

59 Maier, p. 53.

60 Stendahl, p. 55.

61 LaSor, p. 55, and David Steinmetz, "The Superiority of Precritical Exegesis," in *GCH*, p. 65.

62 Thistleton, p. 90.

63 Wainwright, pp. 18-19.

64 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

65 Stanton, p. 65. An interpreter, then, already brings to the text a certain amount of cultural and linguistic baggage even before he or she reads the text. See D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 128, and Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983-1985), p. 26. As Gerhard Hasel reminds us "Absolute Objectivity is impossible . . . for if the interpreter knows the biblical languages, for example, he obviously has learned the meaning of words and gained an understanding of grammar and syntax which generations of scholars have helped to determine." (*Understanding the Living Word of God* [Mountain View, California: Pacific Press, 1980], p. 77). This implies that the attempt to interpret the NT from a detached, neutral standpoint with a scientific and presuppositionless method is impossible (Stanton, pp. 65-66).

66 Otto Kaiser and Werner Kümmel, *Exegetical Method* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), p. 43. In fact, according to Stanton (p. 65), behind every question asked of the NT lies the inquirer's presuppositions. The problem one encounters in presuppositions is that one is often unaware of the basic premises that guide one's life. This is due to the fact that they are almost unconsciously determined at an early age through culture and our families (Geisler and Funberg, p. 70).

67 Erickson, pp. 66-67. This is especially true of the biblical interpreter because the presuppositions adopted consciously or unconsciously are far more influential in the NT than disagreements over method (Stanton, p. 60).

68 Most recently, historical-criticism's validity for interpreting Scripture has been questioned precisely on the point of its presuppositions. See, for example, Eta Linnemann, *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), and Thomas C. Oden, *After Modernity . . . What?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), pp. 103-150.

69 Demarest, p. 35.

70 Edmund Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), p. 13.

71 O'Brien, p. 133.

72 Ryrie, p. 16.

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 4/1 (1993):65-93.

Article copyright © 1993 by Norman R. Gulley.

DISPENSATIONAL BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION: ITS PAST AND PRESENT HERMENEUTICAL SYSTEMS¹

By Norman R. Gulley

Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists

The Past

Modern liberal, progressive scholars divide biblical data through the historical-critical method and its constituent procedures. Dispensationalists, also a modern phenomenon,² divide biblical history into separate and unrelated dispensations. Though different, these methods share a common result: the Bible is robbed of its full right to be its own interpreter (*sola scriptura*). This can be a real danger for some Adventists as they focus on the alleged differences in Scripture rather than being informed by biblical unity, and who view the Bible as a mere casebook.³ We would do well to ponder Grant Osborne's perceptive description of the transformational power of modern historical criticism:

Due to the development of the historical-critical method and of modern theology . . . this view of infallible propositional authority (of Scripture) has collapsed and been replaced by an understanding of Scripture as a symbolic expression of God's redemptive activity, which must be 're-described' in functional terms for our day. In short, in this approach the Bible ceases to contain a revealed set of doctrines that must be believed but rather becomes a *case-book* that provides models to follow in constructing a modern Christianity.⁴

Modernistic methods, such as the historical-critical method, Dispensational and Casebook methods, may construct "a modern Christianity," but only at the expense of biblical authority and

truth. In speaking of the end time Jesus said, "When the Son of Man comes, will he find faith in the earth?" (Luke 18:8). Christ said that those heeding His word will survive tempests for they are on a solid foundation, whereas those who do not heed His words will not survive (Matt 7:24-27). The end-time tempests will be so severe that "none but those who have fortified the mind with the truths of the Bible will stand through the last great conflict."⁵ Therefore, God's end-time sealing (Rev 7:1-3) is a "settling into the truth, both intellectually and spiritually, so" we "cannot be moved."⁶ Our eternal destiny depends upon our relation to biblical truth, hence the importance of biblical interpretation (hermeneutics).⁷

Dispensationalism, which is the focus of this article, is a system of biblical hermeneutics that has "infiltrated almost every branch of Protestantism,"⁸ and has "considerable influence within conservative circles,"⁹ as demonstrated by the *Scofield Reference Bible* (1909, 1917) and the *New Scofield Study Bible* (1967). It is, therefore, important that Seventh-day Adventists be informed regarding Dispensational hermeneutics, and avoid a similar focus on biblical distinctions¹⁰ and preoccupation with Israel and the Middle East in eschatology.¹¹ By looking at the Dispensational presuppositions brought to Scripture, their pragmatic hermeneutics and their failure to see the New Testament as part of the total biblical context for interpreting the Old Testament, these should question similar methods of biblical interpretation practiced now by some Adventists.

Dispensationalism belongs to the Futurist (eschatological) school of prophetic interpretation. It is radically different as compared to the Preterist (contemporary-historical, *zeitgeschichtlich*), the Historical-Critical (analogy, cause-effect, non-predictive, reinterpretation), the Idealist (timeless principles/ideas) or the Historicist schools uninterrupted, predictive, prophetic eras.¹² Toward the end of this article we will evaluate a recent seminal Dispensational book.

The Roots of the Movement¹³

John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) and C. I. Scofield (1843-1921), the principle pioneer contributors to Dispensationalism, were lawyers who later became ministers; Darby in Britain and Scofield

in America. The story begins in Britain. Darby, ordained a deacon in the Church of England (1825), became disenchanted with the politically dominated church, and left it in 1827. Therefore, "It should be carefully noted that Darby's first and basic dissent was not on the question of eschatology, but on the doctrine of the Church."¹⁴

He had "doubts as to the Scriptural authority for church establishments."¹⁵ Add to this the fact that he failed miserably to keep God's law for seven years, and only found relief when he discovered in Ephesians 3 that the church is seated with Christ in heavenly places. He took this to mean that Christians are above the law, and that the law merely applies to the former dispensation, to Israel. This led him "to compartmentalize Israel and the Church as distinct objects of God's separate purposes."¹⁶

This personal experience influenced the way he understood the Bible, and led him to divide Scripture up into seven dispensations. During the years 1862-1868, he came to America and Canada on speaking tours, staying an aggregate of six years,¹⁷ and through contact with C. I. Scofield, and the Scofield Study Bible, the ideas of Dispensationalism spread across North America.

Dispensational Hermeneutics

Dispensations. We need to understand the term "dispensation." Scofield says that "a dispensation is a period of time during which man is tested in respect to his obedience to some specific revelation of God."¹⁸ The word "dispensation" comes from the Greek word *oikonomia*, and is perhaps only referred to as a time period in Ephians 1:10.¹⁹ Its usual meaning is stewardship, rather than a time period. Yet Dispensationalism denotes the dividing of salvation-history into distinct time periods, seven for Darby²⁰ and Scofield,²¹ eight²² or even ten²³ or twelve²⁴ for others, and three for Charles Ryrie.²⁵

Dispensationalists admit that the "the number of dispensations in a Dispensational scheme, and even the names of the dispensations, are relatively minor matters." "The essence of Dispensationalism is (1) the recognition of a distinction between Israel and the Church, (2) a consistently literal principle of interpretation,

and (3) a basic and working conception of the purpose of God as His own glory rather than as a single purpose of salvation."²⁶

Daniel P. Fuller correctly concludes that Dispensationalists "must, however, insist on at least three dispensations in order to assert the idea of the Church as a parenthesis between God's dealings with Israel."²⁷ Dispensationalists believe God's program for Israel is merely on hold during this "church age," to be resumed at the rapture of the church, with ultimate fulfillment of all the covenantal promises to Israel during the millennial kingdom. So at least three dispensations are required.²⁸

The Israel/Church Dichotomy. Ryrie's list of three dispensations places the distinction between Israel and the church as the first essence of Dispensationalism. In fact, this distinction drives the entire system. Remove this distinction and Dispensationalism would cease to exist. The Israel/church dichotomy is basic to Dispensational hermeneutics.²⁹ Keep this basic distinction, and it multiplies numerous other distinctions—even beyond the various dispensations—in order to maintain the basic Israel/church construct.³⁰ Dispensationalists are united on this Israel/church dichotomy, even if they have four different views for when the "church-age" began,³¹ and three views for when it will close.³²

Scofield wrote a book entitled, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*,³³ based upon 2 Tim 2:15. In commenting on "rightly dividing the Word" he said, "The Word of truth, then, has right divisions, and it must be evident that, as one cannot be 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed' without observing them, so *any study* of the Word which ignores divisions must be in large measure profitless and confusing."³⁴ In other words, Israel and the church must be kept separate, and each dispensation must be kept separate. However, we must note that the Biblical word "dividing" does not mean "divisions." The Greek word *orthotomeo* comes from *orthos*, "right" or "honest" and *stemno*, "to cut." "The renowned Syrian exegete Theodoret (c. 393-c. 458) applied the verb to 'a plowman who drives a straight furrow?'"³⁵

