

# DEBATING POSTMILLENNIALISM

## Forgy's First Negative On The Millennium

I am truly excited about this debate with Michael Macon. I pray that we both conduct ourselves upon the highest plane possible.

My opponent's first argument is his insistence that he is consistently literal in his interpretation stressing that the grammatico – historical interpretation will ultimately lead one to a premillennial position. I will challenge this position, which by the way is the foundation for his whole affirmative, and thereby proceed to show his argument to be false.

My opponents' fallacy is that he does not know what literal means, despite his claim to being consistently literal. The word literal is from the Latin *litera*, which means letter. Hence to interpret literally is to pay attention to the letters and words being used. Furthermore to interpret literally is to ask which genera of literature is being interpreted. When this is all done, it will become obvious that a literal interpretation of some writings will require you to understand them symbolically and metaphorically. Hence my opponent who criticizes "symbolism" in favor of "literalism" has erred in his definition of literal. Literal interpretation may require you to understand a passage in a non-literal sense. I know it sounds paradoxical but it is true.

The Bible contains almost every form of literature (genera) there is (narrative, story, epic, tragedy, satire, lyrical poetry, epithlamion, elegy, encomium, proverb, parable, pastoral, prophecy, gospel, epistle, oratory, and apocalypse). This fact should put you on your guard against a monolithic system of interpretation such as my opponent suggests.

We must understand the Bible according to the conventions of the literary type involved. We must ask the questions appropriate to a particular literary form. To do this in no way weakens our belief that the Bible brings us the truth from God. I simply say that God chose to use more than one literary form when he revealed His word to us, just like he used more than one language (Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic). It is no more degrading for us to study the rules of literary interpretation in understanding the Bible than it is to study the rules of Hebrew and Greek.

Under divine inspiration a noun is still a noun, and the same goes for a verb, adverb, adjective, and preposition. Likewise under divine inspiration a poem is still a poem, and a poem is not an oration. In ordinary life we make these distinctions. We distinguish between lyric poetry and legal briefs, between newspaper accounts and epic poems. We distinguish between the style of historical narratives and sermons, between realistic graphic descriptions and exaggeration (hyperbole).

Many people study the Bible as if it were all history or essay, or some straightforward literary prose. As a matter of fact 1/3 of the Bible is poetry! If you are dealing with this type of literature you must ask a different set of questions from narrative. Prose standards will not help you in understanding poetry, because the poet is not aiming to tell you a story or impart factual data. His intention is to express the emotional and aesthetic side of human experience.

So yes, maybe using a consistent "literal" hermeneutic may lead one to a premillennial position, but that in no way establishes that the hermeneutic or the premillennial system is correct.

Let's test my friend's hermeneutic in three conflicting text pairs and see if he will answer, and see where his consistent literal hermeneutic leads him. I will be using only eschatological texts so that he will be dealing with the issue within the topic of this debate.

In John 1:21, John the Baptist claimed that he was not Elijah. But, in Matthew 17:9-13, Jesus affirmed that John was indeed Elijah. Explain using a consistent literal hermeneutic.

In Isaiah 11:7, we are told that lions will exist in the messianic kingdom. But, in Isaiah 35:9 we are told that no lion will be there in the kingdom. Explain while remaining consistently literal.

In Ezekiel 37:22-24 we are told that there will be one king in the messianic kingdom, and that one king is David. While, in Jeremiah 23:5 we read that the branch raised up unto David will be king. Please stay literal in your explanation.

I will continue to raise questions concerning my opponents hermeneutic throughout this whole debate, because if a consistent literal interpretation leads one to a premillennial position then the position falls when the hermeneutic falls.

My opponent's next point is that Revelation specifically defines the millennial period as a literal 1000 years in chapter 20. He gives absolutely no proof of this he just assumes it. I could simply refute him by saying no Revelation 20 does not define the millennial period as a literal 1000 years, because an assertion answers an assertion. But, this is a search for truth, not a forum for assertions.

My first question to my opponent would be, is the word thousand in and of itself a literal designation of time and number? Tell me if 1000 is literal in these two cases.

