

Prophets (9)

that he gave there impressed me as extremely weak. Now I have not studied the Scripture through with the viewpoint to try to make a definite decision on this, whether the church goes through the tribulation or not. There are various passages which should be very carefully studied, if you are going to make such a decision, but I was impressed with the fact that the evidence he had to present was very, very slight on the matter. His arguments consist principally of two types of argument, one type is the insistence on the technical term, that when a word refers to the return of Christ to set up His kingdom, it must refer to that and nothing else. Well, now, as you know, if you say, you could refer to the return of Christ and you don't have to refer to a particular phase of the return, you can refer to the whole aspect of the return, you could refer to the first step of it, you could refer to the time when it reaches its climax, just as we speak of the end of the war. . . By "the end of the war" we could mean the time when the Germans surrendered, we could by "the end of the war" mean the time that the Japanese surrendered, we could by "the end of the war" mean the time when the treaties of peace are actually signed, the various points, but it is hard to fix the exact point. We could use the words covering the whole complex of events or one particular phase of it and this sort of an argument which insists that a word refers to an exact point of time and everything related to that/<sup>word</sup> must come under that definite point is a type of argument which I have found amillennialists using a great deal, and it is not, in my opinion, a valid type of argument. There may be a technical term but you have to find proof that it is a technical term, that it always means exactly the same point and not a series of events of which it may be the outstanding ones or to the beginning of it or to the whole context. The other type of argument which he uses a great deal in the book is the argument of trying to show that two things are mentioned together and therefore they come right together and there is no room for any space in between. Well, now, of course, that is not a valid argument unless it says that there is no space in between. I could say, "I'm going over to Germany and study and then I'm going to come