

Falsehoods in the Bible (If Premillennialism Is True)

By Eddy Gilpin

Gospel Minister West Side Church of Christ

Series of Studies on Premillennialism

Published in the West Side Church of Christ – Salem, VA Bulletin from 2/17/02 to 8/3/03

Falsehoods in the Bible (If Premillennialism Is True)

STUDY		PAGE
STUDY #1	JOSHUA 21:43-45	3
STUDY #2	JOSHUA 23:13	3
STUDY #3	DANIEL 7:13,14	4
STUDY #4	MATTHEW 24:36	4
STUDY #5	JOHN 17:4	5
STUDY #6	JOHN 18:36	5
STUDY #7	JOHN 19:30	5-6
STUDY #8	ACTS 2:30-36	6
STUDY #9	ACTS 2:30-36	6-7
STUDY #10	ACTS 2:30-36	7
STUDY #11	ACTS 3:13-18	8
STUDY #12	ACTS 4:34-37	8-9
STUDY #13	ACTS 15:13-17	9
STUDY #14	ACTS 28:30,31	10
STUDY #15	FIRST CORINTHAINS 11:28	10-11
STUDY #16	FIRST CORINTHAINS 15:23-35	11
STUDY #17	SECOND CORINTHAINS 3:13	11-12
STUDY #18	SECOND CORINTHAINS 10:4	12-13
STUDY #19	GALATIANS 2:16; 3:24; 5:4	13
STUDY #20	EPHESIANS 3:9-11	13-14
STUDY #21	PHILIPPIANS 2:5-11	14
STUDY #22	COLOSSIANS 1:13; 3:1	14-15
STUDY #23	FIRST THESSALONIANS 2:12; 4:16,17; 5:2	15
STUDY #24	SECOND THESSALONIANS 1:6-10	16
STUDY #25	HEBREWS 1:2; 1:8,9	16-17
STUDY #26	HEBREWS 2:9; 2:10; 2:14	17
STUDY #27	HEBREWS 5:7; 5:8,9	18
STUDY #28	HEBREWS 6:19,20	18-19
STUDY #29	HEBREWS 7:11-14	19-20
STUDY #30	HEBREWS 7:23-25	20
STUDY #31	HEBREWS 8:1,2	20-21
STUDY #32	HEBREWS 8:4	21
STUDY #33	HEBREWS 9:11,12	22
STUDY #34	HEBREWS 9:15-17	22-23
STUDY #35	HEBREWS 10:1-6	23
STUDY #36	HEBREWS 10:8-12	24
STUDY #37	HEBREWS 10:17-22	25
STUDY #38	HEBREWS 12:28	25-26
STUDY #39	FIRST PETER 1:18-20	26
STUDY #40	FIRST PETER 2:5,9	27
STUDY #41	SECOND PETER 3:10,11	27-28
STUDY #42	FIRST JOHN 2:18	28
STUDY #43	REVELATION 1:1-3	28-29
STUDY #44	REVELATION 1:9	29-30
STUDY #45	REVELATION 22:6	30

Study #1

The doctrine of Premillennialism always seems to find its way into the headlines whenever some major disaster occurs. Whether it is a devastating natural disaster or an occasion of upheaval on the part of man, such events bring the would be prognosticators of the "end times" to the surface by the scores. Those who hear them and give them credence fail to realize that hundreds just like them have said the same things on dozens of occasions in the past when the same type of disasters occurred. Further, they fail to see what miserable failures were those who preceded their current generation of prophets of doom. Current premillennial prognosticators will likewise fail in their attempts to predict the end of the world and the establishment of "Christ's earthly kingdom."

How can this be said with certainty? Because the Bible does not support the theory nor maintain the doctrine of Premillennialism. It simply cannot be found in Scripture. In fact, if the doctrine of Premillennialism is true, there are many passages of Scripture that are false. Let us examine some of these in this light and determine if Premillennialism or Scripture contains the truth.

Joshua 21:43-45 states: *"And the LORD gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the LORD gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the LORD delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not ought of any good thing which the LORD had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."* One of the primary contentions of the Premillennial doctrine is the thought that the land promise given to Abraham was never fulfilled. In no uncertain terms Joshua states that the land promise was fulfilled. Notice a couple of key phrases from his statement: 1) *"the LORD gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers";* 2) *"there failed not ought of any good thing which the LORD had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."* Notice in particular the use of the word "all" in these two statements. Inspiration was very careful to reveal that nothing had been left out of this land promise, which had been made.

If the theory of Premillennialism is true, this statement of the Bible is false. Now, which of these do you believe to be the truth?

Study #2

Without fail, when some monumental devastating event occurs, there will be numerous individuals arise to speak of how such events point to the end of time. Such was certainly the case (and continues to be) with the attack on our nation some five months ago. This pattern has been followed for several generations, always with the same result -the failure of the predictions of such men. This is the case because the Bible does not uphold the doctrine of Premillennialism. In our study we are noticing passages of Scripture that this doctrine violates. If this theory is true, these passages are false. Notice another of these monumental passages.

Joshua 23:14 states: *"And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the LORD your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof."* As we noted in our last study, Inspiration had already recorded the fact that God had given Israel "all the land" that had been promised their forefathers (Joshua 21:43-45). Here, in his farewell address, Joshua reiterates this thought in capsule form. Without hesitation he states that everything God had promised to the likes of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had now come to pass. Why is it that some continue to attempt to refute the words of this inspired man?

If Premillennialism is true, the words of Joshua found in this passage are false. Which will you accept the words of the Premillennialist or the words of the Holy Spirit?

Study #3

As we have seen thus far, it is a very common occurrence for men by the scores to come to the fore with predictions of "end times" whenever some tragic event occurs (be it natural or manmade). The false doctrine of Premillennialism is promoted by these false teachers and presented as if the Bible were chock full of its various theories. In actuality, the Bible does not contain ideas necessary for Premillennialism to be true. In fact, if this doctrine is true, there are numbers of passages in the Bible that are false. Let us continue our look at some of these.

Daniel 7:13, 14 states: *"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."* The basic tenet of the Premillennial theory is the coming earthly kingdom of Christ. The suppositions of the doctrine are based on the idea that Christ failed in establishing such a kingdom when He came to earth the first time. According to this teaching, He will return to earth again and establish His earthly kingdom.

If Premillennialism is indeed true in this regard, Daniel was all wrong in the vision he saw. He stated that when the "Son of man" came before the "Ancient of days" there "was given" unto Him (among other things) "a kingdom". If Premillennialism is correct, then "the Ancient of days" (God) must be on earth in order to present to Christ this kingdom. However, Daniel states that this transpired when the "Son of man" came before God "with the clouds of heaven". What is seen in this instance is heaven's view of what is seen in Acts 1:9, 10 from earth's vantage point. This is the coronation of Christ as King over His kingdom, the church.

So, once again, we are left with a choice. Will we accept the words of uninspired, unqualified men and adopt the doctrine of Premillennialism; or will we rather accept the words of the Bible and truth concerning the kingdom of Christ? The choice is ours to make. If Premillennialism is true, the vision of Daniel found in this passage is false.

Study #4

In order for the doctrine of Premillennialism to be proven correct, a number of Bible passages must be proven to be false. This is true because these passages are in contradiction to this teaching. As we continue our study of this matter, the concept of Premillennialism gets weaker as the Bible evidence gets stronger.

Matthew 24:36 states: *"But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."* This saying of the Lord comes from what has been called the most misunderstood chapter in all the Bible--Matthew 24. To be sure, it is one of the most misapplied in all of Scripture.

Notice carefully that our Lord Himself said that no man could know the day of His second coming. He illustrated this truth in this context by referring to the days of Noah. Just as men were going about their daily affairs in the time of Noah and suddenly destruction came upon them, so shall men be going about their daily affairs prior to the return of the Lord (Matthew 24:37-39). Just as there was no indication of the coming flood (save the preaching of Noah concerning such), there shall be no "signs" pointing to the imminent coming of the Lord. This is the message of Jesus in this passage. However, there continue to arise men who make the claim (both directly and indirectly) that they can know the time of His coming. This they do via the doctrine of Premillennialism.

We are left, then, with two choices--either man cannot know the time of the Lord's return (as Jesus said), or he can know of such (as Premillennialism teaches). If Premillennial doctrine is true, the Lord was incorrect in what He said in Matthew 24:36. Which do you choose to believe?

Study #5

In order for the doctrine of Premillennialism to be true, several passages of Scripture must be shown to be false. The two are not compatible. If one is going to accept Premillennialism, he must reject the Bible in these areas. Let us continue our examination of some of these passages that must be false if Premillennialism is true.

John 17:4 states, *"I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do."* This passage is found in the context of the prayer of Jesus in the presence of His apostles just prior to His arrest. As He stated in this passage, His "work" was finished. The time for His crucifixion was upon Him. Although they had tried many times in the past, the Jews had not been able to confine Him and put Him to death. That was before His work was "finished". In just a short while from then they would be successful in seizing Him, but only because that was a part of God's plan--and, only because His work on earth was now complete.

However, if Premillennialism is true, Jesus was incorrect in stating that His work was "finished". For, indeed, if He had come to establish an earthly kingdom and such kingdom had not been established, His work was far from being complete. If this tenet is true, then the words of Jesus on this occasion are false. There is no other alternative. One or the other is true, but both cannot be. Which will you choose--the words of the Lord or the words of the Premillennialists?

Study #6

In former installments of this subject we have examined some passages that must be set aside as being in error if the commonly held doctrine of Premillennialism is true. Just one such passage (proven to be false) would be sufficient to show the Bible in error. In the same sense, just one passage which demonstrates the premillennial doctrine to be in error is sufficient to show the entire system to be false. This has been shown abundantly from previously mentioned passages. However, let us examine another.