In Deuteronomy 7:9 the Lord says he will keep the covenant for 1000 generations. Is this literally 1000 generations? If it is my opponent has some problems. First off if it is literal and the covenant was made with Abraham which was 430 years before Sinai and we are now entering the 7000th year of God's creation he has kept the covenant for only 175 generations and the beginning of the New Covenant which you place so much emphasis on could not possibly happen for another 33,000 years. But, if the Jews continue on the New Earth past the end of the millennium time will run out on their covenant in 33,000 years and the New Earth will end. I use these numbers because a generation is 40 years, so 1000 generations is 40,000 years. And considering Hebrews 8:13 says the Old Covenant was about to vanish completely in the first century, 35,000 years seems a bit of a stretch for God saying it was about to vanish. Please explain and be consistently literal. Keep in mind I did not account for the time from Adam to Abraham but the force of the argument is the same even still.

In Psalms 50:10, it says God owns the cattle on the 1000 hills. Is this literal? Does this mean he does not have jurisdiction over hill 1001? Please explain and be consistently literal.

The point is that if one pursues the etymology of the word translated " thousand " in Revelation 20, he would see that it has a symbolic meaning. There are nine words translated " thousand " in the Greek, and that the Holy Spirit chose the one he did to use in Revelation 20 is quite remarkable if he were trying to convey a literal thousand years. The word is Chiloi which is specifically determined by it's etymology, which Strong declares as " a plural with uncertain affinity. " Chiloi is unique in that unlike Chilas (another word for thousand) its plurality is not derived from any known numeric value. Chiloi is an adjective; not a noun as is Chilas, and being a descriptive word is therefore more suitable for a figurative use. Therefore, my opponents demand for Chiloi as being literal is not based on the word or it's etymology, but is based upon his prejudiced hermeneutic he brings to his interpretation. Should it surprise you that that the 1000 years is symbolic when Revelation gives you fair warning in the very first verse that these things are signified to John, which W.E. Vine says means to express by signs? Next, my opponent begins to illustrate what he feels is the correct view of Revelation 20. I want to throw a few stumbling blocks his way.

If my friend wishes to be consistently literal he must say that Revelation 20 deals with 2 millenniums. Follow me on this.

In 20:4 John writes that he saw thrones and on these thrones sit those to who were given judgement. He then speaks of the souls of those who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God. These are said to have lived and reigned with Christ for 1000 years. This is the first group who is mentioned as participating with Christ in reigning 1000 years, in 20:4.

Now, if we continue to literalize which my opponent must do in order to be consistently literal, verse 5 tells us, " But the rest of the dead lived not until the years were finished. This is the first resurrection." This leaves us with some questions.

B1.) What group is under consideration in verse 5? The rest of the dead.

B2.) When will this group live again? Not until the thousand years is finished.

B3.) What is the time called when the rest of the dead live again? This is the first resurrection.

Now keep these questions in mind as we examine verse 6: " Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. " This leaves my opponent in a dilemma concerning his consistent literal hermeneutic. Now, observe why.

B4.) Who is called blessed and holy? Those who have part in the first resurrection or the rest of the dead.

B5.) On whom does the second death have no power? Those who have part in the first resurrection who are the rest of the dead.

B6.) Who is described as becoming priests of God and Christ and reigning with him 1000 years? The rest of the dead which are those who have part in the first resurrection.

B7.) When did the rest of the dead live again, and when did the first resurrection take place? After the thousand years are finished.

B8.) When did the rest of the dead who took part in the first resurrection become priests of God and Christ and reign with him a thousand years? After the thousand years of verse 4 were finished.

When my opponent becomes consistently literal he must admit that the first group that reigns with Christ 1000 years in verse four cannot be the same as the group in verse 6 because two different groups are under consideration, thus according to his literal hermeneutic he must say Revelation 20 teaches two thousand year reigns! Please deal with this, your affirmative depends on it.

Next, I want to deal with my opponent's arguments about the final restoration of Israel, which are false.

His first text is Jeremiah 31:31-34, which Paul gives us an inspired fulfillment in Hebrews 8. What is amazing is that Paul makes this passage apply not to the restoration of Israel, but to the fact that Israel (fleshly) and its ordinances are obsolete. He makes very clear that most of this prophecy was fulfilled when he wrote, and the one aspect that was not fulfilled was very near to fulfillment. Look at these facts.

Hebrews 8 begins by dealing with the fact that Christ is presently as the Hebrew writer wrote a superior priest to that of the Levitical. This fact destroys your case for several reasons. The first being that according to Psalm 110:1-4, it is during your future millennial reign that Christ is to rule after the order of Melchizedek. But, according to the Hebrew writer he was presently a priest in the first century after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. 5:5,6; 6:20; 8:1; etc.). These are all in the present, not future tense. Second of all, this priesthood was to begin according to the Psalmist when Christ rose to sit at the right hand of the Father, which Acts 2:29-34 says happened at Christ's

resurrection. Third, and most devastating of all, is that for Christ to exercise this priesthood he cannot be on earth (Hebrews 8:4), especially if there is the Jewish priesthood of Levi on earth in a restored Israel which your use of Ezekiel demands. Christ is priest by means of his death (Hebrews 9:11-16), which is part of the Gospel (1 Cor. 15:1-4), which is God's power to save Jews and Gentiles alike, not just Gentiles (Romans 1:16,17).

