

Studying eschatology in our seminar system or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  system rather than we were using last term and it was announced as a separate course; it is a continuation and yet it is a distinct course, and so there are quite a few who were with us last semester who are planning that as their course and are not with us this semester. We have I think 17 who are continuing and 8 new ones, so that for the benefit of the new ones I should say just a word or two about our system. We are glad to have anyone take it as an auditor, though we wish to urge such a one to come regularly and if possible to take the tests so as to see how you are getting along with it even though you do not take it for credit. It is possible to take this course for one just one hour of undergraduate credit, in which case it is two hours of class attendance and one hour study each week, reviewing mostly what is done in class. It is possible to take for two hours of undergraduate credit, in which case, as in any other course, of undergraduate nature it is ~~at~~ two hours in class and four hours in study. You can take it for one hour of graduate credit, two hours in class and two hours of study; or for two hours of graduate credit two hours of class attendance and six hours of study outside just as for any other graduate course. And so starting next week I will ask you which of these ways you want to take the course and whether you have done the amount of work which is called for on that basis. And then I will ask you to give a report of what you have done. Now last semester we started in with the discussion of the basis evidences in the Scriptures for the fact of a millenium. And I distributed to those here last semester copies of my little pamphlet on the Millennial Kingdom of Christ in which I have taken up certain of the Old Testament passages that deal with this matter and examined the evidence. Now there are 8 of you who have started it this term and if you do not have these I would like to give you copies of them in order that you can study that same material, because that material I think is rather basic. So here they are for you to get either (Mr King, would you give them out to

those who do not have them). While our work this semester is a separate semester, and we are not expecting, naturally, those who take it for the one semester to study up all the work that we did last semester. Nevertheless we deal a good bit with materials we dealt with last semester, and we want you to get an idea of some of them. And those who are continuing it we want you to keep in mind all the work we did last semester. And so I thought to beginning today it might be good if we went over some of the examination questions a little, because they cover some of the most vital things that we dealt with last semester. Now in my section of the examination the first question that I asked would apply to either section. I asked What is Premillennialism? And I didn't mean by that What does somebody who calls himself a premillennialist believe or what are the views about the nature of God which are held by premillennialists or what are the views as to the time of the rapture held by premillennialists or any other question, but I simply was asking What is Premillennialism? Calvinism is a viewpoint of the teaching of the Scripture which includes all the great doctrines of the Scripture in a certain relation to one another in a concatenated system which includes the teaching of the Scriptures on a great many points, and of course three fourths at least of what is held in Calvinism is held by anyone who accepts the Bible as his source of divine knowledge. Premillennialism is not like that. It is in no sense comparable to Calvinism as being a rounded view of life; it is not that. By Premillennialism we mean simply that you believe in one or two definite, specific things about the future. You believe, in a thousand other points, any view that you want and still be a Premillennialist. And on the other points you could have the same view that the majority of Premillennialists have and not be a Premillennialist at all. For instance, it does not make you a Premillennialist to believe that there is an eternal punishment. Most Christians believe in that; it seems to be very clearly taught in the Scripture. It does not make you a Premillennialist to believe that Christ is coming back to this earth in bodily, visible form. It does not make v

a Premillennialist to believe in a **rapture**. All students of eschatology have believed in a rapture because it is very clearly taught in the Scripture, that the saints shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. That is clearly taught in the Scripture, and whatever you think about the Millennium has nothing to do with your belief in the rapture. So by Premillennialism we simply mean that there is going to be a time, a golden age upon this earth; a time in which there will be a freedom from external danger; in which there will be universal peace and safety and at this period, this golden age upon the earth, which will come after the return of Christ who has come before. That is all that is meant by Premillennialism. And on any other point, one may be Pre, Post, or A-, or any other type of view, and have certain views on other points. That is really all that is distinctive of Premillennialism. So you might say the longer your answer to this question, the less I was satisfied with it. Because I wanted to know just what was Premillennialism, not what are all the different things that a Premillennialist might believe, or that perhaps the majority of those who hold this would also hold. Then the other two questions I asked. One was to look at the Old Testament evidence. I asked you to survey the Old Testament evidences regarding the Millennium. And then I asked what was the nature of the Millennium? And depending on the type of the exam you took, some have that latter question and some did not. Now the survey of the Old Testament evidences; if you gave a good summary of the material in this little pamphlet I would think that that would cover most of the basic material. Because to my mind, if you can --- if a man is walking down the street out in front here, and we have five people here who certify that they saw him walk down the street; and if there are fifty other people who say that either they were not looking out of the window or else that they looked out and they thought somebody went but they were not sure whether or not it was a man or woman, and they were not sure whether it was this man or not, if you have five people who say this man walk down the street, you have pretty good and conclusive evi-

ence. You really don't need much more. A hundred people to certify that they did not see him walk down the street would not be very much evidence, unless these other people looked every second, were possibly watching. So in that passage I was interested not in all the evidence, of which there is a great deal, but in bringing the most vital evidences. I laid stress upon Micah 4 and Isaiah 2. 8 other passage which describes a golden age upon this earth, in which the word of the Lord goes out from Jerusalem and the nations beat their swords into plowshares. And they do not ~~lx~~ learn war any more. Something which it is pretty difficult to interpret in any other way than that there is going to be a period of universal, external peace and safety upon this earth. And then I dealt with Isaiah 11, in which we have the declaration that as a result of the activity of Christ, there will be a time when the lamb and the fatling will go together, and the bear and the different animals, the ferocious animals that are tasty, and it says that they will live together in unison. And this we noticed can be taken in a figurative sense, and show that people will not longer have a ~~ferocious~~ ferocious nature, that there will no longer be destruction anywhere. It can be taken in the literal sense and show that animals as well as people will be free from their destructive and ferocious nature; or their destructive attitude towards others. It can be taken in either of these two senses, but either of these two ways implies a golden age upon this earth. It could hardly be a picture of heaven; it could hardly be a picture of the eternal state; it could hardly be a picture of the present age; it must be a picture of a time, a golden age upon this earth. If you take it figuratively, you have a Post point of view; if you take it literally, you have a Premillennial view; but in either case you have a definite millennium. And so these 3 passages together, with something of the importance of them, was what I had primarily in mind. It seems to me that it is the foundation as far as the Old Testament studies are concerned. We looked at other passages here in the course of the term, and I was

interested in what you had to say about them, but those were the principal points. Now my last question as to the nature of the millenium, the nature of the conditions on earth during the millenium, that of course went more into detail, and I dont think that we should bother the new students this term with this unless somebody had particular question which they should like to ask. Now Dr Buswell had a number of questions on the New Testament, and I wonder if he could take up one or two of them and could summarize them a bit for us. There may have been some questions that someone had about them. He has marked all of his papers in the class and I have spent more time so far looking over his papers than looking over my papers, but I was interested to ~~in~~ note what different approaches some of you took in answer to his questions. So I would be interested to hear somethign from him about them. (Dr Buswell speaking:) I didnt keep notes on the papers but I remeber a few things that probably would need ~~exidxxxx~~ emphasis. In general the questions were answered satisfactorily, and occasionally brilliantly, and occasionally a little below par. One question that escaped some of you, the question of the twp resurrections. Most of you got most of the points in there, but some of you did not; kparticularly the use of prepositions with reference to the resurrection. There is clear reference to two future resurrections in Revelation 20, and most of you put that down. There is a reasonably clear indication of two future resurrections in I Corinthians 15, and most of you got that. You did quite fairly. The reference in John and in Daniel to the resurrections of the just and the unjust; Pauls statement before the Roman court, Believe in the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust. Those do not prove that there will be two resurrections; they do prove that there will be two groups that will be subject to the resurrection and some of you seemed to think that these passsages would prove two resurrections. Well, I think the most you can say is that they are in harmony with the idea that the just and the unjust will be raised at two different times. The use of the preposi-

tions: I will just state that fact one more time. (Question from student). I didn't think that it was ~~xxx~~ at all wrong to mention these other passages; in fact when you state a point you usually should take up any that brought up on the other side; and so it was quite correct to mention it. There were a couple of papers as I remember who handled those as if they were definite and constructive evidence for two resurrections, which is a misunderstanding. Now about the resurrection ek nekron, apo nekron, ek and apo in that position 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  says, and implied a partitive genitive. If you come out of, plural, anything, you leave some of it there. If you come out of a store, you leave the store; if you come out of a crowd, you leave the crowd. So apo or ek with the genitive plural 9 (Other side of record 1 begins here: c2)

So, resurrection ek nekron, and in the case of Lazarus, apo ton nekron, I think one or two others with that that, but ek more commonly, Whenever you have resurrection ek nekron, or ek ton nekron,  $\frac{1}{2}$  ek with the genitive plural; in all those cases the reference is either to the resurrection of Christ or to the resurrection of Christians, or as in the case of Lazarus, the resurrection of one man who certainly left the rest of the dead there. A strong reference in Philippians 4, the eks anastasis ek nekron. The out resurrection, out from the company of the dead, and that was something which Paul said that he hoped to attain to. Paul believed in the resurrection of all, both the just and the unjust, but by faith in Christ he expected to attain to this eks anastasis ek nekron. So that the attaining to that resurrection out from among the dead indicates it as something distinctive and then the usage of it. Now then you find anastasis ek nekron referring to the future resurrection of the wicked. On the contrary, where you have anastasis ton nekron, an objective genitive, or you could take it as a subjective genitive; resurrection of the dead, that is purely indeterminate. It may be resurrection of the righteous dead; it may be resurrection of the wicked dead; it may be resurrection of both, simply the

fact that we believe in the resurrection of the dead. That is enough then on the use of the prepositions or the omission of the prepositions. ~~These~~ Where prepositions are omitted, you may have the wicked included, but never do you have the wicked possibly included where you have anastasis ek nekron. That, when you marshall all the data, does seem to be something. Gerhardt Vos had evidently heard of the argument and heard of it remotely, and did not get exactly the point. Because he said that the Philippians passage, (this is in his Pauline eschatology) he says that to attain to the resurrection, the out resurrection out of the company of the dead, he said that that passage is regarded as teaching a second resurrection of the righteous, but that he can't see how that it does. He does not even mention the use of the prepositions. Evidently somebody had <sup>3</sup> that passage and pounded the table ~~and~~ instead of giving an exegesis of the grammar. And Gerhardt Vos did not get the point; or the argument; so naturally he says that he does not see how that proves a second resurrection. And I didn't pound the table hard enough, or did not exegete the grammar hard enough, for some of you did not quite get the point: the ek with the genitive plural, implying a partitive genitive and not all the dead are raised if anyone is raised ek nekron. I think that is all I can remember. Dr Buswell, I think it would be worthwhile to look at Revelation 20. Could you say a word about this: What do you think about Revelation 19 <sup>ending</sup> ~~being~~ a cycle and starting over again with chapter 20, a new cycle; do you think that is possible? Of course, the cycle theory; there are cycles within cycles, and in general I am against zoning laws. In the city, you pass a law that you shall not have a factory within a certain zone, and therefore any building that you see within that zone is not a factory. So as to the rhetorical construction, I feel quite strongly that <sup>the</sup> a paragraph or a cycle or section ends with Revelation 20.3. I cannot see any grounds for the chapter division where chapter 20 ~~being~~ begins, because the destruction of the beast and the false prophet are and the binding of Satan certainly belong together as the conclusion of

the coming of Christ with His army to destroy the kingdom of the beast.

(MacRae:) There is a point which you brought out which I think is very vital. In chapter 19, verse 20, you have the beast and the false prophet cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. Then in **20**, you have Satan bound a thousand years, and then when you come to verse 10 of chapter 20, ~~the~~ devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire burning with brimstone where the beast and the false prophet are. That would seem to show a continuous narrative rather than a break and recapitulation, would it not? **x** Yes, I didnt quite remember the

point. Yes, I think so. The beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake of fire and the devil is bound, in chapter 19 ending with 23.

And then, later, the devil is cast into the lake of fire where the beast and the false prpphet are. (MacRae:) I think that is a very vital

point. In view of that, is it possible to say that the first resurrection beginning at twenty, the binding of Satan could be at the kfirst coming of Christ? (Buswell:) Now let me see; I am on the spot here. I guess

I am a little thick. (MacRae:) Would the binding of Satan occurred at the first coming of Christ? ~~x~~ Didn't Christ say, I see Satan falling from heaven?  $-6\frac{1}{2}$  ? (Buswell:) Not that I see Satan falling

from heaven; I beheld Satan falling from heaven. (MacRae:) Well, hasnt he already fallen? Is he not already in the pit?, during this age?

(Buswell:) I cannot quite connect up. This is a good example of my dumbness. I cannot quite connect up the cycle business with  $6\frac{3}{4}$  .

I think certainly Satan is not bound in the sense that he should not dedeive the nationsk, when Christ was here on earth. Satan has always been bound by the permissive will of God, in the sense that God could always cast a demon out of a mans life. Satan was bound in the time of Job in the same sense that he was bound when Christ was here on the earth. But Satan bound to deceive the nations no longer certainly has not yet occurred. In our experience, he certainly is deceiving the nations.

(MacRae:) If your last half of 19 and 20 continues and goes together,

then chapter 20 must be after the return of Christ. And if they are separated, then verse 10 of 20 makes no sense where it says where the beast and the false prophet are. (Buswell:) I do think that verse 4 of chapter 20 goes back just a little. that is what I mean by the break. It just goes back a little to bring up the trend, and then goes forward to a future event. Satan gets to the lake of fire a thousand years after the beast and the false prophet. (MacRae:) But do they go there at the time of the first coming, and Satan at the Second coming? (Buswell:) Certainly not. They are not in the lake of fire right now. They have not yet come on the scene. (MacRae:) There is nothing in connection with Christs first coming which you could connect with the last part of chapter 19. (Buswell:) No indeed. The vents of the end of chapter 19 have not yet taken place, and the binding of Satan has not yet taken place. They are to be cast into the lake of fire after they  $8\frac{1}{2}$  and do the various ~~things~~ things which are described. Satan is to be bound after that empire, and then Satan is to be cast into the lake of fire as a still subsequent event. (student question) (Macrae) If the binding of Satan was at the first coming, then the beast and the false prophet would also ~~have~~ have to have been at the first coming, or else verse 10 here would be absolute nonsense, where it says Where the beast and the false prophet are. (Buswell:) I certainly agree with that. Well. (MacRae:) What is one of the other questions which you asked? Oh about the thousand years. (Buswell): Most of them got the reference to Romans 8, very clearly; practically everybody. Romans 8 teaches a period of blessedness on this earth, ---delivered from the curse, subsequent to the Lords return. ~~Practically~~ Practically everone got that one very clearly. (MacRae) It does not mean that the whole earth is groaning and travailing, waiting for the time when it shall be destroyed? But rather waiting for the time when it shall be renewed. (Buswell) I should have taken notes on the exam, but I did not do that. (Macrae) Well, is there any other question about the examination, or should we go on to pick up some new

material? If there is no question on that, I would like to call your attention today to something in the book of Daniel. But before I do that, I would like to go back to another passage Dr Buswell asked about in ~~the~~ the test, simply as introductory to Daniel. That is, I Corinthians 15. Now in I Cor 15, we find in verse 20, Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the firstfruits of them that slept. 10 3/4 is that in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order, Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christs at His coming. Seems to say that at Christs coming those who belong to Christ will be raised up, afterwards they that are Christs at His coming. And then comes the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father. When He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. Now does this mean Christ is raised from the dead and then at Christs coming the righteous dead are raised and raptured to heaven, as is so clearly taught in Thess, <sup>but</sup> ~~or~~ that immediately thereafter then comes the end when He will deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father; that is, that ~~the~~ within a period of an hour or a day or a week or seven years or perhaps even longer, but no longer a time; after the rapture of the righteous, that Christ raises the wicked from the dead and the Great White throne judgment occurs and He delivers up the Kingdom to God, even the Father? Or does it mean that when He returns, we that are Christs at His coming shall be raised from the dead and raptured to meet him in heaven, and then there is a long period, perhaps a thousand years and then comes the end after this period, and then He delivers up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have put down all power and authority. Now you see the difference between the two views. If these two, you might say that one would be that which the Premil would infer, because the Premil believe there is a kingdom of Christ after His return upon this earth, and according to that view then, all they that are Christs at His coming are raised from the dead, at His return, there will be a period of about a thousand years and then

will come the end. And then at the end, a thousand years after, the rest of the dead will be raised up ; there will be the Great White Throne judgment and then Christ will deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father. Now you see the two viewpoints. Now in these verses, as far as we have looked at them now, it does not clearly state which of these two they are. It would seem to me that it shows a break between the resurrection of Christ

13 1/4 the resurrection of those who are Christs at His coming and then comes the end; Now is the end here or is it here? It is later than this. Well, anybody must know that 13 1/2 regardless if you are Pre, Post, or A. From Thessalonians, those who die in Christ are raised and raptured to heaven with Him, and none who did not die in Christ are raptured to Heaven. We are raised up to meet Him together ; meet the righteous dead together with Him in the clouds. That is an action in which only righteous participate, and that must be held regardless of anybody's view on the Millenium. That is clearly taught in Thessalonians. But as far as Thessalonians is concerned, you can have the resurrection of the unrighteous dead the next day, the next hour, the next week, or seven years later; it does not matter. But it is within that decade, we will say, at least. And then the unrighteous dead are raised for judgment at the Great White Throne judgement, cast alive into the lake of fire, and that is the end at approximately the same time as the time when they which are Christs are raised up at His coming. Now both the Post Mill or the A Mill would have to hold that there are two resurrections, because Thessalonians very clearly teaches that, but they would put the two so closely together as to make substantially one. But the Pre mill view has the two resurrections separated by a period of perhaps a thousand years, a period which we designate as a thousand years, which is at least a long period. It may be a round number, or it may be exact. I'm inclined to think that it is exact, but I don't think that it matters particularly. As far as I am concerned, it may be four hundred years or ten thousand years. I think that it will be one thousand, but it is at

a long period of time. And now 15 1/8 but it suggests a  
period in between 15 1/4 that at the end He delivers up the King  
dom to God even the Father. (end of c2)

\* Professor, Gordon College of Theology and  
Missions, Boston, Massachusetts.

Or does Christ reign till He puts all enemies under His feet and the last enemy that is destroyed is death? Is He reigning now? ~~Wakk~~ Well, certainly He is reigning now in the hearts of all those who are His, as we permit Him to reign in our hearts, for He allows us at this time to cast aside His control, but He desires us to submit more and more to Him. He reigns in the hearts of Christians today and God has a control over everything that happens. This is the kingdom of Satan, not the kingdom of God; this present age. So then, could you say that it is this period now of which Christ must reign till He have put all enemies under His feet? Well, perhaps in a way of speaking you could. But it would certainly seem a bit more reasonable to say; I mean that this would fit perhaps a little better if it refers to a reign after His coming back when He is actually reigning over all the earth, rather than now when He is reigning in the hearts of individual people. But we wont say that it is impossible as far as this verse is concerned. The reference to the present time, and then when he comes back to this earth, that is when death is destroyed. There is no more death after His coming back, according to any view other than a <sup>U</sup> Pre Mill view. The last enemy destroyed is death, when He hath put all things under His feet. When He says that all things are put under Him, it is manifested that He is excepted which did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject to Him that put all things under Him that God may be all in all. Now verse 28, seems to refer to the ~~end~~ end, same as verse 24, does it not?

Chr~~k~~st then must reign till He hath put all things under His feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and then He shall be subject to Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all. According to the Pre Mill view, there is a resurrection of those who are Christs at His coming, then Christ reigning for the thousand years, He reigns till He has put all things under His feet and at the end of the thousand years Satan is loosed, and all those whose hearts have not been

yielded up in love to God join with Satan in the great uprising to which Christ puts an end and then comes the resurrection of the unbelievers, the Great White Throne judgment, and then comes the end when He shall have put all things under His feet, and then He delivers up the kingdom to God even the Father, that God may be all in all. That is your Pre Mill view. Your other view, either one of them, or of the Post Mill view might be that the Gospel will yet conquer all the world, and when it has conquered all the world, then Christ will begin to reign, and then He will reign a thousand years even tho he is absent from the earth, when He will reign in the ~~hearts~~ hearts of His people and then will come the end when He returns. The A-Mill views would require that He is now reigning till He puts all things ~~under~~ under His feet and those who are Christs at His coming will be raised from the dead and then right after that, the next hour, day, year, or within seven years, at most a decade, He comes back to this earth; then comes the end. Now death is destroyed, all things are put under His feet, He delivers up the Kingdom unto God the Father, that God may be all in all. Now which of these two is correct? Corinthians, it does not seem to me, proves which. It seems to me that there is a certain inference, a certain suggestion, that there is the period between the resurrections of those who are His at His coming and the end; something of a period; but suppose there is only seven years, or ten years, or an hour or a day; and that it is substantially one event; Corinthians does not prove, but it suggests. At any rate, it shows a great end when the Son is subject to Him that put all things under Him that God may be all in all when death is destroyed. Now the question that I want to ask this afternoon is, as between these two interpretations in Corinthians, the one which certainly seems to fit the language somewhat better than the other, but not decisively, ~~fit~~ as far as Corinthians is concerned I would not think, and the other one which may be suggested as between these two views--does the book of Daniel have anything to say? Now first, I should not talk this long about Corinthians. Dr Buswell, would you criticize

what I have just said about Corinthians? If you don't have some errors to point out in what I have just said about Corinthians why we will go on to Daniel. Well, we look back to Daniel now. Now the thing that I like to do in looking at the Scriptures is to take a passage and see what are the possibilities, because in any sentence in English there are several possibilities. Thus to any sentence in any language. There is an area, there is not a point. But you see what the possibilities are, what is certain, add what is possible, and then you see what another passage shows and you see how these fit together and thus increase the area of certainty. Well, now I want to call your attention to the book of Daniel and I am not going to take time for any thorough of what is contained in chapters two and chapter seven. It would be very interesting to look at chapter two at some length if we had time; I thought of bringing in a recent commentary and looking at what it said about chapter two, which would be very interesting indeed. But for one reason, the commentary I did not see on the shelf when I looked for it, and for another thing it is not so important in relation to Corinthians as the material that 6 1/4. Material I specifically want to bring you, which is from chapter seven. Imagine most of you know a good deal about two, probably less know anything about seven. Probably most people know that chapters two and seven are parallel. And each of them describe the course of this age from a political viewpoint. While in chapter two you have a great image, and you have four great empires, one after the other, and the last one is destroyed, and a new stone comes cut without hands which fills the whole earth. While in chapter seven it is, as you know, not under the figure of one image, but of four different beasts. And Daniel described the first beast, and how it had its dominion and then it died; an another beast came, and a third beast came, and then a fourth that he describes some things about which ~~are~~<sup>is</sup> most terrible of the beasts, and then in this account we find that when we get to verse 15 we have a vision at the end of the reign of the different beasts. That is very interesting. In

verse 13, I saw in the night vision, and behold one like to the Son of man came, with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. Now who is this one like to the Son of man who came in the clouds of heaven and they  $7 \frac{3}{4}$  before Him, and there was given to Him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people's nations and languages should serve Him. Is this a picture of the first coming of Christ? how He came to this earth here; He lived here, and He died and He won His victory over Satan and then was given to Him ~~domi~~ dominion, glory and a kingdom so that He is now reigning, and He is reigning in this age and His reign must last until His return when will come the end and He will give all the Kingdom to God the Father that God may be all in all. Is that true, or is this something that is still to happen?, when the Son of Man comes in the clouds of Heaven?, and there is given to Him dominion and glory and a Kingdom. Well, do we have any Scriptural evidence on that point? Does anyone recall evidence from the Gospels on that point? I wish everyone would recall it; you ought to, I should think. Luke four? I don't think that is it. I don't think that it is early in the Gospels, I think it is at the end of the Gospels. It is when Christ is appearing, is it not, before the High Priest and He says Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. Well, He says then that this verse 13 of chapter 7 which is certainly what He is referring to is still future at that time, does He not? Matthew 24.30. Is that the exact reference? I thought that it was before the High Priest. 26.63. 24.30 is also a similar reference, a reference to the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. But the one that I had in mind is 26.63, in which Christ said to the High Priest: I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of ~~Ma~~ Man sitting on the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven, and the High Priest rent his clothes, and said He spoke in blasphemy. Did the High Priest  $10$  ~~mean~~ mean, I do not think this is going to happen? He didn't mean that; he meant that

Jesus was blaspheming in suggesting that He is the One there referred to. But Christ said, the time when ye (talking to the High Priest, not the disciples) shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power coming in the clouds of heaven is still future. It is not the first coming, at least, not up to that point. Well, but, they went out to the mount of Olives, did they not? And the disciples looked up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight: they saw Him coming on the clouds of Heaven. Is not that the beginning of the time of His reign, that He must reign till He have put all things under His feet, when they saw the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, as described here? It is not, is it, because then he was going away, he was not coming. It is the exact opposite, and furthermore the High Priest, the unbelievers did not see that. That was the disciples only who saw Him, ascending into heaven. This is the opposite of the ascension. This is a return of Christ on the clouds of heaven to this earth. And so I think we can agree that Daniel 7.13 is a picture of the second coming of Christ. I think we must agree on that. It is pretty hard logically to get away from that. **K** I doubt if many people, or any of any view would question that. That chapter 13 of Daniel 7 is a picture of the second coming of Christ. And at the second coming of Christ, He comes on the clouds of Heaven, and He comes to the Ancient of Days and they bring Him near before Him and there is given Him dominion and glory and a kingdom. All the people, nations, and languages shall serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. No one will be able to destroy His kingdom. When Satan leads the great host against they will not be able to destroy it, but will themselves be destroyed. His kingdom will not pass away or be destroyed. Its form may change if He chooses to change it, but no one else can destroy it or cause it to pass away. (Student question) (MacRae:) Where is it that He goes away after the thousand ~~years~~ years? It says that Satan went out to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth and they

came up against the camp of the saints and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them and the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and I saw a great White Throne and Him that sat on it. I don't think there is any picture of any third coming of Christ. I think that Christ during the Millennium will freely go back and forth between earth and heaven, and probably the saints will too. As to when the host of wickedness come up against the camp of the saints, whether He is at that moment in the camp or in the heavens, I do not know. But the statement that you will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven is seeming to refer to His actual second coming, rather than to one of the many 14 after that. It would seem to me that it must refer to this described in Matthew 24, where all of the nations of the earth will mourn because they see His coming upon the clouds of heaven. (Student question) So that His coming on the clouds to receive a kingdom is something that is still future; it is His second coming. If He is reigning now, and He is reigning now, in the hearts of His people, the reign is one that is from a distance. It is not something which is present here. Of course He is omnipresent, as God, and in His human nature He is distant, and He is reigning in our hearts, we do not see Him in this age, and He is reigning openly in the hearts of those who believe on him. So that this pictures here a kingdom and glory, given to Him at His return, which is different from what precedes it. 15 it sounds certainly like something new, at least 15 1/4 They bring Him to the Ancient of Days, and the Ancient of Days gives to Him dominion, glory and a kingdom, that all nations and languages shall serve Him. Well now, you have the same thing brought over further on in the chapter 15 1/4 verse 27 that the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the heavens shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominion shall serve and obey Him. An explicit statement of the Son of Man is back here in verse (end of c3. . .)

...just as at the ascension Christ went up, and at the second coming He comes back, the picture in Daniel is of the One coming in the clouds of heaven, receiving from the Ancient of Days a kingdom. And the picture in Corinthians is that at the end He  $3/4$  God the Father that God may be all in all. And so when you put the two together, I don't see how it can be the same picture as the picture here ~~in the~~. It would seem to be a later state. But He comes on the clouds of heaven, He receives the kingdom, He establishes His dominion which cannot be destroyed but after the last great test fails to destroy it, and wrath is visited upon those who attempt to destroy it, then the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Then the kingdom is given up to God even the Father that God may be all in all. (Student question) \* Nothing can destroy it, no one can destroy it; it is after in the hands of the triune God rather than of Christ the God man. It is not destroyed, it is still the kingdom of God  $1\ 3/4$ . It is Christ the God man who reigns for the thousand years. If you take the end, when he gives up the kingdom, in Corinthians, as being right at the time of His return to this earth, then Daniel ~~would~~ would have to say that One like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and that he gave the kingdom to the Ancient of Days. Instead it is here pictured that the Ancient of Days gave Him. And when you look into it it all fits together. The Ancient of Days is a very beautiful English expression, but if you take the word Ancient as simply Old, long enduring, and Days of course is used where in English we very often say years. Where it says in Genesis that Abraham was entering into the days, the English says that he was well stricken in years. And the Ancient of Days means the Eternal, the One who has existed from all eternity. (Student question). You might even say if you had only Daniel, he had a vision in the night and One like to the Son of Man came in the clouds of heaven, and that could ~~mean~~ <sup>mean</sup> that He came through the womb of the virgin Mary. Actually, it was the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  which pictured as coming in the clouds of heaven. That would be perfectly possible except that in the New Testament Christ shows that it is

specifically literal. He says that Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, and there shows that that portion of the vision is to be fulfilled as to ~~best~~ literal form. So far as the Ancient of Days is concerned, it might conceivably be a Theophany, but it seems to me that it seems equally possible that it represents the power of God the Father accomplishing. (Student question) There was one like the Son of man came like the clouds of heaven, and the Ancient of Days came to him, and they brought him near the throne. And they brought Him near the throne could mean that they brought the Ancient of Days before the Son of Man, and you have the Son of Man before the Ancient of Days. It wouldn't show which. But He came to the Ancient of Days, which shows that the Ancient of Days is the One who sat with authority  $4 \frac{1}{2}$ . And it was the One like to the Son of man who came <sup>in</sup> ~~to~~ the clouds of heaven who was brought to the Ancient of Days. ~~xxxxxx~~ They brought Him near before Him and there was given Him dominion, glory, and a kingdom. Well now, you can interpret it this way: I say in the night vision, and behold one like to the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days and they brought the Son of man near to the Ancient of Days and there was given to the Ancient of Days dominion, glory, and a kingdom. That doesn't seem to fit. It seems as if they bring him to him to receive something. It seems to require that the dominion, glory, and the kingdom was given to the Son of Man by the Ancient of Days. Well, on the other  $5 \frac{1}{2}$  there is no  $5 \frac{1}{2}$  that would seem in itself to show it was to the Ancient of Days. Otherwise you could interpret it verbally, And there was given to the Ancient of Days dominion, power, and a kingdom. But it wouldn't seem to me to make a very sensible conception of the two verses as they stand. And then of course when Christ spoke, he said Ye shall see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom, not coming to give the Kingdom. (Student question) Verse 27 speaks of it as given to the people of the saints of the Most High. That would seem to be something; not the giving up to God the

Father that God may be all in all . (student question) The Ancient of Days is a term used to describe God and the triune God, and while it may be specialized on the Father, it can apply to Christ the Second person of the Trinity. But when you , in this 13 verse, the Son of man and the Ancient of Days are the ~~same~~ 7 The Ancient of days is God rather than the God man. Altho the God man is also God, and so Revelation applies it to Him also. Of course the mystery of the trinity is something that we cannot fathom; we can only apprehend it, we cant comprehend it. And when Corinthians says that He shall give up to the Father that God may be all in all, we cant altogether comprehend what it means, but we can apprehend that there is a time when something takes place which is different from the God man per se, and is given up to the Father. Well have we spent enough time on this passage in Corinthians? (Buswell): It has been very illuminating. Have you noticed the similarity between this passage in Corinthians and Revelation 4 and 5? Where Christ takes the Book. That is, Johns vision of the same 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  events. He received the book, and all the choruses begin to ascribe kingdly prerogatives to Him. So the Book with it follows through His kingdom. (MacRae): Do you think there is something more on the Millenium now that we should cover, or simply touch upon it from time to time and go on to other subjects. (Buswell): I havent any particular passage directly on the Millenium,; (MacRae): If you haven\*t, there is a question I would like to ask in methodology, on which I do not know whether Dr Buswell and I would be in agreement or not, but it impressed me as vital, and I would like to ask about it. It is this: We take the Scripture and we gather from the different sections a hint of this and a hint of that and shint of the other and we put them together and we learn some true facts. And that is very vital, and a thing we must do. Compare Scripture with Scripture. But this impresses me, that God caused the Scripture to be written as it is, and therefore that there are while there is much light to be thrown by comparing Scripture with

Scripture there also is a teaching in each passage as it stands. That there is something in the arrangement, something in what is collected. For instance, in the four Gospels; each of the four Gospels fit together wonderfully, and yet each of them stand as a unit. Matthew presents Christ from one aspect; it shows Him in His kingly aspect; it shows Him as the King of the Jews; it shows Him as the one who has the right to reign in all our lives; and you lose that picture if you ~~jump~~ jump back and forth all the time. You can get details of the picture clarified, and understand it better by jumping back and forth and examining others but there also is great value in taking Matthew as a whole, apart from comparison with others, and seeing what is the emphasis that God wants you to get out of this. And if you had something in Matthew, it may be that in order to fully understand it, you will have to compare it with other passages. But that there is something if it is given without that explanation here, there is a lesson in it as it stands, without the comparison. Now that I state with trepidation and hesitation, but I feel that it is rather vital. Well now, if that is the case about Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, then it seems to me that there are certain passages in Luke which are less complete than they are in Matthew, and which therefore we can understand more fully if we compare with Matthew, and yet I have a feeling that I would like an attempt made to find out just what are the emphases in Luke alone. To see what are the big things that he is trying to get across in Luke. And then to compare for further detail in Matthew. For instance now, in Luke 12. we have a series of parables given, or a discussion of different subjects. Well now these may have been given at various times in other order, they may have been presented in connection with other teaching. There may be details of them which we cannot understand in their full bearing without bringing in the comparison from other passages and from other Gospels. Nevertheless, the thought is that the Holy Spirit put these things together in this <sup>12th</sup> ~~fourth~~ chapter of Luke and gave them in that way, which suggests to

me that there is a purpose in everything that is here given by itself. I mean in all of the big emphases, apart from comparison with other Gospels or the attempt to explain their detail from from other 12  $\frac{1}{2}$ . You think that is safe, Dr Buswell? Well then, will you look at this 12th chapter of Luke. We find a certain message which he is giving in it. In the beginning of it he is asserting the importance ~~of~~ that in our lives we should be conscious of God's presence with us all the time. That we shall ; He tells us that the things which are hidden shall be made manifest. In 8, whosoever shall confess Me before men, him shall the Son of Man also confess before the angels of God. We may not know when the Son of Man is going to confess this, but it does bring out that that there is an importance for the future of what we do now. That thought is surely there without any comparison with other passages. And then we go and we find that 'when they come before magistrates, the Holy Spirit will give them what they are to say. And there is no excuse for laziness in not preparing your sermons here. You won't have many magistrates in your congregation. But it does seem to me that 13  $\frac{3}{4}$  you can look for divine power and need not worry about these little tribles. There is suggestion that you don't have to work hard and definitely for the ordinary affairs of life, which is one of God's means for preparing us for this special crisis. Then we have the story about the rich man who built up his barns and God took everything away from him. And it says in 21, so is he that lays up treasure for himself and is not rich towards God. There are a series of discussions here in which he discusses the attitude that He wants us to have here in this life. And he says in 30, All these things do the nations of the world seek for, and your Father knows that ye have need of these things. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock, for it is your father's godd pleasure to give you the kingdom. What does that verse mean for us, Dr Buswell? (Buswell): The word kingdom means the 15 of God.

(MacRae): that would 't be given up. (Buswell): No, the reigning of the saints is a Daniel doctrine as well as...but I think this is 15 both. (Macrae): And so then we would seem to have a picture here of our present attitude in relation to which there is a futue statement made, that those who are Christ's need not fear tho everything seems to go against them in this life , in this age , because there is a future age in which they will have/something which He calls a kingdom.

(end of c 4)

~~Things~~ Things on this earth are very bad now for you, but you Father permits all this. It is His good pleasure that eventually it will be quite different. That eventually the saints will reign. Eventually He will give you the kingdom. Well then he goes on and in verse 3/4 He is urging here keeping your eyes on God and not being worried with anything. Verse 34: where your treasure is there shall your heart be; not to be worried. And then he seems to get into another aspect of the characteristic which He wishes us to have. He says, Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning. Now your loins girded about doesn't mean get a big thick layer of fat around yourself like I'm getting now. It doesn't mean that. It means be ready for action. It means not bound to the things of this world. Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning; be wide awake. Be vigilant. Be on the job. Don't settle down into the things of this life. And he continues and He says And ye yourself be like unto men that wait for their lord. When he will return from the wedding; that when he comes and knocks, they may open to him immediately. Here he seems to say to them, At all times they are to have their loins girded about and their lights burning; they are to be in constant watchfulness, ready. Be like men who are waiting for their Lord when he will return from the wedding. Whenever he gets there, they will open to him immediately. He says Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching. Now you wonder in verse 37 whether he is still in a simile or whether he is getting into actual teaching. We're to be like men that wait for their Lord, when he comes from the wedding. Now that may refer (that much alone) We may not have any lord, there may not be any wedding, he may not be coming; - it simply means that we are to be wide awake like men would be in those circumstances. But then in 37, he seems to carry on the figure to the point where you wonder whether there is something of a real aspect to it. He says Blessed are those servants whom the lord when he comes shall find watching. Is he now simply giving

a figure, saying to be like men waiting for their lord? Or is he saying that you yourselves are actually those who have a lord and are to be watching for him. Well we can't be sure on 37. We have both possibilities. Further verses may throw light on whether this is a still purely an imaginary figure or whether he is actually making a comparison ~~with~~ that applies to the Christian. But he goes on Blessed are those servants whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching. Verily I say unto you that he shall gird himself and make them to sit down to eat and he shall come forth and serve them. Well, is it still simply the figure, the simile, that we are to be like those who wait for their lord, or is there something in what he is going to do that actually has an eschatological reference, that gives some idea of something that actually is going to happen. And then he says, And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. The implication is that the example that he is giving, whether it is an example or something of reality, it is a situation in which you don't know when he is coming. It may be the second coming, or it may be the third watch, and if he finds them thus, blessed are those servants if he finds them wide awake. And this know, that if the goodman, the master of the house, had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not suffered his house to have been broken into. Well the bearing of that on the previous verse would seem to be You are to be so watchful that you would not be trapped in the situation of a man who had a house and didn't bother to lock his doors, and all of a sudden a thief came in. But you should be ready at all times, not that what is coming to you is necessarily a bad thing as that which came to the owner of the house, but whatever it is you are not to be caught unprepared. You are to be ready. Because just above he has been speaking of a good thing happening; men that wait for their lord when he returns from the wedding, and when he comes and knocks they open to him immediately. But then in verse 40 he seems to depart from all thought of

a figure. He seems to get into actual reality. How much of this is figure and how much is reality might be difficult to tell with certainty; certainly some of it is figure very definitely. It certainly would seem very probably that it is not all figure. But when he says Be ye therefore ready also, when the Son of man comes at an hour when ye think not. That seems to put it into the area in actual, factual discussion. That you are to be ready like the man whose lord has gone off to the wedding, and when he comes 5 3/4 he must be ready to open to him immediately. Whether it is in the second watch, or in the third watch, or whenever it is that he isn't to find them sleeping, but wide awake, active about his business. Be ye ready also, for the Son of man cometh at an hour when you ~~would~~ won't be expecting him. n 6 would not be in line with the theories you might think of the time when it will happen. Well now, when Peter heard this, (Peter isn't necessarily an inspired interpreter, as a disciple. He made mistakes. Peter said things that were definitely wrong. But we can expect this, that of those things which Peter said, when the scripture quotes his discussion in part 6 1/2, I think we are fair in saying that if his comments are wrong, the Scripture would label them as such. That it will show us Christ's attitude toward them. Wouldn't that be right, Dr Buswell? Peter took an utterly erroneous attitude to something which Christ said, the Scripture would say Get thee behind me, Satan, thou savourest not the things of man, the things ~~xxx~~ of heaven, or something like that to make it clear. But that when he simply makes a comment, he is simply showing his understanding of that which 7 ). And so Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or does it have anything to do with us? Is that what he said? It is not, is it. He said, are you speaking this to us, or even to all? And that would seem to me to imply that if Peter understood the parables, he didn't take it as meaning 7 1/2, whether he is <sup>Talking</sup> ~~talking~~ about us or about some people in a far off distant time to whom this will refer. This attitude of watchfulness which they

are to have. But I take it that he thought, The Lord is saying that I, Peter, and these disciples with me, are to have this attitude, but are we the only ones to have it, or are all the followers of Christ to have it? But it at least it includes Peter, and it includes the disciples. That is the way in which Peter understood it. Thus it would seem to me. And the Lord said, when Peter said, Do you speak this to us or to all, The Lord's answer seems to me to imply, tho he doesn't say it in so many words, that this includes definitely Peter and the disciples, but that in addition it also includes/all Christians. And then he goes on, and the Lord says, Who then is that faithful and wise steward? w Peter; is he the only faithful and wise steward? 8½ that certainly he would include them, when the Lord would make ready his household to give them their meat in due season. Blessed is that servant kwhom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. It shows very clearly that the Lord is not saying, Beye ready, and by that I mean I want you to be constantly watching the/signs of the time and look to see how many comets there are and whether there are/some new signs in the heavens to show you that the coming of Christ is drawing near. No. He wants ~~them~~ to find giving the portion of meat in due season; by keeping wide awake, he means that they don't fall into worldliness and intolexity, but that they are/constantly alert in the Lord's service. They are giving their meat in due season to His household. Blessed is that servant whom the lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath; but if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens and to eat and drink and be drunken, then the Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looks not for him, and an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder and will appoint his portion with the unbelievers. And that servant who knew his lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did acc/to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes, but he that knew not his lord's will and did/commit

things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few stripes, but unto whomsoever much is given, much shall be required, and to whom men have committed much to him, men will ask the more. It seems to suggest in here that simply in a discussion not of eschatological events, but merely a discussion of attitudes, which the followers of Christ are to have, that our lord's 10  $\frac{1}{4}$  us here, the fact that all of his followers, beginning with Peter and his disciples are expected to have an attitude of being ready for His coming, because the Son of Man comes in an hour when ye think not. And therefore as far as this passage is concerned, it would seem to me that we have a pretty strong presumption established. That it is Christ's will, that beginning at Peter and Paul and going on thru all Christian history, that it is His will that His people shall take the attitude that one among the various incentives to active Christian service and to giving the portion of meat in due season to the people to whom the Lord sends us as his messengers, that as one incentive to be always on the job we should have this, that the Son of Man comes at an hour when ye ~~think~~ think not. And that you are not able at any time then to say, I know that it won't be today, I know that it won't be tomorrow, I know that it can't be until next year or ten years from now. That there is an attitude urged upon his followers here which attitude seems to rest upon a realization that after all, there is nothing to prevent His coming, and therefore that at each instant they should be so living and so serving him that if they came at that instant, they would not say O my, If I had only known; if I had five minutes more; if I had a month's warning, if I could just plan to be really ready so He would really find me the way I would like to be. Now do you think that I've gotten too much from this chapter, Dr Buswell? Or do you think that we are warranted in saying that that emphasis is present here, in this chapter. (Buswell): It certainly is. The point of; a different point than this, that the coming of the Lord is more than merely the instant of the rapture. The coming of the Lord might be ~~called~~ called

incident a b c d. And with reference to the coming of the Lord the constant readiness is certainly taught most emphatically all the way thru the teachings of Christ. I don't think that kthat includes the fact that a b might come before c d, withink that complex that we call the coming of the Lord. (MacRae): But that there is a least enough unison to the context that it could serve as our incentive for constant Christian activity. (Buswell): Yes, and very 13 1/4 so. It doesn't contradict the fact that Paul knew postiviely that he was going to get to Rome. And it took a few days to get to Rome. But still the coming of the Lord was imminent. (Macrae): I think that Peter knew later on that he was going to be crucified. So that you might say that of all people to whom this would apply, there is one that it would not apply to, and that would be Peter, and he is the one who said, Speakest thou this to us or to all? Well now, I have the feeling that when it comes to the Synoptic comparison I feel like a very ignorant person, 13 1/2 . But just for that reason, it is easy for things to go a little faster than I'm able to follow, therefore I sort of get lost and say, Well, now, I'm very sceptical about it, andso I have a feeling that some stress can be laid on Luke 12 on that 14 . And then I have a feeling that perhaps if I could make an attempt to know what could be drawn from Luke 21 by itself. That is, what you would find rather /clearly taught in Luke 21 ~~and~~ as it stands, and what there would be in Luke 21 that would be simply an open question on which 14 1/2 likely to decide elsewhere. I feel that I might make faster progress that way than I would by starting out 14 1/2 . Well now, what do you think that we should do next, Dr Buswell? (Buswell): Luke 21 is, in the eschatological discourse, and as you say, 14 3/4 . As well as the record of the events. ...Dr Macrae's emphasis. The Scripture both written as units. 15

\*(End of record c5)

Cb Kpns  
here { Leviticus and Deuteronomy. He has a harmony there. Each book 1/2.  
Luke's account of the eschatological discourse of the Lord within the

Gospel of Luke as a book must recognize the fact that Luke has already given almost word for word 1 by his teaching in the Perean section. Christ naturally repeated Himself, as every good teacher must.

1 1/4 a lot of eschatology in his perean ministry which Luke puts down word for word, in that ministry. So that there may be a reason with Luke himself for Luke ~~omitting~~ omitting rather extended paragraphs in the eschatological discourse because he had already given the same teaching material in the ministry of Christ where Christ gave it also at another place. But as background, it throws a little light on the Luke 21 passage, I think. (MacRae): Well, would you like to go through Luke 21 and just show where the points are there may be ... 1 3/4 .

(Buswell): One point that I do bring out that is not brought out in any of the books. That Luke 21.20-24 is not found in Matthew and Mark in the parallel sections. Luke says very simply and very plainly, When you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, then know that ~~it's~~ it's desolation is at hand. And then let the people in Judea flee (and Josephus tells you how they did flee). He does not have the same immediacy that you find in the other events which are described in Matthew and Mark, that you not even turn back for your overcoat, because when Titus took Jerusalem,

2 1/2 was it necessary, but the fleeing was necessary. The prayers for mothers of little children and for the flight not being in winter was necessary in 70 AD. But not the same immediacy. Then Luke describes, not the immediate coming of the Lord, when you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, but (I'm trying to catch exactly the verse I'm looking for), verse 24: fall by the edge of the sword, will be taken captive among all the Gentiles and Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles until the fulness of the Gentiles come. 3 1/2 about what happened in 70 AD, and an extended period of time thereafter where Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles for some time. Matthew and Mark make no reference at all to Jerusalem surrounded with armies. They're talking about something different. And that comes into an exegesis of Matthew and Mark.

But Matthew and Mark do not have the paragraph about Jerusalem surrounded with armies, and a long period during which the Jews would be in captivity. Or at least a period, during which they would be in captivity among all the nation. Then the other follows right along. (MacRae): In Luke 21, would you say then, that it begins in Luke 21, in verse 5, some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned, with goodly stones and gifts, and Christ said, As for the things you behold, the days will come in which there will not be left one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.

Now this doesn't say when. And they asked him and said, Master, when shall these things be, and what sign will there be when these things will come to pass? And He said, Take heed that ye be not deceived, for men shall come in My name, saying I am the Christ, and the time draws near; go not therefore after them, What time do they mean draws near? The time of the destruction of the temple? (Buswell): Well, false prophets were to come, claiming to be connected with the eschatological complex, falsely claiming. (MacRae): but that will be before the destruction of the temple? (Buswell); Well, there were false leaders that arose, all the way thru Jewish history. (MacRae): Well, he is already talking about the eschatological complex? And he says, Take heed, be not deceived. In verse 9, when ye hear of wars and commotion, be not terrified, for these things must first come to pass, but the end is not by and by. (Buswell): The first part of his answer to the question was negative. It isn't this, it isn't this, it isn't this. (MacRae): That is, they've asked for the signs when the temple will be destroyed, and He is talking about signs of the eschatological complex. That's rather peculiar, isn't it?

(Buswell): Well, I think that the destruction of the temple refers to another crisis which is still future. (Macrae): Still future? (Buswell): still future. (Macrae): Now? (Buswell): Now. I think that his reference to not one stone upon another has never yet come to pass. (MacRae): So the destruction of Jerusalem he here points out is still future now? (Buswell): Yes. His first answers are negative. (MacRae): And then he is

talking about the eschatological complex, and he is saying that in the first place, in verse 8, don't let somebody tell you it is right there; don't go after them. Nobody can tell you it is right now. And he says that nation rises against nation; great earthquakes, famines, pestilences, but He says the end is not by and by. You don't know when it is. And before all these things they will lay their hands on you and persecute you, and deliver you up to the synagogues, prisons, and you'll be brought before kings and rulers, and for my names sake, and it shall turn unto you for a testimony. This is, of course, a prediction of persecution. (Student question). Would you like to talk about that, Dr Buswell?

(Buswell): Well, after while, when we get to Matthew. The end is not by and by. That is eutheos, the end is not present. (MacRae): Eutheos means that ...He says that Christ did this, and straightway he went into the (Buswell interrupts): Ouk, Ouk eutheos. The end is not immediately. It is a negative answer. All these things are going to happen

8 the immediate times. (MacRae): I would think that to rest by and by means after a stretch rather than immediately. (Buswell): Now that is your Old English; it isn't the fault of the Greek. (MacRae): It is the fault of the Old English, which means exactly the opposite of what it would mean in modern English. (Student question) Macrae: One of the few places where the Revised is up to date. Yes. If there were more I would use the revised, but there were so few that I got discouraged about it, Well then he continues that there will be earthquakes and pestilences, and fearful sights and great signs from heaven, and before all these they will lay their hands upon you and persecute you, and deliver you to synagogues and prisons. And it will turn to you for a testimony. And settle in your hearts not to meditate what you'll answer, for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, and you'll be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends, and some of you shall they cause to be put to death, and ye shall be ~~hated~~ hated of all men for my name's sake, but there shall not a hair of your

perish; How can not a hair of your head perish if they put you to death, Dr Buswell? (Buswell): The resurrection. (MacRae): Beginning at verse 18 is simply a prediction of the resurrection? (Buswell): Well, if you take it literally. If you take it as figurative, then... 8 1/4 .