The Greek term *orthotomeo* is found only in 2 Timothy 2:15 in the New Testament, and only twice in the Greek (LXX) Old Testament (Prov 3:6; 11:5). Many consider this compound verb to have "probably lost the meaning from which it was derived and. . .

acquired the more general sense of right handling (RV, RSV). It was from this sense that the derived noun came later to denote orthodoxy."³⁶ Orthodoxy holds that rightly dividing means allowing any part to be interpreted by the whole (*sola scriptura*). This means the New Testament will interpret the Old Testament, a premise anathema to Dispensational divisions. "What God has joined together (whole Bible), let man not separate" (Luke 10:9) is also good hermeneutical advice.³⁷

Consistent Literalism. Dispensationalists claim to use a literal "interpretation consistently in all. . . study of the Bible" and charge non-Dispensationalists "with allegorizing or spiritualizing when it comes to the interpretation of prophecy."³⁸ They claim to be the only consistent literalists because they also give prophecy a literal interpretation.³⁹ They oppose "spiritualizing" in defence of Biblical authority,⁴⁰ and against liberals.⁴¹ This includes opposition to a spiritual kingdom now rather than a literal Messianic kingdom later. But this ignores New Testament present fulfillment.⁴² Paradoxically they spiritualize the ascension of the church into a rapture, claiming biblical authority when there is none,⁴³ and so do employ spiritualization in prophetic interpretation.⁴⁴

The New Testament applies Old Testament passages according to their true meaning and shows that it was the literalists in prophetic interpretation who crucified Christ (Matt 23:13-39; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 12:56; John 11:45-57).⁴⁵ Unlike His contemporary Israel, Christ interpreted the kingdom as already in their midst (Matt 10:7; 12:28; more of this later). The entire book of Hebrews is based on the fact that the new covenant promised to Israel and Judah (Jer 31:31) is not some literal event in a future Messianic kingdom, but already inaugurated in Christ for spiritual Israel, the church (Heb 8:6-13).

The question is not literal versus spiritual interpretation. The New Testament speaks of Christ as the "lamb that was slain from the creation of the world" (Rev 13:8), and as coming in the second advent on either a "white cloud" (Rev 14:14) or a "white horse" (Rev 19:11). Here we have a spiritual truth (His death atoning for man from the beginning), a literal truth (His return) and symbolic expressions (cloud/horse) intermingled. Walvoord concedes the problems of only a literal interpretation,⁴⁶ but Dispensationalists

never apply this to the Israel/church relationship as does the New Testament. George E. Ladd rightly comments, "Our point of departure must be the way the New Testament interprets the Old Testament."⁴⁷

We need to define the word literal. Literal, to Dispensationalists, means obvious or clear meaning. It assumes that the words and the passage are transparent. Dispensationalists refer to this hermeneutic as literalism, as "its plain interpretation,"⁴⁸ "normal" "ordinary" or "customary" meaning, the "grammatical-historical method,"⁴⁹ or the "plain grammatical sense."⁵⁰ But is the meaning of the Bible that literalistic, particularly the prophetic passages? Even Dispensationalists recognize that "almost complete confusion reigns in the interpretation of prophecy,"⁵¹ and that "acquiring the knowledge of the spiritual [note this word] content of the Bible is a life task."⁵² Why so long, and why are there so many different interpretations, if the meaning is so obvious? Why does Scripture warn that spiritual things are "spiritually discerned" (1 Cor 2:14)? If the normal understanding of language is sufficient to grasp biblical truth, then would not the "unspiritual" person also understand?

Evidence Opposing Consistent Literalism. Old Testament prophecies are the playground of Dispensationalists, who project their fulfillment onto a future earthly kingdom. Several facts should be weighed against "consistent literalism," or the "transparent understanding" theories: (1) Most Old Testament prophecies are written in the Hebrew language. Hebrew has a small vocabulary, and is not as technically precise as New Testament Greek. "In literary form, written Hebrew is full of metaphors, elastic and vague; sometimes indeed it is capable of more than one meaning."⁵³ (2) "The authors of the various NT books did not introduce and apply the quotations from the OT in a scientific manner, with literary accuracy characteristic of our day. Rather the Old Testament passages were embodied in the Gospels, in the Epistles, in the Acts, and in the Apocalypse in order to bear witness to the fulfillment of the Old Covenant in the New."⁵⁴ This does not mean that NT writers misconstrue the OT in their quotations. They bring out their true meaning and their fuller importance.

As C. Norman Kraus says, "Dispensationalist interpretation

is built on an inadequate concept of the nature of language and its use. In seeking to uphold the supernatural quality of the biblical narrative it has assumed that the biblical language is like the language of a science textbook; that is, that its terms have a fixed meaning from beginning to end."⁵⁵

A Literal Fulfillment of Prophecies Does Not Support Consistent Literalism. Not only do Dispensationalists confine their focus to an alleged transparency of language, but they cite the literal fulfillment of prophecy to prove literalism.⁵⁶ They say, "There is no non-literal fulfillment of these prophecies in the New Testament. This argues strongly for the literal method."⁵⁷ Apply this hermeneutic to Christ. Granted He was born in Bethlehem (Micah 5:2, Matt 2:1), came out of Egypt (Hos 11:1, Matt 2:14-15), was crucified (Isa 53:7-12, John 18:1-19:37) and rose again (Hos 6:1-2, 1 Cor 15:3-4)—all literal fulfillments of prophecy,⁵⁸ but is this all He fulfilled? Is it not also true that through this One Israelite, Jesus Christ, the Abrahamic promise was fulfilled—the promise that "all peoples on the earth will be blessed through you" (Gen 12:3)? Is it not true that "no matter how many promises God has made, they are 'Yes' in Christ" (2 Cor 1:20)? Is it not true that Christ has broken down the wall between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2:11-22), which denies the Dispensational Israel/church dichotomy?

Thus "consistent literalism" makes a selective use of Christ's fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, and hence is an inconsistent interpretation of prophecy.

Typological Interpretation Calls in Question Consistent Literalism. Dispensational systematic theologian Chafer says, "Almost every important truth of the New Testament was typified and foreshadowed in the Old Testament,"⁵⁹ and that "the antitype serves to lift its type out of the commonplace into that which is inexhaustible and to invest it with riches and treasures hitherto unrevealed."⁶⁰ These insights are correct and agree with the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament. If these insights had guided Chafer's theological system, it would have transcended the confining strictures of literalism. There are other statements in Dispensational literature that, like Chafer's, are seminal for a totally different shape of biblical interpretation.⁶¹

The *New Scofield Study Bible* disproves the Dispensational

claim to use a consistent literal interpretation. For the study notes acknowledge that Old Testament people and things not only receive a literal interpretation, but function as types of antitypes in the New Testament. Thus historical persons or things are both literal and typical. Many typify Christ⁶²—they are christologically interpreted. Many typify the church—they are ecclesiologically interpreted. In the introduction to the Song of Solomon the interpretation is threefold, (1) literal (Solomon's love for Shulamite girl), (2) figurative (revelation of God's love to Israel) and (3) allegorical (Christ's love for the church).⁶³

Although Dispensationalists claim that the church is not even thought of in the Old Testament,⁶⁴ yet surprisingly it finds the whole Song of Solomon to be an "allegory" of the church, "in spite of the fact that the book says nothing about either Christ or the church."⁶⁵ The *New Scofield Study Bible* also finds in the Old Testament numerous types for the church, including Eve,⁶⁶ Isaac,⁶⁷ Rebekah,⁶⁸ the tabernacle,⁶⁹ Aaron and sons,⁷⁰ the wave loaves⁷¹ and the Shulamite maiden.⁷² But nowhere is Israel a type of the church, even though its claim to such is far greater than any of the other choices. In fact Dispensationalists specifically state that Israel is not a type of the church.⁷³ This demonstrates the inconsistency of Dispensational typological interpretation when it encounters their Israel/church dichotomy.