This priesthood coincides with Israel's new covenant, which was not according to that made with the fathers, because the Jews broke that covenant and made it invalid (Hebrews 8:9). Israel's new covenant is that which was bought with Christ's blood (Hebrews 9:11-16), which is also the price of the purchase of the church (Acts 20:28), which is the Israel of God (Galatians 6:16). This shows that Jeremiah 31:31-34 which is also Hebrews 8:8-12, is speaking of God's covenant with the Church, which contains both Jews and Gentiles (Ephesians 2) and is the Israel of God. The Hebrew writer said in the first century that Christ, "now...is the mediator of a better covenant," (Heb. 8:6), which is the covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34.

As for the ceasing of evangelism, my opponent misses the meaning. The point is not no more evangelism, but a contrast of the *modus operandi* of the OT and NT. Under the Old, a person was born into a covenant relationship and then taught later, but under the New they are taught then born because a person is not born into the kingdom by blood (John 1:10; 3:3-6). Or, will my opponent affirm that all of Jeremiah 31:31-34 is fulfilled except the ceasing of evangelism? Remember that Jeremiah teaches that they will no longer teach under the New Covenant, but Hebrews affirms the New Covenant has been in effect since the first century. It seems my opponent's consistent literalism has forced him into a situation he must explain.

A few more problems pop - up in his next few arguments.

Isaiah 11:11-12:6 – My opponent says this refers to the future regathering of Israel, but unfortunately my opponent begins with verse 11 instead of 10, even though both verses refer to "in that day." This is also the time in which the wolf shall dwell with the lamb (v.6). But, it is also the day in which the Gentile would come to the Lord (v.10), which according to Paul was being fulfilled in his day (Romans 15:11-18). A few questions for my opponent then are:

As this to happen during the times of the Gentiles, or will the fullness of the gentiles already be brought in? Isaiah seems to teach the restoration of Israel and the times of the gentiles coincide, but your view demands that this be not true.

Is that day of Isaiah 11:10 different than that of verse 11? Please answer, your affirmative depends on it.

Matthew 24:31 – As for this verse which my opponent applies to the restoration of Israel to its land, I only want to ask a question, and then will go further in my second negative. What did Christ mean when he said, "this generation will not pass away until all these things be fulfilled?"

2 Samuel 7:11-16 – Interesting that my friend chooses these verses, seeing that the re-establishment of David's throne would happen while David is dead and sleeping with his fathers (v.12). Peter clearly addresses this in Acts 2:29-36. Peter clearly states the promise made in 2 Samuel by saying that David was dead and buried (sleeping with his fathers) in verse 29, and that at Christ's resurrection he was raised to sit on David's throne (vs. 30,31). This is already fulfilled. As for verse 16 of 2 Samuel 7, does not Hebrews 1:8 show that it is fulfilled? I now want my opponent to deal with this point.

The throne is forever (2 Samuel 7:16)

The throne is at the right hand of God (Acts 2:34)

The right hand of God is in heaven (Acts 7:5,6)

David's throne is in heaven forever (Psalm 89:36,37)

Christ's throne is in heaven (Heb. 8:1)

Christ is ruling on David's throne now (Acts 2:29-36)

Since Christ is to rule on David's throne which is in heaven at the right hand of God forever, how does my opponent bring the throne to earth for 1000 years? Will my opponent say that forever does not mean forever here but then later affirm that forever must mean forever when it comes to the Abrahamic covenant?

Next, my opponent comes to Isaiah 2:1-4 and gives no proof that his literal view is correct. He just says it is correct because he thinks Paul teaches that the church cannot be in view because the church is unrevealed in the OT. His proof texts for this are weak, consider:

Romans 16:25 – The church is not the subject here, but the gospel, which is the same eternal purpose of God in Eph. 3:9,10, which was a mystery since the beginning of the world. Which is made manifest by the church. Even still, Paul affirms the scriptures of the prophets taught it (Rom. 16:26), thus the church is an OT subject since the mystery is made manifest by it. Here are some questions for my friend about the church.

