the idiom? Look it up in the Hebrew in Amos. In fact it would be a very excellent idea to take Amos 9: 11, 12, those two verses, look at them in the Hebrew, and then look at James' quotation, and see, Did James exactly quote? If he did not quote exactly, did he raise it to a higher level? The Old Testament says "possess the remnant of Edom." That is the lower level of conquest. James raised it to a higher level; he said, "That the residue of men g might seek the Lord." Is that what he did? Did he spiritualize, change it in that way to fit on to a higher level? and in connection with that it would be wise to look at the Septuagint. Because, ~~if~~ after all, James may have quoted the Septuagint. In fact, some of his phraseology ~~is~~ is near ~~enough~~ enough to ~~the~~ the LXX to make it quite clear that he is quoting the LXX. Now if James ~~is~~ is quoting the LXX, then if any spiritualizing is done when he is quoting the LXX, then it is the LXX ~~that~~ ^{that did the} spiritualizing it is the LXX and not James, isn't it? So it would be very good to look and see just what does he quote from the LXX, and to how great an extent does the Hebrew of LXX, how great an extent does the LXX agree with Amos. Now you see it is a very important problem. It is one on which many people have given up belief in premillennialism altogether in past years, and in fact some of them this last year have on account of this passage, and it is vital to know, is that a correct

interpretation of this passage, or what is the correct interpretation of the passage. So I wish that everybody would have a definite answer to those ~~this~~-questions, and above all, what is James here arguing about? What is the point here under discussion? (end of lecture)
(end of record)

e 62

Amos 9, and Acts 15, and to compare the two with one another and with the LXX rendering and to tell us just exactly what is under consideration in Acts 15. Let us look now at Amos 9. We find that in Amos 9:8, the prophet says, "Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth, saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of David, saith the Lord. For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of David - Israel among all nations like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. All the sowers of my people shall die by the sword, which say, 'The evil shall not overtake nor prevent us'." Now at this point we have a prediction of exile, a prediction of destruction for the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Destruction and exile, but not complete destruction of the rest. And then we find in v. 11, "a day is coming: "in that day, when I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it up as in the days of old." We have just been talking about the kingdom that David founded. We have read how the kingdom is going to be destroyed; the people are going to be scattered abroad, but the ^{house} kingdom is not going to be entirely destroyed. But now we read, the day is coming when the kingdom of David that is fallen will be raised up. Well, we have been talking about a kingdom. You think right away? Did the tabernacle of David refer to this kingdom which David had established? Well he says it is fallen, close up the breaches of it. Well we know that long before the time of Amos the kingdom of David had divided into two parts. There was a breach, there was a break, it was broken up into two sections. And

then he tells us it is going to break further, it is going to be destroyed. But, He says, the day is coming when it will be raised up. The breaches will be closed; I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it up as in the days of old." I will bring it up in a new sphere, as a great spiritual thing, as a great church, as something different than anything before? That is not what He says. He says, "I will build it up as in the days of yere- old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by my name. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when the re- plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed, and the mountain shall drop sweet wine. All the hills shall melt, and ^I will bring the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them. And they shall plant vineyards and drink the wine thereof. They shall also make gardens and eat the fruit of them. I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no longer be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." Now you take this passage from v. 11 through v. 15 in the light of what preceeds, in relation and contrast to the destruction that is first described, and here He is going ~~to~~ to build up as in the days of old, but very evidently as He goes on far better than in the days of old. The same sort of thing but greatly improved. Great stress on agricultural prosperity in verses 13-15. The people brought back to their own land; planted in their land, no more to be pulled up out of their land, and the tabernacle of David that is fallen is going to be raised up, and the breaches of it closed up, the ruins rebuilt as in the days of old, a wonderful prediction ~~it~~ it would seem of a great kingdom which is going to be established, a reestablishment of the kingdom of David. A reestablishment upon this earth; the people planted on their ~~own~~ own land and nomore pulled up out of the land which I have given them. A wonderful reestablishment of this glorious kingdom, a reestablishment which is a future wonderful contrast to the destruction which is now to come for the sin of the people. That is surely the first, most immediate impression d/2

which we get from Amos now in verses 11-15. (St: Raise up the tabernacle of David, would you say that means the kingdom?) Yes. (That's not absolutely literal, is it?) No, it is certainly not absolutely literal, any more than in verse 9, "He will sift the house of Israel like corn is sifted in a seive. That is certainly not^{absolutely} literal. (St: But that is a different kind of a figure.) What? You mean that is a simile and this is a metaphor. That is right. This is a metaphor. But "the tabernacle of David." Does he mean the tent that David used to live in when he was out in the wilderness? That that tent, which has been mildewed, wrecked and destroyed long before Amos time is going to be rebuilt? I mean, anybody, from any viewpoint whatever will feel that the tabernacle of David is here a figure. Wouldn't you say that? You'd have to. It certainly is not the tent in which David lived at some time in his life. It is a figure for something, unquestionably. And in the light of context, the most natural thing to take the thing to be is a figure for the kingdom that David ruled, for the power for the control which he had established. It is a figure for something undoubtedly. But that, in the light of context, I'm not saying is the correct interpretation. We're not to that point yet. I'm saying that is the most obvious interpretation. That is the thing which strikes you immediately

(St) I think it is very common in speaking of kingdoms and empires in our language to speak of the house of the kingdom as a ~~g~~ figure for it. We talk about the House of the Windsors, the House of the Holl , we use the^{word} "house" very frequently, referring to their power. We speak of "the end of their house," or "the rebuilding of their house," or the "reestablishing of their house." and it is a rather common figure to use the word "house" in that way. ^{Now the question is, is} The word "tabernacle" is used here as we would use "house/" ? It isn't used in that sense. If not in that sense, what other sense might it be? (St: Place of worship.) You mean the tabernacle that the Israelites used in the wilderness, which is referred to, I believe, about six hundred times by the Hebrew word ohel, and maybe three hundred times^{by} the Hebrew word mishcan, but never once by the word

sukah, the word that is used in this verse in Amos. I would hardly think that it would have anything to do with the place of worship, because it is not the word that is used that way in the Bible. You see, there are about six Hebrew words which are translated "tabernacle" in the Old Testament. There are just three roots, and the others are just forms of them. And the word ohel is used very frequently, mishcan quite frequently, but sukah never in that sense in the Old Testament. That is, of course, unless this is an example of it..I mean this one under consideration. It is never used of the tabernacle in the wilderness, or of any tabernacle of worship in any case that can be demonstrated to be such. The word is used in the sense of "tabernacle" I believe nine or twelve times. All of the three of them are references to the Feast of Tabernacles, which was the feast at which they built little booths. The word is sometimes translated "booth" and they built these little booths out of trees and branches and so on to stay in for a few days to remember the way in which they had been pilgrims in the wilderness, living in these booths or tents, and the Feast of Tabernacles, the feast to commemorate that, in all but three times, when this word sukah is translated tabernacle in the Old Testament, it refers to those. One time is this case here. One time is the case in the Book of Job, where the word is used, and the other instance is in Isaiah 2 where it speaks of the people who are going to have a shade above them--it speaks of a tabernacle above them for a shade, and there's the word zukah. In Acts 15 the word "tabernacle" is translated by "skinaï"; the ordinary word for "tent" which is used in Hebrews 11:8 where it speaks of how Abraham was dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, who were those who shared with them in the same promise, "dwelling in tabernacles" it is translated there. It is the word "sk⁷naï" which is the regular word for tent. But Hebrews 11:8, the A.V. translates it "tabernacle," that Abraham dwelt in tabernacles. That is, the Old English word "tabernacle" just means a "tent", and has nothing to do with worship except that there

was a tent made in the wilderness which was used for worship, and which
the tabernacle () 10 1/2
you might say is/the tent (paritsoon) but that particular worship place
is never referred to by this particular Hebrew word. So I think that it
is rather unfortunate that this word "tabernacle" is used here in this
place in Amos, because even though in Old English it doubtless has nothing
to do with worship, it simply means a tent, in Modern English we never
say, "I'm going out camping and staying in a tabernacle a few days," we
don't use that term in Modern English; we have specialized, it refers to
the ~~the~~ worship tabernacle of the Hebrews, but this Hebrew word *zukah*
is never used in that sense at all. Perhaps that is the most immediate
thing that suggests oneself when one reads this, except one reads this,
"And they will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen." Of
course, there was no worship place which is particularly associated with
David. David wasn't the one who established the tabernacle; that was
Moses. And Solomon built the temple. And this is not the word which is ~~is~~
used for tabernacle in any religious sense. It would be much better if
they simply translated the Hebrew word *zukah* with the Greek word "tent."
But I think that "booth" would be better than "tent", because it refers
more to a temporary habitation, usually built of branches and that sort
of thing, rather than specifically to a tent, although a tent may be
called a booth, but it is not the word *ohel* or *mishkan*. And so, "In that
day will I raise up the house of ~~the~~ David," or "the tent of David," would
perhaps be better Modern English than "tabernacle," since in Modern
English "tabernacle" has taken on that peculiar sense which it doesn't
have in the English in the time of King James. And for that reason the
word "tabernacle" does suggest to us the idea of something religious.
Now of course, it could be used of something religious. We speak of the
house of David, that could be of course, and the house of Solomon could
be the temple built, that is, the house that Solomon built. He also
built his own house, his own palace, but he also built the house of
God. And so the word house can be used religiously, or it can be used in

a general sense, and this is exactly the same 12 1/2 . This is house in the sense of a house which is not a permanent solid structure, but the emphasis is on the way in which David's house is gone to pieces. David's house has^{been} broken up into northern and southern kingdoms, and just three verses before he mentions, the kingdom is going to be destroyed, but now he says, a wonderful future is ahead: "The tent of David that~~is~~ fallen will be raised up, its breaches will be closed, his ruins will be raised, and I will build it as in the days of old." And so at first sight, we have that misconception of that word "tabernacle" which comes from its having gone out of use in Modern English, except in the specialized sense that it didn't have in Old English, and which the word *sukah* never has. But aside from that first glance, our first real close look at the question we would undoubtedly say verses 11-15 describe a great future kingdom, a time of great prosperity on this earth, a time of great agricultural prosperity--~~ea-these-~~, a time of satisfaction of every need of the people, a time when the Israelites will be planted on their land, and no more pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God, a time when the great kingdom which God gave to David will be reestablished as in the days of old, only more so. That~~is~~ what we have described here at first sight, and until you come to the New Testament you say, "Yes, that is what we have here;" that is undoubtedly the first impression, and reading it fairly carefully, you feel that everything fits into that interpretation. I doubt if anybody in the days of Amos would ever have thought, "No, this is not a picture of the establishment of God's kingdom; this is a picture of the eternal state, or the heavenly home, or a picture of the church, or something like that." Nobody in Amos day, I am sure, or in the day of Isaiah, or in the day of Jeremiah, would ever have gotten the impression--or in the time when Christ was born-- from these words of anything other than that it is an earthly kingdom which God is going to reestablish. But--I say "When Christ was born."

Now if, however, James, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, interpreted this in a different way, then we as believers in the Scriptures must say, "yes, the Holy Spirit has enabled James to show us that our previous understanding was completely wrong. He has enabled him to make clear to us that this is not an earthly kingdom, that it is something else." If the New Testament clearly and unmistakably shows that this passage in Amos is not a ~~passage~~- picture of an earthly kingdom, but is a picture of something entirely different, then....(end of record)

Second, it shows us that where else we have in the Old Testament pictures of an earthly kingdom, we must carefully consider in each case whether they are also perhaps are pictures of the same thing this is. I don't say it proves that, but it certainly throws the duty upon us of ~~considering~~ ^{also} considering carefully whether they/are not pictures of an earthly kingdom. And then we have open to us the possibility of doing what Dr. Allis has suggested, of taking the Old Testament prophecies and raising them to a higher level--level, and taking the early primitive Old Testament ideas of these early prophets of a kingdom of military conquest and all that, and raising it up to the New Testament level of a glorious spread of the Gospel, an outreaching of the church, and all this which is wonderful indeed, which begins in the New Testament, and which I believe is clearly predicted at various places in the Old Testament. We have then to say that is what the kingdom passages also refer to. I believe it is clearly predicted elsewhere, but is it what these passages refer to. Well, if this passage is that, then it certainly makes a big step in the direction of saying that all the kingdom passages are also. and so we look at Acts 15 and see what James does with it. (St: I think you must admit that before this could be fulfilled as predicted here, it couldn't be fulfilled unless the people turned to the Lord. It would be inconceivable that the Lord would bless the people materially unless there was, unless their hearts had been turned toward the Lord. ...absent in the passage.)

Not stressed in this passage. Not even mentioned. That is right.

(Dr. B: It is in the verses just preceding.) Yes. In the verses just preceding we are told how the house of Israel, which has gone into grievous sin is going to be punished, wiped out from the face of the earth, utterly destroyed, although the house of Jacob is not going to be utterly destroyed. There is going to be a tremendous destruction. The people are going to be widely scattered, and this is going to happen on account of their sin. And then he say, but a glorious day is going to come later on when God ~~is~~ is going to reestablish the kingdom. Now He doesn't make any mention that in connection with the reestablished kingdom there will also be a great spiritual change, but since we are given that as the reason for the terrible previous destruction, it is an escapable conclusion that there must also be great spiritual blessing and great spiritual turning to the Lord, even though He doesn't say it. (Dr. B: But besides- it is implied that the grain sifted out is what experiences the restoration. The sinners are cut off.) Yes, the sinners are cut off and the grain is sifted. And so there is a great selection on God's part, and of course, no one can turn to the Lord unless the Lord-~~the-~~ turns them to Him, and it is implied that He going to turn them, or else He would not give these material blessings to those who were utterly sinful. The stress is not laid on it here. The stress-is-not-laid-e- here is laid upon the material aspect, as it is so often. Now we turn to Acts 15, and we see what James did with this passage. And if we go to Acts 15 and we find that James is convinced that this is not a passage dealing with an earthly kingdom at all, but that it is a picture of a heavenly church which exists in the hearts of men, which does not overspread the earth, but which consists of individuals scattered here and there who are following God and trying to obey ~~by~~ him, and that is what Amos~~is~~ refers to , and all that Amos refers to, then we must-certainly have warrant for seeing if we can do the same thing with all the other kingdom passages in the Old Testament. And if we go to Acts 15 and we find that there is a council which meets and which considers the question,

Is the Church going to be made up simply of the Jews? Is it only the Jews who have the right to be members of the kingdom of heaven? And if we find that after they have considered this, and the council, Shall we permit Gentiles to come in the church? Shall we permit Gentiles to become members of the kingdom of heaven. If we find then that in v. 13 James says to them, "Here is the answer. Simeon has declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name, and to this agree all words of the prophets. Peter has told how God is taking Gentiles and bringing them into the church. Now that is just what the prophets said. "after this I will return again and build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen, and build again the walls and set it up, that the residue of men may seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, says the Lord who does all these things. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world, therefore my word is that we should permit the Gentiles to come into the church, because God has already predicted the establishment of the wonderful church, the building of the tabernacle of David, and that it includes Gentiles as well as Jews, and therefore it is permissible to have Gentiles in the church. And so the tabernacle of David which Amos talks about has nothing to do with any future kingdom, but it is the fact that the church is going to be built. And if James interprets it that way, and interprets Amos this way, and then in v 12 we found that Amos said, "I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen who are called by name, saith the Lord that doeth this," but James raises that to a higher level. Amos is down on that militaristic kingdom level, and he says "possess the remnant of Edom." But James-reads-it;- raised it to the higher level; he says that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called. And so he has raised it up to this higher spiritual level, and he has taken the gross material terms of the kingdom and of agricultural prosperity and no more being pulled out and all

that, and he has brought that up to the high level that what is really taught about there is that there is going to be a church, a great spiritual church is going to exist, and therefore if Amos was describing the coming of the church, we therefore we- have the right to look at all the kingdom passage and say, probably they also are to be taken the same way, and wherever it speaks of a kingdom, it means a church. And so, if this interpretation of James, 'this use of the pasage is correct, we have struck a powerful blow at the foundation of any belief in a reestablished material kingdom upon this earth. However, we want to look at it closely and see if this is the correct view of it, the correct interpretation. See if this is the interpretation which James meant to bring out. And when we do that, we look at the passages, and we notice that in ~~Amos~~ Amos, Amos of course said in v. 11, "I will build it as in the days of old." Now James omits those words. James simply says, "I will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up." Well, he leaves at the reference to the days of old; maybe that is because he now knows it isn't like the days of old. Amos was wrong in thinking it was reestablishing a kingdom as in the days of old. It is something new and different; it's the church, so those words are wrong, so James simply omits the wrong words that Amos used. Well, as Bible-believers we hardly accept that interpretation, and therefore it raises a certain question at this point. Did James still think those words were correct, even ~~thogh~~-- though he didn't bother to quote them? And in line with that we notice another difference--that Amos said, "I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen." James says, "I will return and build again the tabernacle which is fallen/ down. " Amos said, "I will build up the breaches and raise up his ruins." James says, "I will build agian the ruins thereof." That is, twice he inserts the word "again", which was not in Amos. "I will do it again," twice given, (next pg)

and so even though the emphasis is that this is a doing again of something done before, "build it as in the days of old" is omitted, with the omission of those words, yet we find it inserted twice with the insertion of these two words "again." That is, it is the beginning of the word "to rebuild" rather than "build." The insertion of that idea here in the Greek by James is stressing again that it is something ^{which} ~~that~~ was-done-before and which is again done, to build again the tabernacle of David. Now, of course, that is not a great point, but it is one of some interest. Now in verse 17, "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and of all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." Amos ~~is~~ says, "that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all/^{the heathen} who are called by my name." Has James lifted James to a higher level, and changed "possessing the remnant of Edom" to "seeking after the Lord"? Well, we find there the interesting fact that the LXX has it that "the remnant of men and all the Gentiles upon/^{whom} my name is called may ~~is~~ earnestly seek me, saith the Lord who doeth all these things." The "me" in italics; the "me" is not in the Greek. "They may earnestly seek," the "me" doubtless understood. And so if the statement of Amos has been raised up to a higher level, it is not James who has raised it; it is the LXX, two hundred ^e years before Christ. They have taken it, "that the remnant of mankind may seek after the Lord," instead of, "that they may possess the remnant of Edom." The LXX took it that way, and James simply quotes the LXX. Well now, in a case like this, we look at the Hebrew, and we find that with the change of one letter in the Hebrew, it will give what the LXX has, and so if the LXX translated it that way, ^{in 200 B.C.;} ~~and-two-hundred-~~ rather than to say that the LXX translators raised it to a higher spiritual level, especially when they didn't in so many other passages, it would be so much more natural to say that the Hebrew manuscript the LXX translators had before them had this other letter in it. One letter is all the difference. And therefore, that probably the LXX in this particular point preserved for us the original Hebrew, and James in quoting the LXX here is simply ^{quoting} that which is the original Hebrew, and so he is not lifting

to a higher level; he is not making any change; he is not bringing out the ~~truth~~- true significance which wasn't in the original; he is simply translating a better text, the ~~text~~ that the LXX had rather than the one which has been preserved in our Hebrew Bible, a difference of just one letter. (St: I can't understand why the LXX would be better..." If you have the LXX having a text/^{which is}just like our present Hebrew except for one letter, but it makes a big difference in the meaning, but there is one letter different in the original Hebrew, it would suggest that the LXX did not change the idea or spiritualize it in some way, but that they simply had a text which had that other letter in it, and therefore, that would give you ~~eat~~-- at the time of James a LXX text preserving one tradition of an original text, and our Masoretic text with another, and when ask which of the two is correct, we would say, If James uses one rather than the other, it simply means that that is the one he thinks is the correct one. If he thought that the LXX was wrong, ~~if~~ he certainly would have quoted what was right. I would say that in most cases where the LXX and Hebrew differ, the Hebrew is right and the LXX is wrong, because the Hebrew has been far better preserved than the LXX, but not in all. There are a few cases, undoubtedly, where the LXX is correct rather than the Hebrew, and if we find Christ or one of the other apostles quoting the LXX in a place where it ~~it~~ makes a difference in the meaning, I think we are justified in saying the LXX probably has the correct answer. -What- I am simply saying is that it is incorrect to say that in reference to this particular phrase "they will possess the remnant of Edom", James has not raised it to a higher level in saying, -translating it, "that the residue of men might seek after the L^ord," he has taken what the LXX had, "that the residue of men might seek," with "the Lord" understood, / and he has put in "the L_ord" that is, with "me" understood, the L_ord speaking. "...When I raise up the tabernacle of D_avid I will build up his breaches, I will build up his ruins, that the rest of mankind may seek" with "me" understood, and

in the LXX you will read, and he is simply saying the LXX is correct, if there is a difference of importance. If there is not a difference of importance, then he simply gives us a general summary of the Old Testament teaching--it doesn't matter which it is. So ~~if~~ you have no evidence in that phrase that James has spiritualized the passage, and given a different reading in order to show what it means, as being something raised to a higher level. (St: What is that one letter?) The word is "that they may possess ¹⁵ (irushua?) that they may possess, and that they may seek--
~~the-vowel-inside-the-yodh-~~ ^{15 1/2} The question whether that is a yodh or a ~~///~~ ^{daleth} whether it is written this way or whether it is written this way....

(end of record.)