John 18:36 states, *"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."* The basic thought behind the premillennial system is the "earthly kingdom of Christ." If there is to be no such "earthly kingdom" the very foundation of this doctrine is removed. To hear premillennial preachers speak, one would think the Bible is full of statements proclaiming the coming kingdom on earth. However, as clearly seen in this passage, such is not the case; nor could it be since Jesus forthrightly states that His kingdom *"is not of this world."*

From this passage at least three things can be seen. First, Jesus plainly states that His kingdom is not one of this world. Second, He states that, if it were of such a nature, His servants would fight to protect him and keep Him from being taken by anyone who would seek to thwart His efforts. Third, the fact that His servants were not fighting in such a fashion (and that fact alone) was sufficient to demonstrate the nature of His kingdom--not *"of this world"* (earthly), but spiritual.

If Premillennialism is true, Jesus was either deceived or being deceptive in these words recorded in John 18. However, if Jesus' words in this passage are true, then this doctrine is false. The honest student will have no trouble making the proper choice.

Study #7

We continue our examination of passages that must be viewed as false if the doctrine of Premillennialism is true. Previous studies have shown abundant evidence that this doctrine is false and that the Bible is true. However, other passages shed even more light on these facts.

John 19:30 states, *"When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost."* Previously, in connection with this subject, we looked at John 17:4 where the Lord stated, *"I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou*

gavest me to do." In this present passage under consideration, Jesus is seen on the cross, uttering His last words prior to His death. Those words were, *"It is finished."* What was "finished"? Everything He had been sent to accomplish. He would, with His imminent death, blot out the old law (Colossians 2:14), usher in the new law (Hebrews 9:15-17) and lay the foundation upon which His church would soon be built (Matthew 16:18; Acts 2:47; 20:28). With His death these things were accomplished, all of which were the result of His work. With His death, then, His work was finished.

However, if Premillennial doctrine is true, His work was far from finished. He has to return to the earth yet again and do more work. His kingdom was not established. Jesus' final words from the cross were not true. Which of these two choices are we to believe? The answer is obvious. Jesus was correct in His assessment from the cross. His work was finished. He will not return to the earth again, period -not to "finish His work" or to do anything else (cf. I Thessalonians 4:16, 17). As He stated, His work was "finished". Therefore, Premillennial doctrine is false.

Study #8

In a continuation of our look at passages that refute the doctrine of Premillennialism (or as we have stated it, passages that are false if Premillennialism is true), we come to the book of Acts and to the day of Pentecost. Some of Peter's words from this occasion are recorded (cf. Acts 2:40). He spoke of the promise to David.

Acts 2:30-36 states: *"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."*

From this passage notice that David was told by God that one of his descendants would be raised to sit on his throne (thus a king) (Vs. 30). By inspiration, mind you, Peter stated that David (also by inspiration) *"seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ"* (Vs. 31). Note closely that it was "the resurrection" of Christ that would bring about one (Jesus) sitting on the throne of David. Premillennialism maintains that it is the second coming of Christ that will bring this about, not His resurrection from the dead. Thus, if one is to believe Premillennialism, he cannot believe this passage. On the other hand, if one believes this passage, he cannot hold to Premillennialism. As with our other choices in this study, this one is quite simple to make.

Study #9

We continue our examination of this subject in the book of Acts. Last week we looked particularly at Acts 2:30, 31. This week we go further in our look at this section of Scripture in determining whether the Bible or Premillennialism is true.

Acts 2:30-36 states: *"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."*

In Verses 32 and 33, there are two thoughts key to this subject. First, Peter stated, "*This Jesus hath God raised up*" (Vs. 32) and "*Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted*" (Vs. 33). The words "hath" and "being" both indicate something that had already taken place. That God had raised up Jesus serves as an indicator that since His being raised had been accomplished, so had the purpose for His being raised (i.e. to sit on the throne of David). Also, His "*being by the right hand of God exalted*" at the time Peter spoke likewise reveals that the purpose which required His being there (again, to sit on David's throne) had been accomplished. Second, Peter stated of himself and these other apostles assembled on this occasion that they were all "witnesses". Witnesses in the New Testament sense of the word were witnesses of the first class -eyewitnesses. These men bore witness to His being raised from the dead and were eyewitnesses of His ascension into Heaven (Acts 1:9-11). This, combined with their testimony to that end and their inspired words on this occasion of Pentecost, shows conclusively that they knew Him to be a current occupant of the throne of David.

Since Premillennialism holds that Jesus has not yet assumed the throne of David, if it is true, these statements by Peter are false. But, again, if these statements by Peter are true, Premillennialism is false. Those who are honest with truth and the facts involved in this particular case will have no problem distinguishing which is which.

Study #10

In our continuation of this subject we look further into Peter's sermon on Pentecost. Having studied some of the other verses in this section, in this article we shall look to Peter's conclusion on this occasion and note that it reveals Jesus to be seated on David's throne ruling over His kingdom.

Acts 2:30-36 states: "*Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*"

Peter's conclusion begins with "Therefore" (Vs. 36). In it he called upon each one present to reach the same conclusion; namely, that Jesus, the Son of God and descendant of David, now occupied that promised position on the throne of David serving as both "Lord" and "Christ". This was a matter Peter said they could "know assuredly". Their assurance of that knowledge should be based on Old Testament prophecies, the current evidence before them (the empty tomb, etc.) and the testimony of these men who were eyewitnesses of these matters (which was proven on that occasion by the miracles done by them).

However, if Premillennialism is to be believed, then neither these people on Pentecost nor any of us today can know these matters "assuredly". In fact, if this doctrine is true, then not only can these matters spoken by Peter not be known "assuredly", they are completely false. Which will you believe -facts that are irrefutable and that can be "known assuredly" or a doctrine composed by men and without any Biblical sanction?

Study #11

Continuing in this study, we now examine other matters from the book of Acts. Keep in mind that Premillennialism teaches that the death of Jesus on the cross was not a part of the original plan of God. According to this system, Jesus was to set up his earthly, political kingdom when He came to earth originally. However, the Jews rejected Him as their king and caused God to have to postpone the establishment of the kingdom. If the Bible reveals that the death of Jesus was not a matter of the unknown by God, but rather a part of the intentional plan of God, then Premillennialism is shown to be false. Numerous passages reveal that the death of Jesus was no accident, but was revealed in prophecy and preached as fulfillment of the same.

Acts 3:13-18 states: *"The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses. And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all. And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled."*

How anyone can read these verses and conclude that Peter spoke of the death of the Lord on the cross as something unknown by God and for which He had not prepared is a complete mystery to me. The very basis of Peter's sermon to these people was the prophesied death, burial and resurrection of the Christ.

If Premillennialism is to be believed, then this message by Peter was, and is, completely false. If this system is true, the word Peter spoke concerning God's fulfilling of the prophets' words by the death of Jesus are a complete fabrication and not in accordance with prophecy at all. In other words, if we are to believe Premillennialism, we must reject the words of Peter in Acts 3:13-18. Clearly, the doctrine of Premillennialism is a false and dangerous system that calls for the rejection of many Bible passages in order for it to be adopted. The Bible is true. Premillennialism is false.

Study #12

We continue our study by examining other matters from the book of Acts. The next verse under consideration would not of itself be seen to be false if Premillennialism is true, but the approval of that which is said to have occurred would be wrong if this doctrine is viable. In other words, if what was done in this verse currently to be considered is seen to be done with the approval of the apostles, either Premillennialism is false or the apostles were wrong in looking on this action with favor. Let us examine this text and see which is correct.

Acts 4:34-37 states: *"Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, And laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. And Josus, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation), a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, Having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet."*

The situation at this time was critical. There was a dire need for financial assistance by many who had forsaken the Judaistic system and had accepted Christianity. Many of those who owned land and houses sold these possessions in order to care for these needs. In particular, Josus (Barnabas) is mentioned. It is also of interest to note that it is expressly stated that he was "a Levite" (Vs. 36). It is also stated that he "having land, sold it" (Vs. 37). In order to see the point, we must read Leviticus 25:34 which states, *"But the field of the suburbs of their cities may not be sold; for it is their perpetual possession."* That the Levites are under consideration in this passage is obvious when the context is considered. Notice that the lands of the Levites were not to be sold under the Mosaic system.

Now, if Premillennialism is true, the death of Christ was not planned by God, and the Old Testament laws should still be in force. (In fact, this doctrine teaches that the Mosaic law will be reinstated by Jesus upon His return to earth to establish His kingdom.) This being the case, Joses would be in violation of this Old Testament prohibition in selling his land. However, the apostles readily accepted the money he obtained from the sale of the land, and Joses was obviously commended for doing what he did (which served as the basis for the account of Ananias and Sapphira in the next chapter).

If Premillennialism is to be believed, then the action of Joses in selling his land was wrong, and the acceptance of the money and the commendation of Joses for having done so was wrong on the part of the apostles. This one passage is sufficient to prove that the Old Testament law was abolished and the New Testament law was in force at this time. The only thing that could have accomplished this was the death of Christ on the cross--a planned and purposed occurrence. His death ushered in a new system, complete with a new land and a new priesthood (Hebrews 7:12-14). This High Priest (Jesus) "*is set on the right hand*" of God (Hebrews 8:1). Since He is a priest, he is also a king (Zechariah 6:13, 14). He could be neither on earth (Hebrews 8:4). Thus, His priesthood is established, as is His kingdom. The mere facts that Joses sold his land and the apostles commended it prove that Premillennialism is false.