Moreover, the *New Scofield Study Bible* cites many types, even some extreme ones.⁷⁴ As O. T. Allis long ago correctly concluded, "While dispensationalists are extreme literalists, they are very inconsistent ones. They are literalists in interpreting prophecy. But in the interpreting of history, they carry the principle of typical interpretation to an extreme which has rarely been exceeded even by the most ardent of allegorizers."⁷⁵ So Dispensationalists are accused of that for which they accuse others—allegorization.⁷⁶

Typology, is an important hermeneutical key in biblical interpretation, as is recognized by many scholars.⁷⁷

The Principle of Sola Scriptura Opposes Consistent Literalism. Dispensational literalistic interpretation is actually too confining. It limits meaning with no proper regard to the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura*, where the Bible interprets itself. Such an approach to Scripture would seem consistent with

the Dispensational claim to have a broader worldview—God's glory beyond human salvation.

Divine truth is always far greater than human words, even as God's Divine Son was far greater than His manifestation in human flesh. Both the Written (Bible) and Living Word (Jesus Christ) of God contain divine content that transcends the limited vehicle of the human. Literalism limits the meaning of words rather than allowing the theological context of the whole Bible to inform the interpretation of a given text. This means that Old Testament words are confined in their meaning, and are cut off from the unfolding plan of salvation, from typological relationship, and from meeting their intended fulfillment in Christ.

Looking to literalistic future fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy to a literal Israel in Palestine ignores the fact that the New Testament fulfillment is (1) Christological and (2) escalated from a local to a global fulfillment. Here, briefly are some of the biblical facts. Christ recognized that Old Testament people/institutions were types of Himself. True to type/antitype correspondence, He is greater than Jonah (Matt 12:1), greater than Solomon (Matt 12:41), greater than David (Mark 2:25-28) and greater than the temple (Matt 12:6). Just as lambs typified the Lamb of God (John 1:29, Rev 5:12-13, 13:8), so prophets, priests, and kings were supposed to typify Christ's prophetic, priestly and kingly ministries. In each, Christ transcended the type. So His was a better ministry (Heb 8:6), a better sacrifice (Heb 10:11-12), with a better covenant (Heb 8:6) and better promises (Heb 8:6), and consistency requires a better throne. For David's throne is no longer what counts, but Christ's throne in heaven (Acts 2:36, Heb 1:3,13, 8:1, 10:12, 12:1, Rev 3:21).

Therefore, says the New Testament, "What God promised our fathers he has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising up Jesus. . . The fact that God raised him from the dead, never to decay, is stated in these words: 'I will give you the holy and sure blessings promised to David.'" (Acts 13:32-34). So these ancient promises to Israel were fulfilled in Christ. What is involved in this fact? "The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. The Scripture does not say 'and to seeds,' meaning many people, but 'and to your seed,' meaning one person, who is Christ." (Gal 3:16)

Here is reference to Genesis 12:7, 13:15 and 24:7, where possession of the land is promised to Abraham's seed. In the type/antitype correspondence, with its escalated fulfillment, Abraham is heir of the world (Rom 4:13), not just of Israel. His heirs are "as numerous as the stars in the sky and as countless as the sand on the seashore" (Heb 11:11-12). He is the father of many nations (Rom 4:16-17). Yet even the original promise included being "a father of many nations" (Gen 17:5), with heirs as countless as stars and sand (Gen 22:17). Not only is Abraham the father of many nations and heir of the world, transcending race (Israel) and region (Palastine), but in his one seed, Christ, the distinction between Israel and other nations has been removed (Eph 2:13-14), so that they have become "one new man" (Eph 2:15), "one body" (Eph 3:6) and "a holy temple" (Eph 2:21). Translated literally, the Greek of Ephians 3:6 says, "The nations are joint heirs (*sugkleronoma*) and a joint body (*sussoma*) and joint sharers (*summetocha*) of the promise of Him in Christ."

So the promise made to Abraham has been fulfilled in Christ. Abraham was called out so that through him all nations of the world could be blessed (Gen 18:18, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14). These references and their context indicate that many nations would come out of Jacob/Israel (Gen 35:11), that his seed would be as the sands of the sea, and through them God desired to bless the world. So already in the type there is revealed God's desired future that transcends race (Israel) and region (Palestine). That mission depended upon Israel remaining faithful to God. The promises made to Israel were conditional (Deut 28). Their unfaithfulness brought captivities (Assyrian and Babylonian) as predicted (Deut 28:32-68).

So where the seeds of Abraham (Israel) failed, there the seed Christ (Gal 3:16) succeeded. Their failed mission to bless the world (Gen 12:3) was accomplished by Christ (John 3:16). In Christ's history He recapitulated the history of Israel. Indeed He was the new Israel (as the head of his body the church Eph 3:6, 5:19-20, Col 1:18). He came out of Egypt (Matt 2:15; cf. Hos 11:1), spent forty days in the desert (Matt 4:1). Realizing the type/antitype correspondence, Christ's three quotations of Scripture in answer to Satan's wilderness temptations were all taken from Deuteronomy and the experience of Israel in the wilderness (Matt 4:4, cf. Deut 8:3; Matt

4:7, cf. Deut 6:26, Matt 4:10, cf. Deut 6:13). His betrayal was typified by David's (Luke 22:48, cf. Psa 41:9), His death and resurrection after three days was typified by Israel's restoration after three days (1 Cor 15:3-4, cf. Hos 6:1-2). Christ is now on David's throne (Luke 1:32-33, Heb 1:3, 8, 13), from where He guides in the present building of the temple made up of Jew and Gentile Christians (Eph 2:20, 1 Pet 2:4-5).

So although the cosmic nature of the promises and mission given to Abraham were partially foreshadowed in the Old Testament, true to the type/antitype escalation, the New Testament explicates their fulfillment in and through Christ, who became the head (Col 1:18) of the new body (Eph 3:6, Jew and Gentile) which became the new Israel of God" (Gal 6:16). The promise transcends the type of the promised land (Palestine) to antitype of the promised world (Gen 26:26:3-4) and including the heavenly inheritance (2 Tim 4:18, Heb 11:13-16, 13:14, 1 Pet 1:4, 2 Pet 3:13). This inheritance is not only future but already present "in Christ." For "God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in heavenly realms in Christ Jesus" (Eph 2:6). Far transcending the limited Dispensational focus on Palestine and Jerusalem, God says that His new Israel of God "have come to Mount Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God. . . to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant" (Heb 12:22,24). There is also the intended mission. The Israel of God does have a mission to the world (Matt 28:19), as did ancient Israel (Gen 12:3), but "now, through the church, the manifold wisdom of God should be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realms" (Eph 3:10).

Covenant relationship with God was pre-requisite to being true Israel and receiving the covenant promises in the Old Testament (Gen 17:8-9; 22:18; 26:4-5; Deut 28:1-14). So in the New Testament the children of promise, not necessarily the natural children, are Abraham's offspring (Rom 9:2-3). For not all of Israel are Israel (Rom 9:6-7), but only those who are so inwardly (Rom 2:28-29), those belong to Christ (Gal 3:27-29; cf. "receive Christ" John 1:12, and "believe" Gal 3:6-9, Matt 3:9-10). Christ said that Abraham's children are those who do the works of Abraham (John 8:38-40). The present secular state of Israel fails to meet Christ's definition of the "Israel of God." No wonder Gentiles in this new

Israel of God, the church, are called a "chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God" (1 Pet 2:9)!

The New Testament, therefore, speaks about "the mystery that has been kept hidden for ages and generations, but is now disclosed to the saints" which is "Christ in you the hope of glory" (Col 1:26). Paul says, "We proclaim him" (Col 1:28), and considered his Jewish heritage as nothing compared to gaining "Christ and be found in him" (Phil 3:9). As Anthony Thiselton concludes, "The New Testament writers see Christ as an interpretive key for the interpretation and understanding of the Old Testament."⁷⁸ And, by contrast, "Socio-Pragmatic hermeneutics remain explicitly ethnocentric."⁷⁹ Paul sums it up succinctly, "For no matter how many promises God has made, they are 'Yes' in Christ" (2 Cor 1:20).