It has been ~~if~~ difficult/ ^{for me} to tell whether it was a ~~///~~ ^{/// daleth} or a yodh that was written. In writing that is not ~~if~~ extremely careful, if you make your yodh a little large, it can easily be taken for a daleth, if you make your daleth a little small, it can easily be taken for a yodh, and that is the difference between the two texts here. As you read in the English, "that they may possess the remnant of Edom," or "that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord," "may seek me," it sounds utterly different. Actually the only difference is the one letter, ^{because the word "Edom"} and the word "mankind" are exactly the same, that is, the vowels are different, but the vowels were never written until the Fifth Century ~~A.D.~~. The letters are aleph, daleth, mene, "mankind" or "Edom", they are exactly the same. (St) Yes, the first one, with a yodh, is from the root וָיָרַשׁ , which means "to possess," "to possess" or "to seize." And the second one was from the word וָיָדַשׁ which means "to seek". You see, you ~~if~~ change yodh to daleth, z to k in the English, "seize" to "seek", ^{yarash} ~~if~~ to darash, a difference of one letter, and that is a difference long before James' time, because the LXX from 200 B.C. has had this reading. And James is here following the LXX. He is not slavishly following the LXX, he is reminding them of the passage, and is not quoting word for word; the LXX says, "That they may seek me," James

said, "That they may seek the Lord." He is bringing out who it is that they are seeking. "Me," with God speaking, brings it out just as well, but James is bringing out the idea rather than quoting it with slavish literalness. The big difference, between "seek" and "seize", is a difference of one Hebrew letter, and a difference which is already in the LXX, two hundred years before Christ. So that we do not have any evidence of raising it to a higher level at this point. However, we have the big, main question before us yet. Before I mention the big main question I want to mention, not go into right at the moment, but mention one other of the smaller questions. You notice that as James begins it, he says, "After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David. I will return and build again the tabernacle of David. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen." Where does James get this "I will return and will build again," that is, "I will ~~will~~ return and--" where does he get that? It's not in Amos; Amos says, "at that day." James says, "After this I will return and ." That is an interesting difference. Now why the difference. Well some say, "When James says, 'After this I will return and--' ' he is saying, 'This prediction is a prediction of what will happen after the return of Christ,' and therefore James introduces it with words referring to the return of Christ, ' 'after this I will return and--' and then goes on to tell what will happen. Put it in the first person, since the rest of it is in the first person, and showing that it is something after the return of Christ." Well, Amos simply says, "In that day," and what is the day to which ~~the-day-to-~~ he is referring. If it is a future kingdom it must be after the return of Christ, because there has been no opportunity for such a thing before. Such a thing has not/^{yet} happened, and the agricultural prosperity here described, and all this material situation here, well conceivable it could come right before the return of Christ. It certainly would seem much more likely after, but Amos doesn't say/ which; it is simply future to his day. Now James introduces/^{with} the words "after this I

will return," and so that/^{seems}to put it after the return of Christ. But someone says, "No. In the Old Testament the word שׁוּב , "return" is occasionally used to mean "do again", and the Old Testament says, "I will repeat it," "I will do it again," uses shuv, and James has literally translated the shuv, has literally taken it and said, "After this I will return and-" Well the difficulty with that is that there is no shuv ~~in~~ in the passage in the Old Testament. James is not literally translating a word that doesn't occur at this point. And it doesn't occur in the LXX at this point. The LXX begins it, "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen." The LXX doesn't have "return." James has inserted it, and whatever the reason he has done it, ^{it} is something he has done knowingly. He has done it with some per- purpose in mind, because it is not in the Book of Amos at this point. He is evidently interpreting the reference of Amos rather than simply giving us a quotation; he is trying to show where it fits into the prophetic system. Well, ~~it~~ ^{there} is a more vital question in a way than any ~~we~~ we have looked at yet, and that is this one: What is James talking about here anyway? What is the argument under consideration? And we noticed here, if the argument here is, Can Gentiles come in the church? James says, The Bible tells us they can, because it says, "I'm going to build up the church in order that the rest of men and the G_entiles on whom my name is called may seek after the L_ord, and so the building of the Church is to include Gentiles as well as Jews, and therefore it is the church we are talking about here. But is that the question here? Was the council called in order to find out whether ~~the~~ Gentiles could come into the church? Is that the matter under discussion here? Well, you find that if you look back of this chapters, you get clear back to Acts 8:35, and in A_cts 8:35 you find that there was a eunuch from Ethiopia who was on his way down from Palestine, and PHilip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus." And in the rest of ~~chapter 8~~ ^{we} have Philip preaching

Jesus to him, and Philip baptizes him, and the eunich doesn't see Philip anymore, but Philip goes ~~u~~ on his way rejoicing because the eunich has accepted Christ, and there was no mention made there of Philip stopping and saying, "why look here, why do I have to preach Jesus to this man? He's ia Gentile?" The question isn't raised, and there is no evidence that ~~o/ta~~ others raised the question. Many years then before the time of the council at Jerusalem Philip had thought it perfectly all right to preach to a Gentile, to preach Jesus to him, not only that but to baptize him. NOT only that, but you get over to Acts 10, and in Acts 10:47 you find that after Peter had preached the word to Cornelius, and Peter hesitated about preaching it to Cornelius, Peter hesitated greatly, but God ~~g/ab~~ gave Peter a vision to show he should give it to Cornelius, and Peter preached it to Cornelius, and then in verse 47 Peter said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the H^Uly Ghost as well as we?" So they went out and brought in some water, and he baptized him, we read, and he didn't seem to think there ^{anything wrong} was/in it, and then in the next chapter, chapter 11, the people, however, did ask about it. They said, "Is this right?" And so we have the apostles and those in Judea hearing about it, and Peter came up to them, and some of them said, "What is the idea of your going preaching to Gentiles?" And Peter said, "I didn't think of doing it myself, but God gave me a vision I should do it; " he says in verse 15, "As I began to speak the HOLY Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning," and he says in verse 17, "For ~~As~~asmuch as God gave them the like gift as he gave unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God?" And when they heard these things they held their peace and glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the G^Untiles granted ~~to/them~~ repentence unto life." That is back in chapter 11. And then after that, we find up in Antioch, chapter 13, the church up in Antioch, and we find that the HOLY Spirit tells the people to separate Paul and Barnabas, and Paul and B^arnabas go off, and they

go all through Asai Minor preaching the word of Christ, and they have Gentiles brought into the kingdom all through this, and then after all this is over, years after the time when Cornelius was converted, do they have a council in Jerusalem to determine whether Gentiles can be brought in to the kingdom of God and become members of the church? They had settled that years before. That was something everybody was familiar with. God had granted to the Gentiles to be saved. That is not the matter under discussion at all here. The idea that the tabernacle of David here must refer to the church because the discussion is whether the Gentiles shall be brought into the church or not rests upon an entire misunderstanding of the whole subject under discussion in Acts 15, which is very clearly brought out in the introduction to it, because the first verse of the chapter says, that certain men ^{from} ~~of~~ Judea taught the brethren and said, "Except ye be circumcised--" Evidently these whom they called brethren were Gentiles; they weren't circumcised, but they come to them and they say, "Ye must be circumcised. Unless ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." And then in verse 5, certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, it is needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And so the question is not, Shall Gentiles be brought into the church. Gentiles had been brought into the church for some years already. It has been accepted; recognized by the apostles; ~~is~~ recognized by all parts of the church. It is a well-known fact that God is converting Gentiles and bringing them into the church. That is not the discussion at all. The discussion is, Must the Gentiles who were brought into the church then be circumcised. The discussion is over circumcision. (St: In Acts 11 there was a question in their mind, could the Gentiles come into the Old Testament body of believers called the church. Were they brought into the church as a-~~em~~premise- proselytes? Were these Gentiles brought into the church even as Gentiles were brought in in the Old Testament? The question here is whether they can come in

or ~~is~~ not...) Yes, but in chapter 11 there was discussion, but they decided that God had led, and that they were to be brought in, and that is some years previous to chapter 15. (St: That was because of the manifestation, the vision. Peter doubted...) Peter doubted before, yes, before he went he doubted greatly, but God gave him the vision and he went there, and he preached, and to Peter's great surprise the Holy Ghost fell on them, and when that ^{happened} Peter said, "Can any man forbid water?" (St: But after that Peter went back to the Jews...) After that Peter went back and he talked in Jerusalem with the leaders in chapter 11, and presented the matter, and they said, "Then hath God granted to the Gentiles ~~is~~ repentance unto life," and they recognize it, and in chapter 11 Peter and the others have agreed that the Gentiles ~~is~~ ^{be} are to/received into the church. Let's look back at chapter 11. Let's make that clear. V1-17 there are questions raised. And Peter discusses the question. And then in verse 18, "When they ~~heard~~ heard these things they held their peace and glorified God saying, "Then God has also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." (St: They believed, didn't they, that the Gentiles could have life through faith in the Jewish God, didn't they?") (Dr. B: And in the Old Testament way they would have to be circumcised if they were recognized by the Jews.) That is right. In the Old Testament a Gentile could come and could say, "I want to become a Jew. I want to believe in your God. I want to be saved, the way you are." They would say, "All right, come, we'll circum-~~ise~~ cise you," they would make him a Jew by circumcising him, he is now a Jew, he is a member of the Jewish group; he is saved as they are. Well now, Cornelius has not been circumcised. Cornelius is a Gentile, and the Holy Spirit falls upon a Cornelius, and Cornelius is recognized as a Christian now, and this ~~is~~ Peter is now convinced, and the others are convinced, and then they say, "God has granted unto Gentiles repentance unto life." Now if anybody said, "Cornelius has got to be circumcised," there is no

mention of it here ~~is~~ in this chapter. Somebody may have said it, but at least nobody said it loudly enough that it occasioned a big discussion on it. After that, some years after, we have Paul going on a great missionary journey. He goes all through Asia Minor preaching to Gentiles, there are Gentile churches established, and the thing is going along and everybody is glorifying God and saying it is wonderful, and then people begin to say, "Oh yes, but these people in these churches have got to be circumcised. They have got to become Jews or they can't be saved. This is fine that they have accepted Christ, but they also have to be circumcised and become Jews. That is the question they are raising now. To the Christian now it is a question not /of whether Gentiles can be saved, it is a question of whether, to be saved need to be circumcised. That is the question. The question is not just of salvation; the question is circumcison, or you might say, /circumcision. That is the question. And so it is not a question ~~is~~ of whether there is going to be a church established which has Jews and Gentiles. That they have already got. It is a question of whether they will have to circumcise them so that they will all be Jews now. (Dr. B: all get into the kingdom of heaven....)(end of record)

Dr. M: You see how that in Acts 15 it is very vital that we have the question in mind, the question ^{is} ~~is~~ circumcison. Now what does all this have to do with circumcison? Amos doesn't mention circumcison/ at all in his discussion, and in this question now why does he quote a verse here? If he just wants a verse to say, Gentiles can be followers of God, why there are dozens of them in the Old Testament. In fact, take this particular one. What has it got to do with the matter of circumcison? There are much clearer verses than this as to Gentile salvation in the Old Testament, many of them. Why then quote this particular statement in this connection. Let's look again at the course of the ~~is~~ discussion in chapter 15. They said, "except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses,

ye cannot be saved." And then in verse 5, "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed." Now verse 4, before they rose up, we find that in the church, the apostles and the ^{elders} ~~apostles~~ had received and Barnabas.

Paul/ V. 3 we find that Paul and Barnabas ~~had~~ had declared the conversion of the Gentiles, and this caused great joy to all the brethren. They were all rejoicing because the Gentiles had been converted. They are all happy over it. Gentiles can become Christians. That had been recognized for many years. But now these Pharisees, that is former Pharisees who are now Christians, are raising a question. They say, "Yes, that is fine. These people are saved. They are Gentiles. They believe in Christ. They ~~had~~ have got the Holy Spirit. They are saved. Yes. But now we have got to get busy and circumcise them, and tell them to keep the law of Moses. Because, even though salvation is only through Christ, it is only Jews who can be saved in the end. Gentiles can be saved, but they must become Jews. They must be circumcised." The apostles and the others come together to consider the matter. And so, ~~after~~ after much disputing in verse 7, Peter rose up, and Peter/ said, "Men and brethren, you know that a long time ago God made choice of us that by mouth should ~~hear~~ hear the word of the Gospel and believe." He said you know that a long time ago Gentiles believed when we preached, and God made choice of me, that is God sending His special vision to send him up to Cornelius. And v 8, he says, "God that knows the heart bear them witness, He gave them the Holy Ghost as He gave us. He put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith. He says, here is the situation, it has been going on a long time. These people have been coming into the kingdom, these Gentiles; God has made no difference between Gentiles and Jews, they are all Christians, they ~~all~~ all have the Holy Ghost; God has purified their hearts by faith. Peter says, Now therefore, why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, but we believed that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved even as they. Here are Peter's words. Peter says, "We have

known for a long time, years ago I went in front of you. All these years Gentiles have been coming in and we have been rejoicing over it. Now why do we have to tell them they have to be circumcised. Now if they had been circumcised first, if Peter had been on his own, if God hadn't given him the vision in Joppa when the man came to him from Cornelius, Peter would have sent word back, "If you are sincere, get yourself circumcised. Circumcise yourself and your family; join the Jewish community; after you do that, ^{then be glad} I will come and tell you about Christ. But you must do that first." Peter didn't do that because God gave him a special vision and told him to go right ahead. And so he went. And now Peter says, "It is an established thing; this is the way God is doing things; we have been doing it for years now; why do you now begin bringing up this matter of circumcision?" (St) Well for one thing, they probably had not been coming in at Jerusalem itself to any great extent. Cornelius was in northern Palestine, and the believers were up in Antioch and up through Asia Minor, and that the people in Jerusalem heard of it; the head apostles had all talked the matter over ^{with Peter} when Cornelius came in. To them the matter was a settled thing. Evidently these Pharisees, ^{who} were more and more being converted, more of them brought into the church, didn't know about these things that were ~~happening~~ happening outside, and didn't fully understand the whole business, and when they began to hear of it they raised the question, and ^{now} when they heard of this great number coming, they might not have made much fuss with a great instances, but when they hear of all these converts Paul is $4\frac{3}{4}$ up in Asia Minor, and they have heard of these things and they are wondering about it, now Paul and Barnabas, and they have been given the right hand of fellowship by the heads of the apostles and all that, the Pharisees begin to say, "What is this that we are getting into?" Is this according to the Scripture after all, or not? We have heard such things; we have been wanting to hear the truth of it. Here is the man who has led all these people into the kingdom; now," they say, "hadn't we better make a fuss and see to

it that things are done decently and ~~in~~ in order, that there is no slip-up? If these people are made Jews, that they are circumcised?" And so they ~~ris--ri-~~ raised the question. And the question didn't come from the apostles, it came from these others who probably one by one got to talking about it and then they got to talking together and made a big fuss, and now it comes up, now it has got to be settled. And now the matter is before them. And so now, Peter has ~~presented~~ presented the situation, and Peter ~~has~~ said, "God decided this matter. God showed His wonderful grace in giving them the Holy Ghost without ~~asking~~ asking that they be circumcised first. God showed it was His will." And some of the people are sitting there ^{and} saying, "Now I don't understand that. This sounds like a wonderful supernatural work. Peter is a man of honor; we believe what Peter said- says, and the apostles have believed him, and they have approved of this years ~~ago~~ ago, and yet we can't understand it. The Scripture says, "If a person believe he must be circumcised." If a person is going to be saved he must be circumcised. That is what the Bible says. Of course, all the Bible they had then was the Old Testament. That is what the Bible says: You believe; you must be circumcise. But Peter says that God has poured out the Holy Spirit on people who haven't been circumcised. And the apostles here have recognized what Peter has told them, have gone along with him, and have allowed these people to be recognized ~~as~~ as members of the church who haven't been circumcised, and they have approved of Paul and Barnabas going all through Asia Minor and preaching to Gentiles, and not saying to the Gentiles, "Come and be circumcise, and then we will tell you about Christ," but saying, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," and making no mention of circumcision. "Now," they say, "It certainly ~~is~~ /~~it~~ sounds as if there is a supernatural intervention of God to show that this is to be done, but how can God contradict Himself?" God has said, 'You must be circumcised. You must be Jews if you are to be saved.' And to the Jews Christ comes and tells the word of salvation;

now God ~~is~~ by a supernatural act is showing the Gentiles are to be too. Well, if God does it, God does it, but it is self-contradictory. It contradicts the Word of God, and it must be false." That is their situation; that is their frame of mind. Here is God's moral, supernatural ^{we} intervention. Yes/believe it; Peter says it. Paul says it. They are men of honor. But how can it be, because the Old Testament doesn't teach that? And so James solved the problem. After they had given all these things, then James says, "Men and brethren, hearken unto me." Now James sums it up and solves the problem. James says, "Simeon," which, of course, you know is Peter, "Simeon has declared how God has previously, God at the first," now "at the first" doesn't mean "centuries ago," "at the first" means "at the beginning of all this," at the time of Cornelius a few years ago. (St: Could it be the Simeon who took the Lord Jesus in his arms and blessed Him?) I don't think so. In the verses just before we have the account of what Peter said, and then James gets up and says that somebody has said that God has visited the Gentiles to take a people for His name, and that would ~~seem~~ seem to be what Peter just said. Actually it may be two or three forms of the name; it is not a Greek name, of course. It is an Aramaic name. The name means "God has heard me." You ~~do~~ remember ~~that~~/~~that~~ Samuel, Shem-u-el, "God has listened," "God has heard," now this is "Shum-a on-i". "on" I believe is a Greek ending, I don't know so much about the end, "oni," but the root of it is shem-a, "He hath heard." Well now, in Greek, you don't pronounce that ~~y~~, there is no ayin in Greek, and so as you to represent that shum-a in Greek, whether that ayin will express itself or not will depend a bit on how the Greek ear would catch it. And so, one Greek might put it down as "Simon," ignoring the ayin which is a queer sound to him; he can't understand that ayin; in fact, the ayin is very important in modern Arabic, but they say that if you are going to pronounce it correctly, you have to spend a great deal of time around camels, listening to them and ~~learning~~ learning to make the sounds like the camels do. The Arabs are

with the camels all their lives, and they learn it from the camels, that ayin way down in the ~~f~~ throat there, ~~by~~^a/few Europeans have learned to make it excellently, but it is a very difficult sound. (laughter) But now to the Greek, someone would say, "Simon", and the ~~the~~^{Aramaic or the} Hebrew ~~of~~ would say, "No, Shima," and so another one represents it by the "e", and we ~~find~~ find in a good many cases that in our English representation of words, ~~where~~ where there is an ayin, there is apt to be a representation by an "e" in the English which you wouldn't have otherwise. So Simeon, or Simon, it would be very silly to have the name sometimes one and/the other, except if there is some cause of it, and here there is a cause. The actual name has the ayin in it. (St) No, I'm not saying the Bible says it, but I'm saying that that is the way these people had interpreted the Old Testament, because in the Old Testament, the man who was saved, Abraham, was commanded to be circumcise, and Moses, who had not circumcise his child, was almost killed as a result, and all the Israelites were commanded to circumcise their children, and that was the sign of the covenant. The one who was saved was supposed to circumcise himself and his children, and that was God's command to them, and so naturally they went on/^{to}the next ~~step~~ step, and said, "In order to be saved you have to be circumcised. To be a Jew to be circumcised. And a Jew who is a true Jew, who believes ~~in~~ in God and is looking forward ~~for~~ for the redemption of Israel, to the coming of His Son, he is saved. Many many Christians hold that you have to be baptized or you can't saved, or you have to baptized in a certain way. There are all kinds of ideas in any group of people that are not altogether consistent. (St) They would eventually have had to face it, but they had not up to this time. Eventually they did have to. But this sort of thing would bring the question ^(12/5)sharp relief and question the thing.) and so now they are beginning to face it. This thing is the problem. What are you going to do about this? We see supernatural acts of God. Now in your day you will ~~have~~ have people come and tell you they have seen supernatural acts, and they are different from the church. What do

you do? You dare not believe it. The Scripture is my source. I stand by the Scripture. That is what we must do. The Scripture is the final word, and what it says is true, and it is the whole truth. But God can be give a people understanding of His Word; God can show things that were in it that we hadn't seen before. That can happen. And at that time, when the people saw these great supernatural events, they hadn't seen them themselves; they hadn't seen Cornelius, they hadn't seen the people Paul preached to, but they heard Paul tell about it, and they heard Peter tell/ it, and it was / sufficient to convince the apostles, but then the Christian Pharisees are raising the question, and now the question is, "Can you reconcile this with Scriptural truth. If you can't, you have got to give it up." So James says, "Yes, you can." James says, "Peter has declared how God has formerly (turning back to Cornelius) has visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name." You notice the phrase James uses. "He has visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name. And to this agree the words of the apostles." In other words, This is a supernatural thing that God has done, and Peter was explained it/^{and} is definitely for it, but of course we can't accept it if it contradicts the Bible. We must say we were misunderstanding; God isn't really doing it. Devils are doing it; something ~~like~~ that; it is not God if it contradicts the Scripture. But James says, it doesn't contradict the Scripture; the prophets agree to it. It is already predict~~ed~~ in the Old Testament. Well, how does the Old Testament predict something about circumcision? Well, it is not a matter of circumcision now, merely, but the immediate first step is this, "To take out of them, out of the Gentiles, a people for God's name." Now if there is a people for God's name, which is still a Gentile people, they are not part of the Jews, they have not been circumcised, and brought into the Jews, but they are part of the Gentiles; they are a people for God's name which is a Gentile people....(end of record)

Particularly if you show that there are two classes, that there are the Jewish believers, and that there are the Gentiles who are called by H's name. If you can show that there is such two classes, and there continues for any length of time to be such two classes, because a man might come and be a Gentile, but the minute he believes and you circumcise him, you make him a Jew, and he is no longer a Gentile. (St) ..Simon has related.