If the church is not taught in the OT, then how could all the prophets speak of its days? (Acts 3:24)

Why does James apply Amos 9:11-12 to the bringing in of Gentiles during the church age, if it is not spoken of in the OT? Another question here is, is the tabernacle of David to be restored during the times of the Gentiles according to Amos? If not then when? Was this passage being fulfilled in the first century according to James in Acts 15:13-18?

My opponent feels that the mountain of the Lord's house can refer only to Judah and Jerusalem contextually. Of course he says this only because he believes the church cannot be in the OT. But, in 1 Timothy 3:15 the Lord's house is the church, and in Hebrews 12:22-24 the church is God's mountain of Israel's new covenant of Jeremiah 31. My friend's error is that he does not see that OT Israel and its covenant were but a shadow or type (Heb. 8:5; 9:8,9; 10:1; Col. 2:17) and that the church is the fulfillment of that type. Thus the church is often referred to as Israel or Jerusalem in the OT in antitype form.

Macon makes an error in not seeing that Isaiah chapters 2-4 are a single prophecy. And, in Luke 23:28-31 the Lord directly quotes from Isaiah 2:9-10; 19,21 in his prediction of the fall of Jerusalem. Thus Christ himself places the fulfillment at 70 AD.

As for the last days, it is clear from Acts 2 and Hebrew 1:1 that the New Testament was written in the last days. And according to Paul the ends of the ages had come in the first century (1 Cor. 10:11). So, tell me why are the last days of Isaiah not the last days mentioned in these verses?

My friend just keeps making assumptions that he does not prove in this section, he just says it is so because, well, just because he says. That is not proving an affirmative. We know that the word of the Lord began going out from Jerusalem at the great commission (Luke 24:47) in the first century. So, we know that Isaiah 2:3 begins its fulfillment there. The peace of nations ceasing to fight is also perpetuated in Isaiah 11:1-9, in which we are told the peace will be in God's holy mountain which we know from Hebrews 12:22 is the church, the same Zion as Isaiah 2:3. This is so simple yet dispensationalism ignores it. But, my opponent has a bigger problem here. Since we know Isaiah 2:3 began its fulfillment with the great commission, which was during the Jewish age because the end of that age was coming but had not yet happened (1 Cor. 10:11), and was still in the process of passing away (1 Cor. 2:6-8; Heb. 8:13). My friend must then insist that the last days spoken of in Isaiah 2 are the last days of the Jewish age and not

the dispensation of Grace. Preterist's do not have such conflicting problems since we do not maintain these dispensational frameworks.

I would now like to enter into some negative argumentation that should be conclusive against the positions on Israel and the earthly reign of Christ that my friend here holds. First I would like to give 16 reasons that national Israel will not be restored, and is no longer necessary in the plan of God.

If God were to restore national Israel, he would have to raise again the middle wall of partition that Christ destroyed through his death, thereby making the death of Christ null and void, Ephesians 2:14

Israel's favor with God was always conditional (Deut. 28:1,15). Israel no longer met the conditions and perished as a nation (Matt. 23:31-38; Heb. 8:9).

OT prophecies which foretell the return of the Jews to Palestine were fulfilled in release from political captivity (Jer. 25:12; 29:10; Ezra 1:1). Other restorations after this are for Gentiles and Jews (Isa. 49:5-6; Acts 13:47; 2 Cor. 6:2).

The axe lay at the root of national Israel (Matthew 3:10) this was including the wrath about to (Mello) come in verse 7, which was fulfilled in 70 AD. There is hope for restoration if the roots remain (Job 14:7,8; Isa. 11:1), but not when the roots are cut out. "None will taste of my supper," in Luke 14:24 refers to the Jewish majority, a remnant accepted (Romans 11:5). Why did not the Lord give a clue of a future massive Jewish acceptance of the invitation?

In Luke 19:14-27, the Lord said that the citizens of national Israel would not have him to rule over them. The result, he would slay that nation. How will he rule over a slain nation in the millennium?

The theory of Paul expecting a mass conversion of Israel is false because Paul said that he would wish himself accursed for this sort of conversion to happen (Romans 9:3).

Abraham is the father of Jews and Gentiles (Gal. 3:26,29).

Jews and Gentiles alike in the church are the Israel of God (Gal. 6:14-16)

Christians are the circumcision, all that makes up a national Jew is of no effect in Christ (Phil. 3:2-7; Gal. 5:6)

Christians are the twelve tribes, which are the assembly of the saints (James 1:1-2; 2:2).