Study #13

In our continuation of this series we again look to the book of Acts for another text that does not bode well for the proponents of Premillennialism. As in our past installments, we shall again note that, if the passage under consideration is true, then Premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

Acts 15:13-17 states: "*And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.*"

In this context, there was an attempt being made to bind the law of Moses (at least certain portions of it) upon these Gentile converts of Antioch. A meeting was arranged with the apostles and elders of the church of Jerusalem to consider this matter. Peter spoke concerning and condemning the binding of the yoke of Mosaic law upon these people (Acts 15:10). James then speaks (the words recorded in Acts 15:13-17). In this speech he stated that the Gentiles were recipients of truth just as the Jews, and he quoted the prophet Amos as proof of that.

Notice what Amos said: "*In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the LORD that doeth this*" (Amos 9:11, 12).

The fact that the Gentiles were now acceptable was proof that "the tabernacle of David" had been restored at that time in the first century. Premillennialism maintains that "the tabernacle of David" will not be restored until Jesus comes again. Thus, a decision must be made--is Premillennialism correct in saying that "the tabernacle of David" has not yet been restored, but will be at Christ's second coming, or is James (and thus the Bible) correct when he (it) says that "the tabernacle of David" has indeed already been restored? If Premillennial doctrine is true, Amos, James and the Bible are all false.

One further point from this passage: If Premillennialism is true, not only is this passage false, but salvation is not yet available to the Gentile world. It is not until the "tabernacle of David" is restored that salvation can be offered to the Gentiles. Once again, Premillennialism is shown to be a false system.

Study #14

In our continuation of this series we look to the final two verses of the book of Acts for another text that does not bode well for the proponents of Premillennialism. As in our past installments we shall again note that, if the passage under consideration is true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

Acts 28:30, 31: *"And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."*

In this context, Paul is found in Rome as a ward of the state. This is the first of his Roman imprisonments. Doubtless providential, Paul was being allowed many freedoms as a prisoner; not the least of which was the liberty to receive guests and to teach freely the Truth of God's Way. The subject of his preaching during this two-year period is summarized as "the kingdom of God" and "those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." Considering the subject at hand, it is of special interest to note that Paul "preach[ed] the kingdom of God." Just what did he preach about "the kingdom of God?" We refer to some of his own writings about the matter for an easy answer to this question.

That this kingdom was a present reality in Paul's day is evident (Romans 14:17; Hebrews 12:28). That this kingdom is the church of the Christ is also readily seen (Matthew 16:18, 19; Hebrews 12:23, 28). Paul preached that the kingdom will be "delivered up to God" in "the end" of the world (I Corinthians 15:24). He taught that he and the Colossians (and by implication, all Christians) had been "translated into the kingdom" (Colossians 1:13). He spoke of the Thessalonians' suffering for the kingdom (I Thessalonians 1:5). If (as Premillennialism teaches) the kingdom has not yet been established, how are all these things true?

Now note, since Paul taught that the kingdom was in existence in his day and that men could be members of it, if Premillennialism is true, verses such as Acts 28:30, 31 are false, and men like Paul who taught such were false teachers. The truth of the matter is, the kingdom was in existence in Paul's day (having been established on Pentecost in A.D. 33--Acts 2) and is still in existence today. In preaching about the kingdom as a reality, Paul preached the truth. It is not Paul who is wrong, but those who contend that the kingdom is a yet-to-be-established institution.

Study #15

We turn to the book of First Corinthians to examine another text in the light of Premillennialism. As in the past, we shall again note that, if the passage under consideration is true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

I Corinthians 11:28 states, *"But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."*

This chapter concerns the Lord's Supper. The Corinthians were abusing it by making a common meal of it and prohibiting some from participating in it. Paul explained the principles involving it, the beginning of it with the Lord Himself and their abuses of it. In this concluding command about it he stated that men were to eat the bread and drink the cup. However, if Premillennialism is true, Paul was wrong in issuing such a command. Let us note why.

When He instituted the Lord's Supper, Jesus stated to His apostles, *"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom"* (Matthew 26:29). Remember that Paul had earlier stated that the Supper was *"the communion of the body and blood of the Lord"* (I Corinthians 10:16). Thus, when one participates in it, he is communing with the Lord. Or, just as Jesus said, He is participating with us in that. Note, however, that Jesus said this would be done in the kingdom (Matthew 26:29). If this is true, the kingdom would have to be in existence in order for such a "communion" to take place. Premillennialism teaches that the kingdom is not yet in existence, so those who believe the

premillennial doctrine should not partake of the Lord's Supper. Also, if Premillennialism is true, Paul had no right to teach these people to partake of the Lord's Supper. It is a privilege reserved for the kingdom.

Premillennialism is not true. The kingdom has been established and is in existence today. Therefore, we may and must freely participate in the Lord's Supper, communing with Him "in the kingdom".

Study #16

We turn again to the book of First Corinthians to examine another text in the light of Premillennialism. As in the past, we shall again note that if the passage under consideration is true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

I Corinthians 15:23-25 states: *"But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh 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. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."*

This chapter involves the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. Notice that Verse 23 states that those who "are Christ's" will be raised "at His coming". The next phrase (in Verse 24) states: *"Then cometh the end."* When does "the end" come? The word "then" points to it. It is a word indicating when. It comes "at His [Christ's] coming" (Vs. 23). Premillennialism maintains that "the end" doesn't occur at Christ's coming. It maintains that such is the *beginning* of Christ's kingdom and reign.

Also, in continuing our look at Verse 24 we find the phrase *"when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God"*. Notice closely that the time when this occurs is evident from the first phrase of the verse. Paul stated, *"Then cometh the end"*. What will have occurred when "the end" comes? The kingdom will have been "delivered back to God." Premillennialism teaches that the kingdom will just be beginning to be set up at that time. There is a huge difference between Bible doctrine and premillennial doctrine at this point.

Finally, regarding this particular passage, Verse 25 reveals that Jesus *"must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet"*. The word "till" is key. It signifies two things of tremendous significance concerning this subject. First, it shows that at the time these matters of which Paul speaks takes place ("the end"), Jesus will already have been reigning. If He is not reigning over His kingdom now, how can He be reigning "till" a certain point? (Recall that Premillennialism teaches that He is not reigning over His kingdom now, and that His kingdom is not in existence now.) Second, the word "till" also indicates that His reigning will cease at that time. Why? He will deliver the kingdom back to God, presenting it as *"a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing"* (Ephesians 5:27). The word "till", then, reveals emphatically that He is reigning and that His reign will continue until His second coming.

If Premillennialism is to be believed, one has to omit, disregard, rearrange or otherwise do away with plain Biblical teachings. The kingdom has been established and is in existence today, and Jesus reigns over it. He will continue to do so until His second coming, at which time He will submit that kingdom to God the Father. As Paul plainly states here, His kingdom will mark "the end", not a beginning.

Study #17

We next turn our attention to the book of Second Corinthians for another text to be viewed in the light of Premillennialism. As with others in past installments, we shall notice that if the passage currently under consideration is true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

II Corinthians 3:13 states, *"And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished."* This chapter involves a study of the superiority of the New Testament over the Old. In the first century Judaizing teachers posed a great and grave danger to many Christians, especially those new to the faith. Inspired New Testament writers were constantly battling this mindset and movement. In the passage under consideration, Paul explains Moses' use of a veil when he spoke with the children of Israel concerning the law of God (Exodus 34:33-35). Paul's words reveal that the veil was used by Moses, not to cover the shining nature of his face from being in close proximity to Deity on Mt. Sinai, but to keep the children of Israel from seeing the diminishing of that shining. That fading of his shining face symbolized the fading and temporary nature of the law being delivered by Moses at that very time. Paul referred to it as *"the end of that which is abolished."* At the time Paul wrote to the Corinthians, the Law of Moses had been "abolished". Just what does this have to do with Premillennialism? As with every verse dealing with the abolition of the Law of Moses, this verse is fatal to the premillennial system. Premillennialism teaches that the Old Law will be restored when Christ established His earthly kingdom. However, texts such as this passage demonstrate that the Old Testament has come to an end as far as its authority over man and efficacy in approaching God acceptably. If Premillennialism is true, the Old Law has not reached its "end", but will rather have a new beginning. Thus, in actuality it has not "ended" at all. Moses had no need of wearing such a veil.

As the New Testament plainly reveals (in this and other passages), the Old Testament was fulfilled by Christ (Matthew 5:17), blotted out by Him and nailed to His cross (Colossians 2:14) and replaced as God's standard for man by His Will, the New Testament (Hebrews 9:15-17). If Premillennialism is to be believed, these passages cannot be relied on as truth; and thus, neither can the Bible as a whole.

Study #18

We look again to the book of Second Corinthians for another text to be viewed in the light of Premillennialism. As with others in past installments, we shall notice that if the passage currently under consideration is true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then this passage cannot be.

II Corinthians 10:4 states, *"(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to the pulling down of strong holds;)"* Premillennial advocates look to a time when there will be a literal, physical war between the forces of good and the forces of evil. They abuse much of the book of Revelation and numerous other passages to arrive at such. Passages such as this reveal that the servant of the Lord is not in a physical battle.

Jesus proclaimed that His kingdom was *"not of this world"* (John 18:36). He further explained that if His kingdom were of such nature His servants *"would fight"*. However, since His kingdom is spiritual and not physical in nature, there was no need for them to fight at that time. Neither will such a need ever arise. Those who have obeyed the truth are members of that same kingdom. It is still as Jesus described it then-spiritual and not physical in its nature. Thus, there is no need now, nor will there ever be, a need for its advancement using physical force.

Paul spoke in similar terms to the Ephesians in saying, *"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places"* (Ephesians 6:11, 12). This statement was true then; it is true now; it will always be true. The nature of Christ's kingdom will not change.

When one reads the graphic, but fanciful, writings of the premillennial authors, he will notice the numerous references to physical battles and warring factions involved in a supposed "battle of Armageddon". Quite different indeed are the words of Paul in his description of how the Christian should arm and prepare himself. Christ's kingdom is in existence now. It is peaceful in its nature (Isaiah 2:1-5). It had no need of the sword for its establishment and has no need of the sword for its continuance.