Dispensationalist Interpretation of the Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:24-27: Inconsistent with Consistent Literalism. If Dispensationalists really believe in a literalistic interpretation, on what basis do they remove the seventieth week from the other sixty-nine weeks in the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27? They take the seventieth week and jump over nearly two thousand years of church history to give the last pre-advent seven years to literal Israel, after the alleged church rapture. Here again the quest is driven by the need to keep Israel and the church separate. This interpretation of a time prophecy is anything but normal or usual. As Payne notes, it has distinct problems.⁸⁰ The linguistic form of the expression "seventy weeks" in Dan 9:24 excludes the possibility of a gap between the 29 weeks and the 70th week. The "seventy weeks" must be continuous.⁸¹

No other time prophecy in Scripture is interpreted in such a strange way. It seems to me that an authentic literal or normal interpretation would mandate that the seventieth week follow the other sixty-nine. As one scholar asked, "Is it credible that this prophecy, which speaks so definitely of 70 weeks and then subdivides the 70 into 7 and 62 and 1, should require for its correct interpretation that an interval be discovered between the last two of the weeks far longer than the entire period covered by the prophecy itself?"⁸²

Consistent Literalism Critiqued. Since 1945, a number of significant books have critiqued (directly or indirectly) Dispensa-

tional hermeneutics. Some of these include (listed chronologically by publication date) *Prophecy and the Church* (O. T. Allis, 1945),⁸³ *The Seed of Abraham* (A. Pieters, 1950),⁸⁴ *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* (G. E. Ladd, 1952),⁸⁵ *The Kingdom of God* (J. Bright, 1953),⁸⁶ *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (G. E. Ladd, 1959),⁸⁷ *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (G. E. Ladd),⁸⁸ *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territory Doctrine* (W. D. Davies, 1974),⁸⁹ *The Bible and the Future* (Anthony A. Hoekema, 1979), *Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology* (D. P. Fuller, 1980),⁹⁰ *The Israel of God in Prophecy. Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (H. K. LaRondelle, 1983),⁹¹ *The Covenants of Promise. A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants* (T. E. McComiskey, 1985),⁹² Bruce K. Waltke, Old Testament Professor of Regent College, recently wrote, "In my opinion, the works by LaRondelle and Hoekema remain the best on the topic."⁹³ He says LaRondelle's work is a "superb book."⁹⁴ It is a gold mine of information on the subject.⁹⁵

The cumulative evidence, given above, lays out the inconsistency of "consistent literalism," and finds that it has problems that need to be addressed. For example, (1) the alleged unconditionality of the Abrahamic covenant, (2) the alleged belief that Israel can return to Palestine in unbelief, (3) the alleged idea that Christ came to Israel to establish an earthly kingdom, which is only postponed, and (4) the alleged absence of the church in the purview of the Old Testament. The Israel/church dichotomy lies behind each of these four major problems with continuing inconsistencies. Space limitations only permit consideration of the alleged claim that Israel can return to Palestine in unbelief.

Is the Establishment of the State of Israel a Result of OT Prophecy?⁹⁶

Ever since the modern State of Israel was established in May, 1948, Dispensationalists have rejoiced in this as *the* sign of the nearness of Christ's return.⁹⁷ They believe that soon God is going to fulfill all the Old Testament promises to Israel because of the unconditional Abrahamic Covenant. It is God's faithfulness that will bring this about, and not the faithfulness of Israel, and so

apparently it is no problem for Dispensationalists to look at the modern State of Israel as fulfilling covenantal promises, even though Israel is secular, and the vast majority have returned in unbelief.⁹⁸ It is interesting the even the *New Scofield Study Bible* can speak of "restoration dependent on repentance,"⁹⁹ although this is an exception to the normal presentation.¹⁰⁰ Has God made a covenant promising the land to Israel, without any condition?

Loss of Land Due to Unbelief. There is much more to the covenant than a merely formal deed, or legal transaction on paper with no personal involvement. That the Abrahamic covenant is conditional as far as the human partner is concerned is evident from Gen 18:19; 22:16-18 and 26:4-5. In Gen 26:5 it is made clear that obedience to the divine "charge," "commandment," "statutes" and "laws" is the prerequisite to God giving to Abraham's "descendants all these lands." (NASB). Without belief resulting in obedience there can be no covenant experience. The mosaic covenant is also conditional as is evidenced by the fact that it can be violated (Joshua 23:16; Judges 2:20-21) or abandoned (Deut 29:25-26; Jer 22:9). Moreover the captivities of Israel to Assyria (2 Kgs 15:29-17:24) and Judah to Babylon (2 Kgs 18:17-19:36; Dan 1:1-3) were due to unbelief. They had turned from God to serve other gods. Their covenant unfaithfulness did make a difference (Deut 28:15-68). Their captivities argue against the idea of an unconditional covenant, and possession of the land as an inherited right.

Loss of Land Can Be Eternal. If covenantal obedience is decisive to covenant permanence, then what did God mean when He said to David, "your throne will be established forever" (2 Sam 7:16; 1 Chron 22:10; Psa 89:4), and that Israel is God's "forever" (2 Sam 7:24). The Davidic covenant is also conditional on human obedience (Ps 89:28-32). We must remember that God also said that Judah "will lose the inheritance I gave you. . . for you have kindled my anger, and it will burn forever" (Jer 17:4; cf. Jer 23:40; 24:9). Thus Scripture says, "If you are careful to obey me, declares the Lord. . . this city will be inhabited forever" (Jer 17:24-25).¹⁰¹

It is obvious that if Israel's departure from Palestine was due to unbelief, then a return in unbelief¹⁰² does not fulfill any prophetic promise.¹⁰³ Modern Israel is clearly "a nation without prophetic significance."¹⁰⁴ God said, "When you and your children

return to the Lord your God and obey him with all your heart and with all your soul according to everything I command you today, then the Lord your God will restore your fortunes and have compassion on you and gather you again from all the nations where he scattered you" (Deut 30:2-3; cf. 2 Chron 6:24-25; Deut 30:2-3 and God's response in 2 Chron 7:11-22).

When faced with this biblical evidence even Walvoord admits that conditionality is involved.¹⁰⁵ This makes the present State of Israel an entity of history that is outside of biblical prophecy. Nevertheless, Walvoord believes that the return is "one of the greatest miracles of world history"¹⁰⁶ and that "Scriptures make clear that the regathering will continue until consummated after the second advent of Christ."¹⁰⁷ He conveniently provides no biblical support. This is the length to which literalism goes to defend the Israel/church dichotomy.

Return to Location No Substitute for Return to Loyalty. Alexander Wachtel, at the Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy, said, "If we who believe in Jesus Christ as Son of God and Savior of the world cannot find some divine purpose in the return of the Jews, then we are embarked on a course that will undermine the unique claim of our gospel. . . We must find the divine purpose in the return of Israel. If we cannot, then Christ is not the only way."¹⁰⁸ Here Wachtel misses the fundamental nature of the covenant as a relationship. No return to location can substitute for a return of loyalty to God.¹⁰⁹

Is Israel's Original Entrance to the Land a Type for its Present Entrance? The question could be raised, is the present return of Israel a parallel with the original entrance into the land? Concerning that first entrance God said, "It is not because of your righteousness or your integrity that you are going in to take possession of their land; but on account of the wickedness of these nations, the Lord your God will drive them out before you, to accomplish what he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Deut 9:5). Did God bring Israel into Palestine because of His covenant promise to Abraham rather than because of Israel's faithfulness? If the latter were true, this would be the same as the Dispensational argument about Israel's present entrance in unbelief.

We must first note that Deuteronomy 9:5 and 30:2-3 both deserve equal attention. They are not mutually exclusive, nor is one more normative than the other. Rather, Deuteronomy 9 witnesses to the fact that no one is worthy of God's grace. The entrance into Canaan by Israel is a type of entrance into the heavenly Canaan by the redeemed. Not one of the redeemed will be worthy. Grace is the reason for both entrances. By contrast, in Deut 30:2-3, the writer says a return is not possible without a return to God. Where is grace? Without denying the operation of grace (Deut 9), the reader is reminded that grace can be spurned. Whereas no human works earned entrance to the promised land (Deut 9), no return to Palestine will come without a return to God (Deut 30). Both biblical truths stand in their literal meaning.

As Duane L. Christensen put it, "If the gift of the land were contingent on the righteousness of the people, it would never be received. It was a gift, graciously given, not a reward. Nonetheless. . . continued possession of the gift of the land is contingent on obedience. Disobedience of the covenant will lead to forfeiture of the land."¹¹⁰ Scripture does not teach anywhere Israel's return to the land in unbelief.

No Promise of a Return to Palestine in the New Testament. The New Testament does not teach anywhere that a land promise was given to Israel. Not even in Romans 9-11 is there any mention of land. In fact the New Testament does not present Palestine as the goal for Abraham and his descendants. For, he "was looking forward to the city with foundations, whose architect and builder is God" (Heb 11:9-10). They are spoken of as "longing for a better country—a heavenly one" (Heb 11:16). The New Jerusalem witnesses to the union of Israel and the church with the names of the twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles inscribed on the gates and foundations respectively (Rev 21:12-14).

