

New Testament Interpretations
of
Old Testament Prophecies
of the
Kingdom

2000

JAMES D. BALES

**THE NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION
OF
OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES
OF
THE KINGDOM**

TO

**Billy Mattox, a humble Christian who is
always willing to serve.**

The New Testament Interpretation of Old Testament Prophecies of The Kingdom

James D. Bales, Ph.D.

HEAD OF THE BIBLE DEPARTMENT
HARDING COLLEGE

“For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, *nor yet the voice of the prophets which are read every sabbath day*, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.” (Acts 13:27)

THE HARDING COLLEGE PRESS, SEARCY, ARKANSAS
1950

CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	ix
I CHRIST'S WORK SPIRITUAL AND HIS CROSS NECESSARY	1
II THE PERSON AND THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST	11
III THE PROPHETS DID NOT ALWAYS SPEAK IN THE SAME MANNER	17
IV TYPES AND THE INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY	27
V SOME LITERALISM IS UNSCRIPTURAL	41
VI PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS WHICH HELP US TO INTERPRET PROPHECY	57
VII PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS	77
VIII PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS WHICH HELP US INTERPRET PROPHECY	87
IX THE PROPHECY OF JEREMIAH .	107
X THE THRONE OF DAVID	121
XI THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID	149
XII WHY NO NEW TESTAMENT PROPHECIES OF A JEWISH KINGDOM	173

PREFACE

The theme treated in this volume is of vital importance and also a matter of keen current interest among Christian people. The approach of the author is factual and logical rather than emotional. Since the Gospel is factual and since the plan of salvation is logical and the road to eternal life straight, a cool logical study of the prophecies will be appreciated by all real Bible students.

Dr. James D. Bales, the author, has made a special study of this subject during the past ten years. He has brought to bear in this study the same logical thinking that has brought him victoriously through numerous debates. Yet, he has written with that same familiar freedom that characterizes his numerous articles in our religious papers and which makes his work so readable.

As Head of the Bible Department at Harding College, Dr. Bales enjoys the highest measure of confidence from faculty and students. As one who appreciates his leadership at Harding College and his effective service to the brotherhood as a whole, I take real pleasure in commending to Bible students everywhere the careful reading of this volume and a careful consideration of the logical conclusions Dr. Bales has drawn and which to me seem inescapable.

August 3, 1950

George S. Benson
President, Harding College

INTRODUCTION

Believers differ concerning some of the prophecies of the Old Testament. In the main their disagreement is centered in the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament. There are some who maintain that these prophecies have found, or are finding, fulfillment in the kingdom of God's dear Son which is revealed in the New Testament. There are others who claim that they do not therein find their fulfillment, but that they will be fulfilled when Christ comes again. Christ, they maintain, will establish on earth, sometime after His second advent, a kingdom in which the Old Testament kingdom prophecies will find their fulfillment.

The author is convinced that this controversy cannot be settled until the fundamental question of the interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies is investigated. Once one settles the principles on which these prophecies are to be interpreted the other issues are practically settled. At least, one is then in the position to settle them properly.

The aim of this book is to investigate the principles of the interpretation of prophecy at which one will arrive if he will investigate the way in which the New Testament applies Old Testament prophecies.

CHAPTER I
CHRIST'S WORK SPIRITUAL AND
HIS CROSS NECESSARY

Before His birth, and during the early part of His ministry, it was emphasized that Christ came to do a spiritual work, and that the cross was before Him from the very beginning. *Any theory of the interpretation of prophecy which does not take these two facts into consideration is unscriptural.* Any theory which teaches that the first part of Christ's personal ministry announced a kingdom in which Christ was to receive a crown, without first being rejected and crucified, is false.

The very first pages of the New Testament emphasize that the nature of the kingdom of God is spiritual. There is, throughout the Gospels, an enlargement on its nature, a fuller portrayal of its characteristics, but there is no change in essence of the nature of the kingdom which was preached as "at hand" by Christ and the kingdom which is set forth in the parables and in the Lord's teaching thereafter.

1. The Promised Messiah to Do a Spiritual Work (Matt. 1:21)

"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. 1:21). This the angel of the Lord told Joseph in order that he might not fear to take Mary as his wife. *Salvation from sin* was evidently declared, from the very first and thus long before His personal ministry, as the essence of His work; and thus it would constitute the heart of His message. *Since His fundamental work was to save His people from their sins, it follows that the nature of the kingdom, which He came to establish, would be in harmony with the purpose for which He came.* His purpose is also stated clearly by the writer of Hebrews. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he

appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . . So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many . . ." (Heb. 9:24-28). It is very clear that the cross was involved in the purpose of His coming. He came to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. He came, in other words, to be made the offering for sin. This is simply a more detailed statement, than that given by Matthew, concerning the purpose of Christ's coming. Matthew tells us that He came to save His people, and Hebrews tells us how He was to do this, i.e. through the sacrifice of Himself.

This makes it clear that the cross was before Christ from the beginning. How wrong then, are those individuals who maintain that if Israel had accepted Christ that He would have established His kingdom and that the cross would not have taken place. There may not be many who will say that the cross would not have taken place, but some have said it. And it seems to the author that it is the logical conclusion from the idea that Christ came to earth to establish a kingdom in which Israel would have been given political freedom and rule, and in which Christ would have ruled on the literal throne of David on earth. *If this was the purpose of His first coming, then how could it be that His purpose was to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself ?*

Richard Watson, in his commentary, well remarked on this verse: "He does not say, according to the expectation of the Jews, he shall save his people *Israel* from their Gentile *enemies*; but indefinitely, *his people*, all who believe on him, whether Jew or Gentile; and that not from temporal calamity or degradation, but *from their sins*. Thus, from the beginning, was the notion of a political Messiah excluded from the minds of Joseph and Mary. The very name of our Lord, given by divine command, lays a firm foundation for the trust of the guilty; and opens the most glorious hope to man, even that of salvation from the guilt and penalty, from the power and pollution, of sin in this life, and beyond it a resurrection from the dead, immortality, and eternal felicity."

Since Christ came to make possible the establishment of His kingdom, and since He came to save men from sin through the sacrifice of Himself, it should be clear that the spiritual nature of His work has important bearing on the nature of the kingdom.

2. *The New Birth Necessary in Order to Enter the Kingdom*

"There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him,

Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto Him, How can a man be born when he is old? Jesus answered. . Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:1-5).

Nicodemus was a Jew. He was a very religious Jew. But Nicodemus, and all the rest of the Jews, would have to be born again in order to enter into the kingdom of God. *The first birth, even when that birth was of Israel to whom the promises were given, did not count.* This proves that the nature of the kingdom was spiritual. It was not to be entered just because one was of a certain nation. A fleshly birth, no matter of whose flesh, did not put one into the kingdom. A spiritual birth had to take place. Since a spiritual birth was necessary to enter the kingdom it is obvious that it was not a national but a spiritual kingdom.

It is also evident that, as other scriptures show, a Gentile can enter into the kingdom by virtue of the new birth. Then, too, the Gentile is a man who can be born again, and those born again enter it. Thus it is that the kingdom is for Gentiles as well as Jews, but not only that, but for Gentiles on the same basis as Jews. A Jew is to be excluded if he was not born again, but a Gentile will be included if he is born again. So with reference to the kingdom neither Jew nor Gentile could enter except as they were "born-again" individuals.

3. The Kingdom Not to be Local, but Universal

"The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John 4:19-24).

As long as the Old Covenant system was in force certain worship had to center in Jerusalem. Thus the Jews were right about it. They knew what they worshipped, and the Samaritans were wrong about it, for they did not know what they worshipped.

The time was coming, however, when it would be changed and worship would not be in Jerusalem or in the mountain. This did not mean, of course, that none would worship in these literal places, for the disciples later worshipped in Jerusalem (Acts 2:42-47). However, the city of Jerusalem was not to be a center of worship as it had been. It would be neither in the mountain nor in Jerusalem, in that it would not be confined to these places. It would be anywhere and everywhere that men worshipped in spirit and in truth.

By the statement "now is" Jesus did not mean that at that very moment Jerusalem ceased to be the center of worship. That hour *cometh*. It "now is" in the sense that it was the period of time in which Jerusalem would cease to be the sacred city, and the temple worship would cease to be the system of worship for God's people. But though it was the period of time, the actual cessation of worship in Jerusalem did not take place during Jesus' personal ministry. For He and His disciples went there to worship. He enjoined on His disciples the observation of the law of Moses (Matt. 23:1-3); and the old covenant could not have been taken away, and the new established, before His death (Col. 2:14-17; Heb. 9:15-17).

The worship in spirit and in truth is in *contrast* with the worship in Jerusalem. The hour was coming when they would not worship in Jerusalem (4:21), but when the true worshippers shall worship the Father "in spirit and in truth" (4:23). This does not mean according to the Spirit's teaching and sincerity. For such worship had to take place even under the Old Testament in Jerusalem. God never tolerated insincerity and the traditions of men. Between Old Testament and New Testament worship there is no contrast on these scores. In what sense of "spirit and truth" is there a contrast between the Old and New Testaments? Let us remember that John records that truth came through Christ, but the law through Moses (John 1:17). But what Moses taught was the truth of God. What then does this mean? The Old Testament worship was filled with carnal ordinances (Heb. 9:9-10). These were to last only until the time of reformation. The New Testament worship is a spiritual system without the elaborate ritualism and ceremony of the Old Testament system. Furthermore, the Old Testament system was not the truth, in the sense that it was not the reality. It was a system of shadows, or types; while the New Testament is the true, or the very image. (Heb. 9:23-24; 10:1).

Thus we see that Jesus announced the end of the Old Covenant system. Worship would not be in Jerusalem, but everywhere men called on God in spirit and in truth. This announcement, coupled

with other scriptures, tells us two things concerning the nature of the kingdom and the interpretation of the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament. *First*, the cross was necessary. Since it was through the cross that Jesus took away the law (Eph. 2:11-17; Col. 2:14-17; Heb. 9:15-17), it is evident that worship could not cease in Jerusalem, and become universal, until the old law which commanded the Jerusalem worship had been taken out of the way. *Second*, there are Old Testament prophecies, as will be brought out in the chapter as to where premillennialist literalism leads, which indicates that worship, in the days of the Messiah's kingdom, was to be in Jerusalem, and that the temple and the sacrifices would be restored. But this could not be literally accomplished, since Jesus shows that Jerusalem was to cease to be the sacred place. And let us remember that this change is taught *before* the time came when some premillennialists insist that a change took place in the kingdom message because Israel was rejecting the kingdom Jesus and John had announced as at hand.

4. *John the Baptist's Statement About the Nature of the Kingdom*

John's teaching on the nature of the kingdom indicates that the kingdom prophesied by the Old Testament prophets was to be spiritual in its nature. This leads one to raise the question, concerning the Old Testament predictions of the kingdom, as to whether or not literal Israel was not sometimes used in prophecies which pointed forward to spiritual Israel of which literal Israel was a type.

"How does he set about his work of introducing the Kingdom? 'Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' This was called preparing the way of the Lord, filling the valleys, bringing low the mountains, straightening the paths, and making the rough places smooth. Never before nor since did a forerunner prepare after this fashion for the coming of a king. No braying of trumpets, no flying of flags, no holiday processions of the people. The one demand is clean hearts, followed by clean lives. 'Repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance.' It looks as if the King meant to sway His sceptre over the hearts, the inner lives, of the people.

"More remarkable still is John's announcement: 'Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!' He introduces the Messianic king as the Lamb of God whose mission is to take away the sin of the world. It still looks as if the King were concerned chiefly with the inner life of His subjects. Indeed Matthew tells us that His very name indicates that He was coming to 'save his people from their sins.' " (R. C. Reed, *What is the Kingdom of God?* Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, pp. 52-53).

The spiritual nature of the kingdom is emphasized since men must repent as a preparation for their reception of the kingdom.

Its spiritual nature is also emphasized in that John clearly stated that *no man was to be given a place in the kingdom just because he was of literal Israel*. To the Pharisees and Sadducees he said: "And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matt. 3:9). This statement came after John's statements to them to "bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (3:8). *They* needed to repent. Then he warned them lest they should think that they did not need to repent in order to prepare for the kingdom since they were Abraham's literal seed. They were not to **depend on their ancestry, or their nationality. In other words, men would not be given a place in the kingdom simply because they were Israelites according to the flesh. One had to meet spiritual qualifications in order to be prepared for its coming. In other words, literal Israel did not have a place in the kingdom of God just because she was literal Israel. The kingdom would not be given to her just because she was literal Israel. If all of Israel failed to repent then all of literal Israel would be left out of the kingdom of God. As a matter of fact, all but a remnant was rejected. (Rom. 11:5).**

But, one may ask, if all of literal Israel did not repent would not that make it impossible for the kingdom prophecies to be fulfilled? Not at all, for it has not been proved that the prophecies had reference to literal Israel instead of spiritual Israel, which spiritual Israel would include any of literal Israel who repented, and anyone else who repented. In other words, whoever was in it would be in it because of his spiritual condition. Furthermore, did not John indicate that the failure of the Pharisees and Sadducees to repent would not keep God from fulfilling His promise to Abraham's seed? "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matt. 3:9). In other words, God was not limited to Abraham's literal seed but was able to provide a seed of Abraham otherwise. (See the Chapter on Romans).

It is thus evident that John preached the kingdom to be spiritual in its nature, and that national groups *as such* have no place in it.

It may be said that these statements of John have nothing to do with the interpretation of prophecy, and thus have nothing to do with how one should interpret the prophecies of the kingdom of heaven, predicted by the Old Testament prophets. A second thought, however, will show the bearing of these statements on the interpretation of prophecy. John was preaching that *the kingdom of heaven*

was at hand (Matt. 3:2). All Bible-believing scholars realize that the kingdom of which John spoke was the kingdom which had been predicted by the prophets, and to whose establishment the Jews looked forward—although they misunderstood its nature as can be shown. Thus John is teaching that the kingdom which was predicted was to be spiritual in its nature and was not to embrace national groups as such. It is evident, therefore, that these two facts must be taken into consideration in deciding what kind of kingdom the prophets had predicted. Of what type of kingdom did the prophets speak? Did they speak of a national one? Not at all, in the answer of John. Thus those who so interpret the prophets misinterpret them. Those who think that the kingdom prophecies cannot be fulfilled unless literal Israel has a kingdom over which Christ rules are out of harmony with John the Baptist who told certain of the children of Israel, those who considered themselves the most religious Israelites as well as the materialists among them, that God was not dependent on them to find children of Abraham. God did not have to include them in the kingdom in order to establish it, and, furthermore, they would experience wrath, unless they repented and brought forth fruits worthy of repentance.

5. *Christ's Rejection Implied Long Before He Began His Personal Ministry*

After Herod's death Jesus was brought out of Egypt, and into Nazareth. Christ dwelt with his people in Nazareth "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene." (Matt. 2:23). This term, we know, was a term of reproach. When Philip found Nathaniel he told him that "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (John 1:45-46).

"No such passage, as Matt. 2:23, occurs in the Old Testament, nor can Matthew refer to any particular text, because he does not refer to any particular prophet; for his phrase is, 'that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by *the prophets*', in the plural; so that something was thus accomplished in Christ, to which all the prophets gave concurrent testimony. Now it is plain that they all agree that he should be 'despised' as well as 'rejected' of men; that he should be an object of contumely and reproach, and therefore, as Whitby well remarks, 'the angel sent him to this contemptible place, that he might have a name of infamy put upon him.' He shall be called mean and contemptible, as the root of the word signifies, as well as separated. How Nazareth was esteemed, we learn from the words

of the mild Nathanael,— ‘Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?’—and the title Nazarene has been by Jews, and other enemies, always given in contempt to our Savior and his disciples.’” (Richard Watson, *Commentary on Matthew*, p. 42).

This makes it clear that it was realized long before his personal ministry that all would not accept Jesus Christ. He was to be despised and rejected of men, instead of being royally received by all of Israel. A term of contempt and reproach would be put on Him. This being true, whatever kingdom Jesus announced as at hand, when He began His public ministry, must have been one whose nature did not in any way imply that He would not be treated with contempt. Those whose interpretation imply that He would not be treated with contempt, if He had established the kingdom which He proclaimed as at hand, are evidently misinformed. Jesus did not change the nature of the kingdom message, beginning with the parables, when Israel began to reject Him, as some maintain. Instead it has been shown that from the beginning it was taught that He would be considered with contempt, and that thus all Israel would not accept Him and His kingdom message.

6. John Announced Jesus' Death

John the Baptist, the forerunner of the Lord Jesus Christ, made a statement concerning Jesus Christ which indicated that Jesus would die for the sins of the world. “And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God.” (John 1:36). “ . . . John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” (John 1:29). John’s use of the term “Lamb”, and the fact that He would take away the sins of the world, indicate Christ’s death as our sin offering. Lambs were used in the Jewish sacrifices, not only as the passover (Exod. 12:5), but in the daily sacrifice (Exodus. 29:38; Lev. 1:10), or the burnt-offering; and in the peace-offering (Lev. 3:7), and in the sin-offering (Lev. 4:32). Thus the ideas of the “Lamb” and the taking away the sins indicate death and sacrifice. Christ, we know, is the lamb without spot or blemish (I Pet. 1:19). As the Lamb offered He taketh away sin. *He could not take away sins just as prophet, priest, or king.* To take away sins He had also to act in His capacity as the Lamb, as the sin-offering. This makes it evident that His first coming had to do not only with His capacity as prophet, priest, and king, but also with His capacity as the sacrifice for sins. In other words, *His first coming had to do with His death also, and this was clearly implied from the beginning.* As Hebrews 9:26 put it: “ . . . now once in the end of

the world hath *he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*" The end of the world here evidently referred to the end of the Jewish age or world. Thus Christ's first coming was definitely related from the beginning to His being the sin-offering for mankind. It is clear that God gave His only begotten Son to save believers (John 3:16), not only in that He sent Him to earth, but that He gave Him to die as the Lamb of God, the Lamb which God has provided, for the sins of the world.

Thus we see how wrong are those individuals who maintain that if the kingdom, which John and Jesus had preached as at hand, had been accepted by Israel and established, that Christ would have lived on earth as king on David's throne, and not have suffered rejection and the cross. Not all premillennialists believe this, but here or there one finds one that does. All of them, however, can learn from John's statement about the Lamb that the nature of the kingdom which John proclaimed as at hand was such that it took into consideration the fact that Christ came to die for man's sins.

We must conclude that the kingdom was one which was spiritual in its nature, and that its nature took into consideration the fact that Christ would be rejected and die. *The cross had to come before the crown.*

CHAPTER II

THE PERSON AND THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

An examination of the prophecies concerning the person and work of John the Baptist, and a consideration of his preaching, shows that not all prophecy is to be interpreted literally, but that some of it is to be interpreted typically. The New Testament shows that Elijah was a type of John, and that John the anti-type was predicted under the name of the type, Elijah. The language of the type was used in prophecy to designate the anti-type. *He who does not believe the New Testament interpretation of the coming and work of John does not believe the New Testament.* If he believes the Old Testament, but rejects the New Testament interpretation of this Old Testament prophecy, then he must believe that the literal Elijah is yet to come. The Latter Day Saints, for example, show their inconsistency when they claim to believe the New Testament, but do not believe that John fulfilled the prophecy concerning the coming of Elijah.

Let us now consider the predictions and the New Testament interpretations.

1. The Old Testament Prediction

“Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.” (Malachi 4:5-6).

2. Some Jews Were Evidently Expecting the Literal Elijah

“And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not.” (John 1:19-21). Some thought that perhaps Jesus was Elias. (Matt. 16:14, Mk. 6:15). Some of Jesus’ disciples raised a question which indicated that the scribes thought there must be the return of the literal Elias,

before Christ could come, and their question seems to imply that the scribes were saying that since Elijah had not yet come that the Christ could not be here yet, and that therefore Jesus was not the Christ. "And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that Elias must first come?" (Mk. 9:11).

John denied that he was Elijah, but Jesus said: "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, *which was for to come.*" (Matt. 11:14). John was the Elijah who was predicted, but he was not the literal Elijah. The Jews evidently meant was he the literal Elijah, and he was not. So he answered them, in John 1:21, according to the meaning of their question, according to what they had in mind. He was not the Elijah whom they meant, although he was the one whom the prophet Malachi had meant.

3. *John Was the Elijah Who Was Predicted*

"And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed, likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of *John the Baptist.*" (Matt. 17:10-13). "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." (Matt. 11:13-15).

Of John, the angel said, "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." (Lk. 1:17).

Thus it is evident that those Jews who expected the literal Elijah were wrong, and they thus looked in vain for the literal Elijah.

Would it not be worthwhile for premillennialists today to study seriously the question as to whether or not those prophecies, which they think prove that Christ will reign on a literal throne in Jerusalem over literal Israel, are given a typical interpretation by the New Testament?

4. *All of John's Work Was Not Expressed in Literal Language in Prophecy*

. . . The word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about Jordan,

preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; as it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God." (Lk. 3:2-6; compare Matt. 3:3).

It is obvious that no believer in New Testament times thought that John was a contractor who excavated. He did not take the tools of that day and fill the valleys and bring low the hills and the mountains. Symbolism is evidently involved in the prediction of his work. Thus we have scriptural authority for maintaining that some of the prophecies contained some symbolical language. This does not mean, of course, that everything was symbolical or that we must arbitrarily make symbolical any language which we desire to so make.

"These words (Matt. 3:3) are supposed by some to have been first spoken of the return of the Jews from the captivity of Babylon, through the desert places which separated the two countries. Bishop Lowth takes this view, but allows that under the emblem of that deliverance a redemption of an infinitely more glorious nature was shadowed out, and that the evangelists, with the greatest propriety, apply the words to the opening of the gospel dispensation by John the Baptist. But . . . whoever reads the section in which the passage in question stands, and which obviously comprehends the first eleven verses of the fortieth chapter of the same book, will perceive that it is as distinct and perfect a portion of prophecy, and possesses as complete a unity as the former, and has no internal marks of reference whatever to any other event beside that personal appearance of the Messiah, to be introduced by his harbinger. Bishop Lowth opens the passage with his usual taste: 'The prophet hears a voice giving orders by solemn proclamation, to prepare the way of the Lord in the wilderness, to remove all obstructions before Jehovah marching through the desert; the idea being taken from the practice of eastern monarchs, who sent harbingers before them to prepare all things for their passage, and pioneers to open the passes, to level the ways, and to remove impediments.' But what application there is in this to the return of the Jews from Babylon, it is impossible to conceive. Had they marched from Babylon, as from Egypt, with the visible cloud of the divine presence among them, there would then have been an adaptation in the terms of the prophecy to the event; 'Jehovah' would then have had 'his way in the wilderness;' but they returned in scattered parties, without pomp, and especially without any visible presence of the Lord. Isaiah, however, expressly says, that the voice cries, 'Prepare the way of the

Lord;' and the passage which St. Matthew quotes with brevity, declares that 'the glory of the Lord should be revealed, and that all flesh should see it.' It is clear, therefore, that it has no application to the return of the Jews, and refers solely to those events to which the evangelists so explicitly apply it. John the Baptist was '*the voice*' or herald, and Jesus was the JEHOVAH (the Lord, J. D. B.) whose personal appearance as 'God manifest in the flesh,' and subsequent glorious manifestation, he proclaimed and prepared.

