

The Millennial Issue

By G. E. Jones

PART ONE

DIFFERENT POSITIONS ON THE MILLENNIUM THE MEANING OF THE WORD "MILLENNIUM"

The word "Millennium" means a thousand years. It is derived from two Latin words, "Mille," which means a thousand, and "Annum," which means a year. While the word "Millennium" does not occur in our English translations, yet its equivalent does. The expression "Thousand years" occurs six times in Rev. 20:2-7. Those who believed in this doctrine in the centuries following the apostolic age were called "Chiliasts" by those who opposed them. This term came from the Greek word "Chilia," which means a thousand.

THE DIFFERENT POSITIONS ON THE MILLENNIUM

There are three main positions with reference to the thousand years reign mentioned in Rev. 20:2-7. Some believe this thousand years will come before Christ returns. Some believe that Christ must come before the thousand years reign. Others deny that there will be such a thing as a thousand years reign. The first are called Postmillennialists. The second are called Premillennialists. The third are called Non-millennialists.

POSTMILLENNIALISTS

The Postmillennialists are so called because they believe that the second coming of Christ will be after the thousand years reign mentioned in Rev. 20:2-7. Dr. Daniel Whitby of Northhamshire, who was born in 1638, was the originator of this position. They believe that the world will get better instead of worse, and that through the preaching of the gospel and other influences for good that the nations will finally be persuaded to cease from war, and an age of peace and righteousness will come in. After this thousand years of peace and righteousness Christ will return and a general resurrection and a general judgment will take place. Favorite expressions with the Postmillennialists are "Bringing in the kingdom," and "Taking the world for Christ." They think it is the business of the churches to win this world over to Christ. Their long range programs are built around this false conception of the millennium. The tendency among them is to institutionalism. They put great stress on secular training. They are drifting more and more into a social gospel, and they are putting less and less stress on individual regeneration, blood redemption, and personal repentance and faith. With them the high mark of spirituality is to be loyal to their cooperative programs and their denominational leaders.

PREMILLENNIALISTS

The Premillennialists are so called because they believe that Christ must return before the thousand years reign can come. They believe the gospel is to be preached as a witness to all nations, but they do not believe it will be anything like universally accepted. They believe conditions will grow worse and worse in this world. They believe that wars, revolutions, and violence will fill the earth until the end, even as it was in Noah's time. They believe that the closing days of this present age will witness such days of

trouble, wickedness and disaster as the world has never seen. They believe that the Antichrist or beast will be in power on earth when Jesus comes back to the earth to reign. They believe that when our Lord returns to earth to reign the beast or Antichrist will be overcome and cast into the lake of fire, and the Devil will be bound for a thousand years. They believe that after this the earth shall have the thousand years reign of Christ and His saints, and that Christ will occupy the throne of David (reestablished) in Jerusalem, and reign from that throne. They believe in two bodily resurrections, one for the righteous, the other for the unjust, these resurrections being a thousand years apart. Premillennialists believe in the Deity of Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His vicarious death and sufferings, His bodily resurrection, the new birth, the inspiration of the Bible, and His glorious bodily return, not only in the air (I Thess. 4:13-17), but also back to this earth itself, Zech. 14:4, and Rev. 19:11-21.

NON-MILLENNIALISTS

The Non-millennialists are those who do not believe there will be such a thing as a thousand years reign. They seek to bring the Book of Revelation into disrepute by saying it is too highly figurative to be understood, and that it was not meant to be understood. They, as a rule, do not claim to know anything about the Book of Revelation, and they deny that anyone else does. They thus charge the Lord with giving to His people a book written in such language that it is impossible for them to know what He meant or to profit by the book. They discourage the study of this book and frown upon those who teach and preach it. In the days following the apostolic times the Non-millennialists rejected the Book of Revelation and spoke of it as a book of fables. Not only do they seek to discredit the Book of Revelation and its study but they twist and turn the prophecies of the Old Testament to suit their fancies and to explain away the plainly revealed truths concerning our