Study #19

We come now to the book of Galatians for other texts to be viewed in the light of Premillennialism. As in past installments, we shall notice that if the passages under consideration are true, then premillennial doctrine is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, then these passages are false.

Galatians 2:16 states, *"Knowing that a man is not justified by works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."*

Galatians 3:24 states: *"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith."*

Galatians 5:4 states: *"Christ is become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."*

As noted in a previous installment of this series, Premillennialism maintains that when the Lord returns to establish His kingdom the Old Testament system will be reinstated. Old Testament sacrifices will once again be offered, and the Old Testament priesthood and mode of worship will be re-instituted. The main problem with these thoughts is they are not Biblical. These verses from Galatians reveal the superiority of the New Testament, the law of Christ. They also reveal the futility of attempting to be justified in God's sight by the law of Moses. How could anyone maintain that the Lord will re-institute such a law when the Lord Himself established a law far superior in design and end result? If one is to believe the doctrine of Premillennialism, he must disregard such passages as these. If, however, one chooses to believe the truth, such passages as these make the reality of the doctrine of Premillennialism an impossibility.

Study #20

The book of Ephesians provides the passages for our next installment in this series of articles on Premillennialism. As noted in previous articles, if the passages under consideration are true, the doctrine of Premillennialism is false. However, if Premillennialism is true, these passages cannot be.

Ephesians 3:9-11 states: *"And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."*

Earlier in this same chapter (3:3-6), Paul had revealed what this "mystery" is. It is the saving plan of God, which makes provision for the Gentiles and provides them equality with the Jews in Christ. Now, in the passage currently under consideration, Paul reveals that the church is designed to make known to the world the *"manifold wisdom of God"*. This is not so much in reference to the evangelistic nature of the church (even though that is a vital aspect of making known God's plan), but to the very existence and continuation of the church. In other words, the existence of the church itself reveals the "manifold wisdom" of God, as does its continuation in its purity.

Further, Paul reveals that the church is a part of "the eternal purpose" of God. As he states, it was that which He *"purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"*. As was revealed in an earlier study of this subject, the church and the kingdom are one and the same (cf. Matthew 16:18, 19). Thus, when the church was established (Acts 2), the kingdom was established. To say that the church is a part of *"the eternal purpose of God"* is to say that the kingdom is a part of His eternal purpose as well. The church is not a substitute for a greater plan of God that did not work out (as Premillennialism teaches). The church is a part of the "eternal purpose" of God. It is not an after thought, a "Plan B" or any of the other imagined things the false doctrine of Premillennialism presents it as being.

If Premillennialism is true, Paul was mistaken in presenting the church (the kingdom) as a part of the eternal purpose of God; and, thus, this passage is false. On the other hand, if this passage is to be accepted as true, one cannot hold to the doctrine of Premillennialism. The choice for any Bible student is an easy one to make.

Study #21

In our continuing study of this matter of Premillennialism, we come next to the book of Philippians. As with each of these passages we have considered, this one is not meant to be a direct statement against the doctrine of Premillennialism. The doctrine was not in existence at the time the New Testament was written. Like all most false doctrines, it is a late arrival on the scene of time. However, like the previous passages cited, this one, too, tears the heart out of this doctrine and demonstrates it to be false. Either the doctrine of Premillennialism is true or the Bible is true. Both cannot be because they are diametrically opposed.

Philippians 2:5-11 states: *"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."*

From this passage, in connection with this subject, we notice:

1) Jesus humbled Himself and became obedient to the death of the cross; 2) Because of this, God exalted Him; 3) Every knee will bow to Him because of it.

First, notice that Jesus *"humbled Himself and became obedient unto"* the death of the cross. Premillennialism teaches that the crucifixion of Christ was a rejection of Christ on which God had not counted. Because of their rejection of Him, God had to institute "the church age" until such time that Jesus will be accepted by the Jews. The Bible reveals that the crucifixion was a part of the plan of God, not a mistake or something for which God had not known nor for which He had not planned (before time).

Second, because of His obedience to this death, God exalted Christ. He ascended to the right hand of the throne of God (Acts 1:9; Daniel 7:13, 14). Through His resurrection he "overcame" and "was set down with [His] Father in His throne" (Revelation 3:21). Premillennialism, of course, teaches that this is yet to occur.

Third, every knee shall bow to Him because of His going to and overcoming the cross. The idea of all mankind bowing to Him is certainly indicative of His kingly estate. Notice that such was placed upon Him at His resurrection of the dead. It is not something that will be upon Him when He returns to earth, as Premillennialism teaches.

Either this passage from Philippians is true, or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be. To accept one is to reject the other.

Study #22

In our continuing study of this matter of Premillennialism we turn our attention to the book of Colossians. As we do, we shall briefly notice a few select passages and comments about them. As we have noticed in previous installments, either these passages are true or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be.

Colossians 1:13 states: *"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."* This verse reveals that Paul and these brethren to whom he wrote were all members of the kingdom. This passage reveals that they had already been translated "into" His kingdom. The past tense ("*hath translated us*") is used, thus revealing that this is something that has already been done. Premillennialism maintains that the kingdom has

not yet been established. How is it that men were already in it if it is not yet in existence? The kingdom cannot be both in existence and not in existence. Premillennial doctrine teaches that it is not in existence yet. The Bible teaches that it is.

Colossians 2:14 states: *"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."* Previously we noticed that Premillennial doctrine maintains that the Old Testament will be reinstated by Jesus upon His return. Its sacrifices will be established again, along with all the other matters pertaining to that covenant. However, the passage reveals in no uncertain terms the inferiority of the Old Testament to the New. Jesus *"blotted out"* the Old on His cross.

Colossians 3:1 states: *"If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."* Premillennialism would rob our Lord of His rightful place at the right hand of God. There, He reigns as King over his kingdom (Acts 2:29-36). Those who hold to the doctrine of Premillennialism teach that His kingdom has not yet been established; thus, He is not now reigning as king. If this is the case, neither can He be sitting *"on the right hand of God."* The Bible clearly reveals that He is.

Either these passages from Colossians are true, or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be. To accept Premillennial teaching is to reject the Bible.

Study #23

Our study of the subject of Premillennialism brings us to the book of First Thessalonians. We shall examine a few passages from this book in regard to this matter. As we have noticed in previous installments, either these passages are true or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be.

I Thessalonians 2:12 states, *"That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you into his kingdom and glory."* This verse reveals that the kingdom was in existence at the time Paul penned these words; a fact Premillennialism denies. The brethren were in the kingdom, having been "called" into it by God (through means of the gospel II Thessalonians 2:14). If the Premillennial concept is true, this verse is false.

I Thessalonians 4:16, 17 states: *"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."* This verse serves as the basis for the infamous "Rapture" theory. (Neither the word "rapture" nor the concept behind it are found in Scripture.) The key to this passage from the standpoint of the "rapture" idea is the word "so". An adverb of manner, the word "so" describes fashion or means by which something is done. In this case, those who *"meet the Lord in the air"* shall "so" (in this manner, after this fashion) *"be with the Lord"*. He will not (and, as we have seen, cannot) return to the earth itself. He will, however, return *"in the clouds"*. Contrary, then, to being a passage that supports the doctrine of Premillennialism, this passage refutes it.

I Thessalonians 5:2 states: *"For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night."* As expressed in regard to other Scriptures noted in this study, this is another that reveals that no signs point to the time of the Lord's return. Many men are enamoured with the idea that Jesus is coming soon. Such statements have been made concerning every major world occurrence for many years. However, the time of the return of the Lord is something that only God Himself knows (Matthew 24:36).

Either these passages from First Thessalonians are true, or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be. Again it is seen that to accept Premillennial teaching is to reject the Bible.

Study #24

Our study of the subject of Premillennialism has taken us through almost every book of the New Testament to this point. Continuing in our study of this subject, we come not to the book of Second Thessalonians. As we have noticed previously, either these passages are true, or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be.

II Thessalonians 1:6-10 states: *"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day."* Let us notice a few brief points from this text.

First, this passage reveals that God is righteous in recompensing "tribulation" to those who trouble and "rest" to those who are troubled by those deserving of such tribulation. The word "rest", like the word "tribulation" is a noun. This is, therefore, a promise and not a command.

Second, since this is a promise, note the time of fulfillment of it - *"when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven"* (Vs. 7). The word "when" becomes very significant as it is also tied to the word "when" in Verse 10. Both are indicative of the same time, the Lord's coming (His second and final coming).

Third, the description of the punishment of *"them that trouble"* is found in Verses 8 and 9. Verse 9 reveals about them, *"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."* Remember that the "when" of this has already been stated in Verse 7.

It will occur at His coming. Now, in Verse 10, the same word "when" is used in connection with His coming *"to be glorified in his saints... in that day."* Notice closely that it will be a single day ("that day"). These two events, then, are forever tied together as occurring at the same time. "Tribulation" will be recompensed to "troublers" at the same time and in the same event in which "rest" will be given to those who are troubled. There is no room for the dispensationalist's 1000 years between the two. Thus, there is no room for the doctrine of Premillennialism.

As we have seen with the other passages considered, either this passage is true or Premillennialism is true. Both cannot be.

Study #25

Our study of the subject of Premillennialism in this fashion has taken us through the vast majority of the New Testament books. In our continuation of these thoughts we come now to the book of Hebrews. As we have seen clearly and constantly through this study, either these passages are true or Premillennialism is true, but both cannot be.