If you get bald-headed, that is a sign of wisdom. (Macrae): In your patience, possess ye your souls. And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains, and let them in the depart out, and let not them which are in the countries enter thereunto, for these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, to them which give suck in those days, for there shall be ~~sayxxxaf~~ great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people, and they shall fall by the edge of' the sword and shall be led away captive unto all nations. That, you would say, ~~11s/11~~ is specifically the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, and not the future? (Buswell): Yes, and followed by a period of captivity among the nations. (MacRae): the only thing that would prove that this is 70 AD would be the last half of verse 24, wouldn't it? (Buswell): And when you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies; you see, that is definitely a reference to a future event which so very specifically took place. (MacRae): Of course, it has often been surrounded with armies. (Buswell): Well, the very next time that it was surrounded with armies was under Titus. So it would just about have to refer to that one. (MacRae): And then it has been fulfilled, and that ends this particular (Buswell interrupts): That particular things has been fulfilled. (MacRae): And then of course you have the end of 24, which shows that after this...it seems to show there is a long period. Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be ~~111~~ fulfilled. And then verse 25: Is verse 25 coming back to verse 11 with the great earthquakes and famines and pestilences? Are all these things which happened before the destruction of

Jerusalem or is it something else after the destruction of Jerusalem? You think it is after? Whether it has though, to be sure (Buswell interrupts): I think verse 27 nails it down; these signs, these ~~ing~~ tragic upheavals come, the powers of the heavens shaken, and then you will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. ~~E~~ (MacRae): But we have back in 11 fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heavēn; What difference is there between 25 and 11? Is there a recognizable difference between them? (Buswell): Well, I think that there is. That is to say, as I understand the terrific upheavals that are predicted eschatologically, they simply distinguish between ordinary, natural disturbances through which we are expected to go. (MacRae): You think, then, that we can't tell which is which? (Buswell): I think so from other Scriptures. Luke says that these earthquakes and pestilences are not the sign of the ~~answer~~ answer to their question. (MacRae) but signs in the sun and the moon you think are the signs? (Buswell): But then the reference to further signs are here. Powers of the heavens shaken, and then you will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds. (MacRae): Then shall you see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory, and then these things begin to come to pass., ~~is~~ That is, when you begin to see the Son of Man coming in the clouds. Then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh. Is that what it means? (Buswell): 13 1/4 incidental. How far back does touton refer? I rather think that 28 reflects our constant attitude ~~is~~ throughout all the days. (MacRae): That is, that the things began to come to pass right after Christ's death, you might say. 13 1/2 the earthquakes and the breaking of the veil, and the (Buswell interrupts): That is grammatically possible, yes. (MacRae): In other words, that at all times we are to have our heads lifted up, for our redemption is drawing nigh. And then when ye see these things begin to come to pass, lift up, for your redemption draweth nigh. And then we have the parable of the fig tree; would you interpret that in line with what we

what we just said, then? Verse 31, likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass; know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand? That is, we know; in other words, we knew right from the time of the event that it is nigh. (Buswell): 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  for a line or two...

And you know that your redemption draweth near. And when we see this 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  scattered throughout the world we can constantly say that that is one of the signs that He is keeping His word. (MacRae) And that would fit with the reference in Luke 12 we ~~xxxxx~~ looked at, where there was to be a constant attitude of expectancy right from the beginning. A constant readiness for His return. And it is to be a constant motive for Christian service. Of course, that doesn't mean that it is the only motive for Christian service by any means. (End of record #6)

Last semester we discussed the matter of the Millenium, and we saw the Scriptural evidence for the fact of the Millenium, as to the time of the Millenium, that there are certain things about the nature of the Millenium which are actually clear in the Scriptures. And we noticed that there are other things about it on which the Scripture has not fully revealed the details, and therefore we may very well have differences of opinion. Now this semester we will touch upon some of the matters dealing with the Millenium from time to time, but in the main we will be going on to other phases of eschatology which are not particularly related to what one view of the Millenium may be. You could hold any particular view of the Millenium and still hold any one of ~~the~~ various views of the matters to which a good bit of our time this semester will be devoted. We are going, then, this semester, to first pay attention to some of the eschatological material in the Gospels. And last week I said a few words along a somewhat unusual line of approach to this material. I called attention to Luke 12, and in Luke 12 we noticed that in a group of parables and discussions which were not connected with eschatology, where the Lord was discussing what the attitude of His people should be. We stressed the fact that we are to be constantly on the watch, not in the sense of looking for something, but in the sense of being wide awake, active and vigilant. That we are to be constantly wide awake and active and serving Him faithfully so that whenever He should come He would find us actively engaged in His service. And He ended with the words, Be ye therefore ready also, for the Son of Man comes at an hour when ye think not. Peter said, Lord speakest thou this parable unto us or even unto all? And we noticed that the Lord went on and while he did not specifically answer the parable, he seems to imply that not only is Peter included in the parable, but so are all of the other disciples. I think that we agreed on that last time, that ~~it~~ it is altogether fair to take this appearing as it does thus without / any eschatological context, as showing that it was the Lord's

will that His people should always live and act as 3 He might come soon. Be ye also waiting, for the Son of Man comes at an hour when ye think not. If he comes in the second watch, or in the third watch, or whenever he comes He finds you actively engaged in his service; blessed are those servants. Now this, then, seems to show an attitude, a desire of Christ that His people shall consider His coming as imminent. It is striking that he should say to Peter; that Peter should say, Speakest thou this to us or to everybody, when Peter is the one person of whom we could question as to whether or not it really applied to him at all. Because the Lord clearly revealed in the last chapter of John that Peter was going to be crucified, and therefore Peter must know that the Lord wouldn't come as he hadn't yet been crucified. And yet Peter here is quoted by the Holy Spirit as having said this and the Lord went about and discussed it in such a way as to imply that he wants this attitude to be taken even by Peter who is the one man of whom there is clear and conclusive evidence later given that actually the motive for watchfulness wouldn't refer to him, tho the fact of watchfulness evidently does. It is the attitude which he wishes us all to have. Then we went on and I ran over with you the 21st chapter of Luke, in which we had Luke's presentation of the Olivet Discourse. And we did not go into that in full at all, but I merely presented the matter that it seemed to me that he was not giving them a specific timetable for the age, but he was saying that when ye see these things /come to pass, (beginning to come to pass means anytime, after he goes away. )That when you see wars and rumours of wars and all these things, don't say the Lord is here, because you don't know. He may be a long ways off. On the other hand, don't say that he is a long ways off, because he may be right near. And in that passage, the Lord said, In verse 36, Take heed to yourselves lest that at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and the cares of this life so that may come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye

therefore and pray always, that ye may be found worthy to escape all these~~x~~ things that shall come, and to stand before the Son of Man.

I don't recall whether the word Watch here is agrupeo or gregareo, but I'm quite certain that it is one or the other. (Buswell): Agrupneo. (MacRae) I personally don't know any difference between them, but that they are very different from our English word Watch. And I think that ~~that~~ is very important that we have that in mind. Approximately a dozen times in the Synoptic Gospels that the Lord commands His people to watch, using the word gregareo or agrupneo, and I don't know if this is a very good translation: watch. It is if you talk Old English. Paul said, In watchings oft. He doesn't mean by that that there were a good many times when he was out on the street looking to see if the streetcar was coming. He doesn't mean in watchings oft that he was constantly watching to see something coming. He means in watchings oft times when he was kept up all night because there were times in the Lord's service when he couldn't get his ordinary sleep. He had to make a trip somewhere, he had to do something, which meant that he had to be right on the job ~~at~~ in the time when one would normally be asleep. And so he says in watchings oft. And as to the meaning of this word watch, it doesn't mean that the Christian is not to get his normal sleep, but what it does mean is that he is not to lapse into a condition which would be comparable to sleep in his Christian life. He is to be constantly on the alert and vigilant and active in the Lord's service, in order that when the Lord comes the Lord will find him actively in His service and not in a more or less 7 state. It is an additional motive for constant Christian service. Not the primary one, but an additional one, which is stressed about a dozen times in the Synoptic Gospels. He wants us always to be as he says to Peter like those whose loins are girded, ready for the coming of their master. But they don't know when he is coming, and so they are to be constantly ready. ~~That~~ Dr Buswell and I agree thoroughly about the teachings of the Millennium in the Scripture, and we ~~agreed~~ agree

thoroughly in this matter that there is to be a constant attitude of watchfulness and readiness on account of the imminence of the Lord's return. We also agree thoroughly that between the time when the rapture occurs and the Lord takes up his own into heaven, and the time when he returns to this earth with His saints, there is a period of great tribulation on this earth, in which the wrath of God is poured out. I believe on these three points, Dr Buswell and I agree very thoroughly, but I think that it is important that we go into the evidence of these three points and see why both of us are strongly convinced of this. Now beyond these, there are a good many matters of detail on which Dr Buswell and I do not see eye to eye, and that is probably because he has studied so much more than I have in these matters. But I am naturally of rather a skeptical form of mind, and therefore when we get beyond these matters which are clearly taught in the Scripture; when we ~~get~~ get beyond them I have a tendency on every point of argument he raises, for every comparison which he presents, that is, Let's see what can be said on the other side. Let's look into it very thoroughly, and make sure that we are right in our conclusions. And so if you find me being very skeptical when we get beyond these points, don't think that it is  $8 \frac{3}{4}$  critic at all, but simply that I want to be a hundred percent sure if we can, and I don't want to be a hundred percent sure unless the Scriptures can, but to see where the Scriptures therefore differ. So for that reason you may find something more of disagreement in expression this semester than you did last, but it will not be a difference between two different views so much as it will be between one who has studied less in this field and who therefore more hesitant and  $9 \frac{1}{4}$  skeptical and one who has worked more things out.

I hope though, that if you do find us differing on certain of these points, that that will not lead you to feel skeptical or questioning about the matters we discussed last semester, on the nature of the Millennium, and the time of the Millennium, which I feel is very very clearly taught in the Scripture. And on the point of the attitude of imminence, of expectancy,

we agree is very clearly taught, and on the fact that there is to be a tribulation, a time of the wrath of God between the rapture and the ~~de~~ return of Christ, which perhaps is not quite as clearly taught as the other two; nevertheless Dr Buswell and I are in agreement rather definitely on it in the Scriptures, although perhaps we come to it from different grounds. (Student question). Verily this generation shall not pass away until all be fulfilled. Now verse 31. Likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the ~~kingdom~~ kingdom of God is nigh at hand. And what are the things ye see come to pass? Well, the fig tree shoots ~~forth~~ forth it's branches. Well, we see that happening. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ . There are signs in the stars and all that, and the sign of the Son of Man coming. Well, that surely is not what is meant. It seems to me that he is referring to all the things he has given in the chapter: earthquakes, and pestilence, and all these things. You see these things come to pass; you see the destruction of Jerusalem; you see all these things, and you know that the kingdom of God is nearer than the day before. Well, as to how near it is we have this question, What did this mean, this generation shall not pass away. Now the liberal says that that means that Christ thought that before the people of His day died, He would be back but He was mistaken. We do not take it that way. Others take it as meaning this race which the word genea can mean, and it means that the Jewish race is not to be divided up among the nations and lose it's identity as the others nations have all done, but that it is to continue as a separate race until the Lord's return. Some take it that way. Now there are some who take it as meaning that when ye see the Jews begin to go back to Palestine, the ~~fig~~ fig tree casting forth it's leaves, then you know that within a generation after that, before everyone living ~~them~~ has died, (let's say that in modern times 12 began about 1912; well before the people who were children in 1912 have all died, the Lord would come back). Now if that is the case, that does give you something of a timetable. I'm rather skeptical of that latter interpretation. I don't know what Dr Buswell

12/14

thinks as to that. (Student question). I never heard of any body believing in a mid-trib rapture. You don't believe in a mid trib rapture, do you, Dr Buswell? (no) Dr Frost's little book holds it. Yes, but there are those who think--Now Dr Buswell, if I am correct in my interpretation, thinks that it will be in the middle of the week. A mid week, but not a mid tribulation. Now Dr Buswell and I both believe that it is before the tribulation. And personally, I don't know much about weeks, so I won't say it is the beginning or what it is. Maybe I will know more before the semester is over. (Student ~~was asking~~ question). If you took it that way, they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Well, this probably refers most especially to the holy place to the Temple area which has been trodden down of the Gentiles from 70 AD up till the present time. And it was trodden down 14 There is lots of evidence for it that it has been for many, many centuries, because when the Mohammedans oppressed during the Turkish rule, and during the British rule, the Jewss were at least allowed to go up to the edge of the Temple area and kiss the stones which are called the Wailing Wall. Today, they are now allowed to even come near that. And so it is more trodden down than 14½ . Now it might be that it would mean that if the Jews would move in there in masse and drive out the Moslems and take over the holy place, that then within a generation after that the Lord would come. But I'm a little skeptical about that. Now we were going today to look at the Perean section of Luke, specifically, to see what Luke has to say to it there, and Dr Buswell will take that for us. (Buswell): The 17th chapter of Luke...

(End of Record E - 1) (Beginning of Record E 2)

the expectancy of the church. Dr MacRae is very kind. I heard over the radio a remark something of that kind that he was even (Not about Dr MacRae) that that person was even humane. I certainly do not have any more studying in these or other fields than Dr MacRae has, and it is amazing

to me how, when we get a chance to talk over things, we agree. If we disagree on some point, I find it very stimulating. It always makes me work all the harder, to learn more every time. That great text on which we'd all dwell, me huper gegraptai! Not beyond what is written. Me huper gegraptai. And we can say  $1 \frac{3}{4}$  thus and so, the grammar and the syntax of the sentence, it is precisely this. ....Winipeg, thirty below zero, and the conductor stuck his nose out and said, I don't reckon there's no Eskime blood in me. We mean rather, the Word of God, and we can parse the sentences, get the grammar and syntax, and if you talk on that ground and correct lexicography, then we can say, Thus saith the Lord. And then we can put two and two together, and draw cogent inferences, as the longer catechism says, cogent inferences from the Word of God. Or we can say that the Word of God seems clearly to imply so and so. And then when we go beyond that and we make analogical applications and interpretations and conjectures, then we are using our imagination and and 3 imagination if you label it. If you realize what Dr Machen is. There are the different view about eschatology, your Post-millenarian says, Every day in every way I'm getting better and better. And the world is evolving towards the kingdom of Christ. Finally we'll get to the Millennial kingdom of Christ, and then after the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the Christ will come back again. That, if that were the case, then the statistical reports of various church boards and denominations would be the thing to study, and like we hear in some of the modernistic denomination We've advanced the kingdom so much this year; we've added so much to the territory of the kingdom of God. And you could work it out statistically. That attitude is the one that Christ is correcting in the 17th chapter of Luke, the 20th verse: and having been asked by the Pharisees When comes the kingdom of God, He answered to them and said, the kingdom of God does not come meta paratereseos. Now that word paratereseos is simply that it does not come with observation. A little smoother modern English: It does not come ~~with~~ observedly. The word implies the watching of the growth of a movement, and the statistical advance. I've heard some

Methodist bishops report that the kingdom is advancing somuch this year. By the budget, and so on. I have a rather large German Greek lexicon at home which somebody gave me, Walter Bower is the editor, and it translates paratereseos, 5½ achtung! Now achtung is a military command for attention. The German prisoners, the sergeant would always say Achtung, and they would come to attention. Now 5½ means the watching of the progressive 5½. Paratereseos is the same thing. The kingdom of God does not come by watching. I think that this could be employed not only against Post-Millennialism, but also against the Pre-Millennial signs-of-the-times-ism. I heard one of our prominent radio preachers say (I won't name him; we won't get into personalities) as he does preache the Gospel, and the Gospel saves souls, but he preaches lots of other things too, and ;most of them just; well, nobody knows what he is taling about, and thus it goes). This man the other day gave a talk about politics, and he knew a lot more about it than the Word of God does, or gives to us, I mean. Ben heard him last Sunday, and he said positively that the United Nations arms cannot be successful in Korea. Why? Well, because Russia is going to be defeated at Armageddon, or Jehshophat, or somewhere else. anyways. Because Russia is going to be defeated over there, therefore the United Nations arms cannot be successful in Korea. I heard him say a few weeks ago that the Gog and Magog in Ezekiel cannot be the God and Magog in Revelation, and I listened very carefully for his arguments, because I know a lot of good people who hold that, but his chissf argument why there couldn't be same is that the one in Ezekiel comes before the millenium, and the one in Revelation comes after. So therefore they couldn't both come at the same time. I wrote for his pamphlet, and I signed my name very plainly and gave my full address, but the pamphlet hasn't come. I'm; if any of you have his pamphlet on the modern conflict and politics, don't give my name, but I'd like to... Well, Dr Dehan. I'd even forgotten I hadn't named him. I'll tell you a story, but this should be off the record. (The story ensues apart from the record).

I do not believe that the Scripture gives any lengthy process, or any typically observable process whereby we could say that the kingdom of God comes meta paratereseos. Dr Macrae has indicated: I do think that our Scriptural reasons for thinking that the rapture of the church will take place in the middle of a period of seven years, I think that there are reasons for that. But I think that it is very clear from the nature of the situation that nobody will be able to say precisely when that period of seven years begins. And I think that there are indications that the Lord has given certain premonitory signs relative to the instant of the last trumpet that 9 that twinkling of an eye, *ripē pphthalmou*, means that there are certain signs that immediately precede that. But it'll all be in a very closely compact eschatological complex. And the idea of watching Russian politics and saying that Gomer means Germany, and that Rosh means Russia, and *Mkshga* means Moscow, and Tubal means Tobaluk, and all of that, it is not only absurd from the point of view of Bible geography, but also from the meaning of the terms to Ezekiel at that time, and it would also contradict this word. The kingdom does not come as an observable process. (Student question). The Bible doesn't say that they are going to get worse and worse year after year, but it does say that in the last days many will depart from the faith. Well, the last days can mean the whole period, the 10½ the last days began when Christ was born in Bethlehem from the OT point of view, and the NT doesn't discriminate between the general last days and the last days that are within the last days. I would say that that isn't only excuses; that is church history. Why think of the time just before Luther. (Student questions) The fact is that many will depart from the faith in the last days and there is no warrant whatever for a converted world. That is very clear. I think that the overall picture is given in the parable of the wheat and the tares. They both get ripe before the harvest, in the earth; remember the field is the world, not the church, in that parable. I think ... (Student question) We will see as we go on there. Are there other questions relative to these verses? (Student questions). I think that that is what the word para-

tereseos means : tereos, to guard and keep along side of, and it does not come as an observable process, which you would watch. (MacRae) Is there anything else that the phrase could mean? (Buswell) No, it doesn't come in manner such as you would watch; on the contrary, it comes like a flash of lightning all over at once. That what follows. Stand beside and watch; there you are, para and tereo, to stand beside and watch. Now this question will be answered as we go right along in these next verses. Do you have a question? (Student question). Alright, don't let it die. Then you have the next verse here which has caused so much argument. Lo here nor lo there, for the kingdom of God entos humon estin. The kingdom of God is in or (you plural, remember; he doesn't say that the kingdom of God is in their heart, and it was the Pharisees who were hostile who asked the question.) Not that the kingdom of God is in your heart; I think that that is impossible. But since that it is you plural, I would say that the kingdom of God is in your midst. Then I would translate that as an aoristic present, in the light of the verses which follow. Now hold that in suspense; just keep that question in quarantine. What does he mean, the kingdom of God is in your midst? And He said to His disciples, There will come days when you will earnestly desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and you will not see it. And they will say to you, Look here, or Look there; do not go away after them; do not follow the;

(aEnd of record e 2;      beginning of record e 3)

The of heaven to the of heaven; that is from one part of heaven to the other part of heaven, signs to the other part of heaven, so is the ~~Son~~ man. Now this,  $\frac{1}{2}$  how the kingdom of God does come. Therefore, if you stretch back the time of the question, verse 20, the kingdom of God does not come as an observed process, and this flash of lightning reflects back upon the phrase 'the kingdom of God is in your midst'. I can imagine in a good many of the Lord's discourses, His attitudes and suggestions, (that is not a part of the text; that is imagination), but putting together this explanation of the flash of lightning, where is the kingdom of God coming? These Pharisees... Well, negatively, it does not come as an observed process; ~~it/comes~~ don't say Look here or Look there, for, it's in the midst of you. And then He turns to His disciples and says, You will desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and you won't see them. That is, there ~~won't~~ be just more and more and more of the kingdom. But they will say to you Look there, or Look here; do not go away after them. Nor follow them. For just as the flash of lightning lightens from one side of heaven and  $\frac{2}{2}$  to the other part of heaven, so is the Son of man. Now, with the ~~context~~, then, I would say that this phrase, the Kingdom of God is within you, certainly should be translated, Is in your midst. And it is an aoristic present referring to the future, you see. Here it is! That would be the way that you would observe the ~~comig~~ of the Kingdom of God. Here it is! That is a breathing point. (student question). I can't see any possible grounds for a secret rapture. (Macrae) But as far as this verse is concerned, is not the emphasis of this verse on the context of verse 20? Here looking for something that they can observe how He gradually approaches. And he says, No, it comes something like a flash of lightning. That is, the other question of how publicly visible it is is not under ~~consideration~~ at this particular point. (Buswell): Only in the phrase, it shines from one part of heaven to the other part of heaven, and then the parallel in Mt, it shine; from the east to the west, so will be the parousia of the Son of Man.

(Student question). That is implied; they are not to go out and look in one place. In the 24 of Mt, He says that He is not in the secret chambers, or in the desert, or so on. In the context here, He is talking about the way He comes. He comes as the lightning flash. (student question).

Well, it is you plural, and entos means within; within you as a company, and the English of that is, In the midst of you. Within a company; it is not the preposition 'in' that I'm arguing about; it is the fact that the thing that it is within is a company of people. So the way to say...

(student question). He doesn't say Christ within; The Kingdom of God suddenly will be in your company. It will be right in the middle of you.

No, He says 'is', but that, as I say, is a present tense for a vivid future. You can't take it as anything but future reference ~~here~~ here, He is answering a question, 5 may be a fixed idea in your mind.

But he is talking about a present situation. If you lift it entirely out of it's setting, and take it away from the question and the answer and the explanation, then the simple statement The Kingdom of God is entos humon could mean something else. But the Pharisees said, Pote erchetai he basilea, when comes the kingdom of God, and He answered, It does not come ouk erchetai, with the observation of a process. Merely will they say Look here, or Look there, For the kingdom of God entos humon estin. And that estin has got to be a future fact in the context. (student question).

(MacRae): But the previous words are all present. (Buswell) That isn't the way you do it, in any of our familiar languages. When you want a very vivid picture of action, you ~~do~~ lapse into the present tense. You do it with reference to the past, and with reference to the future, and in Gk, and Heb, and English. And in German and French, as far as I know.

(MacRae): As if somebody would say, When does next semester begin? And you would say that next semester doesn't begin in January or in February, It begins in March. You ~~now~~ wouldn't say It will begin in March. If you had just been using the present, you'd keep on using the present. (Buswell) Yes, and the very question there, in that case, uses the present for the

future. (Student question). That is right, but the estin is the very of the vivid action and it is in the midst of future references, so the whole thing, The Kingdom of God is in the midst of you, is telling how He comes. You watch yourself in any discourse, and see how you naturally drop into the present when you want vivid action. You would say, I was walking along the street, I was observing the weather, and I ran into John Jones, and he said to me, There's an accident down the street, and I run as fast as I could run, and he catches up with me, and there you've gotten into the present tense to get your vivid action. So with the reference to the future. (MacRae): Incidentally, if you take this as a present, Is within you, you cannot, if it means as the modernist say, that the character grows up in your heart, then it cannot be a present, it must be a future, in that case. Because if it means that what He is saying to these wicked Pharisees is, that the Kingdom of God means the time when your character is changed, well that time is not yet. In such ~~as~~ a case, from the modernist interpretation, you would have to take it as a future meaning, expressed in the present, wouldn't you? (Buswell): Yes. (Student question) Well, your grammar is just as plain and simple as can be. The use of the present tense is so vividly a presentation of the future action; there's no grammatical problems at all. (question). I think, let me ask you this, analyze your own thots: when you say Within you, you're thinking of the word You as singular, aren't you? And this is obviously a plural. That is one thing that fools us right off at the start. The You in modern English is either singular or plural, and when you say the Kingdom is entos You plural, you've cut the /ground right from under the idea of something within your heart. (Student question). He was telling to these wicked Pharisees, and for <sup>H</sup>im to say, within your heart, is impossible. It says it is in you as a company. (student question). Well 10 Matthew's interpretation, I heard Sheiler Matthews one time. He said, (I was visiting a class. I didn't have that course, but he said very plainly): I used to interpret NT eschatology with the parable of the

leaven, taking the leaven as the progress of the kingdom and the development of the good. But he said, I have come to see that that is not the interpretation. The NT writers that Christ would come cataclysmically. That was just Sheiler Matthews. Then somebody asked about this, Kingdom of God is within you. And his answer then was, That just as (this was shortly after the first World War) that when Pershing landed in France, with just a little detachment of soldiers, and he visited the tomb of Lafayette, and he went with a wreath and laid the wreath on the grave, and he said, Lafayette, Nous Viola! A man from Wisconsin was telling the news and he said, Pershing jumped on the shore and he hollered back across the ocean, Here we are, Lavolette! We have arrived. Now here is Sheiler Matthew's interpretation: With just the general and a small gallant force, America has arrived. And then there was a day later on when the first American troops actually took part in the battle, and of course everybody was watching, you know, and this American sector was attacked and they drove back the enemy. That was a good day. Let me say it again, America has arrived. Now that was Sheiler Matthew's interpretation, taking this verse as I think entirely out of it's context. 12

the kingdom of God is among you. Then that would have meant, at the present time, I am the King and here are a few of My disciples, and so as a token bodyguard, the Kingdom is here. But in the context, He is answering the Pharisees' question, and is further interpreting it to the disciples by the lightning flash, I am compelled to read it as a present tense of vivid and future action. (student question) He answered them all with verses 20 and 21, and then he turns to His disciples and gives them...You, now You, My disciples, you are going to desire to see the days of the Son of man and you won't see them. (MacRae): But when He answered, He answered the Pharisees. He was demanded of the Pharisees when it should come, and He answered them. Doesn't that mean that He answered the people who asked? (Buswell): Yes. (MacRae): "If I asked you a question, and you gave the answer to Mr Burdick, you wouldn't say that Dr MacRae asked, and

Mr Burdick answered him. You'd have to put in the other name, if that was what we meant. ~~He~~ (Buswell): He answered the Pharisees in verse 21, and then (the inference is that they were all standing there) He turned right to His disciples and spoke. He had just said to the Pharisees, It won't be a matter of look here or look there, then He turns to His disciples, and says, You will earnestly ~~desire~~ desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and you won't see it. We're not in the kingdom now, we are not in the days of His parousia. And they will say to you, My disciples, Go here, but don't go with them, because, just as the flash of lightning, so it will be. Well, think it over,...

(end of record e 3; beginning of e 4)

(Record e 4)

Now I think that there is some significance to the fact that a rank modernist who was bitterly opposed to Premillennialism in any sense of the word, a rank modernist like Sheifer Matthews and many of his kind, have come to the conclusion that the NT teaches a cataclysmic coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. That that could be the same that here. But first it is necessary for Him to suffer many things, and to be despised, made nothing of, by this generation. Now notice that Dr MacRae's was answering about this genea 1 (student question). The coming of the kingdom. In any other terms, but a catastrophic coming. When a person is born again, he is translated into the realm of the sovereignty of God. He hath translated you out of the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of His dear Son. And except a man be born again, he cannot see, cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That isn't the coming of the kingdom, but he is a displaced person. (MacRae): ~~It~~ This world isn't now the kingdom of God, but the persons in it who are born again ~~will~~ would have in it now the coming future, and we are members of it 2 (Buswell) Any reference to the coming of the kingdom must be a reference to something that is not now here. Now the spiritual rule of God, unless we are ~~not~~ pilgrims and strangers on the earth, but members of the kingdom, we enter that. I don't think that has ever affected the coming of the Kingdom. (student

question). There have been many times. These Jehovah Witnesses, they say that Christ came in 1870, and He has been in secret ever since. And John Alexander Bowel, north of Chicago there, had a messianic claim, Zion, Ill. Many times the people have said that the Messiah is over here, over there, and I think that is  $\frac{1}{3}$ . The father divine movement and things of that kind are always coupled around Messianic terminology, used in the things of that kind. The  $\frac{1}{4}$  of St John, in II Clement, were those sects who stopped to make out that John the Baptist was the Messiah. And had  $\frac{1}{2}$  readings. Something that he  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Yes, this attempt to locate the Messiah in some limited area is common. (student question). You don't think that when He comes, His kingdom will come? (answer). You mean the word Kingdom of God as distinct ~~from~~ from the Kingdom of Christ? Then I think that the answer is that you have no reference to the coming of the kingdom in any other but the eschatological sense. You do have a number of references to our entering the kingdom in the spiritual sense. In vs 20 & 21, the question is, When comes the kingdom of God. A future catastrophic event. And Christ, in talking to His disciples,  $\frac{1}{4}$  the terms from the coming of the kingdom of God to the Son of man and His coming. I think the answer is that the Scripture always assumes that the coming in the sense of a future event, the visible coming of Christ, is the coming of His kingdom. (MacRae): And He doesn't say in verse 22, ye desire to see the Son of Man. He says ye desire to see one of the days of Son of man, which implies that it is a period which they look forward to rather than a person, (Buswell) I think so. (MacRae) 6 (Buswell): Paul charges Timothy by His appearing and His kingdom. I have not met any type of Bible teacher who does not believe that the future kingdom of Christ begins with the visible return of Christ. Are you familiar with any teaching that would discriminate those chronologically? That is, when the king appears, visibly and gloriously, His kingdom begins. (MacRae): Not acc/to the Postmillennialist. (Buswell) That's right. The Postmillennialist has his kingdom coming with the  $6 \frac{3}{4}$  and the king

coming at the end of his kingdom period. But no Pre or A Mill that I know of would deny that the future kingdom of Christ begins with His physical return. Maybe you have some other thot on that. I think here that He says to these Pharisees, don't let them say look here or look there, and then He turns to His disciples and in the particular application, You will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man. They will say to you, Look here, or look there; don't be chasing them around, because the Son of man will be like the coming of a flash of lightning. A catastrophic event has a worldwide significance; worldwide knowledge. Did you get the word genea in verse 35? He will be put to death of this generation. I had to tell Dr 7 3/4 one time that anthropology was born since the English language. He was trying to force the word race (the word race is from the English language in the technical, anthropological sense), and I got him to read the dictionary, and the illustration was given from Shakespeare, When was Shakespeare written, when did anthropology begin? So he said, hereafter I will say race as used in anthropology. This words genea does not mean genea in the anthropological sense, a biological group. But it means genea, the word brood, literally a begetting. This brood, and it includes all the chickens in the brooder, whether they/all come from the' eggs of one chicken or not. (MacRae): Yet, but does it necessarily mean those in one time, or would it mean those, who 8 3/4 from this group during long periods of time? (Buswell) I think that the ; for regular English, if anthropology hasn't got just the vocabulary, you would say just this race, and then clarify it when the anthropologist comes along, we'd say we don't mean a race in the anthropological sense, but we mean a race in the sense of ordinary English usage. (Student question). ~~At~~ The Jewish race put him to death; they delivered Him over; He suffered many things and was set at nought by this race. He was rejected by the Jewish people. It is perfectly true that the Jews are not a physiological race; they are a mixed, and an ethnic group, if you want a technical word. But a regular English usage before the science of anthropology classifies

the use of the word race for the Jewish race. (student question) He didn't mention it here; they certainly were included. But he says, Aside from the Romans, aside from the Gentiles, He must suffer many things and be put at nought by this race. It doesn't deny that the Romans are equally guilty at all. I certainly wouldn't hold to that. (student question). Mark 8.31 and Mt 16.21. There He specifies in parallel references, the elders and the chief priests and the scribes. Yes. They were the Jewish crowd of people. And I would emphasize it again, the fact that He says that He must be despised by them, does not exclude the fact that the Gentiles are equally guilty. I am very dogmatic on that. But this race, this genea, means this race. Now you see, in the other passage which Dr MacRae had, it is in the eschatological discourse where He is sitting on the Mt of Olives and looking right down there at the Temple. And He says this race will not pass away. And in the Luke context, He has just said that Jerusalem will be destroyed, and its people taken captive among the Gentiles. And Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, but I tell you this race will not pass away until all these things be fulfilled. So follow the interpretation of the term race in the social-cultural sense, not in the anthropological, biological sense. It is a very good reading for genea. (Student question). That is interpreted from Chrysostom down as referring to the event which is next described, namely the Mt of Transfiguration. And Mt, Mk, and Lk all record that saying, There are some standing here who will not taste death, and about a week afterward He took them up into the Mt of Transfiguration, and they had an actual vision of His coming and His power; He was transfigured before them; They saw Moses who had died, and Elijah who had been translated. And He was glistening in white before them. So Chrysostom explains that the Mt of Transfiguration fulfilled that event of prophecy. That certainly seems to hold together. (student question); coming in His power. That particular reference there, Some will not taste death; they had a vision of Him as He will be in eternity, and they had a vision of His

coming in His kingdom. They had that vision, within a week. And the context is so strong there. It goes right straight down the line in Mt, Mk, and Lk, all three of them. (student question). You know, it is a very interesting thing, this Socialistic, Marxian philosophy of education by 14 $\frac{1}{4}$ , and also there is a Jewish religious movement called the Reconstructionism, and it is very noteworthy that these atheistic sources point out the cultural perpetuity of the Jews. (end of Record e 4)

Maintain Judaism as a civilization within a civilization. Of course we know that is a strong tendency. They're insoluble as a group. They weather almost any kind of a storm. We see the Jews immoral, to say nothing of the religion of their fathers as such, but they evolve these social customs, bringing their civilization within our civilization. So I think definitely that is what this prophecy... And in the Luke context, you see, it is specifically connected with the fact that they are to be scattered among all nations, and yet they'll not be dissolved. Now let's look on for the days of Noah. One lesson that I think is very important in this comparison of Lk 17 with the Mt 24 passage is to see that the Lord repeated himself on different occasions. When you stop to think of it, it is only somewhat necessary that He should do that. He had certain sayings that He would repeat time and time again, You have, to go a little farther here, one of the so-called doubly effective sayings. That is, a saying that occurs once in Mt, Mk, and Lk, in all those sections, and then it occurs again in Mt and Lk where Mk is silent. So it is supposed to have stood in Mk and in Q. We don't need to go into that, but these doubly effective sayings; so, that Christ said the same thing on different occasions. A doubly effective saying is a saying that occurs five times in the Synoptic Gospels. Once in the three and once in the two without Mk. So in the Olivet discourse, He gave His saying about the days of Noah, He also gave it in the Perean section. The Perean section of Lk is, as you know, from 9.61, to 19.28, with the exception of the last part of the 18th chapter. 9.51 to 19.28, with the exception of chapter 18.15 to the end of the chapter. That is the so-called Perean section of Lk. You could just say 9.51 to 19.28, and remember that there is a little section in there that is not classed as Perean. Chapter 12, Dr MacRae found it the other day, is in the Perean section. Now here He gives us the thought as it was in the days of Noah. Let's get the teaching. It occurs twice, once in Perea, and once on the Mt of Olives. As it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days of the Son of Man.

They ate, they drank, they got married, they were given in marriage, one word means to take a wife, and the other means to give your daughter to be married to someone. There is nothing wicked about eating and drinking, there is nothing wicked about marrying or giving in marriage. Until the day when Noah entered into the Ark. That is something that people don't realize. I've heard them read this passage and then go on, See how Scripture describes the wickedness of this sort of a conditioned chaos and confusion, communism, and what is the other word, --anarchy; see the awful condition of the world. No, No. Christ says they were carrying on an organized secular life. They went right ahead with their ordinary daily business; they were naturalists, without the Lord. Until the day when Noah entered into the Ark and the Flood came and destroyed all, similarly, ~~xxx~~ (now this does not occur in Mt) as it was in the days of Lot. Now as we think of the days of Lot, we're 6½ the awful decadence, the corrupt condition, found there in the book of Genesis. But what did the Lord pick particularly about the days of Lot? Why, He describes their commercial, and secular, and social activities. Similarly, as it was in the days of Lot, they were eating, they were drinking, they were buying, they were selling, they were ~~to~~ planting, they were building. Christ doesn't say they were in rioting and sodomy and all manner of filthy corruption. That was true, but the outstanding point that Christ mentions about the day of Lot is they were going on in their secular affairs. They were eating, drinking, buying, selling, planting, building. Lot went to Sodom not for the corruption, but for business. And he brought his family into awful corruption. Until the days when Lot went out of Sodom, and it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed all. That Lot reference is not found in Mt or Mk. Then, according to these things will be the days of the Son of Man, when the Son of man will be revealed. Then He gets into this illustration. He gives this statement about the immediate view of the 8½ k. Now our evidence is in Perea; this is not in the Olivet discourse, but it parallels it almost word for word in

Mt 24, In that day, he who is upon the house, and his tools in the house, let him not go down to take them. That is, due to the immediacy of the flight. And he who is in the fields, similarly, not turn back behind him. He/who is in the field. This can only be interpreted as meaning sudden flight. You cannot turn to go even into the house. That standard stairway will be on the outside of the house. When he said it in the Mt discourse, He added some details. If you're on the housetop, don't go down into the house to get your tools. Don't even go and get your overcoat. If you're outside of the city, don't go into the city. That is instantaneous flight, which was not necessary in 70 AD. Lk is talking about something here which does not take place in 70 AD. 9½ sudden flight as this during a period of some weeks or months when people could slip in and out of the city and it was necessary for them to flee from Jerusalem when it was surrounded with armies. And those who were in the country places not to go into the city. But Lk in his section of the Olivet discourse, describes the destruction of Jerusalem and the need for flight from Jerusalem, but not in any such immediate terms as Lk gives in the 17th chapter, in Perea. I think that the inference is that the Lord in His Perea message has told about His coming like a flash of lightning, about the fact that anyone who was in Jerusalem should simply flee; get out of there. Instantaneous flight would be a very different thing. Remember Lot's wife; that is in Lk only, not in Mt or Mk. Whoever would save his life, will lose it, and whoever will lose it will save it. And will save it alive. (Student question). Well, I haven't found any commentary that seems to me to observe certain phenomena in comparison of Mt 24, Mk 13, and Lk 21. At any rate, we notice here that Lk in the 17th chapter gives the instantaneous flight, whereas in the 21st chapter, Lk does not give the instantaneous flight. Mt and Mk do. Just note that, and then when we come to it we will see how we get harmonized. Now comes the very striking phrase about the instance of the rapture. I say to you, in that ~~day~~ night, (now Mt doesn't say In that night. Remember that this

is two different occasions, Lk 17 in Perea, Mt 24 at Olivet). I say to you, in that night, He said in Perea, there will be two in a bed, one will be taken the other left. There will be two women grinding at the same place. One feminine will be taken, and the other will be left. Now Mt doesn't say in that night, and he says, there will be two masculine in the field. Verse 36. I'm glad that you mentioned that. That is not in the critical text. You see, they are 13½ the 36th verse there. The Westcott and Hort, this is based on Westcott and Hort, I think we all missed that... Verse 35, there will be two grinding at one place, and the one will be taken and the other will be left. And they answered and said to Him, Where, Lord? (Epperds says). (End of Record E 5)

(Beginning of Record E 6. . . .)

According to Nestle, the only 1 is D, and the Latin Syriac. Many of the Latin and Syriac MSS. Whether He gave the three in the Perea section, or only two, in Mt 24 He said there will be two in the field, and the one will be taken and the other left. Then two will be grinding at the mill, one will be taken and the other will be left. At the mill; He mentions the mill. Then in Mt 24, at Olivet, He went on, Wherever the body is, there will the eagles get together. (student question). Well, I wasn't going into the textual matter. Of course, it doesn't change the doctrine at all. It is just a question of whether He used the illustration of the field... (student question). The testimony of the versions. Well, there is many Latin and Syriac, And D. In Mt 24.40... Dr Eppard, what do you have in Mt 24 there? Do you have three items or Two? (Eppard) Souter gives the reference to Mt 24.40, because that reference in Mt 24.40 would explain Lk 17.36. (Buswell): What I want to know is, what does the Textus Receptus say in Mt 24? Does it have three items or only two? What does the King James version say in Mt 24.40,41,42? Mt does not have the two in the bed, then. (MacRae) But if you don't have the bed and the field in one chapter, then you don't have the proof that the world is round. (Buswell): Just the same, He is prophesying. He certainly is

prophesying an instantaneous event. And at one and the same instant, there will be two men in bed, two men grinding at the mill, and two men out in the fields. So that proves that the world is round. Evidently Textus Receptus in Mt does not have the two men in bed. Right? He changes from hes to mia, so we would have to say, two men. Now if there weren't any mia there, then you could just say the hes was the general pronoun. But one is taken out of the bed, and the other, naturally, is left. But two are grinding at the mill feminae, and one feminine is taken and the other is left. ∅ (student question) 5½ ..

You wouldn't have hes, and heteros, for a man and his wife. But, and then there is the change from the next illustration. The women as I understand it, grind the food in the morning of the day, so I am told. But we won't make too much of this, but merely the Lord describes in the Perea discourse a situation in which one will be taken and another left in a sudden and instantaneous manner. Then they said Where, Lord? And (student question). There isn't anything in your word that would indicate that. Campbell Morgan has the church going clear thru the tribulation, and he has the <sup>tribulation</sup> people butchered, and 6 3/4 . Paralambano just means to take, and let, to leave. (student) Lot was taken out, and the people left were destroyed; Noah was taken out, and the people left were destroyed, and so one will be taken and the other will be left... The words themselves, paralambano, which means to take along, and aphiami, which means to leave. Where the soma is, there will the eagles be. When He gets to the Mt of Olives, He says Where the ptoma. Now the body, ptoma, (and the ptoma means a corpse. Dr MacRae was mentioning that.) (MacRae): Where is this ptoma business? (Buswell): Ptoma is in Mt 24.28, very graphic. Mt says carcass on the Mt of Olives, and Lk says body in Perea. And it doesn't make any difference about that. This soma is a ptoma. In an open country, way out in the prairies in the west anyway, often a lost person is found by looking to the sky, and seeing where the vultures are circling. This Dr MacRae explained. You don't need to worry,

He'll find you. (MacRae): that must refer to the rapture, huh? Else what would be the point of it? (Buswell): Well, where? (MacRae) Wherever you are He'll search you out. (Buswell): Or look to the sky. It.. He'll find you. (MacRae) And why should He call them corpses? (Buswell): Right, why should He say Ptoma? (MacRae) simply because the illustration calls for it. The vultures don't circle around the living person. The vultures are looking for the one who is their proper meat, and similarly the Spirit of God looks for those who are the saved ones. Not for the people of this world. (Buswell): I am certainly not opposed to that, but don't the vultures follow a lost person, who is wandering? (MacRae) I don't think so. When he was sick they would, certainly. If a person appeared to them to be, then they would. But I don't think that they're apt to pay much attention to one who is surely living. (student). If he was injured, it would appear likely that he would soon be dead. The birds would stay ~~about~~ around him. They might, around the sheep that are lost anyway. I don't know. But they wouldn't around a human being. At least I have never seen do so. (Buswell): I think that the vultures circle an injured person or animal who is more or less lying still. (MacRae): But I had a friend once in the Grnd Canyon whose back hurt him, and he stayed and got in the shade of a rock while I went back a few miles to get some water for him. And when I got back, he told me that the birds circled around overhead, and he waved his arms at them and said, No use, he's coming with water... (Buswell):: The next eight verses are eschatological in part. They are eschatological in their spirit. (student question). I don't think that it is particularly eschatological. Homiletical, certainly. Whoever seeks to preserve his life or soul, will destroy it, or leave it. And whoever will destroy it, or leave it, will preserve it alive. (student question). Seems to me that it is a matter of homiletical application to the general thought of the Lord's return, isn't it? We're going to be putting 11 3/4, and there is going to be greater and greater persecutions. 50. And I expect to see

the most intense persecutions, a very brief and short one, and I think the church will go thru, and I don't think that 12 not to be, at the time of the rapture 12 . Thlipsis is the constant lot of the church, all down thru the years. Orge<sup>l</sup> is not the lot of the church. And I have always taken this to be a word of encouragement. If you 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  to save your life, well, you will lose it, and it won't be worth saving. (student question). It is ejaculatory, as many of the Lord's sayings are, this is one of the sayings that Christ used.

(End of record E 5)

Now when we come to this matter; if you're on the housetop, don't even go down and get your tools. If you are out in the field, don't go back, when this thing comes. But be 1 . That is all that I can make out of it.

(student question). Well, that's good homiletics, I think; it is reasonable.

(MacRae): That is pretty good, to connect up 32, remember Lot's wife, with the idea that he seeks to preserve his life 2 surrounding him.

She looked back on it, and was thinking of those instead of God's will for her. (Buswell) Yes, I think that that is good. (student question).

Now, I think, on the contrary, that he is viewing this whole thing as one picture, that is, His coming in glory. Now when you come to distinguish the rapture from the wrath, and then His coming to release Jerusalem and destroy the Antichrist, I don't think those details are in here. From the point of view here, I think, He is just looking forward to His visible, glorious coming. And not segregating those details. I think certainly that two in a bed and two in the field and two at the mill must be the incident of the rapture. That seems to me quite definite. But that is a part of the picture. Now the unjust judge. (student question). That is a different context. In Mt, he is talking about other things. He simply repeats certain units. (question).

This is Lk 17, here. 3 3/4 . Now get this in your mind. Lk is the separate book with ~~it~~ a unity. Lk chapter 17 is discourse material in Perea. Lk chapter 21 is the Olivet discourse. Well, there is some connection, but each part is a unit. Lk 17 gives you an orderly discourse in Perea. And then Lk 21 gives you excerpts from the Olivet discourse. Now maybe I do not get your point. (question). Well, now you are taking two different sermons of the Lord and trying to make them part of the same outline. It isn't chronological, and they are two different sermons. There is nothing chronological. Lk 17 and Mt 24 couldn't be chronologically the same; they are two different sermons. (question). Now how do you take a sermon chronologically? There is no law that makes anybody mention events in any chronological order unless he chooses to. ~~It~~ Now we haven't gotten to Mt 24 yet. All we see is that in the sermon in Lk 17, which is a unit, Christ used certain blocks of

of material which He also used later in another sermon with another outline. Don't you have any favorite illustrations when you are preaching? You have a certain/sermon that you like to tell to illustrate a certain point. You may drag it in in two or three different sermons. Now you couldn't possibly take an outline of one sermon when you used that illustration and make that outline fit another sermon where you haven't used the same block of material. That is the data that we have before us. The data before us includes two sermons of Christ in which He used identical blocks of material, but not the same sermon outline. See? So the order of the material in Lk 17 hasn't a thing to do with the order of the material in Mt 24. They are different discourses. (MacRae)

One place you might give a discussion of the history of the last 30 years, and you might describe the first World War and the period between and the Second World War, and in another case you might discuss What was the war? And you might say that in the ~~1st~~ first World War they used Enfield rifles; and in the second World War they used rifles and machine guns, with a few Springfield but no more Enfield at all, and then you might go out and say In the First World War we didn't get any tanks made till the end of the war; none of our planes ever reached France. But in the second World War were making tanks right from the start, and shipping them over even before we were shipping the men. And you could go back and forth, and your outline would be entirely different. It would refer to the same facts, in a different order, and with different persons. (Buswell): We haven't any grounds for comparing the order of material in Mt 24 with the order of the material in Lk 17, because they are two different sermons. (MacRae) That is, there may be a point at which the comparison will prove something, but we can't assume there will be. (Buswell) But you do have identical blocks of material. (eppard, from seat). (MacRae) Wouldn't that question be better to leave until we consider Mt 24? And then perhaps come back to your question. Then see if it throws light on it. (Buswell): That is not the same outline material. And in Lk 17, there is no reference to that parable of the short tribulation. No reference whatever. (question). (MacRae) Mr Kirkwood may have some good ideas there, but I think

that we ought to consider them later. (Buswell) When we get to Mt 24, then we will be considering the Olivet discourse. And then we will have to consider all three versions of the Olivet discourse. But in Lk 17, the question of that terrible tribulation doesn't come up. Simply, He says, one will be taken and the other will be left, and they say to him, Where? Where is this place ~~going to be?~~ going to be? Where is this mill going to be, one woman taken; and He answers, with this saying, Where the body is... (question). Yes, and they are two different occasions also. But in Lk He just said, one will be taken and the other will be left, and they said, Where? Where? And His answer was, Where the body is, soma, there will the eagles be gathered. (MacRae) Now may I ask a question right at that point. They said, Where? How did they come to say Where, all of a sudden? I wonder if that perhaps relates back to that original Where ~~why~~ which we found in verse 23: They shall say to you See here, or See there. They say, Here is where the Lord is coming back; There is where the Lord is coming back. Sixty years ago there was a large group of Americans who said, The Lord is coming back soon, and we want to be at Jerusalem when He comes. So they went over and they formed the American Colony in Jerusalem there, in order that they would be there on the ground, in order that they would meet the Lord when He comes. And the Lord says, Don't think that you have to be in any particular place when the Lord comes back; wherever the body is, there the eagles could reach you. The Lord's Spirit knows us more than any vulture; He can look down from heaven, see exactly where you are; and don't think that He will forget you. But you be about your regular business, and whether you are in the field, or whether you are in the bed, or whether you are in Judea or whether you are in Labrador or South America; wherever you are, there the eagles will be gathered together. Don't you think that it makes a point of the whole discourse. It relates back to the original statement at the very beginning of it. (Buswell) When they say, Lo here, and Lo there, that occurs even twice in this section: Once from the Pharisees, and once from His own disciples. Don't bother about this Where; Lo here, or Lo there. And still these disciples come back and

say Where? And He gives this answer: It isn't a matter of where; the Lord will find you. Now this is in the Perean discourse, and that doesn't have to do with the Olivet discourse. There is no mention of any tribulation in the Perean discourse. They simply said, Where is this sudden separation going to be, and as Dr MacRae said, this relates to this Lo here, and Lo there. (question). There is in Mt a reference to a terrible thilipsis which will be very short, but that is in Mt 24 and it isn't mentioned in Lk 17. This doesn't refer to it. (MacRae) It is utterly wrong to say that Christians are to escape the tribulation. Because Christians all thru history have had tribulation. There have been terrific persecutions under the Romans and under the Roman Catholics at the Reformation and for all we know, there may be a great many more terrific persecutions before the Lord will come back. We don't now know. The only thing is that, it seems to be taught that after the rapture of the church, then there will be a particular tribulation in which the Christian / church will not take part, because it will not be here. Wouldn't that be right? (Buswell) I think so (question). I think that the rapture of the church will certainly take place before the time of the wrath of God, which most people call the great tribulation. A thilipsis is the common lot of the church in all ages. Now let's look at this summed up bit very briefly because it is homiletical, and this is the kind of thing that is helpful in preaching to poor, suffering people. And He spoke a parable to them, with a view that men ought always to pray, and not to faint. There is the point. ~~the~~ The persistency in the prayer life, looking forward to the Lord's return. There was a certain judge in a certain city who did not fear God, and who did not respect men. There was a widow in that city, and she came to him, saying, Give me justice from the one who is wronging me. And he did not wish to. After these things, he said to himself, If I do not fear God nor respect men, have no regard for men, thru her coming to me, she will make me troubled. I will give her justice...