If worship is to be centered in Jerusalem with national Israel during the millennium, then why did Jesus say worship would be moved from Jerusalem (John 4:20-24)?

If the church is the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22,23), then surely there would be no need to restore national, earthly Jerusalem in the millennium. That would be setting sites on earthly, not heavenly things.

In speaking of the Jews in Matthew 10:45, Jesus said that the last state of the Jews would be worse than the first. If a massive conversion of the Jews occurs, then the last state would be better than the first, and make Christ give a false prophecy.

In Matthew 21:43, Jesus said that the kingdom that was offered the Jews (the same kingdom), would be taken from them and given to another nation (the church). How can a kingdom postponement or different kingdom for the church theory be maintained in the light of this?

Why did Paul renounce all of his Jewish nationality to be a Christian, if the restoration of the Jews was to be Paul's final destiny after the resurrection in the millennium (Phil. 3:2-8)?

There are more of these that we will use as the debate progresses, but for now I would like to turn my attention to another negative argument.

I feel that this argument is very detrimental to the case of my opponent. In Jeremiah 22:28-30 it says that a certain man named Coniah who was king of Jerusalem sitting on the throne of David, would be cursed to have no man of his seed to sit on the earthly

throne of David in Jerusalem. Some premillennialists try to point out that it says he will be childless. This is not in the literal sense, but in the sense that a ruler whose line would no longer sit on the throne that he occupies is called childless. We know that he did have children from 1 Chronicles 3:9, and from the fact that the Babylonian Chronicles dated from 592 BC, says that Coniah king of Judah had five son's while in captivity in Babylon (J.B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, pg. 308, col. 2). So we see that he did have children. The fact is that the curse is upon any of Coniah's seed ruling in David's throne in literal Jerusalem on earth, hence the strong emphasis on earth in Jeremiah 22:29. And another fact is that Christ is of the seed of Jechoniah (Matt. 1:12). Premillennialist's like to try to point out that Salethiel (the son of Coniah in Matt. 1:12) is named as the Son of Neri in Luke 3:27, then claim that he was not the blood of Coniah and Christ is therefore not his seed. They give weak support for this saying that a Levirite marriage was arranged between one of Coniah's wives and Neri in the emergency of Coniah's imprisonment. This is easily answered.

Levirite marriage was in the case of death, not imprisonment (Deut. 25:5).

Coniah's wives were carried away with him to Babylon (2 Kings 24:15)

So we see that Salenthiel is the blood of Jeconiah, not Neri. The most likely case is that the genealogy skips a generation as they often do. Please deal with this Mr. Macon.

I want now to deal with a few more of Macon's points to show his inconsistency. It need not be that I deal with everything Macon says since all his arguments are based upon the same things (an assumption that Israel in the OT can never refer to the church, and a consistent literal hermeneutic), which we have exposed in this negative. So here are some of the more glaring problems Macon gets himself into.

In Ezekiel 34:25-29 Macon affirms that his literal interpretation has not been fulfilled but will be shortly. What do you mean by shortly Mr. Macon? If you mean soon to happen, why should we accept your use of shortly and deny John's inspired use in which he says the things in Revelation (including the Millennium) were shortly to come to pass?

As for Ezekiel 40-48, we know John said that the living waters were about to be fulfilled in Revelation. But more pressing to Macon is that in this new temple which he insists is to be literal and future, sacrifices are to be made for a sin offering, and would be to make atonement for them. Do you insist that Israel's atonement will come by the blood of bulls and goats in the Millennium? Let your consistent literal hermeneutic explain this one.

As for Joel 2:21-27 you just assumes the seven-year covenant with antichrist (Which will be discussed in a later proposition) without proof. This makes it obvious it is future? This is proof it is future because you say so? Prove your assumptions; this has been fatal to your affirmative. Go to Daniel 7 and prove it, then we will see something. You also admit that verses 1-27 refer to something imminent in Joel's day. This is a fatal admission in this debate that time statements like "surely it is near," (Joel 2:1) are to be taken seriously. This will greatly affect your case in this debate, because my case will be built on the admission you just made.

I also ask you, Peter refers to verse 28 in Acts 2:16, 40, 41. He refers to his days as the last days. Was Peter wrong to apply verse 28 to his generation? Please deal with this.

You say verse 26 is future, yet, verse 28 clearly states that what Peter said happened in Acts (using verse 28) would happen after 26 was fulfilled, saying, "And it will come about after this." After what? Verses 1-27. Your chronology is off Biblically.