"This mission of John, as the harbinger of our Lord, exhibits another instance of the fulfillment of those prophecies to which St. Matthew, as writing first especially to the Jews, directed their attention more frequently than the other evangelists. At the same time the accomplishment of a prophecy which borrows its terms from the magnificence of eastern monarchs, who were preceded by heralds, and before whom valleys were exalted and hills leveled, in a manner so manifestly spiritual, and turns the attention so absolutely from external to moral grandeur, sufficiently reproves those who contend too strenuously for the literal accomplishment of the sayings of the ancient prophets, and thereby often fall into a Jewish mode of interpreting them. Prophecy has its peculiar imagery, its own appropriate dress of metaphor and allegory, which must not be overlooked. Here, the monarch is Christ, but his majesty is in his doctrine, his character, and his works. The herald, too, is a man in rough raiment, issuing from the wild solitudes in which he had been trained to converse with God, to rouse a slumbering people by urging their immediate repentance upon pain of imminent judgments; and the leveling of hills and valleys, is that preparation of the heart for the doctrine of Christ which consists in contrition and humility. That the Baptist was a powerful preacher, the immense number of persons who flocked to his baptism, confessing their sins, is a sufficient proof; that he was a successful one, in his special office of 'preparing the way of the Lord,' appears from this, that several of the apostles, and others of the early disciples of Christ, had been previously the disciples of John; and the effect of his preaching was, no doubt, not only to prepare them, but multitudes of the Jews, to receive the gospel, both in Judea and in other places into which his disciples carried his doctrine; for of this the evangelical history contains many indications." (Watson, *An Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark*, pp. 44, 45).

"Lightfoot has showed from the Rabbinical writings, that the Jews themselves have held, and still hold, that repentance should precede the coming of Messiah." (*Ibid.*, p. 46).

5. *Did the Jews Argue Thusly?*

When one takes the typical interpretation of some of the Old Testament prophecies which relate to the kingdom, there are those who will say: "Did not God mean what He said? Did not God say what He meant? How can you be bold enough to change what is written?" Perhaps that is the kind of argument some of the Jews used with reference to whether or not John was Elijah. The premillennialists need to go to Malachi's prophecy and ask these questions of themselves, and then see how their attitude with reference to the kingdom prophecies would lead them to reject John as being the Elijah who was predicted.

Surely, God meant what He said. But in some cases He clothed His statements in the language of the type when the anti-type was meant, as well as in symbols.

The question, then, is not whether those who reject the premillennial interpretation are saying that God did not mean what He said, etc. It must be granted that there are prophecies which are clothed in the language of types and of symbols. The only issue, then, is whether or not the prophecies of the Messiah's kingdom are clothed in the language of types and symbols in some instances, and, if so, which prophecies are so clothed? One should be able to investigate this question without others trying to head off all investigation by saying: "Don't you believe that God said what He meant, etc.?"

CHAPTER III

THE PROPHETS DID NOT ALWAYS SPEAK IN THE SAME MANNER

Those who maintain that the kingdom prophecies must all be interpreted literally need to consider the fact that the prophets did not always deliver their messages in the same manner. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son. " (Heb. 1:1-2).

The speaking of the prophets was "literally: 'In many parts, and in many ways;' referring to the various revelations at different times, and the various modes in which they were given." (Francis S. Sampson, *A Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York: Robert Carter and Bros., 1860, p. 42). To this agrees Robert Milligan: "The word that is here rendered, 'at sundry times' means properly in many parts. It refers to the well known fact, that God's plan of mercy through Jesus Christ was revealed to the ancients gradually and in fragments." (*Commentary on Hebrews*. Dallas, Texas: Eugene S. Smith, n. d., p. 48).

Joseph Bryant Rotherham commented: " 'In many parts;' intimating, what we otherwise know, that the most abiding truths of the ancient teachings were conveyed by a hint here, and then again—after a time—by another hint there: the disconnected hints being enigmatic for awhile, and needing to be collected with care and connected with skill, in order to decipher their meaning. That was one disadvantage 'of old.'

'In many ways;' in that the ancient teaching came through varieties of manner which, though invested with some charm and utility, yet had many drawbacks. At one time the revelation came by dream or vision, at another by symbolic action, at another by verbal communication. The speech of one prophet was florid and full; of another, plain, brief, abrupt. One prophet, dealing chiefly with current events and wants, only with momentary abruptness darted forth into the future; while his fellow, soaring aloft at once, saw the future in perspective like a vast landscape, his visions demand-

ing an instructed and cultured eye to decipher them. Sometimes several difficulties of manner clogged a single prediction. Nathan, to David, spake—one moment—as if of royal children needing chastisement, and—the next—as if of a Son who needed none. . . Such are some of the difficulties growing out of the ‘many ways’ of ancient Divine Speech in the prophets; and which—it is suggested by contrast—do not characterize the communications of the Son.” (*Studies in the Epistle to Hebrews*. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1906, pp. 24-25).

The statement in Hebrews 1:1 concerning the communication of God's word through the prophets in times past, enables us to draw two conclusions of importance in relation to the question of the interpretation of prophecy. First, since they did speak in many manners, one must take this into consideration in his interpretation of prophecy. In other words, he should not be disturbed to find, but should expect to find, that the language of prophecy is not all to be interpreted by the same rules of interpretation. One may expect to find not merely the literal descriptions of history, but also the presence of symbolism, and such like. Second, one must expect to find that the New Testament is clearer in its speakings concerning subjects of the New Testament period of time than Old Testament reference to the New Testament period of time. In other words, one would expect the teaching in the New Testament concerning the Messiah's present kingdom to be easier to grasp and understand than the teaching of the Old Testament on the same subject. One therefore would always accept the New Testament presentation of the application of prophecies, instead of what he thinks ought to be the interpretation of the prophecy. This, of course, should also follow from the fact that when one accepts the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament, he will therefore believe that when they applied a prophecy that they applied it properly and scripturally.

A study of the divers manners in which the prophets spoke leads to such conclusions as the following:

1. Some Prophecy Is History Written in Advance in the Language of Historical Narrative

There are illustrations of the fact that some prophecy is “pre-written history.” That is, the prophets sometimes spoke of future events in the literal, matter-of fact way that a historian would write of them after they had taken place. Samuel described in literal terms certain events which would occur in the life of Saul (I Sam. 10:3-6). Isaiah made some literal prophecies concerning Christ, such as Isaiah

53. Even there, however, some symbolism is evident, such as when he likened Christ unto a tender plant and a root out of dry ground.

There are other examples, but these will be sufficient for our purpose.

2. Symbols Are Sometimes Used by Prophets

Webster defines a symbol as: "The sign or representation of something moral or intellectual, by the images or properties of natural things; an emblem, a representation; as, the lion is the symbol of courage; the lamb is the symbol of meekness or patience." There are many symbols in the Bible.

Sometimes symbols are found in prophecies. Some of the prophecies were presented in vision. "Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond tree. Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it." (Jer. 1:11, 12). "The almond tree was the first to blossom—in fact, it seemed never to sleep—and consequently it was regarded as a symbol of wakefulness, or watchfulness." (D. R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics*. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, p. 354).

"And the word of the Lord came unto me the second time, saying what seest thou? And I said, I see a seething pot; and the face thereof is toward the north. Then the Lord said unto me, Out of the north an evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land." "A seething caldron, tilted so much as to enable a man to look into the mouth, would be a symbol of a thorough scalding. And the Lord uses it to show what was about to come upon them. The families of the kingdoms of the North should come and sit on the thrones at Jerusalem, and make war with the cities of Judah." (Dungan, *op. cit.*, p. 354. Jer. 1:13-14).

Dungan suggests some rules which will help us in understanding the meaning of the symbols.

"Rule 1. Many of the symbols have been interpreted, in whole or in part, by their authors. In such a case, we have nothing to do but accept the interpretation just as far as it goes.

Rule 2. Other symbols have been interpreted by other inspired authors. This, again, must stand as the interpretation.

Rule 3. Sometimes the symbol has been given in a manner that is difficult, but another writer or speaker has used the same illustration

in such a way that there is no doubt as to its meaning. In that case, that which is perspicuous must declare the meaning of that which is doubtful.

Rule 4. The names of symbols are to be understood literally. While they tell us what they saw and heard, we are to understand them as telling these things in the plainest and most direct manner possible. Many times, too, there is peculiar significance to be found in the etymology of the names or words employed. Hence the words used should be subjected to the same rules as if they were found in other compositions.

Rule 5. There must be found a resemblance, more or less clear, between the symbol and the thing signified. If this relation were not intimate, it is probable that the author would have selected some other.

Rule 6. The condition of those to whom the symbol was given must be known if possible, for the meaning which they would be most likely to get out of it is the meaning that the author intended to put into it." (*Ibid.*, pp. 356-357).

The question may arise in the minds of some as to why symbols are employed. Even though one may be unable to give a thoroughly satisfactory answer to this question it still remains a fact that such are employed. And one of the reasons that they seem strange to some is because they have not been more thorough students of the Bible. For those who study the Bible become acquainted with their usage. Symbols do several things. First, they may make the lesson more vivid. Second, they serve as object lessons which enable one to better remember the lesson. Third, it is often necessary for spiritual things to be presented under the form of symbols for otherwise we would be unable to form any conception of some of them. These symbols were usually drawn from things within their experiences. We today, of course, may in some cases have to study their background somewhat in order to better grasp the symbol. But truths must be taught in terms which the people understand. "The Old Testament prophets used the figures and circumstances with which the people were familiar in order to teach spiritual truths. They addressed a people accustomed to captivity and bondage from the earliest recorded point in this history, a people whose ruling passion was to possess and own their land, and regarded such a possession as the greatest blessing conceivable. It was, therefore, under this figure that the prophets had to describe the new heavens and the new earth. There the inhabitants should live in perfect peace and bliss. When the prophets would teach the eternal abolition of danger and fear from that state of existence it was convenient for

them to say, "No lion shall be there, no weapons of war shall be forged for human destruction, and even a little child shall be safe anywhere in the universe." This was the only way in which the Hebrews could understand anything of what God was preparing for His own people." (George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies* (Grand Rapids 6, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1948, p. 39). And yet, there were enough things said by the prophets to show the people that spiritual meanings were involved.

3. In Prophecy the Type is Sometimes Put for the Anti-type

The book of Hebrews shows us that some things in the Old Testament system were figures, patterns, or types of things under the New Testament. The Old Testament contained the shadow, while the New Testament contains the very image of the thing. This will be discussed in greater detail later, but it is here mentioned in order to indicate one of the divers manners in which the prophets spoke. As an example of this, turn to Ezek. 37:24 where David the type is used when Christ the anti-type is meant.

The question may be raised: How can one know in what manner a prophet is speaking? Can we ever be certain that we are right in treating a prophecy as literal instead of as typical? Or typical instead of as literal? The answer, which is elaborated in the following section, is: Christ and the New Testament interpretation furnish us with the answer. No prophecy should be interpreted in a way which is contrary to the New Testament interpretation or principles set forth in the New Testament. Then, too, "typical" interpretations must be accepted whenever wholesale literalism would make the prophecies contradict themselves.

Some will ask: Where will you stop with spiritualizing once you get started? How can one find a stopping place? In answer it is proper to return the question to the questioner, and then answer it. The questioner may be asked: First, where will you stop literalizing once you get started making literal interpretations? Will David the king in Ezek. 37:24 be literal David? If not, why does one stop before he goes that far with literalizing? Second, since the questioner admits that there are types and symbols in the Bible it is proper to ask him: Where will you stop with spiritualizing once you get started? Third, when these questions are answered the answer to his own question has been presented. One will spiritualize where the context and the rest of the Bible shows that he ought to spiritualize, and literalize in the place where the context and the rest of the Bible shows that it ought to be literalized.

4. *Christ and the Interpretation of Prophecy*

The difficulties in interpreting Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom, and in deciding whether or not the kingdom prophecies often used Israel simply as a type, can be eliminated in the main when it is realized the Christ and His inspired apostles are the final court of appeal in the interpretation of prophecies. When once it is shown that John the Baptist announced as at hand the kingdom prophesied by the Old Testament prophets, and that this kingdom announced by John is the one which Christ established through His apostles, the problem of the interpretation of the kingdom prophecies has been scripturally solved. It will then be seen that the kingdom prophesied by the Old Testament prophets was sometimes pictured, in the prophecies, under the figures and words which originally applied to fleshly Israel. Thus they would have to be interpreted as using Israel as a type of the kingdom of God's dear Son which the apostles established.

It may be objected that this would be unfair to the children of Israel who would naturally understand the prophets as speaking of a gloriously earthly kingdom in which fleshly Israel would occupy a central position. Israel, it may be further argued, does not accept the authority of Christ and thus such interpretations would not at all be plain to her.

The answer to this argument, once it is brought to the reader's attention, is in reality simple. Christians do not use those passages of the prophets, which are filled with typical language, to prove to Israel that Jesus is the Christ and that the kingdom now existing is that which was the subject of those prophecies. Instead, it is by other prophecies that we establish the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such passages as Isaiah 53 and many others establish the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus such as these are appealed to in order to show Israel that the Christ has already come.

The question of authority is fundamental, both with reference to the interpretation of prophecy and with reference to the declaration of new doctrine. (John 16:12-13). Once the authority is established it is to be hearkened to regardless of our past ideas or our opinions as to what certain prophecies "ought" to mean. And certain prophecies of the Old Testament, as well as the resurrection of Christ and other lines of evidence for His Messiahship, establish the authority of Christ. Thus to Him we must hearken in all things, including the interpretation of prophecy. We must also hearken to those whom He sent and who revealed, confirmed, and recorded the New Testament. All Old Testament prophecy must therefore be interpreted in the light

of New Testament teaching concerning these prophecies, the kingdom, and the future.

The principle which has been presented—that Christ is the final authority in these matters and His interpretations and teachings must be adhered to—is not something new but was announced by Moses centuries before Christ came. (“The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; *unto him ye shall hearken*; I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put *my words in his mouth*; and he shall *speak unto them all that I shall command him*. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will *not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name*, I will require it of him.” (Deut. 18:15-19). Christ is the prophet like unto Moses. (Acts 3:22, 23.) There is sufficient reason to accept His interpretations of Old Testament prophecies regardless of whether they were given by Him in His personal ministry or by the Spirit through the inspired men whom He sent to preach the gospel and confirm it. Everything that shows that He is the Christ shows that He must be hearkened to and thus shows that His interpretations of Old Testament prophecies are right. And since Israel has enough evidence to accept Christ, if she will listen, it is not unfair to her that one must ultimately turn to Christ Himself for the proper interpretation of *some* of the Old Testament prophecies.

It must also be added that there are indications in the Old Testament itself that the Messiah was not to establish a kingdom of the kind some of the children of Israel expected.

5. It Is Not a Question of Believing, but of Understanding God's Word

The fact that there are types and symbols in the Bible cuts the ground out from under a general accusation which premillennialists have made against those who reject their “literal” interpretation of certain prophecies. They sometimes charge others with not accepting God's word, with implying that God's word does not mean what it says. They sometimes say that if God did not mean what He said why didn't He say what He meant!

The basic assumption, although it is not stated nor consistently adhered to, is that there are no symbolical, spiritual, (in the sense of types which have a spiritual, not a material and literal, meaning when they find fulfillment in the anti-types), or figurative statements in the Bible. For if there are such statements one must “spiritualize” these or fail to get the meaning. If there are any figurative and spirit-

ual statements at all, one who is opposed to the figurative meaning can always charge you with spiritualizing away the plain statements of the Eternal God. For example, in a discussion with a Roman Catholic the Lord's statement that this is *my blood* was presented by the Roman Catholic. He then insisted: *Don't you believe that the Lord said what He meant and meant what He said?* He then argued that anyone who did not believe that it was Christ's literal blood, instead of fruit of the vine, did not believe the plain statement of the Lord. He continued to argue in this manner although he admitted that figurative language is sometimes found in the scriptures, and although the context shows that Jesus was using the term blood, as applied to the cup, figuratively. One must also here make the cup a figure for the contents of the cup. Since *after* He called it blood He called it the fruit of the vine, it is evident that it did not become literal blood (Matt. 26:28,29). Would a premillennialist think that it would be fair for someone to maintain that he denied the plain word of God unless he believed in transubstantiation?

Since there are figurative, typical, and symbolical statements in the Bible a person does not explain away the Bible just because he does not interpret all prophecy literally.

6. *An Abuse is Not an Argument Against the Proper Use*

The fact that some have abused the interpretation of figurative language, and have made symbolical that which is not symbolical, is not a justification for rejecting all figurative statements and missing their meaning by literalizing them. One extreme may help beget another extreme but that does not justify either extreme. There are extreme literalists but that does not mean that we must reject all literal statements in order to avoid the position of the extremists. There are extreme "spiritualizers" but that does not argue against scriptural spiritualizing.

7. What Has Been Established

No one believes that all prophecies will be literally fulfilled. No one believes that all prophecies involve symbolism and types. Thus no one can discredit another's position simply by saying that he is explaining things away because he does not believe that everything will receive a literal interpretation. In other words, neither one nor the other can discredit the other's position *simply* by saying that it involves spiritualization or that it involves literalization. The Bible justifies the position that some prophecies must be spiritualized and some prophecies must be literalized if the true meaning is to be grasped.

The issue, then, is whether or not one has legitimately spiritualized or literalized.

It is true, of course, that in one sense prophecies always have a literal fulfillment. The fulfillment is an actual fulfillment and in that sense literal, regardless of whether or not literal, typical, or symbolical language was employed by the prophet. But a literal event may have been prophesied in symbolical or typical language. To fail to understand this, in such a case, is to fail to understand the prophecy.

Our aim, therefore, should always be to find out what the Bible teaches, and how it teaches it, regardless of whether or not it fits in with the way that we—before studying the question—assumed that it would be taught. With open hearts let us endeavor to receive the truth therein presented regardless of whether it is presented in symbolical, typical, or literal terms.

CHAPTER IV
TYPES AND THE INTERPRETATION
OF PROPHECY

The meaning of "types" and something of their bearing on the interpretation of prophecy will be dealt with in this chapter. We shall draw somewhat extensively from the works of Patrick Fairbairn, whose work on *Typology* is, in so far as this author knows, the outstanding work in the field. Concerning the meaning of "type" he wrote:

"Occurring once, at least, in the natural sense of *mark* or *impress* made by a hard substance on one of softer material (John 20:25), it commonly bears the general import of *model*, *pattern*, or *exemplar*, but with such a wide diversity of application as to comprehend a material object of worship, or idol (Acts 7:43), an external framework constructed for the service of God (Acts 7:44; Heb. 8:5), the form or copy of an epistle (Acts 23:25), a method of doctrinal instruction delivered by the first heralds and teachers of the Gospel (Rom. 6:17), a representative character, or in certain respects, normal example (Rom. 5:14; I Cor. 10:11; Phil. 3:17; I Thess. 1:7; I Pet. 5:3). Such in New Testament Scripture is the diversified use of the word *type* (disguised, however, under other terms in the authorized version). It is only in the last of the applications noticed, that it has any distinct bearing on the subject of our present inquiry; and this also comprises under it so much of diversity, that if we were to draw our definition of a type simply from the scriptural use of the term, we could give no more specific description of it than this—a certain pattern or exemplar exhibited in the position and character of some individuals, to which others may or should be conformed. Adam stood, we are told, in the relation of a type to the coming Messiah, backsliding Israelites in their guilt and punishment to similar characters in Christian times, faithful pastors to their flocks, first converts to those who should afterwards believe,—a manifestly varied relationship, closer in some than in others, yet in each implying a certain resemblance between the parties associated together; something in the one that admitted of being virtually reproduced in the other. Thus defined and understood, it will be observed that a type is no more peculiar to one dispensation than another. It is found now in the true pastor or in the exemplary

Christian as well as formerly in Adam or in Israel; and since believers generally are predestined to be conformed to the image of Christ, he might, of course, be designated for all times emphatically and pre-eminently *the type* of the Church.

“But presented in this loose and general form, there is nothing in the nature of a type that can be said to call for particular investigation, or that may occasion material difference of opinion. The subject involves only a few leading ideas which are familiar to every intelligent reader of Scripture, and which can prove of small avail to the satisfactory explication of what is peculiar in the history of the divine dispensations. When, however, with reference more to the subject itself than to the mere employment of a particular word in connection with it, we pursue our researches into the testimony of Scripture, we presently find relations indicated between one class of things and another, which, while the same in kind, perhaps, with those just noticed, have yet distinctive features of their own, which call for thoughtful inquiry and discriminating treatment. These have already to some extent come into consideration in the historical and critical review that has been presented of past opinion. It is enough to refer here to such passages as Heb. 9:24—where the holy places of the earthly tabernacle are called the *antitypes* of the true or heavenly; the latter, of course, according to this somewhat peculiar phraseology, being viewed as the *types* of the other: Heb. 8:5—where the whole structure of the tabernacle, with its appointed ritual of service, is designated an example and shadow of heavenly things: Ps. 110; Heb. 6:10-12; Heb. 8.—where Melchizedek is exalted over the ministering priesthood of that tabernacle, as bearing in some important respects a still closer relationship to Christ than was given them to occupy: I Pet. 3:21—where Christian baptism is denominated the antitype to the deluge, and by implication the deluge is made the type of baptism: Matt. 2:15; Luke 22:16; I Cor. 5:7; John 2:19, 6:31-33; I Cor. 10:4—where Christ is in a manner identified with the corporate Israel, the passover, the temple, the manna, the water-giving rock.” (Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900. Vol. I, pp. 42-44).

“The view now given of the symbolical institutions of the Old Testament, as prophetic symbols of the realities of the Gospel, is in perfect accordance with the general descriptions we have of their nature in Scripture itself. These are of two classes. In one they are declared to have been *shadows* of the better things of the Gospel; as in Heb. 10:1, where the law is said to have had ‘a shadow, and not the very image of good things to come;’ in ch. 8:5, where the priests are described as ‘serving unto the example (copy) and shadow of

heavenly things;’ and again in Col. 2:16, where the fleshly ordinances in one mass are denominated ‘shadows of good things to come,’ while it is added, ‘the body is of Christ.’ Now, that the tabernacle, with the ordinances of every kind belonging to it, were shadows of Christ and the blessings of His kingdom, can only mean that they were obscure and imperfect resemblances of these; or that they embodied the same elements of divine truth, but wanted what was necessary to give them proper form and consistence as parts of a final and abiding dispensation of God. And when we go to inquire wherein did the obscurity and imperfection consist, we are always referred to the carnal and earthly nature of the Old as compared with the New. The tabernacle itself was a material fabric, constructed of such things as the present world could supply, and hence called ‘a worldly sanctuary’; while its counterpart under the Gospel is the eternal religion of God’s presence and glory, neither discernible by fleshly eye, nor made by mortal hands. In like manner, the ordinances of worship connected with the tabernacle were all ostensibly directed to the preservation of men’s present existence, or the advancement of their well-being as related to an outward sanctuary and a terrestrial commonwealth; while in the Gospel it is the soul’s relation to the sanctuary above, and its possession of an immortal life of blessedness and glory, which all is directly intended to provide for. In these differences between the Old and the New, which bespeak so much of inferiority on the part of the former, we perceive the darkness and imperfection which hung around the things of the ancient dispensation, and rendered them shadows only of those which were to come. But still shadows are resemblances. Though unlike in one respect, they must be like in another. And as the unlikeness stood in the dissimilar nature of the things immediately handled and perceived—in the different *material*, so to speak, of the two dispensations, wherein should the resemblance be found but in the common truths and relations alike pervading both? By means of an earthly tabernacle, with its appropriate services, God manifested toward His people the same principles of government, and required from them substantially the same disposition and character, that He does now under the higher dispensation of the Gospel. For, look beyond the mere outward diversities, and what do you see? You see in both alike a pure and holy God, enshrined in the recesses of a glorious sanctuary, unapproachable by sinful flesh but through a medium of powerful intercession and cleaning efficacy; yet, when so approached, ever ready to receive and bless with richest tokens of His favor and loving-kindness as many as come in the exercise of genuine contrition for sin, and longing for restored fellowship with Him whom they offended. The same description ap-

plies equally to the service of both dispensations; for in both the same impressions are conveyed of God's character respecting sin and holiness, and the same gracious feelings necessarily awakened by them in the bosom of sincere worshipers. But, then, as to the means of accomplishing this, there was only, in the one case, a shadowy exhibition of spiritual things through earthly materials and temporary expedients; while in the other the naked realities appear in the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, the rich endowments of the Spirit of grace, and the glories of an everlasting kingdom." (*Ibid.*, pp. 55-56).