Evidently the land of Canaan was but a type of the heavenly Canaan, the old Jerusalem but a type of the new Jerusalem, the land of promise but a type of the earth made new. Reductive literalism, refusing to be informed by the full teaching of the Bible of both Testaments, completely misses the magnitude of the promise. The *New Scofield Bible*, which finds so many different types in Scripture, never sees Palestine (the promised land) as a

type of the new earth, nor is there any comment on this land promise in Hebrews 11.¹¹¹

Christ's Earthly Kingdom as His Reign or Rule. "The majority of exegetes have recognized that the central meaning of *basileia*, as of the Hebrew word *malkuth*, is the abstract or dynamic idea of reign, rule, or dominion rather than the concrete idea of realm."¹¹² For "the Kingdom is not a realm or a people but God's reign."¹¹³ George Ladd argues persuasively that the kingdom Christ offered Israel was His rule in their midst. Christ's "authority in deeds and words was nothing less than the presence of the Kingdom of God."¹¹⁴

Whereas God had sent many prophets to call them back to Him, now Christ was Himself in their presence, pleading, "Come unto me, all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest" (John 11:28). This was His gracious rule—to set them free in covenant relationship (Luke 4:18; cf. Isa 61:1). He is the embodiment of that covenant—man joined to God. To Him the promise of the Old Testament meets the fulfillment of the New, for in both "is the dynamic concept of the rule of God."¹¹⁵ He came to give them the essence of that covenant—a relationship of resting in His gracious rule.

But, "He was despised and rejected by men" (Isa 53:3). They did nothing to help Him when He was clothed with a royal robe by Romans who went "up to him again and again, saying, 'Hail, O king of the Jews'" (John 19:2-3). Finally Pilate said to them "'Here is your king.'" But they shouted, "'Take him away! Take him away! Crucify him!'" (John 19:15). They rejected Christ's reign and rule, not the realm.

Calvary: Christ's Last Word about Israel¹¹⁶

Christ spoke of His rejection as a fulfillment of prophecy (Psa 118:22-23), concluding, contrary to Dispensationalists,¹¹⁷ "Therefore I tell you that the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who will produce its fruit" (Matt 21:42-43). So the church takes the place (functionally) of unfaithful Israel, and is called "a holy nation" (2 Pet 2:9). "Israel's day as a nation favored and blessed of God. . . ended."¹¹⁸ The twelve patriarchs of Israel were followed by the twelve disciples of the church, as He

continued His saving mission through the continued true "Israel of God" (Gal 6:16). Not Old Testament literalism but the "It is finished" (John 19:30) from the cross is the last word concerning Israel. The temple veil, rent from top to bottom by a divine hand,¹¹⁹ declaring that the place was holy no more, the sacrifices were now meaningless, God had gone from their midst.¹²⁰ He had committed Himself to the faithful remnant of literal Israel who became Christians.

Hanging on the cross, Christ is the predicted lamb of God. Here is the Prophet, Priest and King to whom OT prophecy pointed. Here is "the Word" made "flesh" (John 1:14), God united with man, the at-one-ment, dying as man's substitute. Here is the embodiment of the covenant, the law and the plan of salvation as well as the recapitulated history of Israel. As the Passover lamb saved the firstborn in the Exodus (type) so the greater Exodus from earth to the heavenly Canaan is possible through the Lamb of God slain at Calvary (antitype). In Christ all believers, whether Jew or Gentile, meet. Here is the ultimate revelation of God's promise to Abraham, and all the families of the world. In the light of the cross, and its subsequent "resurrection-ascension-intercession-return," we see the WORD unfolded in an unfolding revelation that sheds light on all prophetic language, speaking authoritatively about His kingdom rule, already in process, moving towards a realm, embracing a new Jerusalem in a new heaven and a new earth.

The present return of Jews to the State of Israel is, therefore, an event that has nothing to do with the Abrahamic promise or with salvation-history as seen from the perspective of the whole Bible. "For no matter how many promises God has made, they are 'Yes' in Christ" (2 Cor 1:20). He has not merely brought fulfillment to the Abrahamic promise, He is the fulfillment. Through Him all the nations of the world are being blessed (Matt 28:20, John 1:9). Through Jesus Christ all human kind, both Jew and Gentile, will gain entrance into the earth made new and into the true Jerusalem, the one which is in heaven now but will return to earth (Rev 21:1-3).

The Future

Having examined Dispensationalism as known at present, we must now look at an epochal book just released, *Dispensationalism*,

Israel and the Church. The Search for Definition, (1992),¹²¹ which gives insight into some changes taking place in Dispensationalism, allegedly subscribed to by key leaders of Dispensationalism today.¹²² Because of space limitations we can give only a summary overview, with suggestions for future dialogue.

Dispensationalism has experienced four dispensations of its own, i.e. Pre-Scotfieldian, Scotfieldian, Essentialist and Progressive Dispensationalism.¹²³ The fourth era issues out of an attempt to be "more accurate biblically"¹²⁴ and "to re-examine biblically the distinction between Israel and the church."¹²⁵ The resulting seminal book referred to above is written by ten younger Dispensationalist scholars who present a progressive theological hermeneutic beyond the one present in the other three eras of Dispensationalism. Their advance over previous Dispensationalist contributions moves the dialogue with Dispensationalism to a new level, as they have (1) critiqued some of the old positions that non-Dispensationalists also questioned, as well as (2) their acceptance of a new Christological hermeneutic absent in previous Dispensational literature.

The changes from their predecessors include: (1) Progressive fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies/promises in the church age, and thus a rejection of traditional futurism.¹²⁶ (2) Accepting the church as implicit in the Old Testament, and the moral law and the Sermon on the Mount as applicable in the church age rather than relegated to Israel in the millennium.¹²⁷ (3) Accepting that Old Testament prophecy can have double fulfillments in the church age, such as Joel 2 at Pentecost (Acts 2) and in the future.¹²⁸ (4) Progressive fulfillment of prophecy involving an acceptance of inaugurated eschatology¹²⁹ and a rejection of the church age as a parenthesis between Israel in the Old Testament and Israel during the millennium. (5) Progressive fulfillment of prophecy involves rejection of a postponed kingdom and rule of Christ, and focuses on His present rule from heaven's throne over all on planet-earth.¹³⁰ (6) Progressive fulfillment of prophecy rejects that there are two new covenants, one for Israel and the church,¹³¹ finding the one new covenant sequentially fulfilled—spiritually in the church age and physically to Israel in the millennium.¹³² (7) Progressive fulfillment of prophecy rejects the final difference between the earthly

people of God (Israel) and the heavenly people of God (church), opting rather for a dwelling together in the new earth.¹³³

These changes are substantial, and clearly separate Progressive Dispensationalists from the other three kinds. Progressive Dispensationalism has taken more seriously the Christological fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies/promises, and has come a long way to respond positively to the biblical type/antitype hermeneutic that involves escalation in the New Testament fulfillment. The book documents the roots of Progressive Dispensationalism, with (1) the rejection of the distinction between the kingdom of God and kingdom of heaven (1959), and (2) with Ryrie's *Dispensationalism Today* (1965) and then Ryrie's *sina qua non* questioned (1970s). So Progressive Dispensationalism has allegedly been developing for some years. The contributions in this book are by ten authors, all of whom are New Testament scholars, bringing their expertise to bear on traditional Dispensationalism that overlooked the hermeneutical function of the New Testament in interpreting the Old Testament. Although three respondents are Old Testament scholars, they provide further suggestions for additional progress to be made in hermeneutics by Progressive Dispensationalists.

The ten Progressive Dispensationalists have advanced from pure futurism typical of dispensationalism of the past to include inaugurated eschatology. They have transcended the simplistic literal/spiritual dualism, have done more justice to the New Testament's place in interpreting prophecy, and attempted a Christological interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies/promises. This is a development over their predecessors, and is an advance beyond previous Dispensational hermeneutics.

However, the *sina qua non*, shared with the other three stages of Dispensational development, is still the distinction between Israel and the church, even though the book speaks of a "softening" of this distinction.¹³⁴ Progressive fulfillment presents the kingdom as (1) preliminary during the present inter-advent period, (2) intermediate during the millennium and (3) eternal after the millennium. Along this progressive unfolding of the kingdom (fulfillment) the parenthesis (of older Dispensationalism) is simply moved from the church age to the millennium.

Conclusion

Walter Kaiser Jr. suggests that in the next two or three years another book should be written titled *Dispensationalism Tomorrow*.¹³⁵ Craig Blaising and Darrell Bock suggest, "Future publications need to carry the dialogue forward."¹³⁶ I submit four specific suggestions, for consideration, which in my opinion, could carry the dialogue forward in a future book.