Hebrews 1:2 states: *"Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."* The phrase *"these last days"* reveals that there is not to be another dispensation of time (such as Premillennialism espouses) after this current one. It is in this last dispensation (*"these last days"*) that God speaks to mankind exclusively through His Son, Who in turn speaks exclusively through His Word (John 12:48). Peter made reference to "the last days" in Acts 2:17 in quoting from the Prophet Joel. As you may recall from our study of that passage, Peter's comments (inspired, mind you) demonstrate that "the last days" involved those in which Peter was then speaking and in which his audience then lived. Thus, "the last days" began almost 2000 years ago and will continue (being the last dispensation of time) until the Lord returns. This being the case, there is no room for a tribulation period or 1000-year reign. The "last days" mean just that -the last days.

Hebrews 1:8, 9 states: *"But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."* In this passage Paul quotes from the Psalms and applies these matters to the Christ. Notice that these passages reveal that Christ's kingdom "is," and not that it "shall be." Further, in Verse 9, the text speaks of anointing Christ. When did that take place? The inspired apostles tell us - *"For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed...."* (Acts 4:27). Thus, His anointing as King had already taken place at that time. How could it possibly then be an event yet waiting to be accomplished in our day?

These passages do not agree with the doctrine of Premillennialism. One may believe either the Bible or this fanciful doctrine. He cannot believe both and be consistent. (We shall continue our look at Hebrews in future installments.)

Study #26

The book of Hebrews provides a veritable treasure-trove of passages refuting pre-millennial claims. Its focus on the superiority and primacy of the New Testament over the Old demonstrates time and again that matters of the Old Testament have been superseded by the system of the New and that the Old Testament system can never be restored as a viable means of justification before God. Since this is one of the foundational principles of Premillennialism, its being faulty destroys the system itself which is built upon it. Let us examine some additional passages from Hebrews:

Hebrews 2:9 states: *"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."* There is a worthy word of note in this statement concerning this present subject -the word "made." The word is actually the complex word *elatto* in the Greek (meaning "made lower"). It is an aorist passive verb, which means this was done by another individual or agent upon the subject under consideration. Since Jesus is that subject, and since He *"was made lower,"* the only One qualified to have done such was the Father Himself. Thus, it was the will of God the Father that His Son be *"made lower"* than the angels *"for (Greek word *dia*, through) the suffering of death."* Certainly, Jesus allowed such to take place, being *"obedient unto death, even the death of the cross"* (Philippians 2:8). The death of Jesus, then, was neither an unexpected nor an unplanned-for event with God. It was something He fully intended to occur and absolutely knew would happen. Premillennialism maintains that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews and His death at the hands of the Romans were events unanticipated by God. This one word in Hebrews 2:9, however, demonstrates that this was a part of the eternal plan of God.

Hebrews 2:10 states, *"For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."*

Hebrews 2:14 states, *"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."*

These and other passages (from the book of Hebrews as well as others) demonstrate the crucial importance of the death of Jesus to the plan of God. It was not, as espoused by Premillennialism, an event that occurred without the prior knowledge and planning of God. The death of Christ was a part, the very central part, of God's scheme for human redemption. It was not an untimely occurrence for which God had not planned.

These thoughts concerning the death of Christ are in conflict with the doctrine of Premillennialism. One has a choice as to whether he will believe the Bible or this false doctrine. He cannot believe both. (We shall continue our look at Hebrews in future installments.)

Study #27

The book of Hebrews provides numerous passages refuting premillennial claims. It states a great deal about Jesus and His mission in coming to this earth. In doing so it gives us rich insight into the eternal purpose of God. It demonstrates that Christ came to die for the sins of man, not to establish an earthly kingdom. Let us examine some additional passages from Hebrews.

Hebrews 5:7 states: *"Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared."* Here is related a more in-depth look into the sufferings of Jesus just prior to His arrest and crucifixion. The fact that His was a supplication involving *"strong crying and tears"* provides additional details to those matters found in the gospel records. It reveals an even greater plea and petition to the Father on this occasion. The idea that this petition was made *"unto him that was able to save him from death"* indicates that it was to the Father, and that He (the Father) was capable of delivering Him (the Christ) from such death. However, as Jesus has prayed before, the will of the Father was to be done (Matthew 26:39-42; Mark 14:36). Although God could have physically delivered His Son from this excruciating death (cf. Matthew 26:53), He could not do so without violating His own will and without removing from man his only hope of redemption. Therefore, the death of Jesus can never rightfully be called an accident or an incident unplanned or unprepared for by God. If it had been such, He Who had the ability to deliver His Son from such would have done so.

Premillennial claims to the contrary concerning this thought are not only false, but also damnable to the souls of those who adopt them. Because of this and other reasons (matters concerning the kingdom, etc.), Premillennialism is a fatal doctrine that will cause its adherents to be lost eternally.

Hebrews 5:8, 9 states, *"Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."* In this summarization of the previous thought it is seen that the sufferings and death of Jesus were necessary to "perfect" Him as the Redeemer of man. His death on the cross was not a mere matter of rejection by the Jews, an unplanned event in the mind of God. It was, rather, an integral part of the scheme of redemption devised from all eternity. Premillennialism would have us believe this was not Jesus' purpose in coming to earth. Rather, according to this false doctrine, His purpose was to establish an earthly kingdom in which He would reign for a thousand years and then be ascended. If this be the case, how could He have ever been "perfected" as the Redeemer of mankind?

These passages reveal the critical importance of the death of Jesus to the plan of God. He did not come to establish an earthly kingdom. If He had come for that purpose, it would have been fulfilled. He came to offer Himself as a sacrifice for mankind. His purpose, in its entirety, was accomplished.

Study #28

We continue to examine passages from the book of Hebrews in our look at Premillennialism. Hebrews has a great deal to say about Jesus and His mission in coming to this earth. It demonstrates that Christ came to die for the sins of man, not to establish an earthly kingdom. Let us examine some additional passages from Hebrews.

Hebrews 6:19, 20 states: *"Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."* Two things of note concerning this subject can be seen in this passage. First, Jesus "is entered" within the veil. That is, He has entered into the eternal realm (heaven) "for us." Second, He has been made "an high priest for ever." Let's look at these two matters in greater detail.

The fact that Jesus has entered into heaven says a great deal. It reveals that His mission on earth is complete, as He Himself stated (John 17:4; 19:30). It shows He has taken the position prophesied about Him (II Samuel 7:12, 13; Psalm 132:11; Daniel 7:13, 14; Acts 2:29-33). It demonstrates that He is seated on His throne with earth His footstool (Acts 2:34-36).

The fact that He has been "made an high priest for ever" shows that He will not relinquish that position. However if, as Premillennialists maintain, He will one day return to earth as a king, He must relinquish His position as a priest, since He cannot so serve "on earth" (Hebrews 8:4). As we noticed from a previous installment, Zechariah reveals that His service as priest and king would be simultaneous (Zechariah 6:13, 14). So, if He should return to earth, He could not be a priest. Likewise, He could not be a king, since He must serve as both at the same time. His priestly and kingly thrones are in heaven where He is and has been reigning since his ascension. As you might imagine, these facts cause Premillennialists no small problem.

Therefore, once again, we must make a choice. One can believe Premillennialism, or he can believe the Bible. He cannot hold to both. If Premillennialism is true, the Bible is wrong.

Study #29

Since it involves so many matters pertaining to the doctrine of Premillennialism, the book of Hebrews is a vital resource in demonstrating the falsehoods contained in this doctrine. Virtually every chapter contains statements that deal a deathblow to this false system. The author's purpose in writing the book of Hebrews was to stem the tide of those who were turning back to the law of Moses and the Levitical system. One of the primary planks in the system of Premillennialism is the reinstatement of this Levitical system upon the return of Jesus to earth and the establishment of His earthly kingdom. If this Levitical system cannot be so reinstated, one of the primary pillars of Premillennialism is taken away. In light of these thoughts, let us examine another passage from Hebrews.

Hebrews 7:11-14 states: *"If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood."*

First, Paul (the likely author of Hebrews) is quick to point out the imperfect nature of the Levitical system and the law of Moses. If that system had been complete, there would have been no need for "another priest" (Jesus) who would *"rise after the order of Melchisedec"*. However, the fact that Jesus did so rise after such order indicates the insufficiency of the law of Moses and the institution of a better plan (the New Testament).

Second, such a change in the priesthood necessitated a change in the law. The law that governed the former priesthood (the Old Testament) would have forbidden the high priesthood of Jesus (as Paul goes on to show in Verses 13 and 14). Thus, another law had to be implemented -one that would allow His priesthood. That law is the New Testament. That law allows His priesthood; but it also supersedes the former law that forbade such a priesthood. Why would God again reinstate a law that He had determined to be inadequate and that would forbid His Son from serving as High Priest? However, if Premillennialism is true, that is exactly what He must do.

Third, the lineage of the Lord came through Judah, not Levi. Thus, as Paul so eloquently states in these verses, Jesus could never serve as a priest on earth under the Levitical system (cf. Hebrews 8:4). It would be a violation of that law. Also, as we have noted several times in this study, Jesus was to serve as both king and priest simultaneously (Zechariah 6:13, 14). Thus, if He were to be a king on earth (as Premillennialism would make Him), He must also serve as High Priest on earth (which thing Hebrews 7:11-14 and Hebrews 8:4 forbid).

Again it becomes very evident. Either Premillennialism is true and the Bible is wrong, or the Bible is true and Premillennialism is wrong. Jesus currently serves as both King and Priest (as the Bible says He would). he will not (yea, He cannot) serve in these capacities on earth (cf. John 18:36). His kingdom is in existence now. It is spiritual in nature. . . and you can be a part of it.

Study #30

We turn again to the book of Hebrews in our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism. As stated before, this book contains an abundance of information that refutes this doctrine.

Hebrews 7:23-25 states: *"And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."* The contrast between the Old Testament priesthood and the New is evident yet again. The priests of the Old Testament ceased to serve as priests when they died. However, because He ever lives, Jesus has an unchangeable priesthood. This is an indication that the first priesthood changed and, because of the death of the priests, was in a continual state of change. These are not characteristic of the priesthood of Jesus.