II.

(Mr. Eppert: You notice that in ~~second~~-Peter 1, it begins "Simon Peter," there is a certain manuscript which has an alternative reading, "Simeon.")

II. Peter,

That is interesting, that in some manuscripts some- have it as "Simon," and some have it as "Simeon." Some of them getting the ayin represented by the "e", and others not. You just can't arbitrarily stick/in "Simon," if there isn't a reason for it, if there isn't a philological reason, there must be something wrong, but there is in this case, there is that ayin, and the question is, Can we represent it or not in our language.

It is just like the "H" of the Hebrew: there is nothing to represent it in the Greek, and consequently/you'll find it left off altogether, you'll

often

find the "Heth" sometimes ~~em~~- omitted. He quotes then, from Amos, and he begins the quotation with ~~the~~- an introductory phrase to show where he thinks the quotation fits into the situation. Now the reason he quotes this from Amos is very clear when we read verse 14 again. James

says, "Simeon has declared how God has, beginning some years ago, visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name." And he quotes

Amos in verse 17, "--that the rest of men may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." You note that it is the exact same phrase. "A people for H,s name," "those Gentiles upon whom

my name is called." So Amos said, Simeon said, that God is supernaturally showing us that He wants a people from the Gentiles who will be a Gentile people for His name. Well, he says, Amos has told us years ago that at the return of Christ, there will not only be Jews who believe, but there will also at that time be a great people who will be a people upon whom the name of God is called who are still Gentiles, and who are not Jews, ^{and} who

therefore have not been circumcised. And so, James says, this is a difficult question, whether we need to circumcise these people or not. It might not be a matter of salvation by faith. We say-a-people who is ^{that a person} a believer will do certain things; he is not saved because he does them, but if he is saved he will be baptized, he will go and join the church, he will witness to Christ, he will study His Word, he will ~~do~~ do these things if he is saved. Well, now, these people believed in Christ, but is it necessary that they be circumcise? No; if they are circumcised, that makes them Jews, and God has said, at the return of Christ there are going to be not only Jews who are His people, but also Gentiles upon whom His name is called, and so He introduces the quotation with the words, "after this I will return" which are not in English, but are James' introduction to it in order to show where it fits into the scheme of future events. It cannot be James' misunderstanding of the Old Testament. If ^{James} ~~the~~ misquoted the Old Testament, you can be sure those Pharisees would have jumped up and said, "What are you doing, giving us something that isn't even in the Old Testament?" Those people there knew their Old Testament thoroughly, and he wasn't quoting the LXX, because the LXX doesn't say, "after this will I return." The LXX says, "in that day." But he is introducing it to show where it is in the scheme of future events. He says, after this Gospel period; after this time after the death of Christ. There is a time coming when Christ is going to return--and all of the apostles at this time we know were looking forward and longing for the return of Christ, and James says, "Amos has told us something about what is going to ~~do~~ happen after the return of Christ," and the quotation is in the first person, God speaking, Christ speaking, and so he puts "the beginning" into the ~~the~~ same first person to introduce it. "After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up," the future kingdom after His return. He says, when that happens, what is the situation ~~is~~ going to be? That the rest of men may seek after

me," but he puts in "the Lord" to make it abundantly clear what is meant, rather than quoting word for word. "That the rest of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord who doeth all these things." And therefore, James says, the thing that has been given to you by Peter and ~~Paul~~/ Paul, what they have seen, is not a contradiction at all, but it is what Amos predicted. Amos said, when Christ returns and sets up His kingdom upon earth, there will be two classes of people here, there will be the Jews, the circumcised ones, the believers in God, saved through Christ, and there will be those who are the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, and there won't be "Gentiles upon whom my name is called" if it be necessary that they all be circumcised as soon as they become ~~a~~ Christians, and therefore, James says, here is evidence from the Old Testament that/^{it} is not necessary to circumcise these people. And they accept his argument, and they proceed not to require them to be circumcised. (St:...He is putting it as if Amos were saying, "after this"or referring to the time when James....?) Well, there is nothing in the passage to prove one way or the other. (Dr. B: Jeremiah 12:15. This has a definite antecedent, exactly in mind with what you are saying.) Jeremiah 12:15. "It shall come to pass after that I have plucked them out, I will return." (Dr. B: James is quoting.) "I will return and have compassion on them and bring them again, ~~a~~ every man to his heritage, and every man to his land." (Dr. B: James quotes this part as plural, words of the prophets, plural. In other words, he purports to give a compos~~it~~ picture based on more than one prophet. He quotes that "I will return after this" from Jeremiah.) Very interesting suggestion. In any event, "I will return" refers to the return of Christ. Then where else is (perfect ^{8 3/4} future?) (St: "I will return". Well, it might be that he refers to the appearance of Christ there...) Do you know of any place in Old or New Testament where the/^{first} appearance of ~~Christ~~ Christ is spoken of "the return"? I am not saying ~~that~~/~~it~~ isn't, but I have never come across one. I don't

His first coming is ever spoken of as a return that I know of. (St) In the Jeremiah, though, it doesn't refer to the time of Jeremiah. Verse 14 is "Thus saith the Lord against all my evil neighbors which touch the inheritance which I cause my people Israel to inherit, behold I will pluck them out of their land, and pluck out/ ^{the house} of Judah from among them, and it shall come to pass that after I have plucked them out, I will return and have compassion on them, and bring them again every man to his heritage. So in Jeremiah 12 he is referring to the time of the regathering of the Jews, not to the time of Jeremiah by the "after that." (St) James quotes the verse to show what is going to happen at the return of Christ. He says, when Christ comes back to the earth there will be here those who are believing Jews, and ~~also~~ also those who are Gentiles who are a people for the name of God, people on whom the name of God is called. He is-- That is what is going to be at the future time, at the return of Christ, he says. I don't know of any case where the word "return" is used for the first coming of Christ. But it is used hundreds of times for the second. (St) No, not the dispersion, we-get-it, regather. After the regathering, Christ will return. If I were to say, "After the ^{presidential} next ~~elec~~- election, whoever is elected will be installed as president in Washington," that would be future to me. Why couldn't James say, "After the end of this age, Christ will return and set up His kingdom/?" (St: Well he could, but he couldn't apply it to that...12...because the Israelites were dispersed here, and they weren't regathered, so how/they ^{could} talk about...) I don't see anything about "dispersed" or "regathering", he is talking about whether, when Christ comes back, there will then be a people for His name who are Gentiles, and He says, if we circumcise them all, if we start in circumcising every one that believes, they will be Jews, and when Christ comes back, there will not be a ~~grd~~/ great people for His name who are Gentiles. He is talking about what will be when Christ comes back. Otherwise, it has nothing in the world to do with

circumcision. I see no possible connection with it with circumcision, unless that be it. (St) If they are circumcised and keep the law of Moses, those are the indications that they have become Jews. If they do not devote them, then they have not entered into the body of Jewry, but they are a separate people for the name of Christ, a Gentile people for the name of Christ who are not subject to Jewish ordinances, but are subject to the ordinances which God gives for all His people. (St) One new man, some of whom are circumcised, and some^{of whom} are not; some of whom are Jews, and some of whom are Gentiles, and he says that there will be both kinds when Christ comes back. They won't all have to become one kind, become Jewish, -be- but there will be both kinds. (Dr. B: It seems to me that Jeremiah's passage is not by any means confined to the Babylonian captivity; it is a general spiritual truth, it is something that they will look forward to. Now Christ has predicted a scattering of Israel just a few years before, and they knew that Israel was going to be scattered. Israel was now a subject people, and therefore James very consciously quotes this tou touta from Jeremiah to introduce the Amos passage, because Amos has just been talking about a gathering and a sifting, and putting Jeremiah and Amos together, "after this gathering and sifting, the Lord will come back again and restore David's house, or booth, and there will have been a lot of Gentiles.) And that^{gives a} ~~is the~~ reason for not requiring circumcision. Otherwise it has nothing in the world to do with circumcision, and it is almost the other way if James says, "We are going to decide this. Let's give a verse of Scripture," and go ahead and quote a verse that had nothing to do with what they were talking about. (St) Pluck my people out from among them. He is saying, I will take the evil neighbors out of the land of Israel which they are taking from the Jews, and^I will take the Jews out from among all these evil neighbors wherever they are scattered among them--he mentions both aspects here. (end of record)

They have taken the Jew's land. They have it today and he says that he is going to pluck them out of it and he has already plucked them out of ~~2/~~ two-thirds of it today, but not of the other third. And he has plucked the Israelites out of many lands today, but not entirely out of all. It would look as if these things predicted are coming to pass in our day, but not yet completely fulfilled by any means. (St) It may refer to the singular in one verse, and the plural in another, and then, there may be singular and plural in the same verse. You think of them as a single people, or you think of them as an aggregation of individuals, and both are used repeatedly. You can never tell in the Old Testament by singular or plural whether it is Israel or not, because He uses them both indiscrim~~in~~/inately. He will even use both in the same verse. He will say, "I will give thee this land and you shall be happy in it," referring to the people as a whole, or the individual members. (St) I don't see personally how it makes a great deal of difference. Dr. Buswell may very well be right with this Jeremiah passage here in mind; I don't know. Maybe he may not be, but to my mind, whether you say, "After the time of the beginning of the Babylonian captivity Christ will return," or whether you say, "After the end of the (oppression?) Babylonian depression," or whether you say, "After the time of James Christ will return," or whether you say, "After the regathering of the Jews Christ will return," everyone will be true because the return of Christ is after all those things, and everyone of them is before it, so I don't think that there is any difference. He is saying that, "After it, that is what happens." He is not saying how soon after or when. It is sometime~~s~~ after. ~~Not~~ I hadn't thought before of the interpretation which Dr. Buswell has suggested here. I am inclined to take it as Amos' words. Amos is showing where it fits in: "At the return of Christ, these things are going to be." Dr. B's suggestion brings^{ing} in this interpretation of Jeremiah is very interesting. It may be true; I haven't thought it through sufficiently to be sure whether I would accept it or not, but in either event, the "I will return" is clearly a refernce to the reutrn of

it seems to me, which is after all these things, ^{and} after everything has which has happened from the foundation of the world upto the time when He returns. My own personal inclination would be to think that ^{James} ~~Amos~~ is saying, "After these days in which you and I are living, Christ is going to come back, and when He comes back, then there are going to be two classes of people," and therefore there is no reason why you and I should try to make the situation different from that which He has predicted.

(St) ...physical restoration....) Yes; that, he says, is going to happen after the return of Christ. At once--just like I come into this room and give a lecture at once. But one of them is a little bit ahead of the other one. They don't happen at the identical instance. (St:...Wouldn't the physical resurrection be first?) No; if he says here, "I will return and rebuild the tabernacle of David," how could the building of the tabernacle be before He returns, because He puts it in the opposite order. He says, He is going to return and build it. Well, that would be just twisting Scripture completely around, to say He will build it, and then return, wouldn't it?

(See page ~~352~~ 351 b)

(preceded)

(Dr. B: In the Jeremiah passage the planting in the land, preached the return, but the building of David's tabernacle was actually followed by the return.) Yes. I don't see how you could twist this around to get the rebuilding before the return, anymore than you could twist around to get my speech last summer before I went to Geneva. I had to go there first before I could do it, and Christ has to return before He can do the thing He has promised to do after He returns. (St) "These are the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." These are the ones who have accepted. They are the ones who--(St) The Christians who are living in that period. They are the people who are to come up to Jerusalem as we read in Isaiah 2 and Micah 4--all nations shall flow ~~up~~ unto it; they ~~shall~~ will come up there to receive the word from the King there in Jerusalem, to know what His will is. (St) This refers to people saved before He comes back, because it says, "The Gentiles upon whom My name is called." The "residue of men" is the Jews. The rest of the men, that is, the Jews, and the rest of the Gentiles. The Jews and the Gentiles, two classes. The Jews, and the Gentiles on whom My name is called. (St) There are two mentioned, and one of them is specifically called "Gentiles." That would certainly imply the other is the people who are not Gentiles. "The rest of men" and "the Gentiles." That would imply that "the rest of men" are the Jews. (St)and those Gentiles. Whatever the ~~last~~ last part is, it is not included in the first. And if the first was "all the rest of men" it would have to include last, but the first includes Gentiles, it includes the last. If you said, "The Gentiles who were Christians and the rest of men, then the rest would mean those who were left over when the Gentiles were taken out," but when you mention the Gentiles last, the first of them cannot include the last, ^{so} the first can hardly include the Gentiles. So I would think the first was the Jews. (St) If you were to say that Russia was to conquer the people of the United States, and of Michigan, I wouldn't get much sense out of it. If he said, they ~~were~~ were going to conquer the people of the South and of the

North, there would be some sense to that. If you said they were going to conquer the people of the South and of Michigan, it would imply that the rest of the North was going to escape in some way, but that the South would include Michigan to me wouldn't make any sense. (St: If you were to say that the Russians were going to conquer the Northern and the Southern Hemispheres and also the United States... the US., the most important part.) Conquer the Northern Hemisphere and the United States? I can't imagine that--maybe. (Dr. Buswell: If/is- a synthetic parallel then the two terms ~~is/are~~ might be simply parallel. That is, all the rest of the men, namely, all those Gentiles who are called. But they are called by His name, before He returns, so therefore this point on ~~uncertainty~~ ^{noncircumcision.}) And so the discussion here is not Gentile salvation, the discussion is circumcision, and this shows that the reason not to circumcise them is that God has predicted that when Christ returns there will be uncircumcise people who will be Christians. (St) If somebody were to tell me that the word "Satan" in the Scripture was another name for God, I would say, "Show me one instance of it." You can't assume a thing without at least one instance. Now one instance may be a wrong interpretation. If you have one instance we can examine it, and it may be an ~~is~~ incorrect interpretation, but unless there is at least one available to be given, we have nothing to consider. (St) (Dr. B: anstrepso, "I will come back again." It has to be a coming back of somebody who has been here.) Christ never speaks of the ~~is~~ 91/2 a return, a coming back, there is no such thing anywhere in the Scripture. (St: Does James speak with apostolic authority, or with apostolic approval?) Interesting question, but not germane to the discussion. But even if James were not speaking with some particular apostolic authority/ ~~is~~ here, it still would not effect the present discussion, because the point here is, that ~~is~~ here is a meeting of the apostles and the leaders of Christianity, considering an important matter, and the Holy Spirit ~~is~~ tells us, and how that was laid which was the foundation of all subsequent missionary work in the Book of Acts, and the Holy Spirit

gives us a basis of it certain words which James uses from the Old Testament. Now it is clear from that then that the apostles and those present who accepted this decision considered that the argument was a valid one, they considered that it was true, and it is evident that it was God's will that this decision should be made, and that He would give us a decision which was vital in determining the history of future Christianity, and show us how it was made, and yet it was made by a misinterpretation of Scripture is inconceivable, unless He at least explained to us that that was the fact: "Now these people misunderstood the Word, but the conclusion they reached was God wanted, so He let it go," or something like that. There would be an explanation. Now I would be inclined to think on the other question that in a situation like this, most likely, since they recognized James as the head of the Council, James spoke and gave the decision and they approved of it and followed it, I would incline to think that James was speaking here with apostolic authority, but I don't think that enters particularly into the present problem because it would be equally so in either case. (St) In verse 18 there is a difference in our Greek manuscripts, in our New Testament mss, and the RV evidently feels that on the best manuscripts it is not as in the AV. That is a matter of NT textual criticism. (St) (Dr. B: That's a reason for picking out Peter. If you say all the United States will be captured, even New York City---so it could be "all the rest of men, namely ~~the~~ Gentiles who are called by My name," not meaning "all men without exception," but "all men, namely, the Gentiles.") Yes, if 12 2/3 (Dr. B: In any case, meaning that after the return of Christ, then all mankind will have access to His face, as David predicts.) Yes. Whether the Jews and Gentiles are explicitly mentioned separately here, it is in mind that they are to be. The stress here is on the Gentiles. What he is trying to bring out is that after the return of Christ there will be Gentiles who are "called by My name," and consequently that they should not say the Gentiles, when they become Christians, must ^{immediately} be

circumcised. That would be going against God's predictive will as to the situation at the time of the return of Christ. (St) No, he is not in any sense quoting this as a fulfillment of Amos; he is taking up the question of what we should do now. In view of what God is going to do in the future, we should not try to do something which would go contrary to what God says He is going to do in the future. (St) "Seek" may mean "Converted," but not necessarily. We are told that after the return of Christ all nations will come up to Jerusalem to learn His will. They seek after Him; they are inquiring as to His will. We should all be seeking the Lord now. That doesn't mean we all become converted now. We began to seek the Lord a long time ago, but we keep on seeking Him, we shall seek Him still more after He returns. He is going to make it possible for us to seek Him more fully when He is visibly here among us. (St) It improves it, and therefore there is definitely no harm in the world in using "of that", but it also includes a great deal more than that. It doesn't stop with that. (St) I am not saying that there will not be men converted after the return of Christ. Doubtless there will be. But I am saying that this passage here has nothing to do with any people being converted after the return of Christ, because this is referring to those who are already converted, before His return. This is referring to the men "upon whom My name is called," those who are already..... (end of record)

"upon whom My name is called," you wouldn't use that term. And if you did, it would not have anything to do with circumcision anyway. (Dr. B: I don't think the Bible ever speaks of people being called by the Lord's name except in time- terms of their visible profession of faith. You are called by H's name when you are converted, when you are saved. Your name is written in the Lamb's Book of Life before the foundation of the world, but "called by His name" in the sense of kalew here is a certain sense.) Of course the passage enters into the whole question of all the

there are ^h future events in God's plan, and many places where the ~~pr~~ase in the question where ^{we} may ask, Does this throw light on one phase or not, and the question might be asked and discussed various ways. I don't think James is endeavoring ^{sa} to 1 1/4, but he was endeavoring to go into one point: It is not necessary ^{that we} because Gentiles who become Christians to become circumcised. That was the whole point under consideration, to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses. That was the present question under consideration. The answer was, "It is not necessary that we say they must be circumcise, because God H^mself has predicted that when Christ returns, there will then be in the church, in C^rist, those who are called by H^s name, and there won't be any if they all become Jews. Therefore we ~~sh~~ould not require them to be ~~bec~~ome Jews and to keep the law of Moses. That is the one thing James is talking about. Now in the course of James talking about that, He may quote a passage which throws light upon some little phase or other little phase of it, there may be other things which may be more or ~~l~~ess clearly and definitely touched upon, but they are not particu- larly in his mind or particularly in the forefront here. This is the big thing in the talk: Do these people need to be circumcised? And that is determined for all the subsequent history of the Christian Ch^rurch by this Council, and the subsequent history of the Christian Church took its stand here upon this which James presented on the basis of Amos, that this passage in Amos shows that it is not necessary that these people be circumcised. And I have never been able to figure out how it could have anything in the world to do with circumcision other than that he is declaring that when Christ comes back and returns, as He says, "I will re~~tu~~rn," and builds up H^s kingdom and establishes H^s kingdom, that at that time there will be on this earth Gentiles upon whom the name of God will be called; people who are Christians, but still were Gentiles, who were not Jews. (St) Paul, the greatest fighter here

against the necessity of circumcising Gentiles [^]went out after it, right
the next year, himself circumcised Timothy, who was the son of a Jewish
father and a Greek mother. Paul himself considered that a Jew should ^{normally} ~~not~~
only be circumcised, that the proper ^{thing} /for a Jew to do was to take circum-
cision. (St) (Dr. B: If Paul did/^{it} as a matter of accomadation, he did
it on account of the Jews.) That doesn't mean it was wrong. (Dr. B: NO,
not wrong. Paul himself didn't introduce the idea.) No. The normal
thing for a Jew was to be circumcised. Now if a Jew wanted to say, "I
want to become a Gentile rather ~~than~~ than a Jew," Paul would object
to that, perhaps, but he wouldn't necessarily urge it. (St) The remnant
of Edom? I forget the exact ~~the~~ detail on that, whether it is necessary
to consider that that "ek" was not in the text the LXX had or not, or
whether it can be taken as ~~part~~ of the previous word, I don't know.