Lord's earthly reign. With them the Bible never means what it says, and it never says what it means. Every prophecy of Scripture has to be beat out on their anvil and reworked to suit their own theory before being accepted. They pay no attention to the words of Peter who said, "No prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation" (II Peter 1:20), and go right on their way putting their own private interpretation on all prophecy. With them Israel does not mean Israel, but the church. David's throne does not mean David's throne, but the throne of the Heavenly Father in heaven. Mt. Olives does not mean Mt. Olives, but something else. A thousand years does not mean a thousand years, but an indefinite period of time, maybe ten days, maybe a longer time. (I read after one man who made it to be the ten days between our Lord's ascension and the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost.) Immediately does not mean immediately, but perhaps two thousand years. (I had one Non-millennialist to tell me that.) Canaan land does not mean Canaan land. Everlasting means everlasting when connected with the punishment of the wicked, and some of them have it meaning that when connected with the believer's life, but when it is found connected with God's covenant with Abraham then everlasting no longer means everlasting.

I expect to show that both the Postmillennialists and the Non-millennialists play into the hands of the modernists and infidels. Many of the arguments which they use to discredit the doctrine of the Premillennialists are like the arguments infidels have used to discredit the Bible and Christianity as a whole.

I expect to show that in fighting and opposing the preaching of Premillennialists, the Non-millennialists and Postmillennialists are helping to keep people in ignorance as to what is coming on the world in the last days of this age, and that they are lending encouragement to the movements of Antichrist which are among us today.

THE FACT OF THE MILLENNIUM

The fact of the thousand years reign is plainly stated in the Word of God, just as much so as the fact that the one who believes in Christ shall be saved. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be (future) priests of God and of Christ, and shall (future) reign with Him a thousand years," Rev. 20:6. Now, let us put this statement side by side with Acts 16:31.

"They shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years," Rev. 20:6.

"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," Acts 16:31.

The statement about the thousand years reign is as positive and as plain as Paul's statement to the Phillippian jailor about salvation. The man who sets himself to disprove the fact of the thousand years reign sets out to prove that this part of the Bible is not true. We cannot prove with one part of the Bible that what it plainly affirms in another place is not true. To attempt to do so is to array the Scriptures against themselves and discredit the same in the eyes of the unbelieving world. Here is a stone wall against which all Non-millennialists may beat out their theological brains, but they can never upset the fact of the thousand years reign. If they can prove with some other part of the Bible that there is to be no thousand years reign, then with the same argument the infidel can prove that the Bible contradicts itself. It plainly states in one place that certain ones, who are called, "Blessed and

holy," shall reign with Him (Christ) a thousand years. If some other part of the Bible teaches that this is not true, then a contradiction has been found in the Bible and we may as well surrender the whole ground to the infidel. We do not find in the Bible such a statement as "There shall be no such a time as a thousand years reign of the Lord and His people." But we do find people trying to so manipulate the Scriptures as to make them teach the very thing expressed in that statement. Thus they are handling the Word of God in such a way as to make it say in one place the very opposite of what it says in another, and on the same subject. I ask, is this not seeking to discredit the Scriptures in the eyes of the world?

Starting with the fact of the thousand years reign, let us work out from that point. Many insist on understanding all the details connected with the thousand years reign before they are willing to accept the plainly stated fact of this reign. The same method of procedure keeps the infidel from accepting the fact of the resurrection of Christ and the new birth, and our future resurrection. All search after truth must start with some plainly understood and known facts and from that point proceed to search after the complicated and the unknown. The man who waits to understand all the details connected with any truth before accepting a plainly proven fact will never make any progress. Especially is this so with the Word of God. We must first believe because God has spoken, and not because we understand all the why and the wherefore. To refuse to accept a plainly stated fact in the Word of God is to impeach the testimony of God Himself. To withhold our belief in a plainly stated fact in the Bible until we have been shown how such a thing can be is to demand that God's Word be proven true before we accept it. This might be in place for an infidel but it is certainly unbecoming in those who profess to be followers of Christ.