1. *Different classes of types*

(1) *Typical Persons*. "It is to be noted, however, that persons are typical, not as persons, but because of some character or relation which they sustain in the history of redemption." (Terry, *Hermeneutics*, p. 248). Adam was a type of Christ (Rom. 5:14, 19; I Cor. 15:45-47).

(2) *Typical Institutions*. The sacrificial system of the Old Testament was typical of the offering of Christ, for it is only in Him that true atonement is made (Lev. 17:11; I Pet. 1:19; Heb. 9:28). The book of Hebrews shows that the Old Testament sacrifices, and tabernacle, were not the true, or real, but the shadow or type of the real—the real being found in the New Testament (Heb. 9:24; 10:1).

(3) *Typical Offices*. Certain prophets, priests, and kings of the Old Testament were typical of Christ who "unites in himself the offices of prophet, priest, and king, and fulfills the types of former dispensations." (*Ibid.*, p. 250).

(4) *Typical Events*. Some of the experiences of Israel in being delivered from Egyptian bondage into the land of Canaan are typical and are written for our admonition (I Cor. 10:1-11).

(5) *Typical Actions*. These Terry considers to be symbolico-typical, such as the brazen serpent (John 3:14-16), and the sign of the prophet Jonah (Matt. 12:39).

2. *Interpreting types*

(1) "The real point of resemblance between type and antitype should, first of all, be clearly apprehended, and all far-fetched and recondite analogies should be carefully avoided.

(2) "The points of difference and of contrast between type and antitype should also be noted by the interpreter. The type from its very nature must be inferior to the antitype, for we cannot expect

the shadow to equal the substance. 'For,' says Fairbairn, 'as the typical is divine truth on a lower stage, exhibited by means of outward relations and terrestrial interests, so, when making the transition from this to the antitypical, we must expect the truth to appear on a loftier stage, and, if we may so speak, with a more heavenly aspect. What in the one bore immediate respect to the bodily life, must in the other be found to bear immediate respect to the spiritual life. While in the one it is seen and temporal objects that ostensibly present themselves, their proper counterpart in the other is the unseen and eternal:—there, the outward, the present, the worldly; here, the inward, the future, the heavenly.'

(3) "The Old Testament types are susceptible of complete interpretation only by the light of the Gospel." (Terry, *op. cit.*, pp. 251, 254).

(4) "We must never expect the type and the antitype to be the same, for that would not be type and antitype, but identity. We shall find, therefore, that it is utterly impossible to find something in the antitype that is analogous to every feature of the type, or that the type has perfectly prefigured the antitype." (Dungan, *op. cit.*, p. 360).

3. Why were types used?

The failure to answer completely the question as to why types were used would not invalidate the fact that they were used. The following, however, are involved in the correct answer. First, through types people were taught fundamental lessons. Not only people under the typical system, but those who are under the antitypical system. For a type "was 'a figure', a parable, or illustration 'for the time present' (Heb. 9:9)." (Hoven, *op. cit.*, p. 6).

Second, thus the minds of the people were prepared for the reception of the antitype. However, some of them adopted certain attitudes which kept them from being properly instructed and prepared.

Third, types were used to predict. The tabernacle was "a shadow of the good things to come." (Heb. 10:1). This is perhaps the most fundamental value of the type to us for it shows us that the Divine Mind of God, and not the human mind of man, so ordered events and so placed institutions and persons that men could see, when the antitype came, that God was indeed at work here.

A consideration of the following passages in the New Testament help emphasize the fact that many things in the Old Testament were

types. In fact, one is safe in saying that the entire Old Testament system was typical. Israel was a typical nation, with a typical land, a typical worship, a typical system of sacrifices. Foreshadowing the New Testament these things were both preliminary and preparatory to the New Testament. Since the Old Testament system was typical one should not be surprised to find at least some of the prophets using the language which described the type when prophesying concerning the anti-type.

4. *Elijah a Type of John the Baptist*

Before the New Covenant began, and in work immediately preparatory to the personal ministry of Christ, a typical interpretation is given to an Old Testament prophecy. Although some of the Jews were evidently expecting the literal Elijah, the meaning of Malachi's prediction, concerning Elijah's coming (Malachi 4:5-6) was that someone would come in the spirit and power of Elijah (Mk. 9:11; Matt. 11:14-15; 17:10-13; Lk. 1:17).

The work which John was to do was symbolically expressed by Isaiah (Lk.3:2-6; compare Matt. 3:3).

Since one finds the language of type used when the anti-type is meant, and involved in those predictions of the work which was to precede the personal ministry of Christ, should one be surprised to find the language of types used to describe some features of His work and kingdom?

5. *David a Type of Christ*

Christ Himself was predicted under the type David. Ezekiel stated that one nation, instead of two would be made of Israel (Ezekiel 37:21-22). "And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them." (Ezekiel 37:24). According to John Gill, who was well versed in the writings of the Rabbi, *David* was understood by some Jewish writers as meaning Christ. "The King Messiah, as Kimchi interprets it; and so Abarbinel (*Mashmiah Jesuab*, fol. 47.4. Vid. *Sepher Ikkarim*, 1.2.c.28) and others; being of the seed of David, and of whom David was an eminent type; and who, as Mediator, is the Lord's servant, and as man appeared in the form of one: this shows that this prophecy looks further than the time of deliverance from the Babylonish captivity." (*Commentary*, VI:195)

The passage itself does not say that David was simply used here as a type of Christ. But David had long been dead, and the rest of the Old Testament and New Testament show that the one who was to reign over God's people was not a resurrected David, but Christ Himself.

It is significant that not only is David here used as a type of Christ, but that David as a king ruling on a throne over united Israel is used as a type of Christ. What right has one to insist that the ruler is typical but that the nation is not? If one interprets the ruler as a type, and one must so interpret it, then he must also accept the conclusion that David reigned over God's people is used as a type of Christ reigning over God's people. Thus David on the throne over Israel is typical of Christ on His throne over God's people. And Christ is now reigning. But for additional comments on the throne of David see the chapter of that title.

6. Abraham's Seed

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, And if ye be Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:26-29). He is the father of the believer (Rom. 4:12). It follows that if you are not Christ's you are not Abraham's seed in the sense that you are to be the heir according to the promise. Abraham's seed is here used in a spiritual sense. Why should it be thought strange that if, in prophecy, at times Abraham's literal seed should be spoken of when his spiritual seed was meant? >

7. Israelites

"For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but *a new creature.* And as many as walk according to this rule, peace on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." (Gal. 6:16). "Upon all who walk by the rule which I have just stated—the rule which rejects carnal ordinances, and accepts a regenerated life—upon them, even upon the Israel of God, be peace and mercy. The word translated 'and' often means 'even', and it has that force here, for it was Paul's constant contention that Christians were the true Israel of God, the bone-fide sons of Abraham." (J. W. McGarvey, *The Standard Bible Commentary on Galatians*). Surely no one can be of the Israel of God who is not Christ's, and who does not walk

according to the grace of God instead of the law of Moses (Gal. 6:13-15). Not all literal Israel is Israel (Romans 9:6). The church is the commonwealth of Israel (Eph. 2:12-16, 19).

8. *The Commonwealth of Israel*

"That at that time ye (Gentiles, J. D. B.) were without Christ, being *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: but now *in Christ Jesus* ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. Now therefore ye are *no more strangers and foreigners*, but *fellow citizens* with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. 2:12-13, 19).

Literal Israel is no longer the commonwealth of Israel. The church today, composed of both Jew and Gentile, is one body in which the Gentiles are no longer aliens. The Gentiles are no longer aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, but fellow citizens; natives, so to speak, not foreigners. Since they are fellow citizens it is evident that they are in the commonwealth of Israel. But it is just as evident that the commonwealth of Israel is no longer ancient Israel, but only spiritual Israel. It is composed only of those who have become part of the one new body or man (Eph. 2:14-18), which is the church, the body of Christ (Eph. 1:22-23).

"The natural Israel, then, as God's chosen people from among the peoples of the earth, were types of the elect seed, the spiritual and royal priesthood, whom Christ was to choose out of the world, and redeem for His everlasting kingdom. When this latter purpose began to be carried into effect, the former, as a matter of course, began to give way—precisely as the shedding of Christ's blood upon the cross antiquated the whole sacrificial system of Moses. Hence, to indicate (that) the type, in this respect, has passed into the antitype, believers in Christ, of Gentile as well as of Jewish origin, are called Abraham's seed, Israelites, and the commonwealth of Israel." (Fairbairn, *op. cit.*, p. 416).

Since such are the commonwealth of Israel over which Christ rules, is it not clear the predictions of the Messiah's rule would naturally be clothed, at times, in the language describing the type?

As it is shown elsewhere in this book, the house of Israel with which the New covenant was made (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:6-13), was not the literal Israel as such but with any of literal Israel, and with any of the Gentiles who through the new birth became members of this new commonwealth of Israel.

9. Mount Zion

Old Mount Zion was evidently a type of the new, since it has given way to the New which is designated as Mount Zion. "But ye are come unto mount Zion. . ." (Heb. 12:22).

10. The Heavenly Jerusalem

"But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22). We are of the Jerusalem which is from above, and not of the literal Jerusalem (Gal. 4:21-26).

It should be obvious that the new covenant was to be made with a people who would be in a spiritual Zion and heavenly Jerusalem, instead of literal ones. Since there is a spiritual Zion and Jerusalem should it be thought strange that literal Zion and Jerusalem should sometimes have been used in prophecy when the antitype was meant?

11. The Circumcision

"For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." (See Phil. 3:3-9). By having no confidence in the flesh Paul here includes confidence in physical ancestry, yea, even his Israelitish ancestry as is clear from verse five. Those who depend on their ancestry as if it entitled them to something in God's kingdom today overlook the fact that we today must find God's promises in Christ, and not in a physical relationship to Him, but as a spiritual nation. Are not those who hold out hope to physical Israel *as such*, instead of hope to all on the basis of acceptance of Christ, having and teaching confidence in the flesh? It is only they who have the spiritual circumcision (Col. 2:11) who are the Israel of God, the circumcision. Literal circumcision does not count (Gal. 5:6; 6:15). Thus literal Israel does not count for literal Israel is the literal circumcision. It is spiritual Israel, the spiritual circumcision, which counts today.

12. Sacrifices and High Priests

It is perhaps too well known to dwell on in detail that the high priests were a type of Christ the high priest, that their tabernacle was a type of a spiritual reality, and that their sacrifices were a type of the Lamb of God (Heb. 9:8-14, 24; 10:1).

13. Heirs of Abraham's Promise

"Further, this spiritual Israel of the New Testament are expressly declared to be 'heirs according to the promise' (Gal. 3:29)—the

promise, namely, given to Abraham; for it is as Abraham's seed that they are designated heirs; and, of course, the possession of which they are heirs can be no other than that given by promise to Abraham. But then, as the antitypical things have now entered, not the old narrow and transitory inheritance is to be thought of, but that which it typically represented—"the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away" (I Pet. 1:4; the everlasting kingdom, II Pet. 1:11. J. D. B.), which now as an object of hope takes its place. Accordingly, when the higher things of the Gospel are fairly introduced, it is to this nobler inheritance, as alone remaining, that the desires and expectations of the heirs of salvation are pointed. (Like Abraham, his heirs seek the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. J. D. B.). The apostles never allude to any other, when handling the case either of believing Jews or converted Gentiles; and when that inheritance of endless blessing and glory shall become the possession of a redeemed and glorified church, then shall the promise contained in the Old Testament type be fully realized." (Fairbairn, *Op. Cit.*, p. 417).

"But may not something specially belonging to Israel be included in the antitype?—something to distinguish the natural line of believers from those who belong to the seed only by spiritual ties?" No, "the point in question is implied in the very fact of their being types; for, *as such*, they of necessity merged and became lost in the antitype. Was not the Paschal Lamb merged and lost in Christ? And the veil of the temple in Christ's body? And David in the Son of Mary? Every type must, as a matter of necessity, share the same fate; and if any thing peculiar is reserved for the land or people, who served a typical purpose, it must be on some other account than this that it shall belong to them." (*Ibid.*, p. 417).

14. Temple

Under the Old Testament a great physical temple constituted a part of their system. Under the New Testament two temples are mentioned. First, the body of the individual Christian (I Cor. 6:19; II Cor. 6:16). Second, the people or church as a whole (I Peter 2:5; Eph. 2:19-21).

15. The Kingdom Spiritualized

Matt. 21:43; Matt. 8:11; Eph. 2:12; and Col. 1:13 show that "the kingdom can go on without Israel. It can be taken from Israel and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. For . . . Matthew not only reports Christ as teaching that the vineyard shall be

taken away and let out to other husbandmen who shall render him the fruits in their season; but, in the following context, we get the practical bearing of this statement, “The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” (Matt. 21:43) In the previous section, the vineyard would be merely let out to the other husbandmen. But here the kingdom shall actually be taken away and given. Certainly the Pharisees caught the point, when they sought to lay hands on Jesus. For the kingdom would be taken away from them.

“Not only is the kingdom of God here thus spiritualized and generalized, instead of being indissolubly associated with Israel after the flesh. But the same applies to the kingdom of heaven,—Matt. 8:11 “Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into outer darkness.””

“Paul carries out the same idea, by describing the Ephesians as formerly ‘alienable from the *commonwealth* of Israel,’ (the commonwealth here covering the kingdom), but now ‘fellow citizens with saints’, how could this mean anything else than fellow citizens of the kingdom? Eph. 2:12 and 19.

. . . elsewhere, where we read that the kingdom is not a matter of Jewish ceremonies, not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy. Rom. 14:17.

“Again, when Christ says that His kingdom is not of this world, kosmos, else would his followers fight, (John 18:36) it will hardly do to interpret that Christ’s kingdom is not of this age, aion, but of the millennial age. Certainly the millennium would be no time to fight, though there will still be unconverted sinners, according to the current view.” (Wyngaarden, *The Future of the Kingdom In Prophecy and Fulfillment*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House, 1934, pp. 95-97).

16. The Land Spiritualized

There is, Wyngaarden maintains, a latent spiritualization of the holy land in the Old Testament. “The tribes of Israel receive a portion of Canaan as their inheritance. But Jehovah is the portion, the inheritance of the priests.” (*Ibid.*, p. 91. See Num. 18:20). This same is true with reference to all the Levites (Deut. 18:2, Psa. 73:26). But this idea also includes all of Israel for Jehovah is the portion of David (Psa. 16:5; 142:5; 119:57), and of all Israel (Jer. 10:16; 51:19).

Be that as it may, in the New Testament the inheritance is shown to be a spiritual one. Those who with Abraham are heirs of the world are those who have the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:13). Gentiles who are of the faith are "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3:29). They will receive of the Lord "the recompense of the inheritance." (Col. 3:24). As Wyngaarden pointed out: "The inheritance is 'eternal' Heb. 9:15 . . . 'a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.' Heb. 11:10. Thus Abraham's inheritance is spiritualized, 11:8. It virtually includes Jehovah, and the new heaven, Heb. 11:10, and new earth, Rom. 4:13, Matt. 5:5 (II Pet. 3:13. J. D. B.)."

"This inheritance is earned by Christ and it centers in Him, I Peter 1:3. It is an inheritance, I Peter 1:4, incorruptible, 1:4, 18, undefiled, 1:4,19, and that fadeth not away, 1:4, 24, but is as eternal as Christ and His word, 1:18, 19, 24. As Jehovah was the great portion of his covenant people in the Old Testament, so their inheritance receives greater vividness in the New Testament, in Christ Jesus, our portion forever. And shall not the Father with him give us all things, both the new heaven, Heb. 11:10, and the new earth, Matt. 5:5, as our inheritance?" (*Ibid.*, p. 93).

17. Priests and sacrifices

All Christians are priests (Rev. 1:6; 5:9, 10), members of the royal priesthood (I Pet. 2:5, 9), and offer up: (a) their bodies as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1-2); (b) a sacrifice of praise, the fruit of their lips (Heb. 13:15); (c) the sacrifices of doing good and communicating (Heb. 13:16; Phil. 4:18). Our sacrifices are spiritual (I Pet. 2:4).

18. Passover

"For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ." (I Cor. 5:7). Is it not clear that the entire Old Testament system was a type of the New Testament system? Is it not equally obvious that the New Testament sanctions us in maintaining that the language of type, of ancient Israel, is often used when spiritual Israel is meant? Since the New Covenant was to be made with Israel; and since it has been made with spiritual Israel; and since all the above Old Testament designations are used in the New Testament to designate God's spiritual Israel; why should one look to a revival of the type with reference to Israel any more than to a revival or renewal of the other aspects of the typical system, the sacrifices, for instance?

It is surely evident that one cannot dismiss an interpretation of the kingdom prophecies with the statement that if God did not mean what He said, why didn't He say what He meant. He meant what He said, and He said what He meant, but He clothed some prophecies in the language of the type, and if it can be shown that one must thus interpret some of the kingdom prophecies the matter is settled since types are found in the prophecies. And certainly one must look for the fulfillment of a prophecy in an antitype when its literal application would lead to conclusions which contradict truths elsewhere revealed in the Bible.

CHAPTER V

SOME LITERALISM IS UNSCRIPTURAL

In this chapter the literalist's position will be tested by adhering to it in a consideration of some of the prophecies of the reign of the Messiah. If this position leads us to conclusions which are contradictory, or which contradict New Testament positions, it will be evident that the literalistic approach cannot be consistently held to by Bible believers.

1. The Church Age Is Overleaped by the Kingdom Prophecies

If the kingdom promises of the Old Testament do not apply to the present reign of the Messiah, it is clear that the kingdom prophecies leap over the period of the church and deal with an age which is yet to come. This must be the position of those who maintain that the church was such a mystery that it was not revealed before the days of the apostles. If it was so hidden, then obviously it was not prophesied by the prophets.

The church age would also be unknown to the prophets if some premillennialists are right in maintaining that the kingdom proclaimed as at hand by John, and by Jesus in the beginning of His ministry, was the kingdom prophesied by the Old Testament prophets, but that it was postponed due to the rejection of the kingdom by Israel, i.e. due to Israel's sinfulness. If the kingdom was actually at hand, if it was actually time (Mk. 1:14, 15) for its establishment, then obviously it was not time for the establishment of the church age. If the Old Testament prophets prophesied the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom in the first century, then it should be clear that they could not have prophesied the establishment of a kingdom, or church, in the first century which was to last for at least two thousand years. That is, unless the Messiah's kingdom prophesied by the prophets, and the church, the kingdom of God's dear son (Col. 1:13), are the same.

R. H. Boll has argued that the church was not predicted. "That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; that had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the

prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed." (*The Kingdom of God*, 2nd Edition, p. 120). In the church age two things are evident. First, national Israel has not been restored and exalted (Second, that Jew and Gentile are on an equality (Eph. 3:4-16; 2:11-20). It is evident, therefore, that from Boll's position one must conclude that the church age was not the subject of prophecy, since Jew and Gentile are equal in the church age.

How can this position be harmonized with such scriptures as the following: First, Joel spoke of these days (Acts 2:16-17). Second, the present reign of Christ predicted (Acts 2:30-36; 10:43). Third, these days spoken of by Samuel and the prophets which followed him (Acts 3:24). Fourth, the rebellion of some men and the present reign of Christ on the holy hill of Zion is the subject of prophecy (Acts 4:24-30; 13:33). Fifth, Christ's present work of salvation prophesied (Acts 13: 23-41). Sixth, apostles' work among Gentiles prophesied (Acts 13:46-47; Isa. 49:6). Seventh, what Paul taught was what the prophets said would come (Acts 26:22-23). And what shall we say about the passages which are found in the book of Romans? These will be presented in a later chapter.

2. The Old Testament Rituals, Priesthood, and Sacrifices Will Be Re-established

The premillennialist's interpretation of Old Testament prophecies forces him, if he is consistent, to believe that the Old Testament sacrifices will be restored in the millennium. In speaking of the time when "the Gentiles shall come to thy light" (Isa. 60:3), it was stated that "all the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together into thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory." (60:7). God's sanctuary will be beautified (60:13), and what else could it mean but the Old Testament sanctuary since that was the sanctuary known when the prophets spoke! What else could a premillennialist say that it was? It would have to be if the sacrifices are to be offered. "And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord." (66:21). Thus there is the restoration of the Old Testament priesthood! "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before men, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." (66:22-23). "Behold, I will

send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to *his temple*, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purify them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. *Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years.*" (Malachi 3:1-4). Since this was not literally fulfilled in the first coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, the consistent premillennialists must believe that it will be fulfilled literally in His second coming.

Jeremiah said: "In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually." (Jer. 33:15-18, 21, 22). Ezekiel's "last vision of the brighter future presents all under the aspect of a re-edified temple, perfect in its structure and arrangements." (Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, p. 108. Ezekiel 43:1 ff.).

But how can these things be? Isaiah in speaking of the peace between animals and men, and animals and animals, said that "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. 11:9) <But there will be a lot of hurting and destroying if the animal sacrifices are restored.>

<At the time that some premillennialists say that sacrifices will be offered in Jerusalem, Jeremiah said that "they shall say no more, The Ark of the covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more." (3:16). This being the case, the ordinances introduced by Moses must be abolished. Then, too, Jeremiah stated that God would make a new covenant which would not be like the Old Covenant.

Especially we must ask as to how these things can be when we consider the New Testament teaching concerning the purpose and duration of sacrifices.

The New Testament teaches that the Old Testament system was but a shadow of the substance which has already come. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sin. But in those sacrifices there is a resemblance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law." (Heb. 10:1-8). "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (10:14). "Now where remission of these is (sins and iniquities of verse 17), there is no more offering for sin." (10:18).

These passages enable us to draw the following conclusions: First, when the substance or very image comes the shadow flees away. Certainly the type and the anti-type, the substance and the shadow, could not be in force at the same time. Those who have the substance ought not to go back to the shadow. Of what value is the offering of the blood of bulls and goats, which never could take away sin, after the death of Christ which can take away sins?

Second, the sacrifices of the Old Testament were offered continually because they were unable to take away sin (10:2-3). If they had been able to take away sins they would have ceased to be offered (10:2). No repetition of Christ's sacrifice is necessary or possible for His takes away sin (10:10, 12, 14, 17-18). Certainly since the animal sacrifices cannot take away sin, and Christ's sacrifice does, it would be meaningless to revive the Old Testament sacrifices.

Third, God never took pleasure in the animal sacrifices in and of themselves. Of themselves they availed nothing. (10:5, 6, 8). Two great values, at least, did belong to them. (a) They impressed on the individual the fact that he was a lost sinner who needed to be redeemed through another. "Independently of this connection (which we shall next mention, J. D. B.) with Christ's death, it had a meaning of its own, which it was possible for the ancient worshipper to understand, and, so understanding, to present through it an acceptable service to God, whether he might perceive or not the further respect it bore to a dying Savior. It was in its own nature a symbolical transaction, embodying a threefold idea: first, that the worshiper, having been guilty of sin, had forfeited his life to God; then, that the life so for-

feited must be surrendered to divine justice; and finally that being surrendered in the way appointed, it was given back to him again by God, or he became reestablished, as a justified person, in the divine favor and fellowship." (Patrick Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900, I:54).

If, as some premillennialists maintain, there is little or no sin in the assumed millennial reign on earth, what need will there be for animal sacrifices to impress the above things on people during that reign. And if they need, as doubtless they would to some extent, to realize that they were not perfect, but had some things wrong with them, would not the remembrance of Christ's death in our stead, and the holy personal presence of Christ in that reign be enough to accomplish the desired results.