I remember now. The question about "ek" That the rest of mankind shall-
that they shall possess the "ek" remnant of Edom. They shall possess "ek",
sign of the accusative. If you point it that way it is ek. If you
point it this way, it is opl. And the LXX takes it that "the rest of
mankind shall seek Me." You see, there is no difference in consonants at
all. It is just a difference in the vowel pointing. We have probably
covered the facts of this and the essential features of it. There are
many side angles where it touches many different things which wouldn't be
so proper to go in now, but to bring up in connection with other subjects
to be taken up. The one thing they are discussing here is circumcision
and keepng the law of Moses, and James is saying it is not necessar~~ly~~
because Amos~~z~~ said that when Christ returns and sets up His kingdom, there
will be Gentiles who are believers in God. (St) As to particular evidence
from the prophets about Gentiles not being ...9 1/2..(St: RV, Isaiah 45:41)
(Dr. B: That is just the word, "known of old.") The word "known of old"
is-- (Dr. Isaiah 2 and 11, about the Gentiles seeking the Lord--Gentiles
in all belief and faith, many passages say the Gentiles will come up to

seek the face of the Lord during the Messianic Kingdom.) Yes; there are many such passages. (Break)

Dr. Buswell: This book on "The Millennial Faith" by Dr. Hamilton is well worth adding to your library. Dr. Hamilton is an honored missionary under the Independent Board in Korea, and has done great service for the Lord in that field. I had the experience with Dr. Hamilton and with this book some years ago, I was ~~at~~ in Wheaton for Christmas time, driving back to Wilmington, and Dr. Hamilton rode along with me. Dr. Hamilton had the manuscript of this book, which he read to me as I drove. Now the fact that Dr. Hamilton has one opinion and I have another ~~has~~ is nothing against him; in fact, it might be something against me, because he is a man of careful study and of rich experience in things of the Lord. He ~~is~~ holds to the so-called amillennial view, or antichristian view. I'm ~~not~~ taking particularly the chapter on the 20th ch of Rev., which is ~~the~~ chapter 15 in the book. I have to dip into other parts of the book to get the background, because his argument is cumulative. In any discussion of eschatology, the ~~amillennialist~~ premillennialist usually answers the arguments against the premillennial theory, "But what are you going to do with Rev. 20?" It teaches an earthly millenium in the future, and you have no right to spiritualize it away. "That is the end of the quote from the hypothetical premillennialist. It is not too much to say that this chapter is the very citadel of the system, and the ~~the~~ norm to which all other prophetic passages must be made to conform, so I am inclined to take the 8th ch of Romans as a starting point atleast, in my premil teaching. I think that the prophecy there that his creation will experience a period of blessedness subsequent to the Lord's return has been overlooked. It contains all the elements of the millenium except the length of it. It doesn't say that there is to be a thousand years, but it is to enjoy the blessedness of the sons of God subsequent to the Lord's return. But it is true that the 20th ch of Rev. is a clear and precise statement, and that premillennialists must refer to it in discussing

the doctrine of the millenium. "It is said to teach a thousand years earthly reign of Christ in sane language, and though that thousand year earthly kingdom is not found elsewhere in the teaching of Jesus or the apostles, it must be inserted between the lines no matter how many contradictions may be produced by doing so." Now, that, of course, is part--of partisan argument, and he has got a right to be a partisan, the same as we all have. He would say that if there is any~~xxx~~ contradiction with other Scripture, we are wrong. But these premils don't find a contradiction, and we do find this ~~xx~~ reign of Christ upon the earth referred to elsewhere. Continuing: "Nowhere else is the idea of two resurrections separated by one thousand years apart, but the other resurrection passages must be torn in part so that this idea can be inserted somewhere." Now that is his view. He doesn't see any other passages that indicage more than one resurrection. I referred last time to the fact that wherever (and there are a great many such passages) you have anastasis ek nekron, or apo nekron--sometimes the article is used and sometimes not--there you find ek or apo as the genative plural, and there are many, many such passages, you never in those passages find any references to the resurrection of the wicked. You find references to anastasis twn nekron, the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of ~~z~~ the unjust. But ek clearly means, "out ~~of~~ from among." That is to say, the fact that many times the resurrection out from among the dead, the resurrection of believers is many times referred to as an ek anastasis or an anastasis ek ^{ton} nekron, all of those passages are allusion to a direction, and Paul's desire to partake of the fellowship of the suffering and the resurrection of Christ that he may attain to the ek anastasis ek twn nekron. That is only one of several score of references, to ~~xxx~~ more than one resurrection, to the resurrection out from among the dead. Now continuing: "The Great White Throne Judgment must be placed

one thousand years after the coming of Christ, because that is where it is said to be taught in this chapter, although all the other ~~judgment~~ judgment passages take the place of judgment before the alleged millenium, and weird difficulties arise as separating these judgments by a thousand years. (end of record)

..proposed weird difficulties. The resurrection of the rest of the dead.. Paul says, "We believe in the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust. The resurrection of the rest of the dead, so far from creating any difficulties, would seem to be a necessity because of the fact that at ~~His~~ His return, He judges the living people on the earth, He destroys those who are destroying the earth, and gives rewards to His servants. That is to say, here is a general statement that the premil interpretation creates difficulties, and the difficulties are not pressed here. I think it does not create difficulties, but rather straightens out a good many things. Continuing: "The wicked dead are said not to be raised until after the alleged millenium--" That is pretty straight language you see, the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were finished. That is stated very plainly, so it is not just exactly an alleged millenium; "the wicked dead are said not to be raised after the alleged millenium because this chapter is said to have ended in spite of the fact that the rest of Scripture would seem to teach that they are raised when Christ comes again. * Now, he doesn't give any Scripture which says that the wicked dead will be raised when Christ comes again. But the rest of the Scripture, he says, "seems to teach it." "Gentile nations of unregenerated people are said to be on earth during the thousand years under the millennial reign of Christ, in spite of the plain teaching of Christ that after he comes again only those who have glorified bodies will attain to the next age, and "they will be like the angels," Luke 20:24-36. We'll stop for a moment ~~on~~ on that, but I'll finish reading this paragraph. "Because this ~~chapter~~ chapter

in Rev. is said to teach that Satan gathers such wicked nations at the close of the alleged millenium--" It says very plainly, "After the thousand years he is released and goes out to deceive the nations," so ~~that he~~ it hardly seems right to call it an alleged millenium.

~~John~~ John is the one who does the alleging. Now Dr. H believes that what John is ^{really} talking about is the present age, which is only a millenium in the most remote sense of the word, ~~it~~ just a figure of speech for the millenium. But, "Satan gathers ~~the~~ the wicked nations at the close of the alleged millenium. The rest of Scripture is thus forced into conformity with this one chapter, no matter what difficulties of interpretation may arise in such a process." Now, Luke 20:24-36 is one of Dr. H's very important passages, the question of the resurrection. I like to take such passages in a ~~very~~ harmony. Here are the three references. He only cites right here Luke 20:27-28, but it is also in Mark 12:18-27, and follow with Matthew 22:23-33. In all of these cases, in all of these gospels, the Saducees came and put up to Him this ridiculous question about the woman who had been married seven times, and then whose wife would she be in the resurrection. That is the question. Jesus answered to them in Luke: "The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage." In Matthew He said, "You err, not knowing the Scripture, nor the power of God," and in Mark He said, "Do you ~~not~~ not on this account err, not knowing the Scripture nor the power of God?" So the reference to the Scripture, the power of God, is in Mark and in Matthew, the fact that people get married in this present age is in Luke. Luke continues (and in these two lines Matthew and Mark are silent) , "Those who are reckoned worthy tu~~xein~~ (tu~~xano~~) those who are reckoned worthy to attain that age and the resurrection of the dead, the resurrection, the ek nek~~ra~~n, those who are worthy to attain that age and the resurrection ~~is~~ out from among the dead do not marry nor are given in marriage." I think that Dr. H errs right ~~at~~ at this point. He says,

"in spite of the plain teaching of Christ that after He comes again, only (italicised) those who have glorified bodies will attain to the next age, and they will be like the angels." Christ did not say that only the resurrected people would be in the millenium. He did say, "those who are accounted ~~not~~ worthy to attain to that age and the resurrection from among the dead." That is, it is a single class/people who attain to that age through worthiness, and attain to the resurrection of the dead. That group of people do not marry nor are given in marriage but as are the angels. Then Luke continues: "Nor are they able to die, but are equal to the angels and they are sons of God, ~~not~~ being sons of the resurrection." So that in the resurrection, which was the question which the Sadducees had asked Him, there is none of the marriage relation. There is no need for procreation of the resurrected people. (St: Jesus said to the Sadducees here, "You don't know the Scriptures." What do you think He had in mind here? Where in the OT?) That, of course, is in Matthew and in Mark, and the ~~not~~ context in Matthew in Mark simply is this, "For in the resurrection they ~~not~~ neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the ~~angels~~ angels which are in heaven." (St: Jesus was tempted. That ~~not~~ seems to imply that that was taught in the OT.) In all three gospels He goes ahead to quote the reference that God ~~is~~ is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And then He says, "You shouldn't think of Him as the God of the dead. He is the God of the living." That is His particular argument there. Now there are several different aspects of this answer. The Sadducees didn't believe in the spirit, in an invisible spirit either. And the fact that God is called the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob clearly proved that they were spiritually present to God; He is called their God long after they died. But that would answer one part of the Sadducees argument. The inference to the resurrection would imply ~~the~~ the whole OT background for the Pharasaic Jews, and the OT picture indicates the resurrection of the righteous, and the Pharasaic Jews believed that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

would be raised from the dead, as Christ said, they would sit down together in His kingdom. That is a little beside the point of Dr. H's argument, however, but it is relevant to the course. (St: What about given in marriage, though?) Christ doesn't give you any references on marriage in the OT. (Dr. M: Christ said, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage. Does He mean that if they knew the Scripture, they would know that in the ~~resurrection~~ resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage? Well at first sight it would seem to say that that is the case. But when you look closer, it is saying that they are saying, "There is no resurrection of the dead." and in order to prove it they are bringing up an argument. And that He answers and says, "You err; you don't know the Scriptures which clearly teach there is a resurrection of the dead; and you don't know the power of God, which can ~~bring~~ bring a resurrection of the dead, even if you think you can find various reasons to find difficulty in it. Now as to this particular difficulty you have raised, here is the answer." That, I think, is a valid way to ~~interpret~~ interpret it. In other words, that the reference to the Scriptures relates to the whole matter of the resurrection of the dead, and not to this matter of marriage.) Dr. B: That is a very clear way of taking it. It is outside of the immediate point, although it is certainly relevant to the whole point. At any rate, the statement in Matthew and Mark has no reference ~~to~~ except that in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, and the statement in Luke says "those who are counted worthy to attain to that age and the resurrection from among the dead--it is ek nekron, do not marry nor are given in marriage, nor are able to die, but are equal to the angels, ^{they are sons of God} being sons of the resurrection." So that all that Christ says with reference to this point is that those who arise from the dead being counted worthy of the age to come, and rise from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage.

And He does not in any sense of the word deny that there may be ordinary flesh and blood people to continue on into the millenium, who are not the heirs of the Scripture, who without exception were not saved people at the moment of the rapture, and they are not resurrection people. To establish his point he would have to show that there is some Scripture to deny that any flesh and blood people continue on into the millenium, at the rapture of the church. Rather, the Scripture indicates that the flesh and blood people will certainly continue after the moment of the rapture, for you~~re~~ remember in I. Thess 5 he says, "As concerning the times and the seasons brethren, you do not have need for me to write to you, for yourself know that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night. So when they say, "Peace and safety, sudden destruction comes upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape." That is to say, this perilous event comes upon the wicked people of the world as sudden destruction. "You are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief," and so on. There seems to be a reference of the saints of the Lord being suddenly taken, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and other people being left for a time of terrible suffering, but not snuffed out at the instant of the rapture of the saints, which would be at the instant of the ~~of~~ resurrection of the righteous dead. That ~~was~~ much then for Luke 20:24-26 and the parallels in Matthew and Mark. Now Dr. H. has another argument which is strongly in the background, which he doesn't bring in immediately here, the argument that in the parable of the tares, Matthew ²⁴~~29~~:24-30 and 36-43. The parable of the tares had no parallels in Mark or Luke, except for a few of the concluding remarks which are made under other circumstances and different contexts. Matt. 30. There is another lesson which I might bring out as we are going through. If you take the different items and number them in your Bibles, both in the parable and in the explanation, seven different ~~items~~ items. Take for instance ~~the~~

the enumeration as given in verses 38-39. "He who sows the good seed is the Son of Man." That is number 1. "The field is the cosmos." "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." (end of record)

...children of the evil one, and the evil 0 1/2 . The tares are the children of the evil one, and the enemy who sowed them is the devil. Now you have ~~1/1~~ five points. The harvest is the consummation of the age, the telio ainas, and the reapers are the angels. In reference to the doctrine to the purity of the visible church, always remember that the people who wanted to go in and pull out the tares and were told not to are the angels, and not men. I can just imagine the cataclysmic angels of God, who have never known what it was to be a sinner, watching this old world and itching to pour out the vials of wrath. I have a good deal of sympathy with them sometimes, until I remember my own frail self, and how thankful I am that the Lord was patient with me. The angels are the ones who wanted to pull out the tares, and they are told not to do so, but they are told, with reference to the field which is the world, and not the church, but both grow together until the harvest, the harvest being at the end of the age. In other words, this parable taken as Christ interprets it, is perfectly intelligible as an explanation of and the problem divine providence in-regard-to-the-doctrine of evil. Why does God tolerate evil in this world. He does it for a purpose, with reference to the harvest and a climax which is coming. The reapers are the angels, the field is the world, the harvest is the end of the age. But now, Dr. Hamilton's argument is, as you read in both the parable and in the explanation, As then, the tares are gathered and cast into the fire, so it will be in the consummation of the age. The Son of Man will send forth His angels, and will gather together out of His kingdoms, Now this word "kingdom" is not "church" in its context, but it is interpreted there as the world. The Lord Himself said it is the world in this case. "Will gather out of His Kingdom," the world becomes His kingdom in

a visible sense at that time) everything which causes offence and those that make for lawlessness, and He will cast them into the furnace of fire. There will be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth. But the righteous will shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Now Dr. H's argument sounds quite forceful, if you are in the habit of taking everything in one perspective in the prophetic Word. That is to say, I know a lot of Bible students 3 1/2 "When does this event take place?" And they have a kind of a limited "when," as though it were right in a very limited period. It says that, in the consummation of the age, the wicked will be gathered out and cast into the furnace of fire. And Dr. H says, "This is at the beginning of the millenium, and if the wicked are gathered out and the righteous are all redeemed and caught up, if not resurrected then changed and made immortal, then there is nobody left. All the wicked are destroyed, and all the righteous are resurrected or changed, so there are no people to be deceived at the end of a thousand years. Therefore, there isn't any thousand years after the Lord's return; ~~therefore~~ therefore you have got to have the thousand years mean something before the Lord's return; therefore, we are in it now." Well, I think the answer is, that ^{this,} just like a number of other passages, is a wide-lens view; ~~of~~ the consummation of the age is not the beginning of the millenium only. The ~~fact~~ passage is merely stating that in the eschatological complex two things are going to happen: the righteous will be gathered in and will shine out in the kingdom of their Father, and the other is that the wicked will be destroyed. And He does not fill in any more details about the destruction of the wicked. The consummation of the age will involve the destruction of the wicked, but if you realize that there are many Scriptures that ^{give} you a wide-lens view, and this probably should be taken as one of them, there is nothing here which will exclude a millenium within the eschatological complex. We had the same point in II. Thess. 2, where Paul said, "At

His coming He will render wrath to these people who are now persecuting you Thessalonians, and He will render rest to you Thessalonians." And those events are ~~not~~ relatively a thousand years apart in ~~the~~ Rev. 20 and other Scriptures. Also, in II. Peter, if you remember, the heavens and the ~~the~~ earth are connected with ~~the~~ parousia. In those and other passages we have to recognize that there are wide-lens views of the Second Coming of Christ, in which the whole general picture ~~and-which-the-~~ of the revolution of world history is presented, and events at the beginning and at the end of the millenium are not discriminated. But there is no denial that they may occupy a period of more than a thousand years. I remember that Dr. H made a lot of this 13th ch of Matt, that it must come at the beginning of the millenium; that it could not be a general view, and that it destroys all the wicked, and changes or resurrects all ~~the~~ the righteous; therefore there is ~~not~~ nobody left. Well, I would say he hasn't proved his point in those two negative arguments, Matt. 13 and Luke 20 and parallels. That is, there are parallels for the Luke passage. He ~~is~~ says, "Now, of course, we would not imply that any doctrine which is taught in only one chapter of the Bible as impossible. If these ideas which are said to premillennialist to be taught in the 20th ch of Rev. are actually and inescapably taught there, they must be accepted as part of the Scripture by those who accept the Bible as the Word of God. However, if the rest of Scripture cannot be fitted into any such millenial picture, and if there is a plausible alternative/ interpretation, I do not feel that he or any of the amillennialists have in any way indicated that the rest of the Scripture cannot fit with the millenial view, and I do not feel that the alternative which he is about to present is at all plausible. P. 128 "In the second place, structure of the book, which we have shown in the previous chapter, makes it fall into seven parallels, contemporaneous sections." According to the amillennial interpretation of the chapter, that is, of the 20th ch of

R₂v., all seven sections of the book begin with the coming of Christ and describe events between the first and the second events of Christ, but lapping over/^{at the end}into eternity. According to the premillennial interpretation, the first six sections are parallel and contemporaneous, while the seventh, beginning with ch. 20 instead of being parallel and contemporaneous with the other six sections, unlike the others, starting with the first coming of Christ, and going on to eternity, takes up a description of time subsequent to the time recorded in the six sections, thus breaking the harmonious, geometrical structure of the book." Well now, whoever the premills are who have a harmonious geometrical structure of the book I don't know, but I don't plead guilty to that. That is to say, I am against all phoney methods of interpretation. I don't mean to say that so extremely but one of the most harmful things is to take an outline of subject matter in any piece of literature, and then impose a zoning law on it, because any intelligent writer, when he is discussing an subject under the sun, may make incidental refernces to some other subject, so that you can't say, because this is a zone and talks about so and so, therefore ~~/~~ everything in it is about so and so. ~~that/~~

I hope that will come back to you sometime when you are trying to zone the 7th ch of Romans, or the 5th ch of Romans, or impose a certain general subject upon all the material in any given passage of Scripture, because we all bring in collateral references to subordinate subjects. It doesn't mean that we aren't following an intellible plan. I do not see any successions in Rev. beginning with the first coming of Christ, and the^{? 10}(whole additional) argument is an argument from zoning, and I do not see any geometrical structure in the book. (St) I won't deny that there may be a good many premills who have blocked it off into six sections; I don't know. Of course, you know that my own particular view of Rev. is quite peculiar. I am a yellow dog and I admit it, but I keep on barking very very politely, I hope. That is, I have a different view of the outline of Rev. from most of the premillennialists, which doesn't matter

at all. (Dr. B: Wouldn't you say, Dr. B., that in the main portion of it you have seven seals, and seven trumpets, and seven vials, which seem to go along consecutively. At ^aleast a considerable portion of the book has a more or less consecutive movement.) Yes. To/^{my}mind, the book moves consecutively in large blocks. There are many ~~places~~ cases where he goes back and brings up a thread, naturally, but the book moves right along like a progressive outline chronologically. Now that doesn't mean that every part is in chronological order, either; as Dr. M says, I don't see six parallels beginning with the coming of Christ at all. (Dr. M: but even if you did interpret it that way, it seems to me that if we were to say that here is a place in the book that has the coming of Christ that goes on to here, and here is another line, and here is another, and we have six of these. I don't know where you'd get them, where you'd find six sections that start with the coming of Christ, and going through this age, but supposing somebody interprets it that way, what right do we have to say that therefore sylvatry requires that whatever is left be a seventh section like this. Wouldn't it be every bit as symmetrical ~~symmetrical~~ to say, "Here we have six sections which go through this period from different viewpoints, and ~~therefore/therefore/it/~~ then after giving the six, and going through it from these different viewpoints, then we have a section which shows what comes after the termination of these things. I think that would be just as logical as to have a serpent that has a body with certain divisions, and then has a conclusion. Or, suppose that you were to write a history of Roosevelt's administration, or suppose you were to start in and tell about Roosevelt's life. You would start with him as a young man, and you would describe through his life until he became president. Then you might take up Garner, the vice-president. You'd take from the beginning of his life and go up till he became elected. Then you might take Harold Ickes and do the same thing. You might take each ^{member} ~~one~~ of the cabinet and have a chapter telling about their life because they all came together in Roosevelt's

cabinet. Then the next chapter could very well take them all together, and describe the events and the administration as they worked together. I wouldn't be unsymmetrical, though, to have six parallel passages, if you have such a parallel, followed by one which ~~brought-them~~ went off from the others.) Yes, just as reasonable, and it is not to be settled on a priori grounds. Now, of course, Dr. H doesn't feel as if this settles it, but he thinks it adds some probability to his view, which I can't see. Now he says, "Premillennialists usually insist that the Jews reign with Christ over the Gentile nations." He does give a reference there. Footnote 27 ~~Okman and Soltau.~~ ~~Okman and Soltau.~~ Now, there are premillennialists who hold that the Jews reign with Christ, though that is not, I think, the common view. I think that if you examine those references you find it a little bit different. That is to say, those who are to reign with Christ in His millennial kingdom are the born-again people. The Jews are the subjects of the kingdom in so far as they are not members of the church, that is, born-again before the rapture. All Jews who are born-again before the rapture of the church are, of course, part of the church, and have their identity there along with Paul, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But the racial national Israel, who are not born-again as a ~~whole~~ whole...