SYMBOLISM OF REVELATION

Opponents of the thousand years reign try to discredit the testimony of the Book of Revelation by saying the book is highly symbolic. By the same method we can discredit the words of John concerning Christ when he referred to Him as "The Lamb of God." The word "Lamb" is certainly used symbolically in that place. But millennial critics do not stumble over this, nor do those who believe in the inspiration of the Bible miss its meaning. Certainly we have many symbols in the Book of Revelation, but those symbols are explained for us by divine inspiration and we are not left to guess as to their meaning. Neither does the use of symbols argue that we are not to look for a literal fulfilment of this symbolic prophecy, but rather that we should expect a literal fulfilment.

The Book of Daniel is very much like the Book of Revelation, and deals with many of the same truths. Many of the symbols in the Book of Daniel have already had a literal fulfilment and they concerned literal world powers. In the eighth chapter of Daniel the prophet had a vision in which he saw a he goat run into a ram and destroy him. The 20th verse explains the ram and his two horns to represent the kings of Media and Persia. The next verse tells us that the he goat is the king of Grecia. The words "Ram" and "He goat" are symbols. But these symbols are explained to mean literal kings, and this symbolic prophecy had a literal fulfilment in the rise of literal world kings and powers. The four beasts Daniel saw in Dan. 7:3 are said to be four kings in Dan. 7:17. The word beast in Dan. 7:3 is a symbol. But the symbol is explained for us and it had a literal fulfilment in the rise of four world kings. This cannot be denied. Then why object to the same system of symbolism in the Book of Revelation having a literal fulfillment?

THE INSPIRED METHOD OF DEALING WITH VISIONS AND SYMBOLS

The inspired method of dealing with prophetic visions and symbols is to change the tense from past to future when an explanation of the vision and the symbolism is given. I shall prove this with a few passages from Daniel and Revelation.

THE VISION

"Daniel spake and said, I saw (past tense) in my vision by night, and four great beasts came (past tense) up from the sea," Dan. 7:2-3.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VISION

"These great beasts which *are four*, are four kings, which shall (future) arise out of the earth," Dan. 7:17.

THE VISION

"After this I saw (past tense) in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had (past tense) great iron teeth: it: devoured (past tense) and brake (past tense) in pieces, and it had (past tense) ten horns," Dan. 7:7.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VISION

"Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be (future) the fourth kingdom upon the earth, which shall be (future) diverse from all kingdoms, and it shall devour (future) the whole earth, and it shall tread (future) it down, and break (future) it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall (future) arise," Dan. 7:23.

THE VISION

"So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw (past tense) a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having (past tense) seven heads and ten horns," Rev. 17:3.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VISION

"And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet (They were yet future) ; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give (future) their power and strength unto the beast," Rev. 17:12.

From the above examples we see that when we are given a record of what happened in a vision the past tense is used. But when the tense is changed from past to future an inspired interpretation of that vision is being given. Now let us apply that principle to Rev. 20:4 and Rev. 20:6.

THE VISION

"And I saw (past tense) thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast and his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived (past tense) and reigned (past tense) with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were (past) finished," Rev. 20:4-5.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VISION

"This is the first resurrection (John is now explaining.) Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they **shall be** (future) priests of God and Christ, and **shall reign** (future) with him a thousand years," Rev. 20:5, 6.

Here we see the tense changes from past to future even as in Daniel when an interpretation of a vision is being given. In the fourth verse and the first part of the fifth verse we have recorded that part of John's vision concerning a resurrection and the thousand years reign. In that record John uses the past tense. It has to do with the vision which was past. But in the last part of verse five, and in verse six, John is giving his own explanation or interpretation of the vision. The tense now changes from past to future. In the vision which was past it was "And they lived (past) and reigned (past) with Christ a thousand years." In John's interpretation of that vision it is "They **shall be** (future) priests of God and Christ, and **shall reign** (future) with him a thousand years." We need go no further. We are now out of the vision and standing on the ground of an inspired interpretation of the vision. This should be the end of all controversy. The critics can no longer have any

right to hide behind the plea of visions and symbols. John furnishes us with an explanation, and he says in positive language "They **shall be** (future) priests of God and of Christ, and **shall reign** with him a thousand years." Any one who seeks to give any other meaning to Rev. 20:4 is setting aside an inspired interpretation for his own private interpretation. He is hindering the truth in unrighteousness, Rom. 1:18 R. V.