(1) Present a more thorough-going Christological hermeneutic which takes into consideration the limitations of the *sensus plenior* of Old Testament predictions, and does full justice to the historical types with their biblical correspondence in Christ-centered fulfillment.

(2) Think through the present reign of Christ on heaven's throne (e.g. in Hebrews and Revelation) in relation to the church as His Body (Eph 5:30, Col 1:24), the one new man (Eph 2:11-15; cf. 3:6) the one olive tree (Rom 11), one vine (John 15), one chosen people, one holy nation, one royal priesthood (1 Pet 2:9), one bride (Rev 19:7), and the one holy city with names of both prophets and apostles on it (Rev 21:1-14). For "in Christ" the present and future oneness of Israel and the church is functional now and not sequentially divided into stages.

(3) Think through the inaugurated-consummated eschatology of the New Testament in the biblical type/antitype context, with its necessary escalation. Progressive Dispensationalists' commendable acceptance of this escalation is seriously undermined by their returning to the local focus on Israel as a part of consummated eschatology. The Bible simple does not support such a return from the antitype escalation to the localized type. There is no example of this reversal of escalation in Scripture.

(4) Think through the biblical understanding of the millennium which is different from the view given.¹³⁷ All four eras of Dispensationalism are pre-millennial. That is, they believe the second advent will precede a millennium on earth. However, nowhere in the Bible is the thousand years said to be on earth.¹³⁸ For example, the word "throne" (*thronos*) is used 38 times in the book of Revelation, and always about God's heavenly throne, except three instances where the throne is on earth, but in each case it is always occupied by an enemy of God (Rev 2:13, 13:2, 16:10).¹³⁹ This

constitutes persuasive biblical evidence that those who will reign with Christ a thousand years (Rev 20:4) will do so at His heavenly throne, and so does not support an earthly millennium, nor does the literary structure of Rev 20.¹⁴⁰ This calls into question a millennium on earth for Israel. Further biblical evidence supporting a heavenly millennium is the Old Testament day of atonement in the earthly sanctuary (Lev 16) as a type of the antitypical day of atonement in heaven's sanctuary. The judgment/removal of sin process takes place in the sanctuary in both type (Lev 16) and antitype (Rev 20:4-6, 11-15). Only after the millennium in heaven's sanctuary will the sanctuary process be completed in the removal of sin and sinners on earth (Rev 20:7-10, 13-15).

Progressive Dispensationalists have moved the dialogue to a new level by doing more justice to biblical inaugurated eschatology. The next step forward is to do justice to biblical consummated eschatology, and thus to the New Testament paradigm that is fully (not partially) Christological. This would more consistently question traditional Dispensational hermeneutics, and more effectively cause a return to the biblical mode of thinking. This biblical mode of thinking includes the conditionality of the covenants and the community of the faithful (church), that is, the Israel of God, made up of both Jews and Gentiles.

Endnotes

¹ The first paragraphs speak to this challenge. The rest of the article demonstrates the results of a hermeneutic which is less than Christological and *sola scriptura*. Seventh-day Adventists must allow Scripture to reveal its own meaning rather than superimposing ideas onto it from pragmatic/socio/historical-critical presuppositions.

² As a system Dispensationalism did not begin until the early part of the eighteen century in writings of Pierre Poiret, John Edwards and Isaac Watts. See C. C. Ryrie, "Dispensation, Dispensationalism," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. W. A. Elwell, (Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Book House, 1987), pp. 321-323.

³ See Alden Thompson's promotion of the casebook method in *Inspiration. Hard Questions, Honest Answers* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1991).

⁴ Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral, A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL:IVP, 1991), p. 289 (parenthesis and emphasis added).

⁵ Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, pp. 593-594.

⁶ Ellen G. White, MS 172, 1902, published in F. D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington DC: Review and Herald, 1955), 4:1161.

⁷ And also to the One Who is the Truth (John 17:3).

⁸ Thus Oswald T. Allis could say in 1945, "Dispensationalism as such, has made Dispensationalism an issue of greater or lesser importance in practically all evangelical denominations at the present time." *Prophecy and the Church* Philadelphia: The Pres-

byterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 2956), pp. 12-13. By 1958, it was reported that "dispensationalists have infiltrated almost every branch of Protestantism. . ." Arnold B. Rhodes, F. H. Caldwell and L. C. Rudolph, eds. *The Church Faces the Isms: The Members of the Faculty of the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky* (Nashville: Abingdon Press 1958), p. 109.

⁹ Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986), p. 1162.

¹⁰ For example, see Alden Thompson, *Inspiration*, (Hagerstown, Md., Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1991). For an evaluation of the book see my book review in *MINISTRY*, (December 1991): 28-30, and my article "An Evaluation of Alden Thompson's 'Incarnational' Method in the Light of His View of Scripture" in *Issues in Revelation and Inspiration*, (F. Holbrook and Leo Van Dolson, eds. "ATS Occasional Papers," vol. 1, Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1992): 69-90.

¹¹ For example, see R. A. Anderson and J. M. Hoffmann, *All Eyes on Israel*, (Fort Worth, TX: Harvest Press Inc., 1977).

¹² For further data on these schools, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "Israel in Bible Prophecy," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 3/1 (1992): 121-130, Leon Morris, *Revelation, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*, (Leicester, England, IVP), pp. 18-20, Alan F. Johnson, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Revelation*, Vol. 12, Ed. F. E. Gaebelin, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981), pp. 408-410, and Robert H. Mounce, "Revelation" *NICNT*, F. F. Bruce, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), pp. 39-43.

¹³ George M. Marsden compares Dispensationalism to Marxism and Catastrophism, which both divide history into periods brought to an end in judgment as does Dispensationalism. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 64-65.

¹⁴ C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America. Its Rise and Development*, (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1958), p. 27.

¹⁵ John Wick Bowman, "The Bible and Modern Religions," *Interpretation*, 10/2, (1956): 170.

¹⁶ Daniel Payton Fuller, "The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, 1957): 183-184.

¹⁷ Fuller, *The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism*, p. 68.

¹⁸ C. I. Scofield, *The New Scofield Study Bible*, (afterwards *NSB*), (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 3, footnote on heading for Genesis 1:28.

¹⁹ Arnold B. Rhodes, F. H. Caldwell and L. C. Rudolph, eds., *The Church Faces the Isms* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), p. 104.

²⁰ His seven dispensations are as follows: (1) (Paradisical state), to the flood, (2) Noah, (3) Abraham, (4) Israel, (5) Gentiles, (6) The Spirit, and (7) The Millennium. See Kraus, p. 29.

²¹ These seven dispensations are (1) Innocence, (2) Conscience or Moral Responsibility, (3) Human Government, (4) Promise, (5) Law, (6) Church, and (7) Kingdom. *NSB*, pp. 3-4.

²² Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1973), p. 50.

²³ Kraus, p. 26.

²⁴ See Charles F. Baker, *A Dispensational Theology*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Grace Bible College Publications, 1972), p. 3.

²⁵ These three dispensations are (1) the Mosaic law, (2) the present dispensation of Grace, and (3) the future Millennial Kingdom. See Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 50.

²⁶ Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 48.

²⁷ Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Assn., 1980), p. 12.

²⁸ Lewis Chafer calls these three "law," "grace," and "kingdom" in *Systematic Theology* (Dallas, TX, Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), 4:183.

²⁹ Louis A DeCaro, *Israel Today: Fulfillment of Prophecy?*, (Philadelphia: Pres-

byterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1976), p. 26, rightly notes that "Without this basic dichotomy in its hermeneutics, dispensationalism could not endure as a distinct system of biblical interpretation. The whole system turns on this alleged division existing between Israel and the Church."

30 Here are some of these divisions: (1) The church founded by Paul is different from the church founded by Peter, the first is a genuine church, the second a counterfeit. See Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1945), pp. 102-103. (2) Seven judgments are given in the *New Scofield Bible (NSB)*, p. 1384. (3) Although "all Scripture" is profitable (2 Tim 3:16), "all Scripture is not addressed to the Jew, nor is it all addressed to the Christian" writes Lewis S. Chafer, "Dispensationalism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 93 (Oct 1936): 417. Thus, the Sermon on the Mount is not for the Church, Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 108, nor is the Lord's prayer, Lewis S. Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 4: 221-222. There are also other divisions made in the New Testament. (4) contrast between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God, John F. Walvoord, *The Church in Prophecy*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1976), p. 25. (5) There is a spiritual as well as a natural seed of Abraham, John F. Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, (Grand Rapids, MI, Dunham Pub. Co., 1966), p. 144. (6) There is a new covenant for Israel and a new covenant for the church, Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, p. 210. It is understandable that the second coming is divided into two, a secret rapture for the church, and the second coming to earth to reign over Israel.