(b) The sacrifices of the Old Testament had a great value in that they foreshadowed, or typified, the sacrifice of Christ. They were "prophetic symbols of the better things to come in the Gospel" (*Ibid.*, p. 52). In other words, they were a shadow of the good things, or substance, or image, which was to come (Hebrew. 10:1). Of what value, then, would these shadows be in a millennial reign which took place long after the Old Testament system had passed away; after the church age, and during a personal reign of Christ on earth? Of what value is the prophetic type, when it has been fulfilled?

Since God never took pleasure in the animal sacrifices in and of themselves, but evidently gave them because of what they impressed on the worshipper, and what they typified concerning Christ, why should one think that God has such pleasure in them that He will re-establish them for a thousand years when they cannot serve the purposes which they once served?

Fourth, "Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (Heb. 10:18). In other words, since Christ's sacrifice made possible remission there can be *no more offering for sin*. Old Testament sacrifices included sin offerings. If the Old Testament sacrifices are offered in the millennium they cannot be offered as sin offerings since there can be no more offering for sins. They cannot be offered as prophetic types, for the anti-type has already been offered. What will they be, if they are not types and if they are not sin offerings? And if they are not such they are not Old Testament sacrifices.

The New Testament teaches that the Old Testament system was a figure, pattern, or type, for Old Testament times, and that it was not to be imposed after the time of the new covenant. "The Holy

Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was *a figure for the time then present*, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." (Heb. 9:8-10). The time of reformation evidently means the time of the new covenant. These things were imposed until the time of reformation (9:10); they are no longer imposed since the cross rendered them useless (10:18; Col. 2:14-17); therefore, this is the time of reformation, otherwise they should now be imposed.

Any theory or prophetic interpretation which again imposes these Old Testament figures, carnal ordinances, etc., must be wrong, since Paul stated that these things were imposed *until* the time of reformation.

These, then, are some of the things which the New Testament teaches concerning the sacrificial system of the Old Testament. The New Testament is certainly a clearer revelation of God's mind and purpose than was the Old Testament. Several considerations make clear this fact. *First*, God today speaks through His Son. He has revealed Himself in His Son (compare John 14:9), in a way in which He did not reveal Himself to the Old Testament peoples. *Second*, the Old Testament was filled with types, figures, shadows, while the New Testament is the anti-type. It is the good things which were to come, and of which the Old was a shadow (Heb. 10:1). Surely the revelation of God which deals with the "very image of the things" is clearer than that which dealt with the shadow (10:1). *Third*, the New Covenant is superior to the Old Testament (Heb. 8:5; 10:20), so surely its revelation of God's will is superior.

Premillennialists, however, have adopted a principle of interpretation in dealing with the kingdom prophecies which demand that the Old Testament sacrificial system be restored in the millennium. They allow *their* interpretation to rule out the obvious fact that some things that were prophesied were clothed with the language which described the type (as John the Baptist being prophesied as Elijah); and commits them to conclusions which are out of harmony with the New Testament teaching concerning the purpose and duration of the sacrificial system. Surely a position which is not necessary, and which leads to such conclusions, needs to be restudied.

The consistent premillennialist cannot teach that the sacrifices will simply be some sort of memorial, since Ezekiel's prophecies when

literally interpreted will not permit this interpretation. Ezekiel stated that the sin offering and peace offerings would make the people acceptable to God (43:21-27). "And it shall be the prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all solemnities of the house of Israel: he shall prepare the *sin offering*, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, *to make reconciliation for the house of Israel.*" (47:17). How could this be since Christ's blood has been shed? (Heb. 10:18).

3. *The Prophecies Contradict One Another*

If the premillennialists are right in their interpretation of prophecy, there are prophecies which contradict one another.

(1) How can the sacrifices be restored and still there be no hurting and destroying in God's holy mountain? (Isa. 60:7; 66:21, 22, 23; Malachi 3:1-4; Jer. 33:15-18, 21, 22 versus Isa. 11:9; Jer. 3:16).

(2) How can the new covenant be established in the millennium, as some premillennialists teach, and yet the old covenant with its sacrificial system and Levites be restored? (Jer. 33:15-18, 21, 22; Malachi 3:104 versus Jer. 31:31-34; Jer. 3:16). Both cannot be in force at the same time. (Heb. 10:9-10; Rom. 7:1-6).

(3) How can faithful Gentiles, who were martyred for Christ, reign (Rev. 20:4) if Gentiles are to be slaves of the Jews in the millennium? (Isa. 60:3, 6-16; 61:5-9; 49:22-23, 26).

"There is a principle, we may be well assured, which is quite sufficient to harmonize these different representations, and render them perfectly consistent with one another; but no skill or sophistry can ever persuade simple and unprejudiced men that such a harmonizing principle is to be found in reading the whole as one would read history, taking all as matter-of-fact descriptions of Gospel times, or the millennial age. On that principle the contradiction is necessarily real and we have no alternative according to it but that of holding by one portion of the prophetic future and letting go another." (Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, p. 108).

(4) Malachi 1:11 stated that offerings and incense could be and would be offered in every place, while the literalistic interpretation of Isa. 2 and Zech. 14:16-21 brings the nations to Jerusalem for worship since there will be the Lord's house.

4. *Some Prophecies of Isaiah*

In Isaiah 60 a number of things are set forth. Are they "a figurative description of a spiritual religion, such as the Messiah has actually introduced into the world," or a literal description of conditions as they will exist in the future? First, will Midian, Ephah, Sheba, Tarshish, and Kedar be restored and be in subjection to Israel? (60:6-7, 9). Second, will the sacrifices be restored? (60:7). Third, shall the nations all serve Israel, and those who do not be destroyed? (60:10-12). "The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel." (60:14). Will they "also suck the milk of the Gentiles," and "the breast of kings?" (60:16). Fourth, will the sun and the moon no more serve as light? (60:19-20). Fifth, will the people live in the land, of which Jerusalem will evidently be the center (60:14), forever? (60:21).

What will the literalists do with these prophecies? Will they adopt methods of interpretation which they have already condemned in others? Or will they maintain that the law "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (Acts 15:10), will be restored; for restored it must be if the rites and ceremonies of it are to be practiced.

The same question may be asked concerning Isa. 66:19-24. First, will the ancient peoples be restored? (66:19). Second, will people out of all nations ride horses, chariots, the litters, mules, and swift beasts to "my holy mountain Jerusalem"? (66:20). Third, will the priests, Levites, offerings, the new moon, the sabbath, all be restored (66:20-23). In other words, will the Jewish system be revived? Fourth, will the millennium be a time in which Israel will view the carcasses of those who transgressed against God? (66:24).

Will the gentiles lick the dust of the feet of the Jews? "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring their sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me." (Isa. 49:22-23).

Shall the literalists ask themselves the question which they often ask others? Did God say what He meant and mean what He said?

Will one "spiritualize away" this language? The literalists would have to say the time will come when the Gentiles are the servants of the Jews. When their very kings and queens shall perform their, the Jews, domestic tasks; when they shall bow down to the Jew and lick up the dust of their feet.

The vast majority of the premillennialists are not Jews but Gentiles. And, of course they must accept, in faithfulness to their own arguments against those who take the typical interpretation of many of the kingdom prophecies, that the literal Gentiles are meant and that these passages describe the very jobs they will do. This being the case what becomes of the hope of some premillennialists that they will rule over certain literal cities on this earth after Christ comes and fulfills, according to their interpretation, the prophecies concerning the Messiah's reign? How can they straighten out this contradiction in their own system without adopting the principle of interpretation which they condemn in others?

"Is this the true appointed relation between Jews and Gentiles in the fulness of the Messiah's reign? Or is this a figurative and impressive representation of the universal triumph of the true religion of Christ, with the reverence and homage which shall everywhere be rendered to it, and the unhappiness of its rejectors? Does not the latter seem altogether the more rational interpretation?" (Luther F. Dimmick, "The Spirit of Prophecy in Relation to the Future Condition of the Jews", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. IV, May, 1847, pp. 360-361). Surely symbolism and type are found in this prophecy.

5. *The Distinction Between Jews and Gentiles Will Be Restored*

In the New Testament dispensation the distinction between Jew and Gentile is abolished. What counts is not one's nationality but whether or not one is a spiritual child of Abraham; whether one is of the faith of Abraham. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:26-29) "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." (Phil. 3:3). Paul continued by emphasizing his Jewish background, and then stated that "what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ." (3:7). Paul said that the chief advantage which the Jews had was that they had been committed the oracles of God. (Rom. 3:1, 2).

The consistent premillennialists must believe that the distinction between Jew and Gentile will be restored in the millennium, which is supposed to be a much more glorious dispensation than the church age. Not only so, but he must believe that the Gentiles will be the servants of the Jews, and lick the dust of their boots. The Gentiles shall not only come to Israel's light (Isa. 60:3), but they shall also bring their camels, gold, incense, flocks, and such like to Israel (6-11). "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (60:12). "The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings (the literalist is not apt to find this very nourishing, J. D. B.)." (60:14-16). "And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers. But ye shall be named The priests of the Lord: men shall call you The ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves. . . all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed." (Isa. 61:5-9). "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet." (Isa. 49:22-23).

How does this harmonize with the expectation of some Gentile premillennialists that some of them will be kings and rulers in the millennium? If Gentiles are to be the plowmen, cattle tenders, dust lickers, and such like, how can premillennialists, who are mostly Gentiles, expect the places of rulership which some expect? How can each faithful servant of the Lord be made a king, how can each rule over ten cities, more or less? How can this be done when multitudes of His servants in this church age are Gentiles, but consistent literalistic interpretation of prophecy makes the Gentiles slaves and servants in the millennium? Instead of ruling over cities premillennialists may build up the walls of cities (Isa. 60:10).

6. The Ancient Enemies of Israel Will Be Restored

"And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest

shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shimar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the *Philistines* toward the west; they shall spoil them of the east together: they shall lay their hand upon *Edom* and *Moab*; and the children of *Ammon* shall obey them." (Isa. 11:10-14).

7. *Israel Will Evidently War in That Time*

In the time when there is no hurting or destroying the consistent premillennialist must believe that Israel goes forth to war on the *Philistines'* shoulders. "They shall not hurt nor destroy *in all my holy mountains for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And in that day.* But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the *Philistines* toward the west; they shall *spoil* them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon *Edom* and *Moab*; and the children of *Ammon* shall obey them." (Isa. 11:9-14). The oppressors of Israel will be fed with their own flesh and be drunken with their own blood (Isa. 49:26). "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." (Isa. 66:24) In the last passage it does not say just who would thus punish the transgressors, but it does show that Israel will look on those who have been hurt and destroyed.

8. *Modern Modes of Transportation Will Not Be Used*

Instead of using airplanes Israel will do her flying upon the shoulders of the Philistines (Isa. 11:14). Cars and trains will not be used. Instead they shall come in arms (Isa. 49:22); camels and dromedaries will be used (Isa. 60:6). Chariots, litters, mules, horses, and swift beasts will be used to bring people out of all nations unto Jerusalem (Isa. 66:20).

Surely the literalists will not abandon his literalism just because there are swifter and more convenient modes of transportation today.

9. *Premillennial Interpretations Contradict the New Testament*

(1) The New Covenant has been established (Heb. 8:5-10:22), but some premillennialists say that it has not been established. Judah and Israel as a whole rejected the New Covenant, which Jer. 31:31-34 said would be made them. So how can the premillennialists say that Jer. 31:31-34 has been fulfilled?)

(2) The Scriptures teach that there is no more sacrifice for sin (Heb. 9:26; 10:18). Premillennial literalism must maintain that there will be sin offerings, which will make peace and reconciliation, in the future (Ezek. 43:21-27; 47:17).

Concerning this whole matter Fairbairn wrote:

"It is possible enough, however, that what we have put here in the form of extravagant suppositions, will be readily embraced by many who believe in the future restoration of Israel to Canaan. An entire reproduction of the old is now contended for, as necessary to establish the literal truthfulness of Scripture. And among other things to be expected, we are told, in connection with the return of Israel to Canaan, is the building anew, and on a style of higher magnificence, of the material temple, the resuscitation of the Levitical priesthood, and the re-institution of the fleshly sacrifices and pompous ceremonial of the ancient worship. To hold this, indeed, is only to follow to its legitimate results the idea that the former possession of Canaan was typical of another; since, if that earlier possession gave promise of a later one, the establishment of the religious economy connected with it must have foreshadowed its future restoration. But the notion, in this form of it, stands in direct antithesis to the whole genius of the New Testament dispensation, and to some of the most explicit statements also of New Testament Scripture. If any thing be plain in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is, that every thing there assumes a spiritual character and a universal aspect, as contradistinguished from the local and fleshly. Foreseeing this, the prophet Malachi had said that, in the coming age, "incense and a pure offering should in every place be offered to the Lord;" and our Lord Himself announced to the woman of Samaria the approaching abolition of all local distinctions: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, shall men worship the Father;" that is, shall not regard worship rendered in these places as more sacred or more acceptable than worship paid elsewhere. Nay, it is expressly declared that the abolition of the outward forms and services of Judaism was on account of its "weakness and unprofitableness" (Heb. 7:18); and that the law, which ordained such things, was of necessity changed or annulled with the introduction of a new priesthood made after the order

of Melchizedek (Heb. 7:12). And hence those who, in the apostolic age, insisted on the continued observance of the now antiquated rites of Judaism, were expostulated with by the apostle as virtually making void the work of Christ, (Gal. 5:2-4; Col. 2:14-23).

“ Where such scriptural testimonies, so plain in their terms, and so conclusive in their import, fail to produce conviction, it would be vain to expect any thing from human argumentation. It may be proper, however, to present briefly, and more formally than has yet been done, what we deem the proper view of Israel’s typical relations, with respect more immediately to the subject now under consideration. The natural Israel, then, as God’s chosen people from among the peoples of the earth, were types of the elect seed, the spiritual and royal priesthood, whom Christ was to choose out of the world, and redeem for His everlasting kingdom. When this latter purpose began to be carried into effect, the former, as a matter of course, began to give way—precisely as the shedding of Christ’s blood upon the cross antiquated the whole sacrificial system of Moses. Hence, to indicate that the type, in this respect, has passed into the antitype, believers in Christ, of Gentile as well as of Jewish origin, are called Abraham’s seed (Gal. 3:29); Israelites (ch 6:16; Eph. 2:12, 19); comers unto Mount Zion (Heb. 12:22); citizens of the free or heavenly Jerusalem (*ib.*; Gal. 4:26); the circumcision (Phil. 3:3; Col. 2:11); and in the Apocalypse, which is written throughout in the language of symbol and type, they are even called Jews (? J. D. B. ch. 2:9); while the sealed company, in ch. 7., who undoubtedly represented the whole multitude of the redeemed, are identified with the sealed of the twelve tribes of Israel. Further, this spiritual Israel of the New Testament are expressly declared to be ‘heirs according to the promise’ (Gal. 3:29)—the promise, namely, given to Abraham; for it is as Abraham’s seed that they are designated heirs; and, of course, the possession of which they are heirs can be other than that given by promise to Abraham. But then, as the antitypical things have now entered, not the old narrow and transitory inheritance is to be thought of, but that which it typically represented—‘the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away,’ which now as an object of hope takes its place. Accordingly, when the higher things of the Gospel are fairly introduced, it is to this nobler inheritance, as alone remaining, that the desires and expectations of the heirs of salvation are pointed. The apostles never allude to any other, when handling the case either of believing Jews or converted Gentiles; and when that inheritance of endless blessing and of glory,—the inheritance, as we believe it to be, of this earth itself (the new earth II Pet. 3. J. D. B) in a state of heavenly perfection,—when this shall become the posses-

sion of a redeemed and glorified Church, then shall the promise contained in the Old Testament type be fully realized.

“But may not something specially belonging to Israel be included in the antitype?—something to distinguish the natural line of believers from those who belong to the seed only by spiritual ties? So, sometimes, it is argued, as in *Israel Restored*, p. 193: ‘Do they tell us the literal Israel was a type of the spiritual? We instantly grant it. Do they tell us again, that therefore there is a spiritual fulfillment of the covenant to believers? We grant it also. But all this, we say, is nothing to the point. You must go farther. What you need to prove is, that Israel of old, whose descendants still exist, was *so* a type of the spiritual Israel, that they were finally to merge, and be lost in them whom they typified.’ There is no need for any such proof; the point in question is implied in the very fact of their being types; for, *as such*, they of necessity merged and became lost in the antitype. Was not the Paschal Lamb merged and lost in Christ? And the veil of the temple in Christ’s body? And David in the Son of Mary? Every type must, as a matter of necessity, share the same fate; and if anything peculiar is reserved for the land or people, who served a typical purpose, it must be on some other account than this that it shall belong to them.

“More commonly, however, the stress of the argument, as connected with the original position of the Israelites, is laid upon the terms of the covenant with Abraham, in which Canaan is spoken of as their sure and abiding possession. So, among many others, Kurtz (*Geschichte des Alten Bundes*, p. 28), who says, ‘In the renewed promise (Gen. 17:8), the possession of the land is called an everlasting possession, as the covenant is also called an everlasting covenant.—(Ver. 7, 13.) That the covenant should be called an everlasting one cannot appear strange, as it is a covenant that must reach its end. If the fruit of the covenant is of a permanent kind, such also must be the covenant itself, of which it is the fulfillment. The promise of an everlasting possession of the land had respect primarily to the pilgrim-condition of Abraham, which was such as not to admit of his possessions. . . (yet it is Israel’s land forever), though Israel may have been exiled from the land, and whether the exile may have lasted seventy or two thousand years.’ True, no doubt, if the relative position of things continues substantially the same during the longer, as during the shorter period of exile; but not, surely, if they have undergone an essential change. The seed of Abraham has become unspeakably ennobled in Christ, and it is but natural to infer that the inheritance also shall obtain a corresponding elevation. The peculiar distinction of Canaan, and that which most of all rendered it an inheritance of blessing, was its being God’s land. And if in Christ

the whole earth becomes in the same sense the Lord's, that Canaan was of old claimed to be His, then the promise will embrace the earth; nor will it be, in such a case, as if Canaan were lost to any portion of the seed, but rather as if Canaan were indefinitely widened and enlarged to receive them. In like manner, believers have the promise that they shall worship in His temple; and yet, when the heavenly appears to John in its glory, he sees no temple in it. Does the promise therefore fail? On the contrary, it is in the highest sense fulfilled. The no-temple simply means that all has become temple; alike sacred and glorious; just as we may say, the no-Canaan in Christ has become all-Canaan. The inheritance is not lost; it has only ceased to become a part, and extends as far and wide as Christ's peculiar possession reaches.—(Ps. 2). Here, however, we tread on the confines of prophecy, a field on which at present we do not mean to enter. We simply add, in confirmation of what has now been advanced regarding the Abrahamic covenant, that as the covenant is called everlasting, and the land also an everlasting possession, so circumcision is called everlasting: 'My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.'—(Ver. 13) But we know for certain that this was not intended to be in the strict sense perpetual." (Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, pp. 416-418).

CHAPTER VI

PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS WHICH HELP US TO INTERPRET PROPHECY

There are several passages in the Gospels which enable us to discern the scriptural principles which should be followed in the interpretation of the kingdom prophecies. We have already noticed that the work of the Messiah was to be spiritual in its nature, since He came to save His people from their sins (Matt. 1:21). Then, too, the kingdom was to be of such a nature that a Jew simply as a Jew could not enter it. He had to be born again (John 3:1-5; Matt. 3:2-9). The kingdom was to be universal, not local, in its system of worship (John 4:19-24). These, and others, we have already presented in chapter one. Let us now consider some others.

1. "*Out of Egypt Have I Called My Son*" (Matt. 2:15)

The use of types in prophecy is illustrated by Matt. 2:14-15. "When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." Richard Watson, in his Commentary on Matthew, has some pertinent observations on this passage. He wrote:

"This is cited from Hosea 11:1; and has been often adduced, by those who consider the quotations from the Old Testament in the evangelists as mere accommodated allusions, founded upon some vague and undesigned resemblances, as a pregnant proof of their theory. But it is here to be recollected, that the evangelist introduces the quotation with the formula, 'that it might be fulfilled,' as in chap. 1:22, 23, on which see the note. Now this formula is just as appropriate when a type is referred to, as a prophecy; for when the type is not one of human fancy, but of divine appointment, in each case there is an accomplishment, or completion; because a type is predictive, and differs only from a prophecy in form. The passage, as it stands in Hosea, is, 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt;' and, as these words were spoken of the people

Israel, the question is, whether, in any respects, the people Israel bore a typical character? This must be granted, because nothing is more certain, both from the style of the Hebrew prophets, and from the writings of St. Paul, than that Israel 'after the flesh' is often made the type of 'the Israel of God,' or of the Christian church, and the deliverance of the former from Egypt the type of our redemption by Christ. It will be pertinent next to inquire, whether by the prophet Hosea the term Israel is not sometimes used in a sense not literal, and under which, therefore, some religious mystery is contained. Of this we have an instance in chap. 12:3-6: 'By his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him.—Therefore turn thou to thy God: keep mercy and judgment, and wait on thy God continually.' Here, indeed, there is not a typical use of the real Jacob or Israel; but the people are personated and identified with their progenitor, and under that character, as Israel, 'a prince which had power with God,' they are exhorted, as though they had been Jacob or Israel himself, to 'turn to God,' and to 'wait on him continually,' in order to prevail. This is sufficient to prove, that this prophet does not always confine himself to one simple view in the use of the term Israel. But it will throw still greater light upon the subject, if we consider that the people Israel are sometimes spoken of as one person, and called God's 'son,' and his 'first-born' which indicates that Israel was intended to be in some particulars the type of some individual: and who could this be but 'the Son,' and 'the Firstborn' of God, the Messiah? To which we may add this strong confirmation, that the Messiah himself is by the prophets called Israel, doubtless for this reason, for no other can be assigned, that he was, in some respects or other, typified by the people Israel. Thus, in Isaiah 49:3, where Jehovah is introduced speaking to Messiah, he says, 'Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified;' and Isaiah 42:1,—'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth,' is, in the Septuagint, 'Jacob my servant,—and Israel mine elect.' Here too the Jewish uninspired writers afford a proof that they understood the Messiah to be typified by Israel. Thus Dr. Allix remarks, that in the Law it is written, (Ex. 4:22,) 'Israel is my son, even my first-born.' Hence Rabbi Nathan in *Schemoth Rabba* on those words speaks thus:—"As I made Jacob my first-born, (Exodus 4:22,) so have I made Messiah my first-born, as it is said, Psalm 89:27, 'I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.' Thus then, as we find the Messiah called Jacob and Israel, and (no other reason can be assigned for this but that something in the case and history of the people of Israel was realized in him, in the sense of correspondence with an instituted type, the words of Hosea were intended to indicate, at least in one respect, in

what the type consisted, and those of the evangelist how the type was fulfilled in him. Israel was in Egypt subject to a foreign power, and in a lowly state; but was brought out from thence, and, after various trials and wanderings in the desert, was raised to dominion and glory among the nations. (So our Lord was for a time in Egypt, in subjection to a foreign dominion, and in a lowly condition; but was called from thence, that, after his season of trial and humiliation, he might be exalted to glory and universal dominion.) It is in these particulars that the type was fulfilled.) Israel the typical son, and Jesus the true Son, were each called out of Egypt, by special interposition of God, to accomplish his great purposes, and to be raised to honor, and invested with dominion. We may therefore conclude, that the Holy Spirit first dictated the passage quoted to Hosea, and then directed St. Matthew to refer the call of Christ out of Egypt to the same passage, as an accomplishment of it, in order to explain in what the typical character of Israel in reference to Christ consisted, and to convince the Jews by this type that the humiliation and glory of the Messiah were as much connected, in the intention of God, as the humiliation of the ancient Israel, and the glory to which the people were afterwards conducted. Thus the words of the prophet, which had always a mystical reference to Christ, were in the strict sense FULFILLED. With respect to this passage it may, however, be observed that Doddridge, following earlier commentators, inclines to the opinion that the words are in the strictest sense a prophecy and are to be read. "Though Israel be a child that is wayward and perverse, yet I have loved him, and WILL CALL my Son out of Egypt;" the past being used for the future, as is frequent in the prophetic writings. The sense would then be, that, notwithstanding the unworthiness of Israel, yet the compassion of God would still extend to them through the Messiah, and that, after having been preserved from Herod, he would be called out of Egypt to accomplish their salvation." (Richard Watson, *An Exposition of Matthew*, pp. 38-40).