THE PLACE OF THE REIGN

"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the EARTH," Rev. 5:9-10.

There are two positive statements in the above quotation to which I wish to call attention. First, Christ is said to have redeemed people by His blood from every kindred and people. Second, those thus redeemed clearly say they shall reign on the earth. The modernist denies both statements. He denies that Christ has redeemed people with His blood. He also denies that those so redeemed shall reign on the earth.

The Non-millennialist meets the modernist half way. He claims to believe that Christ has redeemed people by His blood from every people. But then he turns around and agrees with the modernist in denying that those same redeemed ones shall reign on the earth. So the Non-millennialist has left the ranks of the true believers and has taken the first step toward modernism. Had that first step never been taken by others we would not have

modernism. I boldly affirm that Non-millennialists and Postmillennialists are headed in the direction of modernism and apostasy.

A close comparison of Rev. 5:10 and Rev. 20:6 show us that the thousand years reign is under consideration in Rev. 5:10 where the redeemed say, "We shall reign on the earth." In this connection they are said to be priests and kings. In Rev. 20:6 they are said to be priests of God and Christ and reign (here we have kings) a thousand years.

"And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High," Dan. 7:27.

The kingdom that is UNDER the whole heaven can be nowhere else but on the earth. Anyone with eyes to see can see that if they will but open their eyes.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth," Matt. 5:5.

"And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod (sceptre) of iron," Rev. 2:26-27.

The overcoming takes "place in this present age. The reigning over the nations will come hereafter as a reward for keeping the works of Christ to the end. One of the works of Christ will be to reign on this earth and bring all things in subjection.

In due time other Scriptures will come up showing that the reign will be on this earth.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION

Premillennialists have always believed that the first resurrection mentioned in Rev. 20:5-6 would be the bodily resurrection of the dead in Christ. Postmillennialists and Non-millennialists have tried to escape the force of Pre-millennial argument in this place by claiming that the first resurrection is the new birth. A few Non-millennialists apply it to the people who came out of their graves when Christ was crucified and resurrected. I shall give that due attention in time.

The English word "Resurrection" is translated from the Greek word "Anastasis." This word means a standing or rising up. It is found 42 times in the New Testament. It occurs 40 times in the Gospels and the Epistles, and twice in Revelation. This word is translated "Resurrection" 39 times. In Mark 9:10 it is translated "Rising again." In Acts 26:23 it is translated "That should rise." In Heb. 11:23 it is translated "Raised to life again." One time this word is compounded. It is "Exanastasis," and it is found in Phil. 3:11. It means "A standing up out of." If we count this compounded form of "Anastasis" then we have just 43 times this word occurs in the New Testament. In no case in the Gospels and the Epistles does it refer to anything but the body. The new birth is nowhere in the Bible called a resurrection. Neither can the Greek word "Anastasis" ever be found applied to the new birth or regeneration. If the reader will bear with me I shall show that in the Gospels and Epistles it always applies to the body.

The word resurrection (Gr. Anastasis) occurs ten times in our Lord's conversation with the Sadducees about the woman who had married seven brothers. The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection and they were trying to trap Jesus with their question as to whose wife she would be in the resurrection. In the three accounts we have of this conversation the word resurrection is found ten times, Matt. 22:23; 22:28; 22:30; 22:31; Mark 12:18; 12:23; Luke 20:27; 20:33; 20:35, and 20:36. It is easy to see that a bodily resurrection from the dead is under consideration in these places.

The word is found twice in John 5:28-29: "The hour is coming', in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Again the body is under consideration.