31 The four options for beginning the church age are Acts 2 (Scofield, Ryrie), Acts 13 (Moderate Ultradispensationalists), Acts 28 (Extreme Ultradispensationalists) and with Paul, before writing his first epistle (Baker). See Baker, pp. 4-6.

32 The three views are pre-tribulation, mid-tribulation and post-tribulation, with the majority of Dispensationalists supportive of the first view.

33 C. I. Scofield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1896).

34 C. I. Scofield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, p. 5.

35 Ralph Earle, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Frank E. Gaebelin, ed., (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1978), 11:402.

36 Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*, (Leicester: IVP, 1988), p. 148.

37 "The truths of the Bible must be rightly interpreted so that no part of the Scriptures will be set in opposition to the picture presented by the Bible as a whole." *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, F. D. Nichol, ed., (Washington D. C., Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1957), 7:336.

38 Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 89; Chafer, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 93 (1936): 400; John F. Walvoord, *The Blessed Hope and the Tribulation*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1977), p. 28.

39 The only exception to this is the obvious use of symbols, Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, p. 130.

40 They claim that "A method of interpretation which is free to spiritualize or overlook important revelations in doctrine has led the way for others to deny the authority of Scripture" Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 4:267.

41 Chafer says "The liberal theologian spiritualizes both the virgin birth and the Davidic throne. . ." "Dispensationalism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 93 (1936): 00. He is right in the first, but overlooks the fact that the New Testament does the second (see Acts 2:33-36; 13:22-37; 15:13-19; Rev 3:7).

42 "The prophecies concerning the King and His earthly kingdom remain unfulfilled to this hour. They are not forgotten or abandoned. Neither are they receiving a spiritual fulfillment. They are yet to be fulfilled when the King returns to the earth," Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 4:176. This overlooks the present fulfillment in the reign of Christ at the throne of God which is an important spiritual interpretation of the New Testament (Acts 2:25, 33-34; 5:31; 7:55-56; Rom 8:34; Ephes 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2 and 1 Pet 3:22).

43 A literal interpretation of 1 Thess 4:1-18 places the ascension of the church at the

time of Christ's descent, to meet Him in the air. This is clearly a second advent passage, not some prior rapture built partially upon a seventieth week taken out of its literal context (Dan 9:24-27). Against this Biblical view of the two simultaneous events, Walvoord dubs the interpretation of the rapture and second advent together as "spiritualization," *The Church in Prophecy*, p. 116.

44 John F. Walvoord, *The Rapture Question*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1976), p. 8.

45 "All of the apostles give spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies, and literalists do not find fault with them for that. It is universally agreed that the chief cornerstone laid in Zion is to be interpreted as Jesus Christ. Peter likens Christians to living stones built up into a spiritual temple. The apostle Paul, speaking of the experiences of Israel in the wilderness says, 'And did all eat the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ' (1 Corinthians 10:3-4)." George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies, A Search for Truth*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1948), p. 40.

46 Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, p. 130.

47 George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1968), pp. 135-141.

48 Charles Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 10.

49 J. Dwight Pentecost, *Things to Come, A Study in Biblical Eschatology*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1978), p. 9.

50 George N. H. Peters, *The Theocratic Kingdom of our Lord Jesus, the Christ, as Covenanted in the Old Testament and Presented in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Pub., 1952), 1:192.

51 John F. Walvoord, *The Blessed Hope and the Tribulation. A Historical and Biblical Study of Posttribulationism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1977), p. 7. A Spirit-led study of Scripture brings the student to the unifying truth that unites all prophecy in a harmonious whole.

52 Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 1:6.

53 Raymond E. Brown, *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture*, (Baltimore, MD: St. Mary's University 1955): p. 125.

54 Simon Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Assen: Van Gorkum, 1961), p. 13.

55 Kraus, p. 132.

56 Note what Pentecost, *Things to Come, A Study in Biblical Eschatology*, p. 61, claims, "In the field of fulfilled prophecy it is not possible to point to nay prophecy hat has been fulfilled in any way other than literally."

57 Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 88.

58 Certainly some details appear to differ in fulfillments. For example, the weeping in Jeremiah 31:15 was in Ramah (north of Jerusalem) whereas in Matthew 2:17-18 the weeping was in Bethlehem (south of Jerusalem). Assumably there may be the understanding that Ramah may be a distich which includes Bethlehem.

59 Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 4:204.

60 Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 1:xxx.

61 Walvoord, *The Church in Prophecy*, says, "It is a major error to make the word *kingdom*, which is a common term, always mean the same in all its uses. Rather, it must be interpreted by its context" p. 26). He should have applied this to the word Israel. Walvoord "Christ's Olivet Discourse on the End of the Age," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 128 (1971):113 says, "The study of prophecy in any area necessarily has to be subject to the context of the entire revelation of the Word of God" This would remove the Israel/church dichotomy. Walvoord, *The Rapture Question*, p. 16, again notes, "It is therefore not too much to say that the rapture question is determined more by ecclesiology than eschatology" This admits the Israel/church presupposition behind the rapture is not rooted in eschatology. Walvoord, "The Resurrection of Israel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 124 (1967):5. says that "prophecy should be interpreted literally unless there is good evidence to the contrary" This opens up the possibility of transcending literalism. Walvoord, *Millennial Kingdom*, p. 251, says, "The partial-rapture theory is also

objectionable because it divides the body of Christ and ignores plain teaching of Scripture. . . Apply this to the Israel/church dichotomy, for the same reason, and Dispensationalism ceases to exist. Pentecost, *Things to Come*, p. 63, says, "The central theme of all prophecy is the Lord Jesus Christ." This insight would radically change Dispensationalism.

62 In my research in the NSB, I discovered the following 30 types of Christ, and there may well be more. (1) skins of Gen 3:21 NSB, p. 8, (2) Lamb NSB, p. 8, (3) Adam NSB, p. 10, (4) Ark NSB, p. 11, (5) Melchizedek NSB, p. 22, (6) Isaac NSB, p. 32, (7) Ram NSB, p. 32, (8) Joseph NSB, p. 53, (9) Benjamin NSB, p. 62, (10) Moses NSB, p. 72, (11) Passover NSB, p. 84, (12) Manna NSB, p. 91, (13) Rock of Exod 17:6 NSB, p. 92, (14) Shewbread NSB, p. 103, (15) Lampstand NSB, p. 103, (16) Acacia wood NSB, p. 104, (17) Inner veil of Exod 26:31 NSB, p. 105, (18) Aaron and sons NSB, p. 106, (19) Altar of incense NSB, p. 111, (20) Laver NSB, p. 112, (21) Burnt offering NSB, p. 127, (22) Bullock/Ox NSB, p. 127, (23) Sweet savor offering NSB, p. 128, (24) Meal offering NSB, p. 128, (25) Peace offering NSB, p. 129, (26) Sin offering NSB, p. 130, (27) Slain a live bird of Lev 14:4 NSB, p. 144, (28) earthen vessel of Lev 14:5 NSB, p. 144, (29) living goat of Lev 16:5 NSB, p. 147, (30) Feast of First Fruits of Lev 23:10, NSB, p. 157, (31) Boaz NSB, p. 161, and (32) Nazarite NSB, p. 175.

63 NSB, p. 705.

64 The church is considered a "parenthesis," "an unforeseen age," not even within the purview of the Old Testament. Walvoord, *Millennial Kingdom*, pp. 231, 247; Chafer in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 93 (1936):404.

65 Erickson, *Christian Theology* p. 1163.

66 NSB, Gen 2:23, p. 6.

67 NSB, Gen 21:3, p. 30.

68 NSB, Gen 24:1, p. 34.

69 NSB, Exod 259, p. 101.

70 NSB, Exod 28:1, p. 106.

71 NSB, Lev. 23:17, p. 157.

72 NSB, Song of Solomon, p. 706.

73 George N. H. Peters, *The Theocratic Kingdom*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1952), 1:212.

74 A few examples include Sarah as a type of grace NSB, p. 30, unnamed servant (Gen 24:1) as a type of the Holy Spirit NSB, p. 34, Asenath (Gen 41:45) as a type of the church NSB, p. 59, rods becoming serpents as symbols of Satan NSB, pp. 78-79, manna as a type of Christ's humiliation, giving His flesh that believer's may have life, NSB, p. 91.

75 Allis, *Prophecy and the Church*, p. 21.

76 We have already noted how one of the three methods of interpreting the Song of Solomon is allegorical, and that Ryrie opposed the allegorical method.