(more of E 6 continued on record E 8) and follows here).

Give me a black eye. He might come and biff me in the eye. But now this is what the unjust judge said. Now even a judge can be forced to do justice by pressure groups, but sufficient pressure. I like the way Mr MacIntire gets delegations to go down to Washington to get the Senate to get some kind of justice. And get things done. But you have to keep at it 1 .

And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge said, 1 ; will He not make justice? or vengeance? 1 1/4 ...cry unto him day and night, and He is long suffering for them, I say to you, He will make justice or vengeance for them, quickly, or that is, sharply. Sudden justice. Then comes the funny question, But, the Son of Man coming, will He find faith on the earth? Will He find saved Christians? That is to say, the point of it is to say that we no longer 2 3/4. Now the Lord is saying e 2 whereby He is going to bring sudden justice, on this earth 2 And we ought to pray, and not to faint. Now the question is, wWhen He comes, will he find faith; Will He find the faith referred to? 2 .

(MacRae) Wouldn't you say, Dr Buswell, that this particular parable does not prove that the world is going to get worse and worse, and it doesn't prove that apostasy is going to cover the whole world so that there'll be hardly any left, but on the other hand it does definitely prove that the Gospel is not going to conquer the world before He comes. It shows very clearly that the faith is at least going to be a minority matter rather than a matter that is universally found. (Buswell) definitely. At the coming of the Son of Man is the patience for God's people. The rectification of their situation. And they cry to Him day and night all down thru the years, and that they be faithful, and when He comes, will he find faith on the earth? The kind of faith that is illustrated in the story of the widow. (MacRae) what is to be done next time? (Buswell) I think that inevitably there has been a lot of confusion in ~~our~~ our minds when we have these things all sh~~een~~ up in scrambled eggs in one ~~basket~~ basket in our thinking. It is quite important to 3 1/2

Perhaps there is something else that should come before this. Mt 24, and by all means, next time bring a harmony. If you can get a Burton~~z~~Goodspeed har-

(MacRae) What would you think of first running thru Mt 24 just to get the big emphases of that as they are presented in the book, regardless of trying to get details. And then go back and go thru the harmony? (Buswell) Yes.

(End of the end of e 6 on record e 8)

(MacRae) ...gratitude we owe Christ for what He had done. That is enough He tells us of the rewards to come. That is enough, but He adds this fourth one~~kn~~, in knowing the weakness of human nature and the need of additional  $\frac{1}{2}$ , but it is one affecting all thru Christian history right from the start. (question). The coming on the clouds with great glory, that is to be 1. And that, we would know when that was, definitely. My impression would be that the signs of nature have come off and on all thru the ages, and you couldn't say, Now we have seen this sign in the heavens, and next week we know that Christ is coming. (question). So that when we see all these things happen, and when the Lord doesn't come, we won't say, Oh, it was all a mistake. We'll know that there may be any number of them. (Buswell) Every time there is a war, premillennialists write books  $1\frac{1}{2}$  Now what the Lord said is specifically, the wars are not the signs. (MacRae) I told a woman last week that I didn't think that there was going to be another world war for ~~at~~ at least three years, and she said that that was what her pastor said; he had been studying the prophets very definitely. (question) In verse 27, here, it does not say, And then shall you see the Son of Man coming on the clouds with power and great glory; it says, then shall they see the Son of Man coming. He is not saying that when you see the Son of Man coming on the clouds with power and great glory then you know that your redemption draws nigh; because He has told us very definitely in Thessalonians that the dead in Christ shall be raised first, and then we which are alive shall be caught up to be ~~together~~ together with ~~with~~ them to meet the Lord in the air, and so we won't see Him coming in the clouds; we'll be with Him. That is, the unbelievers will see Him in the clouds. You wouldn't differ with that, would you, Dr Buswell? (Buswell) Well, you might take it a little differently, because of the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  kn Mt and in Mk.  $3\frac{1}{4}$  in an attempt to reconstruct the course. Coming in the clouds with power and great glory and then He will send forth His angels with the sound of a trumpet, Mt says, and He will gather His elect from the four winds, etc. (MacRae) But there is no such thing here in Lk. (Buswell) Lk omits that. But Mt, Mk

and Lk, words for word, in the reference to coming in the clouds with the power and great glory. (question) (MacRae) I think that you're referring to a particular passage, and that isn't in Lk here, so.. Maybe we ought to leave that for a discussion later. Now we're trying to get what we have in Lk here, We have more of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  in Lk 17, the Perean discourse, where He tells us in Lk 17.20, the kingdom of God comes not with observation. You won't say Lo here or Lo there, the Kingdom of God is within you. He said to the disciples that the days shall come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall not see it. And they will say to you, see here, or see there, Lk 17.23, go not after them or follow them, for as the lightning lighteth out of the one part of the heaven unto the other part of the heaven, so shall also the Son of Man be in His day. That assures the suddenness of it as far as the Christian is concerned. But He comes like the lightning, all of a sudden, and wherever the Christian is, he suddenly finds the Lord's return upon him. And He continues there with notes about the suddenness of it., the unexpectedness of it. And he has over in verse 34, In that night, there shall be two men in one bed, and the one shall be taken and the other left, and two women grinding together, and the one taken and the other left, and two men in the field, one taken and the other left. That is not an atomic bomb; it wouldn't divide that way, would it? And they answered and said to Him, Where Lord? And He said to them, wheresoever the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Would you not say that that passage in Lk 17 is a picture of the rapture? That is definitely a picture of the rapture. That is the sudden taking away of those who are saved, apart from the others. And that would certainly have no room in that for any looking up and seeing Him coming in the clouds before that happened. It is pictured as a sudden, unexpected thing. (question). Well, in Lk 12, we had the great stress laid on the note of expectancy, that the Christian doesn't know when the Lord is coming. But he is so to live that he will be ready at any instant at which He will come. And in Lk 21, there is a stress laid on the fact that there are great cosmic disturbances and when we have these, and war, and He doesn't

come, we are not to become discouraged and say, Oh we knew that He was coming and He didn't, and therefore it is all a lot of junk. We can know that it; we don't know what the time is, so tho it may seem to us that it is going to come, and it doesn't, and that doesn't mean that it wpn't come when we don't expect it to come. At such a time as ye do not expect it, the Son of Man will come. But there is this prediction that seems to be rather definitely the destruction of Jerusalem, but is the only thing that we can pinpoint there, in that discussion. And the omer here in 17, the stress again on the fact that we don't know when it is; when people say that Christ is coming, well, maybe that is pretty good evidence tht He isn't. At a time when ye think not, the Son of Man cometh. That people will be scattered, one taken and the other left, that where the body is, there the eagles will be gathered together. That is, where the Lord's own are, there they will be taken up. It seems to show an unexpectedness, a thing about it which does not ~~and~~ mean that if you are watching, you can jump on the train when it comes, but that if you're active about the Lord's service, you won't be embarrassed when it comes. (question). I would incline very strongly to that position on that particular verse. Verse 28, Dr Buswell, suggested, was right from the time of the ascension. That when these things begin to come to pass; well, they began, --earthquakes, troubles, persecutions, -- right after Pentecost, and when ye see trouble coming, why don't say, Oh my, it is hopeless; say, the return of Christ is that much closer; lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh, and it has been drawing nigh for two thousand years, and it may draw nigh for another two thousand years. We can't tell, but we're always to be in an attitude of readiness whenever He may come. And by readiness He doesn't mean watchings, Is it here, or Is it there? He means being about the business of serving the Lord faithfully. (question). You look out over a great field, and you look, and it is just a lot of wild country, and you don't think anything of it. But you will find that if there is a dead body there, pretty soon the birds will be coming around it. They will come right to the spot, and here in the verse before, we have two men in the field, and one

taken and the other left, and two of them grinding together, and one of them taken and the other left, and you don't need to worry that you are going to be in Jerusalem when the Lord come. Wherever you are, you will be taken up. You will be raptured wherever you are. Mr Stafford, whose hymn we sang in chapel this morning; He went over to Jerusalem about 1880 so as to be there when the Lord would come. He wrote that hymn there. But the Lord will come to take up up to Himself wherever we are, just as easily from here as from Timbuktu. Wherever the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Well, it is a figure. The eagles snatch up that which appeals to them, and they pass over acres and acres of other country and don't look at it. The body is where they know and go right to it. And wherever the Christian is at the time of the rapture, the Holy Spirit knows and takes him right from that spot. (question) At the crucifixion of Christ, it was dark for several hours. Well, they began to come to pass right then, and have been doing so ever since. (question) Whenever you have an upheaval, then you don't say, well, that means that the Lord is coming. But it means that His coming is just that much nearer. Your redemption is beyond it. Well, I guess our time is about up, unless you have another half hour which you would like to give us, Dr Buswell. ( END OF RECORD E 7 )

(BEGINNING RECORD E 8)

We've gotten back into an earlier period to the period; the question of what precedes the Millennium. We haven't in this class taken up I Thess 4, but in I Thess 4 we have something on which there can be no difference of opinion, but there is presented the account of the resurrection of Christ, -- of the believers in Christ. And it is presented that these believers are all of them raised from the dead and raised up to meet the Lord in the air. And they come together with Him in the air, and so shall they ever be with the Lord. And that is called the rapture. Doesn't matter what you want to call it, but that is the term that has been used for many centuries to describe the ~~snatching~~ snatching up of the believers into the air. It is very clear in Scripture.

That Christ does not come down to this earth to the believers, but that the believers are snatched up to Him in the air. The believers are separated ~~from~~ from unbelievers, from the living and from among the dead, before Christ comes. Any picture of Christ coming to this earth and gathering all the people upon this earth before Him, and then judging each one individually as to whether he is to be saved or not is utterly contrary to the teachings of Scripture. The believers are raised up and are caught up together with the living believers in the air to meet Christ, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. That is the statement that is made in Thess. We have not looked into that at all, but it is something of background. We are beginning to look into the eschatological discourses of the Synoptic gospels, to see what light they throw on situations and conditions previous to the coming of Christ. We are interested in seeing something about what will precede it. And in this, as in the matters about the millennium, we are anxious to distinguish sharply our different gradations of certainty. We are interested to know that which is clearly and definitely taught, and to know where there are points that seem so clear that there can be little doubt about it. And where there are matters on which it is entirely questionable as to what the correct interpretation may be. Now in the gospels we noticed, we have these three different gospels which have these three long eschatological sections, and they seem to stem from two distinct discourses of the Lord. Now if we could be there at the time and hear him, in the desert giving one discourse and hear the entire discourse, hear every word that He said in it, we would doubtless have a great many questions to ask Him, and we would also have a great many questions on which our ideas would be definite after we heard Him. Then if we could have been with Him at Olivet, and have heard him answer those disciples' questions as they were looking at the Temple, and heard the complete discourse which He gave them, we would learn a great ~~deal~~ deal, and we would also have a great deal to ask Him. But there are many things doubtless which would be clearer to us simply from hearing Him giving either one of those discourses which are not clear in the Scripture as it stands. Now the reason for that, of course,

is that the Scripture cannot give everything, and does not choose to give everything. It naturally omits some things. And some things which it omits would clarify our ideas on certain facts which are not particularly important, and which God has not chosen to give us complete light upon. Things which we will never know ~~at all~~ until He comes. But there are other matters' on which perhaps it is p there is sufficient light as it stand to give us light on the answer. But if we actually hold to ~~the source~~ <sup>the discourse</sup> we would be sure of it or we would have it more  $9\frac{1}{4}$ . There are such matters undoubtedly. However we don't have those discourses; we were not there with Him across the Jordan in Perea, and we were not with Him in Olivet. We do not have those discourses; we have three different Gospels. And in each of those gospels, we have an account of His eschatological discourses, Mark and Matthew give us each one utterance; And Lk gives us two utterances, which is, as far as I know, the only source for the Perea discourse. (Buswell) Well, there is quite a little bit of eschatological material scattered in other portions of Mt and Mk, in the parables; and I think that Mt and Mk have about as much outside the Olivet discourse as Lk does. But not as much of a concentration. (MacRae) Lk has it gathered more together. So that, as far as this gathering together is concerned, we have that in Lk, but then we have other isolated sections in Mt and Mk which Dr Buswell estimates would make about as much as the Olivet discourse itself, or as much material as Lk has. (Buswell) As much as the Perea section has. (MacRae) We have not looked at those in the past; perhaps it would be good sometime to bring them all together, and get a survey of all that material. But the point I'm trying to make now is that while it is very useful and valuable for us to reconstruct the discourses, and try to find exactly what He said on each occasion and what the entire discourse is, we can never reconstruct the entire discourse. There are doubtless portions of it that are not given us at all. And there are matters about the order of it on which we can never be absolutely certain. And consequently, that when it comes to our final judgment on things, it is not our reconstruction of the discourse, that is, the Word of God, but it is ~~the~~

the way that the Holy Spirit caused that these things should be preserved in the Gospels. That is to say, matters which He caused to be repeated in the Gospels He evidently considered important, either as in relation to the purpose of the particular gospel or important as to be stressed for the Christian in troublous times. And in the selection from the discourses which He gave in each Gospel, He gives us a harmonious whole which is adapted to prove certain things. Now there are certain things which it does not prove. But each of them as it stands has a definite purpose in the total of that particular gospel. And consequently I think that it is very well that we separate the purpose of each section in the Gospel in which it is, and what we can gather from it in that gospel. And of course, then we will try to see how they fit together; reconstructing as far as we can the whole discourse, and also to see where each of them throws light upon the other. Now I may be wrong in this as a matter of methodology, but it does appeal to me as something which I would like to do. To put that much stress on each one individually and see whether it does or does not add light to our understanding. Now we looked first at the section in Lk 21. We noticed there a selection from the discourse; I think that it would be rather well for us to go over these a number of times, and to get in mind just exactly what we have in each gospel, and what seems to be the purpose of the presentation and what we can with certainty ~~derive~~ derive from each one. Now in chapter 21, he began with looking at the temple, and he mentions that the temple will be soon thrown down, and there will not be one stone left upon another which shall not be thrown down. Now do you think that that means literally that not one single stone, that there won't be one stone left. Do you think so? Dr Buswell?

(Buswell) I am rather inclined to take it that there won't be any significant stone left standing together. 13½ a definite part of a wall that became a shrine; I should think that that should be somewhat contrary to this prediction. (MacRae) Well, are you inclined to think that this is not yet fulfilled? (Buswell) From other reasons, I don't think that this has yet been fulfilled. (MacRae) Now Dr Buswell then feels that verse 6 of chapter 21

of Lk has not yet been fulfilled. Now I am not sufficiently familiar with the other reasons to make a judgment on that. But as far as the verse alone is concerned, my guess would be that it was fulfilled. His other reasons might be sufficient to convince him, but as far as the verse is concerned, I would personally think that if you had that great temple, thrown down in such a condition that comparatively  $14\frac{1}{2}$  had one stone upon another, that you could probably say that there shall not be left one stone upon another. It was  $14\frac{1}{2}$  in which the stones were taken away one from the other and only a very, very few remain today. That is, not one stone upon another could be a description of the totally disrupted condition, whether then that every single solitary individual piece of a stone had been removed from the other, and out of, say, five thousand stones, two hundred arranged in their original fashion, one upon another, forming a neat section of a wall, such that it could be made a shrine for the next two thousand years my own inclination would be to think that that small section merely emphasized ~~the~~ what had happened to it as a whole. (End of RECORD E 8)

(Buswell) Otherwise I would say that Babylon should become heaps, and no one should live there, but it is a fact that people live in  $3/4$ . Still that has been fulfilled and there is no significance to  $3/4$ .

It is <sup>not</sup> a place where they go and remember old Babylon. (MacRae) But suppose they did remember old Babylon? Would that interfere with its being heaps?

(Buswell): The fact that Babylon has become heaps means that no one shall occupy the site. (MacRae) But here it doesn't say that no one shall occupy the site, but that not one stone shall be left upon another. (Buswell) There is a prophecy that no one shall occupy the site of old Babylon. Well, now, there isn't any city there that continues in memory of Babylon, ~~there~~ though the village of  $1\ 1/4$  is on the site. It is not significant with reference to Babylon. Those few stones in the wailing wall are to the Jews very significant to the continuity of their Temple. (MacRae) But are they significant as remembering  $1\ 1/2$  that the temple has been destroyed?

(Buswell) They hope to rebuild it. (MacRae) They hope to rebuild it. But they certainly remind them of the fact that the glory of it has gone by. And the temple is gone. This little bit of wall isn't much of a temple. (question) Well, that is a big problem in itself, and I suggest that we leave that to take up by itself. There could be sanctuaries destroyed at several different times. Here, Christ is looking at a specific temple. Now Daniel may be speaking of the ~~same~~ same temple, and he may not be. But here there is no question but that Christ is talking about Herod's temple, is there?  $2\ 1/2$  He is talking about that particular temple. Now He says about that temple ~~that~~ that it shall be so destroyed that there will not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down. Now in 70 AD perhaps that was ~~fulfilled~~ fulfilled, when practically all of the temple was devastated except these few stones, this one little wall of it which a few centuries later was made into a wailing wall by the Jews to remember their former glory of the temple. On the other hand, it might be that someone would say, Now this wailing wall here constitutes a continuous existence of the temple even tho it is a very small part of it, and that can later be rebuilt and then again destroyed.

Those would be two possible interpretations here. But I don't quite see how a reference to a sanctuary in Daniel, without considerable study of the context in Daniel, could be taken as being clear enough to throw light upon it. (question). That is an extremely complicated section of Daniel. I think that it is very valuable for us to study, but I don't see how we could draw anything from it for this passage, unless we took two or three days to study it first. That language is extremely complicated here in Daniel. Wouldn't you feel that way about, Dr Buswell, or would you think that Daniel is much clearer than I think that it is? (Buswell) Well, of course we could branch off from here and gallop off in all directions. I think that the point in mind is that Christ should 4 them. And this is the only discourse of the Lord which is given at length, of which we have more than one account as a discourse, that is 4 $\frac{1}{4}$  sermon on the mount and Luke's form of the sermon on the mount is clearly in a different context. It is the sermon on the plain. This is the only discourse that can be reconstructed from three different gospels. If in connection with that, the Lord quoted Daniel, then you have to take that into account, even tho Luke didn't record it. (MacRae) But does that mean then that we should 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  and take an attitude on Daniel and try to lay a foundation of interpretation of Daniel on which to relate this or to go ahead with this first and then turn to Daniel and see what 4 3/4 . (Buswell) I think that your plan is very profitable, to take the three gospels separately, and then when we take Mt, we will be obliged to take Daniel up from the point of view of Mt. (MacRae) there are two ways that we could do that. We could take Mt and we could try to see what Mt says and what are the possibilities of Mt, I mean what Daniel says, and we could say Daniel meaning this , meaning this, etc, ; most likely he means this, there is a possibility of this, this we'll say goes in between the other two, here's the situation. <sup>4</sup>Now ~~if~~ you go to the NT to see if it throws light on that of Daniel. Or another thing that we could do; we could take Mt, and say Mt may mean this, here's another side to it, there's another, it seems most likely this one is it, but now since there is a reference to Daniel

let's go to Daniel and see ~~if~~ if Daniel shows conclusively which of these is right in Mt, and while we are looking at Daniel, we may find possibilities in Daniel that imply reexamination of Mt. In either case, you have to take one first, whatever you do. (Buswell) It would be profitable to go straight thru Lk now that we have started on that. (MacRae) Do you see what I mean, Mr Kirkwood? I don't think that there is anything from Daniel which at the present point we can bring in which will prove anything, unless we take time to go into it thoroughly. I don't mean that there is any harm in making a suggestion for it, for consideration, but I think that our consideration should later rather than right now. (question). That is that Daniel and Lk would have to be fulfilled at the same time whichever; 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ . So that on this particular point here, as Mr Kirkwood has pointed out, we may find evidence from Daniel which will be conclusive one way or the other here on verse 6. And we leave that as an important thing to examine, but perhaps we leave it till later and look at Daniel as a whole together. And for the present then, notice that in verse 6 there is the one possibility which at first sight impresses me as most likely, that he was saying to these disciples, Ye see this great ~~wall~~ wonderful temple with all of the goodly stones and gifts that are one it; you see all these grand things here in front of you. But the time is going to come when there won't be anything like that there. It will all be gone; just a heap of ruins; not a stone left upon another, just a few stones standing in one little wall somewhere. That will then be a place where the Jews can then come and learn the fact that all of this great glory and all of these great stones are gone and then the time will come when the United Nations will prevent them coming even to that, and make a no man's land so that the Jews can't even get to the wailing wall. Well, that is one possibility. Now there is another possibility, to say that He looks at this wonderful temple with its beautiful stones and gifts and He says look at these things, There's going to be a time when this is going to be so destroyed that not even one individual one of these stones will be left one upon the other. fNow I don't refer to the time a hundred years from now ~~when~~ in saying that, when

there will be 9/10th of it gone, when the glory will be gone, when the jewels and the gifts will be gone, and all the stones and everything will be torn apart and this except just one little insignificant wall. I don't refer to that time. ...  $8\frac{1}{2}$  that that condition will last for 1800 years; I refer to something beyond that still which will be a rebuilding of it, which will be comparable in glory to the present situation, and I mean that that thing, then, is going to be so thrown down that not a single one of its stones or of those here will then stand. Now as between those two possibilities, there is a possibility of a historical continuity which can make the later one be the right one. I wouldn't for a second deny it. But I would say that as I think of Him standing there looking at that particular temple, and seeing the glory of that temple, and saying that to the disciples, and then as I think of 40 years later that terrific disaster to it which left it just a heap of ruins for many centuries till finally a few Jews ~~of~~ came back and found a few stones standing together and made a wailing wall out of them, then He was speaking of the thing which He immediately saw rather than some distant thing, impresses me as the more likely of the two, altho I think that we should wait and see the other evidence later one. (question)

Now that is an interesting idea; very interesting. He says that the time is coming, the day will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down. Well now, 40 years later, 9/10 of the stones were knocked down, and you might say the thing is finished. Practically everything is gone; there is just this little wailing wall. It remains that way 1800 years, but then the time is come when even those are knocked down, and there is just nothing. And then this which would have been largely fulfilled for 1800 years would be then completely and absolutely fulfilled. I think that that certainly is a very definite possibility. I hadn't thought of it, but I think that it certainly should be taken into account. Well now, He then has expressed <sup>this</sup> thing about the temple, and then Lk tells us that they came to Him and said, Master, when shall these things be, and what sign shall there be that these things will come

5  
 to pass? There are people who take the account<sup>1</sup> in Mt as showing that there were three questions asked, and they divide it up into the answers to each of the three questions, one, two, three. Now maybe that is possible, but if you are going to do that, there is at least the possibility that here in L<sup>K</sup> you should say, what are the questions which Lk gives, and then he gives the answers to those particular questions. That is, if the discourse is a matter of the answers to three questions, one, second one answered, third one answered, ~~what~~ then if one writer only gives two questions, it would be reasonable to say that he is giving the answer to those two questions. Now it is possible that you just have three questions which you take up as a lump and give the discourse in answer to them as a lump without dividing the sections by the questions, and it is ... (Buswell): When we get to reading Mt, it will be apparent that the three questions will be considered by Christ as all one. There is only one question. It has three parts in Mt, but He answered it all as one. (MacRae) Well, this evidence in Lk would look very much in that direction. The fact that Lk only gives two questions, and that you cannot very well divide this material up into this is the answer to one, and this is the answer to the other. It would seem that Christ considered the questions as one. (Buswell) Lk's is really one in substance: when will these things be, and ~~what~~ will be the sign when these things are about to come to pass.

(MacRae) And the question, as Lk gives it, makes no ~~reference~~ reference to the return of Christ; none whatever. As Lk gives the question, it relates only to the discussion of the chapter. (Buswell) The answer has to do with the return of Christ. (MacRae) And so one, in answering a question, is perfectly free, in doing so, to go on and deal with other matters which are suggested to his mind by the question but not included in it, doesn't he?

(Buswell) I think that the way in which Christ answered the question in Lk, just taken alone, and in all three, implies that He understood them to be asking about His return. They understood Him to be referring to an event which was connected with His visible return. 13½ (MacRae) but there

is nothing in <sup>The Intrad of</sup> Lk to suggest that, but when you get on to the answer, it

certainly is very strongly suggested. ~~By~~ (Buswell) By the time you have read this far in Lk you have had a lot of references to ~~Christ~~ catastrophic events connected with His return. Now you see that is quite a number of references to catastrophic events connected with His return. But I think that the person who took up Lk as a book, and read it straight thru, by this time he would get it into his mind that they are talking about His parousia. (McRae) I think that is illuminating. Well now, from here then, the question as 14 here is When shall these things be? And what is the sign when these things shall come to pass? And if you just take the beginning of Lk and 14 $\frac{1}{4}$  it sounds as He means the signs when the temple would be destroyed. But as you go on, you find that He didn't confine Himself to the temple; He talked about the return, and as Dr Buswell says, the background of it in Kk is just that it is in your mind already when you come to this, and so you are justified in taking the these things as being the tremendous things that are in store for the world.

14 3/4 . Well then, they asked him about signs, and what was his answer about signs? His answer begins negatively, that

(END OF RECORD E 9)

The time is at hand; the time is right here. I heard a man say once that he spoke about another man who was going to speak in a Bible conference whom he heard, and he said that this other man's message was right between his message part 3/4 (machine skipped some here). A little later he said the whole basis of interpretation of prophecy breaks down if the Lord does not come back in -- I think it was 1924. It may have been 1920, but anyway it was one or two years before that he said Everything points to that; he said The whole statement breaks down if it does not come at that time. And the whole phase of prophecy breaks down, he said; well, our Lord said here, Many will say, the time draws near; here it is, the time is drawing near. Miller, back in 1838 or 1850 preached that the coming of the Lord was coming in a couple of years. And he told the time it was coming, and thousands of people sold everything they had and got ready and got white robes to meet the Lord at His coming. Who was it that said, In 1881 the end of the world will come? Well, many were sure at 1000 AD; of course they were sure 2 a definite thousand years. Many people were actually ready to meet the Lord then. And then we sang that wonderful song here in chapel, When peace like a river encompasseth my way; the man who wrote that hymn knew that the Lord was coming back within the next four years, and he went over to Jerusalem to meet Him, to be there when He got there. He founded the American Colony there. When his family were to come over to join him, and were all killed, he wrote this wonderful hymn showing his trust in God in the face of the terrible adversity of the billows that overflowed the ship and destroyed the family, peace like a river still encompassed his soul because he he knew that they were in God's hand 2 3/4 . It is a wonderful hymn, and it is a wonderful study, and it shows a wonderful faith in God, but the thing that they were going over for was to meet the Lord when He got there. For nearly the American colony continued, and finally they got tired of waiting and turned it into a commercial organization and it is no longer what it was started to be. But there has been person after person and movement after movement thru the ages which has said the Time is drawing near. They said, what are the signs when these things come to pass? He says, many are going to say to you, The

time draws near. But he says, don't go after them. Because, he says, you will hear of wars and commotions ; don't be terrified. These things must come, but that doesn't mean that the ~~end~~ is at hand. At 1914-18 there were terrific wars; the world had never seen anything quite like it. Why they told us the Lord is coming right after it. But they should have read this verse: there will be wars and commotions, but don't be terrified; they don't show that the Lord is coming right then. <sup>They</sup> ~~He~~ said the same thing about this last war, and they'll say the same thing about the next one. That doesn't prove it. He may come at the middle of a war; He may come at the end of a war; He may come at a time of peace. But He said, don't be terrified; don't think that this is a sign of the end of the world, because wars and commotions are going to occur; and that doesn't mean that the end of the world is here. Nation shall rise against nation; kingdom against kingdom; there will be great earthquakes, signs and pestilences, fearful signs and great sights, but He says, These are not the signs of the return of Christ. There will be many of them, but that does not prove that He is coming. He says Before <sup>these things</sup> ~~leave~~ they will lay their hands on you. What does that mean, Before these things: Does that mean before you have any wars and pestilences? Or just more important than all these? (Buswell) Well, that would mean more important. (MacRae) The thing you're interested in isn't the wars and the tumult and the commotion but ~~it is~~ is to be the affairs of the progress of the gospel in which there will be wars and rumours of wars. (Student question). Well, I'm the one you're looking for. Do you think, Dr Buswell, that that is specifically meaning in this verse a that this will be false messiahs or do you think that a man like Miller coming and telling you that the Lord is coming this year, this is the thing, could be a fulfilment? You see, the 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  is not in the original in Lk here. (Buswell) In Lk, no; it is in Mt. (MacRae) But he does specifically predict false messiahs, but is he not also predicting .... (Buswell interrupts, \*)!#(\*!) ego eimi in Jn is certainly I Am, and identified Him with Jehovah. So it is presumptive in Lk that.... (MacRae) Well, is there anyone who has come except Christ and identified himself, 6 except Father Divine? (Buswell) Yes, there was J. A.

Dowie, he was... (MacRae) He said he was God? (Buswell) He was Christ, There have been false Christs, and 6 . There have been false Messiahs. And modern Judaism of course says that America is our Messiah. There have been false Messiahs. (MacRae) So perhaps, in view of the peril in Mt, perhaps the Christ can well be inserted. I think that what I brought out is definitely in it, that you are not to follow people who say Now is the time. But also there is more to it, that there will be people who will say I am the one. He says, Wars and tumults: there are going to be a lot of those things, but that is not the sign that the Lord is coming. And more important than these He says they will lay their hands on you and persecute you. They will deliver you up to synagogues and prisons, and be dragged before kings and rulers for my names sake, and He doesn't say, Well, don't worry; they won't hurt you. Not as yet. But now of course it will turn to you for a testimony. In other words, the vital thing: they say, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? He says, it is not for you to know times and seasons, ~~but~~ but you shall receive power and be witnesses to me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. In other words, the vital thing for you to think of is the testimony. All these things happen, and it will turn to you for a testimony. It gives you an opportunity to speak for the Lord and to show Him in your life and to show in what you do His truth. He stresses that at the beginning here before he deals with the vital but less important matter of how it comes out for the individual. It will turn to you for a testimony. Settle it therefore in your hearts not to meditate what ye shall say. You mustn't prepare your sermons; you mustn't worry about what you're going to present; don't meditate about these things. (student question). Does he mean that before there will be any wars there are going to come all the persecutions? Or does he mean that more important in your life, before this in your life, is the fact of the treatment of the gospel, in persecutions. (Buswell) Of course, the persecutions actually came before there were any wars, but not before there were any earthquakes. (MacRae) Yes, the earthquakes immediately and as far as any great war was concerned, as far as I recall, the first great war that occurred in Judea was the very one in which the temple was destroyed.

The thing that we have just been talking about. Of course, there were persecutions before that, but there were many of them after it. And there have been very great ones since. There may be some chronological element, but it seems to me that the emphasis is on the importance rather than the chronology.

(question) There is a very similar phraseology in Mt 10, early in the ministry, but is not that relating to the disciples going out during His lifetime rather than the future; that is, it is an interesting similarity of phraseology and of thought, but here it is applied to a different period. (question). Of course, most of the time they had some war other than 10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, but it didn't particularly affect the Jews. Weren't they off in the borders of the empire? But of course, they did have ~~xxxx~~ wars going on, certainly great wars, prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. I am not sure that there is much in the chronological element; perhaps it does bring out the fact that the persecutions started real soon; it's not something that is going to be limited to the time of the return of Christ. And of course, it did start right away, right after His death you have Stephen stoned, you had James killed. And He says Don't prepare your sermons at all; don't meditate on what you are going to say; the Lord will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. But in the light of other Scriptures, we think that this only means when you are delivered before Synagogues and rulers and kings that you are not to be prepared. I'm not even sure that it means that you must't prepare even then. I am inclined to think that verse 14 means Don't be anxious and upset and disturbed and terribly worried ~~when/that~~ that you will be able to make a proper presentation, when you appear before in some terrific crucial situation. Don't get all upset and anxious about that, but know that God will give you special grace for a specially difficult situation. It doesn't seem to me that what it means is don't prepare, but don't settle it in your hearts that you're not to be all on edge, What shall I say, What is the best thing to say, Now how am I going to put this, if I don't put it just right it will be terrible. But that He wants us to prepare for all emergencies and all sorts of things but to settle in our hearts not to be upset about the particular crises that come. If you are ready for the lesser things

you can certainly depend on Him ~~text~~ to give you special grace when the special crises comes. (question) Well, of course, it isn't a matter of the English word but of the Greek word. What does the greek word meditate mean? (Buswell) Promeletan. Mello is to have a care for. Promello, don't be anxious about it before hand. Mello is a little more than meditate. (question) I don't think so; it doesn't seem to me to be quite the idea. What is the word in Lk? (Buswell) Merimnao, to take anxious care. (MacRae) Yes; burdened with anxious care. The ideas are similar, but I wouldn't think that the words would be identical. (Buswell) If you are called before the judge, and you have a set case, why it is more or less artificial; whereas if you are up to preach a sermon, you're expected to have an outline. They tell about a man who was called up before the Japs during the war, and they handed him a hymn book and accused him of sedition, and he said, No, I will sing you some of these songs. So he started singing and he preached the gospel to them. He just took the occasion, and he had a perfectly truthful situation in his heart, and just said the thing that was appropriate. He didn't have a set speech, and if he had had a formal outline they would have tried to ~~pick~~ punch holes in it, and find discrepancies in it. When you are up before a judge, you're asked questions. If your case is clear, you don't have to have a set speech, when you're cross-questioned. You're supposed to answer according to the questions. (MacRae) the central idea seems to me to be the one of not being worried and upset about it. Rather than you're supposed to be sloppy and careless about it. I think that He wants you always to be careful and to make proper preparation as opportunity offers for everything, but not to be too excited about whether you can get enough preparation for particular crises, that when the particular crises comes He will give you special grace. And if you're hauled up suddenly in a situation like this you can't know just what the right thing is to say; you can't tell what will appeal to the prejudices of the judge or the jury; what will accord with the particular situation. And don't be worried to death, Now I mustn't say this, will it be alright if I say this, etc; don't worry a lot about thinking over in advance about what you're going to say under circumstances where

you can't tell what is the right thing to say. You can look to the Holy Spirit to give you special leading in that. And I think that the same principle would apply to a great many crises in life. If we can look to the Lord for special grace in situation after situation, but it doesn't mean that we shouldn't put in, in a sober, reasonable, unworried way, all the preparation that we can, on every certain situation that may arise. (END OF RECORD E 10)

Contrast to the idea that you don't have to think how you're going to give an answer. I was very much impressed by Anthony Zeoli's story, how when he was converted in the penitentiary some woman who didn't have much faith herself felt sorry for this poor fellow in the penitentiary, how that it was rather disgraceful to their family that he was a cousin of hers or something, and it would be nice if the Bible would help him some, and she got him a Bible, and he read the Bible <sup>and</sup> was converted. And then when he was converted, he began to talk to the other prisoners about the Lord, and they all scoffed and ridiculed and gave him answers that just/floored him. So he got in his cell and he took the Bible and he knelt before his bed with the Bible before him and he said, What am I going to say now? When this fellow says this, what answer is there? He would take the thing that the fellow said and he would give an answer and he would start over again and he'd give this statement that he would give to one of the others and then he would say, Well now if I say that he will answer this way, and then he would go ahead and give his answer, and then he ~~would say~~ would say, But now maybe he won't answer that way. And so he worked out better answers than they had. He had all the possible ways of answering his presentation of the gospel, and he could give their side better than they could give it. And as he worked out all of the ways in which they might answer him, then he worked out answers from the Scriptures, and he found verses in it and ways of answering their answers. And he thus worked his way into the Scripture. And the Lord used him far more in his dealing with the inmates, and later on in his evangelistic work than if he had just said, Oh well, when I get into a situation, the Lord will give me the word. The Lord may give you the words in special crises, and he will give special grace, but ~~the Lord~~ for ordinary circumstances He expects us to work and train and prepare and then he will enable us in the special crisis to make proper use of the training we have secured. And so this word of his is a very real and vital word, Settle it not to meditate it before what you are going to answer. Settle it there; don't be all upset; this is a definite thing; we're not worrying about this. We don't have to go over and over and over for fear that we won't get it right. But we put normal ordinary preparation the best we can, in all situations, and as Mr pointed

out various verses, and there are many many more which would throw light upon that. For I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. That doesn't mean that every individual is going to be given such wisdom that none of his adversaries can ever resist. But it is a general principle that God is going to give special wisdom to His followers, and that on the whole, the wisdom of followers of Christ is going to be superior to anything that will be presented in gainsaying. It doesn't mean that every individual is going to be superior in the wisdom. We have, to every individual that meets us, often quite the contrary in individual cases.

(question) (Buswell) Souter gives the translation, ~~Praxx~~ Practice beforehand, (MacRae) <sup>y</sup>es, instead of meditating. (question) Settle it there. Don't be unsettled. (question) Well, study doesn't mean simply Don't put any thought on it. I mean, the word study is a very ambiguous word; It could mean that I'm going to do a little bit of studying, or study to show yourself approved to God; That doesn't mean to do a little study to show yourself approved. It means, Make a  $4\frac{1}{2}$  strong effort, and He wants us to make an effort, to be approved of God. But he doesn't want us to get so excited and tense in trying to make our effort that we feel that it is our evidence that is going to determine the thing, because it isn't. It is His grace that is going to determine the thing, and the way that He is going to use our efforts. Well, then He says Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer For I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist, and ye shall be betrayed both by parents,--by both parents? He doesn't mean that everyone of them is going to be betrayed by his parents. He means that among the Christians there will be some who will be betrayed by their parents, some by the mother, and some by both parents, some by brothers, some by kinsfolk, and some by friends. You cannot apply this to every individual. It is a general statement of Christians as a whole, that they will some of them be betrayed by some of these particular ones he mentioned. What He means is, do not depend on every friend; put ~~by~~ your dependence on Christ. You will find that your earthly friends will disappoint you. When my mother was a young woman, she said that there were two ministers that she knew, and

she loved to hear their wonderful evangelistic sermons, and she said that as long as these two men hold their faith in Christ, I will never waver nor wander away. Well, the young woman, she just thought, My, these two great rocks of Gibraltar in the faith of Christ. Why should anybody fear when there was such a stand for Christ as these two wonderful men made? She met the two men forty years later, and one had turned into a rank modernist who said that the idea of the blood of Christ was slaughter-house theology, and there was nothing to do with anything that was valuable. The other one had gotten into social service entirely, and thought that all that mattered was the improving of living quarters and that sort of thing, and they both of them had completely given up their faith in Christ as far as any external evidence was concerned, and were outstanding modernist leaders. And it was a lesson to her that you cannot put your faith upon a human being. And I know a church not many hundreds of miles from here where there was a minister in the church and he was preaching the gospel and he was having difficulty with the leadership of the church, and there were three very prominent people in the church, wealthy people, people of means, and fine students of the Bible, and they kept coming to him and saying, Why do you put up with this sort of business on the part of those apostate church leaders? Why don't you step out? And break away from them and form a church that will be free from them, and with our support you will be able to establish a real church there. And he didn't do it, and they kept coming to him, and coming to him, and finally the time came when he did, and he stepped out and a lot of fine people followed him, but all three of these stayed back in the old church. All three of those who had urged him to come out. There certainly was a case of being betrayed by your friends. But it is a thing that you will find over and over. I've learned in past years, I've asked people what course they would like to take. Would you like to have me teach such-and-such a course next year? What courses would you be interested in? And I've gotten statement where people have told me, My, we should give such a course. Then I've given the course, and half of the people who were so anxious to have it just hadn't taken it. And that has happened enough times so that by this time I don't pay any more attention to it. But you say, This year I am not

interested, and next year if I offer a course you take it or not; it is up to you entirely. The thing of putting your dependence on somebody's expectation or promise in a little thing like that people change their minds and they have a peffect right to change their minds. But our Lord says that even in big things that matter, in final things, don't put your dependence on human beings, because you will find that the human beings which you think will stand by you are the very ones who in a crisis may turn against you. And the ones who are the great stalwarts for the faith may mellow in their old age and turn and give their support to the adversary. You just can't tell what is going to happen, and even your relatives; you should honour your father and your mother, and do everything you can in support and help of your relatives, but you should put Christ first and if you find their desire and His going in opposite directions, you must follow Him. And so don't be surprised when these things have to come, He says. Don't feel too upset; don't say Oh my, I'm going to lose my faith in everything; how can I stand it? I never thought that this person would turn against me. Well, Christ says, don't worry about it. This thing is going to happen. Put your faith in Him and Him alone, and know that the wiles of Satan are so clever that he would deceive the very elect if that were possible, and he does deceive the very elect, not on the matter of salvation, but on the matter of what they should do in particular situations, and in leading them to throw their influence in point after point in the devil's direction instead of in the direction of the Lord. (question) I feel that when He says, from verse 8 up to verse 9, refers to the whole age between the first and the second coming. Do you think that I am wrong there, Dr Buswell? (Buswell) I think it is right. At the end of verse 9, it is quite illuminating. It is a direct answer to the question, When will these things be, what will be the sign when they come to pass, and He says, the end is not immediately. It showed that He 10½ about the end, but it is not to be immediately, and I feel that the Jerusalem surrounded with armies is just a further part of the negative answer. Jerusalem surrounded with armies is not the sign. (MacRae) He told us here what are not the signs. The terrible persecutions are not the signs of His

coming. Earthquakes and pestilence and famine and destruction and persecution; all these things are what we may expect in the long course of this age; we can expect Satan to be active in many ways. And I don't think that He is merely leading up <sup>to</sup> the destruction of Jerusalem, in 70 AD, but that He is discussing the course of the age. That is, I do not see any particular relevance to any grave section between verses 9-19 to .. forty years after Christ's death that wouldn't apply with equal relevance to the 1900 years since, and since ~~He~~ He isn't speaking of specific events, but of general situations and general attitudes, I don't see any reason why we have a right to restrict it. I think that He is talking to us now just as much as He was talking to the people in that periods. And He continues down here: you will be betrayed by parents, and brethren and kinsfolk and friends, and how ~~this~~ <sup>did</sup> ~~to~~ apply to the Reformation period! I don't know how many of you have read Longfellow's account of 12 the inquisitor of Spain, who turned over his own two daughters to the inquisition, but it is a thing that the Reformation was just filled with. Families divided for the sake of Christ, and one time I was walking down near Elkton somewhere, and somebody came along and I was getting a little tired, I guess, and they said, Would you like a little ride, and I didn't hesitate under the conditions. I got in the car and rode along with them, and we got to speaking a little, and they said they had a relative ~~xxx~~ up in Collingwood NJ, and they said, Isn't it awful how Dr McIntire is coming out of the Presby Ch, USA? I said, What is awful about it? Well, they said, it separated our family. One of the sisters is on the one side, and one is on the other. It just made a clash in our family. He says, the gospels is going to divide people; it is going to make people take a stand, and it is going to cause people to be betrayed by parents, and by brethren, and people, Christ said, are even going to think that they do God service when they put you to death. Are going to sincerely think that they are doing God a service, really think that they are serving Him. He comes to make a division and a 13 $\frac{1}{4}$  inevitably does it. In the end it brings unity, but in the meantime it often brings division. (question) The martyrdom of Servitus by Calvin, does that come under "they think

that they do God service?" Well, Cervitus, who denied the Trinity, I wouldn't call that putting godly people to death. (Buswell) Calvin first asked that he not be put to death, and then when all the cities of Switzerland said that he must die, then Calvin asked that he not be burned. Read the next issue of the BibleToday, on Calvin's Calvinism. That has been reprinted now. Even Schaff does not bring out that Calvin asked that he not be put to death. Schaff fails to bring that out. Schaff brings out that Calvin asked the sentence to be commuted from burning to beheading. But in this rather obscure writing of Calvin, Calvin himself says, I asked that he should not be put to death. (END OF RECORD E 11)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 12)

(MacRae) Yes, I don't think that in any sense he was one of God's people. I do think that the idea that was universal in Europe during that time that enemies of the faith should be killed, I don't think was the right way to handle it, and the opponents of Calvin burned hundreds of people. The only one that we know of that Calvin had anything to do with was the burning of Cervitus. I think that it would have been nice if Calvin could have made a clean break with what was the idea of the times, in this regard, instead of we'll say a 99% break, because there were only the one burned there, and there were hundreds on the other side. But one must say then, that in that particular case of all cases, it was one where it would be very difficult to do that, because Cervitus was not certainly the case of a man who innocently stumbled into something and gets deceived, like the Inquisition did with person after person. Cervitus was a man who constantly wrote articles and books against the trinity and taunting letters to Calvin and to the people of Geneva, attacking them and ridiculing them and doing everything he could to injure their work. And when he finally came to Geneva, I think that it would have been very foolish if they had not locked him up, but I do think that it is not a case which in our present is best treated with capital punishment. In the OT times it was, ~~but~~ and God commanded the stoning of the blasphemer, but I don't think that it is well that we should do that in our age. But I certainly don't think that there is any comparison between Calvin's opposition to the wicked teachings of Cervitus and the

opposition to the Christians by those who think that they do God service in opposing them. Many of them are not sincere, but I think that some of them are. And that of course, if what Christ brings out here. They will think that they do God service, but that doesn't mean that they all  $2\frac{1}{2}$ . (question) I couldn't say. I don't think so. I wouldn't think it would. Do you have any light on that, Dr? (Buswell)  $2\frac{3}{4}$  ...that is, this was the opposite of their Messianic hope. (AAM) I think that the Jews expected that the Messiah would defend Jerusalem; I don't think that they would have expected the destruction. (Buswell) They had a superstition that with four walls the temple falls, in the English, and this extra wall of Titus: they were superstitious about it. (AAM) Well then, He says that you shall be hated of men for My name's sake; and then verse 18: there shall not a hair of your head perish. Now of course, James was taken and killed, and Stephen stoned. What's this mean about not a hair of your head shall perish, Dr Buswell? (JOB)  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the purpose the Lord has for it. That is pretty hard for a bald-headed man. (AAM) There shall not a hair of your head perish. (JOB) There is a cross reference to Lk 12.7, where in the Perea section he said, not eschatologically, the hairs of your heads are numbered. (AAM) Yes, the hairs of your head are all numbered, and not a sparrow falls to the ground without your Father's knowledge. But here he says that Not a hair of your head shall perish. If you are going to take that absolutely literally in the context, it would seem to suggest that not a single Christian is going to die for His faith, wouldn't it? When you say Not a hair of your head shall perish, you don't mean that not a ~~hair~~ hair will be cut off. I mean, it is very clearly a figure for physical injury. But there is physical injury. (question). That is, that it won't ultimately perish; that it will last; that in the end it will be raised up. That is, not that your soul will have hairs, but that there will be a bodily resurrection. There will not be a final destruction of the body. (question). Shall preserve thee unto His heavenly kingdom, that, at the heavenly kingdom, Paul would be there with his body intact. That would be the resurrection. (question). That is, taking it in line with the; according to that interpretation, making a

at the end of verse 16, you might say. They ask him, when is the temple going to be destroyed? And what are the signs. And then He goes on and says there are going to be wars and pestilences and everything, and you're going to be persecuted etc, you will be hated of all men for my names sake, but when the temple is destroyed, not a hair of your head is going to perish. In your patience possess ye your souls, and when ye see Jerusalem encompassed etc. It might be, but I wondered if it isn't sort of a sharp transition, isn't it? There is not much to indicate that it is connected with two verses later rather than three verses before. That is, a truth, but it seems to be a bit hard to draw from this verse. If it was a little further on, that would seem to be more appropriate. It simply is a verse.. If you're going to take everything in the Bible with absolute literalness, there shall not a hair of your head perish is a pretty tough one. It seems to me that if you take it that no Christian is going to perish in the ~~xxx~~ seige of Jerusalem, it isn't quite situated right in the context, tho the general context is that, not the immediate. And so I would be inclined to think that the resurrection viewpoint is perhaps the most helpful. (question). This sounds as if He won't permit it, doesn't it? There shall not a hair of your head perish. (question) But the second verse before says, Some of you shall be put to death, and there shall not a hair of your head perish. There is something to be read into it. Either not will perish except as He permits, or will perish in the end. One of the two is certainly correct. (Question). Then, in your patience possess ye your souls. What does he mean by tht, Dr Buswell? (JOB) I don't know. I would take it just literally. (AAM) Does he mean that you shouldn't feel that the end is near because you see wars and pestilences and persecutions and betrayal and all that, but be faithful, possess your souls, and know that Christ will come in His own time and tht you must be ready for it but you can't tell when it is. Is that it? (JOB) Patience; endurance; standing up under the load. (AAM) It is not just a general exhortation to patience; that wouldn't have any place here. I mean he is talking about something specific; He is talking about the course of the age and the attitude of the people in relation to it.