On this same passage Moses Stuart wrote:

"What then are the elements of this case, and of all others like to it? Simply these; viz., that something transacted, done, performed in former days, or any event that happened, if they found an antitype or corresponding resemblance under the new dispensation, might be said to have a fulfilment. But who that ever has studied the New Testament references to the ancient Scriptures, does not know that the words *fulfilment* and *fulfil* have a wide latitude of meaning? Any thing which happened or was done in ancient times, and which for substance is repeated or takes place again under the new dispensation;

any thing later which presents a lively resemblance to another and earlier thing; may be, and often is, spoken of as of that earlier thing. It matters not, now, whether the word by strictly critical and classical usage would bear this latitude of sense. Enough that such is New Testament usage.

"God often calls ancient Israel his child, his son, because he was a special object of his love. The Hebrews were exiles in the land of Egypt; they were delivered from that state by a special providence, and brought to Palestine, the promised land. Jesus, the beloved Son of God in a higher and nobler sense, was an exile in Egypt, he was delivered from this state and brought to Palestine—and all by a special Providence. Angels interposed to accomplish his deliverance. Here then was a case, in which that Son of God in whom he was well pleased was brought to Egypt, and out of Egypt, in a manner not unlike to that recorded in ancient history. What happened in later times, happened in a higher and nobler sense than what happened in earlier times. And might it not be said, on this account, that there was in this case a plerosis? It is said; and why not justly said, and in a way full of meaning?" (*Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy*, 2nd ed., Andover: 1842, pp. 35-36).

There are other prophecies in the New Testament which are interpreted "typically," but all of them will not be examined. This one is given as a sample to indicate that some prophecies are so interpreted. Thus the principle of interpreting some prophecies "typically" is established. As to which prophecies are so interpreted, one must decide from a study of each case or each classification of prophecies. The principle of interpreting prophecies "typically" can be misapplied, **just as any other principle can be misapplied. But that is no argument against the principle.** And the principle itself must be accepted. This means that one cannot automatically reject an interpretation of a prophecy by saying: "That must be wrong since you are interpreting it 'typically,' and it is wrong to interpret any prophecy 'typically.'" Instead of arguing in this manner one must show that the scriptural principle of interpreting some prophecies "typically" has been misapplied in this or that specific case.

2. *The Voice of One Crying (Matt. 3:1-3)*

"In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." (Matt. 3:1-3)

On this Richard Watson commented: "These words are supposed by some to have been first spoken of the return of the Jews from the captivity of Babylon, through the desert places which separated the two countries. Bishop Lowth takes this view, but allows that under the emblem of that deliverance a redemption of an infinitely more glorious nature was shadowed out, and that the evangelists, with the greatest propriety, apply the words to the opening of the gospel dispensation by John the Baptist. But there is no more reason to suppose that this lofty prediction had a primary and an ultimate sense, than that the fifty-third chapter of the same prophet referred first to some person who lived before Christ, and then more perfectly to Christ himself. Many prophecies, indeed, have a double reference, an immediate and an ultimate one, which arose out of that system of typical persons and typical things which we find in scripture. But it is equally certain, that many prophecies of the Old Testament refer to Christ, and to him only. Such, by the acknowledgement of all Christians, is the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; and whoever reads the section in which the passage in question stands, and which obviously comprehends the first eleven verses of the fortieth chapter of the same book, will perceive that it is as distinct and perfect a portion of prophecy, and possesses as complete a unity as the former, and has no internal marks of reference whatever to any other event beside that personal appearance of Messiah, to be introduced by his harbinger. Bishop Lowth opens the passage with his usual taste: 'The prophet hears a voice giving orders by solemn proclamation, to prepare the way of the Lord in the wilderness, to remove all obstructions before Jehovah marching through the desert; the idea taken from the practice of eastern monarchs, who sent harbingers before them to prepare all things for their passage, and pioneers to open the passes, to level the ways, and to remove impediments.' But what application there is in all this to the return of the Jews from Babylon, it is impossible to conceive. Had they marched from Babylon, as from Egypt, with the visible cloud of the divine presence among them, there would then have been an adaptation in the terms of the prophecy to the event; 'Jehovah' would then have had 'his way in the wilderness;' but they returned in scattered parties, without pomp, and especially without any visible presence of the Lord. Isaiah, however, expressly says, that the voice cries, 'Prepare the way of the Lord;' and the passage which St. Matthew quotes with brevity, declares that 'the glory of the Lord should be revealed, and that all flesh should see it.' It is clear, therefore, that it has no application to the return of the Jews, and refers solely to those events to which the evangelists so explicitly apply it. John the Baptist was 'THE VOICE,' or herald, and

Jesus was the JEHOVAH whose personal appearance as 'God manifest in the flesh,' and subsequent glorious manifestation, he proclaimed and prepared.

"This mission of John, as the harbinger of our Lord, exhibits another instance of the fulfillment of those prophecies to which St. Matthew, as writing first especially to the Jews, directed their attention more frequently than the other evangelists. At the same time the accomplishment of a prophecy which borrows its terms from the magnificence of eastern monarchs, who were preceded by heralds, and before whom valleys were exalted and hills levelled, in a manner so manifestly spiritual, and turns the attention so absolutely from external to moral grandeur, sufficiently reproveth those who contend too strenuously for the literal accomplishment of the sayings of the ancient prophets, and thereby often fall into a Jewish mode of interpreting them. Prophecy has its peculiar imagery, its own appropriate dress of metaphor and allegory, which must not be overlooked.

"Here, the monarch is Christ, but his majesty is in his doctrine, his character, and his works. The herald, too, is a man in rough raiment, issuing from the wild solitudes in which he had been trained to converse with God to rouse a slumbering people by urging their immediate repentance upon pain of imminent judgments; and the levelling of hills and valleys, is that preparation of the heart for the doctrine of Christ which consists in contrition and humility. That the Baptist was a powerful preacher, the immense number of persons who flock to his baptism, confessing their sins, is a sufficient proof; that he was a successful one, in his special office of 'preparing the way of the Lord,' appears from this, that several of the apostles, and others of the early disciples of Christ, had been previously the disciples of John; and the effect of his preaching was, no doubt, not only to prepare them, but multitudes of the Jews, to receive the gospel, both in Judea and in other places into which his disciples carried his doctrine; for of this the evangelical history contains many indications.

"Lightfoot has showed from the Rabbinical writings, that the Jews themselves have held, and still hold, that repentance should precede the coming of Messiah." (Watson, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 44-46).

3. Concerning Matt. 4:13-17

"And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the seacoast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephtholim: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephtholim, by the way of the

sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up. From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Thus reads the passage.

"Bishop Lowth, however, following Mr. Mede, begins the prophecy, as in our Bibles, with the whole of the first verse, and translates it, 'But there shall not hereafter be darkness in the land which was distressed; in the former time, (alluding to the Assyrian invasion, and the captivity of the ten tribes,) he debased the land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphtali: but in the latter time he hath made it glorious, even the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people that walk in darkness. . . . There can be no pretence here to suppose an accommodation of this prediction quoted from Isaiah 9., since it stands in connection with the illustrious prophecy of Christ, 'For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given,' etc. Here the divine Saviour, so predicted, rises as the light of the world upon 'Galilee of the Gentiles,' a province which had within itself a mixed population of Jews and Gentiles; being partly inhabited, says Strabo, by Egyptians, Arabians, and Phenicians, and so was a striking emblem of the whole world of Jews and Gentiles. These 'sat in darkness,' in ignorance of God and spiritual things, and 'in the region and shadow of death;' expressions used for the grave, and for the obscure abodes of the departed spirits of the wicked in the invisible world; and, by a strong and impressive metaphor, they are used to describe the misery, helplessness, and danger of a people without truth and piety. In a still stronger sense they apply to all the pagan Gentile nations, and the Jews in that state of unbelief and rejection in which they have been for so many ages. But as Christ fixed his dwelling in Galilee of the Gentiles as THE LIGHT in these regions of darkness, and THE LIFE amidst these shadowy abodes of death, and filled this benighted country with his heavenly doctrine; so shall this glorious prophecy, one of those which, as Lord Bacon says, have 'a germinate accomplishment,' be in every succeeding age more extensively fulfilled, until 'the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.' Isaiah used the phrase 'walked in darkness,' and St. Matthew, 'sat' the meaning of which is the same; each, in the Hebrew mode of speaking, signifying TO BE OR TO DWELL." (*Ibid.*, p. 62, 63).

4. Concerning Matt. 11:4-5

"Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight,

and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." In Luke 18:21 Jesus also applied Isa. 61:1 to the work which He was doing.

"These were the proofs on which our Saviour rested his claim to be the Messiah for the conviction of John's disciples; but why did he refer to such works when the disciples of John could scarcely have been ignorant of his miracles, the 'fame' of which, it is so often said, spread throughout 'all that region?' The reason was, that the message being sent to John their master, manifestly as the proper person to point out its force to his disciples, he could not but perceive that the cogency of Christ's answer lay in the reference which it makes to the fulfillment of two illustrious passages in Isaiah, which speak so clearly of the Messiah, that the Jewish writers themselves hesitated not in applying them to him. The first is Isaiah 35:5, 6: 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.' The other passage was indicated by the last clause of the reply, And the poor have the GOSPEL preached to them. It is Isaiah 61:1, etc.: 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the MEEK; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives,' etc. The Messiah of the prophet was to perform miracles of healing; and he was to be a preacher of GOOD TIDINGS, of the gospel, to poor, humble, afflicted persons, the captives of sin and misery; and this, as though our Lord had said, is the work in which I am engaged. He even adds to the miracles mentioned by Isaiah as to be performed by Messiah, and the dead are raised; the force of which would be felt, if the sentiment of the modern Rabbins was then held, that 'in the land where the dead should arise, the kingdom of the Messiah should commence.' That the Jews expected the Messiah to perform great miracles, is clear from John 7:31: 'When the Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?' " (*Ibid.*, p. 163).

It is easy to see, since this passage applies to the work of Jesus Christ, in relationship to His first coming and the work which He was to do, that figurative language is employed in this prophecy.

(1) The spiritual blossoming of barren spiritual places is described in language drawn from barren land being made productive (35:1-2). These things were connected with the excellency and glory of the Lord being seen. (35:2).

(2) Jesus said that the dumb hear, and this was a fulfillment of Isa. 35:5. He also said that the lame walk (Matt. 11:5). Jesus made them walk. In the prophecy of Isaiah we are told that "Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert." (35:6). What connection, physically speaking, could these things have to do with water breaking out in the wilderness? Isaiah simply continued to use language describing barren physical conditions of the ground, and then drew an illustration from a highway, the highway of holiness over which the unclean shall not pass (35:8). No lions would be there, but the redeemed would travel on it. The ransomed would return and come to Zion and find joy (35:10).

When one turns to the places where these prophecies are found one discovers that a great deal of figurative language is employed. The entire chapter of Isaiah 35 is tied up with the prophecy to which Jesus appealed. The discouraged were to be strengthened by being told that "he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened." ((35:4-5). Thus it is evident that Jesus' first coming was to do the work which is set forth in this chapter. But let us quote the entire chapter.

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall give unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them *that are* of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water, in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go upon thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there: And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Is it not obvious that figurative language is used, and is drawn from two sources? First, figures are drawn from agricultural conditions to show the great spiritual transformations that take place in Christ's work. (Second,) the redeemed are pictured as traveling a highway of holiness and coming to Zion. But it should be obvious that it is not a physical highway which they are traveling, but a spiritual one and thus it must be that their coming to Zion is a spiritual coming. Zion as the center of the worship of God under the Old Testament is used as a figure to portray spiritual Zion under the New Testament. And to such a Zion we are indeed come. "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. . .". (Heb. 12:22). >

Thus, again, it is seen that the New Testament interpretation of Old Testament prophecy sanctions the principles of interpretations which maintain that figurative and typical language are often used in prophecy to describe spiritual realities to come in the New Testament.

5. Christ's Coming and Work Not Warlike (Matt. 12:15-21)

"But when Jesus knew it, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; And charged them that they should not make him known: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break and smoking flax shall he not quench till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

On verses 17 through 21 Watson comments:

"That it might be fulfilled—On the authority of the inspired evangelist we are taught, that this prophecy had a direct reference to the messiah, and was truly fulfilled in our Lord. From it we learn that the Messiah was God's chosen servant; his beloved, in whom he is well pleased; that he was anointed of the Holy Ghost, I will put my Spirit upon him; that he should show judgment, that is, make a revelation of truth, for the word signifies a body of doctrine, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles; and that in his name the Gentiles should trust, should rely upon him for salvation, and find it in him. Now it was necessary that some marks should be exhibited by which the great personage who was appointed to confer such benefits should be

known when he appeared upon earth, and these the prophecy distinctly sets forth. The first is the humble and unostentatious manner in which he should fulfill his great ministry: 'He shall not strive, nor cry' in vehement contention with his opposers in support of his claims; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets, in loud and boastful proclamation of them. The second mark is his tender condescension to the weak, the afflicted, and the lowly: A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench. To these particulars, inserted in the prophecy on purpose to make the Messiah manifest to the attentive observer when he should in fact appear, our Lord's conduct so strikingly corresponded, and in so natural and unaffected a manner, that this agreement proves that he was the person intended in the prophecy. A dignified humility, an entire deadness to human applause, and the meekest submission to his whole appointed course of reproach and calumny, are among the most obvious traits of his character as a public teacher; and whether we take the beautiful figures which are employed by the prophet to illustrate his tenderness, as representations of the bodily or mental infirmities and afflictions of men, the application is equally convincing. Their first application to the corporal infirmities and almost expiring life of those our Lord healed, is obvious; but still more emphatically, the bruised reed is the emblem of the sorrow under which the spirit bows, as a reed which when bruised can no longer stand erect; hence, 'to hang down the head like a bulrush' or reed, has become proverbial. The smoking expiring wick of the lamp, requiring a fresh supply of oil, represents the almost expiring state of the light of truth in the minds of the Jewish people, approaching utter extinction, and calling for immediate attention to excite the flickering dying flame: both the figures too are taken from mean and common things, to indicate that the persons represented were precisely those whom the Jewish teachers most despised, the poor, and humble. How many such characters came to Jesus during his sojourn on earth for help and deliverance! and which of them ever applied in vain? Bruised spirits, bent down by a sense of sin, or a weight of bodily suffering, and often both, were the objects of his special compassion; and innumerable were the monuments which he left throughout the land of his prompt and effectual pity. Nor with less sympathy did he regard the ignorance of a neglected people, in danger of having the last ray of truth extinguished in their minds from the want of proper instructors. In every docile and inquiring mind he trimmed the lamp of the understanding; and amidst all the fogs and vapors of prejudices which rendered the communication of truth difficult in itself, and trying to the patience of the teacher, as the kindling of a lamp where the wick is faulty and the atmosphere foul, he kindled that light which 'guided their feet into the way of

peace,' and rendered many of them the guides of their nation and the world into the way of salvation. To our blessed Lord alone these characteristics belong, and they prove that the whole prophecy had respect to him. To apply it, as some have done, to Cyrus, or to the nation of Israel, has not the slightest plausibility; for neither can anyone of its particulars be affirmed, even in a primary and inferior sense. The Chaldee paraphrase and several of the Jewish writers regarded it as spoken wholly to the Messiah; and 'to no other person whatever,' says Bishop Lowth, 'can it with any justice or propriety be applied.' St. Matthew's quotation differs from the Septuagint, but agrees with the Hebrew, in all but two clauses. 'Till he have set forth judgment in the earth,' is, the evangelist, *till he send forth judgment unto victory.* The sense is, however, the same; for to SET or establish judgment in the earth, and to bring forth or lead on judgment to victory, each obviously refers to the triumphs of his doctrine, the truth he reveals; for in the Old Testament it is used for the laws of God, his divine laws and institutions, which should PREVAIL at length over all nations, through that very compassion and tenderness which brought under their influence so many of his own people, and trained them up to instruct others. *And in his name shall the Gentiles trust,* is, in Isaiah, 'And the isles shall wait for his law.' The evangelist here agrees with the Septuagint, which takes the isles, in an extensive sense, for any Gentiles, however distant; and to wait for, in the sense of to hope or trust, which the Hebrew word justifies. Thus the difference is only apparent, and arises from translation only." (*Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179).

Albert Barnes, in his commentary, comments as follows on verse 17: "Matthew here quotes a passage from Isa. 42:1-4, to show *the reason why he thus retired from his enemies and sought concealment.* The Jews, and the disciples also, at first, expected that the Messiah would be a conqueror, and vindicate himself from all his enemies. When they saw him retiring before them, and instead of subduing them by force, seeking a place of concealment, it was contrary to all their previous notions of the Messiah. Matthew, by this quotation, shows that *their conception of him had been wrong.* Instead of a warrior and an earthly conqueror, he was predicted under a totally different character. Instead of shouting for battle, lifting up his voice in the streets, oppressing the feeble—breaking bruising reeds, and quenching smoking flax, as a conqueror—he would be peaceful, retiring, and strengthen the feeble, and cherishing the faintest desires of holiness. This appears to be the general meaning of this quotation here."

Thus we see that the prophet Isaiah had foretold the fact that He would not be a warlike Messiah. Thus the kingdom announced as at

hand by John the Baptist could not have been one in which Christ would rule with carnal might and in warfare of a carnal nature overcome His enemies and the enemies of Israel. There is no difference, therefore, in the nature of the kingdom as first proclaimed and the kingdom which was finally established. This teaching in Matt. 12:17-21 indicates this even before Jesus began to teach in parables. In fact, it is indicated in Matt. 1:21. It is also the teaching of Christ just before His death, when He showed that the nature of the kingdom was such that His disciples did not fight that He might not be delivered to His enemies (John 18:36).

This shows also that Christ's work was not to be limited to the Jews, but was also to include the Gentiles (Isa. 42:1, 4, 6; Matt. 12:17-21). The work among the Gentiles in the present covenant is the work which the prophets prophesied (Acts 13:46-48).

6. *The Hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees* *Predicted (Matt. 15:7-9)*

"Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying: This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

The prophecy is from Isa. 29:13 and in this chapter we find a description of the spiritual blindness of Israel during Christ's time. This was the time when God would do a marvelous work and a wonder (Isa. 29:14). Such a work has been done by and through Christ.

Again we see that the prophets had foreseen that all Israel would not be in the condition of heart which was essential to acceptance of Jesus the Christ.

7. *"Thy King Cometh Unto Thee"* (Matt. 21:4-5)

"All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." The remarks of Richard Watson on this passage are worthy of consideration.

"The end of the action was not merely or chiefly to fulfill the prophecy, but the prophecy was uttered with reference to it, and was fulfilled by it, whilst the action itself rested upon other reasons. These appear to have been, (1.) To assert his majesty, as in truth the King Messiah, and yet still to show that his kingdom was not a civil one,

by his taking no step to avail himself of the popular excitement to seize the reins of government; for after the events of this triumphal day he retired into the secrecy and solitude of the Mount of Olives. (2.) To give an opportunity to the people publicly to declare their belief that he was the Messiah, the Son of David, of which they were generally persuaded, although their views of the true character of the Messiah were confused and erring. (3.) To profess more publicly than heretofore, and in the very metropolis of Judea, that he was that 'King' of Zion of whom the prophet Zecharias had spoken, as coming 'riding upon the foal of an ass,' and thus to apply to himself a prophecy which both ancient and modern commentators have referred to their Messiah, as Bochart has shown by several extractions. (4.) To allow his followers to acknowledge him, by their acclamations, as the Messiah, in order to restrain the chief priests and Pharisees, by fear of the popular feeling in his favor, for an immediate attempt upon his life, and to gain time for the delivery of those important discourses, consisting of prophecies and rebukes, which for five successive days before his crucifixion he pronounced in the temple, whilst at night he retired to the Mount of Olives.

"The prophecy cited is from Zech. 9:9 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass,' or rather, 'EVEN upon a colt, the foal of an ass,' the last clause being an explanatory parallelism. The first clause mentions the species of beast, the second its age; and this greater particularity in the prophecy rendered the fulfilment the more striking. The evangelist has quoted rather the substance than the exact words of the prophecy; which as writing for the Jews, was sufficient to refer them to their own scriptures. Both St. Matthew and the Septuagint seem to have read *meeek*, instead of *abased* or *afflicted*, which is supported by the Targum, Jarchi, and Kimchi, who all explain it by *humble* or *meeek*. This prophecy is incapable of being applied to any other than Christ, even in a lower sense. Those who would refer it to Zerubbabel forget that it was written subsequent to his residence in Jerusalem; beside that in no sense could he be called king, who was but the deputy of a foreign power, Nehemiah was also appointed by Artaxerxes to be 'governor,' the viceroy, but not a king; and certainly, of neither of these, nor of Judas Maccabeus and his successors, could it be said that 'he should speak peace to the heathen, and have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.' On these grounds, a few of the Rabbins, who, to avoid the application of this prophecy to Jesus of Nazareth, pretended that it related not to the Messiah, but to one or other of the above persons, are stoutly opposed by others, who

generally allow that to Messiah alone it can be consistently applied. Thus, Rabbi Solomon, upon Zech. 9:9: 'This place cannot be interpreted of any other, because it is said of him, 'And his dominion shall be from sea to sea.' It looks directly to Christ, without the intervention of any other; and it may be asked of the Jews, what King of theirs ever came to Zion in the manner described by the prophet, save Jesus of Nazareth? Sion is put for Jerusalem; and both are personified, according to oriental custom, as a virgin, or 'daughter.'

"This prophecy is quoted both by St. Matthew and St. John in brief, to direct attention to the whole section in which it stands, and which will be found richly charged with the most important views of the character of the Messiah, and the great results of his reign. There he is represented, amidst all his lowliness, as 'a king,' 'righteous,' 'having salvation,' and so answering to Melchizedec, as 'king of righteousness,' and 'king of peace,' Heb. 7:2. And as the prophecy proceeds, it gives an important and most interesting reason why our Lord rode into his metropolis on an ass; it was to declare that his kingdom was to be one of PEACE, not of WAR: 'And I will cut off the CHARIOT from Ephraim, and the HORSE from Jerusalem;' both which the Jews were forbidden by the law to use, in order to take away the temptation to offensive wars, as above stated. 'And the battle bow shall be cut off, and he shall speak peace unto the heathen, and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth;' and yet these extensive conquests were to be made without 'chariots' of war, without battle 'horses,' or the 'battle bow.' So that the spiritual nature of Christ's reign could not be more strongly expressed; and that the prophecy was not so interpreted by the Jews is in proof that their earthly-mindedness and ambition wholly blinded them to the meaning of their own scriptures. Yet it is curious to observe that some of their more modern commentators come so much nearer to the truth. Rabbi Saadiah Gaon, on Dan. 7:13, says, 'Is it not written in Zechariah, of Messiah, 'lowly and riding on an ass? Shall he not rather come with humility, than with equipage and grandeur?' And David Kimchi, 'He shall ride upon an ass, not through any want, because the whole world shall be under his dominion, but through his humility, and to acquaint the Jews that there was no farther need of horses and chariots for the prophet adds, 'I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem.' Here again, the light of the gospel could not be wholly excluded from these Rabbins, who, in the controversy which had been excited with the Christians, were compelled, by the force of the prophecies brought against them, to admit a humbled as well as an exalted Messiah; only they either feigned two Messiahs, or took refuge in the figment of the

Messiah being for a long time hidden before he would manifest himself. These were not, however, the views of the Jewish doctors in the time of our Lord, who looked only for a sudden advent of Messiah in all his glory, to set up his dominion among them. Nor does the prophecy terminate here, 'Captives' are to be delivered; another work, would the Jews say, of a conquering Messiah; but they are to be delivered 'by the blood of the covenant,' not by arms. 'As for thee also, by the BLOOD OF THY COVENANT I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water;' and then, as 'prisoners of hope,' they are exhorted to turn to the 'strong hold,' the Zion, the city of God, and there to receive 'the double,' the abundance of all blessings. To show then to the Jews that he was the king Messiah, he made a triumphal entry into Jerusalem; but to show that he was that meek and peaceful king spoken of by Zechariah, he rode upon *the foal of an ass*, and thus turned their attention to a prophecy which, if they had closely examined it, would have dissipated all their carnal conceptions, as to an earthly kingdom and a warlike Messiah." (*Ibid.*, pp. 295-297).