77 Leonhard Goppelt, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, Editors, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Translator and Editor, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans), 8:246-259; Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Types Structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), pp. 15-111; John E. Alsup, "Typology," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, David Noel Freedman, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:682-685; Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy. Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), pp. 35-59, and Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), pp. 163-164.

78 Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), p. 27.

79 Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, p. 27.

80 J. Barton Payne, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy, The Complete Guide to Scriptural Predictions and Their Fulfillment* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973), p. 388. "Dispensational writers commonly take Dan 9:27 as separated from, and subsequent to, v. 26 rather than as an explanation of it; and the subject who confirms the testament (or covenant) is held to be the prince of v. 26, meaning the Antichrist. Serious problems, however, beset such a reconstruction. These problems include (1) no interval between the 69 and 1 are hinted at in Scripture, (2) "it assumes an unprecedented covenant-making by the

Anti-Christ" with no hint of such in Scripture, and (3) "it transforms a past prince of Rome into a future deputy of the devil," Payne, p. 389.

81 See the forthcoming study by Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Plural of the Term for 'Weeks' in Daniel 9:24," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (1993).

82 Allis, *Prophecy and the Church*, p. 118.

83 (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1945).

84 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.)

85 Ibid.

86 (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.)

87 (Wm. B. Eerdmans.)

88 (London: S.P.C.K.)

89 (Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.)

90 (Wm. B. Eerdmans.)

91 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.)

92 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.)

93 Bruce K. Walke, in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church. The Search for Definition*, eds. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), p. 353.

94 Ibid.

95 I have read LaRondelle's book more than once, and gained many insights behind ideas presented in this article. The book helped launch me some time ago into an in-depth study into Biblical and Dispensational and non-Dispensational sources relative to the topic. For this I am indebted to Hans LaRondelle.

96 For further reading on this question, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "Israel in Bible Prophecy," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 3/1 (1992): 120-155.

97 The modern state of Israel is considered "the great sign." Alexander Wachtel, "Why Did the Jews Have to Return to Israel?" in *Prophecy in the Making*, Carl F. H. Henry, ed. (Illinois: Creation House, 1971), p. 158. Walvoord, *ibid*, p. 341: "God's principal sign" It is the "paramount prophetic sign," and "most important prophetic sign" of Christ's imminent return according to Hal Lindsey, with C. C. Carlson, *The Great Late Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1974), pp. 43, 57.

98 Robert L. Evans, *The Jew in the Plan of God* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Inc., 1950), p. 176.

99 NSB, p. 251.

100 For example, the following (note the order or sequence) "restored (to land) and converted" NSB, pp. 716, 747, 974, parenthesis supplied, "a partial restoration of Israel to the land in unbelief has already taken place in accordance with prophecy" NSB, p. 446. No biblical evidence is given. There is none. See Deut 28.

101 Cf. Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 577, *idem*, *Great Controversy*, p. 19.

102 I agree with DeCaro, *Israel Today: Fulfillment of Prophecy?*: p. 21: "Any return to the land would be predicated upon the same conditions necessary to retain possession of the land—faith, obedience, and covenant renewal."

103 "The return in unbelief notion was not in the theology of the prophets, neither is it consistent with the whole of the biblical context" (DeCaro, p. 32). Alexander Wachtel, *Prophecy in the Making*, p. 152: misses this fact. He claims that the return in Deuteronomy. . . is precipitated by repentance. . . In Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel the return is precipitated by the pardoning act of God."

104 DeCaro, *Israel Today: Fulfillment of Prophecy?*, p. 35.

105 Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, p. 177.

106 Walvoord, *Armageddon, Oil and the Middle East* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1990), p. 66, considers the return of Israel to Palestine as "one of the greatest miracles of world history" He further believes that "the history of Israel since 1948 is a remarkable record of divine providence as God has miraculously preserved Israel, in spite of her unbelief in Christ. . ." (p. 32). Such a preservation in unbelief is contrary to the biblical history between God and Israel in the Old Testament. Walvoord is inconsistent in holding

to the conditions (repentance, Deut 30:2-3, see footnote 106) for returning to the land with the unconditional land promise, (p. 69). These positions are mutually exclusive.

107 Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom*, p. 182 (parenthesis supplied).

108 Wachtel, "Why Did the Jews Have to Return to Israel," pp. 157-158.

109 Walvoord in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 103 (1946) 21, turns the Biblical data upside down, and calls this a literal interpretation. For example, instead of the condition for the return of the land to be a return to God, he says, "The fulfillment of the new covenant is conditioned on the regathering of Israel from their world-wide dispersion. . ."

110 Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy. Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 6A, (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991), p. 184.

111 See *NSB*, p. 1322. In comment on Rev 21:2, the *NSB* says, "The new Jerusalem is the dwelling place throughout eternity for the saints of all ages and fulfills the hope of Abraham for the heavenly city, Heb 11:10-16; cf. Heb 12:22-24." *NSB*, p. 1375. The implications of this fact are never spelled out or taken seriously.

112 George E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom, The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (London: S. P. C. K., 1966), p. 126.

113 Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom*, p. 21.

114 Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom*, p. 162.

115 John Bright, *The Kingdom of God. The Biblical Concept and its Meaning for the Church* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), p. 197.

116 Calvary is Christ's last word about Israel in His human history, although later words He gave the Holy Spirit in the New Testament (John 16:12-14).

117 Lewis Chafer, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 93 (1936): p. 403, says, "The rejection of the divine offer at Kadesh corresponds to the rejection of the King." He concludes that just as Israel entered the land forty years later, so "Israel will yet be regathered into her own land. . ."

118 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 21: "When Christ should hang upon the cross of Calvary, Israel's day as a nation favored and blessed of God would be ended."

119 For those believing, the church is a continuation of Israel. Chafer asks a series of questions, including "why the rent veil?" Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 1:xix. This reveals that Chafer did not understand the significance of this act.

120 Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, pp. 756-757.

121 Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, eds, *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church. The Search for Definition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992) (afterwards cited as *DIAC*).

122 According to a report given to this writer by Darrell Bock, one of the editors of *DIAC*, after presenting a paper at the Adventist Theological Society meeting, November 20, 1992, Airport Hilton, San Francisco. However, I asked Dr. Bock if they ever planned to put out a revised edition of the popular *New Scofield Study Bible* incorporating the advance positions taken in their book. He did not believe they would. If Dispensationalists continue to look to the *NSB* as their Bible, one wonders what impact Progressive Dispensationalists will have on them in the long run. It is significant that John F. Walvoord updated his *Armageddon, Oil and the Middle East Crisis* (1974, 1976) in 1990 at the time of the Gulf War without changing any of the traditional Dispensational views. The cover claims that over one million copies are in print. One wonders how many of these readers have been affected by Progressive Dispensationalism? This is why I have presented traditional Dispensational thinking in this article, as it still remains a formidable challenge despite the changes made by Progressive Dispensationalists.

123 *DIAC*, p. 379, cf. p. 15.

124 *DIAC*, p. 15.

125 *DIAC*, p. 33.

126 For example, *DIAC*, pp. 46-51, 224.

127 *DIAC*, pp. 253-254.

128 *DIAC*, p. 58.

129 *DIAC*, pp. 39-43.

130 *DIAC*, pp. 46-55.

131 *DIAC*, p. 91.

132 *DIAC*, pp. 93-97.

133 *DIAC*, pp. 303.

134 *DIAC*, p. 224.

135 In his response found in *DIAC*, p. 373.

136 *DIAC*, p. 385.

137 Progressive Dispensationalists believe that God's kingdom comes in three stages, inaugurated at Christ's first advent, the millennial phase to begin at Christ's second advent, and the third phase will be the eternal reign, *DIAC*, pp. 290-291. They believe in a "greater continuity between the Millennium and the eternal kingdom" (*DIAC*, p. 383) and that at His second advent Christ "will do all that the prophets of the Old Testament promised," (*DIAC*, p. 66). Hence they look for a Millennium with special significance for Israel. Concerning the land promise they ask, "If Christ reigns from *Israel* and has authority over the whole earth, does this not solve the question about the land promised to *Israel*?" (*DIAC*, p. 390).

138 In *DIAC* Old Testament passages of the eternal state are read into the Millennium (see p. 284), in a similar way to imposing Old Testament prophecies about *Israel* onto the Millennium (see p. 392).

139 See Joel Badina, "The Millennium," *Symposium on Revelation*, 2 vols., Frank B. Holbrook, ed. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1992), 2:240, 241.

140 See also William H. Shea, "The Parallel Literary Structure of Revelation 12 and 20," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 23 (1985):37-54.