(JOB) There is a parallel use: he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved, which was repeated also in the sending out of the twelve. He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved was just for the journey of the ~~ix~~ 12. (AAM) But here, surely he is talking about signs; don't feel that it has got to come right away. Be patient; possess your souls; keep your trust in Christ strong; follow him. And then he goes into this matter of Jerusalem. He says, when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Now of course Jerusalem has been compassed with armies many many times in the course of 2000 years. Jerusalem was compassed with armies for several days in 1917. The British army came up from Egypt, at the cost of about 20 British soldiers a mile, in the coming. It was a very difficult hard-fought campaign, to march from Egypt up there into Palestine. But when finally they overcame the Turkish force, that was resisting the entrance to Palestine, then they came up around Jerusalem there; the great battle was down near the sea, and now the armies were up around Jerusalem, and the people were in Jerusalem there, and the American consul in Jerusalem, who happened to be a Swede who lived in the American colony want out with (no, he was mayor of Jerusalem; he may hve been counsul also) and he went out with a flag of truce. Jerusalem was surrounded with armies, and here were these British armies all around, and the people of Jerusalem were shut in there and it was hard to get anything to eat ~~but~~ or to get in or out and they didn't know what was going to happen, whether the armies were going to rush across the country, or whether the place would be devastated, or what. Besides, Jerusalem was compassed by armies. And this man went out with a flag of truce to try to surrender the city, ~~but~~ so they wouldn't be attacked and destroyed. There wa no one in there who wanted to fight, and he went out and the Turkish soldiers were gone, and nobody else was interested, and tremendous armies around, and he went out with his flag of truce and he found a British private, and he said, I would like to surrender the city, and the private said, How can you surrender it to me? Well, he said, I want to surrender the city. He said, well, ~~but~~ I'll go look and see if I can find a corporal, and he found a corporal, and he had the same story, and he went and saw the sergeant, and they carried it on

till eventually it took three days before they got up to a British general who was competent to receive the surrender of the city, and all the time the people in there were wondering what was going to happen to them, whether they were going to get anything to eat, whether they were going to be destroyed, or what. And when finally they got a British general and he took the surrender, stopped the fighting, and they stopped and General Allenby marched up into Jerusalem and took over the city, and they established government in there. Well, they saw Jerusalem encompassed by armies, but there was no destruction. There was absolutely no destruction of the city; it was a sign that the war was over. Not a sign that desolation was ahead; not a sign that those in Judea should flee to the mountains. They would have been very silly to flee to the mountains. In other words, this is not a general principle like what we had before. We have had general principles all the way up to this, dealing to time after time during those 40 years and time after time since those 40 years/. But now we refer to a specific situation, and a specific situation is finished and done/ If I say, Anytime you see the B and O train come in here with a red flag on the front engine you'd better call the fire dept, ~~but~~ why that means that whenever you see it you call the fire<sup>e</sup> dept. But I say, Now tomorrow please watch and if you see a red flag on the front of the B and O train, that means that the Russian counsel is aboard, and so get out of the way, why that wouldn't mean that if you saw a red flag three weeks or more that the Russians were aboard. It would be referring to one specific thing, and that is the place where people get into great difficulty with the thing which is called double fulfillment of prophecy. If a prediction is given of an event, the prediction refers to the event, and when the event occurs the prediction is fulfilled. You can't refer it to anything else. The prediction is fulfilled. There cannot be such a thing as a double fulfillment of a single prediction. But if a general statement is given, that can be fulfilled a hundred times. You have the condition involved in it satisfied. Whenever you have this situation, this results. The Bible is full of general statements and is full of specific predictions. You want to distinguish between them, and never think that a specific prediction will have a double fulfillment. <sup>it</sup> a specific prediction could be a prediction

that something would happen twice. You could say that two men are going to come into the city tomorrow in 1915 Fords, and when you see one come in, you say that the prediction is not yet fulfilled; another is coming. But if you would say that tomorrow a special train is coming down from Phila carrying the mayor of Phila, when you saw the special train coming you would say, There is the train. You wouldn't look for another train; you wouldn't look for the second train. Well now in this case we leave this general 14 3/4 and we turn to specific predictions. When you see Jerusalem compassed with armies, and in this case he means the first time you see it, because there were many times since, and ordinarily they haven't meant ~~anything~~ anything. The same thing that happened under Allenby happened about 650. What is the date of the Hegira? Is it 621? I always remember 21, but I get a bit puzzled with the century. I think that it is 621. Well, (END OF RECORD E 12)

The Moslem armies came marching towards Jerusalem, and those tremendous armies' encompassed Jerusalem, and they encompassed Jerusalem, and the people of Jerusalem surrendered. The Moslems marched in the city and there was no destruction whatsoever. To them, Jerusalem was a holy city, and they took it over. The great Caliph, the head of the Mohammedans, entered the city to take it over, and he being not a very high character he refused to let the negro slave walk all the time while he rode, so they agreed that he would ride for two miles and the negro slave would walk, and then he would walk and the slave ride. And it so happened that when they got a half a mile from Jerusalem it was time for him to get off and the negro to get on, so the slave got on and he got off and when they got to Jerusalem for the surrender that was the way that they were. He wouldn't change his procedure  $1\frac{1}{2}$  entered the city, so all the people hailed the slave and nobody paid any attention to the Caliph who was walking along behind. And ~~there~~ there was no destruction of Jerusalem. It was a very peaceful taking over by ... anyway it was a very peaceful taking over about 650 AD, and there have been destructions of Jerusalem, a number of them, but there have been a good many times when it has been surrounded with armies and peacefully taken over. So here when he says, When you see Jerusalem compassed with armies, he means the first time you see it. You look for it, and when that happens, this prediction is fulfilled. When you see armies all around Jerusalem, well there have been armies before around Jerusalem, many times. Sometimes Jerusalem has been destroyed, but in the great bulk of times it hasn't been. In Isaiah's day, the armies were around Jerusalem, and Isaiah said, they will not touch Jerusalem. King Sennacherib will depart the way he came, and the Lord smote the army of Sennacherib with a tremendous pestilence and they marched back the way that they came. Jerusalem has long been surrounded with armies, without any harm, but ~~there~~ the next time you see it, when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then you are to know that it's desolation is near. And that doesn't continue then; that is finished in AD 70, or whenever the first surrounding was. It has happened, it is finished, it is done for. It has nothing to do with the future relevance. That doesn't refer to anything in the last days, does it, Dr Buswell? (JOB) It is part of His/

negative answer. (AAM) It relates to that; it happened then; he tells us something about it, and that is that. And so you see ~~the~~ Jerusalem surrounded with armies, and you know that the desolation is near, and when the Christians saw it, those of them that were in Judea fled to the mountains, and those who were in the middle of Jerusalem went out of Jerusalem, and those in the country ~~went~~ outside did not come into Jerusalem, but they went off at a distance and

3½ thousands and thousands of Jews were killed in that terrific slaughter; no Christians were involved in it because they had been warned of Christ to avoid it in this case. (question) You mean, anywhere else in Scripture besides this particular passage? Previous to the time of Christ, any predictions to the destruction of Jerusalem. If the interpretation which Mr Kirkwood just suggested of Daniel is the correct one, then Daniel predicts it. He says, For these are the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled. That doesn't leave anything to be written to be fulfilled' later, does it, Dr Buswell? (JOB) These are days of vengeance. (AAM) But still these are days of vengeance that all things which were written may be fulfilled. What have you got that is supposed to happen after that, Dr Buswell? (JOB) Well these are days of vengeance, so that everything written should be fulfilled. Doesn't say that these are the only days of vengeance. I think that there is indication that when the Messiah is cut off there will be a scattering of people; Amos says, I will scatter them, but not one grain shall fall to the ground. There are 5¼ of the scattering of Israel after their return from Babylon, and another scattering. The days will come when they will no longer say The Lord liveth who brought us up out of Egypt, and out of the north country, and all places whithersoever I have scattered them. (AAM) So that there seems to be predictions in the OT which would relate to the destruction of Jerusalem and these are the days of vengeance when all the things written about that period of vengeance are to be fulfilled. That is implied. Not all these things written, because the second coming isn't fulfilled then, and many things yet to come are not fulfilled. But when all the many things that God has in store for that time will occur. (question) Well, that is a very complicated matter, as I say; it is very difficult. I would rather leave it. I

mean, I'd like to call attention to any possible relation, but I'd rather not say definitely what there is. Well, as Dr Buswell spoke of references to the scattering of the people, later on after the return from Babylon... (JOB) Ezekiel 37 has reference to the people being in a scattered and pitiable condition, ~~from~~ and then restored to be led by their Messiah, as a king. (question) (AAM) But I still see a definite problem in what Mr Jones has presented, that is, we haven't gathered much which seems to specifically to refer to this, yet here is a rather definite verse, These are days of vengeance when all things which I have predicted should be fulfilled. How many things have been fulfilled? have been written about these days? It suggests that there is quite a little written. (question). 8 that which is fulfilled. Very good suggestion. (question) Well, Zechariah is not one of the easiest books. (JOB) This little phrase, To fulfill everything which is written, doesn't mean to fulfill every single prophecy that has ever been written about anything... (AAM) but it suggests that there is quite a bit involved, not just a couple of... (JOB) Well, the warnings in Lev, If you don't obey the law you'll be punished, you'll be scattered, and the prayer of Solomon in the temple, when thy people cry unto Thee, etc, and the repeated spiritual fact that when they were unfaithful they were scattered. There is a lot of that kind, but that is in line with their scattering now. (AAM) Well, it is an interesting verse, and I am not sure that we have entirely dealt with it yet, but I think that we have gotten some interesting aspects. And then he continues, but ~~where~~ woe to them that are with child, to them who give suck in those days. For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon the people. I suppose you could say, Woe to those who are with child in any days of tribulation or upheaval, wouldn't you? That is a rather general statement. (JOB) Josephus describes the dreadful conditions of the children in that time. 9½ .(AAM) A letter just come from one of our alumni who is in China, and the communists gave them considerable freedom, ~~but~~ after the liberation, and they have written some rather nice letters about the accomplishments that they have been allowed to do, altho they haven't been able to travel. They have to stay in their towns. Now I haven't seen this letter; I think that my wife saw it in the last day or

so but now they tell in the letter how all of a sudden the communists came in and took over most of their houses and just took everything over and then all their property, and they had to leave, to move away and take practically nothing with them. They have two children, one just a year old, and the child had chicken pox and whooping cough. It is bad enough to have to move, and flee under those conditions, but with a child of that age it is very difficult. Children tremendously complicate the misery of such times. This statement here, as far as I know, doesn't have any particular reference to a particular feature of those days which is particularly related to children, but simply to the general difficulties to the time of tribulation. Wouldn't you think so, Dr Buswell? There is no specific reference that I can think of, and yet we do have this same thing taught in Mt. And in Mk. In a place which you would attribute to another period, the same thing is said, and it seems to be in both of these a more or less general statement, but there is some particular aspect of it. (JOB) I would think that there is a lesson here, that Christians were warned in the Scriptures that they ~~should~~ should get out, and that they shouldn't bring their children around, into Jerusalem. The man who had his family on the way to Jerusalem to watch for the Lord's return just hadn't read his Bible. Keep children out of Jerusalem, while the eschatological complex is on, according to Mt and Mk. And evidently the Christians did that very thing in the time of 70 AD. And then verse 24, there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people, and there shall fall by the edge of the sword. Now 12 there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. We haven't had that phrase 'this people' before 12 have we? He means the Jewish people, doesn't He, or does he mean the people of Jerusalem? Well, they are related. Is it a racial or geographical... (JOB) The people of this land. He was on the Mt of Olives looking at Jerusalem. (AAM) So this people is the people of this area. (question) Yes, and they were looking right at Jerusalem then. This people would be the people of this area. It could imply Gentiles. Yes, I would think it would be. (question) And Zechariah is written, of course, after the return from exile. So it doesn't refer to Nebuchadnezzar's destruction, but the critics say that such

a thing as this couldn't have been written afterwards because it had already happened, so they say that the last half of Zechariah was written before the exile. with most books they try to make portions of them late, but in this case they take the last half and make it earlier; before the things happened predicted in Zechariah. If it was late, as we believe it is, then it is after the return, then it must refer to something still future which would seem to refer to this. Very good. (question) Yes, but it wouldn't necessarily be a chronological order. Then there is death in the land, and wrath upon the people of the land, and they will fall by the edge of the sword and be led captive away into all nations. Thus far, events are to occur; specific events, specific predictions of sudden events from verse 20 on, and the attitude of the Christian 15 but to flee from it; it is something that is hopeless; nothing can be done. If the Romans could be driven away from Jerusalem and the lives of the Jews spared and Jerusalem kept from being destroyed by the Christians joining with the Jews and fighting, they certainly would do it. They would be ~~traitors~~ traitors to their own people, they would be wicked, they would be wrong, to run off, that is to accept no hope in the situation, it is predicted as definite, as going to happen, we should get in line with the ways of the future and should flee away from there and have no part in it. And here of course (END OF RECORD E 13)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD e 14)

The Lord specifically said it was going to happen, and He said that the thing that He wanted the Christian to do was to flee from it, not to join in in trying to defend it. He finished the specific prediction, They will be led away captive. That doesn't say that there is going to be Jews taken captive in the middle ages, or taken captive in the <sup>PRESENT ERA</sup>  $\frac{1}{2}$ , or taken captive at the end of this age; it is a specific prediction of the time of the destruction of Jerusalem which occurred in 70 AD. Wouldn't you say that, Dr Buswell? It is a specific prediction, specifically and literally fulfilled. They will be led away captive unto all nations, but then comes the last half of this, which is not a prediction of an event, but the prediction of a continuing situation. It is a different type of prediction. Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles. Well, the Gentiles walked across Jerusalem after Titus conquered it. It has been trodden down, but is it over? No. It is a continuous situation. Gentiles trod upon Jerusalem then, and then <sup>BAR KOKHBA</sup>  $1\frac{1}{2}$  in 134 and had his rebellion, and Hadrian's soldiers overcame them and killed all his men, and Jerusalem was trodden down of the Gentiles and the order was given that no Jews could come within ten miles of the city. And then 150 years later Constantine established it as a Christian city, and 50 yrs after that Julian the apostate tried to make it a Jewish city, and gave the Jews permission and helped to make it a Jewish city, but fire came out of heaven and drove away the people who were trying to rebuild the temple and the efforts were given up and it continued to be trodden down of the Gentiles. And three years ago it looked as if the Jewish armies were going to just go straight across the all of Canaan, and they were going to take all of Jerusalem, and they would have the whole thing in their hands, and they would do whatever they wanted with the holy places, and with the situation at Jerusalem, and many of them say England and America caused that we should be stopped. I saw a booklet lately put out by the Jews that said that they would have conquered the whole seven Arab nations, they would have overcome the power of the whole senate of the Arab nations, ~~but/what~~ and won a complete victory if the United Nations hadn't stepped in and stopped them from their job, and of course the result of

it is that Jerusalem, old Jerusalem with the holy places and the temple are still in Arab hands. Of course, the Arabs there said that the Arab legion would have conquered all Israel and driven the Jews into the sea if the British hadn't stopped giving them ammunition and prevented it, and it was all the British fault that there were any Jews left there. So both of them hate the British now; each of them blames their woes on the British. Whatever it is due to, the fact is that Jerusalem is more trodden down of the Gentiles today than it was ten years ago. The Jews for many centuries have been able to come to the wailing wall, and now they can't even come within a block of the wailing wall. You can go over there and pull out the Jewish prayers that have been left there, and walk out with them, and no Jew can even come near the place. It is very definitely trodden down of the Gentiles right now. Now, somebody may say Well, some night maybe the Jews will march over there and seize the place; maybe they will. But this doesn't say that they will never get it; it says that it will be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And when will they be fulfilled, you might say? Are they fulfilled a hundred years before Christ returns? are they fulfilled fifty years before? Seven years before? On the day when He returns? When will they be fulfilled? As far as I know, we are not told in the Scripture. At least we are told that there is a long period of the times of the Gentiles in which Jerusalem is trodden down of the Gentiles and that is exactly what we have had and still have. And no force up to this time has been able to bring an end to it. And so this is a prediction which was given by the Lord and the situation, a continuing situation; thus you might say there is double fulfillment; there is a hundred fulfillments. There is fulfillment anytime as long as the situation lasts. It is a situation that extends over a period of nearly two thousand years. (question). Fulfilled here I think means ended. Until the period that can be called the times of the Gentiles comes to an end. (JOB) Yes, and it seems similar to Romans eleven, where when the fullness of the Gentiles comes then all Israel will be saved. (AAM) When the fullness comes; but here we have the times of the Gentiles, and then we have over in some of the epistles, The dispensation of the fullness of times. (question)

I am a little skeptical of the relation Dr Buswell just spoke of in Romans 11. That is, I am inclined to think that there is a temporal similarity, that the fulness of the Gentiles comes, and then all Israel is saved, if about the time perhaps when the times of the Gentiles comes to an end. So there is an approximation, but as to the actual meaning of the two phrases, they are quite different. That is, that the fulness of the Gentiles is referring to the completion of the making up of the body of Christ insofar as the Gentile component is concerned. I wouldn't  $6\frac{1}{2}$  means. The times of the Gentiles means the times of the Gentile domination over Jerusalem. (question)

Yes, it means non-Jew. It is an ethnic rather than a religious term. (ques)

Well, you might have a real problem there if you had a large group of Jewish Christians who became Christians and took over Jerusalem. On the other hand, I don't think that you have a problem. (JOB) WH has a variant reading here. Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles until they are fulfilled and then they will be times of the Gentiles. That is the way WH reads. But Nestle reads, Textus Receptus, until times of Gentiles. (AAM) But whether we are justified in taking times of the Gentiles here as a technical term for a particular era in God's economy, or whether it is merely a general term here, and says Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles until the end of the time in which it is to be trodden down of the Gentiles, and then the times of the Gentiles is just a period in which it is trodden down. I am inclined to think that at least an argument can be made for that. (JOB) Well, fulfilling, pleromasi, and Luke is Paul's travelling companion, and when Paul says Fulness of the Gentiles, Pperoma ton ethon, it fits the similarity. Fill up the times of the Gentiles, and the fulness of the Gentiles. (AAM) In one case He is talking about the Christian testimony, and in the other case He is talking about the political control. (JOB) In both cases, he is talking about future events, and the time when the Jews will be restored, the branches will be grafted in again. Jerusalem will be trodden down till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; the branches will be cut off until the fulness of the Gentiles, and then Israel as a whole will be saved. (AAM) I think that I

ready at this point to go on far enough to say that possibly in God's sight the two are identical. But the question whether the evidence is sufficient to lead us to feel any certainty about it; that is to say, I would not see that it would be at all impossible that Christ would say, This city is going to be trodden down until the Gentile, -- the treading down of the Gentiles is at an end. There is a period to be fulfilled in which Gentiles tread it down. A long period; it is a big thing. There might be another thousand years when the Jews had Jerusalem, before 9 3/4 . I don't see that that would be impossible. In that case, the fulness of the Gentiles would go on a thousand years after the times when the Gentiles were treading down Jerusalem. Now it is altogether possible that the two represent one unified account, complex, and come to an end at the same time, but that we have sufficient Scriptural evidence to be sure that, then I would question ~~it~~ it very seriously. (ques) It says that Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. It seems to me that that means till the times that the Jews are treading down Jerusalem are fulfilled. (JOB) In this parallel, Paul says blindness in part has happened to Israel, till the fulness of the Gentiles comes. (AAM) Yes, but the treading of Jerusalem hadn't yet started. (JOB) the blindness that happened to Israel --- (AAM) Yes, but they still had Jerusalem. (JOB) The grafting in of the cut off branches and the time when Jerusalem will not be trodden of the Gentiles, and then the 11th chapter of Revelation is a picture of the temple and the worshippers and the altar being free, but the outer court and the city trodden down of the Gentiles for 42 months. That seems to be a reflexion of the words of Christ, Trodden down of the Gentiles. (AAM) Well now, we have 11 of the Gentiles; we have this period along here when Paul is turning to the Gentiles, at the time when the Jewish branches were being broken off. Does that come right at the crucifixion of Christ? five, or ten, or twenty years after? It isn't long. It is fairly soon after when the branches are broken off and new branches are grafted in. So then starts the time of the fulness of the Gentiles, when the Gentile membership is being filled up. Well now, just when that time will finish we do not know. When the fulness of the Gentiles comes

means when the last Gentile has been converted that is going to be converted. After this, here is the place where Jerusalem begins to be trodden down. They start differently. They are in the same century, but the start is different. Now Jerusalem is trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. Now that can be until the times when the gentiles are treading down Jerusalem, is fulfilled. There is going to be the 12 of the treading down of Jerusalem. Well now, under those circumstances, it might conceivably be that  $12\frac{1}{4}$  the times Jerusalem is trodden down; that is fulfilled, Here the fulness of the Gentiles come in and that is fulfilled. They start at different time, and they might end at different times. Now it is also possible that there is one thing in the Lord's plan which you might say is the times of or the fulness of the Gentiles, a thing which begins here and here at two different points but which continues on and then comes to an end; and it is more or less a unified idea, and the heathen nations are treading down Jerusalem and Christians are being converted from Gentiles, and this goes on and then the heathen nations are driven out of Jerusalem and Israel is saved, - a nation is saved in a day, and the 13 . But having 13 the two of them, which of them is the actual ~~situ~~ situation? I question whether the evidence enables us to decide. That is, either of the possibilities, and I just don't know which it is. (JOB) Don't you think that the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD is all a part of the one transition period in which God 14 His theme from the Jewish form of worship to a Gentile form. It is all one transition. Blindness came, and the Jews more and more turned away, tho many were saved in Paul's time in Rome. (AAM) And so I incline to have a certain emotional leaning towards this interpretation, that from the viewpoint of 14 I find myself impossible to rule out the possibilities (record very foggy here). (JOB) There are other Scriptures. The 11th chapter of Revelation, Jerusalem trodden down of the Gentiles  $14\frac{1}{2}$  and then the mystery of God will be finished at the 7th trumpet. Paul has a definite usage of the mystery of God. (END OF RECORD E 14)

It seems to me that if you look at the end of this passage, and note particularly the statements which you have in Mark and in Mt, He says, Whether the master returns in the evening, or in the midnight, or in the morning, or in the late morning, be ready for ye know not the day nor the hour when He comes! And so that it is imminent in the sense not that it is going to happen right now, but in the sense that we have no right to say that it can't happen right now. That as far as we know, it may come in God's sight; it is absolutely definite, He knows the day, and the hour, and the instant, but as far as we're concerned, Peter says, speakest thou these things to us only, or to all? The Lord said to him, Watch, for you don't know when He comes. He wants you to be like people who expect their master any time. (question) Yes, but supposing that the Lord takes---that suddenly a shout comes, and the dead in Christ rise first, and we which are alive are taken up with them, into the air to meet the Lord in the heavens, and then that we have the marriage feast of the Lamb with Christ, which might take five years, or seven years, or a hundred years, whatever it takes, and then we come down to the earth with Christ; Why you could tell that He wouldn't come to the earth until certain specific events had taken place which you could name. But you couldn't say that His coming for His own couldn't happen until specific events occurred, because that might precede all events. (question) According to that interpretation, the fulness of the Gentiles would be at the rapture, and the times of the Gentiles would be at the conquest of Jerusalem from the Gentiles by the Jews which might take place before the rapture, at the rapture, a year after the rapture, or ten years after the rapture. We just don't know the exact relation, altho as Dr Buswell has pointed out, ~~these~~ they are parts of one general group. But as there was a difference of thirty or forty years in the start of the two phases the could very easily be quite a difference between the end of the two phases/ And you would find nothing objectionable there, would you, Dr Buswell? (JOB) Well, you'd have to bring in other Scriptures... (AAM) From what we have had so far in Lk, we wouldn't tell when the times of the Gentiles ends. As far as what is said in LKk here is concerned, Jerusalem might have been ~~the~~

reconquered by the Jews in 1000 AD and held by them. You'd have a long period ~~of~~ of the times of the Gentiles, sufficient to fulfill this, I would think, even if we had a thousand years with the Jews in Jerusalem before the return of Christ. I heard a very very fine preacher, a man whom I think/very highly of, and who is, in general, accurate in what he says, say over the radio, that the times of the Gentiles began when the Gentiles assumed control' of the world, and before that the Jews ruled the world. And I think that he began the times of the Gentiles ~~when~~ Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem, and ~~the~~ and then the Gentiles began to control the world, and the Gentiles will reign till the coming of Christ, but before that the Jews ruled the world. Well, I don't know when the Jews ever ruled the world. (JOB) Well, it is commonly said that the times of the Gentiles began when the Gentiles began to rule in Palestine. (AAM) That is, the times of the Gentiles ~~forme~~ would not be the times when the Gentiles ruled the world, for they have always ruled the world. But the times when the Gentiles ~~thead down~~ Jerusalem... (JOB) 8 You usually have the times of the Gentiles beginning with the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. And then continuing on until the rapture. (AAM) But that the close of it is connected with the rapture is an inference which you would have to have Scripture proof of. It might conceivably be a few years before or after the rapture, ... (JOB) It isn't proved by this passage in Lk, anyway. (AAM) What would you suggest, Dr Buswell? (JOB) Well, then, let's finish the Lk passage. 9 And bring a harmony if possible.

(AAM) We were noticing in Lk 21 last time. We were speaking at that time about the one stone not being upon another, and whether that meant literally every ~~single~~ single stone, or whether it described an overwhelming 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ . And Mr Pote calls attention to Lk 19.42ff, the Lord said, He wept over the city and He spoke to the city, that is nobody heard him except the disciples probably. It was a figurative manner of speech, but it was an expression of His feelings. He beheld the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, even in this thy day the things which ~~the~~ belong unto thy peace but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee that

thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee and compass thee around and keep thee in on every side and shall lay thee even with the ground and thy children within thee. And they shall not leave indeed one stone upon another because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. And Mr Pote was asking in view of this phrase at the end, Because thou knewest not the time of thine visitation, or perhaps at the beginning, If thou hadst known, even thou, even in this thy day, the things that belong to thy people; that in view of those the prediction here made he that would relate to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70p. And if this relates to AD 70, then he predicts that in AD 70 they will not leave one stone upon another; and if that is the case, it would seem that not leaving one stone upon another would not have to be taken in the absolute sense of every single stone. It means that there is such an overwhelming overflow that even if a few stones are left, which could make a shrine a few centuries later for people to weep over what had happened to their country, that still you could say that that was sufficiently fulfilled. (question).

Now maybe I am wrong in this, but I would take that as saying that Christ said to the city, Now if you, Jerusalem, in this your day, had known what would make for peace for you; in other words, to accept your Messiah, to receive the peace which the Lord gives thru the Lord Jesus Christ, and this opportunity when you had it right in front of you; if you had recognized this thing which was needful and necessary and desirable for your peace, and that would relate also to the end of 44 where He says, Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation, you didn't recognize that now was the time when God was working His cause here in the ~~xxx~~ person of the Second Person of the Trinity. That is, I ... Dr Buswell, does that seem to you incorrect, (JOB) I think that the phrase stone upon stone isn't enough to base the conclusion on, whether the reference is to 70 AD or to the future. There are other Scriptures that...

(AAM) But you think that this particular (mixed voices...) 13 $\frac{1}{4}$

(AAM) So that as far as that is concerned, we wouldn't know whether it was AD 70 or not, but you would think this inference in Lk 19 he is speaking about AD 70, wouldn't you? (JOB) Well, I am not sure that it isn't a reference to a still future destruction, in Lk 19. Now Titus circled the city, encompassed it

with armies, 14 $\frac{1}{4}$  predicts an encompassment of the city that doesn't seem to correspond with anything that happened yet. (too indistinct around 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) So that there may be here a reference to the destruction to come, as in Zechariah 14. (AAM) You say, Zechariah says he delivered the people? (JOB) He will come, and He will deliver his people. (AAM) But would there still be time in that that leaves time for a destruction that leaves not stone upon stone at that time? (JOB) I don't think so. (AAM) But you wouldn't deduce that from Zechariah. (JOB) Well, from Zechariah and other Scriptures that go together; That is to say, there are a number of passages 15 just preceding the second advent of the Messiah 15 to stand on the Mt of Olives. (AAM) That is a matter that I have not looked into very much. (END OF RECORD e 15)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD e 16)

Previous impression I have, but the impression has not been based on any careful study. But the impression I've had was that it was felt by most students of prophecy that the Scripture presented the time of a terrific attack upon Palestine, in which the Jews might perhaps be jammed into Jerusalem. But my impression has always been that the Lord would come back and deliver them before the city was actually measured by the enemy. (JOB) Read Zech 14, right straight down thru; the houses will be destroyed, and the terrible devastation of the people and of the city, which makes it clear also that the Gog and Magog attack is something different. (AAM) You mean Gog and Magog do not take the city. (JOB) No, they don't touch it. (AAM) You mean that Zech 14 then shows that in the time of the return of Christ at the end of this age, Jerusalem is destroyed by an enemy. (JOB) Yes (AAM) That is an entirely new idea to me. Very interesting. (JOB) There is quite a lot of Scriptures that focus on that. (AAM) Now do you think that it would be most worthwhile to look at some of those now. I am utterly unfamiliar with it. I mean, I had always assumed that in Lk and Mt when it says that Jerusalem will be torn down, not one stone left upon another, it was a wonderful prediction of the conquest of Jerusalem in AD 70. And all of it is something else, or parts of it are some-

thing else, I mean I am not in a position to judge it till I look into such evidence. Now would you rather do that now, or at some later time? I have something else in mind for today, but... (JOB) We are not thru with the section in Lk 21. (AAM) Well, shall we look back at Lk 21, then.

We have looked then ~~by~~ briefly at this in Lk 19, which Mr Pote called to my attention, and in which as I glanced at it, it immediately impressed me the way he had stated that the beginning of it said, If they had treated Christ differently, there wouldn't be the destruction in AD 70. And that the end said the same thing, and that in between there was therefore a description of AD 70/. Now maybe that is reading into it, but that is the impression that I got from looking at it. Now it may be that this can be so interpreted so as to refer to a different later event, ~~xxxxxxx~~ this would seem to me that Lk 19.42-44 should refer to one thing or the other, but it doesn't seem to me that it refers to two different destructions; it would be one or the other. And up to the present, what Dr Buswell just said is all I have known about any other destruction. Therefore my inclination at present would be to refer this to 70 AD, but of course that is other evidence to look into. So that I think that as far as I am concerned, I would say that Lk 19 impresses me now as a description of 70 AD, but in view of what he said, I would hold in abeyance the possibility that it is not looking at 70 AD at all, but that it is looking at something else that has not yet occurred. Well then, we could look back at Lk 21. (JOB) In Lk 21.20 there could hardly be any doubt about 70 AD, He doesn't merely say that there is going to come a time when you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, and it is a Hotan, when, when the time comes, if you see this particular event. Well, that conspicuously took place in 70 AD, and that was when it took place. (AAM) So 21.20 then, Buswell thinks, is definitely 70 AD. (JOB) I think that it could mean nothing else but 70 AD, and the period following. (AAM) And then, what were the remaining things questionable, or were there more verses we haven't looked at? (JOB) We only read, I think, thru 24, didn't we? (AAM) Thru 24. Yes. Well then, at verse 25, how does it begin? What does And there shall be mean? (JOB) It is kai.

(AAM) It is just and, it is just kai. That is to say, I could say Julius Caesar could conquer Britain, and England will install a labour government. I could say that, and the and doesn't show whether it was immediate, or a century later, or ten, or a billion years later. Between 24 and 25, in fact you could not tell here from 25 whether it is simultaneous with 24; there is nothing in verse 25 to indicate whether as the people fall by the edge of the ~~swire~~ sword and are led away captive there are at that time the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, or whether they fall and are led ~~away~~ captive and right afterwards there are 'signs in the ~~sn~~, moon,, and stars; or whether they are led away captive and for a long period after that there are continuously signs in the sun, moon, and stars, kor whether they are led away captive and then that isn't the end for Jerusalem, but something else happens a million years later, and there ~~will~~ come signs in the sun, moon, and the stars. That is, there is absolutely as far as I can see, no indication in 25 of its chronological relationship to 24, whether it is simultaneous, immediately after, continuously after, or some time after. It would seem very reasonable to say that 20-24, at least 20 to the first half of 24, expressed one period that is comparatively brief. But as to whether 25 is identical or different, I see nothing to indicate. (question). Well, now, I was suggesting that we take Lk, that is, I suggested last time that it seemed to me tho this all may be, and in fact almost certainly are, sections taken from one long discourse, yet that the Spirit had a purpose in giving it to us in this form. And therefore I was suggesting that we take up Lk by itself and study it first, and then we take Mk by itself and study it, casting on it such light as we can from our study in Lk, and then we take Mt and examine it, and cast ~~on~~ it such light as we might from the other two. When you are in the middle of Lk here, if you jump over to Mt, you unnecessarily complicate the thing, unless you have first taken time to look at Mt as a whole. So I would suggest that any/question relating to Mt be left till we get to Mt, and I would suggest this: that when we look at Lk we say, Now Lk , as it stands, this is evident. Now if you find something which you say somethig in Mt proves that it is different; then be sure to ~~exist~~

hoist the question, but raise it this way: Say, it seems to me that there is evidence in Mt which would suggest a different interpretation. Here is the other interpretation, let's put it on the shelf and hold it till we get to Mt. It is just a matter of method, a matter of order, but I think that we have to proceed in some definite order or we will run in all directions. (question)/ That is, Mr Leonard feels, as I understand it, in 22,23, (you mean just those two verses, don't you?), that there is evidence in Mt tht 20-23 relate not to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD70 but to something that is yet future. Now that is your statement, isn'tit? Then, in answer to that, we would say I think two things: first, that Dr Buswell points out that in 20 we have a historical situation described which acc/to Josephus occurs precisely as described, and therefore that that would therefore seem to tie verse 20 down to AD 70. Of course, that doesn't prove that that same situation might not occur at another time, but it is pretty strong evidence in favour of 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  but not conclusive. Another thing which appears to me to even stronger is tht in 24 it is predicted that this is to be followed by a long period. They fall by the edge of the sword, and are led away captive to all nations, and Jerusalem is trodden down of the Gentiles until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. That seems to; doesn't specifically say that there is a long period after this happens, but it seems to suggest very strongly tht there is a treading down of the Gentiles which occupies a substantial time, and we find that there was such a treading down of Jerusalem at AD70 which has continued now for nearly 2000 years. Well now, of course, it would be possible that there might be a destruction of Jerusalem next year and after that a treadingg down of the Gentiles which might continue the next 2000 years. But most of us feel that if the great event described did not relate to AD 70, that it relates to the very closing years of the age and would not be a long period after that for the treading down of the Gentiles. So I don't think tht either of these arguments is conclusive, but that they look pretty strongly in favour of 20-24 describing AD 70. And if we are able to put a peg here and say Lk 21.20-24 relates to AD 70, kthen if we come to Mt and find some words parallel with it, then you have your problem in Mt rather than here.

Now that brings in a study of Mt and a study of Daniel, which is two big subjects, and ~~wan't~~ do them in the next five minutes. We can take ~~them~~ them up in full later, but at the present time I don't think that we can draw any conclusions from ~~them~~. I think that all we can say is that in view of certain statements in Mt about the abomination of desolation, and certain statements parallel to this in Mt, he questions whether this relates to AD 70. And despite the two arguments I have just given, he thinks that these two could be explained in such a way as to not be inconsistent with this being a description of a situation at the very end of the age. Would that be stating your question? Well, if that is so, we could put that in abeyance till we get to those other places. I think that it is very important that we do state these things exactly as we come to them. (question) (JOB) Everything in the Scriptures will be fulfilled in it's proper place, not that everything is going to be fulfilled here. (AAM) But this would certainly suggest that at those days here described another thing will be fulfilled, wouldn't it? (JOB) The Scriptures are lined with future predictions. (AAM) I see. You take this These are the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled as meaning that this is merely one of the all things, perhaps. It could be taken that way. (JOB) Yes; (AAM) When Christ ~~was~~ was born in Bethlehem, you could say that the birth occurred in Bethlehem that all things in the Scripture might be fulfilled, this being one of the all things. (JOB) Yes/ because even at the 13 your purposive infinitive, tou plesthenai, so as to fulfill everything written in the Scriptures, this being one of the everything. (AAM) That is an interesting suggestion, it is new to me. (JOB) Well, it couldn't mean everything spoken of in this one event. (AAM) /that would be impossible? (JOB) Absurd. (AAM) Another suggestion, simply on the sentence alone: these are the days of vengeance, in order that all the things predicted about the days of vengeance might be fulfilled. (JOB) It doesn't say that either. It just doesn't say that. That would be eisegesis. There is a lot more about vengeance than the lake of fire, when the people get thrown in the lake of fire. (AAM) We have at present three different types of eisegesis to choose from. (question). (END OF RECORD E 16.)

(Buswell)

references to cosmic disturbances. The first is in verse eleven. Things are bound to happen right along anyway, that is the way that the earth is made. There are these things, and don't be upset about these things. Settle it in your hearts. Then, after describing the destruction of Jerusalem, and the scattering of the people until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, He has another reference to cosmic disturbances in which he seems to use more distinct terms. You shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds. (MAM) Well now, which are your more distinct terms? (JOB) Seems to me that the latter group are the more distinct terms when you put them all together. (AAM) Well, then, am I correctly interpreting what you say to take it this way: that if you see nation rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, great earthquakes in divers places and famines and pestilences and fearful sights and great signs from heaven, don't pay any attention to them; they are just ordinary. That doesn't say anything about his coming. But if you see, as in verse 25, signs in the stars and in the moon, and on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear, looking after those things which are coming on the earth, then you know that the Lord's return is right near. (JOB) It is hard to discriminate things just as they come, but Hebrews 12.26 with Haggai 2.6:                    2                    This signifies it will be shaken once more, and then they'll be moved. So that there are phrases in the second group of cosmic disturbances that go beyond any phrases in the first group. And the second group concludes: and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds, with power and great glory. Heb 12.26 interpreting Hag 2.6. (AAM) Hag 2.6: Be strong O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord, and be strong O Joshua, son of Josedesh, the high priest; and be strong, all the people of the land, saith the Lord, and work; for I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts; according to the word that I covenanted with you when you came out of Egypt; so my Spirit remains among you; fear you not, for Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Yet once it is a little while; and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will

shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former. These are the reasons why Zerubbabel and Joshua are not to fear but to be calm. (JOB) Heb 12.26,27 interprets that, Yet the hapax signifies the removal of the things that are shaken, and if they are going to be shaken once more, the heavens and the earth, not merely the earth but the heavens and the earth, shaken once more, and this once more signifies their removal, Then Christ is certainly proving that the powers of the heavens will be shaken, which is an allusion and not a quotation of Hag 2.6, in Heb 12.26,27. (AAM) And Heb goes on, Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, that we may serve our God acceptably, for our God is a consuming ~~fire~~ fire. (JOB) The phrase that I am quoting in Heb is, The Once signifies the removal of the things fixed. (AAM) I would like to take a day or two on Haggai before I would know much about that. At first sight, it looks to me to be rather questionable. (JOB) Well, Heb is your inspired commentary on Haggai. (AAM) What would you think of leaving Heb for this year, and next year taking the book of Heb and going thru and looking at all of those OT references? (JOB) Well, there is very little eschatology in Heb, except in general... (AAM) but there are a good many interesting uses of the OT. (JOB) But this particular phrase where Christ is referring to shaking the powers of heaven, as well as the earth, Heb says that the Yet once more signifies the removal of those things. Take them, and here is the difference between the two groups of references in Lk, the two cosmic disturbances, and Lk goes right on to connect that with the Lord's return, in the second group, not the first. (AAM) As I see it then, in Lk here, one way of taking it, which is not the way that we have been speaking of up to the present, would be to say, He says, after the death of Christ, there are going to be earthquakes and famines and pestilences and fearful signs, and persecutions, but settle it in your hearts, not to worry about these things; wait till you see Jerusalem compassed with armies. Then know that your desolation

is night then flee. And then after Jerusalem was compassed with armies, and after the fall of Jerusalem, then there is another period of greater signs than the  $6\frac{1}{4}$ . And when these come, you are nearer the Second Coming than you were the first time. Now that is one possibility. Now a second possibility which doesn't, which may be right but which impresses me as rather questionable is, When you see small earthquakes and famines and pestilences and fearful sights and great signs, don't get disturbed; but when you see the big ones, then you know that the Son of Man is near. (JOB) That is what he has said here. (AAM) No, ... (JOB) Why don't we read thru the rest of the chapter with the thought that He is answering a question. The whole discourse here in Lk is predicated upon the questions recorded in Lk, and the whole thing must be taken in the light of that passage. (AAM) And now just to remind us just exactly what is the question, so as to have it in mind. (JOB) The question is, When will these things come, or be, and what is the sign when these things come to pass. (AAM) And you take the These Things not as referring to verse six, ~~but~~ the throwing down of one stone upon another, but... Oh, you do? (JOB) Definitely; that is the only context, is the tauta. (AAM) Oh, I see. It refers to verse 6, where he says, This beautiful temple you see is going to be torn down, and the question is, When is it going to happen, and what is the sign of it. And in verse 20, the sign is when you see Jerusalem compassed with armies. (JOB) No, he give first the negative answer, that certain things are not the answer to their questions, and I think that one of the things which is not an answer to their question is when you see Jerusalem compassed with armies, you know that that is going to happen, but it may be a long time after that. (AAM) Because when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is night (JOB) This desolation isn't night, but... (AAM) but he said this city, this temple is going to be torn down, and they said, When are these things going to happen? He said, when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, ye know that this desolation is night. I don't quite see how you are going to separate verse 20 from verse 6. (JOB) Well, they are close

together, but one is the prediction about the temple, and the destruction of the temple, of the city, is to be followed by a period of time, a rather extended period, when they shall be taken captive among all nations.

(AAM) That is to say, as far as I am concerned, this distinction that part of the chapter is negative and part is positive; it may be a valid distinction, but I just haven't seen it yet. (JOB) Anyway, he answers their question, relates to His glorious return. (AAM) Well then, he does not say whether verse 25 is simultaneous with verse 24, or immediately after, or a long time after. But verse 24 suggests a long time immediately following. So that would suggest that verse 25 is sometime later. And then 25 tells of this distress of nations, and signs in the stars and moon, 26 men's hearts failing them for fear for the looking after those things which are coming on the earth, for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. What does that mean, for the powers of heaven shall be 'shaken? (JOB) I think that that is an allusion to Haggai. (AAM) But there are two possibilities at first sight. One is that it is reiterating what occurred in 25. A second is that it is giving the reason for 25, that it is something not yet stated but distinct from that. And he says there will be signs in the sun, moon, and stars. And then afterwards he says that men's hearts shall fail them for fear, for the powers of heaven shall be shaken, for they see the signs in the sun, moon, and stars. Now the second possibility is there are signs in the sun/moon and stars, and men's hearts ~~fail~~ fail them for fear because Satan is cast down from heaven. There is a great spiritual war in the heavenlies, which resulted in Satan and his hosts being cast down, which can be described as the powers of heaven being shaken, and this is what makes people's hearts fail them for fear, and for looking up to those things coming to the earth. Now between the two, I don't know which is right. At first sight, they would both seem to me to be possibilities. Would you say that one of them was right, or both, or neither? (JOB) I would quickly pass by that question and come to the fact that in answering their question He referred to His glorious return, very affirmatively, very positively. So that his return in power and great glory constitutes an affirmative part of his

answer to their question. (AAM) But the question is, When will these be cast down? (JOB) That is right. (AAM) Well, the answer isn't after His return in glory, is it? (JOB) It doesn't say after. (AAM) But I mean, it is not a sign if the other things happen before. (JOB) Well, I think that if you read Lk straight thru, and get his eschatological references, they couldn't have doubted one thing when he said that about the temple. It is something connected with His return. And when they said, When will these things come to pass, the direct reference is to the temple, but the whole context indicates that they were asking about his return. Now in his answer, whatever else he says, he includes his glorious return in the answer. (AAM) That is, the return is part of the answer as to when Jerusalem is to be desolated? (JOB) I think so. (AAM) Or is Jerusalem desolated to lead up to it? 12 the temple utterly destroyed, in the way in which he referred to it. (AAM) Here in Lk, we have no further reference to any destruction of the temple, or of Jerusalem, beyond verse 24. There is none here; it just speaks of the sun, moon, and stars as signs, and men's hearts failing them for fear, and then they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds. There is no reference here to any destruction of Jerusalem at that time. (JOB) He is answering their question about the destruction of the Temple, and among other things He brings in His return, and he says, When these things begin to come, lift up your heads, for your redemption draws near. (AAM) Well, they hadn't asked about redemption in verse 6, tho. (JOB) I think they had, that is, I think that the whole context in Lk would imply that they understood the destruction of the temple to be connected with his righteous judgment on 13. (AAM) That is a very interesting suggestion, and I hesitate... (JOB) Well, here it is. The section in Lk starts with the remark about the temple, in which the question is asked, and then the extended answer, 13  $\frac{1}{4}$

(AAM) But as to that proving that the reference to the temple related to the return... (JOB) You have to take other Scriptures. Lk suggests the idea/. (AAM) Student question. Of course, in Lk if you were to say in verse 27,

When shall the sign of these things be, and what shall, what sign will there be, it might be that they thought, Now what: is there going to be a sign in the stars, is there going to be a destruction, is there some particular thing which means now the Lord is coming? And he says, No, you will have earthquakes, pestilences, all these, and that doesn't mean that the Lord is coming.

15 And when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, well then it's desolation is near, but that doesn't mean that the Lord is coming back. He says, after Jerusalem is taken, it is going to be trodden down of the Gentiles, and there will be a long period after that. That is not the time. But the time is, When there are signs in the stars and moon and sun and mens hearts failigg them for fear.

(END OF RECORD E 17)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 18)

The best sign is when you actually see Him coming, of course. That is when you can't get away from it, when you see him in the clouds, that then the return is close. Well, now, there are these different possibilities in Lk. What I'm interested in doing; maybe it isn't the best approach, but it is the one I like to take with any Scripture. I am not interested in finding out what this passage means; but in what is definitely taught in this Scripture. And what are the possibilities of the passage on which we cannot decide from the passage alone, but which we have to leave open till we get on further. And then when I get what is definite in the passage, then I have that as something I can tie to when I look at another passage. I look at another passage and I say, Yes, but over in Lk you find this. And what there is that is questionable in Lk I leave for further consideration later. Well, I would say tht it is definite that Jerusalem is going to be destroyed, and there is going to be a long period after it is destroyed; it is not a ~~sign~~ sign of his return. That it is destroyed and there is a long time after. / That seems to me definite. And it seems to me that it is definite that there are going to be earthquakes and famines and pestilences and all kinds of disturbances before Jerusalem is destroyed, and this won't mean the sign of His return, and possibly after which won't be the sign of His ~~xx~~ return, because

He seems to imply a long period after Jerusalem is destroyed. That seems to me quite definite. And then it seems to me definite, that somebody, He doesn't say you, He says they; somebody is going to see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and great glory. That seems to me to be absolutely definite. And it is absolutely definite in verses 14 to 18 to 19 that they are to be patient and not too excited about looking for signs of the times, but busy with witnessing for Christ, despite persecution and difficulty. Witnessing for him, not saying Well, he is going to come tomorrow, what is the use of planning a meeting for the next day. Witnessing all the time, and going ahead and possessing your souls in patience, knowing that ~~He~~ He is going to come in His own time and there is a whole lot to happen first. Now maybe that is going beyond, but it seems to me that we can go that far. And then on these other things I think that it is very good to get the possibilities in mind, in order that when we look somewhere else we may find out which of these possibilities is certain. But that much, it seems to me, or nearly that much, is pretty certain. Then we go on here to verse 27, Then they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and great glory, and it seems to imply that shortly before his coming the powers of heaven are shaken and men's hearts fail them for fear, and there are going to be great cosmic signs. But then in verse 28, He doesn't say when ye see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and great glory look up and lift up your heads for your redemption draws nigh, and he doesn't say when you see the signs in the sun, moon and stars, then lift up your head, for your redemption draws nigh; He says when these things begin to come to pass, Well, how are you going to know when they begin to come to pass that they see Him coming in the clouds? How are you going to know when it begins to come to pass that men's hearts fail them for fear? certainly about the fourth or fifth century men's hearts failed them for fear as much as they ever have since, at least as much as they are now, surely. There have been tremendous upheavals in the history of the world. When do these things begin to pass so that then you can lift up your heads? I don't know. I am inclined

to think that it means that with all of these things, earthquakes, pestilence and upheavels and everthing, don't get discouraged, but say Praise the Lord, His return is one day nearer. (JOB) And that is what Paul said: And now your salvation is nearer than when ye first believed. That is a constant attitude. (AAM) It seems to me that there are two things in the Scripture. First that we never have a right to say that Christ is coming back tomorrow, or next yer, or this century; second, that we never have a right to say that Christ will not come this century, or tomorrow, or today. He stresses both; he stresses that ye don't know, as God has it in his own power; in your patience possess ye your soul; He stresses to be ready, for ye know not the hour that he is coming, and whether it be in the first watch, or in the second, or the third, or the tenth: whenever it is, be ready, because then you don't expect it at all. The matter of always being ready and watching, and not knowing enogh to say when it is coming, and not knowing enough to say that it isn't coming, but to say that I must be ready if it does come. This impresses me as pretty much emphasized in the Gospels and in the Epistles. An air of expectancy, of readiness. Peter said, sayest thou these things to us only, or to all? And then Christ went on and gave that illustration in chapter 12. Be ready at any time, as ye don't know when he is ~~going~~ coming. But he wants you to be ready each instant, for His return. Verse 28 now, if it means, now is your salvation nearer than when ye believed, and whatever happens say Praise the Lord, it is a day nearer. To me that is good interpretation of verse 28, but if verse 28 means Now here is a sign, and when ye see that sign you will know that the Lord is coming, then I don't know what sign he is referring to. It doesn't seem to me that that is the latter meaning. (student question) When these things begin to come to pass; when ye have trouble, say Praise the Lord, for His return is one day nearer; lift up your heads, for your redemption is draws nigh. It is a day nearer, tho it still may be three thousand years off, but it is definitely coming. (student question) When these things begin to come to pass, when they bgin to be signs in the sun and moon and stars. Well, he said in verse 11 there are going to be fearful sight in

and great signs from heaven. If you have fearful sights and great signs from heaven, possess your soul in patience, for it doesn't mean that Christ is coming, but when there begin to be signs in the sun and moon and stars, then you know that he is coming, you see. Well, what is the distinction? I don't know. (student question). Well, I wouldn't express it that way. These are not proof that he is coming now. But they are proof that he is definitely coming. And they are proof that the coming is nearer than it was before, and we are to possess our souls in patience; no matter what comes not to put on a white robe and go out on the road and expect him tomorrow. And on the other hand, we are to know, no matter what comes, Christ is definitely coming: lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh. It is nearer than it was, but that doesn't mean that it is tomorrow or the next day or the next century. Now the same thing can't be the sign that he is coming and the sign that he isn't coming. And yet at first sight, it does say both. (JOB) But the fulfillment of the things that are not the sign are the ~~the~~ signification of the approach of his coming. That is very sensible. (AAM) Yes, it means the approach. And the earthquakes in Judea in 40 AD, and all these things, they indicated that it was near. It was coming, and it would be within the next ten thousand years for sure. As far as I know we not only might think, but we would think; that is as far as I know, we are definitely told that until He comes, we don't know. That in such an hour as ye think not, He comes, and if you were sure that these were the signs that he was coming tomorrow, that would be pretty good evidence that he wasn't coming tomorrow. Because he comes in an hour that ye think not. The father has it in his own power; you are not to know the times or the seasons, but to witness to the Lord, and to be ready at whatever time that he comes. The first coming was one that was not preceded by ~~as~~ such overwhelming matters, but when Christ was here upon the earth, the persons who studied the OT prophecies should have recognized him as Simeon did in the temple. The person should have known, This is God's Messiah, and followed him, and when he was crucified, they should have known that this was what

Christ predicted. But the things that he does after his second coming, it is perfectly obvious that they are the things, because he will come in the clouds of the heavens, and we will all know that he is coming. It won't be like then when he was born in the manger. I don't think that you can blame people in Judea for not going to Bethlehem when he was born. I don't think that you can blame them for not recognizing him as a boy, but when he was about preaching and doing things, they should have. After he comes to this earth and sets up his kingdom, if anybody fails to recognize him there would be something pretty clear. Now the Russelites claim that he is already here, he has come. I think that they are completely wrong. I don't think that it is possible for him to come to this earth the next time without everybody knowing that he has come, for every eye is going to see him. But that people before he comes will know him, that this is the time when he is coming, in view of the many statements in the NT that the Father has put these things in his own power, and it is not for you to know the signs or the seasons, and that you're to be ready anytime, for you don't know when he is coming, it seems to me that it is just as unlikely, or more unlikely, than that a person of that they could have said that next year the Messiah is going to be born in Bethlehem; The great mass of the Jews had no reason to know or to say that next year he is going to be born in Jerusalem. But after he was grown, then... They asked Christ the question: they said, Lord doest thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? Now if when they asked that they had understood from this discourse that it had occurred a month earlier, that before he came back to this earth Jerusalem was going to be destroyed and trodden underfoot of the Gentiles for so many years, they wouldn't have asked that thing. So that any question which would give them an understanding of this would not answer in their minds. Christ had told them these things, they were pondering it, they were trying to understand it, and then he died, and Lk tells us that they said Oh we thought that he was the one who would have redeemed Israel; it is all a mistake. And then when he was raised from the dead, he said, you fools and slow of heart not to believe all that the prophets have spoken.