The word is found twice in connection with the raising of Lazarus. Martha said, "I know he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Jesus replied, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live," John 11:24-25. A bodily resurrection is under consideration in these two places.

We find the word resurrection in Luke 14:14 where Jesus tells His disciples they shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.

The word "resurrection" is found eleven times in connection with our Lord's resurrection. In Matt. 27:53 it is translated from the Greek word "Egersis." In the other places it is a translation of the word "Anastasis," Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:33; 17:18; 17:32; Rom. 1:4; 6:5; Phil. 3:10; I Peter 1:3; I Peter 3:21. No one could say that regeneration was under consideration in any of these places.

The word "resurrection" (Anastasis) is found four times in the 15th chapter of First Corinthians where Paul is proving by the resurrection of Christ that the dead do rise, I Cor. 15:12; 15:13; 15:21; 15:42.

In Acts 4:1-2 we find the Sadducees were grieved because the apostles preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead. Then in Acts 23:8 we find that the 'Sadducees say there is no resurrection. The body is under consideration in these places.

In Acts 24:21 Paul, in his defense before Felix, said that he was called in question touching the resurrection of the dead which he preached. By going back to Acts 23:6-10 we read that a great tumult had been raised in Jerusalem between the Sadducees and the Pharisees when Paul declared that he was a Pharisee on the question of the resurrection of the dead. The Roman soldiers had to intervene to keep Paul from being pulled in pieces. So Paul had in mind a bodily resurrection both in Acts 23:6 and 24:21. Then in Acts 24:15 Paul declared his belief in the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.

In II Tim. 2:17-18 Paul said certain men had erred in saying the resurrection was past already. Paul did not believe it to be past, but future. This shows that he had the body in mind.

The English word "resurrection" is found twice in the Book of Hebrews. In Heb. 6:2 the writer speaks about the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment. In Heb. 11:35 he speaks about certain ones who were being tortured would not accept deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection. The

connection shows plainly that the body is under consideration. In the same verse it is said that women received their dead raise to life again. Here the Greek verb "anastaseos" is used. We still have the body under consideration.

In Phil. 3:10, Paul spoke about the death and resurrection of Christ and in the next verse he expressed his desire to attain "unto the resurrection (Gr. Exanastasis) from the dead." This also refers to the body.

After our Lord's transfiguration He told Peter, James and John to say nothing about the matter until He was risen from the dead. Then the apostles questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead (Gr. Anastanai) should mean, Mark 9:1

The above takes into consideration every place the word resurrection is found in the New Testament and every place the noun "Anastasis," or its verb form occurs, except the two places in Rev. 20:5-6. Here again we have the English word "resurrection" and the Greek word "anastasis." Now, if this English word "resurrection" and the Greek word "anastasis" have their application to the body in all the places where they occur in the Gospels and the Epistles, then by what process of logic can one reason that it means something different in Rev. 20:5-6? I ask do not those who claim that regeneration is under consideration here throw all Bible examples and usage to the winds and strike out in a direction foreign to all other Scriptures? In the many places in the Gospels and Epistles where the new birth is under consideration the words "resurrection" and "anastasis" are never found. And in all places in the Gospels and the Epistles where these words are found the reference is clearly to the body. Then I ask what Scriptural authority and example do Postmillennialists and Non-millennialists have to justify them in saying that the word resurrection as found in Rev. 20:5-6 refers to the new birth, and not to a bodily resurrection ?