(end of record)

...subjects of the kingdom, not the reigning people, and I think that is the prevailing premillennial view. Those who are to reign with Christ are the resurrection people, those who have been made immortal, either ~~by~~ changed and made immortal, or raised from the dead. Amillennialists on the other ~~hand~~ hand say, "The 20th ch of Rev begins with events which occur ~~shortly~~ shortly after the first advent of ~~Christ~~ Christ, and describe events in the intra-adventual period. You see, the first advent and the second advent, so the intra-adventual period. They put the thousand years of Rev. 20 into ~~the~~ the present age as an indefinitely long period of time. The first mention is the binding of Satan. This

This is substantially the argument that I gave you once before, but we might as well read it here from Dr. H.: "The first event is the binding of Satan. If the chapter describes events in the intra-adventual period, then we ought to find something connected with the ministry of Christ which would fit in with the binding of Satan. If we turn to Matthew 12: 24-29 we find exactly such an event as we are searching for. The Pharisees charged Jesus with casting out demons by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of ~~demons~~. Jesus replied, "If that were the case, Satan's kingdom would be divided against itself. But if by ^{the power of the Spirit} ~~the power of the Spirit~~ of God we cast out demons, then the kingdom of God is come upon them." He then went on to explain that no man can spoil the house of the strong man without first binding the master of the house." Now a number of the amils make a lot of that point. The context makes it perfectly plain that Christ was explaining that He could cast out ~~demons~~ demons because He had first bound Satan. The word "bound" is in italics; the word "first" is not in italics, but I emphasized that. To go back, he introduces this thought by saying, "We must find the beginning of the millenium in events which occurred shortly after the first advent." Now this reference to the binding of Satan and the casting out of the ~~demons~~ demon was not after the first advent, but rather was prior to the cross, and Christ, in using those words, it seems that before He died, before He arose again, before the day of Pentecost, Satan was bound in such a sense that God could cast out Satan from a Satan-bound life. My point is that there never was a time when Satan was not bound in that sense. Satan never could go beyond--my father used to say, "God has the devil on a dog-chain." Satan always has been bound in that sense. God has always has had the power over the spirit of Satan, to cast out Satan from a Satan-bound life. And Christ was merely saying that He could not possibly be doing this by the power of Satan, but the fact that He could cast out devils proved that He then, and there and always had power over Satan. Dr. H. takes that as a

chronological event which happend at a certain point, and then begins the millenium, begins the thousand years, a figurative thousand years. Reading on, "Here then, we have definite authority in the words of Jesus Himself which say/He bound Satan before casting out de~~mons~~. How was that possible? by His resisting all the temptations of Satan ~~of~~ in the wilderness, and all through His life, by His bearing the penalty due to His people, and thus setting them free in ~~of~~ principle from the bondage of Satan by His rising from the dead, and breaking the power of death itself, of all these things, but particularly of opening the way of salvation of the Gentiles who dwelt in the power of darkness, under ~~and-the~~ deception of Satan, and making it possible for them to be deceived any longer as to the way of salvation. Before the coming of Christ, the ~~antians~~ nations of the world could only come to ~~of~~ God through becoming Jews." Anyone who believed in the God of Abraham, and accepted His promises would be regarded spiritually as a Jew, and so would be saved/ .

~~but--~~ The binding of Satan includes the whole of the redemptive work of Christ, would certainly not have been finished chronologically when Christ cast out the demon. It goes on to quite a strong dispensational position here which I think Dr. H. would really call anathema in another context. "I suppose no one would insist that Satan is to be bound with a literal chain of iron or some other metal, ~~because~~ ~~for~~ Satan is a spirit and material chains could not hold him captive for a moment." Well obviously "chain" doesn't have to be a ~~of~~ material chain, but the binding, Satan is pictured as being incarcerated, and the incarceration is the confinement and the ~~cessation~~ of exterior activities. That seems clear in the picture. So much then for the chain. A slave is bound to his master, but not physically bound with a chain always. So Satan being bound does not mean that he is powerless to tempt people; we know that he does. It is merely a limitation of Satan's power in one particular respect, especially that of ability to deceive the nations. "Now you see, to put the two together, Satan being bound so that Christ could

cast out demons from poor life, and then that that is the same binding of Satan as the binding so as not to deceive the nations, and when he gets over in this other ~~page~~ page I think he has forgotten what he said about the individual man and Satan being bound, because he says it doesn't mean individuals, but it means nations. In other words, there is, on the part of many amillennialists an endeavor to make that reference to the binding of Satan or the casting out of demons identical with the binding of Satan so that they shall-- shall not deceive the nations anymore; the two are problematical. Does Satan not have power to bind lives? There are people under the power of the devil today. That power has not ceased. Does Satan not have power to deceive nations? It looks to me as though Satan went on deceiving nations as nations for a long time. (St: If during the millenium Satan is to be bound so as not to deceive the nations, it seems to me there would be world-wide conversion, according to the view the (premillennialists) are presenting, don't you think....not any substantial difference from the one you have here now.) You see too, hypothetically, since Adam was created sinless and holy, that he never would have rebelled against God, corrupted himself, but the hypothetical doesn't guarantee. That is to say, in the millenium Satan is to be bound so that he will not be able to deceive the nations. You won't have the Adamic nature in the people of flesh and blood, but the presence of Christ will reign and will restrain all outbreacking evil. But I think it is quite consistent with the Scriptural view of redemption and human sin to suppose that there are many who do not really give themselves to the Lord in saving faith, and just as soon as the devil is let loose again, they do in large numbers again what Adam did, and are deceived. (St: The binding of Satan is not if that makes for a world peace, that is about all that it makes for; then it doesn't make for a person turning to the Lord at all.) Well, if evidently does. There are many indications of a vast turning to the Lord. We haven't touched upon

all those Scriptures yet. (Not a complete turning.) No. There are evidently a vast number of people who are ~~bur-~~ born under this reign of peace and safety ~~ad~~ and evil being restrained, who at the end, when God once more withdraws His hand and lets Satan tempt them, just go right away after the devil. It looks to me like a very appropriate thing, that, whereas humanists all through the ages have ~~complained~~ about this awful doctrine of original sin, "I wasn't there; I wasn't to ~~g~~ blame," a thousand years to vindicate His creative purpose, to show ~~what~~ what He intended this earth to be, and then once more let the race that has seen a thousand years of blessedness endure temptation, and look how great a multitude go away after the devil. (St: I can't see how the millenium is anything glorious if men don't turn in their hearts to the Lord. If they are still at heart rebellious, how ~~is~~ can there be anything glorious about it?) It doesn't say that there aren't many that turn to the Lord. (St: But at the end there is going to be a multitude who are deceived.) Yes. Most of the population will be at that time. Multitudes have proved wrong a good many times, you know. The more people we have active the more food we have, it looks like, plenty of resources, and there will be a great many who will rebel. That is what the Scripture says. You can't pin it on a priori grounds, and then too, I think we have to take Ez. 37, 38 and 39 as parallel Old Testament records. It isn't an ~~ap~~ a priori question, however, but when you get the statement it does look as though it is very appropriate that for a thousand years He would show what He intended this earth to be, and then He would give one more demonstration of what man will do in large numbers. (St: God certainly intended the earth to be a place filled with men who would worship Him with all their hearts.) How do you know? (St: But that is not going to be in the millenium.) You haven't any Scripture on that. If He intended it, it would have been that way. (St: That is

the way He made it.) If He had, in the sense that His intention, His decree, then it would have been that way. What He intended this earth to be is ~~was~~ what it is, namely a place of probation. If the earth is ~~hw~~ what it is, a place of probation where a great many people are going to be saved. (St: Then you can say God intended ~~evill~~ evil.) Well He certainly intended to permit evil; ~~thre~~^e is no doubt about it. You can't get around that because evil is. There are some who deny the reality of evil, but not John Calvin. Evil is, and whatever is ^{is} in the decrees of God, the total~~ity~~. God intended His Son to be crucified, but He is not the author of evil; He is the author of a situation that was free to produce evil, and He intended this earth as a demonstration ground for the working out of His plan of redemption, and He demonstrated ^{again} and again in different circumstances the ~~wonderful~~^{one simple} principle of His grace and the need of His grace. Now in this thousand years of blessedness to me ^{as a} it seems very appropriate ~~that-the~~ conclusion of this earth. Now the, it does say, as to the new heavens and the new earth, ~~that~~ there will be righteousness in the New Jerusalem, and that there will by no means enter in anything to defile it. The presumption is that God intended to permit sin. Now I think that is a very hard lesson for us to learn. I have seen a number of different cases where people would start out and say, "Now ^{movement} let's have a clean ~~moment~~, and it will be different from anything that ever was before. " And then when evil creeps in, the first thing you know they are just down in the dumps, "I didn't think that this would ever happen." And so the whole movement is a failure because evil crept in. But that isn't so. It is possible ⁱⁿ this world to have a movement to the glory of God, where sin, when it becomes apparant, is justly disciplined, but it isn't a presumption that God will keep the thing perfect in this world, that God will not allow evil. A little more about this view. ^YIn the intra-adventual period the Gospel is to be proclaimed to all nations, that is clear. Satan is powerless to prevent it; grace and salvation is to be open to all nations. There

is nothing that Satan can do to block that way. Well, it does seem to me that the whole picture....14 1/2 What ~~it~~ has happened to the Chinese people and the Russian people who had the Gospel in the early days, and then it got corrupted with idolatry even worse than Rome, and what happened when Mohammedanism came in, and poor Mohammed never met a sound Trinitarian, and never met a real Orthodox Jew, but just had renegade Judaism and ~~Arianism~~ Arianism all mixed up, and produced that religion which is just an awful curse. It seems like the devil has been deceiving the nations and individuals. Since the time he has corrupted the nations as before the time of Christ. Many people accepted the Lord before Christ, and many people after, but today most of them don't.

(end of record)

He holds that the releasing of Satan at the end of the millenium does refer to a

terrible time just before the Second Coming of Christ, and that such events as we saw in the World War might be connected with it. But then that war was settled, and then we had peace again 0 3/4 and now we are in another mess, and then we will be in another mess. It is true that the amillennial view, bringing the thousand years back into this age, admits that there is a terrible outbreak just before the Lord's return. But there have been so many of those outbreaks. All the way through history, each particular one, where the devil is deceiving the nations. Certainly the devil deceived the nations to bring about this last World War. The devil is deceiving the nations; he is deceiving England and France about a (sum of letters?) too. Some people down in Washington get deceived. Now, ^{"The} ~~The~~ limitation of Satan's power through the work of Christ is repeatedly taught in the New Testament. In Col 2:14 and 15 we read, 'Having ^{blotted} ~~blotted~~ out the bond written in ordinances which was against us, which was contrary to us, He has taken it out of the way, nailing it to His cross, having ^{spoiled} ~~destroyed~~ the principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly,

triumphing over them and it.' The principalities and powers can only be the power of Satan, and Paul here declares, if Christ has destroyed despoiled Satan, and destroyed him openly, and triumphed over him, this certainly means that He has limited Satan's power. John 12:31 "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." Jesus declares that then, that is, during His earthly life, the devil was to be cast out, defeated by the Son of God in the conflict in which they were engaged. Certainly this was limiting the power of Satan. In Hebrews 2:4, the writer tells that ~~g~~ through death He might bring to naught him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.. Christ brought the devil to naught; that is, He limited the devil's power in such a way that his efforts amounted to nothing, and his power was definitely frustrated. Now that is right in line with dispensationalism. That is to say, in the Old Testament time the devil had powers which he doesn't have now. Dr. H's view is that this time, or this parenthesis in time, the devil was bound in such a ~~state~~ ~~state~~ sense that the devil's relationship to the world is quite different since the time of Christ. Now that would be right in ~~with~~ ^{harmony} with the dispensational view of the Old Testament. Dont' let's spiritualize... 1 3/4/ lower plane...Dr. H doesn't say that, but that was Paul. Before the coming of Christ the devil could bind a man, but then after a while God decided to bind him so that he couldn't. The devil back here could deceive nations, but then God bound him so that he couldn't deceive nations. That would be the dispensational view, whereas ~~of~~ regardless of the millenium, it seems to ~~me~~ very clear that the binding of Satan so that God can save a poor demon-possessed man has been constant in all time, throughout all ages. And God's power to send the Gospel to any nation or race of people, He gave the light to the nations before Abraham; they turned to idoltry before Abraham; the Jews themselves fell into idolatry, He disciplined themthem by various ways. ~~Finally~~ Finally He sent His Son into the world. The whole business of God through the ~~the~~ ages has been sending out the light to a rebellious and gainsaying people, Jew and G^untile together. So

I react very strongly against the notion that the binding of Satan that the binding of Satan took place here in any sense that it hadn't taken place long before. (St) The dispensationalist rather generally teaches that Old Testament religion was on a lower plane; that grace today is on a much higher plane than it was in the Old Testament time. Now this notion that Satan was bound in the time of ~~Christ~~ Christ in ^{some} a sense that He wasn't bound before fits in with the dispensational view, and it seems to me to violate the principle of the unity of the covenant of ~~grace~~ grace. (St:New Testament. / .to the Gentiles more glorious than in the Old....) You belong to the Western tradition. You have inherited your ~~of~~ culture through the center of the missionary stream, but if you take the world as a whole and the percentage of people ~~of~~ who have turned to the Lord, and the terrible times of darkness even among Western nations, you get a perspective like that. It doesn't seem to me that the argument would hold up. (St) I made the statement that the ~~of~~ majority of Christians in most ages are the children of Christians, but then you couldn't quite see why the whole world didn't turn out to be Christian. "Christ brought the devil to nought. That is, He limited the devil's power in such a way that all His efforts amounted to nothing, and ~~of~~ his power was definitely frustrated. All these things show that the New Testament, that in the NT, Christ claimed that in a very real sense He had bound Satan and limited his power. Rev. 20 One particular aspect of that binding is before us, namely, the limiting of Satan's power to deceive the nations as he did before the coming of Christ so that he could not deceive the nations as he did before the coming of Christ. From that time forward--" I inserted in my own words here, "from that time back", because I hold that the cross is retroactive just as truly as it is active on subsequent events. But H says, "From that time forward, and during the whole of the intra-adventual dispensation, Satan is defeated in principle." Well, I would say Satan was defeated in principle before

the Garden of Eden, for God announced right there that the seed of the woman would bruise his head. "The event which defeated ~~S-fa-~~ Satan ~~certa~~ certainly is the cross, there is no doubt about that, according to the unity of the covenant of grace, are just as strong before as after. That is, from that time he was defeated in ~~pr~~ principle in regard to the national deception he is defeated in fact. He still go about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, ^{but} /In this particular resepect he is a caged lion." I don't see it. "But in the end time Satan is to be loosed for a little time, to deceive the nations again and to gather them to war against since--" that is, he will be able to stop the preaching of the Gospel ~~in~~ in the ends of the earth; he will again be able to control the thinking of the nations so that they will become his willing dupes to believe a lie. We look about us in the world today--~~now~~ this was during the II World WAR, 1942--who can say that we are not entering on the period of such deception of the nations. Who would have dreamed even ~~ten~~ ten years ago that the whole of Europe could be brought under the control of one Hitler? In that short space of years, as we see the whole of Germany giving blind adoration to their idol, who was to suppress so much true Christianity in his country. Is this not almost national deception?" I would say YES, national deception. Whether this is the time prophecied in Rev. 20 or not, the view of such a time of national deception will come before Christ comes again does not seem in the light of recent international events so preposterous as it might have seemed thirty ~~years~~ years ago. I mean to say, there have been ~~Hitlers~~ right along. Look at Kaiser Wilhelm. He probably wasn't as bad as ~~H-telr-~~ Hitler. There was Napoleon, there was Gustavus ~~Ad-~~ Adolphus, there was an Attila it seems to me. There have been ~~of~~ these people who ~~have~~ deceived nations. In the leading five instances. This starts out a new argument with reference to the soul. The next item of note in this 20th ch is v 4, 'I saw souls, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. This word ~~of~~ "sould" is $\xi \upsilon \kappa \eta$

in Greek. It used one hundred and five times in Greek, and in one hundred ~~of~~ places unquestionably means "the soul of man as distinct from his body." In the remaining five instances, one of which is Rev. 24, there is a question as to whether the body is referred to as well as the soul." I would say there is no question in Rev. 24. It says, "I saw the souls of ~~the~~ them who had been beheaded, and he is referring to souls with their heads cut off. So in that case too, "I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded and ^{all} those who had not worshipped the beast," I would say there it means the disembodied spirit. But as he saw the souls waiting, and they were told they would have to wait a while longer, in Rev. 20:4 he sees the souls, and εἶργον αὐ. In the following verse 5, the resurrection is mentioned, and the soul living and reigning with Christ mentioned in v 4 is said to be the first resurrection. The soul living and reigning with Christ is said to be in the first ^u resurrection. " Yes, if you take "living" in the aorist indicative as it stands, but not in the English present. As we have already said, Scripture gives many precedents for believing that the first resurrection is the new birth." Now I 12 3/4 that; I would rather say there is not one reference to the first resurrection as the new birth. "You have been made alive with Him, being dead in trespasses in sins," and yet I can't find one reference to anything that is called anastasis as being regeneration or the new birth. "~~reaches-its-consummation-~~ repeats its culmination in the consummation when the soul ~~of-a-re~~ will leave the body and go to reign with Christ in heaven. That is, the consummation of being born-again, the glory of consummation (he doesn't use the word glorious) is to depart to be with the Lord." Well, Paul does say that is far better, but he doesn't want it; he would rather live until the rapture. "The deliberate choice of the word 'soul' --it almost universally means 'soul' as distinct from 'body', 13 3/4 believers now reigning with Christ. Note what it says; it doesn't say, "I saw the souls of the martyrs reigning with Christ."

It says, "I saw the souls of the martyrs (and all of them) and they came to life and reigned with Christ a $\frac{1}{2}$ thousand years." $\epsilon\ \xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$. H.G. (something of an amil)
 Robertson/says this $\epsilon\ \xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ if you take it as a 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ year, that meant they had some kind of a deeper experience, it can't merely that they went on living. He says that would have to be an imp^{er}fect. But $\epsilon\ \xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ as a 14 $\frac{3}{4}$ would mean they had something which was regarded as a unit in itself, but it seems to be very obvious that the way to take it/as an ^{is} aggressive aorist (in the ordinary sense?) because χ of the whole context. "If it were a literal resurrection of the body, why should he 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ choose the word which almost always does not mean "body"?"

(end of record)

e 73

.... reigning with Christ from henceforth, now in the presence of Christ and reigning with Him in the reign of which He said, 'All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth.'" Now we ask the question, 'Why doesn't the word "soul" mean "soul"? Any premil that I know says, "Yes, it means the soul." John saw the souls, and they came to life, and the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were finished. And Dr. H himself takes the second $\epsilon\ \xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ as the literal resurrection of bodies. Just across the page he answers his own question very clearly: "Additional proof that this is the correct interpretation of the words in v 5, 'the rest of the dead' indicating that the one just mentioned belong to the category of the dead." The ones just mentioned, that is to say, that the souls which he saw ~~were~~ were the souls of the dead, and he still didn't put it in that they belonged to the dead and they came to life. The rest of the dead, their spirits have been resurrected in the first resurrection. He makes that spiritual. Now he goes on, "The rest of the dead are in hopeless darkness, without eternal life, and when their bodies are raised after Christ comes, it is only to ~~sah~~-shame and everlasting contempt. " Now there he has the rest of the dead, that

bodies raised. Alford says that none of the commentators would think of taking the second $\epsilon\xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ as anything but a literal bodily resurrection. Evidently Dr. H takes this second $\epsilon\xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ as a literal bodily resurrection. Here you have, "I saw the souls of these people when they ~~had~~ came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years, and the~~s~~ rest of the dead--" Certainly he is talking about the dead, "--came to life, and the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection; on such the second death has no power." Then he goes right on to describe after the thousand years, he say the Great White Throne and all the dead, the small and the great stood before God. The rest of the dead now have been resurrected, $\epsilon\xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, and stood before God. (St: soul sleep?) $\epsilon\xi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ indicates that they had some experience which was new to them. Robertson takes it that they had a deeper life, but what would that do to you? The rest of the dead did not have this deeper life until after the end of the millenium, and then you have the wicked dead coming into a deeper life. So that would be quite a problem. "This idea of reigning with Christ now on the earth is a common one in the NT." I would say, on the contrary, we never are ~~not~~ said to be reigning now with Christ. I have made a study of ~~all~~ all the cases of reigning with Christ, and the different references to feasting and banqueting with Him ~~with-~~ in His kingdom, and without exception, now we are not reigning with Christ, but if we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him. There is not one reference int ~~in~~ the NT to our now reigning with Christ. In Romans 5:17 "Much more shall they who receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ." That is future, and you can't say that they are now reigning. Paul writes to the Corinthians, you know, "I wish you were reigning. You are strutting around like kings. I wish you were kings, because then we would be reigning too." (St: Resurrection life?) Yes. He is referring to eternal issues here in Romans 5 right down the line. "Shall reign in life," and it is

eternal life there. Eternal life and eternal death are contrasted right along. That is one passage. "The context clearly indicates," he says, "that/^{this} is the present earthly reign with Christ." It doesn't indicate anything of the kind to me. Romans 5:21. Grace is said to reign now. "Grace" es- is an abstraction. Where sin abounds, grace much more abounds. God's grace reigns and prevails in the hearts of believers, but that is not our reigning in this present life. II. Peter 2:9 "We are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation." We are heirs of the ~~XX~~ kingdom, but our reign has not yet begun. Those who are a royal priesthood belong to a royal family, yes, they are the children of the king. But we are not yet reigning. (St: In what sense are we going to reign in the millenium?) Well there are several indications. He says, you are going to judge angels, you will set on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel, be ruler over five or ten cities. What that means literally, of course, we don't know, but it gives a lot of indications of resurrection people during this reign over this earth. It is all after He comes again. (St) With the visible people of this earth, and exercise power. Christ wasn't any policeman during the forty days. He was in blessed fellowship with the people of this earth. I think the inference is that a great many of the people of the earth will give their hearts to the Lord; that Israel as a whole will be saved,^{and} and that the message of the Gospel will go out to the remote places. You can't fill in the details as far as the en'gin-
eering problems are concerned. There are ^{three more} mere/paragraph supposed to show that we now reign with Christ. We are joint heirs, but now the heirs-- that refernce is Romans 8 " We are sharing His reign with joint heirs." But what does He say? "If we suffer with Him, we will be glorified together." For I reckon that the ~~s/s~~ sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Back there in Romans 8 our being heirs indicates the receiving of the inheritance at the resurrection. We now have the ~~inh~~ earnest of our inheritance, but not the fullness of it. Col. 1:13 "God has delivered us

out of the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of H's dear Son." I don't think that is a very important passage, neglected by many premillennialists or dispensationalists. There are those who refer to a present day spiritual kingdom of Christ, which is very wrong. We have been translated out of Satan's kingdom into the kingdom of ~~Christ~~ Christ. It does not in any sense weaken the doctrine of a physical kingdom to admit the fact of a spiritual kingdom now. We are in His spiritual kingdom. I think John 3 refers to that, too. (St: Doesn't the church today ~~exercise~~ exercise in some sense rule over ~~Christ's~~ Christ's spiritual kingdom?) Not ruling. That would be ~~an~~ ^{9 1/2}ianism. That is anathema to most Reformed people. We don't want to exercise any claim of rule in this earth as a church. If God calls ^{on} us as individuals to have our part in government, then we as Christian individuals participate in government, but the church as a church doesn't want ot rule. Among ourselves we exercise discipline, and we as born-again people are in the spiritual kingdom, but we don't rule with Christ. Another-one-he-gives-here-is- I read Col 1:13 that the kingdom is the present kingdom of Christ, and we reign ^{with Him} in spiritual realms now, continuing to reign with Him after death in heaven, R^{ev.} 24, and will reign with God the Father and Christ the Son throughout all eternity, R^{ev.} 21-27. I do not feel that he has pointed out any passage ⁱⁿ which we are said to be reigning with Christ in the present age. I feel that there are many indications that Scripture does not regard us as reigning now with Christ. In the future we will reign with Him. (St) Political power. Paul has no elaborate and systematic doctrine of these things. In my reviews of Calvin's Commentary I have tried to point out a number of definite premillennial teachings; every once in a while Calvin says, "This must refer to the time after the Lord's return." He doesn't exclude a kingdom period after the return of Christ. (St) He very commonly takes the things that the premils apply to the time after the return of Christ

and he brings them into the present age. (Dr. MCalvin believing in the church having political rule in this age...) The day the church was organized it was more or less a theocracy, or a churchocracy, with a city church or state church, but in Geneva, remember, the civilian powers were quite separate from the ecclesiastical powers. Calvin was ordered by the city fathers to try to keep ~~the~~ Servitus as an enemy of the state on religious grounds. Calvin proved him guilty, of course. The case was submitted to Basil and Zurich and other cities, and they all said, "Servitus must burn." Calvin as a minister said that he should not burn, but the city fathers burned him. There was a distinction, but separation of church and state didn't become clear until about the time of the American Revolution. (Dr M: I don't think Calvin ever suggested that the church as a church should rule, it- or that a minister, as a minister, should have any political power.) I don't recall that he did. It was confused, but I don't think he wanted the church as such. Andrew A. Bonar's Robert Murray McCheyne. I have just been reading Bonar's life of (Mary-de-Shane) It is a glorious thing. He was very opposed to the political powers that the church had gotten. (St) John the Baptist reproved Herod, but not in any sense of reigning authority. The church is to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. It is to bear testimony against wickedness, but not in the sense of ruling. The church has no civil power in this age. (St) We are still children of the kingdom, and we are definitely related to Christ, who is the Father of all. Our priesthood is connected with His sovereignty. That is far as Peter goes.