And then Lk tells us that they went out to the Mt of Olives, and they said, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? And he said, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, but ye shall receive power, and ye shall witness to me thruout the world. And then here we find that that seems to be what his answer was to their question. What are the signs of the coming? He says, when ye see all kinds of signs, don't get excited, for you won't be able to recognize any signs. But when ye see the signs, know this: that then your redemption is drawing nigh. Then know that I'm definitely coming, and that every day your redemption is a little nearer than it was the day before. The more the trouble that you go thru, the surer you can be that Christ is actually coming back. So their asking of the question What shall be the sign of thy coming, they seem not to have answered. (student question) We have in this verse then; verse 28, When these things begin to come to pass, and they began to come to pass at his resurrection, when they begin to come to pass during the days when he was with them and during the days immediately after the ascension and ever since, look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draws nigh. And he spoke to them a parable. He said Behold a fig tree of all the trees, when it puts it shoots forth, you see and know your own self that summer is now nigh; so likewise when ye see these things come to pass (what things? these things); Is that the coming of the Son of man in the clouds with power and great glory? Is it the signs in the sun, moon, and stars? Is it the earthquakes in divers places and famines and pestilences? Is it Jerusalem destroyed and trodden underfoot of the Gentiles for many centuries? Whatever it is, when ye see these things come to pass, you will know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you that this race shall not pass away until all of these things have been fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away, so the sign is that this race shall not pass away until all things be fulfilled. The sign is that all thru the ages, when people can say Well, look here, there is nothing to this

14½ Christ died, ~~and~~ and that is the end. They say he was raised, they say he went to heaven, they say that he is coming back again, but we don't

see any sign of it. Well, the answer is, This race shall not pass away until all of these things be fulfilled. Frederick the Gt said to his chaplain, Give me in one word some proof of Christianity. The chaplain says, The Jew. The babylonians have disappeared; the ancient Egyptians, there is nothing left of them, or of their glory. All of the races of antiquity have completely gone, and they have been replaced by a new set of upstart nations that were wandering around as savages in Northern Europe when those nations were in their prime. They have all disappeared, but the Jew remains a potent force all over the world. This race shall not pass away till all be fulfilled; heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. So just as surely as you know tht summer is ~~coming~~ coming.

(END OF RECORD E 18)

Upheavals and famines and turbulence and pestilences and persecutions and signs in the sun, moon, and stars, and all these things, why you know that the coming of the Lord is a day nearer than it was the day before, and that it is absolutely certain to come, and coming you don't know when; maybe very soon, maybe not. But it is definitely coming. Heavens and earths shall pass away but my words shall not pass away; and take heed to yourself, lest at any times your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and see to it that you keep ~~ing~~ in mind that He is coming and that he may come today and that he may come a hundred years from now, and that he may come a thousand years from now; be ready whenever he comes. And if every upheaval, and every sign in the heavens, when the sun got red last summer and stayed so for several days (or was it last fall, I forget), I don't know whether the moon and stars were affected by it or not, why you know that the Lord's coming is that much nearer. Dr Buswell, do you have something to add at that point? (JOB) I think that this whole thing, as a whole, not completely summed up, I think that it is a real answer to their question, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  of what you said there. (AAM) But in Lk here, no specific thing given that somebody can recognize and say that when we see this we know that definitely it is going to be within the next ten years. f(student question). He said in Lk 12, to Peter You be ready, right now. You don't know when he is coming. Be ready any-time. The idea is that they don't disconcert us and lead us to think that it is all a mistake and that he isn't coming. It is like when you go out, and somebody hires you to sell books in the summer, and says You go out and you'll make a lot of money. And that sounds wonderful to you, but they say Now watch out, there are going to be some pretty bad disappointments and you're going to have people close the doors, you're going to have a lot of them refuse to buy, but don't let that discourage you because if you keep at it you'll make plenty of money in the summer. Now when you meet these difficulties, you know that they are coming, and you expect them, and have been warned of them, and therefore they don't disconcert you. And he says, when ye find the great earthquakes and the pestilences and the famines

and all that, don't say Well now, this must be a sign of his coming, and if he doesn't come right after this there is nothing to it; I'll give up my religion. You say that he predicted that even if you got a lot of these things, just lift up your heads and rejoice, because he is that much nearer, but it doesn't mean that he is right near. And how often Christians put their heads in a noose, for when something happens they say Look here, Here is the proof; kthe Scripture predicted it, Christ is coming, this is absolutely true, because this has happened. And then ten years passs and he doesn't come, and they say We thought this was surely the sign, and now we see that this is all a mistake. There is nothing to that Christianity anyhow. Christ says, they will say as in the times of Noah, Things continue as they were from the beginning. They go on and one and on ; there seems to be no change, and then all of a sudden the flood came and carried them off. They do not have a period of warning when they can be getting ready for his coming. It comes on unexpectedly. (student question) It is the negative meaning, but a very important negative meaning, because it has the positive meaning of trusting  $4\frac{1}{2}$  of knowing it is coming, and being ready for it whenever it comes, whether near or far. And the stress is on both. The stress is on the Be ready if he comes today, if he comes tomorrow. Peter said, Sayest thou these things to us, or to all? Christ says, it is so that everybody will know who is a follower of Christ whether he comes in the first watch or in the second or the tenth, whenever he comes they will be ready. But then he says, do not say that it is going to be at this time;, and then lose your faith when it doesn't/. When ye see these things, just lift up your heads and rejoice that it is near. Don't rejoice tht it is here, but rejoice that it is near. After all, wht is a thousand years in God's sight? It is but a day, a watch in the night. It is true that when you get a concept in your mind it often seems to simple that you think that three words would do and that you wouldn't need a long chapter, but often it takes a long chapter to get it across. It seems very involved before you get it; it seems very simple afterwards. (question). I'm just trying to see what Lk says, for the present. Any inferences any one wants to derive we are not

to draw as yet. (question) That is a very interesting change of person, isn't it? If you leave the book of Thess out of account, I would be apt to say that there is no account to it at all. But if you read in Thess that the dead in Christ shall rise first, and that we shall be caught up with them to meet the Lord in the air, then it would seem to say that you are not the ones who see Him come, but they who are left on the earth at the time. It would seem that the middle change of a pronoun was not to give as a truth but to fit in to something somewhere else. I wouldn't hang the truth on that, but I would just note how carefully and exactly he uses his words when he teaches so as not to contradict what he teaches elsewhere. (question) I don't think that we have had any difference on our views thus far, have we, Dr Buswell? Perfect harmony. In the early part of the hour, there were certain points at which, as to the interpretation of certain words we seemed to have a difference of opinion. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Last summer I remember up in the hotel in Rochester Minn I made a statement and he pretty near threw me out of the window. He jumped all over me, because the statement was positively terrible, and the way he spoke I thought was terrible. I felt like throwing him out of the door. And we went on and discussed it a little bit, and it took time to get into the facts and to see what the evidences were, and exactly what we meant, and when we came to the end we found that we both meant exactly the same thing, and agreed precisely on it. Isn't that so? And I think that you will find that very often that is the case, when you have at first sight a superficial ~~difficult~~ differences on Scripture: if you are willing to take the passages as they stand and study the facts carefully, and see exactly what God has said, you will find that in the end, if the Scripture is your guide, you will agree pretty closely. We usually come to an agreement if we have on most things, and I hope that we will on all. (question) (JOB) I'm perfectly willing to concede, as far as Lk is concerned, that that particular thing might have occurred in 70 AD. As far as that particular incident. I do think that there is other evidence. (question) I think so, but I wouldn't try to prove it from Lk. I think that just as far as Lk is concerned; Dr MacRae has summed

precisely what there is (AAM) We agree exactly in Lk. Now when it comes to Mt, at present, there seems to be considerable difference of opinion between us on Mt, but that is doubtless due to the fact that he has studied Mt a great deal, and I very little. And after we study it together, we will probably agree on it. I think that we expect to, in view of past experiences. (question). Well, 10 was simply fearful sights, and great signs from heaven, but 25 is signs in the sun, moon, and stars. And verse 10 was nation rising against nation, kingdom against kingdom, and fearful sight, and 26 is the sea and the waves roaring, and upon the earth distress of nations and perplexity and men's hearts failing them for fear. The terminology is quite different. (JOB) I said about these early signs and these later signs, that is to say, they are mentioned in two different places, it just occurred to me right now that verses 20-24 might be considered as Christ gave his discourse as a parenthesis, that is, he was telling them that the end was not nouth, not immediately. And then 11 he stopped and turned aside and said this about Jerusalem, in that paragraph, and then it occurs to me now that possibly verse 25 takes up where verse 19 leaves off. And that that would have been 11½ two different groups of cosmic disturbances. You might read consecutively from 19 to 25, skipping those four verses as a parenthesis. (AAM) Add if you did that, then you would mean that the signs in 11 and 10 and 25 and 26 would be more or less continuous. (JOB) More or less continuous. (AAM) That impresses me as very good, that idea. I recognize that the great earthquakes in the time of Nero didn't mean anything, but that this one now does. There will be a general increase towards the end, but the thing is that you have these tremendous signs that are going to come; things are going to go along, and everytime that you see one you say there is proof that God is on the throne; His word is going to be accomplished; he is going to do what he says. In patience you possess your soul, and don't say This means that it's not that. When it is his will, he will come, and I must be ready. (JOB) That is the thing to preach; that is the thing to tell everybody. Now then, the details are subject to further study.

(AAM) The big thing is to be ready whenever he comes: if he comes in Peter's time, if he comes in Paul's time, be ready. And if he doesn't come for a thousand years, possess your soul in patience and know that he is definitely coming. But whenever he comes, be ready. That is the big point. (question) Separation which began at the flood and which has continued every since. (question). Now I don't recall either one of these verses. Is 13.10. Behold the day of the Lord cometh, cruel with both wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sanners out of it. For the stars of heavens and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth; the moon shall not cause her light to shine; Then verse 17, I will stir up the Medes against them, which shall not regard silver; and as for gold, they shall not delight in it. Verse 19, and Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the chaldeans excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. This is a prediction of the overthrow of Babylon by the Medes at about 400 BC, and has nothing to do with anything that is still future today. Isaiah 34.4: Come ye nations to hear; for the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations and his fury upon all their armies. Verse 3, Their slain shall be cast out, their stink shall come up and be cast out....

(END OF RECORD E 19)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 20)

heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll. This seems to say here that there is a tremendous number slain and a terrific slaughter before the t  $\frac{1}{2}$  doesn't it? The scroll, wouldn't that be a picture of the great cosmic disturbances after the great final battle rather than before? I don't know, but offhand I would feel that way. 34 and 35 are not easy in Isaiah, they are among the harder chapters. But it is true that there are going to be great cosmic disturbances in connection with great events in God's economy. The sun was darkened for three hours when Christ was on the cross, and there are great disturbances at various times. I think that in America here we

read of the 1 . I felt much nearer them in Europe, while I was' studying in Berline. When they had fast day. Here we have a feast day, and we call it Thanksgiving day, and we all eat so that we can't walk. But in Germany they have a day, and they call it repentance day, about the same time that we have Thanksgiving, and on that day the folks repented of their sins and turned to the Lord. But we had to light the streetlights at noontime. It was ...and then I remember that when it came Easter that year, Friday it was dark like that. They had to light the streetlights at noon; it was very very dark and gloomy, and everybody was going to church, and then when it came to Easter Sunday two days later it was as bright as could be. It couldn't be better. Well now, God doesn't do those things every time that we have an anniversary, but in connection with the great events he undoubtedly does do marvelous signs. But that we can recognize them, I think that this chapter is saying No, Don't pose your faith on what you recognize out of signs; build it on God's Word. He continues then, Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and the cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come, not on you, but on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man. That is a difficult verse. Verse 36 is possible to be interpreted standing alone in various ways. One way is, If you watch and if you pray, then you'll stand before the Son of man, and if you don't, you'll be lost. Now that is clearly contrary to what is taught elsewhere in the Scriptures. It is those who are saved who stand before the Son of man, not those who watch and pray. And another way of interpreting it would be Watch and pray, look for the signs and be ready, because if you do you'll be included in the rapture, and if you don't it will pass you by and you won't stand before the Son of man. A rapture for those who are looking for it. I don't think that there is any Scriptural evidence of such a view, and that would be a misinterpretation of the passage. Now a third way of taking it

is like the statement in Hebrews which say that these blessings are yours if you continue in the faith grounded, and which exhort you to continue, to follow on. The Christian is not told, ~~Here/are~~ You are on a feather bed, you are on a train, you step on the train, and that is all; you're all right, everything is fine. You are to have the attitude, Trust the Lord' completely, put your confidence in Him, and you needn't worry about anything. But on the other hand we are told we must resist temptation, resist till it hurts. We must pray, we must strive, we must 4 to do God's will. We must seek to overcome the old nature. We must continue in the faith, we must press on and persevere. But we know that we will if we are truly Christ'd. There is no question about it, there is no uncertainty, there is an exhortation to do that which we will do 4 1/2 . And so in this verse Hemeans, if you are truly a Christian, if you have been born again then you are going to do these things. But now the responsibility is on you to do it. You watch and stay awake and be vigilant and it doesn't mean to keep looking for signs. You be vigilant; you be wide awake you be active; you be the opposite of what 5 . Be wide awake and vigilant and active; pray always that you may be accounted worthy to escape these things, and know that if you are truly Christ's then you will escape things things that come to pass because when these great terrific, this great terrific persecution and suffering comes upon the earth, you will then be with Christ. You will stand before the Son of Man and you will if you ~~are~~ are a Christian. (question) Paul was saved, and he had eternal life immediately when he was saved, and yet he was pressing forward to eternal life. God wants us to have that attitude constantly. (JOB)The word, to be accounted worthy, I think is quite a mistake there. It is 5 3/4 that you might be strong to flee out of these things. (AAM) Yes, it isn on accoumt of any worthiness in us, but it means the Father's grace. (JOB) To escape. (AAM) For strength to stand true to the Lord, and not to be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and the cares of this life, so that that day will come on you unawares. So that you will say Oh, I have just been enjoying life and having a good job preaching a sermon on Sunday

and otherwise taking it easy, and all of a sudden here the Lord comes and says, Here, you unfaithful servant, why aren't you more active? He says, No don't say that the Lord delays his coming, I can do as I feel like; say that he may come today, tomorrow, I must get surfeited with the cares of this life at any time, I must constantly be on the alert, serving him and ready whenever he comes. And I must pray him for the strength to flee away from these dangers of surfeiting and drunkenness and the cares of this life. (question) Well, it is near, it is a day nearer every day, it is at

about  
7  
hand. It is something that is definitely coming to pass. It doesn't mean that it is at hand the next minute or something; we don't know; it may be. Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand? You mean, Repent because Christ is not going to come and start preaching? (JOB) I don't think so; 7½ the kingdom is offered and rejected. I think rather that the sovereign rule of God is near. As you might state to the Norwegian underground during the war: your sovereign rule is 8 remotely. (AAM) And that is what he says here in v 31, When ye see these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is near at hand; know that God is controlling these things; His hand is upon them, kHe is working in 8 with his perfect will, and He will cause Christ to come back at the time which is His time for it. It is not that the world is getting out of control and God can't help it. It is all a part of His plan. His control is here, it is near, it is right at hand. (question) (JOB) It isn't at hand in the chronological sense. It is near. (AAM) \*½ (JOB) Well, 8½ is a place near. Now of course you say you might 8½ (question)

(AAM) Joel two and Joel three. Now Joel two 29. (quoted from Bible)

These verses Peter quoted at Pentecost, and they were then fulfilled. (ques)

You mean that some of these things in verse 25r happened immediately before the col~~ing~~ rather than being scattered thru the period. I think most likely there will be. But that it will be that somebody can say, This is it, that I would question highly! When my friend, Dr R. D. Wilson and his wife were in Yokahama harbor in 1925 they left the hotel in Yokahama and they came down to the harbour, and they got in the boat, and the dock was covered with automobiles, and people were throwing confetti and streamers out, and the band was playing ~~the~~ and the boat was just about to sail. And as they stood there, as they sat there, all of a sudden the whole dock dissappeared under the water, and all those dozens of cars disappeared and they lifted up 10½ and they could see that great hotel that they stayed at the night before. And it fell just like a house of cards. And fire sprang up all over, and it looked to them as if this was the end of the world. And if the boat had gone an hour before they would have been out to sea. As it was they got entangled there and were there for ten days before they could get away. And it just seemed as if it was the very end of everything. Now that there would be one of which you could say, This is the end of the world, the Scrip;ture doesn't say. But that there will be a 11

Well, I have been 11½ . And so I guess that finishes it, doesn't it? ~~37, 38, 39~~ 37, 38, 39 are simply the quotation marks. So then, should we look back now at Luke 17, or should we go to Mark? Did we finish 17? 17 was the Perean discourse in which he spoke very similarly to what we have noticed here. ~~Of~~ that is right, we looked at it at some length just before this. That you are not to be able to say, Look here, look there, here is Christ. It is not to come with observation, but all of a sudden it is here. You are to be ready whenever it comes; it is like the days of Noah. Everything goes along in normal fashion, and all of a sudden, Christ appears. And where will they get the Christians? Well, they are the body which is where the eagles are gathered together. You don't need to be in Jerusalem when He comes; anywhere that you are the Lord can reach you. / Shall we go over to Mark? I want sometime to take a few minutes on Thess and Isaiah. 12½ We have the similar passage in Mk 13, and that would be what you have in mind, wouldn't it, Dr Buswell? (Dr Buswell indistinct) I think that it might be, because I think that we are justified in saying that what the Lord put together as a message as a unit, and if he had put the larger passages together we would get more light, and we might get some added impact, from looking at the smaller passages. So I would think that it might be interesting to look at it this way. And see what we get out of it alone, and see where we meet passages and problems that we meet in Matthew to understand, we say, we'll just leave that till we get to Mt; we will look at the possibilities. Here in Mark, it begins that as he went out of the temple. just before that we had the widow's mite story. And then he goes out of the temple and one of the disciples says to him, Master, see what manner of stones and what building; isn't it wonderful? And Jesus answers and says, Ye see these great buildings? Well, there will not be left one stone upon another that will not be ~~it/it~~ thrown down. (question) It means a tremendous overthrow; yes. Well, suppose there were five thousand stones, and 4900 were left not one standing upon another. And there were just 100 which stayed one little side wall standing alone, covered with dirt from a few hundred years, and then the Jews should come back and find it standing there, and

think that it a wonderful place to wail over the glory which is gone and the temple which is /gone, and to make a wailing wall over it, I wouldn't think that that would interfere with that particular verse. (question) 15  
Well, there won't be one stone left on another, then he means that these buildings are going to be destroyed so that there won't be more than one percent of these stones left upon another, but what I am talking about is when another temple is destroyed so that there won't be even one...

(END OF RECORD E 20)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 21)

one little wall, one side of it, one corner of it left, why it seems to me quite  $\frac{1}{2}$  to consider that that is what he had in mind in this particular statement. (ques) (JOB, indistinct) Stone upon stone is 1 upon language, but I wouldn't build a house upon this. (AAM) Then Peter, James, John, Andrew ask Him  $1\frac{1}{4}$  that we have not been told in Lk, I believe, that four of them came and  $1\frac{1}{4}$ . And they asked him privately, and they said, Tell us, when shall these things be, and what sign when all these things shall be fulfilled? When all these things shall be fulfilled.  $1\frac{1}{2}$

And Jesus answering said, Take heed lest anyone deceive you, for many shall come in my name saying I am, and shall deceive many. Don't let somebody say now, Here is Christ. Be patient. And when you hear of wars and rumours of wars, don't be troubled. Ye must .. Even if somebody says that the atom bomb is going to destroy civilization. Don't be troubled. For these things must needs be, but the end is not yet. Now that doesn't mean that it won't be right after one terrific war, and maybe this one. Maybe shortly after the last one, before there is another one. But it does mean that you cannot say from any particular war, This is that war. When you hear of wars and rumours of wars, don't be troubled. These things must needs be, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be earthquakes, there shall be famines, there shall be troubles; These are the beginnings of sorrows, and of course we know that those things happened right after His departure. And they were the beginning of the sorrows. But take heed to yourselves, for they shall deliver you to councils, and synagogues, and ye shall be beaten, and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them, and the gospel must first be ~~published~~ published among all nations. Now that is an interesting note which I don't think that we had in Lk, did we? That the gospel shall first be preached for a testimony to all nations? That is something new in Mk that wasn't in Lk, but Lk does say that you will be delivered to synagogues for my names sake, and for a testimony. And when they shall lead you and deliver you up, take no thought before hand what ye shall speak, neither do ye pre-meditate. But whatsoever shall be given to you in that hour, that speak ye.

For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son, and the children shall rise up against their parents and shall cause them to be put to death, and ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake, but ye that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved. That seems to be just about as 4 as what we had in Lk except that Lk said, ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake but there shall not a hair of your head be hurt. While this says, ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake, but he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved. But Lk said, there shall not a hair of your head perish, in your patience possess ye your souls. And this one says, ye shall be hated of all men for my names sake, but he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved. It is an interesting little difference between the two, and while they are so parallel up to this point. And then right at that point, the next verse in Lk writes And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation is nigh, and then let him which is in Judea flee into the mountains, and this one says, when ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing where it ought not, let him that readeth understand, then let them be in Judea flee into the mountains. And then Mk goes on with some material which wasn't in Lk right here. Let him that is on the house top not come down, neither enter therein to take anything out of his house, and let him that is in the fields not turn again to take up his 5. And the next verse, But woe to them that are with child, that give suck in those days, was exactly the same in verse 23 in Lk. But woe to them that are with child, to them that give suck in those days. But mark interjects a note that wasn't in Lk there, Then pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, and Mk continues, In those days shall be afflictions, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created until this time, and neither shall be. And he continues, And except the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved. But for the elect's sake, whom he has chosen, he has shortened those days. And then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or Lo he is there believe him not. We already had that in verse 6, and here it is repeated.

Believe him not, for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders to seduce if it were possible even the elect, and behold I have foretold you all things. So it sounds like a long period, in which there are false Christs and false prophets. But take heed, for I have foretold ye these things. And then verse 24, but in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give here light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken, which seems to be very close ~~that~~ to this in Lk, verses 25, and 26. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and great glory, and 26 identical with 27 of Lk, then there is a verse inserted here which isn't in LK: and then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds from the uttermost part of the earth, to the uttermost part of heaven, which in Lk, instead of that, it sayd, And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, lift up your heads, for your redemption draws nigh. And then 28 begins the parable of the fig tree, which you have in 29 in Lk, continued just the same as in LK, : Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away, and then verse 32 here is not in Lk ~~and~~ in exactly this form, But of that day and that hour knows no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the son, but the Father. Even the Son doesn't know. Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is. They had asked, What is the time? He says, of that day and hour knows no man. He says You don't know what the time is. He says the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey which left his house and gave authority to his servants and every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh; at even, right soon after his departure, or at midnight, the 8  
Or at the 8 the reformation comes, and there were many then who went out. Or in the morning, in 1881 to an end the world will come, 8  
Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping, and what I say unto you, I say unto all: Watch. The note of our ignorance of the time is much more explicit here than in Lk. There is much more stress here in Mk on No man knows the day nor

Watch for ye know not when the master comes, even at ~~mid~~ midnight, or cock-drawing, or in the morning. What I say to you, I say to all: watch. Of that day nor hour knows no man, not even the angels in heaven, neither the son. Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is. It is repeated and stressed in this fashion, that you don't know. They said, What is the sign? You don't know, not even the Son know. Be ready at any time, soon or late, whenever he comes. There will be false Christs, there will be people, there will be this /and that and the other, but nothing that you can say is a sign of His coming. (question) He says, what I say unto you, I say unto all: watch. He says, watch ye therefore, for ye know when the master of the household cometh. It seems to me that this great stress at the end of the chapter is inconsistent with anything at the beginning of the chapter, meaning that during the 1900years that have passed we could know that he couldn't yet come. It seems to me that any interpretation of verse 10 meaning that up to the present time it was impossible for him to come, is utterly inconsistent with the emphasis that is found here, in verses 32-37 here in Mk. I don't see any possibility of taking it that way, unless you just remove 32-37 from the Bible. (ques) It was never imminent in the sense that it might happen at the next instant. Because God ordained from the foundation of the world the exact second that the Son would come back. And that second was not prior to 1950 AD. And therefore it was not imminent in the sense that it might happen any time before. But in line with what Christ said to Peter in verse 12 and what is stressed in Lk 21, and what he is stressing in these latter verses of Mk, it would seem that as far as anybody knew it might have come.. at any-time after His ascension up to the present. And to take this one verse here, and say, Well, the gospel must first be preached/ among all nations, well it 1lk . And therefore when we get to those three it could come, but it never could have come before and it can't come now till we get to those three. That would rule out the whole of the chapter, the whole of Lk, the whole of the latter part, and everything, on the basis of one section of a verse that isn't even given 11½ . And I would think that that would be reducing Scripture to nonsense. That is to say, it would be altogether

possible to say that Christ had once said, Watch therefore, for ye know not the day nor the ~~hour~~ hour, <sup>but</sup> ~~one~~ he said it, and we may be misinterpreting that. Here is the statement that it ~~has~~ has to be preached to all nations, so we ~~know~~ know that that doesn't apply, till after it is preached to all nations. But when he says it repeatedly, over and over in the Synoptics it is given, and here in Mk there are at least four or five different separate statements stressing that fact, and in Lk 12 12 to watch and be ready for ye know not when he comes, first watch, secone watch, fifth watch, mid-night, or in the morning. So rule all that out on the basis of one verse that isn't even in Lk. That is distorting Scripture. Don't you think so, Dr Buswell? (JOB) Well, I don't think that it would rule anything out that is here. I think that it would rule out the statement that 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  it might come at any time, regardless if Jerusalem is to be surrounded with armies 12 3/4 . So I think that we might take the Scriptures systematically, 13 . They didn't know how big the world was. 13 But they knew that Jerusalem was to be surrounded with armies, that this prediction of 13 ; so from the attention of Christ, I think that it is too strong to say that it might come at any time. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  (Buswell very indistinct) (AAM) The times and the seasons the Father has in His hand, and we don't know when it is. But you are to receive power, and you are to be witnesses in Jerusalem, and all Judea, and unto the uttermost parts of the world. We have our command to do that. But when it has been published to the extent that he has intended it to be before his return, it will be a pretty good guess that at the time of the ascension that it hadn't been yet when it hadn't yet begun. When the apostles had gone out, and spent their lives going pretty far, no one would then know 14 and I question very seriously whether anybody at any time since has been in a position to sufficiently say that thisverse has been sufficiently fulfilled or not. We don't know. Maybe there is a lot more preaching; there may be several hundred more years of preaching. 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  And of course, the Nestorians in the Middle Ages, they 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  and they preached the gospel, and they established some pretty good sized churches, and just how

many nations it has to be published in, and just how big a nations is, we don't know. (question)

(END OF RECORD E 21)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 22)

Well, that is a matter of Greek exegesis. I have heard it so that those verses show that Christ considers  $\frac{1}{2}$  the gospel which was preached to all nations under heaven be considered that it had been preached to all nations. That is, there is a lot more preaching to do. But of course, after all,  $\frac{1}{2}$  was a part of the Roman empire. So as soon as you have begun to preach in Judea, you have preached in the Roman nation.  $\frac{3}{4}$  If it was a matter of preaching it to every individual, then of course, it will never be done. 1 ...and I think that Dr Buswell interprets that as an aorist, meaning that it is going to be. (JOB) Paul said, It has been preached 1 and I am on my way to tell it. (AAM) And whatever missionary work is to be done before Christ returns is part of God's plan. And there may be 300 years yet of very extensive preaching of the Gospel. The whole world may be yet opened, for all we know. On the other hand, I don't think that any one of us ~~is~~ has the right to say, if Christ had come back in the 16th century, to say that You couldn't have come back, for the Gospel ~~hasn't~~ hasn't been preached to all the nations. We are not able to say in any precise manner just what that means. It is a general evidence to it that our duty is to publish the gospel, and 2 . (question). That is a matter, in my opinion, of misinterpretation. If you take it that way, it means that you don't even have to think of Christ's coming. Just forget it, because the time will come when everybody in the world will know, Now he is here. Well, now, I don't think that that is what that passage means. (ques) Whether we will ever see the man of sin or not, I don't think that the Scripture tells. We know that Christ will destroy the man of sin at His coming, Well not, our time is just about up, and we have run thru this in Mk, and we have noticed that in Mk ~~is~~ the emphasis is the same as in Lk. Only a little more so, on the negative aspect of the signs. 3 because we have this great stress at the end of the chapter, You don't know when the time is,

so take heed, watch and pray, for what I say to you I say to all. It is an attitude of the saints from the very beginning: you don't know  $3\frac{1}{2}$  even, midnight, cockcrow, or in the morning, you don't know ~~which~~ it is going to be, so be ready whenever it is. Be ready immediately; kwhat I say to you I say to all, Watch. So if he should come like that, then you are ready. Well, then, thru the two chapters we have a very great similarity. We went thru steep by step, and we found a very great similarity, but we found one interesting thing. Right after the statement of the persecution which we have in Lk, fir<sup>s</sup> we have the statement of wars and earthquakes which are not the sign, sthen the statement of the persecution in Lk, and then in 20-24 we have what seemed to us to be rather definitely a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD and then he went on about great cosmic signs in the heavens and the son of man coming in great glory, and then the parable of the fig tree, and so on. Well, now, in Mk, we had almost an exact paralle here. We had first the nations against nations, the earthquakes and famines, which are not the signs of his coming, then we have the persecutions, the witness- ing, and then we have where Lk says When you see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then knw that the desolation thereof is nigh, and those in Judea flee to the mountains, and at the same place, Mk said, when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, let him that r<sup>4</sup>adeth unde<sup>5</sup>stand, then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains, kand then we went on with woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days, in both passages, and the stat~~ements~~ of terrific persecutions, of fearful tribulations in both sections, only that where Lk ended up with saying that Jerusalem is trodden of the Gentiles till the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled, ~~Mk~~ Mk says instead, lLo if any man say to you, Here is Christ, or There is Christ, follow him not, for false Christs and false prophets shall rise and show signs and wonders ; but take ye heed. Behold I have foretold ye all things but know that after that tribulation the sun is dark and the moon not give here light. That is, Mk if anything, shows a longer period with the false Christ, and the false prophets,

and signs and wonders and all, clearly if anything a longer period between the distress and suffering in Judea and the end  $5\frac{1}{2}$  in Lk. s

And the two passages are very similar. The one difference between them being, that Mk says, When ye see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, and Lk says, when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies. And so there are those who say that when it says the Abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, then it means the hostile armies, and the holy place is Judea, where they ought not to be. And that this statement, the Abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, is an exact parallel to the statement Jerusalem shall be compassed about with armies. And that both of them are predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem. Now that is the interpretation which some advance of the two. Based upon the remarkable parallelism of the two, and the remarkable parallel of this section here ~~which seems~~ with the section which seems in Lk to be definitely the destruction of Jerusalem. Now I know a great many who don't think that that is the correct interpretation. They think that Lk's discussion of the destruction of Jerusalem is completely omitted in Mk, and that Mk's  $6\frac{3}{4}$  is dealing with an entirely different thing which takes place at an entirely different time, despite the very close parallel of the two passages. Now between those two interpretations, I am inclined to ~~xxx~~ be very ignorant. I hope to have my ignorance dispelled during the course of the year. But up to the present, I simply don't know. And I don't want to make a mistake on it, and consequently I may seem over skeptical. ~~It~~ It doesn't mean that I don't see the weight of some of the questions, but I want to see it absolutely before I reach my conclusion. And I very definitely  $7\frac{1}{2}$

JOB - too indistinct to read.  $8\frac{1}{2}$  We go back once more for harmonistic references.  $8\frac{3}{4}$  recognizing first of all that this is a unit in itself. The Bible is made up of books, and books must be treated at least as books, in their own entire unity ; then beginning the book in its very context  $9\frac{1}{4}$  and then we will be getting something more, and we will be getting an historical reconstruction of the events. We have the Bible which gives us a system of doctrine, and a Bible which gives us an historical Christ.

Mt 24, And Jesus going out from the Temple was proceeding, and the disciples came to him to show to him the architectural features of the temple. That is the picture of the setting of this discourse: the departure from the temple, and the calling to attention of the architectural features. And he answering said to them, See not thee all ~~these~~ these stones? Surely I tell you there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down. The next verse gives the 10½ point of view. He being seated upon the Mt of Olives, the disciples came to him privately saying, When will these things be, and what are the signs of Thy parousia, and of the consummation of the age? Not just taking this as it stands, we might understand these questions, we might understand these three questions, but I suggest in anticipation that as we read the whole things in it's context, we will see that they regarded these questions, and the Lord himself regarded these questions as all one question. So lets keep it open in our minds, whether we have three questions or one. Suggest that we read right straight thru, and then that we take collateral references. (AAM) In verse one, you said architectural features. (JOB) That is only one building, so since 12½ But that seems to be what they were talking about: the architectural structure. We will get the harmonistic references shortly. And now He was seated on the Mt of Olives and they came to him privately saying, When will these things be, and what will be the sign of thy parousia, and the consummation of the age. That is, there is three questions in their minds and in his mind, 13 all one question that simply had three different ways of stating it. We will leave that open in your minds here, with answering it in full detail. These things, thy parousia, and the consummation of the age. Jesus answering said, Watch out, lest anyone deceive you. That is the negative answer to this group here, Watch out lest anyone deceive you, for many will come in my name, saying, I am the Christ, and they will deceive many. 13 3/4

...wars and the talk of wars. Look lest you be disturbed, or, do not be disturbed, for it is necessary for these things to come to pass, but the end is not yet. Remember that in Lk he said that it was not immediately, but here the end is not yet. For nations will rise against nation, and kingdom against

kingdom, and there will be ~~fasts~~ famines and earthquakes in various places, and these things are the beginning of trouble. Now it could be that these things are a source of trouble. Beginning of troubles would be better.

14 3/4 . Then they will deliver you up to tribulation, and they will kill you... (END OF RECORD ~~///~~ E 22)

persecuted of all of the Gentiles for my names sake. This is very brief here in Mt  $\frac{1}{2}$  (very indistinct) . Altho many will be caused to stumble, and they will deceive one another, and they will hate one another, and many false prophets will arise, and they will deceive many 1 (indistinct) on account of the increase of wickedness, the love of many will grow cold. These who abide faithful until the end, these will be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in all the world for a testimony to all the Gentiles, or all the nations. And they will come  $1\frac{1}{2}$  .

And that is the first affirmative answer which we have had  $1\frac{3}{4}$  their question, What will the sign of thy coming, and of the  $1\frac{3}{4}$  of the age. So here he says, then will come the end of the 2 . Then will come the end when the Gospel has been preached for a witness to all the nations. So up to verse 14, it is entirely negative in Mt. But the end of verse 14, you have an affirmative part of the answer. When therefore you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, (he who reads must understand), then those in Judea must flee into the mountains, and he ~~upon~~<sup>upon</sup> upon the housetop must not come down to take all the things out of the house. And he who is in the field must not turn back to take his coat. Sorrow to those who are about to give birth to children, and to those who have nursing children in those days, Pray that your flight may not be in the winter, nor on the Sabbath.  $3\frac{1}{2}$

Or the Sabbath. I have just a simple suggestion there; that word is peculiar to Mt anyway; that from the time of the attack of the Maccabees on down thru the time of Hitler and Pearl Harbour, an attack on a holiday is more devastating. That is to say, the people who are planning the sudden attack will fall when the population are relaxed. And at least that does make sense; ? Whether that is the meaning here or not, the Jews were fairly butchered when they were attacked on their Sabbath day. But then they made up their minds' that the Sabbath was not a day for them to get butchered, so the next time the enemies came and attacked them, we read in I Macc , they answered back and their enemies were thrown back on their heels. So an attack on the Sabbath day is rather an obvious thing, I should think.

I don't think that it means any particular Jewish reference, but not on a rest day. Or not on a religious Sabbath, for that matter. And there will be days of great thlipsis, great tribulation. It has a footnote which we must look up there: Daniel 12.1. Such as not come from the beginning of the cosmos until now, no, nor ever would come. And unless those days were shortened, no flesh could be saved, but an account of the elect, (and here you have the word elect. Mt is writing after most of Paul's epistles are in circulation, and as Christ gave these words before Paul, yet it would seem that Mt would explain that he didn't mean the elct when he said the elect. But he is talking about the elect, and the time of the elect will be shortened). Then if anyone says to you, Look here is Christ, or there, do not believe, for there will come, false Christs and false prophets, and they will do great things, (now the false Christs giving false signs is something a little in advance, of the initial negative warning. ) There will be false Christs and false prophets, and many will come in my name saying, I am Christ; ~~and here~~ and here he says that at this time, following this abomination of desolation, there will come false Christs and false prophets, and they will give signs. I was going to suggest the connection of the false prophet of Rev 13, who does have miracle power, and great signs and errors. So as to deceive if possible the elect. Look, I have told you before. If therefore they say to you, Look in the desert, do not go out. Look, he is in secret chambers, do not believe. For just as the lightning comes over the west, and shines to the east, so will be the parousia of the Son of man. Now you see they had asked him about the parousia, and he explains with reference to this time just after the abomination of desolation, that they are not to be deceived by any secret Christ, any local Christ, for it will be like a flash of lightning visible thruout the entire horizon. Where the body is, there will be gathered together the eagles. And immediately after the tribulation of those days,

7½

. I think that we can show a reference to this event in the eleventh chapter of Revelation, but that is another question. Immediately after this very short and very terrible thlipsis, the sun will be darkend and the moon will not ~~give~~ give its brilliance, and the stars will fall from

heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken. Now re that referen  
 the powers of the heavens being shaken, and the interpretation in Heb 12.26  
 and Hag 2.6, we had that from Lk. Now this is not the only time when the sun  
 is going to be dark, or the moon turn to blood, or there be a star shower,  
 a meteoric shower, but after this terrible tribulation there will be these  
 events, and the time when the powers of the heavens will be shaken. And then  
 will be seen the sign of the son of man in heaven. I don't think that that is  
 the sign of the son of man in the sense that it is the sign of something else,  
 but I think that that clearly is a genitive of apposition, the sign: then will  
 be seen the sign, the Son of man coming in heaven. That is, I read it as a  
 genitive of apposition. And then will weep all the tribes of the earth, and  
 they will see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and  
 great glory, and he will send out his angels with a great trumpet, and they  
 will gather together his elect from the four winds and corners of heaven to  
 corners thereof.

9 3/4

. k From the fig tree learn a par-

able. When its twigs are tender, and it sprouts forth its buds, you know that  
 the summer is near. So also do when ye see all these things. Know that ~~the~~  
 it is near or he is near, -- which? Well, the thing that we are talking about  
 is near, and that includes his parousia, at the door. Yes, the kingdom of God  
 is near. And Mt and Mk say, At the door. Lk doesn't say at the door, but  
 the Kingdom of God. I would say that the things that we are talking about is  
 near. And this is the imminency of the Lord's return, and includes all these  
 things that he has just referred to. Truly I tell you, that this race shall  
 not pass away until all these things come to pass. I was very sure about that  
 reading race in Lk 17.25

11 1/4

. (JOB constantly indistinct)

There is the prophecy of the perpetuity of the Jew. Heaven and earth will  
 pass away, but my word will not pass away. But concernig that day and ~~hour~~  
 hour nobody knows, not the angels of heaven, nor the son, but the Father only.  
 Now here he gives this reference to the days of Noah which he had also given  
 in Perea. Just as the days of Noah, so will be the parousia. He is answer-  
 ing their question. And as they were in those day before the flood, eating  
 and drinking and getting married, and giving their daughters in marriage,

There is nothing wrong with what they were doing. It is just the continuity of secularity. Until the day that Noah went into the ark. And they did not know; that is to say, they were warned but they did not know, they did not take it in; until the cataclysm came and took them all away. So will be the parousia of the son of man. Then there will be two in the field, one will be taken and one will be left. Two feminine will be grinding at the mill, one will be taken and the other left. Watch therefore, for ye do not know what day the Lord comes. You know that fact, that if the goodman of the house (and one of my students insisted that this meant a righteous man) had known at what watch the thief would come, he would have watched (this is a condition contrary to fact) he would have watched and would have not permitted his house to be broken into. You be also ready, because at such an hour as you think not, the son of man comes. Who therefore is  $14\frac{1}{2}$  and wise ~~servant~~ servant whom his lord  $14\frac{1}{2}$  Blessed is that servant, whom, his lord coming, is found  $14\frac{1}{2}$ . Truly I tell you, that over all his possessions he will place him. But if that evil servant say to himself, in his heart, My Lord is taking his time, and he begins to beat his fellow servants, and to eat and to drink with the  $15$ , the lord of that servant will come in a day (END OF RECORD e 23) (BEGINNING OF RECORD e 24)

...will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.  $\frac{1}{4}$  It isn't the English indefinite, but in that day will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. It is not necessarily a reference to eternal punishment. Well, it is translated;  $\frac{1}{2}$  It must be an idiom, like  $\frac{3}{4}$ . (very indistinct) I think that  $\frac{3}{4}$  for cutting him off. (mumbling) In that day will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Now that  $1\frac{1}{2}$  with reference to the immediacy of the parousia of Christ in a number of different passages. I don't think this  $1\frac{1}{2}$  refers to eternal punishment. It may. I wouldn't deny it, but I  $1\frac{1}{2}$ . Those who are left outside at the time of the parousia will be in a place of weeping and gnashing of teeth. Right here on this earth, and that may be taken as  $1\frac{3}{4}$ . The kingdom of heaven is ~~is~~ likened unto ten virgins, who taking their lamps, went out to

the meeting of the bridegroom. Five of them were morons; five were wise. And the foolish ones, taking their lamps did not take with them oil. But the wise took oil in their containers. As the bridegroom stayed, or occupied time, all of them (that is an ingressive aorist, and an imperfect of continuous action) began to nod and went to sleep. You can just see them there. I don't think there is any moral lesson. I think that they did what was natural to do, and in the time of waiting at night. So they began to nod and they went to sleep. Maybe they are morally reprehensible, but that would have to be an interpretation. At midnight there came a cry: Look, the bridegroom is coming. Go out to meet him. Then arose all those virgins and began to trim their lamps. And the foolish said to the wise, Give us some of your oil, for our lamps are gone out. We have to stop for just a bit of exegesis here. I suggest that the ten virgins represent people in church who are professing Christians, and that the oil in the lamps of the five foolish ones represents the ordinary common grace of God mediated by ordinary Christian culture. There is the common grace of God, and the supply of oil represents being born again by the indwelling Holy Spirit. Well, anyway their lights had gone out. And they couldn't have been Arminians; maybe they were Arminians, as their lights went out. And they said, Give us some of your oil, because our lights have gone out. And answered the wise ones, saying, No, for there is not enough for us and you. So go get it where it is to be got. That is to say, Nobody's spirituality can shine for any other person, in this sense of the word. In other words, this midnight cry, The Lord is going to come, will wake up a lot of people, and some of those who have been just worldly Christians or tent followers will begin to realize that they don't have any fuel for light, and they'll say, Let us shine in your light. No, you have go get it where I got it. Well, that is interpretation anyway. It is eschatological, and refers to His coming again. Go rather to those who sell, and buy for yourselves. And as they had gone away to buy, the bridegroom came. And those who were ready went in with him into the marriage. And the door was locked. Later come the rest, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. He answering said, Truly I tell you, I do not know you. This has the phrase added, Where did you come from? ; I know you not. Evidently these are not

born again people. They are left outside, they are not in the rapture. After Watch therefore, for you do not know the day nor the hour. Just as a man travelling, that is going away from home. All his servants and he gave to them his goods. To the one he gave five talents, and to another two talents, and the parable of the  $6 \frac{3}{4}$  is in Lk 19, in the Perean section. But this is the parable of the talents. The one went and dug and hid it in the earth. The one who received the one talent went away and dug the earth and hid his lord's money. After a long time, he comes, the Lord of these servants, and he has words with them, an accounting with them. And he who received the five talents comes and says, Here are five other talents, Lord. You gave me five talents, here are five other talents. Said to him his lord, good, good and faithful servant. Two different words, We say, well done, good and faithful servant. In a few things you were faithful; over many things I will place you. Enter into the joy of thy lord. Cometh also the one who had the two talents. He said, Lord, two talents you gave to me.. Lool, two other talents I have gained. Said to him his lord, Well done, good servant and faithful, in a few things you have been faithful, over many things I will place you. Enter into the joy of thy lord. And then came the one having the one talent. He said, Lord, I knew you, that you are a hard man. Lk uses the word ~~st~~ stern man; gathering where you did not sow. And I was afraid, and I went away and I hid your talent in the earth, Here, you have what is yours. And answering him his lord, he said to him, Evil servant and slothful. You knew that I gathered where I did not sow, and I pick up where I did not put down, You ought to have cast this to the bankers, the investment brokers, (and here is a clear evidence in favour of capitalism) in order that coming I might have my own with interest. That word interest is just the word for fruit-bearing, Take from him therefore the talent, and give ~~it~~ it to him that had the ten talents, for to him that has shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away. Even what he has shall be taken away. That is one of the doubly attested sayings, occurring five times in the three Gospels. Cast him into the outer darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Well, it

is a very familiar sunday-school lesson, but the eschatology of it is very clear, and it is a part of the natural course. Then comes this reference to the sheep and the goats. When therefore the Son of man comes in His glory, and all His angels with Him, there He will sit upon His glorious throne and there will be gathered before him all of the nations, and He will separate them (masc pl) (I think that that is important. It doesn't say that He will separate them Neuter Pl, but He will separate them as people) Separate the sheep from the goats. And He will place the sheep upon his right hand, and the goats upon his left hand. Then will say the king to those on his right hand, Come, you blessed ones, you who are blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. I was hungry and you gave me meat; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger and you associated with me; naked was I and you clothed me; I was weak and you looked after me; in prison was I and you came to me; then will answer to him the righteous saying (everybody surprised, for they hadn't been engaged in social service particularly. They are surprised) Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink? When did we see you a stranger and associate with you, or naked and clothed you? When did we see you weak and in prison and come to you. There is no account of having done that such thing. The king answering will say to them, Truly I tell you, forasmuch as you did it to one of these my brothers, these sheep, you did it to me. Now the reaction to that as social service and salvation by works has caused a great many faulty things. The whole point of it is that it showed their attitude towards him. And he answers them, All these things that I am talking about are evidences of your faith in me. It isn't salvation by works. But it is judgement by evidence. The 13 of faith, the parallel references for the brethren of the Lord are Mt 12.15, Mk 3.35, and Lk 8.21. Who are the brethren of the Lord? Those that do the will of their Father. Then (ques) They came to him, and His relatives came to Him, and the people said that Your mother and your brethren are looking for you, and He said who is my mother, and who are my brethren? This is as simple as can be, that when the Lord comes,

the people who are caught up to meet him in the clouds, and who are going to reign with him, are the people who have been waiting for him to come, and giving an evidence of the fact that they had a regard for Christ. If we have a regard for Christ, we will love His brothers. By this we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. We haven't passed out of death unto life because we love the brethren, but we have an assurance of it because we love the brethren. And so here the love for the brethren is in evidence that we have  $14\frac{1}{2}$ . To those on his left hand: depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry and you did not give me food, and thirsty and you did not give me drink, naked was I and you did not clothe me, a stranger was I and you did not associate with me, weak and in prison and you did not look after me. Then will they answer also, saying, Lord, when did we see you hungry, or thirsty or a stranger, or naked, or sick or in prison and did not minister to you? Then he will answer (END OF RECORD E 24)

the evidence shows that he did not have faith in Christ. These will go away into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels and the righteous into life eternal. Two more verses to get the connection. And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these words, he said to his disciples, You know that after two days comes the passover, and the Son of man will be betrayed to be crucified. Matthew regards this as a continuous discourse, and at the end of it, he reminded them of his crucifixion which was then imminent. 1