But if it be argued that Paul taught that the new birth was a resurrection in Eph. 2:6, where he said, "God hath raised us up together, and made us to sit together in heavenly places in Christ," then I can assure them that the new birth is not under consideration in this place. Paul is simply setting forth our federal position in Christ Jesus in this place. In Eph. 1:20, Paul speaks about God raising Christ from the dead and setting Him at His own right hand in HEAVENLY PLACES. Surely Paul was talking about the bodily resurrection of Jesus in this place. In Eph. 2:6, in which he is talking about the same thing that is under consideration in Eph. 1:20, Paul tells us that God hath raised us up together, (that is, together with Christ) and made us sit together in HEAVENLY PLACES in Christ Jesus. Christ was raised up from the dead, bodily. At the same time, in God's reckoning, we were raised up bodily with Him and in Him, our federal head. After His bodily resurrection Christ was made to sit down bodily at God's right hand in the HEAVENLY PLACES. At the same time God made us to sit together with Him, our Federal Head, in heavenly places. This passage simply means that in the reckoning of God we were all raised from the dead in the resurrection of our Federal Head, Jesus Christ, when He rose from the dead. When He was glorified and exalted to His own right hand in the HEAVENLY PLACES, then, in God's mind, we were also glorified and made to sit in HEAVENLY PLACES in Christ Jesus, our Federal Head.

This takes away from the Postmillennialists and Non-millennialists the last vestige of an argument they can make on the new birth being a resurrection. It is never called such in the Bible. That is simply some of their twisting of the Scriptures in a vain effort to dodge Premillennial truth.

In closing this part of this work I wish to consider the theory that the first resurrection has reference to those who came out of their

graves when Christ arose. Such an interpretation wholly ignores all references to the beast and his mark, and the death some who are in the first resurrection shall suffer. This death they will suffer (a physical death) for refusing to worship the beast or receive his mark. All this was still future when the saints came out of their graves at the resurrection of Jesus. This interpretation shows ignorance of the divisions of the Book of Revelation. Jesus Himself divided the Book of Revelation into three divisions. John was told to write: (1) "The things which thou hast seen." (2) "And the things which are." (8) "And the things which shall be hereafter," Rev. 1:19. So the third and last division was about things which were to be afterwards. By turning to Rev. 4:1 we find that the third and last division of the Book of Revelation starts with that verse. Here a voice said to John, "Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which MUST BE HEREAFTER." So the part of Revelation which deals with the things HEREAFTER commences with Rev. 4:1 and continues to the end of the book. The resurrection of Christ and the incident about the saints coming out of their graves were already past when John was given this revelation. By no means could they be classed as "things which must be HEREAFTER." So all the things about the beast, his mark, the first resurrection, the thousand years reign, the great white throne judgment, and the coming down of the New Jerusalem all belonged to the future in the days when John received this revelation. These critics would do well to make a careful study of the Book of Revelation, its three divisions, where those three divisions are found, and with what they deal. I have my first person to see yet except Premillennialists who paid the least attention to the divisions of the book our Lord made in Rev. 1:19 and Rev. 4:1. It is no wonder they blunder so in the Book of Revelation when they go about its study in such a haphazard way. In fact not many of them make any effort to study this book and to know its contents. The Non-millennialists of the early centuries rejected the Book of Revelation as being inspired. The Non-millennialists of today, as a rule, give it a good letting alone. So far as they are concerned it may as well not have been inspired. Most of them have as little to do with it as they do the Koran of the Mohammedans.

In the argument presented above I have shown that the first resurrection is a bodily resurrection of the saved. Neither have I yet used all the argument that is to be made on this line. Since the first resurrection is the bodily resurrection of the saved it will not come until Christ returns. In speaking of the order of the resurrection, Paul said, "Every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits: afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming," I Cor. 15:23. This verse tells us plainly that it is Christ's people that shall be raised at His return. There is not a hint here about the resurrection of the wicked at the same time. Their resurrection must come later. In Rev. 20:5 John tells us it will not be until after the thousand years: "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Since Christ must come before the saints can rise, then the thousand years reign, which comes after the first resurrection, must come after our Lord's return. So Premillennialists are right. We shall have more on this later on.

[Note by Editor: It was my blessed privilege to have known brother G. E. Jones before the Lord took him home. He was a faithful student of the word and a beloved preacher. Although Brother Jones did not believe nor teach the doctrine of God's sovereign grace as we teach it, he believed that a person was saved through the righteousness of Jesus Christ alone. He also believed in the pre-tribulation rapture. -- Leon King]