I did not deal with every verse point by point, because you make the same point in every case, (such as literal interpretation, mountain of the Lord etc.), so in reality all

points are answered. Yet, your whole case falls if your consistent literalism falls. So let's see what happens.

I would like to point out that my opponent did not deal one wit with the first part of his proposition, which was, " The Bible teaches that Jesus will return to the earth at a day future from ours. " I have dealt with Christ and his rule on earth, but now I am going to enter into this part of the argument. Does the Bible teach a future coming of Christ? Let's take a look at some scriptures.

1 Cor. 1:7,8 – This verse was written specifically to the Corinthians, and not to the church in general. This is proven by the fact that Paul made a similar statement to the Romans,

" For I long to see you that I might impart some Spiritual gift to you, that you may be established. " (Rom. 1:11)

If it is argued that the Corinthian scripture is applied to the Church in general, there is a problem because that verse could not in any way be applied to the Roman church that had not yet obtained gifts. No one would say that the Roman passage could be applied to the Corinthians because the Corinthians were not lacking gifts, instead the Corinthians were told that they would possess gifts until the Coming of Christ from heaven. Another fact that makes this passage apply directly to the Corinthians and not to the Church in general is the fact that these two verses are not within the general body of the letter, but in Paul's greeting to the Corinthians. Paul does not begin the body of the letter until verse 10 with, " now I exhort you. " Verses 1-9 are the greeting, and he was greeting the Corinthians and not the Church in general (1 Cor. 1:2). This is proof that this passage is addressed specifically to the Corinthians. Why does this matter? Well, because Paul had just told the Corinthians that they would possess the gifts of the Spirit until the revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven, which is his coming! But, the Corinthians, their city, and their church have not been in existence for thousands of years! Did Paul utter a false promise to them? That is not even a valid question in my mind. The answer must be that Christ returned before the Corinthians ceased to exist. Even if this were a promise to the church in general it would still be a false promise to the direct audience the Corinthians, for they no longer possess existence, let alone gifts! What will you do with this Mr. Macon? Will you give up your consistent literalism and try to argue that Paul's words have a spiritual application to the church in general? If so you give up your affirmative, and you still have the problem of the promise not being fulfilled to its original audience!

Matthew 10:23 – Here we have Christ saying that the Son of Man will return before the 12 go over all the cities of Israel. Did he come before then or not?

James 5:8,9 – Here we have James saying the coming of the Lord was at hand when he wrote in the first century. Mr. Macon already admitted in his argument on Joel that time statements must be taken seriously. Will he deny that now? James said it was at hand, was it delayed? If so why?

Hebrews 10:37 – Here we see Paul saying that Christ would be coming in a very little while. How long is a little while? When you talk about Joel you say that when something is near that it was indeed near. What will you say here?

These are just a few of the verses I could use and will use as the debate progresses, but let's see what Macon will do with these few. These seem clear that if one would take a consistent literal interpretation on them, that they surely teach that the Lord was expected back soon in the first century. In no way would a consistent literal approach make these clear statements mean 2000 or more years, will Mr. Macon give up his consistent literalism here? We will see I guess. But I want to address what I think will be Mr. Macon's rebuttal to the time statements here. I suspect he will use the thousand

years is only a day with the Lord theory here, and say that 2000 years is only two days with the Lord, so in God's time it has not been along time and these things were near from God's perspective. Let's see how this works in statements when God says something would not happen for a long time.

Num. 21:17 – Here Balaam says that Christ's first coming was not near, it was a long time away. But, in reality it was only 1400 years away. If 1000 years is a day with God, then this is less than a day and a half! Is 2000 years near under inspiration and 1400 years not near? Consistency is a jewel.

Daniel 8 – Even Marvin C. Pate admits that the passages here in Daniel refer to 365 years later during the infamy of Antiochus Epiphanies. God said it was many days in the future in verse 26. But if 1000 years is a day is applicable in prophetic language then it is only about 12 hours for God, and surely not far into the future. Does God call 365 years a long time and 2000 years near?

Jeremiah 29:10 – Here we are told the Babylonian captivity is 70 years long. But, in verse 28 it is called along time under inspiration. Is 70 years a long time and yet 2000 years is at hand or near? This is less than an hour if 1000 years is a day to God in prophetic literature!

There are more where this came from, but this is enough to show that the 1000 years a day with God, and not a long time theory will not work for Macon. That argument would make him go from consistently literal to consistently inconsistent. Well, let's see what he does.