From this prophecy the following conclusions may be drawn. First, contrary to the expectation of those who believed that Christ came to establish a kingdom in which He would rule with an earthly sceptre, and physically overcome His enemies, the prophet Zechariah saw that His Messiahship would be one which would not use chariots and battle bows to extend and enforce His authority. Second, it did not mean that He would bring universal peace when His reign began. Zechariah 9:10 stated that 'I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen: and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.' Instead of literal Jerusalem enjoying peace, it was cut off in the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. It evidently meant that the nature of his kingdom and His rule would be one of peace. And it is true that peace is found in His kingdom—peace with God, peace within, and peace with men who accept the gospel. Its influence is for peace among all men. But it was spiritual, not literal, Jerusalem in which the battle bow was cut off. Third, evidently Ephraim and Jerusalem are used as types, instead of as literal Ephraim and Jerusalem. For not only did literal Ephraim and Jerusalem not find relief from the sword but some in literal Jerusalem raised the literal sword against Christ and His kingdom.

8. Concerning Luke 4:17-21

"And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where

it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Watson comments on this passage as follows:

"The passage he had selected from Isaiah, they all knew related to the Messiah, for in that their interpretations were universally agreed; and as he had already preached largely throughout Galilee, and spoken and acted in the character of the Messiah, the eyes of all them in the synagogue were fastened upon him, in eager expectation as to what use he might make of the passage, or whether he would apply it to himself.

"*To the poor*— In Hebrew it is *the meek*, but St. Luke follows the LXX. The words, however, come from the same root; and *spiritual poverty, or lowliness and humility of mind, is intended*. Not indeed, as Bishop Horsley well observes, that the figurative sense is to exclude the literal; 'for the Christian revelation is emphatically glad tidings to the poor,' as it opens to them without respect of persons the same glorious hopes as to the most exalted. Still even these must become 'poor in spirit' before they can obtain the true riches. *The broken hearted are the contrite and penitent, who are truly healed by pardoning mercy*. Persons oppressed also with great trouble of mind, arising from outward afflictions, are not excluded. With such, if they bring their case to Christ in prayer, he tenderly sympathizes, grants support and solace; and by the influences of his grace he turns the sorrows of life into the means of *healing the soul*. *To preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, is also to be understood figuratively of our redemption from the captivity of our spiritual enemies.* *Instead of recovery of sight to the blind, which is the reading of the LXX., the Hebrew is, and freedom to those bound in prison;* which is but repetition of the preceding clause. The LXX. probably followed a different reading; or, since it was not uncommon in the east to put out the eyes of prisoners, they took the repetition of the Hebrew to express captivity in its harshest forms, and so concluded the captives spoken of, like Samson, to have been deprived of sight, and put to mean and wasting labours. The deliverance of the demoniacs from the bondage of Satan by our merciful Redeemer, and the opening the eyes of those actually deprived of natural sight, were fulfillments of this illustrious prophecy; but only in a primary and

and inferior sense, as these were visible TYPES, and most certain PLEDGES, of the power of the Saviour to rescue us from the greater calamities of spiritual thralldom, blindness, and degradation. The Chaldee paraphrase interprets the last clause thus, 'To the prisoners, Be ye revealed to the light;' which in substance agrees with the LXX., since to be brought out of constant darkness may be said to be a *recovery of sight to the blind*. The allusion in this case will not be to the custom of putting out the eyes of prisoners, but to that of confining them in pits and dark dungeons. Hence the Messiah, in Isaiah 49:9, is appointed to 'say to the PRISONERS, Go forth; to them that are in DARKNESS, Show yourselves.' The next clause, *to set at liberty them that are bruised*, worn down and wounded by the weight of their chains, is still a heightened representation of the miserable condition of the captives. This clause is not, however, either in the present copies of the Hebrew or Septuagint. The same words occur in the LXX., Isaiah 58.

"To preach, proclaim, the acceptable year of the Lord. An acceptable time is a season in which God shows himself gracious and benign; and there is here an allusion to the year of jubilee, when all debts were cancelled, inheritances restored, and freedom given to all Hebrew bondsmen. This interesting political institution, equally marked by wisdom and benevolence, and which, when once proclaimed by sound of trumpet, filled the whole land with joy and gladness, and was, to those especially who were to partake its benefits, an acceptable and most grateful time, was the type of the gospel age of deliverance and restoration, and was therefore so used by the prophets, and quoted by our Lord. Our Lord began the proclamation of the commencement of this spiritual jubilee; and it is the delightful work of his servants still to publish it, and to offer the benefits of the day, the season of grace, to all who will accept them,—the remission of the debt of sin, the restoration of the alienated inheritance of heaven, and spiritual freedom. Animated by the same fine thought, St. Paul exclaims, 'Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation,' II Cor. 6:2 Verse 21. This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.—That is, in your hearing; as though he had said, I declare to you this day that it is fulfilled; which implied that the acceptable year spoken of by the prophet had arrived, and that he himself was the Messiah who was anointed to preach the good tidings." (Ibid., pp. 577-579).

Since, as has been pointed out elsewhere, the New Testament writers do not always quote the full statement from the Old Testament, but give enough that one may know where the statement is and that they may base their argument on it, let us turn to Isa. 61. Beginning

with verse 2 we read "To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called Trees of righteousness, The planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified. And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations. And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers. But ye shall be named The priests of the Lord: men shall call you The ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves." (61:2-6). These are some of the things contained in that context.

The work of Christ in His first coming was to bring joy to Zion and prosperity in cities, fields and flocks. Yet it is connected with their being trees in a spiritual sense, and priests and ministers of God. Since Jesus applied the prophecy of Isa. 61 to Himself, and to the work which He was then proclaiming, it is evident that one must interpret this prophecy spiritually and not in the literal sense. Since no such work as the rebuilding of physical cities was proclaimed by Christ, nor accomplished by Him and His disciples then or later, it is evident that conditions of renewed physical prosperity are used to describe spiritual conditions. By itself the passage, even considered apart from the New Testament interpretation, shows that spiritual realities are fundamentally involved for they are called trees, but trees of righteousness which were planted by the Lord.

Those today who receive the word of God are planted by the Lord. In speaking of the kingdom, Jesus shows that the word of God is the seed (Matt. 13:19). In condemning those who violated the word of God in order to teach the doctrines of men; of those who drew near with their lips but their hearts were far from him (Matt. 15:7-9), Jesus said: "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." (15:13). It is obvious, therefore, that one is said to be planted by the Lord when he follows the word of the Lord. Those who follow Christ's teaching indeed become trees of righteousness.

The followers of the Lord Jesus Christ are all priests of God (I Pet. 2:5, 9), and this is exactly in harmony with Isa. 61:6 that "ye shall be named The priests of the Lord." We are not, however, priests according to the regulations of the Old Testament, but according to the New. Instead of having carnal ordinances and offerings, we make spiritual offerings unto the Lord (Rom. 12:1-2; Heb. 13:15-16).

Again we are impressed with the lack of harmony between the literalistic interpretation of some Old Testament kingdom prophecies, and the New Testament interpretation.

9. Christ's Suffering Had to Come Before His Glory (Lk. 24:25-27)

"Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

It is evident that if they had understood the prophets they would have realized that Christ must suffer "these things" (his rejection, persecution, death) and to enter into His glory. His entering into His glory was to come *after* His suffering, according to the prophets (Isa. 53, for example). This means that it would have been impossible for Christ to have fulfilled prophecies in their correct order and to have established a triumphant, earthly, kingdom among the Jews in His first advent. And yet, there are some who maintain that Jesus came to establish such a kingdom; but, that when it was certain that Israel would reject Him, He changed His teaching (beginning with the parables of the Kingdom, Matt. 13) concerning the kingdom and established the church instead. This cannot be since the church is based on His death, burial, and resurrection. He came to establish the church *since* He came to suffer and afterwards enter into His glory.

One is, with those early disciples, "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken" if he thinks that the kingdom preached as at hand by John and by Jesus was any different from the kingdom which was later established. For the kingdom which was preached as at hand, had to be a kingdom whose nature took into consideration the suffering of Christ before His entering into His glory. For, in order to fulfill the prophecies in their correct order, Jesus had to suffer before entering into His glory. Thus He had to suffer before establishing His kingdom. The kingdom which He established through the apostles does take into consideration, in its nature, these facts. So it is the kingdom which was announced as at hand.

CHAPTER VII

PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

As in other books, so in the book of Acts we are not concerned with the application in the New Testament of *all* Old Testament prophecies, but only with some of those which will help us in our study of the kingdom question. The first of these is the prophecy of Joel.

1. The Last Days Have Started (Acts 2:16-17)

"But *this is that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God. . . ." One does not have to put his finger on every event, and its fulfillment, which was spoken by Joel in order to know that Peter told the truth in his application of the prophecy. Peter said *this is that* of which Joel spoke, and it is infidelity to say that *this is not that*. The things which were taking place were things which Joel said would come to pass. And Joel said that they would come to pass in the last days, so evidently they were coming to pass in the last days. Thus the last days dispensation is already upon us. It is not something which is yet to come. The last days, of course, have not already run their course, but they had started when Peter spoke, and they continue even until now.

When we turn to the prophecy of Joel it is evident that the language describing a type is used in prophesying the anti-type under the New Testament. "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: *for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance*, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." (Joel 2:32). The sense in which there was deliverance in Mount Zion and Jerusalem was not in a physical but in a spiritual sense. It was in them literally only as they were the places in which the gospel was proclaimed at first. Physically speaking, there was no deliverance in Jerusalem, but destruction, when Rome destroyed the city in A.D. 70. As a physical place it was not a place of deliverance.

However, it is evident from the prophecy that physical Mount Zion and Jerusalem are not the theme of Joel 2:32. If they were it

would contradict John 4:24. Salvation or deliverance in Zion is connected with calling on the name of the Lord to be saved. Those who call "shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance." All who call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered, and people call on Him today in places other than literal Jerusalem. In the first century they called in many other literal places, and were delivered. But how could this have been if literal Jerusalem had been meant. They were not all in that literal city and if that was where deliverance was, then they would have had to have come there to receive the deliverance that comes through calling on the name of the Lord. So it must be that just as Mount Zion and Jerusalem were the center of the Old Testament system, and people there called on the name of the Lord; just so in spiritual Zion—which the old Zion typified—believers would find salvation. Thus Hebrews 12:22 says: "But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem."

We know that we do not find deliverance in literal Zion, but in Spiritual Zion. We know that these are the days, promised by Joel, in which men would find salvation in Zion through calling on God's name.

The conclusions established by Peter's application of Joel's prophecy are as follows: First, we are now in the last days dispensation, and since it is the last we do not look for another dispensation on this earth. Second, the prophecies sometimes used symbols, since the moon was not literally turned into blood, and no one, known to the author, expects that it will thus literally take place at any time in the future. Third, that literal Zion and Jerusalem were used when spiritual Zion was meant. He who interprets this literally misinterprets it. God meant what He said, but He said it in language which described the type although He meant the anti-type.

2. *The Throne of David* (Acts 2:30-36)

Since a long chapter is devoted to this subject elsewhere in the book it will not be examined here.

3. *At the Right Hand of God* (Acts 2:34-35)

"For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool."

This quotation is from the 110th Psalm, and when we turn to it we find some things which will help us in interpreting prophecy. Concerning this psalm we suggest:

(1) It is obvious that although the gospel, and the proclamation of His reign, was first proclaimed in literal Zion, it was not confined to it; neither was literal Zion the seat of His rule. He was ruling from His position at the right hand of God. This psalm predicts, therefore, not a so-called millennial reign in literal Zion on the literal throne of David, but the spiritual reign of the Messiah. Thus, this present reign was not something unforeseen by the prophets.

(2) The church age is predicted in the Old Testament for Psalms 110:1 describes the present reign of Jesus which was first proclaimed to the world, as an established fact, on the first Pentecost, after the resurrection of Christ, which is the birthday of the church. (Acts 2:34-35).

(3) The reign of the Messiah was not to be one in which He would not encounter enemies; instead His rule was to be "in the midst of thine enemies." (Psalms 110:2). This is also indicated by the fact that He was to reign until all enemies were conquered, so evidently there were enemies existing while He reigned. His reign did not automatically banish all enemies.

(4) He was to reign as a priest (Psalms 110:4). Christ is today the priest after the order of Melchizedek (Hebrews 7:1-8:4).

(5) He is to overcome his enemies. Adam Clarke maintains that this entire psalm is a "war song," and that its terms are military terms. (Commentary, Vol III: 584. Col.1). And certainly it does speak of the reign, the battles, and the triumph of Christ. However, we know that He is not engaged today in a carnal warfare with His enemies, but in a spiritual one. He does not overthrow them with the power of arms borne by His disciples, but through His word and through His providence. And although at last His enemies shall be literally banished from His presence (2 Thess. 1:6-12), yet any of the terms in the psalm which describe His warfare at least until that time, must be interpreted spiritually.

4. *The Sufferings, thus the Rejection, of Christ Predicted (Acts 3:18)*

"But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled."

Since the sufferings of Christ were predicted, at least two conclusions follow: First, that the nature of the kingdom which John and Jesus had preached as at hand, took into consideration the fact that Christ was to be rejected before His glorification. For Christ was to suffer (3:18), and then be glorified (3:13). The suffering, and

subsequent glorification of Christ, is in harmony with the nature of the kingdom of God's dear Son of which we are now members. Thus it is the kingdom announced as at hand (Matt. 3:1-2, etc.). If this is not so, then it follows that there was a contradiction within Christ's first coming to earth. If His first coming had to do with His suffering and then being glorified, then it could not have had to do with establishing a kingdom which all Israel would accept and which would, therefore, mean that He would not suffer and be rejected. Christ could not have come to do both at the same time. And yet, the persecution and denial of Christ by Israel's leaders (Acts 3:13-17), "so fulfilled" the prophecies (3:18). This makes it evident that His first coming had to do with these things, and that therefore the kingdom which He proclaimed as at hand was one whose nature provided for His rejection by all but a remnant of Israel. Thus it is evident that there was no change in the kingdom message preached by John, and by Jesus, and the kingdom of God's dear Son which was finally established.

Second, this makes it obvious, of course, that the church age was the subject of prophecy.

5. Destroyed from Among the People

Christ is the prophet like unto Moses (Deut. 18:15-18; Acts 3:22-23). Those who would not hearken to Him were to be cut off from among the people. Under the Old Testament the "usual mode of punishing such offences was by cutting the offender off from among the people." (Ex. 30:33; 12:15; 19:31; Num. 5:31; 19:13; Lev. 7:20, 21, 25, 27. Barnes, *Op. Cit.*). A term is used, to describe Christ's work, which under the Old Testament was associated with the destruction of the individual who was cut off. And yet, as it is used to describe Christ's work it does not involve today just what it involved under the Old Testament. Although it is true that ultimately those who reject Christ will be destroyed, yet the present cutting off means that they are not His people, but are cut off from covenant relationship with God. They are excluded. Thus the remnant who heeded His voice were placed in covenant relationship with Him under the new covenant (Rom. 11:5). Those who did not believe were cut off because of their unbelief (Rom. 11:20-22).

Thus we see that terms under which the old covenant described a physical cutting off, are used to describe a spiritual cutting off when describing Christ's work.

6. Samuel, and the Prophets which Followed Him,
Foretold the Church Age (Acts 3:24)

After showing that Jesus was the prophet like unto Moses (3:20-23), Peter said: "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days."

Of what days do the Old Testament prophets prophesy? Although they prophesied in some matters which were not directly related to the Messiah's kingdom, yet that was one of the big subjects of their prophecy. As related to Jesus, they prophesied concerning suffering, His reign, and kingdom. There are some who say that the church age is not the subject of prophecy, but they are in disagreement with Peter. "These days" of which Peter spoke were the days which were then unfolding. They were the days wherein the prophet like unto Moses spoke and exercised authority. We are now in those days, so the prophets spoke of the days in which we, who are under the new covenant, live.

If the prophecies of the kingdom of the Messiah are not being fulfilled in the present kingdom (Col. 1:13), but will be fulfilled in a future reign, then where in the prophecies of Samuel, and those who came thereafter, do we find any predictions of the present reign of the Messiah. Such predictions must be there, for Peter said that they are. But if they are not the ones which speak of the Messiah's kingdom, then where are they?

If, for example, II Sam. 7:16 does not refer to the present reign of Christ, where in the prophecies of Samuel can we find any reference to Christ's present reign?

7. The King Set Upon the Holy Hill of Zion (Acts 4:24-30)

"Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus."

The reference is to Psalms 2. There the rebellion of men against God and His Anointed, or Christ, is set forth, and the foolishness of their efforts is emphasized.

God shows that in spite of their opposition: "Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion" (Psa. 2:6). From *Acts* we know that this psalm is applied to Christ and to the opposition of Jews and Gentiles to Christ and to His disciples after Him. But in spite of this God had made Christ king, and had proclaimed such in literal Zion on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. *He hath been made* both Lord and Christ. He is *now* at God's right hand *reigning* as king over His kingdom (Acts 2:30-36; Col. 1:13). His reign, however, is in spiritual Zion (Heb. 12:22 shows that it is to spiritual, not literal, Zion that we have come), although in literal Zion as well as elsewhere this fact has been proclaimed.

Further proof that Christ is now king upon the holy hill of Zion (Psa. 2:6), is found in the fact that the very next verse has already been fulfilled. God set His king on the holy hill of Zion. The Son declared the decree to men. "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." (Psa. 2:7). "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." (Acts 13:33). The passage is applied not to His being born of Mary, but to His resurrection wherein He was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:4). Christ was raised up from the dead and He ascended to take His place as king at the right hand of God (Acts 2:30-36).

Thus we must conclude that the holy hill of Zion is used in this prophecy to refer to Christ's reign in heaven over the church, which is spiritual Zion. A literalistic interpretation of this prophecy is a false interpretation.

8. *The Suffering, Before His Exaltation, of Jesus Prophesied* (Acts 8:30-35)

Beginning at Isaiah 53 Philip preached Jesus unto the Eunuch. He thus set forth the humiliation of Christ, *which came before His exaltation*. For did not the prophet say: "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; *because* he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." (53:12). Were not His days

to be prolonged after His soul had been made an offering for sin? (53:10) Thus is it not evident that His triumphs followed His suffering and death? *Was not the way of the cross the way that led to the crown?* In other words, according to prophecy *the cross had to come before the crown?* He could not reign before He had been put to death.

This makes it evident that the message of the kingdom preached by John the Baptist set forth the same kingdom which was finally established. The kingdom which was established in fact was the kingdom which He received after His death and resurrection. The kingdom proclaimed as at hand by John, had to be the kingdom which took into account the fact that the cross came before the crown. The kingdom which was at hand, therefore, could not have been established before the rejection, suffering, and death of the Lord Jesus Christ. The nature of the kingdom which was established in fact made provisions for this, and the kingdom which John proclaimed as at hand had to make provision for it. Thus they must be the same kingdom, and those err who think that any other kind of kingdom could have been at hand in John's day. If another type of kingdom was proclaimed as at hand, it is evident that the cross could not have come before the crown. And this would have meant that Isa. 53 was false.

When Jesus stated that the time was fulfilled, and that the kingdom was at hand (Mk. 1:14, 15), our premillennial friends agree that this kingdom was the one prophesied by the Old Testament prophets, the Messianic Kingdom. They must also agree that for Isa. 53 to be fulfilled the cross had to come before the crown. Thus they should accept the conclusion that it was not only the period of time for the establishment of the kingdom promised in the Old Testament, but that it was also the period of time for the cross to take place; and that the cross had to take place before the establishment of the promised kingdom. Thus it could not have been a time for the establishment of a triumphant kingdom on earth in which Jesus would be accepted by the Jews, instead of rejected by them and going the way of the cross before He entered into His triumph and reign.

9. Jesus Promised as the Savior (Acts 13:23)

Of David's "seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus." This is in harmony with the angel's statement that "she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. 1:21).

This was the mission on which He came. There was no change of this mission during His personal ministry, or after His ascension

and the sending of the apostles to preach the gospel. For after telling Israel that God had raised up Jesus the Saviour (Acts 13:23), he said: "Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent." (13:26). Jesus was raised up as a Saviour, and the apostle was bringing them the word of this salvation. Thus the work done by the apostles in preaching the gospel was the bringing of the word of the salvation which Jesus came to bring to Israel.

Thus the promise that God "made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again." (Acts 13:32-33).

10. The Sure Mercies of David Fulfilled in Christ (Acts 13:34-37)

"And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption."

According to Isaiah 55:3 the sure mercies of David are equal to the everlasting covenant which was to be made with those who were hungry and thirsty. Thus the everlasting covenant, according to Acts 13:34-37 is with us now. It is not something to be established in a future age.

11. Christ Sent to Be a Light Unto the Gentiles (Acts 13:46-47)

. . . Lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth." The work of Christ among the Gentiles, and the universal nature of His message, are the subject of prophecy. It is to this present dispensation that this prophecy is applied. Therefore, it was of this present dispensation that Isaiah spoke. The church age, therefore, is the subject of prophecy.

This prophecy is taken from Isa. 49:6. "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the end of the earth." At the time the Messiah was to do this work on the behalf of Jacob and Israel He was also to be a light to the Gentiles. Christ is

now the light unto the Gentiles; "for salvation unto the ends of the earth" (Acts 13:48); as well as the one who now brings salvation to all of Israel (13:23, 26), who do not despise His work (13:40-41), and judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life (13:46). He is working among both Jew and Gentile. But He was to *also* be a light to the Gentiles when He raised up and restored Jacob and Israel. So he is now doing the work prophesied concerning Jacob and Israel. This makes it evident that one must take a spiritual view of this prophecy. The restoration of which the prophet spoke was a spiritual one, and not a physical one of literal Israel to her literal land. This also makes it clear that R. H. Boll is wrong in assuming that the blessing of the Gentiles in the present dispensation is not the subject of prophecy; for he stated that it was only after the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and only in subservience to Israel, that the prophet had predicted that the Gentiles were to be blessed.

12. *The Tabernacle of David* (Acts 15:16)

This is dealt with in detail in another chapter of the book.

13. *The New Covenant and Its Work Prophesied* (Acts 26:22-23)

"Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and unto the Gentiles." By the people is meant the Jews (compare verse 17), and thus Paul preached Christ as light to both Jews and Gentiles, and what he was doing was what the prophets had said would be done. So the new covenant and its work is predicted by the prophets, for the new covenant is based on Christ's death, and resurrection; and through the gospel message light is brought to Jew and Gentile. Isa. 49:6 had promised Him as a light to the Gentiles, and Isa. 60:1 shows that Israel's light would come, and that the Gentiles would "come to thy light" (60:3). This work is now being done in Christ.

