R 5

include that. I think even the use of "faith" where Paul uses it one way and James uses it another is a strong warning against that method of interpretation. We know perfectly well what Paul means. We know perfectly well what James means, but if you take their words they contradict each other simply because you are assuming faith must always mean the same thing. It means a different thing in different contexts, and when we come to a phrase "the day of the Lord"--well, "the day of the Lord"is used, I think, is used in many different connections in Scripture and whether you can say, "It has to be precisely this", I just question. If we had time I'd like to take two or three hours on this particular verse but I question whether the evidence is definite enough for that to be necessary

verse

-

R 6

background interpretations of it, where there is so much in the / we don't know, we certainly would have to do the same thing with verse 7. Many people build a big argument for post-tribulation rapture on verse 7. It seems to me that is a mistake. Verse 7 is an obscure verse. But if you are soing to try to see what you can do with verse 3 where there is so much that is uncertain, you certainly would have to do the same with verse 7, and regarding verse 7, there are three interpretations which I have heard. One of them is the mystery of iniquity works now but the antichrist can't be revealed till the one who now hinders is taken out of the way and the one who now hinders tme is the activity of the Holy Spirit as expressed through the body of/believers. That is the view which is generally accepted by those who believe in a prewho tribulation rapture. Now, according to that view, the one who hinders/is to be taken out of the way before the antichrist is revealed is, not that the Holy Spirit leaves the earth-- that's absurd-- the Holy Spirit didn't come to /earth

that if we want to take time to look into chapter 3, at the various possible

32