Notice carefully the tense of the words used in these passages. Of those Levitical priests of the Old Testament, Verse 23 states that they "were" (past). Of the priesthood of Jesus, Verse 24 states that He "hath" (present) an "unchangeable priesthood". Verse 25 continues the use of the present tense in stating that He "is able" and that He "ever liveth". There is a definite contrast between these two. However, there is another very vital point to be made here. If (as Premillennialism suggests) Jesus is not yet serving as King, neither can He currently be serving as Priest (Zechariah 6:13, 14). Since He is not now serving as King (again, according to Premillennialism), we have no High Priest. Quite to the contrary, however, the Hebrews writer states that we do have such--Jesus "hath" (currently) such an office. That being the case, He also currently has a Kingdom and serves as a King.

If Premillennialism is to be believed, we currently have neither a High Priest nor a King. The Bible states that we currently have both. One can accept the Bible as truth, or Premillennialism. However, he cannot accept both. If Premillennialism is correct on this issue, the Bible is wrong. If the Bible is right about this matter, Premillennialism is wrong. Which will you choose?

Study #31

In our continued study of the false doctrine of Premillennialism, we continue to examine the book of Hebrews, a rich volume, containing much material about this subject. Last week we looked at Hebrews 7:23-25 and noted the use of the present tense in speaking of the priesthood of Jesus. We continue on this same thought in this week's article.

Hebrews 8:1, 2 states, *"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."* One is immediately impressed with the fact that Paul states, *"we have"* (currently) *"an high priest."* He also states that He "is set" (currently) *"on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens."* This is in perfect accord with Peter's statements on Pentecost (cf. Acts 2:30-36). Peter states, *"Therefore being [currently] by the right hand of God exalted"* (Acts 2:33). Also, Peter ties this fact with the promise made to David that Christ would sit on His throne (Acts 2:30). Thus, at that time on that Pentecost day Jesus was sitting on the right hand of God, on David's throne, ruling over His kingdom. As Paul states in the verse of Hebrews currently under consideration, *"we have [currently] such an high priest."* Not only is He sitting as High Priest, but also as King. As we have seen numerous times in this study, these two must be done simultaneously (Zechariah 6:13, 14).

Paul also states that He (Jesus) is *"a minister in the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."* This "true tabernacle" is the church, the antetype of the tabernacle of old. It is the kingdom (Matthew 16:18, 19). Men are added to it by Him upon their obedience to the gospel (Acts 2:47).

What, then, do we determine concerning the Premillennial theory as we study these passages? We note that we currently have a High Priest. We also know that we currently have a King. That High Priest and that King are one and the same -Jesus, the Christ. We know that he reigns as High Priest over His kingdom (something he could never do on earth). Thus, we determine that He reigns (currently) as High Priest over His spiritual kingdom, the church. This being the case, we should not look for a future fulfillment of these matters since they have already been fulfilled and are in existence at this present time. Premillennialism is in opposition to these passages. Both cannot be true.

Study #32

We continue our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism by examining New Testament passages that are made false if Premillennialism is true. We have been in the book of Hebrews for several weeks because of the nature of the book and its rich supply of passages that refute this false doctrine.

Hebrews 8:4 states: *"For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law."* This passage has been referred to several times already in this study. However, it is such a notable passage that it could not be overlooked as we approached it in our survey of the book of Hebrews. We have noticed several times in our study the fact that Jesus was prophesied to be a high priest and a king (Psalm 110:4; Hebrews 7:21; II Samuel 7:12, 13; Psalm 132:11). We have also noted that He was to hold both these positions at the same time (Zechariah 6:13, 14). This current passage reveals the truth that Jesus could never be a priest on earth. He could not because such would be a violation of the law of Moses, the very law which supplied the requirements for the priesthood (Hebrews 7:14). Since He could not and cannot serve as high priest on earth, the same is true of His being a king on earth (which, of course, Premillennialism maintains He must). Stated plainly in syllogistic form, the argument is this:

- 1) Jesus was to serve as both king and priest at the same time (Zechariah 6:13, 14).
- 2) Jesus could never serve as a priest on earth (Hebrews 8:4).
- 3) Therefore, Jesus could never serve as king on earth.

The conclusion is irrefutable. Jesus will never serve as king on earth because He can never serve as a priest on earth.

How then is He to be king and high priest? He is such now--not over a physical kingdom, but over a spiritual kingdom. Paul spoke of His being (presently) a high priest (Hebrews 8:1). He has been serving as king over His kingdom since Pentecost (Acts 2:29-36; esp. Vss. 31, 33) and will continue to do so until "the end" (I Corinthians 15:23, 24). Jesus Himself stated that He was never intended to be a king over a physical kingdom (John 18:36).

We currently have a high priest and a king-Jesus the Christ. He reigns from heaven at God's right hand (Acts 2:33; 5:31; Hebrews 10:11-13) over His kingdom, the church (Matthew 16:18, 19). However, if one is to believe Premillennial doctrine, he must reject all of these Bible truths. The two are not compatible.

Study #33

In our continuing study of the doctrine of Premillennialism, we look further into the book of Hebrews, a veritable gold mine of passages dealing with this subject. As has been the case all along, if Premillennialism is true, these New Testament passages must be false. However, if these New Testament passages are correct, then Premillennialism is wrong.

Hebrews 9:11, 12 states: *"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."* In the preceding verses of this chapter, Paul goes to great lengths to describe that first tabernacle (the one built by Moses). He details some of the sacrifices that were offered and some of the activities of the priests in the process. He then concludes that the tabernacle and all these matters surrounding it were figures that obviously pointed to the true substances, which were (at the time of the tabernacle) yet to be revealed.

Verse 11 begins with the word "but." It reveals an obvious contrast. The contrast is between the tabernacle of Moses (the figure) and the tabernacle (church) of Jesus (true substance). The tabernacle of Jesus is "not made with hands." As we have seen many times in this study, it is not material in nature (cf. John 18:36). Again, in contrast to the annual trek of the high priest into the Most Holy Place of Moses' tabernacle, Jesus *"entered once into the [Most] holy place."* Having done so, he accomplished eternal redemption for those who would obey Him (cf. Hebrews 5:8, 9). He thus finished His work (John 19:30). That being the case, He has no further work to accomplish on this earth. He will return "in the clouds" (I Thessalonians 4:16, 17) to collect His own, but the Scriptures nowhere teach that He will ever set foot on earth again. Why would He? His work here has been accomplished. His "tabernacle" has been established. Redemption's price has been paid. However, if Premillennialism is true, these are fabrications and not facts; thus, the Hebrews writer was wrong. On the other hand, if the Holy Spirit's record is correct, Premillennialism suffers yet another defeat.

Study #34

We continue our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism by looking at additional passages from the book of Hebrews. As with others, we have examined, if Premillennialism is true, these passages cannot be. Likewise, if these passages are true, Premillennialism fails that test and should be rejected.

Hebrews 9:15-17 states: *"And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth."* As has been stated already in this study, Premillennialism maintains that the Old Testament system will be reinstated upon Jesus' return to the earth when He established His Kingdom. Neither the reinstatement nor the establishment of an earthly kingdom have any basis in reality. None of these will ever happen.

This passage demonstrates that Jesus is "the mediator of the new testament." Being the mediator of the New Testament (which is far superior--Hebrews 8:6), why would He ever seek to reinstate the Old Testament? The Premillennial supposition that He will come back to the earth and reign over some reinstated Old Testament Judaism is without merit and nullifies the New Testament which His blood ratified (Matthew 26:28).

Further, this passage maintains that for a testament to be of force, there must first be "the death of the testator." Just who is it that is going to die and make the Old Testament "of force" again? Jesus died to make the New Testament "of force," and in so doing sealed it for all time as the covenant God recognizes and requires His people to follow.

Finally, the passage teaches that a testament is in force only after its testator is dead. (Those who place more trust in the thief on the cross than the cross of Christ for their salvation would do well to understand this point.) At His death, the will (testament) of Christ (the New Testament) became effective. It, and it alone, provides that man needs in order to be saved eternally (cf. Vs. 15); something the Old Testament with its accompanying sacrifices could never do (Hebrews 10:4).

The New Testament is God's will for man today, and will be until time is no more (Hebrews 1:2; James 1:25). There will not be another dispensation following this one as it encompasses "the last days" (cf. Acts 2:17). The truth of this matter is that Premillennialism is false to the very core. It denies that Christ is now reigning, annuls the gospel dispensation, makes the first coming of Christ a failure and denies the Scriptures which teach that the Second Coming will also be the end of the world. God's Word is true. Therefore, Premillennialism is false.

Study #35

We continue our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism by looking at additional passages from the book of Hebrews. As with others we have examined, if Premillennialism is true, these passages cannot be. Likewise, if these passages are true, Premillennialism fails that test and should be rejected.

Hebrews 10:1-6 states: *"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure."*

Recall from past studies that Premillennialism maintains that the Old Testament system will be reinstated upon Jesus' "return to earth." As we have seen, however, this is not in accordance with what the Bible teaches. If the premillennial teachings regarding this matter are true, passages like Hebrews 10:1-6 hold no meaning whatsoever.

This passage reveals a "never" about the Old Testament system of sacrifice. It can *"never... make the comers thereunto perfect."* Therein lays the "fault" of the first covenant (Hebrews 8:7). It was superseded by that which could make man complete - the New Testament of Christ (Hebrews 7:19; 8:6). If the Old Testament system had been able to accomplish this, it would never have ceased (the thought conveyed in Paul's question of Verse 2). This being the case, why would God ever reinstate such an inferior system? The answer, of course, is that He would not and will not.