Thus we see that the book of Acts applies Old Testament prophecies of the kingship of Christ, and of His work, to the work now going on in the church age.

CHAPTER VIII

PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS WHICH HELP US INTERPRET PROPHECY

There are a large number of passages in the book of Romans which help us to rightly interpret Old Testament prophecies. The first of these is found in the second verse of the book of Romans, and it proves that the church was predicted in the Old Testament.

1. The Church Age a Subject of Prophecy

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, (which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy Scripture), concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord . . ." (Rom. 1:1-3).

"The gospel to which Paul was set apart is characterized by four facts which deserve special mention. It is God's gospel; he formerly promised it; promised it through his prophets; promised it in the holy Scriptures. For Jews these facts contain a fine argument. They had the prophecies which they acknowledged to be the product of inspired men. They were then compelled, first, either to repudiate these prophecies, or deny that they promised a gospel; or, second, to deny that the gospel which Paul preached was the gospel they promised, or to accept his gospel. The first and second they could not do. They, therefore, decided to deny that the prophecies promised the gospel which Paul preached, and consequently to reject it; and this they did, notwithstanding the fact that his gospel was confirmed by miracles performed before their eyes." (Moses E. Lard, *Commentary on Romans*. Dallas: Eugene S. Smith, Publisher, n.d., p. 26).

The church is built on the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. It is the result of the gospel. Since the gospel was prophesied the church was prophesied, for the church is made up of those who have been redeemed by the gospel of Christ. It is therefore evident that they are wrong who maintain that the church age was not predicted by the Old Testament prophets. Thus we should expect to find, and we shall find, predictions in the Old Testament which set forth the gospel age.

2. The Real Jew Is the Spiritual Jew

"For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." (Rom. 2:28, 29: compare Rev. 3:9).

This makes it clear that the gospel dispensation is composed not of those who are Jews outwardly, but those who are Jews inwardly—spiritual Jews. What counts in this church age is not whether one is a Jew outwardly, but whether he is one spiritually, in the heart. This is what the gospel dispensation emphasizes, and this is the Jew which is justified in the gospel dispensation.

Since the gospel dispensation was prophesied by the Old Testament prophets (Rom. 1:2); and since the gospel dispensation justifies only those who are Jews spiritually, it follows that the Old Testament predictions in speaking of God's people under the gospel dispensation speaks of them as spiritual Jews. In other words, regardless of what language may be used to describe, in prophecy, God's people in the gospel dispensation, it is evident that those terms or that language must be interpreted of those who are Jews spiritually, and not of those who are Jews physically. Since it is the spiritual Jew only who is justified, it is the spiritual Jew only who is meant in prophecy when God's people under the gospel dispensation are described in prophecy.

This passage is also of value in interpreting Old Testament prophecy, in that it clearly shows us that the term Jew is used in the New Testament, at times, as a term for God's spiritual house, the church. Thus we can conclude that in such a case the term implies that the Jew was a type, and the Christian the anti-type. Thus there is on the one hand the physical, literal, Jew, and on the other the spiritual Jew. Since the term Jew is used to describe the spiritual Jew, the physical Jew as God's covenant race under the Old Testament must be used sometimes as a type of God's spiritual race under the New Testament. This should lead us to expect that sometimes, in prophecies of the gospel dispensation, the terms which described the literal Jew would be used when the spiritual was meant—just as David is used when Christ is meant. (Ezek. 37:24).

If it be objected that we are not spiritually Jews, if we are physically Gentiles, we shall point out that: First, our circumcision is of the heart, thus we must be the Jew of which Rom. 2:29 speaks (Col. 2:11). Second, we Christians are the circumcision (Phil. 3:3).

It must also be pointed out that since the fulfillment of the promises of God is to the spiritual Jew, and not just to one who is a Jew outwardly, that the blessings must have been promised only to such as were spiritually Jews. The persons who were blessed in fact were those who were inwardly Jews, thus they must have been the only ones included in the prophecies. This is in harmony with John's teaching in Matt. 3, Jesus' teaching in John 3:5, and Paul's in Rom. 9:2-8.

3. *The Law and the Prophets Bear Witness to the Gospel*

"But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference." (Rom. 3:21-22). By the righteousness of God, Paul means God's way of making men righteous—of justifying men through Christ.

"The expression 'law and prophets' is here equivalent to the writings of the Old Testament. These writings attest a justification without law. They both teach the doctrine and exemplify it—this being the way in which they attest it. Abraham, for example, is a case in point, whose belief was counted to him for justification; that is, he was justified without law. Much that the prophets say is also to the same effect. Indeed, one of them asserts the doctrine in so many words, namely, 'the just by belief shall live.' The law, too, pointed to Christ as the true Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world; and remitting sin is the radical fact in justification. In a word, both the law and the prophets bare testimony to Christ, and to the salvation which is in him. This salvation, which, at bottom, is justification, is without law. Thus, the law and the prophets attest justification without law, by attesting the salvation of Christ, which is without it." (*Ibid.*, p. 114)

This passage also makes it clear that the Old Testament does predict the gospel dispensation, and thus, of course, it predicts the church which is composed of the justified.

4. *God's Promise to Abraham Embraced Spiritual Descendants Also*

"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) . . ." (Rom. 4:16-17).

This makes it clear that the promise to Abraham had a spiritual significance also. They are the seed of Abraham who are of the faith of Abraham. The promise made to Abraham was to the spiritual seed also. And the many nations which have descended from him are not physical races only, but also the spiritual race. This consists of those who are Christ's (Gal. 3:28-29).

Those literal descendants of Abraham do not inherit the promise if they seek it of the law instead of through the gospel. Thus we must realize that although the promise was also given to those who were of the law, yet they could not receive it through the law. They must receive it through faith in Christ.

In interpreting the prophecies one must realize that the promises around which the prophecies of God centered—insofar as they were concerned with redemption—embraced the spiritual seed of Abraham, and that they must be so interpreted. Thus although in prophecies terms may be used which, if literally interpreted, would mean only Abraham's physical descendants, we must interpret of his spiritual descendants also. And the physical descendants would be included only so far as they were inwardly Jews (Rom. 3:28-29). They could not get it through the law, but only through faith. (Rom. 4:15-16).

5. Even When God Dealt with Abraham He Looked Forward to His Spiritual Children Under the New Covenant

Abraham was "fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;" (Rom. 3:21-24).

This statement "carries us back to the time when it was indited, and to the vision and purpose of its author. It was written for Abraham's sake, it is true, but not for his alone. It was written for our benefit also. We who are of Abraham's belief were before its author's mind at the instant when he penned it. He looked through the centuries to come, and the vision of the redeemed rose before him. Of purpose he wrote for their sake. He had them in thought as his hand moved over the parchment; and as he told how belief was counted to Abraham, he told how, in like manner, it would be counted even to us. Truly is justification by belief attested by the prophets." (*Ibid.*, p:150)..

This makes it clear that in the Old Testament, God looked down the stream of time to the time of the gospel dispensation under which we now live.

6. God's Promises Concerning Israel Are Fulfilled in Spiritual Israel (Rom. 9:2-8)

Paul's kinsmen according to the flesh had been cut off, as a whole, from God. They had not submitted themselves to God's righteousness, and thus they had been cut off for their unbelief (Rom. 10:1-4; 11:20). Only a remnant of literal Israel had been saved, and they were the ones who had submitted themselves to God's way of making men righteous through Christ (Rom. 10:1-4; 11:5). Paul felt keenly the condition of his kinsmen according to the flesh, and thus he wrote: "I have great heaviness and continually sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the *flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. *Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.*" (Rom. 2:2-8).

Moses E. Lard has some thought-provoking comments on these passages.

"*But I do not mean that God's word has failed*, in saying, 'I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren,' the Apostle has indicated his view of their condition. *He regarded them as accursed from Christ.* Nor was this his view of a few only of them; for the vast body of them had repudiated Christ. This is the fact which underlies what he here says, and gives rise to his remark. *But I do not mean* in what I imply that God's word respecting Israel has failed. For such is not the case. 'God's word' must here be taken comprehensively for all his promises relative to the salvation of Israel. That word has not failed; *because it never contemplated the whole of Israel*, and the whole are not accursed. It contemplated a 'remnant' only; and a remnant are already saved. Therefore God's word has not failed, for all that are of Israel are not Israel. Confirmatory of the preceding remark. That is, the clause is designed to show that God's word of promise has not failed. All the offspring of Jacob are not Israel in the sense in which the word is used in the promise. The word is there used of those only who are so sincere and true as to receive the Messiah. As to these, God's word has not failed. The true Israel, Israel within the meaning of the promise, have accepted Christ; and

as the promise embraced no others, it has therefore been strictly kept. It never comprehended the whole unassorted mass of Israel, but those only who should prove themselves true to the gospel. The ultimate rejection of the rest, it has always contemplated. *Nor are they all children because Abraham's offspring.* Of the same tenor with the foregoing clause, and like that designed to confirm the remark that God's word has not failed. The Israelites, because Abraham's offspring, are not all children within the scope of the promise. Therefore, though God should reject a part of them, and even the greater part, it does not follow that his word has failed. His word of promise now no more includes the whole of Abraham's offspring than it did in time gone. Then it included Isaac and his posterity only, and rejected Ishmael and his. And so now. His word of promise to bless, includes those only who believe in Christ. Many of these he has already blessed, and many more he will. Consequently, his word has not failed. As for those who repudiate Christ, rejecting all of them implies no failure of his word, because he never promised to bless them.

But in Isaac your children shall be called. 'Called' here is equivalent to chosen, a sense which the passive of *kalleo* sometimes has. The children of Ishmael and of Isaac were alike offspring of Abraham. But of these God chose only the children of Isaac to be his particular people and rejected the others. What then if he should do likewise now? Would this imply a failure of his promise? No more than it did then. Therefore he may accept those who believe in Christ, as he chose the children of Isaac; and he may reject those who reject Christ, as he rejected the children of Ishmael; and it will all work no failure of his word.

That is, the children of the flesh are not children of God, an explanation relative to the preceding clause, and a deduction as to the case in hand. The children merely of the flesh were not in the past accepted of God as his children. On the contrary, they were cast out as was the case with Ishmael. But the children of promise, as in the case of Isaac, were alone chosen as his children—not children in the sense of being regenerate, but in that of being his peculiar people. Thus it is now. The children of the flesh only, which includes all that are at present called Israel, are not children of God; that is, they are not children in Christ merely because children of the flesh; for if they have no other claim than this, God disowns them. They are none of his. To be born of the flesh, no matter whose flesh it is, is now no ground of acceptance with God. A wholly different birth is necessary.

But the children of promise are counted for children, that is, are counted for God's children. As it was in the past, so it is now. The

children of Isaac, alone were children of promise; and they alone were chosen. In like manner, those only who now believe in Christ are children of promise. For 'they who are of belief, the same are the children of Abraham;' and his children alone are children of promise. Therefore those only who now believe in Christ will be accepted. All the others, no matter from whom descended, will be rejected." (*Ibid.*, pp. 298-299).

⟨*There are some who say that unless literal Israel all accepts the Lord, and unless a special kingdom is established for her (or at least in which she shall have preeminence) that God's promises in the Old Testament fail.* This is not so. God's word in these matters cannot fail even if most of literal Israel never obeys the gospel. For not all of Israel (literal) is the true Israel. Those who are of the promise, those who accept Christ, are the true Israel and in them God's promises are fulfilled.

7. The Present Calling of the Gentiles Prophesied (Rom. 9:25-26)

⟨*As he says also by Hosea: I will call those my people that are not my people, and her beloved, that is not beloved.*⟩ (The passage is compiled from Hosea 1:10 and 2:23).

"The apostle now proposes to establish from prophecy two points: (1.) That the Gentiles are to become the people of God. (2.) That only a remnant of Israel is to be saved. It is thus to be made apparent to the Jews that their own prophets confirm all Paul says. I will call those my people: I will so call or name them, because they will then be my people. The time will come when the Gentiles will obey the gospel, and be saved. They will then be my people, and I will so style them. That are not my people: That are not my peculiar people in the sense in which Israel are. Not that I now repudiate all Gentiles; only that as a body they are not mine in a special sense. And her beloved (An allusion no doubt to the church) As much as to say, the Gentiles are at present not a chosen people, which is the force of 'not beloved.' But the time is coming when they will compose the church, the Lamb's wife. As such, they will then be beloved. Israel is now the beloved, and the Gentiles the not-beloved. No fact could be mentioned more offensive to Israel than this. Yet the time had come when it must be stated.

⟨*And in the place where it was said to them, You are not my people, they shall be called sons of the living God.*⟩ To the same effect as the preceding. . Paul's use of the passage is the best evidence of what God intended by it. Nor does the Apostle cite it in an accommodated sense, as some commentators think; that is, merely

because it happens to express his own ideas. He cited it rather because it proves that God long since purposed and said that the Gentiles should become his people. This point the Apostle is anxious to establish; and he completely does so by Hosea. *And in the place*—Not in any one particular place, but among the Gentiles generally. It was the common twit of the Jews that the Gentiles were not God's people. *There they shall be called*—There they shall actually be sons of God, and therefore shall be so called. The reception of the Gentiles being now established by Hosea, the Apostle proceeds to prove from Isaiah that only a remnant of Israel is to be saved." (*Ibid.*, pp. 313-314).

8. The Rejection of Israel, as Well as the Reception Of the Gentiles, Prophesied

"Esaïas also crieth concerning Israel, though the number of the children of Israel be as the sands of the sea, a remnant shall be saved: for he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth. And as Esaïas said before, Except the Lord of Sabbaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrhah. What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone; as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offense: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." (Rom. 9:27-33).

"Besides, Isaiah cries over Israel: Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved. That is, only a remnant shall be saved. This remnant, from and after Christ, consisted of those who accepted him. The vast remainder were all rejected. It was the rejection of Christ by this remainder, and their consequent anathematization that gave the Apostle the 'great grief and continual sorrow' of which he speaks in the first of the chapter.

"Now the Lord will execute this saying upon the land, fulfilling it and ending it quickly. That *logon* refers to the saying of Isaiah in the preceding verse, I assume as certain. Accordingly, I render it saying, and prefix 'this' to it, so as to render the reference definite. The Lord will execute 'this saying'—he will fulfill it, to the letter. This he will do by actually saving the remnant, and rejecting the remainder. Thus he will verify all I teach in regard to Israel. 'Upon the land'—the land of Israel. 'Fulfilling it and ending it quickly'—

fulfilling the saying and bringing the fulfillment at once at an end. The citation in this and the preceding verse is from Isaiah 10:22, 23. The Apostle follows the sense of the passage rather than the verbiage.

"And as Isaiah had before said: Had not the Lord of hosts left us offspring, we should have been as Sodom, and been made like Gomorrah. Here Isa. 1:9; hence the rendering, 'had before said;' that is, he had said what is here cited before he said what is cited in vs. 27, 28. The passage is designed as a still farther proof that a mere remnant of Israel is to be saved. *The Lord of hosts*—The Lord that rears them up and preserves them. The phrase is used with admirable propriety here. *Left us*—left to us Israelites. *Offspring*—some offspring, a remnant. *We should have become as Sodom*—we should have become wholly extinct, not even one left. *And been made like Gomorrah*—we should have been utterly cut off from the earth, made a complete desolation. The Apostle clearly regards these two cities as instances of entire extinction, not considering Lot as belonging to them, but as a mere temporary dweller in one of them.

"But the Lord of hosts has preserved us offspring, a mere remnant, it is true, in comparison with those that are lost, still enough to preserve our name from oblivion. This remnant is small in numbers, but mighty nevertheless. It has been purified in the blood of Christ, and is now the light of the world. It's name is to endure forever; and its victories are to extend to the remotest bounds of earth. All nations shall bless God for it. In the loss of Israel there is cause for 'continual sorrow'; but in the salvation of the remnant, still greater cause for joy; and in the end, God's name will be more honored. . . After all, then, God has not been nursing Israel to no purpose." (*Ibid.*, pp. 318-319).

Isaiah also prophesied the unbelief of the Jews in other places. Others also prophesied it. "But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you. But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me. But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." (Rom. 10:19-21) *Israel's unbelief, and the reception of the Gentiles, were both foreseen and prophesied by Old Testament prophets.*

9. The Church Has Received That for which Israel Sought

(Rom. 11:7-10)

"What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according

as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them; let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their backs always." (Rom. 11:7-10).

The remnant are those who have accepted grace, i.e. who have accepted the gospel. This gospel dispensation, however, is made up not only of the remnant of literal Israel (11:5) who accepted His grace, but also of Gentiles who accepted it.

What literal Israel sought, spiritual Israel attained.

The fact that literal Israel would not all find that for which they sought had been foreseen by the prophets, said Paul.

"What then? That which Israel seek, they found not; The conclusion from the foregoing premises. What then? That is, what shall we now say, or what inference draw? We draw the following: That what Israel is seeking, they did not find. But what are they seeking? The usual reply is, justification. But this I think not correct. Justification is not the subject before the Apostle's mind. Rejection and acceptance are what he is speaking of. I hence deem it safest to limit the reply to these two items. Israel were seeking to be retained as God's people, but failed. To this honor the remnant alone attained. This gives the true reply.

"But the chosen found it, Literally the choice or election found it; but the abstract here is best dropped or laid aside for the concrete. The chosen, of course, were those who became obedient to Christ; and these alone were retained in the divine favor. But they were not first chosen, and then pursuantly obeyed. On the contrary, they obeyed and pursuantly were chosen. In all cases, acceptance with God depends on acceptance of Christ." (Ibid., pp. 350-351).

It is therefore evident that that which the church has is that which God in the prophets had promised true Israel. It is that which true Israel receives in the church today. To know what God promised in the prophets one has only to see what the church has received, for it has received what He promised.

10. Israel's Redeemer to Come Out of Zion (Rom. 11:26-27)

"And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

The new covenant, which takes away sins, and which God promised to Israel (Jer. 31:31-35) has already been established (Heb. 8:6-10; 18). It has been established with all who accept Christ, including the remnant of literal Israel (Rom. 11:5), and including any Israelite at any time who accepts the gospel. God promised to take away sins under the new covenant, and thus it is that any Israelite in the future who has sins taken away will have them taken away through the blood of the new covenant, and through his entering into covenant relationship under the new covenant which is now in force. This fact is also established by Paul's statement that Israel was cut off because of unbelief in the gospel, and that she can be grafted in any time that she believes the gospel (Rom. 11:20-24).

Patrick Fairbairn has some thought-provoking observations on this passage. "It is the prophecy in Isa. 59:20, 21, which, as applied in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, has been supposed incapable of explanation, excepting on grounds that necessarily involve at least the restoration of the Jewish people. . . . One not of the least difficulties connected with this passage is the change which the apostle makes on the words of the original. In the prophet, it is to Zion that the Redeemer was to come, not out of it; and he was to come, not to turn away ungodliness from Jacob, but to those that turn from ungodliness in Jacob." Such deviations from the words and scope of the original have appeared to some so material, that they regard the apostle here, not so properly interpreting an old prediction, as uttering a prediction of his own, clothed as nearly as possible in the familiar language of an ancient prophecy. A manifestly untenable view; for how could we, in that case, have vindicated the apostle from the want of godly simplicity, using, as he must then have done, his accustomed formula for prophetic quotations ('As it is written') only to disguise and recommend an announcement properly his own?

"We repudiate any such solution of the difficulty, which would represent the apostle as sailing under false colors. Nor can we regard alterations as the result of accident or forgetfulness. They can only have sprung from design; and we take the right explanation to be this: The apostle gives the substantial import of the prophecy in Isaiah, but in accordance with his design gives it also a more special direction, and one that pointed to the kind of fulfillment it must now be expected in that direction to receive. According to the prophet, the Redeemer was to come to or for Zion, somehow in its behalf, and in the behalf also of penitent souls in it, those turning from transgression. So, indeed, he had done already in the most literal and exact manner; and the small remnant who turned from transgression recognized him, and hailed his coming. But the apostle is here looking beyond these; he is

looking to the posterity of Jacob generally, for whom, in this and other similar predictions, he describes a purpose of mercy still in reserve. For while he strenuously contends that the promise of a seed of blessing to Abraham, through the line of Jacob, was not *confined* to the natural offspring, he explicitly declares this to have been always included—not the whole, certainly, yet an elect portion out of it. At that very time, when so many were rejected, there was, he tells us, such an elect portion; and there must still continue to be so, 'for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;' that is, God having connected a blessing with Abraham and his seed in perpetuity, he could never recall it again; there should never cease to be some in whom that blessing was realized. But, besides, there must here also be a fullness; the first-fruits of blessing gave assurance of a coming harvest. The fullness of the Gentiles itself is a pledge of it; for if there was to be a fullness of these coming in to inherit the blessing, because of the purpose of God to bless the families of the earth in Abraham and his seed, how much more must there be such a fullness in the seed itself? The overflowings of the stream could not possibly reach further than the direct channel. But then, this fullness, in the case of the natural Israel, was not to be (as they themselves imagined and as many along with them still imagine) separate and apart; as of by providing some dispensation of grace or external position for them individually. Of this, the apostle gives no intimation whatever. Nay, on purpose, we believe, to exclude that very idea, he gives the more special turn to the prophecy, so as to make it out of Zion that the Redeemer was to come, and with the view of turning away ungodliness from those in Jacob. For, the old literal Zion, in the apostle's view, was now gone. Its whole framework was presently to be laid in ruins; and the only Zion, in connection with which the Redeemer could henceforth come, was that Zion in which he now dwells, which is the same with the heavenly Jerusalem, the Church of the New Testament. He must come out of it, at the same time that he comes to or for it, in behalf of the natural seed of Jacob. And this is all one with saying, these could now only attain to blessing in connection with the Christian church; or, as the apostle himself puts it, could only obtain mercy through *their* mercy—namely, by the reflux of that mercy which, issuing from Israel, has gone forth upon the Gentiles, and has been bearing in their fullness. It is one salvation, one blessing for both parties alike, which Israel had the honor to bring in.

"Thus explained, both the prophecy itself, and the apostle's use of it, are in perfect accordance with his principles of interpretation elsewhere, and with those we have endeavored to establish. And it holds out the amplest encouragement in respect to the good yet in store

for the natural Israel. It holds out none, indeed, in respect to the fond hope of a literal reestablishment of their ancient polity. It rather tends to discourage any such expectation; for the Zion, in connection with which it tells us the Messiah is to come, is the one in which he at present dwells, the Zion of the New Testament Church; to which he can no longer come, except at the same time by coming *out of* it. Let those, therefore, who already dwell with him in this Zion go forth in his name, and deal in faith and love with these members of the stock of Israel. Let them feel that in such evangelistic work the presence and power of the Lord are pledged to be with them; and let them do it in the sure conviction and hope that the conversion of Jew and Gentile shall happily react on each other, till the promised fullness on both sides is attained. For this important work, and the animating prospects connected with it, they have sure ground to go upon; but for local changes and external relationships they have none; and it is no part of the design of prophecy to lead the Christian church either to wait for such, or to work for them." (Fairbairn, *On Prophecy*, pp. 282-285).

It should be evident that by "all Israel" in 11:26-27 Paul does not mean all of literal Israel, as he had already stated that all literal Israel is not the true Israel to whom the promise is made. (Rom. 9:6-7).

11. Christ Would Be Reproached, the Prophets Said (Rom. 15:3)

"For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me." This quotation is from Psalms 69:9. The New Testament quotes more than once from this Psalm (John 2:17; 15:25; 19:28; Rom. 11:9, 10; 15:3; compared with Psa. 69:9, 4, 21, 22, 23). Yet, something in the Psalm applies to David (65:5) unless 69:5 speaks of the sins of the world being Christ's own sins since He was to bear the sins of the world. In either event it is true that the prophet saw that Christ would not be welcomed by all, but that He would be scorned by some.