(end of record)

... a lot more tangible and civil in the visible kingdom of Christ. The reigning with Christ seems to be far more definite and visible than that. (Dr. M: Isn't it important to know which is the adjective and which is the noun? If it says we are a royal priesthood? Now if it says, we are a holy group of rulers, that would mean, we are people who are ruling. We have the quality of being holy. But this says, "We are a royal priesthood." That is, we are people who have the activity of being priests., who are ruling. You might say, the man is the Congressional chaplain. That wouldn't mean that he rules the nations. That would mean that he is a chaplain under or for the Congress, and we are here a priesthood; that is, we are those who are offering up spiritual sacrifices to God. There is nothing in ruling there. But we are a royal priesthood; that is, we are children of the King, and are designated by God, the great Royal One, to perform this great function as priest. There is no word in it of any ruling function.) (St) Reformed theology makes quite a difference between the functions of prophet, priest and king. We now have the function of priests, priests of God. We don't have the function of kingship now. But we are children of the king. We are a priesthood now. We are a nation, of course, only figuratively, but we are a holy nation and a peculiar people. He refers to the fact that we can rejoice in the happiness of our reigning in heaven in Christ. He refers both to our reigning on these thrones and are the blessed dead in heaven. But John says, judgment was given to them. Judgment. Now who do they judge up in heaven? The exercise of judgment is a function of civil government. and that phrase, that judgment is given to them, hardly fits with any description of the blessed dead in heaven. The wicked are not there. They are awaiting the judgment of the Great White Throne. The question, whom do they judge, in Mark. (St: Is. 1:26 " I will restore thy judges as at the first and thy counsellors as at the beginning,....." Possibly, if we do have judgment committed to us, it may be in this capacity.) Yes. The

institutions of this earth, as well as time and place and material, ~~are~~ have a very definite significance in God's plan. And He is going to show for a thousand years the way He wants the human race to go along, and He will have resurrection ~~pepe~~ people to exercise some ~~kid~~ kind of judgment. I would rather have Him put me on a library committee. (St) There are premillennialists who suggest that all Gentiles have their spiritual status as being ~~graft~~-grafted into the promises of Abraham, and that the saints will reign with Christ and all the redeemed people. Now the particular entity which is continuous in its autonomy from the Jewish age to the future is the dynasty of David, but that in the person of Christ. Then when anyone believes, he becomes the subject of the king who reigns from David's throne. But the Jewish people, in flesh and blood, who have not been saved before the rapture, are the subjects of the kingdom, not the reigning people. A part of. The reigning subjects. And I suppose they doubtless inhabit Palestine, and ~~those~~ who accept the Lord will be happy to preach the Gospel to the remote places of the earth. There are indications of that. But ~~the-new~~ ^{He will} rule in ^{all the} our-world, and will use us in some reasonable capacity. ^{Dr. H's book, p. 134.} Rev. 20:8 Gog and Magog./"On premillennial assumptions, this is at the close at the alleged millenium, but in Ez. 39:1ff, the destruction of Gog and Magog precedes the bringing ~~ab~~ back of the captivity of Jacob." We can put that on ice until we go through those chapters in Ezekiel, but that is definitely a misconception. In Ez. 37, 38, 39. the people are brought back to the reign of David, (and that would be a name for Christ), and they are dwelling in security/^{and safety} and peace ~~and-peace-~~ and prosperity for an extended period before the Gog and Magog ~~period~~ rebellion, so this is definitely a misconception ~~of~~ of what Ezekiel says. I wonder ~~hw~~ Machen brought that out, because in the Second General Assembly of the Pres. Ch of Am. he got ^(excited ?) started on the millenium. He said, "I can see that Ezekiel would seem to indicate an attack upon Zion after a period of blessedness," and then he stopped and said, "But I think it is capable of another interpretation." Then he went on, "I like to

think that when I see the face of the Lord there will be no more trouble afterwards." One thing that is very hard for the amil to accept is the notion of a final rebellion after the millenium. It seems so unreasonable, if God ever gets things in His hands again, that He would allow Sätan to get loose again. I wanted to say that it doesn't make the least bit of difference what we like to think. (In answer to a st,) It would seem that the earth would want the earth to be filled with men who would praise Him. But if you look at it/a ⁱⁿ very broad way, from a premillennial point of view, then the a priori presumption would be in favor of the use of this earth as a probationary place, and there is no presumption against the fact that God might at the end of this earth's history allow another rebellion which would seem to me to vindicate His whole dealing with the children of men during all the ages. P. 134. "As we have already shown, the greatest problem of all for the premillennialist is the ~~le~~ losing of Sätan and the gathering of the wicked nations to war against the saints, Rev. 27 and 9." Well, that is not a problem for the premil. It seems ~~to~~ to fit in with what Ezekiel says. Again, "returned saints" is always applied to the Christian in the New Testament, and according to the premillennial principle, the church has already been raptured before the millenium, so all the saints would have glorified bodies. The argument is, how could Gog and Magog come up ag~~ain~~st the Beloved City, the camp of the saints, to make war ag~~ain~~st it? Well, the word "saints," in OT and NT, means "people of God," "holy people." A great many people, and the Jews as a group, as a whole, are saved, they are worshipping the Lord in Jerusalem. Jerusalem could very well be called "the camp of the saints," in spite of the fact that the resurrection people have glorified bodies. H: "It is unbelievable that they should be called saints in the NT unless they become Christians." Well, why shouldn't they? "Even though~~ly~~ they were not Jews, they could not die or have material bodies." That goes back to the same argument that there will not be any people in the millenium with flesh and blood bodies. We have taken care of that.

"Since no wicked nations exist on the earth at the beginning of the alleged millenium, having all been sent to eternal punishment, since the righteous cannot fall into sin and cannot bear children, and since the wicked dead have not yet been raised, ~~ad~~ according to the premillennialist, just who could Satan gather to war against the saints?" That is the same argument, that there will not be any flesh and blood people to populate the earth during the millenium. "Of course we understand very well that Zacharia 8:5 and Isaiah 65:20, if literally interpreted, incline to a future Jewish national restoration, 11 1/2 that there will be births, then, but if that be accepted as literally true, how can it be reconciled with the words of Jesus, that we have referred to above, in which He says that there will be ~~not~~ marriages during the period following the resurrection?" That is the same argument. He has read into the words of Jesus the statement that there won't be anybody else except the resurrection people. "The true interpretation of Rev. ^{20:7 (?)} 28 is that this war, there pictured, is the same one as that which occurs before the coming of Christ." That is, he identifies the Gog and Magog rebellion with disturbances that are ~~sia-~~ said to precede the Lord's return. He is certainly not a post-mil. He sees very clearly that the Lord's return will be immediately preceded by great disturbances. He says, "If it is one and the same war, then there is no problem." Well, I think the evidence is that it is not one and the same war. We'll finish rev. 20 next time.

Dr. MacRae: After that Ez. 37-39, and the first two or three verses of 40 also. Get that well in mind; see what the bearing of that is on this.

(end of record)

RV

Ez. 37, The vision of the dry bones. "The hand of Jehovah was upon me, and He brought me out in the Spirit of Jehovah, and set me down in the midst and it was of the valley; ~~which was~~ full of bones, And He caused me to pass by them round about: and behold there were very many in the open valley; and lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord Jehovah, thou knowest. (Read through v. 10)."

Now the meaning of the figure, at this point, I would suggest that this is not the literal resurrection of the dead. It seems to be a company of people of God, or at least a company of people who are as a company, and as a group, within God's general favor. The resurrection of the righteous dead is said to be an instantaneous matter, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last ~~g~~ trump." This is a gradual process which doesn't seem to correspond in any way to any literal resurrection of dead people. It would seem, stopping at this point, that you have a figurative representation of the restoration of a nation, a restoration of Israel, rather than a literal resurrection. So the interpretation seems to follow. (Read v 11-14.) Now there are some who will say that this reference to graves, "opening your graves and bringing you back to the land of Israel" would indicate that it is a literal resurrection. I think that that interpretation is ruled out by the comment, they were saying to themselves, 'We are dead,' but they ~~were~~ ^{were} live people, and the bones are said to be the whole house of Israel, which would seem to correspond with what Paul says in the 11th ch of Romans, all Israel will be saved. So I think this paragraph does not indicate a literal resurrection, but a national restoration. "The word of Jehovah came again unto me saying (Read 15-17)." You see, this is from the historical point of view of B_abylonian captivity, Ezekiel being there in Elam with the people of the captivity, the sad background of a divided kingdom being in their minds before Judah was taken to Babylonia, and the N_orthern tribes having been taken captive before that, and the hope of every pious, God-fearing Jew being that Israel as a whole would ultimately be restored. So you

have a little figure of speech which would very unlikely refer to a literal resurrection, but these two sticks to be united into one stick, one staff, indicating the union of a whole people as a whole. (Read v 18-23c). Up to v. 23 it would seem that the actual restoration to Palestine ~~after the~~ after the seventy years of captivity/ may be what is contemplated. But this prophecy, that they would no more defile themselves with their idols or with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions, that seems to rule out the notion that this vision of the dry bones and this parable of the two sticks would refer to the restoration under Zerubbabel, or at the end of the seventy years. "Vs. 23d --But I will save them out of all... (thru 24a)." That, of course, must be taken as a reference to Christ, whose family name is "David." David personally wouldn't be expected here, but the name "David" applied to his family, and Christ as the heir of David. "My servant David will be king over them." It must refer to someone of the line of David, even in Ezekiel's time, and to his contemporaries, I should think. "He- "They shall also walk in mine ordinances, and observe my statutes, and do them." Remember in the theology class we had up to ch. 20, where Ezekiel quotes over and over that refrain in Leviticus 18, "which if a man do, he shall live in them." Ezekiel said, "You did not keep God's statutes, so He plucked you up and put you down in the midst of the stench of heathenism, so that you would get a smell of this kind of life, which are ordinances and statutes in which a man ought not to live, because you do not keep my statutes, which, if a man do, he shall live in them." But now, under David, "They shall also walk in my ordinances, and observe my statutes, and do them." Surely we must take this as a reference back to what he has said in ch. 20. (Read 25-28.) Now that chapter is quite obviously a literary unit. This has been indicated in different commentaries. The fact that any writer breaks his chronology and goes back and brings up another thread of argument. One of the best illustrations of that is the novel, "Ivanhoe" by Sir Walter Scott, where, describing the battle of ¹¹ØØ 1/4

he brings up group after group to the place of the battle, and then describes the battle, describes the different aspects of the battle. You can't tell everything at once, and you know very well that any writer in human language has to go back and bring up the thread of the argument, so it's there is always an open question as to whether different units in any writing are chronologically in sequence, or whether you have different paragraphs and different divisions. Here it would seem that chapter 37 is one gestalt; it gives you a unified picture, and it has a vision and a parable, two different illustrations there, and the point of it is, the permanent and complete restoration of Israel to its own land under the rulership of the Messiah. It would seem to me that that is the theme of the chapter, and it would be very difficult to break it apart. It just stands there as the obvious, literary unit. Now, it is a rather open question as to whether ch.38 is continuous in sequence of thought, or whether it may go back and take up another theme. In the RV it is printed with a space between, that is, more than a paragraph division, which indicates that the editors of the RV thought that here you have something new. I would certainly not base anything upon ^{the context or} the continuity between 37 and 38, but I suggest that at least we ought to consider whether 37 may not lead up to 38. I would not be at all dogmatic about it. I would be rather positive that 37 itself was a literary unit, and could be taken as a unit. I would read 38 with the thought in mind that possibly it develops still farther the thought that was introduced in ch 37, or possibly not. But at least, watch out for the possibility of a continuity.

(St: V 25...God will multiply them...how does that fit into a millenium?)

According to the premillennial view, all Jews who are born-again in this age are simply naturally a part of the church, and they are possessed of every blessing that the church has in the resurrection, in the rapture, and in the reigning with Christ for a thousand years. But Israel as a whole, and as a nation--that is, as a cultural group--are not to be saved until the fullness of the Gentiles comes in. Now, what does that phrase mean--"they will be saved

after the fullness of the Gentiles comes in," and I think most premils understand that to mean, after the consummation of the Gentile church as constituted for this age, after the rapture of the church. Of course, we have to sketch broad outlines in a discussion of this kind, and don't have time for details, but I think the picture shows that after the rapture of the church the people that we call "the Jews," who, of course, ethnically or culturally include the remnants of all the tribes, unidentified--the only tribes you can identify is Levi, and Cohan, and so on, and that is only presumptuous, the Jews simply mixed in together. (end of record.)

e 78

...a whole, they will be saved, but they will be flesh and blood people. (St) In the millenium Israel will be completely under the rule of Christ, and ~~of~~ the kata sarka will be the same entumati; that is to say, there will be the flesh and blood people, who as a group and as a whole will have turned to the Lord in faith, but they will still be flesh and blood people. (St: Children during the millenium...? Christians..) The resurrection of the righteous takes place during a moment, during the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, at the which time, though we have not all fallen asleep, we shall all be changed. At that instant, all born again people will be made immortal. Subsequent to that instant, Israel as a whole will be saved, but ~~at this~~ they have missed the rapture. They will go on into the millenium as a flesh ~~of~~ and blood people. They are not heirs of the kingdom. They have not attained to the resurrection or to the rapture. They are the people who populate the earth with some Gentiles, probably many Gentiles, who will be convinced by the fact of the rapture. I imagine that a great multitude of Gentiles who have not accepted Christ will be suddenly convinced when the rapture takes place. (St: You mean then that there will be some with incorruptible bodies and some with corruptible bodies in the millenium?) The only people who have redeemed bodies, that is, immortal bodies, in the millenium, are the people who have accepted Christ before the instant of the rapture. That, of course, is an essential point about the millenium. All people who have not accepted Christ/~~at~~ ^{up to} that

moment, that twinkling of an eye, are flesh and blood people. Now, many of them will be put to death under the wrath of God, the outpouring of His wrath. Many of them will be put to death, all those who worshipped the beast and accepted his mark will be put to death when Christ comes to stand upon the Mount of Olives and to plead with the nations. The armies of the beast will be put to death at that point. But the great mass of humanity, who were neither in the armies of the beast, nor had been born again prior to the rapture, nor had been killed by the outpouring of God's wrath, that mass of humanity simply go on as Christ establishes His kingdom. Great multitudes will probably accept Him in genuine faith, but they have missed the resurrection. (St: ...Rev. 20...~~ly~~ how would that include those who were saved after the rapture?) No, that would be excluded. Those who have not worshipped the beast; those who have not been members of the kingdom of the beast, who have died, and so came to life. That is, only the resurrection people, who are specifically mentioned in Rev. 20. Now, we know from Paul that the living, born again people are not to be mentioned in that context. Rev. 20, those who reign with Christ, are those who are ~~sia-sadi-~~ said to come to life at that time. Now, all the people who attain to the resurrection are the heirs of the world to come. They have immortal bodies, and neither marry nor are given in marriage. But the salvation of Israel as a whole, as contemplated in Romans 11, evidently comes subsequent to the resurrection of the saints. (St) This is a national restoration in Palestine, under the immediate rule of one called David, and it is a permanent restoration to a state of holiness in the habitation of the land. That is all it is supposed to be. That is a mighty glorious thing. He isn't talking about the resurrection to immortality. (St: When do these Jews receive their resurrection bodies?) That is not revealed in the Scripture. In the OT, there is no clear statement about what would happen to the living righteous people at the coming of the Messiah. Paul gives you that answer, and he says that that is what Isaiah was really talking about when he said, "Death will be swallowed up in victory."

That rather cryptic saying describes the change when the living righteous people will be enveloped with immortality. Now the analogy that the Old Testament didn't answer that question, and Paul gave you the answer, we find certain necessary questions still answered with reference to the millenium. Now I would say that it is a reasonable inference, but I am not an inspired writer, at the close of the millenium that the saints of God who accepted Christ in the flesh after the rapture will be made immortal. I know that all the dead will be brought to life at the Great White Throne. All the dead. And it would be reasonable to suppose that the living saints will be made immortal at that time, but ~~there-~~is~~~~ I can't find any answer explicitly in the Scripture. (St: What happens to their souls...)

What happens to the souls to the righteous people at any time? (St: At that time we will all have received our glorified bodies...someone converted during the millenium, still having his corruptible body, will die and be buried...what happens to his soul during that period there?) I can imagine what I would do if I were the Lord. I'd take them to heaven, the same as I did all the other people all down through the years. (St: You'd have some down on earth, during the millenium, reigning, and some in heaven?) You'd have some ~~pp~~ people who have missed the resurrection, ^{the} same as you do now. (St: They wouldn't be with the Lord, in other words, because the Lord would be here.) Isn't He omnipresent? Wherever you find "be with the Lord" or "coming of the Lord" in spiritual presence, you have to read, "a manifestation of the Lord." Remember the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. It didn't mean that the Holy Spirit wasn't here. So, "to go to be with the Lord" doesn't mean that God isn't here. God is omnipresent, and I haven't the slightest doubt that those who believe in Christ, and then are put to death after the rapture of the church, will be in blessed fellowship with the Lord in a disembodied state. And yet that doesn't at all limit the fact that His visible presence will be manifested on earth. This is a very important point. These are just the questions which are asked by people who have trouble with the millenium.

93/4

Dr. MacRae: I think it would be worth noting here that the problems you have in this connection are very very similar, in fact, no different, I think, at all from the problems which all evangelical Christians face, with the questions which people ask you now as to What about people in many lands where the Gospel has not been reached? What about people before the coming of Christ? All over the world, the people who were not Jews, what happened to all those people? Is every one of those people lost? Does that seem fair, that the Jews, who had received the Word, that all these other people wouldn't? Does it seem fair that people in the heart of Africa, where no missionaries went until about a hundred years ago, through these last fifteen hundred years should^{all} be lost? What is the situation? Well, we have a very difficult problem. These are very different things to answer, and whatever inequality there is, or difficulty of understanding just how things would be worked out in connection with these matters in relation to the millenium, I don't think there is a fraction of the difficulty. If we all face, as evangelical Christians, these other great problems, there is just a great deal we^{just} don't know about God's plans, and all we can do is to carefully and thankfully accept the facts that are revealed to us, that we do know, and stand on them, and then--there-- at many many points, just say, We don't know.