I had a purpose in mind. We should have skipped some of the more familiar passages, but I just summed it right along and read it straight thru. Having read it thru, I think to see reasons for making the interrogation all one question rather than three. Are these any reactions to that? When will these things be, and what will be the sign of thy coming, and what will be the consummation of the age? He didn't seem to give an answer to three questions, but He seemed to give an answer to one question, with different aspects. Having in view the eschatology of the previous chapters in Mt, and the same thing in Lk, it wouldn't be surprising that they had in mind a catastrophic event in which there would be overturning and overturning and his kingdom would be established. And if that is the case, then he understood their remarks, and they understood their remarks about the 2 of connected words. The transformation of the age, and his parousia,. I would like to take the references in Daniel, and you are the OT expert. And there are those referred to here. That would seem to be the next logical step here in connection with Mt 24. And they we will fit the two discourses together, just to review them, and see what he has to say. (AAM) Those passages in Daniel are extremely difficult, and while I could look at them now, I am not ready to speak on them with any great knowledge. (JOB) Well, I will just sum up very ~~briefly~~ briefly. He says, If any man see the one spoken of by Daniel the prophet. Now that phrase in the LXX occurs in Dan 9.27 and 11.31, and 12.11. That is where the abomination of desolation is referred to. In Dan 9.27, the exact word from the LXX, that is to say there are many variant reading in the LXX, but the LXX and Theodotian give the Abomination of Desolation. In the other two places,

the LXX gives the singular of the word desolation, and in 11 and 12 chapter both the LXX and Theodotiann give the exact words that Christ used here. The abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet. That being the literary allusion, it seems to me that we are obliged to look back, and you can read. We don't need to go into too much detail about Daniel's weeks. I am not a Daniel expert by any means. But here he says, 70 sevens; 5 and then the angel came and spoke to him and said, Seventy sevens are determined upon thy people, and the holy city, to finish the transgressions, to make an end of sin, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up the vision and the prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. I am reading from the revised version.  $5\frac{1}{2}$  (too fast and indistinct) There shall be 7 sevens, and three score and two sevens,  $5\frac{1}{2}$  instead of weeks. The RV says weeks. It shall be built again the street and moat in troublous times. (AAM) ...you have to say seven sevens and threescore and two sevens. That is, why don't you say seven sevens, and stop. And then say and threescore and two sevens the street shall be built. Is there any justification for putting those two things together there? If I was going to say that something was going to be 38 weeks from now, I wouldn't say that it was going to be 16 weeks and 22 weeks from now. I might say that it will be 16 weeks till the beginning of vacation, and then 22 more till the fall. But I wouldn't say that the beginning of vacation will be 16 weeks and 22 weeks; fall will come with the new semester. (JOB) You wouldn't admit that you had some special reason for chopping it up. I mean, what (this is AAM) right do we have to chop it in such a strange place as that? That is my question: did Daniel do it, or did the RV do it? (JOB) No (AAM) I don't think that the Heb does it; I think that the Heb separates it. (JOB) You mean that punctuation mark. The angel said 70 sevens. You have been talking about 70 years. Now 70 sevens will accomplish these things. (AAM) And then he tells something about 7 of them, and then he tells something about 62 of them, and something of one of them. And for us to take the 7 and the 62 and just lump them together is rather ignoring what would seem to be a plain distinction which the passage is showing. (JOB) You usually take words with the verb to make sentences, if you

can. (AAM) Well, now supposing that I were to say that from now until the end of the semester will be 16 weeks, and 22 weeks we will not have any classes. And then will come a new semester. Now you could just as well say it this way: say from now till the end of the semester will be 16 weeks and 22 weeks we will have a new semester and classes will begin. Now that is what the RV is saying. There are two periods of time, and two things given, and they have stuck both periods with the first thing, and the second thing with no period. It is rather irrational. (JOB) I am not so much concerned with the first 69 weeks. I don't see; suppose you said there are 16 weeks to this semester, and then you went on to enumerate five and 10 and 1. It would be rather obvious that you were talking about 16. (AAM) that is right, certainly. (JOB) And if we broke it up into 5 and 10 and 1, it may be conceived that there is a vacation in between there, after the five or so, that is, something or other might come. Now the angel says 70, and then he enumerates 7, 62, and 1. So he talks about a total of 70. And then he says there will be 7 and 62. Now if you take it the way that it is punctuated in the RV, you make a sentence. That is, you have a predication with a verb to it. (AAM) Well, if you move your punctuation back, you would still have a sentence. From the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto the anointed one the prince shall be 7 weeks. ; And 62 weeks it shall be built again, with street and moat even in troublous times. And after the 62 weeks shall  $9\frac{1}{2}$  It is just a matter of putting your period a little further back, and having your two periods of time to go with two different sentences instead of jabbing them both in with one and leaving the second without any period of time. (JOB) There shall be 7 weeks, period. (AAM) Seven weeks, semicolon, then, and during 62 weeks such and such a thing is going to happen, then after the 62 another thing is going to happen. (JOB) I am not interested in that so much now. I am interested in it. (AAM) I am merely saying that at this point, the English version has inserted a punctuation which is not justified in the Heb. or in Logic. (AAM) I will be interested to see how you make a point. I think that the 7 weeks began at the first year of Titus. And the temple was built, and

but then there was a terrible relapse and there was a gap; There was a revival under Ezra and Nehemiah, and it comes out to about 62 sevens till the time of Christ. But all these things I know that you and I agree on this, that OT' chronology is not like modern bookkeeping. First there is the 70 years that Daniel has been talking about. Then there is the battle of Charchamesh, and the first year of Cyrus, and you have an awful job. The 11½ to 516 it is easy to get 70 years. Then the temple was destroyed in 586 and it was finished in 515. That seems to be 70 years stretch. The point is that the destruction took from 606 to 586, and the rebuilding took from 538 to well, clear down a long time. (AAM) But you would ~~xxxx~~ hardly take the 70 years as running from 516, because you find in 538 Daniel prayed to the Lord in view of the 12. (JOB) Well, I have the date of the first year of this Darius, and did Daniel say, It is now up, or, It is going to be up? (AAM) It is going to be up. (JOB) Yes. (AAM) But he didn't say that it was going to be up in 22 years. I mean, It is going to be up would imply that it is going to be within a couple of years. (JOB) But Daniel knew that it had been a good long time since the first part of the destruction. He knew that it hadn't been 70 years since the destruction of the Temple. And he was praying about it. The temple had been devastated for nearly 50 years. But what were are interested in is in the 27th verse, with reference to the 24th of Mt. After three score and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, that is translated the Messiah generally, and the KJ version says, But not for himself. It certainly makes good sense. And the people of the prince that shall come (AAM) It makes good sense, but I don't think that it would naturally be translated that way. It seems naturally to mean, There is nothing to him, or, he has nothing. The idea of 'not' is not in there. It is rather a loose translation. (JOB) a And the KJ version is translated, But not for himself. Ayin means nothing more than it means not. (AAM) Yes; not is lo. (JOB) I took it as no strike against him; he is the sinless one. Nothing against him. 14 but there is nothing against him. It is a cryptic reference, whatever. And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city 14½ and the end thereof shall be with a flood, even to the end shall be war; desolation are

determined, and he shall make a covenant with the many for one seven. Now you have 70 sevens, and then you had reference to 7 sevens, 62 sevens, and 1 seven. The subject of He shall perform a covenant is, in anybody's grammar, the prince that shall come. That is to say, you are to ignore that and go back to something else 15 . The A-Mills, of course, try to make out that Christ is the one who confirms this covenant. But the proximate subject of that verb is the Prince tht shall come. (END OF RECORD E 25)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 26)

In the midst of the seven, he shall ~~cause~~ the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. And upon the whole of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate even until the consumation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. Now that is a very loose phrase, and difficult to read, and there are plenty of different chances, but at any rate the phrase abomination of desolations occurs here. Abominations of desolation is the word used here. So this is the place where Daniel refers to what Christ is talking about. And altho the syntax of this sentence is quite loose, it is in the midst of the week that he stopped their sacrifice and oblation. This prince tht shall confirm a covenant for one seven, and in the midst of the seven will he stop the sacrifice and the oblation, and then is the very difficult sentence in which occurs the phrase abominations of desolation. (ques) the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city etc, and he, namely the prince that shall come, will make a covenant for one seven. In the midst of that seven he will stop their sacrifice and their oblation, and then comes this reference to abomination of desolation. (ques) (AAM) You are interpreting verse 26 up to the one stopping it as the first advent, and then jumping over to the second advent in the middle of that week. (JOB) Oh, you have ~~exists~~ not for himself, and I have for nothing. Well that I would take as 30 AD. (AAM) And then you jump right there. (JOB) There is the case where you have 3 .

(aam) I think that most interpreters take what follows as being the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. (JOB) But then you have a double fulfillment, because there isn't any midst of any seven in which any sacrifice could be cut off.

(AAM) But some take the end of 26 as being the people, the Roman people, being the same people who are connected with the antichrist 2000 years later. (JOB) I know. (AAM) And that the people, then, come and destroy the city and the sanctuary, and there are wars and desolations then, but that the Prince that shall come, who is one out of this people, but much later, in 27...(JOB) I know. That is the usual way. (AAM) But you don't accept that. (JOB)O but that pulls it all apart. You wouldn't have any continuity of argument at all. The Messiah is cut off, and things move right along after that. Now in Dan 2,7,9,11, you have a great parenthesis. Just where that parenthesis comes in chapter 11 Dr Mac and I have never gotten together on that. I think that the part that we are approaching is on it's boundaries. In 2, it is perfectly clear.  $4 \frac{1}{4}$  1 In chapter 7, ~~and~~ the false beast  $4 \frac{1}{2}$  Rome  $4 \frac{1}{2}$ . (AAM) Why could you not, on that analogy, have 26 be Rome, destroying the city and the sanctuary, and then your same gap and 27 the antichrist 2000 years later, just the same as the gap between the iron and the iron/clay. (JOB) Well, as far as this verse is concerned, it could be that way. But I think that there are other reasons. (QUES) (AAM) In 27, he shall confirm, and he was asking how the antecedent could be the prince. Well, in the first place there is no he in the Heb. It is 'one' shall confirm. And who is that one? Is it somebody already spoken of or not? It might be not anybody spoken of, but it goes forward, and jumps 2000 years to a situation in which somebody confirms a covenant. Or it could be that the he in that verse 27 ~~xxxxxxx~~ refers back to the prince that shall come referred to in 26; 26 tells about the destruction of Jerusalem by the people of the ~~iron~~ iron legs, which later is followed by the iron and the clay when you have a prince from that same people who then is the prince that shall come and verse 26 is speaking of the people of the prince that shall come. That is, the usual interpretation of it is that in 26 it refers to 30-70 AD, and verse 27 to a later ~~xxx~~ period. JOB's suggestion that the gap comes not at the end of 26 but in the middle of it does not at first sight impress me particularly. But with further study I may come to think that he is right, as he is on so many other points. (ques)

(JOB) You can get infinite variety in the commentaries. Up to the cutting off of the Messiah, I think that we are on fairly clear ground; and you could read And the people of the prince that shall come will destroy the city in 70 AD, and after a long time, he shall confirm the covenant. This is the 3 sing verb, he shall confirm. It isn't, as a verb, someone whom he confirms. In chapter 11, you have all the sevens in 23 8 also the prince of the covenant. It doesn't stand as a part of the sentence. It is the same word for prince... Now this prince of the covenant in chapter 11 gets very excited about the holy covenant, and he is the one who sets up the abomination of desolation. Wherever the transition come in chapter 11, certainly it leads up to the future eschatology, and just lets rapidly survey chapter 11 to get the reference. (AAM) Before we go on to chapter 11, shall we say that as far as chapter 9 is concerned; the passage from 24-27 there is one in which I am sure there are some very important and vital matters for us. I think that a few are clear, but most of it is pretty hazy. And the haziest verse is probably verse 27, on which there is written a good many different interpretations that have been suggested, some fairly good and some extremely bad. ~~And~~ But as it stands in the Heb and in the English, there is no phrase, Abomination of desolation. There is such a phrase in the LXX, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  I don't exactly see how that it fits in with the Heb here, or the Eng here, or how 9 3/4 with the verse, so as far as I'm concerned at the present, any relation between Daniel 9:27 and Mt 24 seems to me a very dark and uncertain avenue. I may in further study find that this explains Mt or that Mt explains this, but this verse 27 is one on which I need a few hours study, and then I am not sure about it. But I don't see the abomination of desolation in it all at the present, except that the LXX has the phrase. (JOB) The English, the overspreading of abomination ~~is~~ to make it desolate. (AAM) What does that mean? (JOB) Well, there is your word abomination, and desolation. Christ used it as an infinitive and an attributive genitive. That is, the word which means abominations of desolation is there. The words abomination and desolation are there in the text, in the Heb and in the LXX, and in the English.

(AAM) Of course, as the English translates it in the Authorized version ~~here~~ here, then For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate. Even unto the consumation. Well, now, an idea of abomination of desolation is quite different from the overspreading abomination he shall make it desolate. (JOB) I don't think so. The abomination of desolation, the abomination characterized by desolation; that is what Christ said. And here is the reference to the overspreading of abomination which shall make it desolate. (AAM) Well, then, as far as this verse is concerned, you say that Christ in Mt is referring to an overspreading of abomination that maketh desolate. (JOB) He is referring to an abomination characterized by desolation to which Daniel refers. (AAM) From this 27th verse, you wouldn't know what this abomination is tho. You have no idea. (JOB) It seems to be associated with the middle of this seven. It is at the middle of this heptad that he stops the sacrifice ! Now chapter 11, this phrase, the prince of the covenant is introduced at the end of verse 23, and after the league made with him, he shall work deceitfully; for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people. He shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches; yea, he shall devise his devices against the stronghold, even for a time. (Verses 25-27 are quoted in full) Verse 28, Then shall he return into his land with great riches. Now there are many obscure references there, but the he of 28 seems to be the prince of the covenant. He shall return into his land with great substance, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant. Now this is the prince of the covenant, and after some kind of a ruckus with the king of the south, he comes back with great spoil, and his heart is against the holy covenant. And he shall do exploits and shall return to his land. (Verse 29 and 30 quoted) Now if this is the same covenant, then the traitors to the covenant he will connive with. Verse 31 quoted: there is the cessation of their offering. That is the phrase, the abomination of desolation. Verses 33-35 quoted in full. Verse 36, And the king shall do acc/to his own will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of the gods,---That seems to be quoted by Paul in

2 Thess 2, when he exalts himself above everything that is called God. And the future man of sin is to do that. Verse 36 continues: and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

(END OF RECORD # E 26)

(indistinct, rapid quotation from Daniel)

I think that when Christ said, If you're in Jerusalem, flee into the mountains, that that would most likely mean the 1 . That is the way that some take it. Either Ammon and Moab, or 1 . (very indistinct)

(quotation, indistinct, of Dan 11 and 12, by JOB) Time, times and a half in Revelation 12 are equated with 42 months, and 1260 days equals 3 1/2 years.

...the continual burnt offering taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up. That is, that seems to be one time that is true, in this sentence. That must refer, I think, to Daniel 9:27, the taking away of the burnt offering, that is what occurs in 11:31, and in 9:27, and the abomination of desolation set up. There shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days, he adds an extra month. 4 1/2 . At least the abomination of desolation

spoken of by Daniel the prophet is referred to, and the third of the references that I pointed out there is a connection with the period of time that would seem 5 to 3 1/2 years. Christ said, the abomination referred to by Daniel, and when you see it (so it was still future). (ques) Well, I can't imagine myself making a ~~careless~~ careless reference to such a well known book.

(ques) No, he referred to the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet. And there are two or three of them. (AAM) You could use the phrase for a future things that would be sooner than something that was described in the past. (JOB) I don't quite get it. (AAM) What I mean is, that if a book told of something that happened in the past, you could, in predicting something in the future, draw an analogy, and say, When you see something come, that is similar to this thing, then you want to watch out. That would be a possible interpretation.

(JOB) Christ said, When you see... That would be your double interpretation. In the 8th chapter, you have a reference to days, the term from the desolation of the temple 6/ 3/4 ages, to the time of the purification of the temple. In the inter-testamental period. (AAM)

Chapter 8 refers to the desolation of the temple by Antiochus, in the inter-testamental period. (JOB) And the days of the desolation are given, and it actually came out that way. (AAM) ~~88~~ there was a desolation of the temple

by Antiochus at that time. In 9.27, tho it is a very obscure verse, it does not impress me as still being future to our time. But when you come to chapter 11 here, from 11.36 it says, the king shall do acc/t o his will, and then it goes on and talks about a man, who is introduced in .36 by the name The King. And it tells what this king is going to do, and from 11.36 on to 12.2 you seem to have a continuous account of Antichrist and that which follows. And there are two interpretations of this, from 11.36 on. One is that which says that it is here antichrist described. The other interpretation says that this is a description about Antiochus by a man who was completely mistaken about him because it doesn't fit him at all. So that if Daniel is true, and if this is God's Word and not the word of some mistaken man, 11.36 on definitely refers to the antichrist, and cannot possibly refer to the Antiochus. Well not, 36 is introduced with this phrase, The king shall do acc/to his will. But before that, everything that we have has simply been telling about a man who for many verses has simply been spoken of as 'he' / We have had no antecedent back there: he shall do this, he shall do that, etc, and you go clear back and from 35 back, Dr Buswell began reading from 22: And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant. That doesn't sound like the beginning of the section at all, but 22 sounds as if it must follow 21. (JOB) No, I started in the middle of 22. Beginning with 'yea also' the prince of the covenant, is not syntactically connectd with what goes before; it is a disconnected phrase, and seems to me that it introduces a new topic. (AAM) You would take 22 this way: And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him and shall be broken. And also the prince of the covenant, and after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully. (JOB) Now then, they go on to talk about the prince of the covenant, and from there on he is the subject of discourse. Your massoretic punctuation doesn't substantiate that, does it? (AAM) The difficulty with that is that in 11 you would have an account which begins with the kings of Persia, goes on to Alexander the great, describes quite a number of unimportant kings, relatively unimportant, that is, but

traces right thru, father to son, father to son, giving interesting things about them but not particularly important. As you read it, you say: All this is fulfilled historically; it exactly fits, but what is the importance of it? And you get up to verse 21, you have a man described, and then in 22, the next one in line would be 10½. And you read in 22, And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. Now that is exactly what Antiochus did. And from the arms of a flood shall they be overflowed, from before him, and shall be broken; and that is exactly what Antiochus did. And then if you continue on, you have all this passage of 20 verses telling in long detail about a lot of people that you don't care anything about 11 and when you get to him, you have only two verses. Then all of a sudden you stop. Whereas if you continue, consider that it continues to talk about Antiochus Epiphanes, you find that verses 22ff exactly fit the history of Antiochus. Just about every detail of it can be compared historically with events recorded about him. Verse 30, the ships of chittim coming against him is an exact picture of the Romans interfering with the 11½ conquest and how therefore he was grieved and returned and he was so angry that the Romans wouldn't let him by to conquer Egypt that he turned his indignation against the Jews, as described in .30. And so the passage from verse 21 to 35 can be interpreted in such a way as to exactly fit the history of Antiochus, and the history of Antiochus is elsewhere stressed in Daniel, and you have all the long account before which is of no purpose unless it is to lead up to Antiochus. And then when you get to 35, then to say that Now we have talked about Antiochus, we have had quite a long and full account of him, now we go forward and talk about the antichrist who is similar but a different individual, at a later time, who did many things that Antiochus never did, but is similar in character, and really makes the last great end. That is the reason why most interpreters feel that the break comes at verse 35, and the reason why I would find it difficult in my present viewpoint at least to think of a break anywhere earlier than 36. (JOB) I cannot reconcile it with the words of Christ, that is, Antiochus desecrate the temple

the altar, brought swines around and ~~xxx~~ made them eat pork. II Macc is full of details of heroism . Came up to the temple to worship, and they told him, Look here, old man, you go home and get some dried beef and ~~xxxx~~ put it under your coat and you come up here, and when we tell you to eat pork, you take that dried beef and you chew on it. Then we won't kill you. And he said, For eighty some years I have taught themen of Israel to obey the law of God; shall I now strike out my already long life by seeming to disobey his laws. And they beat him to death. But this prince of the covenant is the same who would refer to the prince who made a covenant. (AAM) Where is your other references? (JOB) Verse 27, the prince tht shall come, he will make a dovenant. (AAM) Hundreds of persons have made convenants; and you don't call him the prince of the covenant simply bevause he made a covenant. (JOB)That is to say, the answer not only remembers that you are talking about world history , but this is a book, which is an integrated unity in itself, and cross references in it's own self, and Christ referred to it as a unit, as a book that talks about an abomination characterized by desolation. Christ refers to this abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, and in the 12th chapter of Daniel, he puts it as prior to a period slightly more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. And in the next chapter of Daniel it is in the middle of 7, and in Thess 2; 15 seems to me to quite identical with what has in Daniel 11 after .36.

(END OF RECORD E 27)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 28) Christ is God in the flesh, and this man will claim to be God in the flesh, and that identifies him as the antichrist. Don't be afraid, don't be frightened, don't be shaken out of your wits;

$\frac{1}{2}$  . So that Paul's reference to this man and this claiming to be God seems to be exactly centered to the setting up of the abomination of desolation. The one spoken of by Daniel the prophet. And in the book of Revelation, the seventh trumpet introduced the beast who, after a period of 42 months, has been able to conquer the witnesses of God. And then he is allowed to continue for 42 months, and then the vials of God's wrath are poured out upon him.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  , which seems to quite similar to the man of sin claiming to be God. And that seems to be set in the middle of the

seven year period. So these collateral references should lead us quite widely afield. Now take a word about the harmonistic nature now. Well, just to go back over Mt 24 now, harmonistically, 2 almost identical in Mark. Whatever your view of the synoptic problem may be, Mt and Lk seem to follow Mk, and to introduce some independent data other than Mk. Anyhow, the temple in Mt and Mk, these architectural structures. In Lk, you do not have exactly the same setting, but certain words spoken to him concerning the temple. That with beautiful stones and devoted gifts it was decorated. I think that the inference is plenty strong enough that Lk is giving the same discourse. Now the Sermon on the Mt in Lk is not the same; it is the Sermon on the Plain. It was when he came down from the Mt that he said that. Christ gives a similar outline on two different occasions, with reference to what is called the Sermon on the Mt. But here, I think that that there are three ~~accounts~~ <sup>accounts</sup> of one discourse, three partial accounts. Mt and Mk give practically the same setting, and Lk says they were talking about the Temple, and it's decorations. And they said to him...they show him these features. And he said to them, You see these things? 3½. Mt and Mk use the strong negative with the aorist subjunctive, and Lk has the negative with the future indicative. There will not be left here. And then comes two lines identical in all three. Stone upon stone which will not be thrown down. I beg your pardon. Mk and Lk have the future indicative positive, and Mk has the aorist subjunctive passage. Mt and Mk state then that he was seated on the Mt of Olives. Mk adds that he was facing the temple, which of course he would be, being there at the brow of the hill. The disciples came to him. Mk ~~there~~ there says Peter and James and John and Andrew came to him. Mt and Mk agree that it was a private question, and Lk doesn't mention it. And they said, tell us, when will these things be? All three. What will be the sign? Now, Mt says, the sign of thy parousia and the/consumation of the age. Mk says, what will be the sign when these things are about to be accomplished. Lk says, what will be the sign when these things are about to come to pass. In Mt you have a twofold statement of the question; in Mk and Lk you do not have. But in Mt, there is no evidence that I have been able to see that it was regarded as a threefold

question. It is all one question, I think. 6 Mk and Lk do not. I take it as all one question. And Jesus answered to them and said, Look out, Look out, that they won't deceive you. For there will be many who will come in my name, and will say (Mt) and the time has come. The first thing that he said in answer to their question was, Look out, there will be many false Christs. Don't be deceived. You are going to hear about wars and reports of wars. Do not be troubled. These things must come to pass first, but the end is not immediately. Mt and Mk says that the end is not yet. Lk says immediately. Lk adds now, Then he said to them, nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. Mt, there will be famines and earthquakes in divers places. Mk, there will be earthquakes in various places, there will be famines, Lk, there will be great earthquakes in varied places, and pestilences and famines there will be. Terrible sights also from heaven; great signs there will be. But before all these things, Lk says, they will lay a hand upon you. Then comes this section in which all three give warnings about their 8 . And of course that follows immediately. Mt gives the briefest account of persecution, because he has to eliminate a more lengthy account of persecution in the sending forth of the twelve. There seems to be a definite tendency on the part of the Synoptists not to repeat themselves extensively. They do ~~not~~ repeat themselves, with brief sayings, but where they had given a block of teaching material, in one context, they shortened it the next time that it came or else they left it out. Which seems to be a very reasonable way to do. Mt on the Mountain of Olives shortens the warnings of persecution, and he gives a longer account of the persecution in the sending out of the 12. References to the Gentiles are to me quite interesting, as obviously thru the course of the days there would be a witness to the Gentiles, but in the sending out of the 12, in Mt 10.18, it will be a testimony for you, and to the Gentiles. The sending out of the 12 had reference to the Gentiles. He was not silent with reference to the Gentiles who observed His ministry. Then there is that part which AAM commented on in Lk. Settle it in your hearts not to prepare your answer. I think that that has been well covered. It doesn't mean not to prepare your sermons. For it is not you that speak.

Christ had said all that in the sending out of the 12. But then he goes on: you will be hated of all the Gentiles for my names sake. In Mt 10, he had not mentioned the Gentile 10. You will be hated by all of them for my names sake. That is another of the ~~many~~ doubly attested sayings. It occurs three times in Mt, Mk, and Lk, in parallel, and once in Mt and once in Lk where Mk is silent. So this warning about trouble, about people being caused to stumble, but a hair of your head will not perish, Lk says. I guess we have covered that fairly well. So, I postulated, that Lk who was not present on any occasion, and Mk was not present, Mt 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  altho his name is not mentioned. I postulate that Lk, who had his own interests and insights and knowledge and the Holy Spirit used him in a special sort of way Lk puts in a paragraph that Mt and Mk do not put in. Mk heard from Peter we'd say; Mt either was there or was one of the original twelve; Mk was not there, but got it from those who were there. When ye see Jerusalem surrounded with armies. Not we have discussed that at some length. I pointed out that whereas Lk gives the warnings for flight from Jerusalem in 22, he does not give it in terms of immediacy or instantaneous flight. He has already given that in chapter 17 with reference to the parousia. In 17, where he is talking about the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of glory, there he had already said, If you are on the housetop, don't come down and take your tools out of the house. He that is in the fields, do not turn back. He had given the instantaneous flight, and he had connected it with the Lord's return in glory. Lk knew then, that this instantaneous flight from Jerusalem had to do with that. 12 $\frac{1}{4}$  chapter 22 when he is talking about Jerusalem surrounded with armies, Lk makes no reference to the abomination of desolation. There he says, If you are in Judea, flee to the mts, and if you are in the midst of it, get out, and if you are in the country, do not go into it. Those days will be a terrible time for nursing mothers. He doesn't say Pray that your flight will not be in the winter or on the Sabbath day. You remember in 70 AD there was a period of time when they could get in and out. They had better get out. They did get out. But Lk with reference to Jerusalem surrounded with armies does not give the same immediacy which Lk had

given with reference to the coming of Christ in the clouds. So I feel quite strongly that Lk 21.20-24 is a different section of that Olivet discourse. Lk got that and he does not put down the abomination of desolation because he has recorded that in Perea. The Lord had given his warning of instantaneous flight in the Perea discourse when he referred to the abomination of desolation. But he had told them about this time when in a flash of lightning the Lord should come. In that day, whoever is on the housetop, and his tools in the house, he must not come down to take them; and he who is in the fields similarly must not turn back. So Lk omitted the reference to the abomination of desolation and the instantaneous flight in 21. We had the instantaneous flight in 17. Mt and Mk run right down straight thru, almost word for word, with that of Lk 14 $\frac{1}{4}$  ./. Pray that your flight be not in the winter and Mt has, Nor on the Sabbath day. Mt and Mk are word for word parallel about the Gt Tribulation; the greatest tribulation that has ever been, from the beginning of the creation of God, Mk says. Mt says from the beginning of time. And there will never be again. Now what is right there in Dan 11 the greatest tribulation, I think that this is specially for 15 . I noticed it as we went thru. The greatest of all tribulations is a short tribulation. But it will be shortened on account of the elect. Then comes the

(END OF RECORD E 28)

So there you have this warning about the abomination of desolation which I take to be the man of sin displaying himself as God. After the tribulation of that time: introduces the next section. (AAM) I would just like to say a word before we are thru. The suggestion that JOB made that in Lk we have the account of the destruction of Jerusalem; and that in Mt and Mk you have instead a presentation of the events which are to happen at the end time, is one which has a good deal to be said in its favour, and has much to be said in it and is worthy of much consideration. I would like, however, not as saying that I do not accept it, but simply as presenting obstacles which should be considered before one's mind is made up, to call your attention to the fourth parallel of the discourse in the two passages, 1½ Mt and Mk much closer than either of them is to Lk, but you have in the beginning the wars, rumours of wars, and all that; verse after verse almost identical in all three. Then you have the account of persecutions, almost identical in all three. Then you have the statement in Mt and Mk When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains, and right exactly at that place in Lk you have the statement, And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation is nigh; then let them which are in Judea flee into the mountains: And then you go down and you have the same statement, in both of them, Woe to them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days, for there shall be great distress in the land ~~and~~ and wrath upon this people. And ~~then~~ then you go on in both of them and you have signs in the moon sun and stars, men's hearts failing them for fear, and they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and with great glory. And then you have the parable of the fig tree. And so there is a remarkable parallel to all three going right straight thru, and in the same place in Lk you have the account of the destruction of Jerusalem and in Mt and Mk you have this other material which refers to the abomination of desolation. But even in that passage there is a remarkable similarity. Now at first sight it certainly will seem that the three passages are all parallel

and that either they all three are talking of the last days, or they all three are talking of the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. Now in the case of Lk it would seem very strong that it is talking of the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, because of the treading down of the Gentiles which seems to suggest pretty strongly that this is that early time. Now if one is to say that Mt and Mk here at this one place alone in the whole of the chapters is different from Lk and Lk had an entirely different incident, it would seem to me that there is a pretty strong burden of proof on the person who presents that view to give evidence in its favour. Now the evidence which he gives in its favour about the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not is different from Lk saying Jerusalem encompassed with armies. Some people think that the foreign armies on the soil of Judea is the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place. But he feels that it refers to something quite distinct from that, something connected with the cessation of sacrifices. (JOB) Could I add, however, that weren't the Roman guards right there in the temple when Christ was talking? (AAM) Yes. But not a great army. (AAM) Well, the other argument which ~~she~~ he gives is that in Lk you have a statement that gives you a little time to get out, and you have similarly an exhortation to get out in Mt and Mk, but it seems to have more immediacy. Well there is a good deal to be said for the arguments which he has presented. But I am not sure that they are 100% watertight. (JOB) And after they are surrounded with armies, there is a long period of captivity. (AAM) Which is not mentioned in Mt and Mk. (JOB) After the Mk and Mt, in which the persecution had a terrible thkipsis, (AAM) That is to say, that in any case there are gaps in all. But the question is where you are going to put a big gap in Mt and Mk, before the abomination of desolation, or after the destruction of Jerusalem. You have to put it one place or the other. In Lk, the gap seems to be more filled in. There is more of a suggestion of a long gap after it than in Lk. I think there is much to be said for the view that Dr Buswell presents but I don't think that it is obvious by any means. I think that these things need further study than I have ever been able to give it, but this phrase Abomination of Desolation; I confess that I don't know a great deal

about it yet, as the Daniel passages are very difficult, but if these two here can be so very similar, and yet refer to two different things, and I think that it is entirely possible that they do, then I do not see why it could not be possible that in Daniel there might be two different abominations of desolation, one of which was in the time of Antiochus and the other one of which was later. But we can go on there next time. I merely wanted to raise these questions for you to think about.

(JOB) Qués. What is the meaning of the phrase in Mt 24.6, Mk 13.7, Lk 21.9. Lk says Not immediately is the telos; Mt and Mk say, Not yet is the telos. And then I pointed out that Mt uses the word Telos again in .14, the gospel must be preached etc, then will come the end. So when the world is evangelized as God sees it, (we never will be able to point out the moment), but when God sees that the world is evangelized, then will come the end. That is the answer to their question. I think that the word sunteleia in the question is fully equivalent with the word telos in the context. (ques). (AAM) I'm not sure that we have the right to take a word as a technical term unless we have absolute proof that it is so intended. And when he says, the end is not yet, then does he necessarily mean that some specific technical time is not yet, or does he mean that you will hear of wars and rumours of war and these are not the sign; there are still going to be more. It ~~isn't~~ isn't yet the end of wars and rumours of war. There will be something else that brings wars and rumours of wars to an end. And when he says in .14, that the gospel must be preached for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come, ~~it~~ does <sup>it</sup> not mean that the gospel must be preached until the end of the preaching which God desires, until that period of witnessing to the nations reaches its end. One may be the end of the wars, one may be the end of the preaching, and one could be the end of something ~~else~~.else. And of course, sunteleia is a word which brings together a lot of ends. (JOB) If you figure that way, then you have it that there will be wars till wars stop, and there are going to be wars and the wars are not the end of the wars. There is going to be an end of the wars, but it won't be wars. (AAM) That is to say, that because you see great

wars, you have no right to say, Now this is the 1st great war. There may be others. (JOB) There is nothing anywhere in the context about the end of wars. There is a definite question which he is answering about the consumation of the age. (AAM) But that is sunteleia. (And he doesn't say, This is not yet the sunteleia. He says, This is not yet the telos. You hear of the great war, and you say, It can't get any worse. Well, a war is not the way in which you know. There may still be more. It is not the end of wars. (JOB) The gospel must be preached in all the world for a witness to all the nations, then will come the end of the preaching of the gospel. (AAM) In other words, it doesn't go until everyone is converted, but until it reaches that point at which God intends that it should stop. (JOB) And there are indications of the preaching of the gospel in the Millenium. (AAM) Yes, that would be a different witness to this one. (JOB) In your context you have a question, When will these things be, What will be the sign of thy coming, and of the the sunteleia of the age. (QUES) The question itself connects the parousia with the consumation of the age. (ques) Now the words are no more synonomous than the English words are, end and consumation. But if I ask you, What will be the consumation of this semester, and you said, We have to have a Spring vacation, and some more classes, and an examination, and that, after that would come the end. I would think that I was doing ~~xxxx~~ violence to the 'end' if I took the end as one thing and consumation as another. So it seems to me that the difference in vocabulary ~~is a difference~~ that we would expect in good style. Sunteleia and telos are not synonyms anymore than end and consumation are synonyms. But if I asked you about a consumation and you used the word end in your answer, I would think that I was doing violence to your answer if I didn't take it as referring to what I was talking about. So (AAM) If you had to take the whole answer into consideration, then you could reach such a conclusion. ~~k~~For instance, you said, When is the consumation of the semester? And if I were to say, Classes would continue for another ten weeks and then comes the end and then the examination begin, (JOB) But that would be a contradiction. That would be an absurdity. (AAM) For me to say that the end comes when the classes

are over. (JOB)No, Then comes the end and then follow the examinations.  
I would think that you had not understood my question.

(END OF RECORD E 29)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 30) (JOB) A war of the antichrist against Christ  
I cannot see any indication here of anything about the end of wars. The thing  
that we call the consumation of the age  $\frac{1}{2}$  includes quite a  
number of details. In fact, the whole picture of the second coming of Christ  
is catastrophic. And the whole NT picture. 1 a-millennialist would  
generally agree on that. The general impression that the disciples had of the  
return of the Lord was a tremendous overpowering catastrophe, which would  
bring in the kingdom of righteousness. I haven't all the data before us  
about these ~~xxx~~ words telos. You just read it in its context. We were summing  
up last week, summing up the threefold analysis of the discourse, and we'll  
pick up a few threads. He first, not because it is logically first, but  
practically first, to have books in the Bible. And the books are infallible.  
In spoken ~~ng~~ language and in regular discourse, take the regular principles of  
exegesis, and take each book for the book, and do it justice, and not under-  
stand it in some distorted way. You have a system of doctrine in the Scrip-  
tures and I think that we fundamentalists over the country are prone to forget  
about that. We say, when we are persecut~~d~~ in one text, flee to another.  
If you find a text that disagrees with you, you should change in your private  
study. Not that I mean that in your pulpit you should preach the things that  
you are not sure about, but in your own study. You believe that this book  
is not only infallible, but you believe that it teaches a system of truth.  
Now the church has never yet worked out a systematic eschatology. So that  
the very 3 of eschatology should be expected to fit in with the scheme  
of eschatology. As it took the church down till Chalcedon 451 to clarify the  
definition of the person and the natures of Christ, yet the decision of Chal-  
cedon has stuck. It took the church down to Nicea to clarify the definition  
of the trinity, but that definition has stuck. And now people who believe the  
Bible can see that that is what the Bible teaches. So we have never yet had

an ecumenical council on eschatology; maybe if the Lord tarries we will have one. But all of us should expect to find passage fitting passage, and group fitting group, parts of truth fitting together into a system of doctrine. We should expect that rather than the contrary. (ques) We have to admit that there are areas of truth of the Scripture which we have not sufficiently explored. And re which it would be very wrong for us to excomm anybody. There are other areas in which we would feel that it was very wrong to debar anybody from the ministry. (AAM) Don't you think, tho, that it is entirely possible that as the days come nearer, the Holy Spirit may enable us to see more clearly the truth on certain points? After we see that, it is vital that we stand on it, not be wishy-washy! (JOB) O I think very clearly that when we see clearly a system of truth in the Scriptures, that we should expound it. But 5 $\frac{1}{4}$  not to debar from ministerial fellowship a man who cannot see the literal millenium. This has been our position from the beginnigg. Because we know that there are honest men who believe the Bible who just simply are just in the dark country. It has been so 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  with dispensational studies that are more or less irrevelant, some true and some false, but irrelevant to that question, that we have liberty then. (AAM) Still, you have to judge in the individual case just how much darkness that you wanted in the man. ~~KXXX~~ (JOB) We wouldn't have on the faculty of Shelton College a man who wasn't a premill. It is in our doctrinal platform, and we are a premil institution. And so for purposes of that faculty, we wouldn't have a non-premil teacher. We would have, and we did have for years, a man who thought that the church was going clear thru the time of the wrath of God. (names) But he caused a lot of confusion in eschatology, but he steed stirred up; minds, and he didn't unChristianize anybody. And he got people to thinking. I always defended his rights. He was within the doctrinal platform of the school; I disagree with him, but I defended his right to teach that way. I think that that is quite a 6 3/4 that is, it throws sand in the wheels. I think that if you look at it that way, it makes it more difficult for you to 7 the system which I believe is here. That is, in these books, we have a system of

system of doctrine and thirdly we have the fact of Christ. Let us not forget that. The Barthians emphasize Christ apart from the Bible, and of course we know that it isn't the historical Christ. But if we emphasize the Bible apart from Christ we would be making a mistake. Christ actually lived in the flesh and said these things. And what he said is of extreme importance. We have it, tho, only thru the written record. Then fourthly, there being the book and the system of doctrine and the fact of Christ, --- the historical Christ, and in this particular instance, we have three records of the same discourse. In Mt and Mk, the setting is given very precisely, and I think that we are all aware of the fact that Lk is probably talking about the same discourse on the same occasion. This is not true of any of the other great discourses, the so-called Sermon on the Mt is not given in Lk in the same time and place, but was given on the Plain. Although in Lk (record stuck) 8 3/4

The discourse as a whole begins with a remark about the temple. And that we have gone over. He said there shall not be left stone upon stone which shall not be thrown down, and then they raised a question. The question was in Mk and in Lk, when will these things be, and what will be the sign when these things come to pass. In Mt, the question is when will these things be, what will be the sign of thy parousia, and of the consummation of the age. Now as we read it in Mt alone, we seemed to all agree that Mt gives us one question and not three. And that the 'these things' in the discourse are the same as the parousia and the same as the consummation of the age. There might be grounds to debate that, but it does seem very reasonable to me to take that as one question and not three. Then you have three accounts of one question. In all three accounts, they ask him when will these things be to these things, referring to the destruction of the temple. All 3 accounts of the discourse

10 1/4 unexpected coming. I think that that point we hadn't sufficiently covered. Is there any doubt about that? The 10 1/2 of the attitude of Christ to the question had to do with the eschatological complex. That is his coming in the clouds of glory. It is clear that the main emphasis of all 3 discourses is on the eschatological complex. Then I would infer,

that his answer was to the effect that the utter destruction of the temple about which he was talking was in the eschatological complex. (AAM) Does that relate to Lk also? (JOB) All three. Lk's great emphasis is on the second coming of Christ. That is clear, isn't it? He comes up to the conclusion that we must always be ready. Heaven and earth will pass away, my word will not pass away; this race will not pass away till these things come to pass. Watch yourself therefore, do not be overcome with surfeiting and rioting etc. And you may escape these things and stand before the Son of Man. So Lk with the rest of them, concludes his discourse with the main emphasis on the imminency of the eschatological complex. (ques). Lk has his sources of information about this discourse. Lk gave a great account/amount of the eschatological material in the Perea ministry and it was the tendency of Mt and Lk not to duplicate material very much. Thus Christ had said the same thing in Perea, Lk was inclined to leave it out, when it came to this discourse. This is one of Lk's rather obvious motives for omission. (ques) Lk has the 14 in his Perea section. Now I wouldn't say that Lk has as much in bulk as Mt and Mk, but Mt has more in bulk, but a vast amount of his eschatological material is interwoven with homiletics, how you ought to live from day to day. There is a lot of that in Mt's eschatology. (ques) (END OF RECORD E 30)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 31)

See following sheet.

But I think that Lk had a very probably reason for leaving out that paragraph, because in the Perean section, with specific refernce to the parousia,  $\frac{1}{2}$  he was giving these warnings that instigated flight. Now whether he had given that teaching, ;  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the Perean teaching, I can imagine tht Lk felt guided to leave that out, and Lk just left it out. (ques) This doesn't mean that the ordinary harmony is right in making that parallel. Mt and Mk quote from Christ who quotes from that passage in Daniel 12, The worst tribulation that ever has been, ~~or~~ that ever will be. Now Lk in what is put parallel in your ordinary harmonies, says there will be a distress upon the land and wrath against this peop;le, and then he goes right on to say that they will fall by the edge of the sword, they will be taken captive among all the nations, and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentile nations till the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. So Lk is not talking about the worst of all possible tribulations. (ques) I would say that Lk, in his source, has a paagraph which classy refers to the destruction of Jerusalem; Mt and Mk left it out. Why did they leave it out? I haven't any answer at all. But it is just not here. Lk had it. I can imagine a motive for Lk  $2\frac{1}{2}$  of course the Holy Spirit guided, but He chose his instrument and I can very well understand that if Christ had in this discourse given all of the paragraph Lk 21.20-24 and then if He had gone right on, When therefore ye se the abomination spoken of by Daniel, 3 I can very well see how here  $3\frac{1}{4}$  found it very difficult to assume it. Jerusalem surrounded with armies, and as I postulated, all three of these were written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And it being difficult for them to assimilate it, the Holy Spirit Having His own mind and putting it in to Lk, might have permitted them to leave it out. It is conjecture, of course, (AAM) On the other hand, the same argument I think works in the opposite direction. Mt was writing primarily for the Jews, the first thing, tho for all; Lk is writing with particular interest in the Gentiles. Now it would be of particular importance to warn the Jewish Christians of the forthcoming disaster to Jerusalem than when the armies are surrounding Jerusalem. It is a good time for them to get out, while Lk's gospel,

read a history that way, you couldn't read any articles that way. What would the sentences predicate? That is the question. (ques) So the total material up to 14, with the exception of the last phrase, is negative. These are not the signs; these are all negative answers, but he says, The Gospel, etc, and then comes the end. It seems to me like the first instance of the affirmative answer to their question. But don't make these things chronological ~~14~~ just because they come in sequence in discourse. You couldn't write a history that way. And I wouldn't put too much weight upon the fact that the abomination of desolation is mentioned subsequent to the full evangelization of the world, and the coming of the end, whatever that end refers to. It is true that it follows in sequence, and it might establish a slight presumption. But my point with reference to ~~s~~this abomination of desolation as being in the eschatological complex and not taking place at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, is under two headings: First, in the discourse itself, Christ connected with the eschatological complex and what he says about it, specially that in Dan the ~~ab~~omination of desolation that Daniel talked about. It is placed by Daniel in the middle of a heptad that he specifies. So the abomination of Antiochus isn't called an abomination of desolation in Daniel 8, but it is called an abomination in I Macc 1. That abomination is said to be just exactly so many days before it is cleared up. And you take the chronology of the events, and he actually did clear things up. 12 this idol altar on top of the altar of God, in the court of the temple. So that particular thing Daniel didn't call an ~~ab~~omination of desolation. Within a period of days, and the days were literally fulfilled, and you can point to it as a remarkable instance of fulfilled prophecy. <sup>11</sup>Now then, the thing that Daniel called an ~~ab~~omination of desolation, Daniel put in the midst of the heptad. And in the 12th chapter, he specified certain days, from the placing of the abomination that maketh desolate, to the end, will be so many days. Blessed is he that stays and abides another month and a half. That is not plain. The only conjecture that I know of is that after allowing the antichrist to continue  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, and  $13\frac{1}{4}$  at the end of the 1260 days, the times, time and a half a time, the Lord chooses to take a month, and then another month

and a half for a clearing up process. That is merely conjectural. But Dan 12 puts it,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  yrs, times time and a half a time, on the one hand, and then it speaks of a specified 1290 days and 1335 days. (AAM) You say that ~~the~~ the days in the Maccabees are different? (JOB) In Macc, there is no refernece to the 100 days. In Dan 8, an abomination that he did not call an abomination of desolation is said to come 14 but it comes out exactly right. So many years before, so many days, it is right there in the middle of Dan 8. And you can figure the date quite readily. The days in Dan 8 correspond exactly to what happened in the time of Antiochus. You don't get 7 years out of 2300 days, do you? Anyway, in your OT commentaries you find that from the time that Antiochus did this particular thing there on the altar, to the time of the cleansing of the temple... (END OF RECORD E 31)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 32)

in that particular case. It was made up in that many days, and they just had their cleansing of the temple. They reestablished their purification system. It would be an inference then that in the 12th chapter when Daniel days time times and a half, and then specifies 1290, 1335 days, having specified the midst of a heptad in the 9th chapter, the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet is placed in the midst of a heptad. Keil is very strong that the prince that shall come in chapter 9 must refer in the connection in Daniel to one of two people. Either Antiochus, prophesied in chapter 3, or the little horn who is prophesied in chapter 7. And then shows that this prince tht shall come could not correspond to Antiochus  $1\frac{1}{2}$  this prince that shall come, who confirms a covenant for one heptad in breaks it in the midst is the antichrist, who is the little horn of chapter 7. Keil goes on to say that Christ's interpretation of it certainly places it in the eschatological complex, and identifies the abomination as an act of the antichrist. Keil is not infallible. But that is Keil's teaching in the Keil Del. teaching in the commentary on Daniel. Now there are two reasons for putting this abomination of desolation in the eschatological complex  $2\frac{1}{4}$  First, that Christ identifies it with the eschatological complex, and Second, that Daniel puts it in the midst of this heptad.

Which Keil thinks from Daniel is in the eschatological complex. Now just let us look at now, reading across from <sup>Mt</sup> to Mk; it is almost word for word the same, but not fully so. When therefore ye see (identical) the abomination of desolation (identical) spoken of by Daniel the prophet (Mt) standing in the holy place is Mt; standing where it ought not is Mk; he who reads must understand is in both of them. Then <sup>τοτε</sup> ~~kata~~-- you can't build a house on the time sequence of <sup>τοτε</sup> ~~kata~~. We are not building the argument just on the <sup>τοτε</sup> ~~kata~~'s in this discourse. Tote can be a rhetorical transition as well as a chronological one. I'm not building heavily on the tote. Trust the English word then, and you know that in English you say then when you mean the logical consequence, and we say then when we mean time identification. But he says, When ye see these things, then those in Judea must flee to the mountains, and that is word for word the same in Mt, Mk, and Lk. (AAM) Did you say that Spoken of by Daniel the prophet is only in Mt? (JOB) Only in Mt. (AAM) In the English it is in Mk also. (JOB) Well, those are variants. You see, your variant reading skip; over from one gospel to another, but this is the book that Hort takes. I don't have the MSS attestation here, but WH is pretty reliable. fMt says in the holy place, Mk says where it ought not. Now Mt and Mk, not Lk, say ;he who is on the top of the house must not come down to take (Mk adds nor enter in to take) the things in the house. Lk says that, in 17, with specific reference to the parousia. So luke does not have the same thing here. He who is on the housetop must not come down to take his vessels out of the house. And in Mt and Mk, he who is in the fields must not come back to take his garment. Now that was not true at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. There was no need for any such immediacy as that then. But Lk ~~17~~ 17 has given the immediacy with reference to the parousia. There was a time when people should get out of Jerusalem, in 70 AD, and they did, and the Christians were not harmed by their destruction. The christians got out. There was terrible distress on the part of the Jews, awful suffering, but there was a period of months when they at least could go back and forth, and a period of months from the time when it was surrounded to the time when you couldn't escape.

