

Son of God and that He was bodily raised from the dead, and will explain away the clear teachings of the coming kingdom. Well, its illogical, but thank God for them being illogical. I would rather a man hold the great central truths and be illogical on the others, than to be illogical (10 3/4) and reject . Thank God people are illogical, but I do think that it is much better to be logical and to accept all the Scripture as God wants us to do.

Now we go on to number five. Brief consideration of pre-millennialism. We've looked at the other two, and a-millennialism and post-millennialism, Small a. Its good points. Number one. It accepts all the Biblical statements without explaining any away. There may be statements we can't understand. Let's wait and try to explain them. But when we've had clear statements of not merely one, but many, we should stand upon them. The Old Testament has its great emphasis on the coming kingdom of external peace and safety. The New Testament has a great emphasis on the personal, visible, bodily return of Christ. You can accept the Old Testament emphasis and be either a pre-millennialist or a post-millennialist, and accept the New Testament emphasis, that is, disregarding the book of Revelation, and be either a pre-millennialist or an a-millennialist. But the pre-millennialist view holds to both of the emphasis, the great Old Testament emphasis, the great New Testament emphasis which are fit together in this chapter in Revelation rather than explaining it away. Number two, Retains both the great New Testament emphasis on the return of Christ, and the great Old Testament emphasis on the coming of the Lord Jesus. You have these two emphases. I think the Lord wants us to have both of them. I think in our age, the emphasis on the return of Christ is more vital. But they are both clearly taught in Scripture (13 1/4). Now, b. Small b. Brief consideration of objections to pre-millennialism. Here let me read you a passage from this book by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism. I'm reading this particularly for the first of these objections, I want to mention, but I'm going to read the whole paragraph, for it deals with other matters, because they also are important, but not for this immediate point. He says on page 48 in his book of Christianity and Liberalism: In the second place we do not mean in insisting upon the doctrinal basis of Christianity that all points of doctrine