Dr. Buswell: ~~What would~~ (St: What would be another way of interpreting Ezekiel 37 if you didn't take it as a restoration of Israel in the days? As an amil, or a post-mil?) I don't recall having heard any detailed amillennial interpretation of this chapter. I do remember that incident when Dr. Machen said that he would admit that ch. 38 and 39 in Ez. looked like an attack of Gog and Magog after a period of literal blessedness in the Messianic Age, but all that he said on that occasion was that, "I think that the Scripture is capable ~~is~~ of another interpretation, and I like to believe that when I've seen the Lord, there will be no more rebellion after that. I can't answer though, just how an amil would deal with this passage. (St) That would answer it; that is the typical p-m interpretation

of practically all Messianic prophecy. Now as to the question raised there, that taking David as Christ is figurative, I would deny that. I would say that taking David as Christ ~~is~~ is most literal, and is right in line with ancient usage of names. Certainly Ezekiel didn't think ~~that~~ ^{of such a thing} as David himself, personally and individually. Obviously what he would mean to his contemporaries, right there in that context, would be, "one of David's line." So, ~~think~~- taking the whole thing literally, you have a prophecy of restoration under Messiah. Now this other point which you read, if we take it literally, we are discouraging the Jews from accepting Christ. That, of course, I don't see follows at all; if a ~~J~~ Jew becomes convinced that Jesus is the one of David's line who is to reign in the future, the thing that he does is to accept Christ as his Saviour, if he believes that Christ is literally going to restore Israel in the future. This prophecy actually is used many times in Jewish missions. I have known a good many Jewish missionaries who would refer to this and ~~to~~ other similar prophecies to get point of contact with the Jew: "We believe that your people will be literally restored to Palestine, and will actually be under the reign of your Messiah, but we ~~cannot~~ can show you that your Messiah, who is going to do that, is the Lord Jesus Christ." I know a good many cases where contact was made and Jews were brought to the Lord through this literal interpretation. (Dr. M: And that connects up with Mr. J's question again, whether this wonderful glory that is predicted here could be inferior to the glory which He promised to the church? I think it definitely is. I ~~think~~ think there is a wonderful future glory promised to Israel here, but there is nothing in it which could in ~~any~~ any way deter one from accepting Christ; the ~~glory~~ glory He promised to the church is even greater, ~~than~~ than the glory which is here promised to Israel. It is, however, a very common error nowadays to put the Jew in a position which is not given in the Scripture. That is, there are two opposing errors. There is the one which puts the Jew out of the picture all together, as if when Christ

was born the Jews were ended; there was nothing more. The Scripture is full of predictions of a future for the Jews. On the other hand, there are those who, in view of the glorious predictions for the Jew sort of idolize the Jew. Someone said this morning...(end of record)

Europe has done the same thing to the thing.... seemed to think it was quite unbelievable, as if, because God promised that that- the Jews will go back, that therefore the Jews will go back as Christians. That is not prophecied at all; they go back in unbelief. The Christian is interested in the aspirations of Israel; we are interested in verything good that will happen to Israel, but we have no illusions about the fact that they are unsaved people, and that the character-- character of many of them is no better than that of the other people with whom they are in contact. Their salvation as a nation is still a future matter. Someone mentioned to me that in Israel there are a little-- lot of missionaries there who are simply glorifying the Jews. Of course, that is not the purpose of the missionary. The purpose is to win the Jews to Christ. You can show the wonderful future glory of Israel, but there is an even greater glory to those in this age who are in Christ. (St: What is the purpose of the restoration?) ~~to fulfill~~ To fulfill God's promises; to carry on this race through which He brought Christ into the world, the race through which He brought the Word of God into the world; who have had so great a part in His economy. He made wonderful promises to the founders of it, and they are yet going to be fulfilled, in full. It's a part of the (epistraphae) ^{1 3/4}. Even though we are unfaithful, if we are God's elect, He is faithful. He abideth faithful; He cannot deny His own. And even though we wander far from Him we know that He will bring us back in His own time. (2)

(St) It is said of something being for a relatively short space. There is a wonderful promise that Israel is to come back into this land, and is to be established there, and that there will be a long continuation. That is what is promised. Now, there is nothing said here as to whether

runs on and the end of the millenium means a change, but not a conclusion; simply a change of ^{form-} form in some places, or whether this particular passage prophecy finds its complete end at the end of the millenium. But the question you have raised is one that I thought someone would surely raise, about that 25th verse, the word OLAH. He says that they, and their children, and their children's children to OLAH. The first year of the Seminary I received a letter from a very godly man who had written a very fine book. He had written a number of books before which he had published, and they were much used in Christian circles. But this book was written on the eternal punishment of the wicked, a thing which is very clearly taught in Scripture. But in his book he based all his discussion, the eternal punishment of the wicked upon this one word OLAH. "The wicked is to suffer until OLAH." And he said, "OLAH means- means "eternity"; it must mean "eternity" because there is no other Hebrew word for eternity. And therefore OLAH must mean "eternity," and therefore it is "forever," and there is no end to it." And the book was very beautifully written, but to my sorrow I had to write back and tell him that I did not think the Hebrew foundation of this book was valid at all. He didn't publish the book, but he didn't ask my advice about his next book. It was a true teaching of Scripture, and there is abundant New Testament evidence of it, but the evidence does not rest upon this particular word, because as I showed him, the word OLAH is a word which is used of the past just the same as of the future. It speaks of "these are the men of OLAH," speaking of the men before the flood. And he uses it occasionally of the future, of events which take place within a period of a few hundred years. The word OLAH does not mean "without limitation." It means "a very, very long distance." And, of course, that is instanced by the fact that sometimes you say, "To the OLAH of OLAH," a continuation of continuation. You express it as very, very far, but the figure of the word is like as if you were to ~~look~~ look at a street or road, and you see the two tracks going off in the distance to where you see them come together. It does not say that they go on absolutely without any end.

That is not in the Scripture (5) . And so I do not think that this verse says that there is an end to this promised kingdom that God is going to do, it does not say that, but it does not say that it is without end. It does say that it extends on for a long period of time, much longer than any period of time than any Jewish kingdom has ever existed before. (St: You said that they would return back in unbelief. Is that correct?) Well, that is what they are doing now, certainly; they are going back in unbelief. (St: ~~Aeeerid~~- According to Ezekiel 37. No, I wasn't speaking of that. I was referring to the present return of the Jews, which is a return in unbelief. This / which is described here is something which is certainly of those who are following God and trusting God, following Him. It is ~~entirely~~ different. Now the present may be a beginning phase of ~~the~~ this, but what this describes is certainly something that comes after the return of Christ, rather than before. Woudln't you say that, Dr. B? (Dr. B: Yes.) (St: Would you say then that God's restoration of Israel is not an end in itself....but rather a future beyond this, more abundant....) Yes. That is what Paul says, that what is there, the casting aside of them means great blessing to the Gentiles, what will there regathering in be but life from the dead? Remember in Romans 11? He does not say that any of God's purposes are any one of them just for ourselves, but He saved us in order that He may use us for His purposes, to be a blessing to others. (St: It doesn't seem to me that this period of blessedness is an end in itself.) I think of all God's works we can say, their is an end in itself in a way, but there is also a means to even ~~grd~~ greater things that God is accomplishing through it. (St) --two eschatologies, I would say that there is a different future for any different groups of people or different individuals. Now, as far as the millenium is concerned, we have the redeemed, whether of Jewish or of Gentile background, who come with Christ and who reign with Christ. Then we have the people upon this earth over whom Christ reigns, and of many of these people upon this earth, I would think the Jews, the Jewish nation, is in a privileged position, that they are

especially used of Him in His purposes, but that they are inferior to the church very definitely. (St: Is that an eternal position?) We are not told. There is, as far as I know, nothing in the Scripture to show whether at the end of the millenium this is all merged together, and there is one final division with the lost into the hell and the saved all simply one group, or whether God has a new great purpose beyond that that may have tremendous complexity that we just don't know anything about. As far as I know it is just not revealed. (ST: We haven't disucussed yet the religion.) The saints^{over} reign with Christ ~~veer~~ the earth. (St: You are painting a picture of a Jewish kingdom.) There is a Jewish kingdom in Palestine, but it is subject to Christ and the saints, who are ruling the rest of the world, and doubtless many Jews take subordinate positions in the administration of the world of sinners. (St: And possibly ruling Gentiles?)- from Palestine?) Christ will rule from Palestine. (St: The Jewish kingdom shall just be in the land of Palestine?) I wouldn't say dogmatically that that is what is stressed here. It would at least be that. And there is nothing said that there would be more than that, that I know of. (St) I distributed some little pamphlets a couple of months ago, ⁱⁿ and which I discussed the millenial kingdom, and in the first two or three pages I discussed the meaning of the word "kingdom," or "the kingdom of God." And I showed there that the word "kingdom" does not describe just one brief period. It might be applied par excellance perhaps to one brief period, but the kingdom of Christ is the reign of Christ, and the ~~reign~~ reign of Christ in the hearts of H's people is a very real aspect of His kingdom. And Christ's kingdom has its members today, ~~scattered~~ scattered all over the world, individuals here and there who are serving Him, but who are surrounded by those who are bitterly hostile to them. But the time is coming when His kingdom will be visibly present over all the earth; it is one kingdom, but it has a wider manifestation, and a manifestation in other spheres then which are not included now, although the spheres included now will ~~not~~ continue to be included. (Dr. B: I heard Taylor Matthew one time on that very question, 10

the kingdom of heaven. Taylor Matthews is a very bitter anti-millennialist, very bitterly opposed to the doctrine of the visible return of Christ. I was not a member of that class, but I just listened in as a visitor one day. I ^{heard} ~~heard~~ him say this: "I used to interpret the New Testament teaching about the second/^{coming} of Christ along the line of the parable of the leaven, taking the leaven as it spread its spirituality, but I have come to see that I was mistaken. The NT writers did not so understand the coming of the kingdom. The NT writers ~~ta-~~ taught and the early Christians believed that Christ would come catastrophically, cataclysmically, to establish a kingdom of righteousness in power and judgment." That was Taylor Matthews. Now then, he took up the question, in what sense is the kingdom at hand? This was many years ago, ~~shre-~~ shortly after the First World War, and he used the illustration of Gen. Pershing landing with just the Rainbow Division, a rather skeleton organization, just a few soldiers. The German from Wisconsin described that "he chumped on the shore and he hollered back, here we are, La Follich." Pershing went to LaFayette's grave, laid a wreath on the grave, and said, " , " "Here we are, LaFayette." Of course, that was something different from "La Follich." But now, Taylor Matthews said, "We have arrived." Well, who was there? Just the staff of a skeleton organization. We haven't arrived in full. And he used that illustration of the Americans ~~z~~ arrival in France in token at that particular time. I think the illustration is true as far ~~as~~ ~~it~~ it goes. I think, of course, there is a great deal more to what Christ said about the ^{12 1/2} (humanisia). I think what Dr. M has brought ~~z~~ out about the spiritual~~z~~ity of the kingdom in this present age is certainly one important aspect of it. This referenee to the restoration of Israel I think cannot refer to a resurrection to glorified form because of the way in which Christ spoke about the resurrection. That is, Christ said, so positively, those who attain to the resurrection ef- are the heirs of the age to come, neither ~~mary-~~ marry nor ~~are~~ given in marriage. Now this resotration is so specifically coupled with fertility and multipkation of

children that if Christ had conceived this as a prophecy simply of the general restoration of things all at once at His second coming, some explanation would be necessary. But on the contrary, ~~the-~~ this seems to be a prophecy of a restoration of flesh and blood ~~pep-~~ people, which would fit in with Romans 11, the restoration of the Jews. God has used visible people, groups of people, from time to time. He has seen fit to keep alive a visible church, in different ~~fem-~~ forms, in different ages. The perpetuity of the Jewish cultural group down through all the history of our western civilization has been quite a testimony to the truth of God. I read the story about different ~~peepele-~~ people, but I read it once with reference to Frederick the Great. I don't know if it is authentic or not, but he asked his chaplain, according to the story, for a miracle, and his chaplain said, "The Jew, your majesty, is a miracle. The valuable character of the Jewish cultural group in western civilization is something quite remarkable, and for God to do just as He says in Romans 11, after the fullness of the Gentiles, to restore this cultural group, ~~and~~ and to bring them to a point of faith would be a remarkable testimony, and all the events leading up to it have been a remarkable testimony to the truth of ~~the-~~ the Scriptures. I don't think that the Jews are any higher or any lower than other people. They ~~ah-~~ have their peculiar function, as Scotland has its peculiar in the history of ~~fiath-~~~~fa-~~ faith. Germany, with Martin Luther, had its particular function. Switzerland, with Calvin, had its particular function, and in the same way God chose some ~~to~~ of the most stubborn and stiffnecked, mean group of people in all the world, to be the greatest trophy of His grace. So that it is no particular compliment to the Jews in the flesh that God has chosen to use them. It is no particular compliment to us that God has chosen to use us.

(end of record)

....
 by Himself. But He does that ~~down~~-- to visible groups down through the ~~11/14~~
 history of civilization from time to time. It is entirely consistent that
 He should, in a miraculous way, perpetuate this cultural group, and see
 to it that there is to be a period of history in which His ^{0 1/2}
 purposes, His [?] temporal purposes, for those people, will be vindicated.
 Well now to move on to the 38th chapter--(St:Why couldn't verses ~~20~~/ 1-14
 refer to those Jews who, between the time of Abraham and David, who believed
 in God, and were saved, and are resurrected, with other Christians?) The
 prophecy of the resurrection of the righteous ~~in~~ indicates that it will
 take place in an instant, not by the gathering of bone with bone and joint
 with joint and sinew with sinew, and covered with skin. The resurrection
 of the righteous is to be an instantaneous affair. And in these fourteen
 verses there are several successive steps. But as they are described, the
 resurrection is not instantaneous. This restoration of this great army
 is in several successive steps. It fits in thoroughly with a national
 restoration, which is in stages, and I think we see the Jews going back
 to Palestine in unbelief now as probably something of a stirring of the
 bones, but not yet in the spirit, but this seems to fit in with a literal
 national restoration which will come to its consummation after the rapture
 of the church and the visible presence of Christ. (St: (v. 12?))A figure..
 (St: ...about the bones coming together...) I don't think it is two
 figures. You see, a grave isn't at all necessarily a ~~10~~/ hole in the
 ground. (St) The connection is in v. 11. "They said unto me, these bones
 are those of the whole house of Israel. Behold, they say, 'Our bones
 are dried up, and our hope is lost. We are clean cut off.'" The Jews
 were saying to themselves, "We are just dead people." (Dr. MacR: I
 think v. 11 is perhaps the strongest evidence against this being a resurrec-
 tion. They say, "Our bones are dried up; we are cut off." You can't ima-
 gine dead people saying anything like that. That would be more the nation.)
 Yes. And , carrying on exactly the same figure, he says, "Y_ou are over there
 in Elam, you are in Babylonia, and you are going to be scattered in various

places, and go to your graves. You think you are just buried. You are lost; you ~~de-~~ are dead; and you are just dried bones, wherever you are.

I will gather you. (St: You take the "graves" as a figure of the lands where they are in captivity?) That is what it says. I didn't do that. Ezekiel did. He goes right on to explain it: "I shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live." V. 12. (St) (Dr. MacR: He says, "bring you out of your graves and bring you into the land of Israel. That makes the "graves" antithetical to the land of Israel. The end of v. 12.)

(St) If you want my little pamphlet which I wroteⁱⁿ about 1924 on Revelation, it gives my answer to that question. All you have to do is to send a quarter to my office, and they will send it to you~~/~~. (St:.... says you have to believe in a pre-tribulation rapture before they accept you, and I was wondering how they could explain that in relation to the churchtoday.) I thoroughly believe that. I didn't know that was in the RCA creed. I agree with it, and I think I can prove it, but it takes a long time. It takes a long time to read even the first ~~s~~ syllable of Ezekiel 38, doesn't it? (St: ...the relation of the church to Israel today?)

The church to Israel today is completely explained in Rom. 11. It is the relation of the grafted-in branches growing in the same ~~s~~ old stump, and (enough of that?) Your ~~s~~ only hope today is in a Jewish hope, a Jewsi- Jewish Christ. (St: I mean, are we true Israelites, or are the Jews, members of the church.) Very clearly, in Rom. 11, Paul takes Israel in two distinct senses that are not at all confused. The remnant went right on into the church, and God has not cast away His people for that reason. But, the cultural group that we call the Jews, who are really a part of the Jews, have become blind, and blindness has come to them until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in. And then, all Israel will be saved. ~o the 11th Ch of Romans is really the key th- to the whole interpretation of the future of Israel. He makes it very plain that the literal national--I don't like to use the word "racial" because you know they are not a physiological race; they are a cultural group (that

is the technical term), the people that we call "the Jews" today--are going to be restored as a group as- and as a whole, and yet, now, our are only standing in grace through the promise of God to Abraham. We have no other standing except that we are drafted in to the those promises.

(St: Then we are spiritual--the church is just a temporary standing--)

Yes. The church, as we call it today, in the sense as when we say "church history", you know what we mean, although we believe in the ei continuity of the church. When we say "church history" we begin with the First Century. So the church, in that sense of the word, is God's way of dealing with humanity until the rapture. And then He is going to restore the national way of dealing. But in the millenium, all the kingdoms of the earth will receive the blessings of Messianic reign. It will be a Jewsi-- Jewish Christ who reigns, and the continuity of the Davidic dynasty that prevails, with all the blessings of Christ, will go out over all the earth. He will rule over all the people in the Davidic line.

(St: The church isn't going to rule over Israel, but spiritual Israel will rule over Israel according to the flesh?) I would say, both are true. The church, that is the body of Christ, the redeemed and ransomed saints, including Araham, Isaac and Jacob, are going to rule with Christ during the millenium, and that will, from our point of view, be the spiritual Israel reigning over the Israel according to the flesh. Both are true. (St: Do you apply any of this 37th ch. to the return after the seventy years of captivity?) I was arguing that it could not apply to the return from the seventy years of captivity, because it is a return to perfection and perpetual righteousness. Now, that return from Babylonia was certainly not such a return. I mean now, if this is a literary unit, the whole chapter holds together as dealing with one subject, and I would say that the chapter here does not have to do with the reutrnr from Babylonia, but it has to do with a still future return.

Now chapter 38: The collateral change of thought are very valuable, but there is always the difficulty to know just how many collateral trains of thought to pursue, how many to exclude, and how many to postpone.

About half, at least. Ezekiel 38:1 "And the word of God came unto me, saying Son of man, set thy face toward Gog, of the land of Magog--" now the RV says, "prince of Rosh," and the margin reads, "chief prince of Meshech". "The prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal, ~~and~~ " "chief prince of Meshech and Tubal." "Rosh", of course, as you know very well, means "head", or "title", or "first chief," and "chief prince of Rosh," it is true, that in your old Gesenius lexicon, there is a suggestion that "Rosh" might mean Russia. No data is given. I asked one time, who was very positive that "Rosh" means Russia. I said, "Did you ever look up the history of the word "Russia." He published several books on the subject. And he looked at me in great astonishment and said, "I never thought of that!" It had just never occurred to him to look up the derivation of the word "Russia." Well, the ~~Arch~~ Encyclopedia Britannica indicates that it is a Scandinavian word, "rusman" meaning "oarsman," originated in the Baltic area, the people across the Baltic were called "oarsmen", and the word "Russian" spread from the Baltic, and "rusman" is not related to the Hebrew "rosh." "Rosh" means "sheep," and it just is sheer leaping over eternity, or leaping over--well, it is just sheer speculation to identify "Rosh" with "Russia." And Tubal and Meshech, --the tribe of Dan might as well have lived in Danville, Illinois; there would be more reason for that, because the word "Dan" does come from the Scriptures, and you might as well go on with Anglo-Israelism and have the United States and Canada for Ephraim and Manassah, as to identify "Rosh" with "Russia." Meshech and Tubal. (St) Tubal. Many people want to identify things in that way. It is like arguing why fire-engines are red, to me. You are all familiar with that adage? Why? Well, newspapers are red too, and two times two is four, ~~and~~ ^{three} and ~~two~~ times four is twelve, and there ~~are~~ twelve inches in a ruler. Now, Queen Elizabeth is a ruler, but Queen Elizabeth is also a ship. A ship sails on the ocean, the ocean is full of fish, and the fish have fins, and the Russians are red, and fire-engines are always rushing around, so fire-engines are red. (laughter) ...it's perfect logic.