This passage also reveals an impossibility - *"it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins"* (Vs. 4). Since this is true, why should God set aside that sacrifice (Jesus) which could accomplish this for man to reestablish a system far inferior that could never accomplish this task? Again, the answer is obvious.

This passage teaches the very reason for the Lord's coming into the world (Vs. 5). *"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not."* Why? Because they were insufficient to satisfy the justice of God. After all, they can never take away sin (Vs. 4). *"But,"* he states, *"a body hast thou prepared me."* What kind of body? A body intended for sacrifice; the kind of sacrifice that those bulls and goats of the Old Testament could never be. Thus, Jesus came into the world, not to establish an earthly kingdom, but to die a sacrificial death. (Remember that Premillennialism maintains that the death of Jesus was unexpected and unplanned for by God.)

Finally, if, as Verse 6 states, *"in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure,"* why would He then seek to reestablish such a system? To ask is to answer. He would not. He will not. He could not. To do so would be to turn His back on all the redemptive work accomplished by the death of Jesus.

As stated previously in this study, the New Testament is God's will for man today and will be until time is no more (Hebrews 1:2; James 1:25). This being the case, Premillennialism is false. These passages are true.

Study #36

In our continuing study of the doctrine of Premillennialism we turn again to the book of Hebrews. There is much that is repetitive concerning this doctrine as we examine it through this book; however, in such repetition is demonstrated the ridiculous nature of the doctrine for, as we have stated many times, if Premillennialism is true, these passages cannot be. Likewise, if these passages are true, Premillennialism fails that test and should be rejected.

Hebrews 10:8-12 states: *"Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."*

As we study this passage, remember that Premillennialism maintains that the Old Testament system will be reinstated upon Jesus' "return to earth" (an event that will not happen). With this in mind, notice that the writer states that God had no pleasure in those sacrifices of the Old Testament (Vs. 8). God had ordained that system and those sacrifices. How is it that He had no pleasure in those things? They did not sanctify man. They did not pay redemption's price. It took something far greater to do that (the death of Jesus). Question: Why would God (as Premillennialism maintains) reinstate that in which He had no pleasure for the system His Son established (the Son in whom He was "well pleased" Matthew 3:17; 17:5)?

The next verse (9) connects the Lord's doing the will of God with His taking away the law with its sacrificial system. Such had to be done in order for the second (the New Testament) to be established. Forgetting the numerous Scriptural references that refute Premillennialism for a moment, does it make any sense for God to send His Son to die in order that He might, through His death, revoke a system that He will later return to instate again? Not only does this doctrine violate numerous passages of Scripture, it violates principles of logic and common sense.

Verse 10 begins with the phrase *"by the which will"*. Which will would that be? None other than "the second" (from the end of Verse 9), the New Testament of Christ. Notice that it is through this will that man is sanctified. That being the case, the establishment (or even re-establishment) of another would nullify man's ability to be "sanctified". What does such a change say about the wisdom and integrity of God?

Verse 11 reveals that the offerings of that first covenant could *"never take away sins"*. Never included the time when that law was effectual, and would certainly include any time after that. What good would it do for God to reinstate a system that, even when it was formerly in practice, could "never" take away man's sins?

The final verse of this passage reveals that Christ *"offered one sacrifice for sins for ever"*. It would be no less than a slap in the face of the Savior to reinstate a system that could "never take away sins" to replace the one for which He died and which could take away sins.

Time and again Premillennialism fails the test. The doctrine is false to the core. It relegates the role of Christ and His will (the New Testament) to temporary status and second place. These Hebrews passages are true; therefore, Premillennialism is false.

Study #37

We continue in our series of studies of the doctrine of Premillennialism by looking again at the book of Hebrews. As stated all along in our study, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true (and certainly it is), Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

Hebrews 10:17-22 states: *"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."*

Several things should be noted from this passage. First, it should be noted that there would come a time when *"their sins and iniquities will I remember no more"* (Vs. 17). At the time of the writing of the book of Hebrews that time had already come. Paul was quoting from Jeremiah and shows from that quotation that the promised time of remission had been fulfilled.

Second, the writer states, *"where remission of these [sins] is, there is no more offering for sin"* (Vs. 18). Naturally, if sins are remitted, there is no need for further remission. The means of sin remission in actuality had come (Jesus, the ultimate sacrifice). Since this was true, there was no need for further sacrifice. However, keep in mind that Premillennialism maintains a reestablishing of the Old Testament law (together with its sacrificial system) when Jesus returns. Such is incompatible with numerous Bible verses.

Third, Verse 19 begins with an interesting word--"having". As the context goes to show, the matters about which the author writes are in place. Verse 19 notes that we now have "boldness" because of His sacrifice. Verse 20 continues the thought by showing that the way is "new and living" and that it was made possible by His sacrifice.

Fourth, in Verse 21 the word "having" is used again (another assurance that the object under consideration is already in place). What is this object? Paul states that we now have *"an high priest over the house of God."* This is a very significant statement for two reasons. One, it reveals that the Lord is (at that moment and this) a "high priest". As we noticed in an earlier study, Jesus would be both priest and king simultaneously (Zechariah 6:13, 14). Therefore, since He is now a priest, He is also now a king. (Recall that He could not be both if He were on earth Hebrews 8:4). Two, it reveals that the Lord is (at that moment and this) over "the house of God". What is "the house of God"? It is His church (I Timothy 3:15), His kingdom (Matthew 6:18, 19). So then, if Premillennialism is true and Jesus has not yet established His kingdom, how can the inspired writer of Hebrews state that He is now over that which does not exist? The answer is simple. His kingdom is in existence. He is over it as both priest and king. Thus, Premillennialism is false.

Study #38

In our continuing series of studies of the doctrine of Premillennialism we look once again to the book of Hebrews. As we have noted, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true (and certainly it is), Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

Hebrews 12:28 states: *"Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear."* In this context there is a contrast drawn between Mt. Sinai and Mt. Zion, symbolizing the contrast between Judaism and the Law of Christ. One of the prominent features of this contrast is *"the church of the firstborn"* (Hebrews 12:23). It is the same institution referred to as *"a kingdom which cannot be moved"* (Hebrews 12:28). As you will recall, the Lord had earlier spoken of these two as being one and the same (Matthew 16:18, 19). It is that Divine institution against which *"the gates of hell shall not prevail"* (Matthew 16:18). It is that kingdom (that would "stand forever") pictured by Daniel in interpreting Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Daniel 2:44). It is that kingdom *"which cannot be moved"* (Hebrews 12:28). It is the church of our Lord, the church of Christ (cf. Romans 16:16; Matthew 16:18; Acts 2:47).

In this particular Hebrews passage under consideration, the word "receiving" is a present active participle. The Holy Spirit could have chosen the future tense without any problem (and would have, had this kingdom been something future in its nature). Since He chose the present tense, this means that this kingdom was (at that time) something they were able to "receive". This being the case, it is not possible for this kingdom to be something yet future in our day (as Premillennialism maintains).

Taken in conjunction with several other passages that speak of the kingdom as being present in that first century period, this text is devastating to the Premillennial doctrine. Some of these other passages include:

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" (Colossians 1:13).

"That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you into his kingdom and glory" (I Thessalonians 2:13).

"For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Romans 14:7).

"I John, who am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Revelation 1:9).

Premillennialism is a false doctrine. These passages are true.

Study #39

In our continuing series of studies of the doctrine of Premillennialism we turn our attention to the book of First Peter. As we have noted, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true (and certainly it is), Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

First Peter 1:18-20 states: *"Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you."*

Redemption's price was paid by the Son of God. His death on the cross assures man of the hope of eternal life for those obedient to His Will (Heb. 5:8,9). There is prophecy in Scripture concerning basically every facet of His life and death. In this particular instance, Peter speaks of His death as being something ordained before the world ever began. Let's look at this statement in relation to the modern ideas of Premillennialism.

As we have seen again and again, Premillennialism maintains that the death of Jesus was not a matter of certainty with God. In fact, the doctrine of Premillennialism maintains that the death of Jesus was not something on which God had planned. His original plan was for Jesus to establish His kingdom on earth. However, the Jews rejected Him as said king and put Him to death. When this occurred, God implemented the "church age" until such time when the Jews will receive Him. When that time comes, He will return to earth and establish His kingdom. As we have also seen many times, this doctrine contains much error.

In order for the Premillennial idea that Jesus' death was an unplanned and unexpected event to be true, we must reject the words of Peter in this verse under consideration (as well as numerous other passages of Scripture). Peter states that the death of Jesus (as with all other facets of His life) was an event planned before the world was ever established.

Is it not strange that those who espouse the Premillennial doctrine want to hold tenaciously to the blood that was shed on Calvary yet want to reject the eternal plan of God that brought it about. Isn't it indeed strange that this doctrine holds that a rejection by man (which had no place in the plan of God) brought about man's redemption (to use Peter's words). Indeed, the Premillennialist has plenty for which to answer.

Premillennialism is a false doctrine. These passages are true.

Study #40

In our continuing series of studies of the doctrine of Premillennialism we look again to the book of First Peter. As we have noted, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true (and it certainly is), Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

First Peter 2:5, 9 states, *"Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."*

As demonstrated in several articles in this series, if what Premillennialism maintains is true, Jesus is not now serving as High Priest. In fact, if the Premillennial tenet is right, it would be an impossibility for Him to be so serving. The Bible reveals that He was to be/is a King and Priest at the same time (Zechariah 6:13, 14). However, He cannot serve as a Priest on earth (Hebrews 8:4). Further, if Premillennialism is true, He is not now a King; thus not now a High Priest either (since both occur simultaneously). This being the case, since by Premillennial standards Jesus is not currently a High Priest, the Christians cannot now be priests as maintained in these verses of First Peter. In order for a priesthood to be in place, there must be a High Priest. That High Priest in this arrangement is Jesus. Since, again according to Premillennialism, Jesus is not now King, neither is He currently High Priest. Thus, there is no system in place that will support the fact that Christians are priests as Peter declares.