The woe to women about to give birth to children is true in any time of disaster. Mt and Mk are identical here. And Lk with reference to the women and children. Mt and Mk have a section which Lk does not have at all. <sup>1</sup>

Pray that your flight may not be in the winter, nor on the Sabbath; the reference to the Sabbath is in Mt only; I am not particularly sure that Mt is Jewish, but of course it has the Jewish element. I can't see that this reference to the Sabbath makes it Jewish. It seems to me rather obvious that any attack on any holiday is particularly devastating. I think that we did mention that. ~~M~~ Mt and Mk gives this statement which is quoted in substance from Daniel 12.1, There will be then great thlipsis, such as has not been from the beginning of the creation, says Mt and Mk, (Mk says the creation of God), unto now, and ou me genetai, with the strongest negative, not under any circumstances will be. The greatest thlipsis that has ever been. This is not orge. And unless those days were shortened, Mk says, unless the Lord shortens those days, no flesh would be saved. But on account of the elect, whom he has elected, Mk adds, those days will be shortened. This greatest of all tribulations, --now if you want a conjecture here just simply to throw in like a cherry on the ice cream, in the Revelation, I like to start at the 7th trumpet and work both ways, there is the picture of the mighty angels who says at the sounding of the 7th trumpet, the mystery of God will be finished. I conjecture that the mystery of God in that passage is the same as Paul's mystery of God, which is Christ, which is Christ<sup>s</sup> in you the hope of glory, God's particular method of administering the plan of salvation for this age. The mystery of God will be finished at the 7th trumpet. Well, I think that that refers to the rapture. But then is a picture of the temple, the altar, and the worshippers. The work is going on, and it is 9 for 3½ yrs. But John is told, Don't measure the outside court; leave it out. Because the outside court and the city will be trodden down of the Gentiles for 42 months. That looks to me like the first half of Daniel's 70th week, and certainly John 9½ at the destruction of Jerusalem. And here is a simple altar of worshippers under Gentile domination, but the temple not interfered with.

for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. Then there are the two witnesses who prophesy for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, and the beast who is going to come up out of the abyss 10 for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. He is unable to harm them, and they go on with miracles and demonstrations for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, but when he gets to the height of his power, and that seems to me to synchronize perfectly with the time when the antichrist proclaims himself as God, and sets up his image to be worshipped, then he slays these two witnesses, and their dead bodies lie on the streets of the city for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days. And the people of the earth rejoice over them, and give gifts one to another. Because these two witnesses tormented those dwelling on the earth. The people of the earth rejoicing over the dead bodies of these two witnesses. But at the end of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, life comes into them, and they stand upon their feet, and their enemies beheld them (I imagine they were watching by television), and they heard the voice and were caught up in the clouds. And at that moment there was the great earthquake etc. I put this very brief and very terrible of all tribulations in that  $3\frac{1}{2}$  day period, in the midst of the week. I postulate a great putsch of the world dictator, Now I am going to be God, and we'll have it all organized, we'll pounce on all the people of all the earth, my image goes up in the holy of holies, I tell the Jews to stop their sacrifices, I'm their Messiah, I kill these two prophets, overcome them, and I am God. As in the days of Esther, the leaders thought that they could pounce upon the Jews; on a certain day and they couldn't. Haman hung on his own gallows. So with the slaying of these two prophets, the people of the earth rejoice over God's people. Now that you can put together if it fits in your own mind. It rather seems to me to fit in the midst of the week. (ques)<sub>0</sub> But when he comes to power and proclaims himself as God, then the Lord withdraws his hand, and . Then this brief and most awful of all tribulations comes in this  $3\frac{1}{2}$  day period. This is certainly not a conclusion, but it is a suggestion. There will be this abomination of desolation; there will be a sudden and instantantous flight from Jerusalem; there will be the most awful tribulation, Thalipsis, that the world has ever seen or ever will see from the ~~firm~~ foundation of the world. It will be shortened for the sake of the elect

Now you are familiar with the tendency to make the elect here the Jews.

That seems to me to do violence to the historical usage. Mt was written after Paul's major epistles, and the Christian public knew what the elect of God meant to Paul, Who is going to plead against the elect of God? That had resounded ~~through~~ thru the churches, and for Mt writing to the Christian public and recording the words of Christ, if Christ didn't mean the elect when he said the elect, I think that Mt would have put in an explanation here; it is conceivable that the disciples were sitting on the Mt of Olives, and might have understood the elect to have meant the Jews only, but that is not conceivable to me that Mt and Mk would have said the elect if they hadn't meant the elect of God. It will be shortened for the sake of the elect. Then there will be all sorts of wild rumours. You will hear it over the radio. If anybody says to you, here is Christ, there is Christ, there will arise false Christs and prophets. 14½

And this false prophet is going to make that beast king, and they will hve it broadcast. You will hear it and see the whole thing by television and radio. This is God. 15 I rode down on the train this morning with a polite and courteous old gentleman, and got to talking about the church etc; He had the thing in his mind to get all the denominations together. He had been to hear Vincent Peal last night, and he said that it was just as good as any show he ever went to. (END OF RECORD E 32)

This man represents the greatest achievement of man; probably he will be a very nice personality with a good radio voice. He will get all of the beauty of the music, the ritual, the architecture of the different religions and have a world religion

3/4 A couple of years ago he was more outspoken than he is now. He has gone under cover a little, but he used profane language. His Marxian propaganda, We'll get control of the society, and then we will tell those who disagree to get the hell out of here. This was his expression. I'm just quoting his words, because that is the spirit of it. Well, there will be 1 1/2 that will be by this false prophet. (indistinct all thru the beginning of the record...) I don't like to have my faith called a myth. Oh I'm very sorry, he said, I intended to leave room enough for the fundamentalist... Now for instance, I said, ~~Capitalism~~ <sup>communism</sup> is your god. 2 And he shook his head very politely, and he said, I'm awfully sorry... They will try to deceive the elect if they can possibly do so. If then they say to you, Look, he is in the desert, don't go out there. You stay where you are hidden away in the mountains. Look, he is in secret chambers. Don't believe them. For as a flash of lightning comes out of the east and shines to the west, so will be the parousia of the son of man. . Now L k has already said that in chapter 17, in Christ's preaching in Judea. For wherever the sarcase is, there will be gathered together the eagles. (ques) At that particular junction, there will be the greatest particular temptation to which Christian people have ever been subjected. It is a terrible thing for these weak Christians to be scoffed at. The can't get it thru their heads; some of them that really love the Lord. 3 1/2 . The recurrence of false Christs and false prophets, but in the revelation it is the false prophet who definitely works miracles and encourages men to ~~worship~~ worship the beast. So I take this to be a special reference to the intensity of that deception at that particular junction. (ques) I think that you're in a little terrible intense juncture in the midst of the weak. a(ques) I don't say that it just confines it to just 3 1/2 days, but the two witnesses after the 3 1/2 days, heard the voice from heaven and were daught up in the clouds. I think that that terrible time of persecution is 3 1/2 days.

And that it is consummated by the rapture. I don't think that that is the same thing at all as the wrath, the time of the outpouring of his wrath. (ques). Of course if you are a Bible student you will know. These can't be killed till their work is thru, and when their work is thru, they will be killed. Of course, that is a great comfort to a Christian worker anyhow. You are in the hands of the Lord. (ques) The warnings at the beginning of the chapter is not coupled with miracles, and I think that the book of revelation clearly indicates that there will be a far more intense and plausible presentation of an antichrist at the end than any antichrist that has come thru the course of history. (ques) I think that with all the other Scripture it fits in better as a warning for this particular juncture, but keep it in quarantine for a few minutes; think it over. (ques) In the earlier part of the chapter where they mentioned false Christs and false prophets, I don't think that he mentioned any miracles, and there have been of course Satanic miracles, but they haven't had anything like the prominence that the miracles of the second beast in Revelation. At that juncture where the antichrist claims worship, this false prophet has great miracle power so as to try to deceive everybody. (ques) It isn't a big point with me. If you take this simply as a repetition of what he told them before. I don't think so; I think that you are losing a little part of the meaning. I think that it has a special connection with what John says about the false prophet. (ques) This false prophet is able ~~XXXX~~ to work signs, miracles, and to deceive if possible the elect. He will deceive the people that live on the earth. The deceptive miracles are particularly mentioned. (ques) I would never admit that there are not any events which must take place before the instant of the rapture. It is one thing to say that the apokalupsis of Jesus Christ is imminent, in the sense that in every day of our lives we are to expect it; but the apokalupsis of Jesus Christ includes quite a number of details; and I do not think that the instant of the last trump comes at any moment. That would contradict the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, that would contradict ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Peter's knowledge of his death, that would contradict Paul's knowing that he

was going to get to Rome. That would contradict quite a number of things. The Bible does not teach the any-moment theory of the last trump. It does teach the imminency of the complex of events which we call the Lord's return. Not look at Mt 24.29: How I have tried to read these some other way. You know how you get perverse notions and you try to force them into something else' Immediately after the thlipsis of those days,---so you can't read it any other way. Mk Meta with the accusative means after, and it doesn't mean along with. After that particular thlipsis which is very short but very intense. (ques) Mark is not so specific. He says, In those days. Yet Mk says after that thlipsis. So Mk is just as specific. (ques)

(cont'd on page 4).

Matthew uses euthēos, Mk does not. Mt says, Immediately after the thlipsis of those days, the sun shall be darkened, the moon shall not give its light, the stars of the heavens shall fall. (AAM) And that would put that thlipsis at the very end, would it not? (JOB) This particular cosmic upheaval comes after the thlipsis. And Mt says immediately after. With my theory you can take it for what it is worth. In Revelation, the 7th trumpet announcec reward for the righteous dead very positively; the 7th trumpet announces the wrath of God. ~~By~~ wrath has come. So at the 7th trumpet begins the pouring out of the vials of wrath. If the 7th trumpet is the trumpet of rewards for the righteous dead, which it says very positively, then we know that rewards for the righteous dead come at the resurrection of the righteous dead, Lk 14.14, the resurrection of the righteous dead comes at the rapture of all the born again. We shall all be changed in a momemt, in the twinkling of an eye. Now the 7th trumpet begins the wrath of God. Now all the saints who emphasize that the church will not go thru the tribulation emphasize that the church will not come under the wrath of God. It is not true that the church does not go thru thlipsis. Thlipsis is the common lot of Christianity all thru the ages, but the church does not come under the wrath of God. This is a very cryptic reference, and as you say, you have had signs in the sun, you have had a darkening of the sun, you have had meteoric showers, you have had the moon turn to blood. So in the light of the revelation, I say that this is ~~is~~ intended to be a reference to the upheaval that takes place after the 7th trumpet, ~~during~~ during the outpouring of the wrath of God. Now I frankly say that there is not enought here in Mt and Mk and Lk to indicate the identifivation, but at least it fits with the scheme of things. Then there is this other verse which is quoted in all three. And now, by the way, we seem to be back parallel again. The powers of the heavens will be shaken, and that I did quote Heb 12.26 and Hag 2.6. Yet once more signifies that the next time they will be removed. The powrs of the heavens will be shaken yet once more, and not twice more. So the reference to the pwers of the heavens being shaken as interpreted in Hebrews, would seem to verify the theory that this particular reference to upheavels in the

sun, moon, and stars, shaking the powers of heaven, ~~is something~~ something that is in the eschatological complex, and it follows this most terrible of all tribulations. It would fall right in with that time of the wrath of God, but it would be subsequent to the rapture of the church. Now you have another tote. Then.... (END OF RECORD e 33)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 34)

And they will see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, in power and great glory. All three Gospels mention it. And he will send forth his angels with a great trumpet. Now  $\frac{1}{2}$  Paul says the last trump, and here is another trumpet that is quite conspicuously different. It is the same trump. The 7th trumpet of revelation, the last trump of Paul, 1 a trumpet when he will gather his elect. I used to say that we identify the events by the tote references, but you have a most terrible but a very brief tribulation 1 comes to an end, then begins the wrath. At that point, the son of man is seen in the clouds, and he gathers his elect to meet him in the clouds. (ques) It is striking that they prophesy for 42 months, and the antichrist can't touch them. Then after 42 months, which certainly seems to indicate the middle of the 70th week, then he is able to make war with them and kill them. they lie there for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, and the whole world rejoicing over them, and at the end of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, they hear a voice from heaven, the life from God comes into ~~the~~ them, they come to their feet, their enemies behold them, and they are caught up in the clouds. I can't help from jumping to the conclusion that that is the same cloud. And that that voice from heaven is the same voice that we are ~~going~~ going to hear. It certainly fits in very beautifully with that view. (ques). At the last trump, the resurrection of believers takes place. We know that. At the last trump the righteous are to be changed,--that is clear, isn't it? Then at the 7th trump, the righteous dead receive their rewards, and we shall receive our rewards at the resurrection of the rightseous. Lk 14.14. So therefore the 7th trump of revelation and the trump of reward for the righteous dead must be the last trump of I Corinthians, and the great trumpet of I Thess 4;, and since this is the trumpet that gathers the elect, I would say

it is the same as this pictures. (ques) Zechariah 12.2,10: Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of reeling, and unto all peoples round about from Jerusalem, there shall be a seige against Jerusalem. That ~~is~~ a marginal reading in my printed text. No 12.10: I will pour ~~me~~ out upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication. They shall look unto me whom they have pierced and they shall mourn for him. All tribes of the earth will mourn because of him. Christ says, All tribes of the earth will mourn for him. And Zech says that Israel will mourn for him whom they have pierced. Now you asked what will happen to the unbelieving Jews? (at the time of the rapture of the church). Well, that of course is a very large study in itself, and your 5 $\frac{1}{4}$  I think is in Romans 11. All Israel will be saved; blindness is come to them until the fulness of the Gentiles. These cut off branches of Israel are going to be grafted in~~y~~ at a future time which Paul calls a fulness of the Gentiles. Now here are the mass of the Jews, and of course in Daniel the reference to their sufferings. They have built their temple, and established their worship, and have a contract with the world dictator, and they are not interferred with for 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  years. And suddenly he says, I'm God, I'm your Messiah. Stop this sacrifice business, for I have come. I will fulfill everyting. Well, seeing how utterly disillusioned they will be, and then suddenly Christ snatches out from this world (And I believe that it is the most noisey, conspicuous and catastrophic event that this world has ever seen, this rapture. There is no Scripture for a secret rapture) He just takes all the born again people out of this world. Well the Jews will weep. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  which they thought that they had, and the rapture of the church will convince a lot of them. A nation in a day will turn to ~~the~~ the Lord in a day, after the rapture. Surely after the middle of the week. I think that the reference is in Dan 12: they will have a time of Jacob's trouble. (ques) Well, not all tribes of the earth; no. (ques) All the tribes of the earth couldn't possibly refer to the Jews. The way that the NT uses the word tribes, every tribe and kindred and people and tongue and language. That is one of your current phrases. Zechariah specifies Israel. Israele will certainly weep for him whom they have pierced.

When they see the rapture of the church, but.. (ques) If you want to make this mean the 12 tribes of Israel, I don't object, for they will weep too. But it is all the tribes of the earth, tes ges: do you think that that would mean all of the tribes of Palestine? I don't object, but I don't think that that is what he means. I think that he means all the nations. They will see him, and then the rapture of the church. It will have special reference to Palestine, no doubt, and to those who have escaped from Jerusalem, but it will be a worldwide event. He will catch up his own people from all over this world, and it will be a great passage of people from the earth. (ques) Your hope is in the beginning of that complex of events. kThe 9 of Jesus Christ is imminent, and has been all these years. It hasn't been imminent in the sense that the instant of the rapture can come at any moment. But it has been imminent in the sense that every day of our lives that aspect of the events should be imminent. (ques) The instant of the last trump is the high hope in the apocapypse of Jesus Christ. (AAM) Is not the coming with the clouds all together different from the rapture? Isn't the coming in the clouds when He comes with the church at the very end? (JOB) Well, we shall be caught up to meet him in the clouds. / We meet him in the clouds. I have taken that to mean that the rapture will be a visible event to all the earth. Behold he cometh in the clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. There you have your answer, Revel 1.9: All the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him, and they also that pierced him. There is his coming with the clouds. (AAM) I thot that that was verse 30 of Mt 24. Then shall appear the sign of the son of man in the heaven and they shall all the tribes of the earth mourn and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. (JOB) And he will send forth his angels and gather his elect. I don't see tht his coming with the clouds is any different from our meeting him in the clouds. (AAM) You take 24.30 as the rapture, and then the coming to the eathh after. (JOB) Well, I think that the shaking of the powers of heaven, 28 verses 29 and 30, p; ; ; ; just verse 29 in Mt is a reference to what

happens at the time of the wrath of God. (AAM) Then you mean that 29 comes after 30? (JOB) see, there are three events that are going on at the same instant. The instant of the rapture starts the wrath, but the instant of the rapture is the instance of the last trumpet, the gathering of the elect. Now when he comes to stand on the Mt of Olives, I don't think that there will be any clouds, but there is no reference that I know of for the clouds with reference to his coming there. After the time of wrath he comes with his armies, and there is nothing to obscure anybody's vision. Heaven splits wide open, and he comes down, and the beast is taken. (ques) The reference to the tribes of the earth mourning that I ~~just~~ just quoted is ~~is~~ Rev 1. about the 9th verse. Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him. This I take to be the rapture. And they that pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him, even so, amen. When the rapture takes place, the people of the earth, including the Jews, (they also that pierced him) they will all be terribly shaken. And of course the beast will gather his armies, and organize his forces, and fight against the Lord and against his annointed. Let us break their bands asunder, let us cast away their cords from us. The Lord will continue to pour out his vials of wrath, the beast will continue to fight back, until the end of this  $3\frac{1}{2}$  period he is permitted to continue in power for 42 months, until the wrath of God. (ques) (END OF RECORD E 34)

I could give a brief overall view of that judgment of the sheep and the goats, tho I think that there is scarcely any debatable material in this. Most of it is obvious homiletics. (ques) I don't think that you will ever be able to figure back just to when the 7 year period began. It could have ~~be~~ begun already. As far as I know, we may be half way thru the first half of the week. I don't think that we are, but then it says that in the time that ye think not he is coming. You won't be able to figure it to the day and the hour, but you will be able to warn people. Let's look at Mt 25. I have a lot of peculiar views. You have heard about the man who had no peculiarities, and a friend challenged him. He said, let me see you stir your coffee. And he did it with the right hand. And he said, that is your peculiarity: most people stir it with a ~~spoon~~ spoon. I take Mt 25.31-46 as a wide lens camera view. (ques) It does seem to fit in that way.  $2\frac{1}{2}$  . If I am in Jerusalem, I am going to do just what Jesus said, literally. Hide away in the mountains. I'm not going ~~but~~ in to the plains. I will take a radio set along, if I have one. Portable. But I am going to be ready for the rapture very, very quickly. Mt 24, when the son of man comes,--this is the conclusion of his eschatological discourse,-- and it is his object to give them a general picture, a final paragraph, a final section. And ~~when~~ he comes in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then he will sit upon the throne of his glory. Now, many Bible students will try to pin you down~~K~~, Just when does this take place? And they have their cameras set for a very narrow range, fine picture. They insist on taking it at least within a week. Does this come at the beginning of Daniel's 70th week period, or in the middle, or at the end? I think that it comes all over the place. I think that this is a wide lens camera picture of the whole eschatological complex. 4 a period a thousand years long. Just to be brief, I think that the Come ye blessed is the same thing as the rapture. And I think that the Depart ye cursed is the same thing as the Great White throne judgment at the end of the thousand years. And that is a picture of Christ in glory, reigning over this earth a thousand years long. Now it is very hard for us to adjust to different perspectives. My brother out in Ill.

bought a little farm. He is a chemist; and he ~~is~~ investment, and also he wants to work out certain experiments. On his farm, he has a little cabin and creek where you can paddle a canoe up and down for a little ways, and he is fond of archery. He has an archery range. Well, he sent us some pictures, and the first was of his archery range, and there just beside the target was a great gnarled old oak tree, a very interesting looking tree. And there was another picture with fields and meadows, way off across the hill, and over in one corner was the gnarled old oak tree. We figured out that it was the same tree. But it is taken from an entirely different angle. Now you know what the wide lens camera does. It takes a broad expanse, and here the Lord wants to conclude this particular discourse and drive home the whole thought of his coming and the meaning of his coming. So he says, when the son of man comes in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then he will sit upon the throne of his glory. Now some pre-mills will make that a particular chair inside the walls of ancient Jerusalem. David Brown tries to describe how all the nations of the earth physically crowd into the walls of old Jerusalem, and Christ sits on a particular chair that David used to sit on. As though that is what it means to sit upon the throne. And he makes all things perfectly ridiculous. He starts out with a town meeting up in New England. The telegraph has announced that Christ has returned, and so the mayor calls a town meeting and they vote ...and the mayor asks the bishop to lead in prayer, and the bishop gets up and reminds the mayor that prayer is no longer appropriate, so they can send a telegram. So the mayor dispatches a messenger boy with a telegram to greet the Lord and to promise allegiance to him and the boy starts out from the town hall and finds a line a block long. All the people in the town who decided to say their prayers are suddenly realizing that they can send telegrams. So now the people try to get to Palestine, as though the physical presence of the Lord were withdrawn from the ~~any~~ spiritual presence. As though the people didn't pray when he was on the earth before. And they then try to crowd all the nations of the earth within the walls of ancient Jerusalem, and he describes the sanitary conditions, and the awful congestion, and how he tries his best, being in the

body to administer justice and separate the sheep from the goats. Well, that kind of a book will do us some good, even if it just throws us back on the Word of God. I think that the place of his throne may very well be in the clouds, just the whole world spinning around beneath the footstool of his throne. That is just my imagination, and who am I to settle the engineering problem. It is too big for me. I can't settle the engineering problems of a hundred years from now, to say nothing of the millenium which isn't necessarily any time away, but certainly will be different. He will sit upon the throne of his glory, and all of the nations will be before him on his throne. They don't even have to get out of their land. It will be before his throne. He will separate them out, masculine plural, --not the nations one from another as nations, but the nations as people. And he will say to those on his right hand, come ye blessed. Now I postulate that Come ye blessed as the same thing as the rapture, when he will take out of this world all of his people, all of his born again people. It is those who have been saved before the rapture who are going to reign with him. Those who are saved after the rapture remain as flesh and blood people. They are the subjects of the kingdom, but not the heirs. The heirs of the kingdom neither marry nor give in marriage, but are as the angels. So he says, Come ye blessed, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. That I just take it as a very beautiful way of putting the rapture into this total, over all picture. And he will say to the others, depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Now that depart from me ye cursed is a picturesque way of summarizing the whole business of the wrath of God upon the living who are destroying the earth, at the ~~beginning~~ beginning of the millenium. Then the Great White throne judgment at the end of the millenium. Then the Christ-rejecters go to their ultimate doom. Then here is the conclusion: these will go away into ever lasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. That overall wide camera view, --does it seem to click in your mind? I had Arthur Diffenback writing his thesis, and he wanted to write on the 24th and 25th of Mt, and we worked together a whole semester and when he wrote his thesis, he said, I still

disagree with you in my thesis, and I couldn't find where he disagreed. He wrote a very good thesis, a BD thesis, or... But he came so close to this view that I couldn't tell the difference. I think that he did have some details that I had never thought of, ~~which~~ which is all very good. But this makes sense to me. It is the notion that here at the end of this discourse Christ sums it all up in a ~~xxxx~~ broad way: 11 $\frac{1}{2}$  fills in many details, but he is going to come, he is going to sit on the throne of his glory, and he is going to take those who have accepted him and have given evidence of it, Come ye blessed; and ~~xxx~~ he is going to say to those who have rejected him, Depart ye cursed. (quew) The chapter division I hadn't thought of as being significant, because he makes this reference to faithfulness, the nobleman going on a journey. After~~x~~ having come to the hour that no man knoweth, then he proceeds with a lot of homiletical material which is quite familiar: as it was in the days of Noah, and it is like a nobleman going into a far country, and it is like the ten virgins. So 25.31-46 is simply a very suitable conclusion to the whole eschatological discourse. (AAM) Well, JOB gave much today which is new to me, and I want to take time to think them over, and know what conclusions that I come to about them. I would like sometime to compare Mt again with Lk, and to notice some of the conclusions which we came to in Lk which I think are reinforced in certain sections of Mt, particularly in that homiletical section. I would like to think a little about its bearing on the whole, and on certain conclusions which I have tried to draw from it, and which has a little bit of disagreement with JOB's conclusions, and I would like to look a little more thoroughly into the matter of the destruction of Jerusalem. That is new to me, and both commentators have held that Lk and Mt here were the same, and that in Lk where it speaks of being surrounded with armies, and Mt where it speaks of the abomination of desolation, both commentators have held that the abomination of desolation there referred to the standards of the Roman legion when the armies came up as being in the holy place, the holy land of Palestine, and that has been the common view, but Alford I think disagrees with that view, and thinks that the abomination instead, that the armies are the outward but that there is the in-

part which is the abomination of desolation, and he says that the abomination is usually used in Scripture of something that is abused, not of something imposed on them from the outside. And so his feeling is that it is a trial within Jerusalem, which is visible to the Christians and which would help them in their determination to flee. I think that JOB has given some good arguments against this view of Alfords, and against the view that most commentators hold, but I would like to go into it a little further myself, and then on the Daniel passages there are certain questions which I would like to present; the abomination of desolation there, and the events related to it.

(END OF RECORD E 35)

~~END~~ (BEGINNING OF RECORD E 36)

Revel 11, beginning with the 15th verse. And the 7th angel sounded his trumpet, and they heard great voices from heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world, and it is singular in the Gk text, the kingdom of this world has become our Lord's and His Christ's, and he will reign forever and ever. Now that is an announcement that comes at the 7th trumpet. And we tried to make a list of the things that occur at the 7th trumpet. This is the first item. The kingdom of this world has become our Lord's and His Christ's. And he will reign forever and ever. This must refer to some phase of his kingly sovereignty which is not discerned at the present time. It is true that Christ is always a king. He is the creator, the Lord, the sovereign, and may be referred to as the king of the universe including all the wicked over whom he will exercise his wrath in the future, or the king of the redeemed. He is the king. But there is some sense in which he is going to be a king in which he is not now a king. That is you stop me now at any time if I go beyond something which the Scripture says. Here is a future event at which the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of Christ. It is going to become a kingdom in a sense in which it is now not so because it is a future event. (ques) Let's now just analyze what happens at the seventh trumpet. What I want to do is to start at this point and see if we do not find a benchmark. Who doesn't know what a benchmark is? It is a landmark which you use as a reference point in surveying or mapmaking.

The govt surveys the land, and puts down a marker which definite data upon it. It is set in concrete or sometimes drilled into a rock, and usually has a brass cap, which will say elevation so much, and that is a known point in geography and from that point your surveyor can take his instruments and lay out any piece of ~~ax~~ land. ~~s~~ Up at the TriState Bible Conference there is a benchmark, and it near the corner of three states. Now if you can find in the Bible a benchmark, a known point where certain things happen, or certain things are declared, then we can measure out the rest. That is the point of view from which we are going to study this thing, and then the various things will be related. The first thing that happened and is announced at the 7th trumpet, is the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of our Lord. That must be a future state of the kingdom. We know that the OT predicts his kingdom as a messianic rule over all the world, and that he referred to his coming to reign, and I would say that from this sentence we could reasonably infer that such is the beginning of his visible, his messianic kingdom. This is not now existent. Take the illustration of ~~Christ~~ as a king from Queen Wil of the Netherlands, the King of Norway during the war they were driven out. Now Christ is not been driven out in any sense, but they were absent and the enemy was ruling over their land. The King of Norway was a king, but the reason ~~why~~ why he was not reigning in Norway was because he didn't have the power. Now that is not applicable to Christ, but he was not actually reigning in Norway. Norway was his kingdom, but it was in the hands of others. And the same with the queen of the Netherlands. Well, after the war they went back. Some of the kings tried to go back and they didn't succeed. But these are both wonderful Christians, and they went back, and then their land was their kingdom again. Now Christ is not absent in the body from any weakness, but he is absent because he has told us he is giving time for repentance. There is coming a time when he is going to take his kingly prerogatives over this world and exercise his prerogatives as king. (ques) In this context, it is the kingdom which is this world. I take it as a ~~genitive of apposition~~ genitive of apposition. ; The kingdom, namely this world. The King James version reads in the plural.

But the critical text has the singular. The kingdom, namely this world, has become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. And he will reign forever and forever. AND the 24 elders were before God, seated upon their thrones, fell down upon their faces and worshipped God, saying, -- now this is a declaration of the elders. The first sentence was a declaration of a great voice from heaven. In the Scriptures it is important to know who said what. Satan said certain things, and they may or they may not be true. At the opening of the 6th seal, or during the 6th seal, the wicked people of the earth say certain things. These I take to be false. But here the heavenly voice says, it is become his kingdom, and the 24 elders, who are holy beings, before the throne of God, they now speak. We give thee thanks, Lord God Almighty, the one who is and who was, and the erchomenos is not there. Up to this point you have had a recurring phrase, The one who is, and who was, and who is coming. But now the erchomenos is not there. It is in the textus receptus, but it does not occur in the best MSS. 10 . That is significant, if this is the point of his visible glorious return. But that is not a positive predication. Just take it as a suggestive fact. Because thou hast taken thy great power and thou hast begun to reign. It must be an ingressive aorist, because no other form of the aorist would fit, and the ingressive fits perfectly with the whole context. We give thee thanks that thou hast taken thy great power and thou hast begun to reign. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath has come. The anger of the nations is a constant fact, increasingly. Thou hast begun to reign is the same point as you had before. The kingdom of this world has become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, and he will reign forever and ever. But thy wrath has come. I take that to be a statement that this is the beginning of the period of wrath. The time that is called the wrath of God. So I would name that as point two: the beginning of the wrath of God. a(ques) These are all declarations that come at the sounding of the 7th trumpet. The great point is, He begins to reign. Now at the same time, the nations being very angry, his wrath is come. The pouring out of the vials of the wrath begins at the 7th trumpet. (ques) The kingdom of the antichrist is just becoming revealed, and his wrath

against God, but Thy wrath has come. So at the 7th trumpet, the wrath of God comes. And, now here is point number three, the time of the dead to be judged, even to give the rewards to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to those fearing thy name, to the small and to the great. Point number three is rewards for the righteous dead. The time of rewards for the righteous dead comes at the 7th trumpet. (ques) Only the righteous. The kai means even. Otherwise you would have a contradiction. If it is the time of judging all the dead, then you have a contradiction, because in the 14 you have a thousand years, between the judgement of the righteous dead and the judgment of the unrighteous dead. It is the time of the dead to be judged, even to give the rewards to thy servants the prophets, and to all those who fear thy name, both small and great. Rewards for the righteous dead, at the 7th trumpet. Point number four, to destroy those who are destroying the earth. The destruction of those who are destroying the earth. Now lets go back. Rewards for the righteous dead, Lk 14.14. (END OF RECORD E 36)

Rewards for the righteous dead comes at the resurrection of the righteous dead. Then to destroy those who are destroying the earth, would mean the living on the earth, the pouring out of the wrath of God upon those who are destroying the earth, and the ultimate destruction of the kingdom of the beast, which begins at this point. If these 4 things occur at the 7th trumpet: this world becomes Christ's kingdom, He takes his power and begins to reign, His wrath begins, He gives rewards to the righteous dead, and he initiates the destruction of those who are destroying the earth. Then the fact that this is the point of the judgment of the righteous dead, I would conclude that this is the time of the resurrection of the righteous dead. Because the rewards are to come at the resurrection of the righteous. You don't think of Him as rewarding the righteous and leaving them in a state of disembodied spirits. No. Paul says, there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give me at that day, and also Paul loved His appearing. So this rewards for the righteous dead is the point of the resurrection of the righteous dead, therefore this is the trumpet of the rapture. We have established quite a chain of inference, but doesn't it seem to be all based on solid data? (ques) The only answer that I know to that is, we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. And for that reason I can't find any grounds for any resurrection of the righteous except at one moment of time. (ques) You will hear people quoting me from Dan to Beersheba, that I believe that the 7th trumpet is the last trumpet merely for the fact that it is the last trumpet mentioned, and for no other reason. That isn't my reason at all. Paul doesn't say the last trumpet ever to be sounded in all the universe; he doesn't say the last of what;. And it might be the last trumpet on the day of trumpets; might be the last of a certain series that they have in mind. Just from the last trump you can't draw a conclusion. Well, from the fact that the rewards for the righteous dead are at the time of the 7th trumpet, from that fact I conclude that this is the trumpet of the resurrection of the righteous dead, and therefore that this is the last trumpet that Paul mentioned. (ques) Well, they certainly did live. They came to

life. When we were discussing the 20th chapter, of course you know what I had in mind. I pointed out that I believe that a new paragraph begins at verse 4. In other words, I think that John goes back to the 7th trumpet and refers again to this same resurrection. They didn't worship the beast. Suppose that my interpretation of the abomination of desolation is correct, and that that most terrible of all troubles, but very brief, suppose that that is correct. (ques) During that terrible thlipsis in the midst of the week, they refuse to obey the orders of Satan, and they have their heads cut off. All of those who didn't worship the beast got caught up. So then this would synchronize. (ques) Now find a benchmark in our surveying. At the 7th trumpet, four things are declared to come to pass. They are declared by heavenly voices, not by earthly people, and so they are taken to be the truth. The kingdom of this world becomes Christ's kingdom. He takes his power and he begins to reign. That is point one. The wrath of God comes, point two. The judgment of rewards for righteous dead; not the judgment of all the dead, but the judgment of the righteous, the time of the dead that they should be judged, even that thou shouldst give rewards to thy servants the prophets, to the saints who fear thy name, both the small and the great. Rewards for the righteous dead, and destruction of those who are destroying the earth. Four things happen. (ques) This particular one is connected with other events in a matter of sequence. That is the answer. Rewards for the righteous dead are declared to come at the resurrection of the righteous, Lk 14.14, and there is a definite connection. The resurrection of the righteous is declared to come at the trumpet of the rapture, which Paul happens to call the last trump. So just because there is that definite connection of data, that is it. (ques) The wrath is no more connected with the rewards for the righteous than it is connected with the kingdom. All four things happen at the 7th trumpet. He begins to reign, he begins his wrath, he gives rewards to the righteous, and he destroys those who are destroying the earth. (ques) Why do we say that this is not the judgment of all the dead? Because the word kai may just as well mean even. And if this is the judgment of all the dead, then John is contradicting himself.

When he says that some came to life at the beginning of the thousand years, and the rest of the dead did not come to life till the thousand years were finished. So it would introduce a contradiction. Kai means two different things, It doesn't have to connect two different things. So read it even, and it leaves no contradiction and it makes good sense. The time of the dead to be judged, even to give the rewards to the righteous... (ques) In the description of the vials of wrath, there is no reference to the dead. The vials of wrath are poured out on the earth, on those who are destroying the earth. There is no reference here to any judgment of the wicked dead. (ques) Your reference to eternal punishment, the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, that is not particularly --- of course it is the wrath of God, but depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. But that is simply the eternal judgment of God. The wrath of God is (ques). The wicked dead are not in the lake of fire now; they are in Hades, waiting the great white throne judgment. Thy wrath has come, and then John goes on to tell about the pouring out of 7 bowls of wrath upon this earth. There is no reference to the wicked dead there. And I think that the coming of His wrath and the destroying of those destroying the earth refers to the same thing except that destroying those destroying the earth shows the results of his wrath, that the beast and his kingdom will be destroyed. This is the beginning of his kingdom in a sense in which it is not now his kingdom. In a future sense this begins his kingdom. This earth is always under his sovereignty, but this announcement is that the kingdom, this earth, becomes his kingdom, and as it indicated that his kingdom in the future has reference to this earth in this sense. The kingdom, this earth, has become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. (ques) These announcements of the 7th trumpet are given by heavenly beings, and they are taken to be the truth. At the 6th seal, the wicked people of the earth, in all of these cosmic upheavals, they say that it is the day of his wrath, and who can hide from his wrath? But the narrative goes right on, and there comes a great revival after that! 144000 Jews are born again, and an innumerable number of Gentiles are born again. So they were mistaken about it.

But that is typical of what the wicked always say in times of great cosmic upheavals. So that is why I pointed that out: these are heavenly voices. So it is not merely an outcry of the wicked in fear, but this is to be taken as the truth of God, because it comes down from heaven. Now let's begin with the 10th chapter, and read up to the 7th trumpet, to get the lay of the land.

Now the principles of Bible interpretation have been mentioned, and the principles of interpretation of the book of Revelation. Let us discuss a few broad principles of any piece of writing, whether it is the word of God or the word of man. If any piece of writing enumerates its sections, then you have to pay attention to the enumeration. If it says, first this, second this, third this, fourth this, etc, then you can't disrupt that order. When any writer enumerates the order, then you have to ask yourself, is that a logical or a chronological order? And you have to determine by what he says, whether the points are chronological or logical. So then, in the midst of the (END OF RECORD E 37)  
(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 38)

There is no ~~apriori~~ apriori way of determining the order. Here is an illustration. I am reviewing my economic vocabulary. It is out of date. I started in reading Samuelson, which is the most popular book on economics in the schools today. You read along, and then you have a table. And then you have a graph, and it shows where you should soak the rich and bless the poor, and take everything in taxes so that people can't put anything in the savings bank. It isn't quite as rabid as that. How do you know where a table or a diagram fits with the reading material? The only way is to ask yourself what it is 1  
And you will find the diagram, the graphs, near the reading material that they are about, either before, or after, or in the middle. That is the way that you read any book. A better illustration would be a picture book. I have a refresher course in sociology a while ago. I have my vocabulary of 35 years ago, and now I have a new one. The textbook was very well got up. I disagreed with much of it, but it was very well organized. And you would read along about sociological principles, and then you would have a series of pictures. Here is a cave man that was supposed to do thus and so. He has a perfectly

smooth shave and a trimmed mustasche. Utterly contrary to fact, I suppose, but it gave his imaginary environment, and there were other pictures. Some pictures of relics of ancient man, and some modern pictures. ~~Next~~<sup>Now</sup> the pictures had to do with the text, but the pictures cannot in exact order. They were put where they were appropriate. In the book of Revelation, you have 7 letters to 7 churches. And John doesn't tell you that the order is chronological, but you find by looking at the map that these are mentioned in the geographical order, and if there is any chronology to them, you would have to infer it from the material. And I think there is. But that is an inference. There are 7 letters to 7 churches. Then we have two chapters of a vision in heaen, chapters 4 and 5. And that vision in heaven is not chronologically enumerated, or logically enumerated. It is a record of a vision, and you will see that it is very much like the vision of Daniel 7. Then chapter 6 you hve 7 seals of the book, opened, and they are expected to be in chronological order. That is, the visions are in chronological order. When he opened the first seal the first living creature said, Come and see, and I saw a white horse, and him that sat upon it, a crown and a bow, and he went forth riding and to conquer. And when he opened the second seal, I saw a red horse, etc. And when he opened the third seal... (ques) I would think that the inference ~~is~~ is that since the visons are said to be in chronological order, that the events are also. I think that it is quite clear, and that nobody denies, that the 7th seal has a series refers to a series of events in chronological order. (ques) If it is the same event in different terms, it would have to be pretty definite data. You might have a story like this: the first picture that I am going to throw on the screen is Mt Shasta, from the west. And then you describe that. The second picture I am going to throw on the screen is Mt Shasta from the north. In that case, the pictures would be chronological, but the meaning would not be. It would be geographical. Hypothetically, you could have, but I think that it is very clear that the material in the 7th seal is events in sequence. (ques) Some of them would seem to be contradictory, if they are synchronous. That is, the first horse is a brilliant picture of going forth

conquering and to conquer, and the bow is symbolical of the Word of God quite frequently. And then the next one is trouble, worse trouble, and the fourth one is still worse trouble, darkness. So there will be 6 and the fifth seal is the seal of the martyred dead, the blessed dead in heaven, and then the 6th seal is the terrible troubles on the earth and then the great revival. Great many people saved, so I would think that if you would try to fit them over one another they would almost be contradictory. At any rate, the principle is clear that John enumerated 7 visions in the openings of the seals of the book. The visions being in sequence, and I personally feel that the events come in sequence. But then after the 6th seal, you have quite a lot of description of revival, 144000 Jews, and an innumerable multitude of Gentiles. They are saved and sealed with the presence of the Spirit in their lives.

~~xx~~ They have washed their robes and made them white by means of the ~~xxx~~ blood of the Lamb. They have quite a large picture put in between the 6th and the 7th seal. Then the 7th seal introduces 7 trumpets, and those trumpets are sounded in sequence. The first trumpet sounded, and so and so took place, and the second trumpet sounded, and ~~xx~~ so and so took place, etc. (ques)

I think that the explanatory material between the 6th and the 7th seal refers to a great revival at the time of the 6th seal. That is what I think. (ques) Now if you hadn't had certain teachings outside of the Scriptures, and you read that narrative right straight thru, you would take from your Greek syntax the great tribulation that we have just described being at this time when there are meteoric showers and terrible storms and great earthquakes. These are those who have come out of the great tribulation tht we have just told you about.

~~x~~ The one in the immediate context. (ques) The great tribulation, -- in your greek article it would mean, the one that we are talking about, in the context. Unless there was some strong reason to the contrary. Few people know the syntax of the Greek article. These are they that came out of the great tribulation that we have just mentioned, would be the most natural inference. I don't think that that is the same tribulation as the one that Christ said is the one which will be the one which is the worst that ever shall be. (ques)

What the Scripture calls it, and what people call it, you will see are quite different. 10 if the greatest tribulation that ever has been or ever will be, and it is very short. And that couldn't happen but one, ~~but~~ because it is the superlative. But this one in the sixth seal is simply the great trouble. These are they that came out of the great trouble. What great trouble? Well, he has just spoken about the terrible cosmic upheaval. It is in the attributive position, the article the, and the adjective great. That is all that there is to it. John introduces 7 trumpets, and they are clearly in sequence, and one thing happens after another in the 7th trumpet, because they couldn't all happen at one time. That would be contradictory. After the 6th trumpet, between the 6th and the 7th trumpet there comes an extended description. And this description is what I want to read. When the material is enumerated in sequence, then you cannot break the sequence, but you have to find out whether it is chronological or logical. But when you have an extended explanatory section, then you have to read it and see whether it comes in sequence or not. It is put in here between the 6th and the 7th trumpet. And the presumption is that it has to do with the events of these trumpets. That is at least a presumption, I think. With that in mind, there are more pictures after the 7th trumpet, and then comes these vials of wrath. And with the last vial of wrath, the destruction of the kingdom of the beast. The 10th chapter now. This is explanatory, not in sequence, ~~like~~ like a picture put into a book. You know that it has something to do with what comes before and after, but you don't know just where it fits till you read it. And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, clothed with a cloud, and the rainbow round about his head, and his face as the sun, and his feet as columns of fire, and he had in his hand a little book, opened. Now in the 4th and 5th chapter, you have the sealed book, and Christ came and took the sealed book and opened it. Now this strong angel, whom I think is a picture of Christ, with the countenance like the sun, and feet like columns of fire, he has an open book. I think that it is the same book, but we won't settle that point right now. He had this open book in his hand, and he placed his right foot upon the sea and his left foot upon the land, and he cried with a great cry

as when a lion roars: And when he cried, 7 thunders uttered their voice, and when the 7thunders spoke, I was about to write, and I heard a voice out of ~~heaven~~ heaven saying, Seak what the 7 thunders said, do not write it. Now why couldn't he write it? (END OF RECORD E 38)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 39)

There was an utterance there at the 7th trumpet, but John was not allowed to write it down. So we don't have it. But we do have what John did write down. And the angel whom I saw, standing upon the sea and the land, lifted up his right hand to heaven, and swore by him that liveth forever and ever, who created heaven and the things in it, and the earth and the things in it, and the sea and the things in it, that, time no longer would be. But in the days of the voice of the 7th angel, when he is about to sound, the mystery of God will be finished. That is the vision of the angel with the open book. Time will be no longer. This doesn't mean that at that time it is blotted out, but rather that time is up. With reference to what he is talking about, with reference to the mystery of God. When the clock gets around to a certain tick, we will say that time is up. Some people have taken this altogether out of context, and have taken it to mean that now that time is up eternity is come and there is no more time. Well, there is a thousand years after this, and there are a lot of events after this. But this obviously means that there will be no more delay, no more time for the thing that he is talking about; namely the finishing of the mystery of God. Now what did John mean by the mystery of God? (ques) We have our round numbers in English. Forty years was a round number in the OT. So seven conveys the thought of completeness. Don't carry any farther than that. The mystery of God is finished at the 7th trumpet. Now John doesn't explain. He wrote the Revelation probably after the epistles of Paul. We understand that John went to Ephesus after Paul with the dead, so John undoubtedly had the epistles of Paul. And John was banished to the isle of Patmos, in the Aegean sea. In Eph and Col, Paul talks about the mystery of God.

4 in the Bible Today; I just took the concordance, and took everyplace where the word mystery occurs in the whole Bible, and I didn't come to any startling conclusions, but the mystery of God as Paul uses it means the plan of Salvation as implemented for the present age. The mystery of God is the answer to Nicodemus' question, How can these things be? It is Christ in you, the hope of ~~Glory~~ Glory. It is Christ, Christ in his manifestation at the present time. I think the best definition of Paul's special use of the

word mystery is that it is the plan of salvation as implemented for this present age. Now John was in Paul's territory, and he must have read Paul's letters by this time, and it is reasonable to suppose that when John said that the mystery of God would be finished, or when the angel told John that the mystery of God would be finished, that John was referring to the same thing that Paul was referring to, namely, the conclusion of this age, of the church. Now I wouldn't build a house on that, because I am drawing inferences. This isn't like the case where it says, Thou hast taken thy great power and begun to reign. The kingdom of this world has become... No, that is positive predication. I think that this is a fairly clear inference: the mystery of God will be finished means the church will be finished, as the age 6 for this present age. The particular economy of things. What we generally call a Gentile church. A Gentile age of the church, if you like. Well, it certainly fits in there. This angel announces that at the 7th trumpet, the mystery of God will be finished, and that is given a reasonable and probable meaning by understanding what Paul meant. And that would mean that the rapture would take place at the 7th trumpet. 6½ and the things where we think we are drawing a very reasonable inference. I do think that this is a reasonable inference. And the voice which I heard from heaven again speaking with me. Get up and take this book which is open in the hands of the angel who took his stand upon the sea and upon the land. Get up and take it. I think that we will stop for just a minute on the nature of that book. I'll try to summarize it. In Daniel 7, the Son of man coming to the Ancient of Days to receive a kingdom. In Revelation 4 and 5, the Lamb slain comes before him who sits on the throne and receives a book, and the symbolism is very similar. I think that you can see that John has in mind the picture of Daniel 7. When he takes the book, all the creatures of the universe begin to sing kingly praises: Dominion, power, and glory and might, and all the host of words that have to do with kingly prerogatives. So many Bible teachers have inferred that taking the little book in Rev 5 and taking the kingdom in Dan 7 are the same thing, or in other words the little book is his title to the kingdom.

There again, that is an inference. But I think that it is a reasonable inference. Now, Get up and take this book from the hands of the angel. Well, I'm drawing another inference: that this open book after the 7th seal has been opened is the same book. (ques) 9 and you are led to think that John saw this vision, and put in words, he was thinking about Daniel 7. Now just take the suggestion that this little book represents the visible, earthly kingdom of Jesus Christ in the messianic age, and see what he does with this book. And I 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  saying, Give me this little book; and he said to me take, and eat it down. And this will make your stomach sour, but in your mouth it will be sweet as honey. And I took the little book out of the hand of the angel, and I ate it down, and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness, ~~tax~~ but when I had eaten it, my stomach was bitter. Now the figure of eating a book is very familiar. Jeremiah says, Thy words were found, and I did eat them, and Ezekiel was commanded to eat the book. That is a good English idiom: I just devoured this book. To eat a book is a very familiar metaphor, isn't it? What does it mean, It was sweet to the taste, but bitter to digest? It has its sweet aspect, and it has its bitter aspect. Now there is an explanation given. It was bitter. And they said to me, It is necessary for you to prophesy again over people and nations and tongues and kings. John wasn't thru his prophesying. He had seen the Lamb take the book and open it, and now now he has this vision in which he is told to eat the book, and it is sweet but it is bitter, and the explanation is that he has much more to prophesy about (not before) people and kings and tongues and kingdoms and nations. All this mass of humanity. I think that that day is very important missionary vision. A very important concept for us to get with reference to the progress of missions. Now we premillenarians we are anxious for the return of the Lord, and that is right. Lord come quickly. It is not wicked to say, Lord how long? The blessed in heaven say that. But when you stop to think about this business about premillenarians being so excited and so eager to set the date, -- some of them quitting work, etc. One great missionary agency had funds that could not be used for any building, because the return of the Lord was going to be so

soon. With a hasty, superficial evangelism, no schools or colleges or education... Some premillenarians think that we shouldn't have built a Seminary. There is the gospel, and just get it out, for the Lord is coming aback right away! Now I think that we ought to 13 . I hope that the Lord will come, but lets think of the woe and the wrath of all of these millions of people. It is a bitter truth. And not just a sweet truth. It is a sweet truth, but it's also very bitter. Now we looked at ii Peter, and his attitude towards the longsuffering of the Lord : the Lord is not dilatory with regards to his coming, but is longsuffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And 14 the longsuffering of God means salvation to that many more people. I really think that this bitterness is part of the truth that we premillenarians ought to follow. And it ought to make us more zealous for missions. More zealous for spreading the Gospel.

14 The Scripture says that not only we don't know the day nor the hour, but it is not for you to know the times nor the seasons. We are not intended to say that the Lord has to come back within 50 years, even. And I think that is it. John took this little book and he ate it, and it was very sweet and it was very bitter, and the angel told him , You have a lot more to say about a lot more people. And then he goes on. (ques)....