A gap of eternity between these (14) . If you can draw inferences like that, and call it logic. But now let us not cast any sarcasm at poor people who think that Rosh ~~mena-~~ means Russia- Russia. Let's see ~~what~~ what Ezekiel says about it. "Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal: and I will turn thee about, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, ~~horses~~ horses and horsemen, all of them clothed in full armor, a great company with buckler and shield, all of them handling swords: Persia, Cush, and Put ~~with~~ with them, all of them with shield and ~~helmet~~ helmet; Gomer, and all his hordes; the house of Togarmah--" Now "Gomer" is the Hebrew word for "border", they are border-people, the people who live ~~at~~ over the borders. Gomer is mentioned in the Genesis genealogy. Gomer has positively nothing to do with Ger-man-y. Different root entirely. The ~~kind~~ Teutonic people called themselves Teutony or Alemony. The Latins picked up a Celtic word, ~~Germany~~ Germany, and applied it to the people there around the Rhine in the north. So "germany" is a Celtic word adopted by the Latins to apply to the German people, and to make that out to be Gomer is certainly walking on thin air. (end of record)

(Dr. Buswell speaking)
 some of them are rather vaguely identified in the Bible. Some of them we know positively. Geographical names have shifted ...gone from place to place, as geographical names do. Take the man from down below the Mason-Dixon line--at least if he is an older man--to hear the American army called Yankees, well, he'd just start to fight. Yet the fact is that/our troops are sometimes called Yankees. That is quite a by-word. Paul Roberts told me that he was practically twenty-one years old before he ever knew that "damn Yankee" was two words. (laughter) And yet the word "Yankee" has spread, and is used ~~very~~ loosely to refer to people who are very vigorous in telling us that they are not Yankees. The geographical terms husper--

"Be thou prepared and prepare thyself and all thy company that are assembled with thee, and be thou a guard unto them. /After many days thou shalt be visited In the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from Assyria, that is gathered out of many peoples upon the ~~the~~ mountains of Israel." Now that seems to me like an allusion to what is accomplished in chapter 37, the land that is brought back from the sword, gathered out of many peoples upon the mountains of Israel, which have been a continual waste, but it is brought forth out of the pepples, and they shall dwell securely, all of them, and thou shall ascend, thou shalt come like a storm, thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou and all thy hords, and many with thee. Thus saith the Lord Jehovah. It shall come to pass in that day that things shall come into thy mind, and thou shalt devise an evil device." I think the King James Version says, "Thou shalt think an evil thought." John, in the 20th ch. of Rev. says, "Satan shall go out to decieve the nations," "Thou shalt devise an evil device; things shalt come into thy mind, thou shalt thnk an evil thought. Thou shalt say, "I will go up to the land of un-walled villages. I will go to them that are at rest; that dwell securely., all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither guards nor gate. " I have found some people who are very determined that the Gog and Magog rebellion must come before the millanum, and ~~that~~ they have argued that the cities of Palestine today do not have bars and gates, as though that

fits the picture here. They have barbed wire entanglements, and armed guards and perpetual fear. ~~They~~ Not only does Ezekiel say they have no walls and no guards and gates, but he says they are dwelling securely, without fear. Now, this Gog and Magog hoard are going to say, v. 12, "To take the spoil and to take the prey, and to turn thy hand against the waste places that are now inhabited, and against the people that are gathered out of the nations, that have gotten cattle and goods and dwell in the middle of the earth. Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof--" Tarshish is regularly meant as Spain, but because England has young lions and cartoons in the newspapers, therefore Tarshish has to mean England, which I don't think Ezekiel meant. "--Shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take the spoil? hast thou assembled thy company to take the prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take great spoil?" Now right there, certain of our good ^{friends} ~~introduce~~ in premillennialism introduce a conflict, an international conflict. Here is Gog and Magog and Gomer, and the northern confederacy that they make out, and here is Sheba and Dedan ~~and~~ and Tarshish. They say, are you going to take the prey and the spoil? Then they introduce something to the effect that there is a northern confederacy brought against this southern and eastern confederacy, and one defended Palestine, and the other fought against Palestine. All of which is ~~between~~ between the lines. You know the definition of nothing? Are you up on your mathematics? The rimless spectacles without any lenses used by the little man that wasn't there, as you read between the lines in the unwritten law. So the evidence for this conflict between Sheba and Dedan and Tarshish on one hand, and Gog and Magog and Gomer on the other hand, is to me just positively nothing. (St) There is a very strong tendency in the minds of some good people to always represent Great Britain in a fine light in the prophetic Scriptures. Now I am not anti-British by any means, but I am not pro-British either. The British have rather generally historically been kind to the Jews more than other

countries, more than /Spain and more than Germany and more than Russia, but they haven't been so kind to the Jews in recent years, and to read Britain in here anywhere as defending the Jews, you get a whole line-up of nations in the battle of Jehoshaphat, and yet get England in one side and the United States and Canada always brought in there, and they are fighting against Germany and Russia, because they are ~~of~~ kind to the Jews. Well I just can't see that in Scripture anywhere. I don't see it at all. Many years ago I attended a conference at which Christabel(?) Pankhurst spoke. It was shortly after she had been converted, and she was lecturing on some internatinn politics in Daniel. ^{FORD C OTTMAN} ~~Forsee Ockman~~ was in charge of the conference. He was a great prophetic student. He had written extensively in prophecy. After the meeting I got Dr. Ottman off on the side, and I said, "I can see what she says in the newspaper currently, but I can't find it in the Scripture." Dr. Ottman had quite a fine sense of humor, and he looked at me and he winked his eye, and he said, "I can't find it either, but didn't ~~she~~ she have a fine spirit?" So all this business of our ~~northern~~ northern confederacy and England fighting against Germany and Russia in the 38th ch. of Ezekiel, to me is just pure 7 3/4; ~~it isn't here.~~ it isn't here. The inference I would draw from the story is that these other nations join in the raid. If you're going up to raid Palestine, well from all the rest of the story it seems to be a consolidated raid on Israel. (Ez. 38:14) "Therefore, son of man, prophesy, and say unto Gog, Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: In that day when my people Israel dwell ~~th~~ securely, shalt thou not know it? And thou shalt come from thy place out of the uttermost parts of the north, ~~of~~-----" Now, of course, that confirms the idea it must be Russia. "---Thou, and many peoples with thee, all of them riding upon horses, a great company, and a mighty army, and thou shalt come up against my people Israel, as a cloud to cover the land: it shall come to pass in the latter days, that I will bring thee against my land, that the nations may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes. (v. 17, then through 18 b) And it shall come to pass in that day, when Gog shall come against the land of Israel--"

Now would it seem here that this whole mass of nations are now being addressed by their leader, who is called "Gog"? Alfred says that by the time of Ezekiel, and in the intertestamental literature, Gog and Magog are a general name for the hostile Gentile horde, a rather indiscriminate general name, ~~the~~ "saith the Lord Jehovah. But my wrath shall come up into my nostrils, for in my jealousy and in the fire of my wrath have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel; so that the fishes of the sea, and the birds of the heavens, and the beast of the field, and all ^{the} creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that ~~are~~ are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at my presence, and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground, and I will call for a sword against him unto all my mountains, saith the Lord Jehovah: every man's sword shall be against his brother. (Read through v. 22-23.)

(St) I think Ezekiel means there that when it comes to ~~pass~~ pass, they will look back to Ezekiel's ~~prop~~ prophecy. I think Ezekiel is talking about himself. I think that is a very natural way for a prophet to speak. When all this comes to pass they will look back and remember that Ezekiel had given this prophecy. Remember how John brings it in--

(St) "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, art thou he of whom I ~~spake~~ spake in the old time by my servants the prophets of Israel that prophesied in those days, for many years, that I will bring thee against them." John, of course, repeats it, and you ^{11 1/4} ~~will need~~ (will, only) need more than (two, to) reference to the plural; sometimes we use it in the humorous way. An American officer told me that a sergeant spoke to him over in Germany, asking him some question about procedure, and the sergeant went back to his buddies, and the officer heard him say, "The fellows over there say so and so." Well, that is not an uncommon kind of reference. Ezekiel was conscious of being one of the prophets, and of course, John repeats ~~it~~ it also. (St: Would it be possible 12

that some prophet might have ~~prop~~ prophesied in cooboration(?) of this, and it wouldn't

be in the Scriptures?) It wouldn't be 12 1/4 the

latter time. I think Ezekiel and Jöhn are all we need to satisfy this verse. (St) I can't see that at all, myself. Daniel 11 seems to me not-- (St) Well, Daniel's "end" has to do with Daniel's context, what Daniel there i n the context was referring to. But Ezkiel doesn't give the phrase, "the time of the end" here, does he? I don't see that he does. He simply says, "of old~~///~~, by my servants the prophets." Now I think that "of old" there is predictive. The time has come. You will remember what the prophets said way back there. I don't think that it is all unnatural that Ezekiel should ~~f~~ use the plural, and then John later on refers to it. Remember what Jöhn says about it: "And when a thousand years are finished, Satan will be loosed out of his prison, and will go forth to deceive the nations that are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog." The Bible dictionaries tell us that "Magog" is probably from the Persian word meaning "land of Gog", Matgog. That is just a conjecture, but not unreasonable. Now Gog and Magog, as used in Jöhn, why it certainly sounds to me like just an ¹⁴interrogation, "Now don't you remember?" /This is the Gog and Magog story." John is constantly conscious of Old Testament prophecy. There is more Old Testament prophecy quoted and alluded to in the Apocalypse than any other portion of the New Testament in proportion to its size. The Book of Revelation is just full of prophetic allusion, and for Jöhn to just throw in the words "Gog and Magog", --they are not in any close grammatical construction, don't you see. They stand in apposition to the nations that are in the four corners of the earth, and it would just seem as though Jöhn said, "Remember, the Gog and Magog story." For all these nations, from all-the different parts of the earth, are all summed up by Jöhn as Gog and Magog. "He gathered them together to the war, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth and eircled- they encircled the camp of the saints, and the beloved city, and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them." Now, "fire came down out of heaven and devoured them" is just a brief summary of the last verses of the

38th ch and the entire 39th chapter. You have fire and brimstone and pestilence, but fire from heaven is the thing that John uses to sum it all up. Now let us go very rapidly through the 39th chapter. (st)

(end of record)

Genesis titles, but the evidence seems to be as Alford says, that by this time Gog was taken as ~~it~~ just simply a word to indicate hostile hordes. (St) Not exactly. As we would say, "We were fighting against Hitler." Now, there was Hitler and there was Mussalini and there was Stalin. There were quite a gang of people ~~it~~ there, and we didn't ~~feel~~ feel it necessary to specify all the different people. We simply picked out the most conspicuous one and used his name to describe the whole crowd. And names do spread that way. (Dr. M: Here in Genesis 10 you have the sons of Jacob: Gomer, and Magog, and Meshich, and Tabal . That is quite a number of the same names.) Magog, ~~but~~ but not Gog.) Now, if "Magog" means "land of Gog", well then, you'd have a little light from that fact. (Dr. M:....guess..) Yes, it is a guess. It ~~is~~ is like anything else, I suppose. But the question is, way back there in Genesis--if I said Gog is a particular people, I ~~may~~ may have slipped there.) Magog is a particular people. But the fact is well known that geographical names and racial names broaden out and shift their ground. The evidence seems to be that by the time of the Revelation, "Gog ~~and~~ and Magog" is a phrase to refer to the hostile nations in the four corners of the earth. In fact, it stands in apposition. That is the way John understands it, and Alford feels that that is the way we should understand Ezekiel. Gog and Magog, the nations in the four corners ~~of~~ of the earth. We know that geographical names do shift in similar ways. So John, in the Revelation, ~~it~~ uses "Gog and Magog" with no further explanation than merely to say, "the nations in four corners of the earth." (St) In this case John read it correctly, and this ~~is~~ is the impression that I have always gotten from Ezekiel 38 and 39. In fact, right there in verse 14 of 38, it seems to me that it would be a necessary matter of literary

interpretation to say that Gog refers to the whole gang, the whole hostile ~~hea~~- horde. In just the most natural way in the world we refer to all/under ^{of our enemies} name, without discrimination, and there is no obscurity about it. So, right there, in verse 14, the whole crowd can be called "Gog," and John uses "Gog and Magog" in apposition to "the nations in the four corners of the earth." (St) In Ezekiel 38 you have quite an enumeration, and Gog is among the ~~oht~~ others. But by the time we get to verse 14 in the same chapter, Gog seems to be addressed as the leader of the whole crowd. And by the time you get to Revelation 20, John refers to the nations in the four corners of the earth as "Gog and Magog." That is the way language goes; it is the most natural development in the world. So it would seem to me, up to this point that Revelation 20:7,8 would have to stand as a summary of Ezekiel 38,39. Now ch. 39. "And thou, son of man, ~~pre~~- prophecy against Gog/ ^{and say, --} "the others have just dropped off because there is no use in mentioning everybody's ~~al~~ name. We are talking about Gog. "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal: and I will turn thee about, and will lead thee on, and will cause thee to come up from the uttermost parts of the north; and I will bring thee upon the mountains ~~of~~ of Israel--(read through v. 9)." I have heard some premils say that this can't be after the millenium ~~of~~ because there isn't time, and that simply means that they have drawn their chart that way so that there isn't any time. They have got ~~of~~ the thousand years, and then they have drawn a straight line and put the Great White Throne over here, and there isn't any time on their chart. ~~That's it~~ But in the Book of Revelation, John specifically says, "Satan will be loosened for a little season, and will go off to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth," so that ~~there~~ there is a little season in there, and the little season, the clearing up after the little season, has got to be at least seven years long according to this. (St) I wouldn't build a house on that, but it is at least interesting. For a thousand years they will not learn war anymore. There is no military equipment, as such. Now, you couldn't go out to a

battlefield and burn weapons that were made of steel. About all you could burn would be the butts of the guns. I think that it just is a coincidence there. If it is to be taken literally, the presumption is that a peaceful people who suddenly decided to turn to war would pick up plastics and wooden implements and things that could be burned; they wouldn't take time to go to elaborate steel production, because nobody else has steel weapons. It fits with the idea after the millenium, but changes many big points. (St) There won't be any wildness in the earth, It is possible in the development of technology that plastics will replace steel, to a large extent, I mean. Plastics are a lot easier to work, and you can turn them out in large numbers, and the tendency now is for ~~xxx~~ sportsmen to hunt with bows and arrows, rather than with guns. It is quite a fad. Two brothers were interested in archery, and each of them hoped some day to kill a buck with a bow and arrow. One brother was a missionary in China, a little bit soft-hearted. He saw a nice big deer within range, and he just stood there and took a picture of him, and let the old deer get away. (St) There will be no ferocity. Whether we will have beefsteak for dinner or not is not the question, and whether we will ~~xx~~ hunt in the sense of using the wild life. I don't ~~xx~~ 9 1/2 in the sense that the free animal life of the earth. The ferocious nature of wild things will be gone. (St) We don't need to settle that. At least it is quite in ~~xxx~~ line with the extremely advanced civilization living in peace for a ~~xxx~~ thousand years. Then if they should very suddenly turn to war, they might very ~~xx~~ well use weapons that can be burned. I made that remark out there at a conference one time at Moody Institute, and English picked it up and wrote an article about it, and it sort of clicks in ~~xxx~~ your mind, but I don't want anybody to think that I would make much of it. After the millenium it is reasonable to suppose that such weapons as they would take would be burnable. I wouldn't go any farther than that. (St: Wouldn't you have terrific overpopulation on the face of the earth.) You must read ~~xxx~~ ^{Malcolm} ~~Moffett~~ and then you must read the answer to ~~Moffett~~ ^{Malcolm}.

M has been wrong every time. Every time people have tried to apply M . There were ~~several~~ several articles in the Scientific Monthly and Scientific American and the National Geographic about three years ago, showing how they are using up all the wealth of the world, and we have just got to limit the population, and then some of the biggest scientists came back and said, just the sunlight that falls on the earth continuously would keep it going. if we use up all the hard coal. There is no ~~timable~~ 11 1/4 knowledge to the limitation of the population of the population. (St) I wouldn't rule out the Kosher butcher shop myself, but I have been brushing up on Malcus lately for other purposes, and the idea of over-population of the earth in a thousand years just doesn't hold up to the facts. The 12 of the land has progressed in the last two hundred years much more rapidly than the development of the population. (Dr. MacRae: A comparatively small part of the earth is' being used at present.) The food value of the ocean just hasn't been touched. The enormous source of food. (Dr. M: As a matter of fact, there is at least three times as much ground on the earth that is well usable as is being used, only it would take a certain amount of trains of thought to make it available.) R^{ad} the article on Holland in the National Geographic, how ~~they~~ are getting the richest kind of 13 soil out of the heart of the ocean, out of the Zeider Zee. (St: How about death in animal life?) I just don't know. I don't see why we should spend five minutes on that. The Bible doesn't ~~say~~ that animals don't get killed. Evidently vegetables will be killed, and I won't hold a funeral service for a rabbit or for a cow. I t seems to me that it is 13 1/2 to speculate about eating animal or vegetable food in the millenium. There certainly is no sin to it. At least, I am not a vegetarian on Scriptural grounds, and I don't hope to be in the millenium. (St) You can sit ~~hear~~ here and dream for hours on end on the kind of onions we are going to eat in the millenium. There is nothing in all the data known to us that would in any way contradict what the Scripture says about the fruitfulness of the earth during the millenium. "There shall

be a handful of corn in the top of the mountain. The fruit thereof shall taste like Lebanon, the desert shall blossom like a rose, instead of the thorn shall be the fir tree; instead of the briar, the myrtle tree. All these various figurative, poetical or literal references indicate great fertility and prosperity. I am so much interested in economics as a sci- science that I just realize that it wouldn't be possible to go and try to lay out economic laws for the millenium. You couldn't anyway, because you don't know. (St) : You said just a little time that the beast would be let out again?) Not the beast; Satan.

(end of record)

-418-

Let's try to get a hasty
 survey of the 39th chapter. bring the weapons. And John says
 there will be a little season when Satan will be loosed. There is no
 Scripture which says that the end of ~~the~~ this earth will come immediately
 after the thousand years. So there is time enough to bring up these weapons
 as far as that is concerned. It would take no wood out of the ^{Ezekiel 39:10} field ^{-1-3/4}
 ". . . neither ^{shall make fires of the weapons} plunder
~~to~~ cut down many of the forests, for they / . They shall ~~come to~~ those
 plunder ^{Jehovah}
 that ~~come to~~ them, rob those that rob them, saith the Lord ~~Jehovah~~." That
 is to say, the dead, lying there would be ^{cleared} ~~carried-~~ up. Then he goes
 on to give the description of the clearing up of the ground. It will take
 seven months to bury the dead, and take care of them, and to bury bones here
 and there. Verse 17 (read through 20). After every battle-field there is this
 terrible gluttony of the birds of prey. This will be the ~~greatest~~ of all
 such . (Read from ~~verse~~ 21 -22). Now, Dr. Mill, M.I. Mill,
 asked a question in this conference, "How could that be after the millenium?
 The house of Israel has already known." I pointed out that the knowledge of
 God is progressive, "when we've been there ten thousand years, bright shining
 as the sun" we'll just begin to know the Lord, and then what follows is
 extremely appropriate, it seems to me, "and the nations shall know that the
 house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity." That is to say,
 Ezekiel is comforting the exiles in the captivity, and he is predicting
 a time when they shall dwell securely under the ~~the~~ reign of the Messiah,
 and ^{there} they will be the most terrible of all raids against them, and the enemy
 will not get anywhere with it; the enemy will be utterly destroyed by fire
 from heaven, and then the nations will know, the wicked will know that when
 Israel did go into captivity, ^{3 1/2} ~~that~~ at that time, it was for their
 sins. "So I gave them the hand of their adversaries, and they swallowed them
 by the sword, according to their uncleanness and according to their transgres-
 sion did I unto them, and I hid my face from them. Therefore, thus saith
 the Lord Jehovah, now I will bring back the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy up
~~through~~
 the whole house of Israel; and I will be jealous for my ~~holy~~ holy name. (Read

through 26-29)" So Ezekiel makes the ~~homeletiesl-~~ homeletical application: there is going to be a final restoration, after which the enemies will make the most terrible of all raids, but they will not accomplish anything. ~~47~~

And this final raid and this final destruction of your enemies will show that when you were taken into ~~ex~~captivity, it was because of your sin. So this seems to stand as a final vindication of the righteousness of God in dealing with the nation of Israel. It seems to me that detail by detail and point by point, and incident by incident, it corresponds exactly with what John says. In fact if you would take the small picture as you do in a stereoptical camera, and then the large projection on a sheet or on a screen, that Rev. 20:7,8, corresponds to Ezekiel chapters 38 and 39, just ^{like} the magnifying of a picture. The whole thing is in ~~exactly~~ exactly the same outline. (St) Parallels. They are always parallels of all kind of disasters. The birds to feed upon carion flesh at the destructionn of the kingdom of the beast before the ~~1~~ millenium. They are always parallels in all disasters. (St: Zachariah 14) Zachariah clearly indicates a destruction prior to the coming of the Messiah. Now if you take a passage of literature, no matter what it is--suppose it's quite close, suppose it's some ancient mythology--and you pick out ~~co~~incidences and try to interpret in that way, and ~~anythin-~~ everything can ~~mean~~ mean anything. "Here is a reference to birds of prey. ~~Here~~ is a reference to birds of prey. Therefore it is the same birds of prey. It is the same ~~incident~~ incident." I don't think that is the way to interpret any literature, but if you have an indicatinn of a destruction led by Gog and Magog, in which Gog seems to be very promient, and it follows a time of peace and ~~sa~~ safety under the Messiah, that gives you your framework, you see? (St: Are there ~~any~~ any other parallels which speak about the birds and the ⁷....?) If you go through with a microscope and take Ezekiel 38 and 39, I venture to say that you could find a hundred striking parallels to the present terrible situation in Korea. (St: That is not the problem, though.) Well, that is the ~~flaw~~ false method that is pursued. If you find parallels here and there, you're not at liberty to

identify whole pictures. (St: If John was an inspired prophet and found parallels, you wouldn't say anything was wrong with that, would you?) The parallelism of anything; it's what are you talking about, see? You find an analogy between every hour of this class all semester long. You have said something similarly. That doesn't prove that you always have the same. John puts his Gog and Magog after his millenium. That is something you can't shake off. (St: Couldn't it also be that the word "Babylon" stands for a(century?) ...)..Old Testament...exegesis is fixed, it seems to me.

Dr. MacRae: Our time is up...Would you look over Isaiah 64 and 65, and get an idea in Isaiah 64 exactly what is the prayer, who is praying, what is the general attitude shown, and in Isaiah 65, exactly what predictions do you have about the future, and to whom do they refer, and when will they be fulfilled. That is a long assignment; I don't think it will be necessary to study all the details in the original, but get that as best you can.