As clearly seen by so many of the passages we have studied thus far, Premillennialism is a false doctrine. If it were true, passages like I Peter 2:5, 9 would be false. It would be impossible for it to be otherwise. However, since passages like I Peter 2:5, 9 are true, Premillennialism is that which is false in this instance.

Study #41

We continue our series of studies of the doctrine of Premillennialism by looking to the book of Second Peter. As we have noted, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true (and it certainly is), Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

Second Peter 3:10, 11 state: *"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness."*

That *"the day of the Lord"* in this passage is a reference to the second coming of Christ there can be no doubt. Of the time in which that day and these occurrences will take place, Jesus said neither angel, men, nor He Himself knew (Matthew 24:36; Mark 13:32). As Peter states, it would be *"as a thief in the night."* Notice closely what will transpire when He comes again: 1) the heavens (atmosphere) will pass with a great noise; 2) the elements will melt with fervent heat; 3) the earth and all its works will be destroyed by fire. These matters being true, there is no room for the premillennial concept of an earthly kingdom. Simply put, there will be no earth on which to have an "earthly kingdom." Peter was dead wrong in that which he states here if Premillennialism is true. However, Peter is right on target with his statement. It is Premillennialism that is dead wrong.

At least one other point should be noticed from this passage. Verse 11 states, *"seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved...."* The word for "dissolved" is the same Greek word found in Acts 13:43. Paul had preached to the occupants of a synagogue in Athens. His speech being completed, the Bible states, *"Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God."* The phrase "broken up" is this same Greek word used in II Peter 3:11, where it is translated "dissolved." Thus, the heavens and the earth will be "broken up" just as the assembly in Acts 13:43. This being the case, there will be no place for the supposed earthly kingdom of Premillennialism. Thus, this one word of this one verse is enough to refute this false doctrine in the

mind of anyone who is rational. Once again the Bible is seen to be true, and the doctrine of Premillennialism is seen to be false.

Study #42

We turn our attention to the book of First John as we continue our look at various passages regarding the doctrine of Premillennialism. As we have noted, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, since the Bible is true in its every facet, Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

First John 2:18 states: *"Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time."* The Greek word translated time is *hora* (hour). The definite article "the" is not found in the original. John thus states, *"it is last hour"* at the beginning of this verse and *"we know that it is last hour"* at the end of this verse. This Greek word is used at times to indicate the whole of the Christian dispensation (cf. John 4:21). "Last days," "last times," "last hour" and "these last days" are used interchangeably (i.e. Isaiah 2:2; Hebrews 1:1, 2; Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:21) in reference to the Christian dispensation, the last dispensation of time.

Premillennialism maintains that the "last days" (times, hour, etc.) is a reference to the final days just prior to the Lord's "return to earth" to establish His kingdom. As we have seen time and again, the Lord's kingdom is spiritual and not earthly in nature (John 18:36), and it is already in existence (Colossians 1:13, 14; etc.). When John penned these words (over 1900 years ago), he said, *"it IS the last time."* To further demonstrate this point he made it clear that the presence (at that time) of "antichrists" proved that it was "the last time." Only in the writings of John (I John 2:18, 22; 4:3; II John 7) does this word appear. He defines what he means by it (I John 2:22). The existence of these "antichrists" proved John's contention that the "last times" had already begun; and also disproves the premillennial contention that the "last times" are in reference to a time yet future.

Once again it is seen that the Scriptures will not support the premises of Premillennialism. It is a false system of thought. We now live in the "last days" and have ever since Pentecost of Acts 2. The "last days" (time, hour) is simply a reference to the Christian dispensation, the last dispensation of time.

Study #43

In our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism we come now to the book of Revelation, the book on which the doctrine of Premillennialism hinges. All Premillennialists turn to the highly figurative book of Revelation in support of their doctrine. Sufficient information has already been given to demonstrate that this doctrine is not in agreement with the Bible. However, in order to expose it completely, we must engage in at least a brief study of John's Revelation. As we have noted continually throughout this series, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true, Premillennialism is a false doctrine.

Revelation 1:1-3 states: *"The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand."*

The Premillennial concept of the book of Revelation is that it is a book detailing "the last days" (as defined by Premillennialism) prior to "the Rapture," "the battle of Armageddon" and the return of Christ to earth to establish His kingdom and reign on the literal throne of David in the literal city of Jerusalem. As we have already seen in our study, none of these matters is in agreement with the Bible. However, the advocates of Premillennialism maintain that these matters are indeed taught in the book of Revelation. But, to the contrary, the first three verses of Revelation are enough to devastate this false doctrine.

At the outset of this book its inspired writer states to his audience (not to an audience two millennia down the road) that the particulars of this book concern "*things which must shortly come to pass*" (Vs. 1) and that for these matters "*the time is at hand*" (Vs. 3). Thus, whatever the particulars of this book address, it is very obvious that they were addressed to the people of John's day and not to 21st century man. What possible good could have been accomplished in addressing matters concerning 21st (or later) century man to the people of the first century? Why would the Holy Spirit lead a man to write to a particular group of people that things were "at hand" and to "shortly come to pass" knowing full well that those things were not "at hand" and would not "shortly come to pass," knowing also that the matters addressed in the book would not affect them in any fashion?

If Revelation 1:1-3 is correct, Premillennialism dies at the very outset of the book that is supposed to give it life. If Premillennialism is true, the first three verses of Revelation are false. Thus, for Premillennialism, this is a dilemma. To maintain that the first three verses are true is to deal a deathblow to the doctrine. To say that they are false would cast doubt on the remainder of the book. After all, if the first three verses cannot be trusted, what reason is there to believe the remainder of the book can be?

Rest assured that Revelation 1:1-3 is correct. It is the doctrine of Premillennialism that is false.

Study #44

Again we come to look at the book of Revelation in regards to our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism. If there is anywhere in Scripture where this doctrine should be able to go for support, it is the book of Revelation. However, as we have already seen, there is no support for it in this (or any other) book of the Bible. As we have continually maintained throughout this series, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true, Premillennialism is false.

Revelation 1:9 states: "*I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.*" What! John a member of "the kingdom"? Is it not the case (according to Premillennialism) that John is about to write matters concerning the establishment of Christ's kingdom? How could he possibly be a member of that which is yet to be established?

In one of our previous studies we noticed that the Colossians were said to have been "*translated into the kingdom of His dear Son*" (Colossians 1:13). Paul even included himself in the number of those who had been thus "translated" (through the use of the word "us"). How could Paul, the Colossians and, now, John all be members of the "kingdom" if that kingdom is still not in existence in this the 21st century (as Premillennialism would have us believe? The answer is simple. The kingdom was in existence in the days of Paul, John and the Colossians. Premillennialism is false in its contention that the kingdom is yet to be established.

It is most interesting (not to mention quite telling) that the writer of the very book that is supposed to maintain the doctrine of Premillennialism more so than any other should make the statement that he was already "in the kingdom". As with our previous study of Revelation 1:1-3, this passage also places Premillennialism in a dilemma. If John is correct in stating that he was "in the kingdom," Premillennialism (with its boasts that the kingdom has not yet been established) is proven false. However, if Premillennialists maintain that John was not a member of the kingdom, they make him to be a liar and unworthy of consideration in anything else he might write about that kingdom.

This "dilemma" is easily resolved when one understands the truth of the matter-- Premillennialism is false. John was a member of the kingdom (as were Paul and the Colossians). It was in existence then and still is now. John was correct, and Premillennialism is false.

Study #45

In our final installment of this series we again look to the book of Revelation in regards to our study of the doctrine of Premillennialism. As we have already seen, there is no support for this doctrine in this (or any other) book of the Bible. As we have continually maintained throughout this series, if Premillennialism is true, these passages are false. However, if the Bible is true, Premillennialism is false.

Revelation 22:6 states: *"And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done."* Revelation 22:10 states: *"And he said unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand."*

Previously, in studying from this same book, we noticed that the first three verses of Revelation are sufficient to refute the doctrine of Premillennialism. Verses one and three of chapter one contain the phrases *"must shortly come to pass"* and *"the time is at hand"* respectively speaking of the time element of the matters discussed therein. It is interesting to see that here, at the end of the book, the Lord saw fit again to have John repeat these sentiments. God anticipated every error that would come along. Every erroneous doctrine taught by man is answered in the Bible. The doctrine of Premillennialism is no exception.

As we noticed in our study of Revelation 1:1, 3, the fact that the matters discussed by John were to *"shortly come to pass"* and were *"at hand"* clearly reveals the significance of the events to be discussed to his current audience of the first century. To label these matters as end-of-the-world events (as Premillennialism does) makes John (and thus the Holy Spirit Who inspired him) untrue to his word. If these matters are premillennial in nature, there was nothing of significance to those people of the first century (John's primary audience); and he was completely wrong in indicating to them that these matters were of significance to them.

The same is true of the verse currently under consideration. The same phraseology is used at the end of the book that was used in the beginning. The time for these matters to take place was indeed *"at hand"* and these things would *"shortly be done"*. If Premillennialism is true, these matters have not taken place even to this good hour. Thus, these verses (1:1, 3; 22:6, 10) are all false. We know, however, that it is not the Bible that is false, but the doctrine of Premillennialism.

This concludes our survey of some Bible passages (and we've not looked at them all by any means) that are false if the doctrine of Premillennialism is true. These passages we have considered and this doctrine are completely incompatible. Both cannot be right. This being the case, the false doctrine of Premillennialism must be rejected by any who hold to the truthfulness and integrity of the Bible.

West Side Church of Christ

1705 Starview Drive

Salem, VA 24153

(540) 389-9139

www.westsidecofc-salem.com