(END OF RECORD E 39)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 40)

~~There-was-an-ut~~ ...blessedness for the blessed and wrath for the wicked. The armies of the beast are going to be destroyed and the people of the earth who haven't actually joined the armies of the beast are going to go thru a terrible time of wrath. The coming of the kingdom of Christ, in the future sense of the kingdom, is a very brief prospect  $\frac{1}{2}$  but it is a very sad thing to think about when we think of unbelievers. That is it. In Dan 7, Christ received a kingdom and destroys the antichrist, and sets up his kingdom. The sad part of it is, all of these people are lost. And we should be very zealous. I think that this text, if it is the correct interpretation, would give us a balance towards the coming of the Lord 1

about the establishment of the work~~d~~ of the Lord. There is one thing about ~~fundamentalists~~ of our day, they don't have the concept of building a church. That is, in the sense of a group of born again people who bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. (quite indistinct)

But they neglect the solid, constructive work that will tell in the years to come. And so, we should think of the Lord's return as ~~when~~ something 2 come soon, but if we pray, so many more people will be saved. And if He comes, it will have a very bitten effect upon those whom we haven't reached. (ques)

Suppose the little book is the title deed to the kingdom. <sup>N</sup>ow John thoroughly digests it, he reads it so that he gets the facts. The kingdom of Chr~~k~~st comes,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  how sweet, but how bitter. And all His wrath. And then he has  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , you've got a lot more to say about people, ~~xxx~~ tongues, and nations and kings. And then John naturally describes the wrath of God. (ques) We haven't read Daniel 7, or Revel 4 and 5. In Revelation 4 and 5 the taking of the book involves the taking of the visible kingdom. So the book represents the coming of his visible earthly kingdom. That fact is both sweet and bitter. Now we can easily see why the fact of His visible earthly kingdom is both sweet and bitter. (ques) The Scripture represents Him as grieved over the lost. Of course it is bitter. You don't think that God enjoys it. His wrath is also given in sorrow. Picture Christ weeping over Jerusalem. He denounced their sin, but it is a very sad thing to do. We Christians say that God's judgments are right, but nevertheless we are weeping for the lost. (ques) God is always sorry tht anybody is wiked. I think that you~~d~~ are making up psychology for God that isn't Scriptural at all. It doesn't say that He enjoys being a consumigg fire towards the wicked. For people to ~~xxx~~ trample underfoot the blood of his Son is grief, and it is also wrath. Wrath and grief are not inconsistent. It is very consistent, and it breaks God's heart. (ques). And He wishes all to repent, but that goesn't mean that all are going to repent. There is that distorted form of Calvinism which will not allow God to have any emotions, and which will not distinguish His wish from his will, but that isn't Scriptural. The God of the Bible says

thou shalt not steal to all mankind, saved and lost as well. But people do steal. It is His wish that they don't steal, but it is not His decree. So the death and the eternal punishment of the wicked is a terrible fact, and fearful, and we ought to feel that God is right, and God knows that He is right. Nevertheless we ought to try to win them, and it ought to deepen our missionary zeal. Here is a little book to eat, and it is connected in the 5th chapter with Christ's kingly prerogatives, and to eat it is sweet and bitter. Christ's visible coming kingdom will be very sweet, but it will have its bitter aspect. And so the figure of speech seems quite reasonable. In the 11th chapter, another paragraph. And there was given to me a reed like a rod, saying, tread out and measure the temple of God and the altar, those worshipping in it; but the court which is outside of the temple, do not measure it, because it is given to the Gentiles, and the holy city they will tread underfoot 32 months. Now a condition is described. We believe that this was written after 70 AD, and the temple of Jerusalem was not then standing. John then saw a vision of the reconstructed temple. I don't think that anybody would date the Revelation before 70 AD. Now John is given a vision of a reconstructed temple, and a period of 42 months, during which time the temple and the altar and the worshippers are not interfered with, but they are protected. But the outside court, which was like the court of the Gentiles in the time of Christ, and the holy city are trodden underfoot of the Gentiles for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. Now what does that remind you of?  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years while their worship is going on. And yet they are under Gentile domination. At least it would certainly correspond to the first half of Daniel's 70 week. (ques  $\emptyset$ ) The temple in Jerusalem is called the temple of God as a building, and I think we will see that the Jews, who have a contract with the prince that shall come, are devout people who do not worship Christ, they are not saved. But they try to reestablish their own Jewish worship from a cultural point of view. And in doing it, some of them believe in God, and some of them are just atheists. I'm speaking of the Jews today. 10 rebuild the temple of their God; and John would call it the temple of God. I don't think that that is strange. They are under Gentile rule

and the outer court is dominated exactly as it was in the time of Christ. The court of the Gentiles, and there was a Roman garrison there in case there should be a mob, as in the case when Paul was sacrificing. The Roman guard had to rush down and rescue him, but in the time of Christ and Paul the Romans kept out of the Temple. They didn't want to bother the Jews. They would only go in there if they had to. There was the court of the Gentiles where they could go. But the altar and the worshippers were protected by Rome, that is, they were not interfered with. But Rome dominated the city and the court of the Gentiles. Now John postulates a period of 42 months in which this is going on. Now look back to Daniel 9, and see how it fits in. (question), That is an old metaphor, the domination. We have the 70 sevens determined on thy people, and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and after the 12 shall the annointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing. Nothing against him, for himself. And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city, and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, even unto the end shall be wars; desolations are determined. ~~kk~~ Add he, the prince that shall come, ...KD commentary on this section. Keil says  $12\frac{1}{2}$ . Either Antiochus of the 8th chapter, or the antichrist of the 7th chapter. And it could not possibly be Antiochus, says Keil, therefore it must be the antichrist of the 7th chapter. The little horn. That is exactly what I believe right along. He shall confirm a covenant with the many for one seven. In the midst of the seven he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. That would imply that for the first half of the seven years the sacrifice and the oblation is not interfered with, wouldn't it? In the midst he destroys it, or causes it to cease, and you would imply that in the first half he does not cause it to cease. (verse 27 is read) That seven in the midst of which the sacrifice and the oblation are stopped would imply the first half in which the sacrifice and the oblation goes on. So I think that that is very significant. Now the next paragraph. I will give to my two witnesses. (ques). I think that according to Daniel 9 and Daniel 12, the abomination of desolation, and abominating desolation comes in the middle of that

seven year period. It is given as such both in the 9th and the 12th chapter.

(END OF RECORD E 40)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 41)

The 42 months they worship without interference. Now the two witnesses.

They will prophesy 1260 days. That is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, and a little short. Counting 30 day months, it is exactly  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. These are the two olive trees and the two lights, who shall stand before the Lord. Now that is 1 to Zech 4, vs 3 and 11-14, add in additiona to Zech, it was Zerubbabel and the high priest whom the Lord was using as the great leaders of that time. But here these are two witnesses, and they are like the olive tree and the lights in the vision of Zech. The oil poured directly from the tree into the lamps and the lamps were kept burning. This is of course not as far as it goes, but the oil of the Holy Spirit burning in a burning light in the life of the children of God. These are spiritual men, in other words. These are spirit-filled men like Zerrubabel. I think that that is all that it means here. And if anyone wishes to hurt them, fire proceeds out of their mouth and devours their enemies. And if anyone wishes to harm them, it is necessary for him to be killed. These have authority to lock up heaven, that it shall not rain upon the earth for the days of their prophecy, and they have authority over the weather, to turn them into drought, and to smite the earth with every plague whatever they wish. Now these miracles of these two witnesses continue for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. I take them to be two witnesses, great spiritual men, but I take these to indicate a recurrence of sign miracles. That is, the miracle of grace continues constantly, and God may work sign miracles whenever He chooses, of course, but God does not work sign miracles, display miracles, generally, except in certain epochs. The three epochs of sign miracles in the OT: the time of the Exodus and the leadership under Moses, ~~when~~ when people had forgotten the name of God; the time of revival under ~~XXX~~ Elijah and Elisha, great miracles when people had hyphenated the name of God, (there were some miracles in Daniel's time) but the third great epoch of sign miracles was in the time of Christ and the apostles, when people had made idolatry out of the gery fount of worship which Jehovah had prescribed. And of course when the NT church was being established, the recurrence of sign mkracles, and in this particular time God will raise up two witnesses and give them this power. They will see that these particular plague

are identical with the events which take place during the 7th trumpet. And then their testimony is finished, or, when they finish their testimony, after the 1260 days, the beast who comes up out of the abyss,--now he ~~is~~  $4\frac{1}{2}$  in the 13th chapter he is described. John says, now look ahead, I'm going to tell you about this beast later on, but this beast who comes up out of the abyss, he will make war with them, and will kill them, . The beast whom I think is identical with the antichrist, he cannot even touch them, he cannot hurt them, until the midst of the week. He hates them, and grows more and more aggr~~u~~ with them, but he can't touch them till they have finished their ministry. There of course is a great homiletical lesson. Nobody can hurt you till your work is done, if you are in the will of God. And when your work is done, you may be burned at the stake, or boiled in oil, or most anything, but that can't happen till you have done what God wants you to do, if you are in the will of God. So, nobody can touch these men till they finish their work, and then they are killed. (ques). I think that this beast is the prince that shall come of Daniel 9, the little horn of Daniel 7, the man of sin of 2 Thes 2 and the contemptible person of Daniel 11. (ques) I think that it is clear from the picture that nobody will know that he is the antichrist until the first  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years is just about up. There have been so many white papers for the Jews and so many worldl leaders have made promises to the Jews, that I don't believe that you'll be able to identify this man until the period of 7 years has gone along a little ways. I do think that students of prophecy may be able to come to some degree of assurance, so that just before the midst of the week they would get out of the city of Jerusalem, as Christ said. I don't think that you'll ever be able to say that it has been just exactly so many days since this particular time the covenant was signed. This beast, after  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years makes war with them and conquers them and kills them. And their dead bodies lie upon the streets of the great city, which is called spiritually Sodom and Egypt. John has had some experiences with Jerusalem, and the antichrist is about to desecrate it. Where also our Lord was crucified, (that identifies Jerusalem). Spiritually it is Sodom and Egypt, but geographically it is Jenus-

alem. And,--now they give you televisioon here. John didn't know about television here, but ,--they will look of all the people and tribes and tongues and nations, they will see their dead bodies. I think that you can very well imagine this kingdom of the beast. He has decided to be God. He has suddenly turned and broken his covenant, and set up his idol in the temple, and is declaring himself as God. And of course he controls the radio~~s~~ and the televisio and people all around the world  $8\frac{1}{2}$  and their dead bodies lie there. And the television plays on it constantly. Here are these corpses and there they lie on the streets of the city. The people of the earth rejoice over them, and make merry and they send gifts one to another because these two prophets torment<sup>ed</sup> those who dwelt on the earth. They are sitting there before their television sets, and they are saying, We have gotten rid of these fanatics here. How did they get that power, to stop the rain and to ~~make~~ turn water into blood. Well, look now, see the flies gathering around, mice and rats' and everything. Just imagine the gruesome scene. (ques) John thinks of them as representing all the peoples of the earth, and in  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days you would have great difficulty in having those of all these nations get there. Why not use television? Of course John doesn't mention television; that was my baby. Now if you want them to go in delegations, (ques). w John says, And out of the tribes, --and he certainly means a world wide vision of this local event,-- There is no reason to take it otherwise. From the people and the tribes and the tongues and the nations: they will see their dead bodies lying there on the street. Seems to me that the fact of televison is illuminating in this context. A world looks on. That certainly is contemplated here. (ques) After  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, the Spirit of life from God enters into them. And they stood upon their feet, and fear fell upon those watching them, and they heart a great voice out of heaven saying, cOme up here. And they went up to heaven in the clouds. What clouds? And their enemies say them. Now this is a world-wide picture. I don't think that it is foolbsh to bring in the thought of television here. Now if the 7th trumpet is the trumpet of the rapture, and in Mt 24 Christ puts the gathering of the elect by the angels after the abominatio

now if there is the rise of the beast here, his coming power and his killing these two witnesses, if that corresponds with the abomination, then you have this most terrible persecution (I think placed by inference) ; all of the people of the world rejoice over the death of these two witnesses, and the pride of the beast has come to pass so that he can present himself as God, ~~we~~ he can kill these witnesses, he can stop the Jewish worship in the temple. You can just imagine the terrible persecution, and why Christ told the Christians to run and hide in the mountains. That surely is not marching orders for every day. When you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel, then run and hide. Get out of Jerusalem. It all seems to synchronize so remarkably. These two witnesses prophesying for 1260 days, and then lying there dead for 3 days...

(END OF RECORD E 41)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 42)

Their enemies behold them. There is no secret rapture about that, is there? It is a tremendously spectacular event. (ques) I take these to be individuals myself. The Lord gives His work to great leaders, and He has particular prophets for particular times, with particular miracle power, and I don't see why it wouldn't be most reasonable to say He will raise up two particular leaders and they will be put to death by the beast as he comes to power, and after  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days when the people of the world will rejoice against God, then they will be caught up in the clouds. I think that ... In that hour, a great earthquake and the fifth part of the city fell, and those that were ~~abain~~ in the earthquake numbered 7000 men, and the rest  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and gave glory to the God of heaven. Now there is a case where they did give glory to God. (ques) After these ~~xxx~~ witnesses have been going for a while, then I would become convinced and say, Well it does look like it. I wouldn't be too sure till they had been going for quite a while. (ques) There is a rapture of the church, and their rapture is the same point of time with the rapture of the whole church. I think that the rapture of the church will be the most stupendous time that the world has ever seen. All the cemeteries will be ripped open, every business will be disrupted, born again people snatched right out. Think of a great

bank. If every born again cashier is /gone...think of the whole world, every born again engineer, fireman, etc. Think of the airplanes. Every born again pilot is just taken. (ques) There is no secret rapture in the Bible. That is the only text that I have ever heard quoted for a secrtr rapture is the reference to the coming of the Lord as a thief, and the Scripture always associates the coming as a thief with the wicked. The wicked people. To them it will be like the coming of a thief. It is not a sneak thief. That day shall not overtake you as a thief. The Christians will not know the day nor the hour, and they will not know the times nor the seasons, but the Christians will not think of it as the coming of a thief. Only the people of the world will think of it as a thief. But it doesn't say a sneak thief. There is no scripture for the secret rapture. If you think of any, I wish that you would tell me, because I have looked for years. The rapture is a noisy event. The shout, the voice of the archangel, the trump of God. It is stpendous, and the antichrist will know that that is taking place, and that is why he gathers his armies, to prevent Christ from taking Jerusalem. Just exactly the way that Herod tried to prevent Christ from growing up. (ques) Here are the steps. The judgment of the righteous dead takes place at the 7th trumpet; the judgment of the righteous dead takes place at the resurrection; the resurrection takes place at the last trump; now in Mt 24, the rapture of the righteous is at the same time as the resurrection of the righteous, and in Mt 24 the rapture of the righteous follows very shortly after the abomination of desolation. That is the step that is often left out. He sends forthi His angels with the sound of a great trumpet, and He gathers His elect from the four winds. There is the abomination, a short but terrible thlipsis, and then the rapture of the elect. Then is the rapture of the elect takes place shortly after the abomination of desolation, and if the abomination is in the midst of the week, now these two witnesses are put to death as the beast comes to power. He comes to power, proclaims himself as God and sets up the abomination. Therefore the death of these two witnesses comes at the time of the abomination. (ques) Rewards for the righteous dedd at the 7th trumpet; rewards for the righteous dead at the resurrection.of the righteous

dead, Lk 14.14. Therefore rewards for the righteous dead at the resurrection of the righteous dead. Now then the resurrection of the righteous dead at the last trumpet. Therefore the last trumpet is the 7th trumpet. I (ques)

In Mt 24, you have the abomination, a brief but terrible thlipsis, and then the rapture of all the saints. In Revelation you have the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of witness, the beast comes to power, the witnesses are killed,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days their dead bodies are there and then they are caught up to heaven. (ques) (Much repetitive discussion here). 1260 days is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. Now in Daniel's vision, there is a 70 of sevens, and half of that, which will be a time in which they will have religious liberty. Half of 7 years is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years; 1260 days is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. (ques) You take each of them literally, just as it is stated here. 42 months is 42 months. 1260 days is 1260 days. And then you realize that both of these equal  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. Then you take  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days as  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days. Their dead corpses lie in the street. You wouldn't take that as figurative. It is right there. So  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days after they are killed, they are caught up to heaven. (ques) Daniel talks about 70 years of Jeremiah. Then he talks about 70 sevens. Most any commentary says that he must mean 70 sevens of years. So one seven in Dan 9 means 7 years. What is half of seven years?  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. 42 months is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. 1260 days is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. So the first half of Daniel's 70th week the people are not to be disturbed in their worship. And then for 42 months they are not interfered with in their worship in the temple. For 1260 days the prophets of God can't be hurt. And it is all  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. (ques) (END OF RECORD E 42)

I have said that that will be followed by a brief but terrible persecution, and He shall send forth His angels and gather His elect from everywhere. It certainly describes the rapture. Now these two witnesses are put to death when the beast comes to power, which would be the time when he sets up the abomination. They lie there  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, and they are caught up in the clouds. So it would seem quite reasonable to say that the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days would probably be the time of the terrible persecution. Now Revelation 12, 13, and 17.

I started in the middle of the eleventh chapter, with the illustration of the surveyor's benchmark. Seems that at the sounding of the 7th trumpet, you have clear proclamations that this is the time of the judgment for rewards for the righteous dead. Among all the various interpretations, among which some are pure conjecture, it does seem as tho this is one of the certain things. The time of the days to be judged, even the time when God gives rewards to the righteous servants the prophets, and to those saints and to those who fear Thy name, both the small and the great. In connection with the 7th trumpet, the beginning of the kingdom in a sense in which the kingdom is not now present because the beginning of the kingdom is referred to, speaking of the kingdom if this world is become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. The coming of the wrath of God, destroying those who are destroying the earth. So we can say that at the 7th trumpet come rewards for the righteous dead, the beginning of the kingdom in a sense in which it can begin at a future time, the beginning of the wrath of God, the.. The rewards for the righteous dead come at the resurrection of the righteous dead, Lk 14.14. Now if the rewards come at the resurrection of the righteous, then this is the time of the resurrection of the righteous dead, and then this 7th trumpet would be what Paul calls the last trump. It isn't because Paul thought that it was the last trump, but because it ~~points~~ coincides with the resurrection of the righteous dead. Then this would be the trumpet referred to in I Th 4, and then this would be the great trumpet of Mt 24 when he sends forth His angels to gather His elect from the four winds. This is connected with the sign of the coming of the Son of man in the clouds. So with all that series of identifications, we went over it.

Then we started to read in the 10th chapter, and we found the mighty angel announced, prior to the sounding of the 7th trumpet, that the mystery of God would be finished at the 7th trumpet. This is something in which you can't be dogmatic, but Paul used the phrase "mystery of God" to refer to the Gentile church, or the church as it is constituted in the present age. It is reasonable that John should use it in the same way that Paul did. ~~X~~The mystery of God will be finished at the sounding of the 7th trumpet, which coincides. Then we saw in the first verses of the 11th chapter a vision of the worshippers in the temple and the altar, not interfered with for 42 months, with the statement that the outer court and the city are under the domination of the Gentiles for that period of 42 months. And that seemed rather striking as corresponding to what would take place up to the midst of the week in Dan 9. This is the condition which prevailed in the time of Christ and of Paul, that the worshippers were not interfered with, but there was the outer court for the Gentiles, and the city under Gentile domination. Then next we saw that the two witnesses have miracle power for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. They can't be touched by the beast for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. The beast introduced the conclusion of the testimony of these two witnesses. When they have finished their work, then the beast will make war with them and conquer them and kill them. And the dead bodies lie in the streets of Jerusalem for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, and then they come to life and are taken up in the clouds. So in the first part of chapter 11, you have two different visions or situations each one lasting  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years. One is called 42 months, and one is called 1250 days. And each one of these would at least fit in with the first half of Daniel's 70th ~~xxxx~~ week. Then in the 12th chapter, we saw a recurrence,--the first 6 verses tell the story, and then the 7th verse goes back over it again and tells the same story from a different point of view, which is only a natural literary phenomenon, and found in the Scripture and out of the Scripture. I taught that the woman should probably be identified with organized Christendom. And that the child which is caught up to God when it is born should probably be identified with the rapture of the church. The overcomers are to rule the nations with a rod of iron, with Christ, so at least ... The woman of the

17th and 19th chapters and the woman in the 12th chapter are identical. The relation between the beast and the apostate church, or the apostate organized religion is to me exactly what we find in the world today. The devil hates liberal religion, but he uses it. So this woman rides the beast; the beast hates her, and yet this organized religion that has the Bible is kept alive for the last  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years after the birth of the child, and it is said in the 13th chapter that the beast is allowed to prevail for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years and the woman rides the beast and he hates her and seeks to destroy her. The woman has the remnant of her seed which has the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus, which would at least correspond with people being born again by the influence of the Bible. And that is a brief summary. In many parts of the book of Revelation you have just a picture thrown on the screen, and you draw your own inference from the context and from other Scripture and find what it means. Chapter 13 there is a textual problem whether he stood upon the sands, or whether I stood, but the critical text reads He stood, that is, the dragon, on the sands of the sea. Doesn't make any difference as to the exegesis of the figures. And I saw coming up out of the sea a beast, having ten horns and seven heads. Now we must remember that John had Daniel in mind, and his readers were expected to have Daniel in mind also, and I think that it is quite imperative that we face John as more or less conscious of the fact that there are some elements of Daniels 7th chapter said over here in a different setting and in a different combination, here in this 13th chapter. The beast rising up out of the sea having ten horns and seven heads. And upon the horns ten diadems, and upon the heads names of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like a leopard, and his feet like a bear; and his mouth as a lion, and there was given to him (indistinct 14 ) (END OF RECORD E 33)

(BEGINNING OF RECORD E 44)

And the dragon gave to him his power and his throne, and great authority. This beast is the one who is ~~worshipped~~ worshipped as though he is God, and he is the antichrist. Christ is God manifest in the flesh; this one is made a God by the dragon, and the dragon is Satan. The trinity: the dragon, the beast

who is worshipped as God, being in the ~~fix~~ flesh, and then the false prophet whose function is to cause everybody to worship the first beast. And that would seem to be a counterfeit of the Holy Spirit. So the dragon gives him his throne and great authority and power, and I saw one head of the beast wounded to the point of death, and the stroke of death was healed. And the whole world marvelled at the beast. And they worshipped the dragon because he gave his authority to the beast, and they worshipped the beast, saying, who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him? And there was given to him a mouth speaking great things, even blasphemy. And there was given him authority to do, to prevail, to carry on 42 months. That seems quite coincidental with the last half of Daniels 70th week. He is given power to carry on for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years (AAM) Why do you connect it with the last half rather than the first half? (JOB) The first half, prior to the abomination of desolation, the people and their worship are not interfered with. Their sacrifice and their oblation goes on. And in chap 11, from the abomination to the end is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, with a little time left over. In the 9th chapter, he stops their worship in the midst of the week, and in chap 11 he does practically the same thing, and.. Here, the beast cannot touch the two witnesses to hurt them during the days of their prophecy. They prophesy for 1260 days, but when their work is done then he is allowed to conquer them and to kill them. And that first  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years he can't hurt them, and for the last  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years he is allowed to prevail.. So at least it is coincidental.. Now he blasphemes the name of God and His tabernacle, and those dwelling in heaven. Those dwelling in heaven would be a little more significant if we would postulate that this is after the rapture. The ones dwelling ~~in~~ in heaven are the holy angels anyway, and the blessed dead, but it is significant that the rapture has already taken place before this period of 42 months in which the beast is allowed to prevail. It is given him to make war with the saints and to conquer them. Now that is a reference back to Dan 11.7. There it is said of these two witnesses that the beast could not hurt them...Wait: Revelation 11.7, not Daniel! When their testimony is finished, the beast coming out of the abyss will make war with them and will conquer them and will kill them. This in 13.7 simply ties the story together.

This is the beast that he was talking about there, who has the power to make war with the saints and to conquer them. And there was given him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. And they worshipped him, all who dwelt on the earth, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Paragraph division now, with verse 9. If anyone has ears he must hear. If anyone is for captivity, into captivity he goes. If anyone kills with the sword, it is necessary for him by the sword to be killed. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints. I conceive of those two verses as simply drawing a spiritual lesson for anybody in any age, anytime. These terrible things are going to take place, but whoever is converted and who is on earth at the time, or whoever is here with the two witnesses during the first half of the 70th week period, before the beast can touch them, anybody anytime should take these verses. That obviously is homiletical material for the comfort of the Lord's people. From this point on there is a number of similar passages which John gives which would be of comfort to anybody in any age. 12.17, 14, 12, 13 16.15. It is very gracious of the Holy Spirit to give us these words of comfort in the midst of these terrible visions of agony. And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns, like the Lamb, and he spake as a dragon. He exercised all the authority of the first beast in his presence, before him. And he causes the earth and those dwelling in it that they should worship the first beast, whose death-stroke was healed. And he causes or works great signs so that he makes fire come down out of heaven into the earth in the presence of men, and he deceives those dwelling in the earth by the signs which he is permitted to work in the presence of the beast. Saying to those dwelling upon the earth, Make an image to the beast who had the sword stroke and came to life. This would indicate that it was not merely to the point of death, but that this beast was actually out of the picture for a while, and then came to life. And it was given to him to give spirit to the image of the beast, so that it should speak to the image of the beast and should cause that whoever does not worship the image of the beast shall be killed. And he causes everyone, small ~~and~~,

and great, the rich and the poor, and the free and the bound, that they receive that they give to them a mark in their hand or on their heads. The mark in the hand is not always visible, but the mark in the head is visible to everybody. I have heard devotional messages on that. There is a mark which can be covered up in the closed fist, and there is the mark which shows out right on the face. I suppose the criminals could put a hat on or wear handkerchiefs over their faces and ~~not~~ cover up the mark anyway. And causes that no one should be able to buy or to sell who does not have the mark or the name of the beast or the number of his name. Here is wisdom...number of a man, and the number of him is 666. It is foolish for us to try to identify the beast till these other things come to pass merely by having us adding up numbers. You take the latin, or drop out his middle name or use his titles, etc. You can get 666 out of any name in Christendom, by this method. You know precisely what it says here, and nothing more, I think. It is a number of a man, the number of his name, and it is a trademark, so that no one is allowed to buy or to sell without this trademark. I can conjecture that under the time of the wrath of God, some people who are born again who have refused this mark of the beast hid away in some cellar somewhere, and may be able to buy a loaf of bread because they have this information. But we know only precisely what is revealed. There is a vast amount of writing that is utterly futile, trying to figure out about this number 666. Chapter 14 gives the vision of the 144000 on Mt Zion, and a vision of angels flying thru the heavens giving warnings etc to those dwelling upon the earth, and a vision of angels reaping the harvest, reaping the vineyard of the earth, and that is quite similar to OT symbolism. In chapter 15 another picture of an innumerable multitude in heavenly bliss with the Lord. In chapter 16, you have the 7 vials of the wrath of God. Reading the vials and the trumpets in parallel makes it quite clear that the two could not be synchronized, because in a number of cases the trumpet is only one third as severe as the vial. The trumpets when they do occur precede the 7th trumpet, and the 7th trumpet announces the coming of the wrath of God, and so the 7 vials of the wrath of God follow the ~~the~~ 7 trumpets. (end of RECORD E 44)

- the interpretation of chapter 13. (Student). . . . the seventh trumpet at the (1 1/2) of the Lord's coming, (hard to hear), following the seventh trumpet, but chapter 12, 13, 14 and 15 are a series of (1 3/4). They are not an enumerated series of events. They are a picture. Then in 16 they are a series of events, trumpet right after another, 7 vials of wrath. Then after chapter 16, chapter ~~16~~<sup>17</sup> and 18 ~~and~~ are expository. (Student). The vials of wrath? (Student). No, I didn't mean to say that. The only reason I'm skipping to chapter 17 is because chapter 17 is the commentary to chapter 13. We don't have anything like this except in 13, until we get to 17. (3) later on when I teach the course in Revelation, I'll dwell on those intermediate passages, and I think they fit into (3) if you realize that they are not a number of series of events, but that they are pictures which are dealing with the general content. But that's the reason for skipping to chapter 17 now. Chapter 17 is explanatory, not a part of the series of the 7 vials of wrath. There is a break after chapter 16, and (3 1/2) which has to see where it fits. You can only judge by what it says where it fits. (Reading of 17:1, 2a.) Now this great harlot is seen again in the 19th chapter which is destroyed by the wrath of God. The Alleluia by the saints, for thou hast judged the great woman whore, etc. So the ~~word~~<sup>woman</sup> in the 19th chapter is practically identical with the woman in the 17th chapter and I think that it is the same as the woman in the 12th chapter. That is not always the view. The Roman Catholics think that the woman in the 12th chapter is the virgin Mary. But I don't think so. At any rate, this is the same as the one in the 19th chapter, ~~(Student)~~ Dr. MacRae (Does the ~~fit~~ sitting on many waters indicate a specific empire?) Why, that is part of the (5) picture. Verse 15, the waters where the woman sits are peoples, and crowds, and nations, and tongues. The picture of a woman riding away, is intended to be a ~~peit~~ picture of a woman riding upon many people. So many population that (5 1/2). So the waters are ~~a~~ interpreted. Now that being the interpretation of the waters, in chapter 17, it conjectures that the beast (5 3/4) from the sea, is intended to represent the beast arising democratically from among the people. But you can't be positive that the ~~p~~ figure of speech is carried over from one chapter to another. (6) it might be found that

many waters - you couldn't say that that represented the (6) people of the earth in the same sense, that this harlot rides upon the waters, but here in this 17th chapter, this woman riding upon many waters is intended to represent I think a religious system, so that the kings of the earth commit fornication with this woman. That would exactly fit with the world religion, in (6 1/2) or world rulers, have had their religion. That they themselves have had (6 1/2) to use it politically, (6 3/4) the use of religion for political means, would seem to fit in here. Now here is the suggestion of the system anyway. And the description of the beast. And he took me away in the desert. Now the woman in chapter 12, was fled into the desert. The desert place, a place there was a wilderness. It doesn't mean a dry desert necessarily. But it connects it with the woman in chapter 12, desert to a place where there was a (7 1/2) and here ~~is~~ John is taken to the wilderness, (7 1/2) same woman as chapter 12, and I saw the woman sitting upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of blasphemous names, having seven heads and ten horns. So this practically identifies the same beast. And the woman which was garbed in purple and scarlet, and gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and unclean things of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, which is ~~as~~ interpreted as the word mystery here, Is mystery babylon a part of her ~~the~~ title, or simply (8 1/2) her name is Babylon, whichever you take it, (8 1/2) a mystic name, so that mystery Babylon, or simply the name (8 3/4) interpretation (8 3/4) Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and of abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs - that surely was a picture of organized religion, (9) and organized religion which put the martyrs to death. The reformation came. (Student). (9 1/2) in every detail that this woman has (9 1/2) organized religion, (Student). That would fit very well, I would like to put on the brakes (9 1/2) of going too far, of identifying this woman as Rome, the woman is called Babylon, and this woman is the great (10) of the kings of the earth, in John's time that (10), this woman is Babylon this woman is Rome. I think that the fact that she is called Babylon (10) Rome, would

make one conscious of ~~the~~ calling her Rome. (Dr. MacRae: Was she actually called Rome?)  
 - here its the great city, that (10 1/4) the great kings of the earth. She is the great city  
 that rules over the kings of the earth. That could be Rome. I think the fact that (10 1/2)  
 And Peter was in Rome when Paul (10 1/2), Mark was in Rome when Paul wrote  
 Colossians, Mark was in Babylon when Peter wrote I Peter, and (11) came  
 earlier on an errand, (11) when Peter wrote I Peter. (11) Mark from literal  
 city?  
 Babylon, here over in Rome, such a remarkable coincidence that the same Scripture fits the  
 same people. So it seems to be very clear that Peter meant Rome when he said Babylon.  
 And Mystery, Babylon, the city that dominates the kings of the earth, as Babylon was in the  
 Old Testament, so Rome was to be in the Apocalypse. John of course was writing after Nero.  
 Paul wrote Colossians in the (11 1/2) reign of (11 3/4) (Dr. MacRae: So Babylon  
 could be a figure for Rome then.) (12) both Babylon and Rome meaning the great  
 (12) religious, political power that (12). (Dr. MacRae: Would you say  
 it wasn't Rome at all?) No, I would say that (12 1/4). the Roman Catholic church.  
 (Student). I wouldn't object to saying (13). (Hard to hear).

46. (0)

It is easy to see the elements of human society which it is intended to describe.  
 It is not the actual political ruling ~~which~~ because she is (1/2) the beast, she is to  
 the king's (1/2).but she is right in cahoots with him. It is quite strongly probable  
 that this woman is to represent organized religion, in its final stage, and the 12th chapter  
 then ~~would~~ be all the more clear, that the rapture of the church would be like the birth of a  
 child out of this, apostate system, the true born again people being taken up to the Lord.  
 Now about this beast, (1 1/2) I marvelled, with great astonishment, and ~~at~~ the  
~~end of an~~ angel said to me, why are you astonished? I will tell you the secret of the  
 woman, and of the beast, that carries her, that has seven heads, and the ten horns. Verse  
 8, the beast which you saw was and is not and is going to come out of the abyss. Now in  
 the 11th ~~ch~~ chapter, John said, the beast which is going to come out of the abyss, will make

war with these two witnesses, and kill them. In the 13th chapter, this is the beast which makes war with the <sup>saints</sup> ~~saints-a two-witnesses~~ and kills them. This is the beast which was, and is not, and is going to come up out of the abyss, and he is going to go into destruction. And those who dwell on the earth will marvel whose names are not written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world. They will marvel when they see the beast, that he was, and is not, and he is going to come. He is going to be here. And here is the mind which has wisdom, and as to say this is an interpretation of the apocalyptic picture, this is like a labelled cartoon - I don't like the word cartoon but you could label it as a picture, Were, here is the mind which has wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains where the woman is seated, upon them, and they are seven kings. I think that the Revised Version reads and they are - who has the Revised Version? Anybody? What is it saying? (Student). And they are seven kings. So it is not merely my wilfulness that reads it, they are, I grant you that

(3 1/2) the subject which of course is not expressed, (student), you could read, and there are seven kings, now if these are the seven hills of Rome, all right, and it is (4) than anything else, and I don't object, with these seven heads are seven mountains, and they are seven kings, then she is not (4) in prophetic writing for mountain and the picture stands for a great (4), or a great earthly ruler. The stone cut out of the mountain without ~~the~~ hands, became a great mountain and filled the earth. So the seven heads is the same as seven mountains, same as the kings, but it isn't at all necessary. You take the verse simply seven mountains, and then there are seven kings, then you lose the continuity with the

(4 1/2). One of these heads was wounded to death, and the beast came to life again, Now the beast, well, I'll read on a little further. Now we'll get an interpretation of the beast. And they are or there are seven kings, five have fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come, and when he comes, it is necessary for him to remain a little time, and the beast which you saw, which was, and is not, even he is the eighth and is of the seven. And he goes into destruction. Now, five are fallen, and one is, and one is not yet come. I think that David Smith in (5 1/2) Letters of Paul has a suggestion about the beast, with reference to some

material in II Thessalonians. (6) The Antichrist is a personage who is to appear but the principle of literally in history (6) ~~the~~ Antichrist, is recurrent in history. (6) against God or His dominion, lifting up his head against God, in (6). So this beast is not only the individual, that is, he is not only a picture of the individual, that is he is not only a picture of the individual who is going to be the ~~id~~ individual antichrist but this ~~p#~~ beast is a picture of the whole business. ~~One~~ world empire against God. And the seven kings, five of whom are fallen, one is, and one is not yet come, to be taken as different stages of antigod world empires, looking back from (6 1/2), (6 1/2) of Rome, and then the kingdom of the antichrist, and then he comes back, Rome will be the one that is, (7) back, five are fallen, you can probably take these and (7) Babylon, and then too beyond that. Assyria and Egypt, I don't know. At least from that point of view we wouldn't (7) think back over 5 great wicked world empires, that lifted up their heads against God, Rome would be the one that now is. And the last one has not yet come. The last one would be the same as the two horns in Daniel 7 I should think. And the beast, the same as an individual, the little horn, and he then is the eighth and is of the seven, then the (8) would be not at all difficult to interpret in the light of history, (8) from the fall of Rome, until past our time I hope, the idea of a world empire, is ~~tried to get started~~ (8) but it hasn't really got anywhere. Different emperors have tried to rule the world, but (8 1/2) one world empire is not the popular conception, we ~~read~~ live in a world of nationalism. But for a long time now in the period of history, anybody who would lift up his head (8 1/2) and says, I'm the ruler of the world, well all the other heads will crack down on him, and so for a long time in world history this idea of world empire, has been out of the picture, then we look for the seventh stage of world empire, as Zahn counts it, or a fifth stage, as Daniel counts it, now then the ten horns. And the ten horns, which you saw are ten kings who have not yet received a kingdom. That is, there are ten kings, I take it that are not now in existence. In John's time you couldn't count ten independent kings, who could gather together and give their power to a world ruler, you could count more than ten subordinate kings who were puppets under Rome alright, but these ~~kings~~ ten horns are ten kings who have not yet

received their kingdom. But they receive power as kings for one hour. (the accusative of duration). Now that shouldn't be taken as 60 minutes. With the beast, There are ten great kings seen who receive power for an hour with the beast. I can't help reading current history into this. It is the idea of a world dictator being set up by a league of nations, it is certainly in the background of a lot of people's thinking. There are plenty of people who are discouraged with democracy, even well-meaning people, as well as (10 1/2) people, and they would (10 1/2) to see a world dicatator. Of course, I hope it won't come in our time. Rev. 17: 12, they receive power as kings one hour with the beast. (Dr. MacRae: That would suggest quite clearly that the ten are contemperaneous rather than successive then). (Mr. Eppard: Dr. Buswell, that idea of one government, is that the same as world government)? Well, there is at least one world government today that we can see that would be similar. I think it would be very (11 1/2) to say that the United Nations are the ten kings. We just don't know. There was one student of prophecy who said, the United Nations, they are the ten kings. They are the ten kings of the earth that (11 1/2), and take counsel together against God, (11 3/4). (Hard to hear). (I thought the United Nations. I was listening over the radio, I missed the opening, (12 1/2) said, we shall all stand for a moment, and silent, and my heart ~~stiff~~ stood silent, and I said, well here they are going to have prayer, and meditation, and a moment of silent meditation, but then he promptly proceeded to say that the United Nations is the company of the ten kings, but at least all these things in importance at the end of time, shows us how this thing is entirely possible, that it may come very quickly. (13). These come, and receive power, one hour with the beast, these have one mind. The nations of the earth to me don't seem to have one opinion, not very much anyway. They make war with the saints. Now you can just picture this end time. You have the Russian conflict, and the (13 1/2) and Europe just (13 1/2), and let's all turn around and (13 1/2) to him. They give their power and their authority to the beast. They come to a united opinion. These (14) now that would take you back to the second (14), They turn

against the Lord and against His anointed. These will make war with the lamb. And the lamb will conquer them, because he is Lord of lords, and King of kings, and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and crowds, and races, and tongues.

E-47.

And they make her desolate, and they burn her flesh with fire, and God has put it in their hearts that they should do His will, that is to say, this verse is very picturesque, of the situation of false religion. The atheistic philosophys despise literally the liberals, - some of them really respect the fundamentalists. The (1) people. But there will be deliverance. I've told you many times about my talk with Bodez. Alexander Bodez. I was introduced to him as a member of the clergy. And he warmed (1) right up to me, and he said, I take it that you are a liberal, and I want you to understand that we naturalists will work with the liberals, and he went on and he mentioned Oxnam by name, and he was ready to work with, and yet in his writings and in Dewey's writings, occasionally they write bitter attacks against (1 1/2), They just despise the liberals. They have no conviction, and although they certainly hate the fundamentalist, they have no respect - but it does seem to me that this woman acts the part of apostate teaching, God has put it into the heart of these kings to hate and despise and burn and make destitute this woman. And to accomplish his own purposes. And thou hast put it into their hearts to give their authority to the beast, until the words of God are fulfilled. And the woman which you saw is the great city which has reigns over the kings of the earth. Now, there you have a picture, and some of these things in our modern world are a similar situation which is described.

(Student). The wicked king and this wicked woman hate each other. And God has made it that way. And these wicked kings set up a world dictator. Well, God told them to do it. That just brings the (3) to a head, and no (3). (Student). I would simply say it is one and the same time. That they come to their supreme authority, it is working towards a climax, I certainly

(3 1/4) would not take it as sixty minutes. Of course, that would contradict many other things. One hour is frequently used in the sense of one and the same time. Now that is a

stopping point Dr. MacRae. (IStudent). In the 17th chapter, you see that the ten kings give the beast all of their authority. And also God in His principality, gave the beast his power. Because the beast couldn't touch these two witnesses until their job was through. And then God permitted it, and the kings of the earth permitted it. As I see the (4 1/2) we will not know until we get quite well along ~~and~~ into Daniel's seventieth week, - we will not know Palestine? that this is the antichrist. There are so many white papers dealing with college science. Palestine

There is ~~so much~~ a strong movement to go back to (4 1/2). (4 1/2) the temple or even to get some of it done. And in the 11th chapter of Daniel there is a little phrase there. He shall attain a kingdom with a small people. He shall come in by (5). He will come in through diplomacy. And then when he gets the authority, he will (5). The little horn you remember. And after he got in he kicked out the others. Now the kingdom of the beast, plenty of discord. during the first part of Daniel's seventieth week, will have (5 1/2). ~~Remain~~

Remember the toes of the image in Daniel 2 were made of iron and clay, and Daniel gave the ~~interpretation~~ interpretation there. He didn't say the clay means democracy. He said the iron and the clay won't mix. They will mingle themselves with the seed of men. They will try to move around the population. That's an old old trick. To consolidate and get everybody to be blood brothers. But it won't work. There's plenty of (6). within the kingdom of the beast. But the beast comes (6) and after he has conquered his enemies, for the first little while, then he comes to the point where he (6). and from that point on, he is allowed to prevail after the (6 1/4) of his image, that abomination of desolation is just the setting up of an image of the beast, so that after that he is allowed to prevail 42 months, and then in Daniel 11, and then <sup>43 months</sup> (6 1/2) 4 1/2 months, and we are not told what that extra month and that extra month and a half mean. And I can only conjecture that they would be a time for carrying out after the beast and the false prophet are thrown into the lake of fire. (Student).

Yes, from Daniel's point of view there were four distinct cases. And the (7) has 10 horns, which is really a fifth stage. (Student). John sees the beast. He is like a leopard, his like a bear. He is like a lion. And he has the ten horns. So John puts together the various elements

to predict this beast ~~and~~ as being the embodiment of the whole principle of antichrist.

(Student). Yes, in that conjecture there is the principle of one empire against God. has died out

(8) and for a long time the politics (8), you don't have anyone being a world empire.

The world emperor has been very unpopular. Napoleon, and Titus, and Kaiser may have had

that (8) and they may have not, Hitler was going to have a new ordinance and

Stalin certainly has got that back of his head, but all other nations for a long time had

lined up against anybody who tried to be a world emperor. So that this idea of the beast,

the king of the world, who is strong enough to defy God, showing himself as God. That idea

has been out for a long time. (Student). The 7th head, would be the 7th strong world empire,

~~wjef~~ which is future to John's time. And that would seem to correspond to the league of

the ten horns, that finally set up the beast himself. Who is called the 8th and is of the 7.

(Student). Now in the 7th chapter of Daniel you see, the little horn seems to be, from looking

at it, seems to come from the ten horns. The ten horns go on the head of the 4th beast, in

Daniel's prophecy, in the midst of the ten horns, comes up the little horn, and then he

kicks out the others, and he dominates, the whole situation. But he is of the group, but he

is still (10). That seems to be as much as I can make out of it. (Student). Well, to me, to set up a more powerful government, it is not contrary to history.

(10 1/2) (Student). Well,

that idea is very common today. You'd be surprised. (10 1/2). Well, let's

have a dictator. A world dictator. I'm against it myself. (Student). Well, that's an

entirely different thing. I (11) the wounding of the beast, and ~~that is~~ then his

(11) again, this long period of history, in which the very idea of world empire is

(11). That is, it isn't operative, and it wouldn't be in actual politics. When you get a League of 10 nations, with world power, now you've got a United Nations with

(11), you've got the United Nations. It has an army. (11 1/4) they are afraid

that army is going to do something. But still they do have an army. Now the beast is ~~is~~

just an arm of it. There are ten great powers in the United Nations, and they have lots of

trouble and they wish they had a dictator, that would be the (11 1/2) again. A world

E-47. (11 1/2)

10.

have it

emperor, against God. (Student). Well we ~~haven't~~ said quite clearly that the leopard was the Grecian empire. And the bear is the Meo-Persian empire, And the lion was the *Babylonian* was it not, and John now writing with the people having ~~in~~ Daniel in their mind, that this beast is the embodiment of all of these other beasts. (Student). It is quite clearly, in chapter 15, every people, tongue, tribe or nation, oh, now there is a subject that often comes up. The reestablishment of the old Roman empire, I think all you can say as to what it is, that there is a kind of personality. That the ten horns come out of the ~~ve~~ fourth beast, and that's all there is to it. Now Rome never had a constitution, made up of (13 1/2) powers, giving authority to a dictator, that never was Rome. It is not the physical autonomy of the Roman empire. But nevertheless, the Roman idea, we are on the edge of Roman civilization. Our civilization is Latin. Our Language is g~~er~~manic. But our laws, literature, you can't read English unless you've studied some Latin, (14) rise up and smite me for that, but you can (14) but it is true. Our jurisprudence goes back to Rome, not all of it, but a lot of it does, we are in a (14) civilization, any which has a (14), has the Roman Caesar idea. All of South America is Latin, and civilization and its ideals, so these ten nations grow out of Roman cultures, ~~and~~ at some point of view, but there is not any indication, ~~is~~ that they are within the boundaries, of the Roman empire. And (14 1/2) tenth verse, has quite a lecture to deliver on this, he would, recite incidents that took place, on the boundary of the Eastern Roman empire. ~~is~~ I'd rather give that ~~m~~verse when I was a very young pastor over there in Brooklyn, and I went up to Stony Brook and he gave his talk, that it happened around the boundaries -

E-48. (Apparently this was skipped.)

used it for prophecy and ~~was~~ a friend of my father's and I pulled him by the elbow, and I said Dr. Ottman, I can see that all in the newspaper but I can't see it in the Bible. And he had quite a sense of humour, and he ~~he~~ winked at me, and he said, I can't either, but didn't she have a fine spirit. That is to say, you take any natural boundary, just as peoples live, and there are always going to be political incidents. (1). And if you take any great river in Europe, you will always find events taking place around it or toward it, or before it, or on this side of it or on that side of it, and all the incidents in the (1) around the boundary of the ancient Roman empire, wouldn't prove anything to me. I can't see it in Scripture. That the boundaries of ancient Rome are ever going to be reestablish. They say were very different from age to age. They were always changing. And expanding generally and contracting. So I can't see any reasons for reestablishing a boundary. But I can't see (1 1/2) for a continuity of civilization, in that the ten horns grow out of the 4th beast.

Now there is a stopping point, Dr. MacRae. Have you some material. (Dr. MacRae:

Would you like something from Isaiah? Well, let's turn back if you would like to the Isaiah apocalypse. As I've already called your attention last fall to the 24th chapter of Isaiah. And we noticed in the 24th chapter of Isaiah, that there was the picture of the progress of this age. And that picture leads up right to the end of the age, when God intervenes, and then we have in verse 21, that the Lord seizes the host of the high ones, the rulers of this darkness and heavenly places, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. 22. And verse 23 shows them put in the pit, and kept there for many days, and then visited. That was the great change in their condition - after many days ~~shall they be visited~~ of being in prison. This corresponds, exactly as we've noticed with the description in the beginning of Revelation 20, when Satan is bound in the pit, and held there for a thousand years, to deceive the nations no more, and at the end of the thousand years he is released for a little season. And then verse 23, describes the wonderful condition upon this earth while Satan is bound. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously.

Then in ~~v~~ chapter 25 you have a prayer of praise to God, I'm not going to linger over 25, or most of 26 today, but I wanted to bring out the ~~matter of~~ latter part of 26. In 25 we have this prayer to God, praising him for his overcoming of the forces of evil, and in verse 6 we have the declaration of the wonderful work which He will do on calvary. And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in the mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail spread over all nations. There he is taking undoubtedly a condition of calvary and of the wonderful ~~m~~ blessings that are in this mountain, which is for all nations by the wonderful grace of God. Now verse 8 shows the outworking, the result of calvary, He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces. He looks forward to the fulfillment in actuality of that which is one in principal, through the destruction of Satan at calvary. And then verses 9, the praise to God again in 10, 11 and 12. God's overcoming the forces of wickedness. And then in 26 we have a prayer of praise to God, and in this prayer the emphasis would seem to be on this age again. Verse 3, thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee. There the stress is not on the age when all the world is in righteousness, but it is the age in which we in the midst of upheavals and turmoils and difficulties keep our minds stayed on Christ, and receive peace from Him. Verse 4, Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength. And you notice in your authorized version you have Jehovah here, in capitals. Some people think that Jehovah is a word simply of the Revised Version. The Revised Version will say it is more specific than the Authorized Version. The Authorized uses it four times, in the Old Testament. The Revised Version uses it wherever that same word occurs in the Hebrew. But it is used in the Authorized version. And then we go on there with the praise to God, and our soul desiring him in the (5 1/2). I'm not going to try today to see where the transition occurs. There is praise to the Lord in the early parts of the chapter and here is a picture of the course of the age,= would we find. Somewhat corresponding to that in chapter 24, but from a different

viewpoint. That is, looking at it from the viewpoint of a different group of people.

In chapter 26 here then, we find that in verse 10, the difference between those words the  
saved and the lost. Let favour be shewed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness. (6).