12. Christ Came to Confirm or Make Good the Promises Made to Israel (Rom. 15:8)

"Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:" (Rom. 15:8). The promises made to the fathers were promises concerning the Messiah, and His work for both Jew and Gentile. For Paul shows that Jew and Gentile are embraced in the Old Testament

prophecies. This shows that God has accepted both, and therefore both ought to receive one another as Christ has also received us (Rom. 15:7). Lard comments as follows on 15:8-12.

"For I say that Christ became a minister of the circumcision," Lard here introduces the explanation of how Christ came to accept both Jews and Gentiles. 'Circumcision' stands for the Jews. Christ became a minister of the Jews or belonged to them, in order to save them.

"For the sake of God's truthfulness, Or that his truthfulness might be absolutely maintained. The truthfulness referred to is that of the promises mentioned in the next clause. Two considerations demanded its maintenance: (1) The character of God; (2) The salvation of the human family. These were the high ends that induced Christ to become a minister under circumcision.

"In order to make good the promises to the fathers. This clause depends on both the preceding ones, and on neither exclusively. Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the sake of God's truthfulness—all this he did in order to make good the promises, not merely to confirm them, but to place their realization beyond even a contingency. Now these promises to the fathers being thus made good, secured salvation to so many of the Jews as obeyed Christ. Thus Christ accepted them; and he did it from the heart, or without reservation. So must we Gentiles accept the Jews.

"And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy: That is, Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the sake of God's truthfulness, not that the Jews alone might be saved, but also that the Gentiles might; for the promises respect both; in other words, that the Gentiles, being saved, might have reason to glorify God for his mercy. Thus Christ accepted the Gentiles also; and he did it as cordially as he accepted the Jews. In like manner, consequently, must the Jews accept the Gentiles; for the injunction is, 'accept one another, even as Christ accepted you.' The expression 'his mercy' denotes the mercy of God, not of Christ; and 'minister' comprehends Christ in the fulness of his official character.

"As it is written: for this reason. (For what reason?) Because both Jews and Gentiles were to be accepted by Christ, and to compose one united and happy people. David looks forward to that time, and represents himself as among the Gentiles and rejoicing with them.

"I will confess to you among the Gentiles, and will sing to your name. Ps. 18:49. When David represents himself as among the

Gentiles, as confessing to God, and singing with them, he foreshows that the time was coming when Jews and Gentiles would mutually accept each other; nay more, that they would be so completely one as to recognize the same God and sing the same songs; and mutual cordial acceptance is the point before the Apostle's mind. His admonition is, 'accept one another, even as Christ accepted you!'

"And again he says, Be glad you Gentiles with his people. The words of Moses taken from his great song, Deut. 32:43. In the former citation, David represents himself as singing to God among the Gentiles; here the Gentiles are represented as being glad among the Jews. The design of both passages is the same, to establish mutual acceptance.

"And once more: All you Gentiles praise the Lord, yes, all you peoples praise him. Ps. 117:1. The intervening *kai* here is better rendered *yes*, as I have done, making it simply intensive. All you Gentiles praise the Lord because he has accepted you, and filled you with the spirit of joy. The passage is conclusive proof that not the Jews alone, but also all nations were to share the redemption of the Messiah. The application is obvious: Christ has accepted all; do you then accept one another.

"And father, Isaiah says: There shall be a root of Jesse; and he shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, yes, in him the Gentiles shall trust. Proof still to the same effect, but this time from Isaiah. 'There shall be a root of Jesse'—of course this is Christ. This root was to rise up, or be exalted to the throne of God, and invested with dominion over all nations, Gentiles as well as Jews. 'In him the Gentiles shall trust'—trust for salvation equally with the Jews, and as successfully. Christ was to be Lord over and Saviour to the one people as fully as to the other. The passage is from Is. 11:10, and corresponds *verbatim* with the Septuagint, except that it omits the clause 'in that day,' because it was not material to Paul's purpose." (*Ibid.*, pp. 434-436).

13. The Root of Jesse Has Arisen and Is Reigning (Rom. 15:12)

"And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust." This passage shows that God had promised to receive the Gentiles. God has confirmed or made good that promise in Christ (15:8), and thus Christians—Jews and Gentiles—ought to receive one another as Christ has received them (15:7). This prophecy has been and is being fulfilled, since the Lord is now reigning over Gentiles, as well as over Jews, who accept Him. God had sent Paul especially to the

Gentiles "That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost. . . . For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, *to make the Gentiles obedient*, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." (Rom. 15:16-19). Thus we see that Paul worked so that the Gentiles would accept, or trust, the Lord. He reigns over those Gentiles who trust Him, since we know that those who trust the Lord, in the way the scriptures direct, are translated into the kingdom of God, or of Christ (Col. 1:13; Rom. 14:17).

When we turn to the prophecy of Isaiah we find some things which show that literal Israel is sometimes used when spiritual Israel is meant. The entire chapter concerns this one who was to come from Jesse and rule over the people, including the Gentiles. We now quote Isaiah 11.

"And there shall come forth a rod of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:

And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord;

And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears:

But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.

And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins:

The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea.

And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.

But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west; they shall spoil them of the east together: they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them.

And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry-shod.

And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt."

Concerning this chapter we shall confine ourselves to the following comments: First, we know that the prophesied one has come. Second, we know that He is doing in His present reign that which the prophet prophesied. For He is now the ensign; He is now sought by Gentiles; He is now trusted by Gentiles, as Paul clearly shows (Rom. 15:8-19). Therefore, we know that "that day" which the prophet saw (Isa. 11:10-11), is the present day or dispensation in which Christ rules.

Concerning the interpretation of prophecy the above conclusions establish at least the following: First, symbolism is sometimes used in prophecy. The idea of wild animals, snakes, and children being friendly must be used symbolically to portray the peaceful nature of Christ's

message and work. ² Second, Israel must have been used in prophecy as a type of spiritual Israel, and her literal restoration must have been used as a type of a spiritual restoration in Christ. For these things are things which were to take place in "that day" (Isa. 11:10-16), and we are now in that day (Rom. 15:8-19). Since these things are not literally fulfilled in this dispensation they must be spiritually or typically fulfilled.

14. *The Conversion of Gentiles Predicted* (Rom. 15:20-21)

"Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: But as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand." These statements follow Paul's statements concerning His work among the Gentiles; thus it must be that in that work he is accomplishing what the prophet had spoken. Thus it is evident that Christ is now doing the work among many nations, which work was prophesied by Isa. 52:15.

15. *The Promises of God to the Fathers, now Made Good in Christ, Were of a Spiritual Nature* (Rom. 15:27)

Paul had told Christians to receive one another. He had pointed out that Christ had come to confirm or make good the promises of God unto the Israelitish fathers (15:8). And among the things which Christ came to do, and which had been promised by the prophets of Israel, was to rule over the Gentiles that they might glorify God for His mercy (15:9-12). This was being accomplished through such work as that of Paul among the Gentiles (15:16-21). What sort of work did Paul do, and what sort of blessings did he bring to the Gentiles? Were they spiritual blessings or material and national blessings? They were spiritual. In speaking of the Gentile aid to the Jews Paul wrote: "It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the *Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things,* their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." (Rom. 15:27). Thus it is evident that the blessings which both Jew and Gentile were then receiving through the gospel were spiritual blessings. Thus the reign of which Isa. 11 spoke, and which Rom. 15:12 shows is fulfilled in Christ, is a reign in which spiritual things are the things which are involved (Since Christ's reign is one in spiritual things and which ministers spiritual things to Jew and Gentile, it is evident that a spiritual reign was predicted by Isaiah.

16. The New Testament Is Clearer than the Old Testament, Although the Old Testament Was Not Silent as to the New Testament Work. (Rom. 16:25-27)

"Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:" (Rom. 16:25-27). Evidently it was not entirely unknown to the Old Testament or it could not have been made manifest in any way by the Scriptures of the prophets. The above passage in Romans does make clear that the New Testament is a fuller revelation than the Old Testament. Thus we may expect it to shed more light on the kingdom question than does the Old Testament.

This passage is somewhat like the one in Ephesians. Paul spoke of the mystery of Christ "which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ by the gospel:" (Eph. 3:5-6). This passage does *not* say that nothing concerning the church was revealed in the Old Testament. It was not known then *as* it is now. And the fundamental thing which was not clear to the Old Testament prophets was the equality of Jew and Gentile. From Oswald T. Allis' long discussion of this verse we quote the following:

"1. The Nature of the Mystery

It is significant that Paul never uses the expression, 'the mystery of the Church.' He does not tell us that the Church is a mystery. What he is concerned to tell us is, that something about the Church is a mystery. This he states with great plainness and very emphatically. The mystery is, that the Gentiles are to enjoy, actually do enjoy, a status of complete equality with the Jews in the Christian Church. They are 'fellow-heirs, fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel.' The word rendered 'fellow' is the preposition 'with' ('with-heirs,' etc.); which indicates close association or identification. They are co-heirs with the Jews; they belong to the same body; they share equally with the Jews in 'the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel.' This is a doctrine which Paul preached with great earnestness (e.g., Rom. 1:14, 3:22, 10:12; I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28f.; Eph. 2:12f.). This important

feature of the Christian Church was the mystery. But it was not a mystery in the sense that no inkling of it had ever been given. For by insisting that the Abrahamic covenant included all who were of like faith with Abraham (Rom. 4.) Paul had already made it clear that the rights of the Gentiles for which he was contending were theirs by virtue of that covenant. It was a mystery in the sense that, like other teachings which are spoken of as such, it was not fully revealed in the Old Testament and was completely hidden from the carnal minded. A doctrine which was so hated by Jews that they were ready to kill those who preached it (Lk. 4:16f., Acts 22:21f.) and which was unknown to Gentiles, might well be called a mystery. But, we repeat, it was not the Church itself, but this doctrine regarding the Church which was the mystery." (Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, pp. 92, 93).

CHAPTER IX
THE PROPHECY OF JEREMIAH

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” (Jer. 31:31-34).

The following observations concerning the nature of the new covenant are found in Jeremiah’s prophecy.

(1) The covenant which was to be made would be a new covenant. It would not be like the old covenant.

(2) The old covenant was the covenant which God had made when He took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. This covenant was the ten commandment, the decalogue, covenant. Note: “There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt.” “And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.” (I Kings 8:9, 21). Since there was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone, the ten commandments, and since what was in the ark was the covenant, it is obvious that the covenant here spoken of was the ten commandment covenant.

(3) The Israelites were unfaithful under the old covenant. They broke it.

(4) God’s laws were to be put in their hearts.

- (5) He was to be their God, and they His people.
 (6) All with whom the covenant was made would know the Lord, and thus they would not need to be taught to know the Lord.
 (7) Their sins to be forgiven and remembered no more.
 (8) It was to be with Judah and Israel; or as one of the verses put it—Israel.

1. *The New Testament Application of Jeremiah's Prophecy*

"But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better* covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the *second*. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *new* covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." (Heb. 8:6-8). The prophecy of Jeremiah is then quoted (8:9-12).

On this we observe:

(1) The new covenant is better, because it is established on better promises.

(2) It is the new covenant which is here spoken of since He said: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." (8:13-9:1). So the covenant which was made when Israel was brought out of Egypt (8:9) is called the first, and it is also called the old.

We refer to 9:1 in order to show that the decalogue covenant contained more than the ten commandments, since it had a worldly sanctuary, tabernacle, etc. (9:2). But the decalogue was the basis of it and evidently it is for that reason called the covenant.

Just as the first covenant (8:7) is the old (9:13), just so the second covenant (8:7) is the new (8:13).

If the new covenant has not yet been established, obviously the second covenant has not yet been established, since the new is the second. If it has not been established, Christ is not now the mediator of the better covenant (8:6), for the better covenant is the second covenant (8:7).

The new covenant which Jeremiah promised that God would establish is called the second covenant. "For if that first covenant had

been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith. I will make a *new covenant.*" (8:7-8).

(3) Thus it is clear that Paul is showing that the better covenant of which Christ is mediator was the covenant which God had predicted He would establish with Israel and Judah. This better covenant is established on better promises (8:6), just as Jeremiah had foreseen that it would be since God had said that under that new covenant he would "be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more" (8:12). These indeed are better promises. In fact, no promises could be better for it is on the basis of God's fulfillment of these promises that we have hope of eternal life.

(4) The better covenant is the new testament. In 8:6 Christ is called "the mediator of a better covenant." In 9:15 Christ is said to be "the mediator of the new testament"; or covenant (12:24). Surely no one will contend that Christ is now the mediator of two different covenants? If He is with whom is each covenant made? But He is not, for the writer speaks of only two covenants throughout Hebrews 8, 9, and 10. And these two covenants are the old and the new. And Christ is the mediator of the new, and not the mediator of two.

(5) The better covenant is the new covenant (8:6,7,13). The better covenant is already established, so evidently the new covenant is already established. "He is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises" (8:6).

(6) Sins were remembered under the old, or first, covenant. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." (Heb. 10:1-4). The remembrance of sins under the old covenant—in other words, the fact that the old covenant would not forgive sins—is implied in the statement that God made when He promised that under the new covenant iniquity would not be remembered, but that it would be forgiven. Since God pointed this out as a special characteristic of the new covenant, and since the new was not to be according to the old, it is evident that the old could not forgive sins.

(7) The new covenant provides for the forgiveness of sins. The old could not because it had only the blood of animals (10:3-4). The new is dedicated with the blood of Christ (9:18-26). Christ put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (9:26). God has forgiven our sins because of the blood of Christ, and thus there is neither remembrance nor offering for sin any more. "Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (10:18). There had to be offerings continually under the old because their sacrifices could not forgive sins (10:2-4), but Christ's sacrifice is sufficient to forgive sins, thus there is no need for further offering; there is no need for remembrance again of sins every year.

(8) Christ came to take away the first that He might establish the second (Heb. 10:9). The first was the old covenant, and the second the new (8:6, 7, 13). Now if the new covenant has not yet been established Christ has not yet done that which He came to do.

(9) The second will or testament is that which sanctifies us through Christ. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. *By the which will* we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (10:9-10). Notice that just after speaking of the *second* he said *by the which will*. So the second is again shown to be the will or new testament of which Christ is mediator. If this will is not yet established we are not sanctified through the body of Christ today, and we are yet in our sins. How utterly foreign to the teaching of the gospel.

(10) Paul applied to us the promise of God in Jeremiah 31: 31-34. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Having *therefore*, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a *new and living way* (remember Paul spoke in II Cor. 3:6 of being ministers of the *new testament which gives life*, J. D. B.), which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;" (Heb. 10:14-20).

It is clear that Paul states that our being free from sin in Christ, due to His one sufficient sacrifice (10:12), is borne witness to by the Holy Spirit in the prophecy of the new covenant which stated that sins would be forgiven and not be remembered. If the new covenant has not yet been established, then the apostle Paul was wrong in saying that the "Holy Ghost also is a witness to us," and then quoting Jer.

31:34 for that witness. If Jer. 31:34 does not apply to the covenant with which we are identified, Paul bore false witness against the Holy Spirit. If Jer. 31:34 did not refer to our being freed from sin through Christ (10:12, 14, 18), Paul misapplied scripture.

He also misinterpreted it in drawing the conclusion that the remission of sins promised by Jer. 31:34 means that there will be no more offering for sins now (10:18). And yet, part of Paul's argument is that the remission of sins implied that there would be no more offering for sins; and that this is fulfilled in Christ because His one sacrifice is sufficient to atone for sins (9:26; 10:9-10, 12, 14, 19). We stand with Paul and not with those who reject the fact that the new covenant has already been established.

If the new covenant has not yet been established, what right has anyone to maintain that sins are forgiven in Christ today? If it is not yet time for the new covenant it is not yet time for the forgiveness and non-remembrance of sins. What Paul declared is for us (9:10, 12, 14-20), is not for us, in such a case.

2. Point by Point Identification of the Present Covenant With The Covenant Prophesied by Jeremiah

It is clear to all who are not blinded by a human theory that the new covenant has been established. Let us, however, continue our argument by listing the characteristics of the covenant prophesied by Jeremiah and show how these are fulfilled item by item in the characteristics of the new covenant.

JEREMIAH'S PROPHECY

(1)
With Judah and Israel, or
with Israel as Jer. 31:33
states it.

NEW TESTAMENT FULFILLMENT

(1)
Made with all who would accept it.
It could be made only with those
who accepted it. Thousands of those
of literal Israel accepted it (Acts
2:36, 41, etc.). In comparison with
the whole body of Israelites those
who accepted it were, however, only
a remnant (Rom. 11:5). Yet this
was the covenant which the Lord
made with all of literal Israel and
Judah, who would accept it; and
which was made with *all* of spiritual
Israel.

Jeremiah said that God would make it with certain ones, and Paul said that the covenant has been made, so then it was evidently made with those whom God designed to make it. It was not for literal Israel as such (Rom. 9:6).

(2)
Unlike the old covenant.

(2)
The new covenant which is now binding is unlike the old covenant.
(a) It is the anti-type of which the old was the type. It is the true of which the old was a figure. It is the very image of which the old was a shadow (Heb. 9:9-10, 23, 24; 10:1).
(b) It has a different high priest, different worship, different sacrifice.
(c) Forgiveness and life made possible by it (II Cor. 3:6-14; Heb. 9:15-17; 10:2-4, 9-20).

(3)
Covenant under which Jeremiah lived is now old (Heb. 8:7, 13).

(3)
Our covenant is new. It is called the "better" (Heb. 8:6); "the second" (Heb. 8:7; 10:9); and the "new." For "In that he saith a new covenant (which is the second, see verse 7, 8, J. D. B.), he hath made the *first* old." (Heb. 8:13). The first being the old the second is bound to be the new. Heb. 8:7-8 shows this also. ". . . the *second* . . . a new covenant. . . ."

(4)
On tables of stones.

(4)
Not on tables of stones. God's law is "*within* them, not an external code. In the latter the 'fleshly tablets of the heart' are contrasted with 'the tables of the Law.' This is the first of the 'better promises'." (C. J. Ellicott, *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, Vol. III:313). "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read

of all men; forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tablets of the heart." (II Cor. 3:3). Paul then continued and talked about the old and new testaments, and that they were ministers of the new testament. So it was as "able ministers of the new testament" (II Cor. 3:6), that those "ministered by us" had written on their hearts, not on tables of stones, God's will (3:3).

Christ emphasized the "inwardness" of his work (John 4:10, 14). Paul contrasted hearts with stone tables (II Cor. 3:3), and thus emphasized inwardness. Ours is spiritual not carnal (John 4:23-24; Heb. 9:9-10).

(5)

Be their God.

(5)

Certainly God is our God, and we His people under the new covenant. And any of fleshly Israel can come into Christ whenever they forsake their unbelief (Rom. 11:23). In Christ they lose their identity as literal Israel (Gal. 3:28), but become Abraham's seed in the sense which counts (Gal. 3:29, 26, 27), and are thus indeed God's people.

(6)

All know the Lord.

(6)

All in the new covenant do know the Lord. God is obviously talking about the people with whom He has the covenant (Heb. 8:10-11). One of the differences between the Old and the New is that you were born in the Old and then taught as you grew up, but in the New you have to be taught before you can be born again and enter into cove-

nant relationship with God (Gen. 17:9-14). Jesus told men that they must be born again (John 3:1-5). "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." (John 6:44-45; II Thess. 2:14). Thus God draws men through teaching, and one must hear and learn before he can come to Christ. The reason the great commission was given was that men might hear, learn and be baptized into Christ (Matt. 28:19; Mk. 16:15-16; Gal. 3:26-27).

Since one must be taught before he can enter into the new covenant it is obvious that those who are in covenant relationship do not need to be taught to know God, because they already know God.

Paul has shown that the new covenant is established so it is evident that this promise also is being fulfilled in the New Covenant today. How it is fulfilled we have just shown, but even if we did not understand how this particular promise is fulfilled, it is clearly taught that the new covenant has been established, and thus this condition has been and is being fulfilled in the way God meant for it to be fulfilled.

Surely the premillennialists do not believe that there will be no teaching in the millennium. So they cannot argue that it means that no teaching will take place under the new cove-

nant, and that therefore the new covenant is not now in force. For this would mean that, it is yet to be fulfilled in a millennium, that no teaching will take place in the millennium.

(7)
Sins forgiven, not remembered.

(7)
Forgiven (Heb. 10:2-4; 10-18).

Thus one can see how that the new covenant has already been established, and that it fulfills the description of the new covenant as given by Jeremiah.

There are some, however, who are forced to deny that the new covenant has been established. *They must deny it in order to cling to their theory.* Surely once their attention is called to the unscriptural conclusion to which their theory leads they will re-investigate the theory. But let us notice *some of the arguments which are used to deny that the new covenant has been established.*

3. Objections to the New Covenant Being Established

The following arguments are used by some to disprove the position that the new covenant has already been established. But we already see that such plain and strong arguments supported the fact of its establishment that all objections can be based not on scripture but on misunderstandings, or they are simply quibbles which are offered to try to sustain a lost cause.

(1) It is argued that not every man in the world today knows the Lord, but that there are people who need to be taught to know the Lord; therefore, the new covenant is not in force since this promise is not fulfilled.

It has already been shown that the new covenant has actually been established. Therefore, this objection is based on the objectors own misunderstanding as to the nature of the promise concerning the Lord. In our previous pages we have shown that this aspect of the prophecy has been fulfilled. But if we could not place our finger with certainty on the specific meaning of this promise, it can be shown that our failure here would not overthrow the positive evidence for the establishment of the new covenant.

The objectors own argument can be turned against him. Doubtless most premillennialists will agree with R. H. Boll that in the

millennium people must believe the gospel. "There can never be any salvation for anyone, anywhere, anytime, except by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and obedience to the gospel. Whatever changes that new era may bring, there can never be any altering of this fundamental and essential truth." (*The Kingdom of God*, 2nd Edition, p. 162). But faith comes by hearing the word of God, and how can people believe unless they hear? How can they hear unless they are taught (Rom. 10:14-17). Thus gospel preaching would be necessary in the millennium in order for people to be taught. Also they believe that children will be born in the millennium. But children are not born with a knowledge of God. Therefore, they will have to be taught in order to know God. And thus we could say to the objector that the prophecy cannot be fulfilled even in the millennium *in the sense in which he maintains that it must be fulfilled*. Thus the interpretation which he places on this part of the prophecy in order to prove that it is not now fulfilled would prove that it will not be fulfilled in a millennium wherein he says that it will be fulfilled. Thus it would follow that the new covenant would not even be established then, and if not then, then never, since even the premillennialist does not think that it will be established after that time.

(2) It was not made with literal Israel as such. Hebrews 8:8 stated that God would make a new covenant with Israel and Judah, and verse 10 stated that "this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel." Thus it is evident that the term Israel could be used to cover both Judah and Israel. Matthew Pool commented that "Israel is the comprehensive name of all the twelve tribes, as ver. 8, compare Exod. 16:31; 40:38; and is so used by the Lord himself, Matt. 10:6, and by Peter, Acts 2:36."

God did make the new covenant with all of physical Israel who would accept it. Peter told "all the house of Israel" to "know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:36). He continued and testified and exhorted saying, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." (2:40). The only ones with whom any covenant can be made are those who are willing to accept the covenant. Only a remnant was willing to accept it (Rom. 11:5), and thus obtained that for which all literal Israel sought (Rom. 11:7).

"In the light of all the pertinent teaching of the New Testament it is plain that the terms 'house of Israel' and 'house of Judah' in Jeremiah's prophecy are used as designations of the covenant people of God. But the fulfillment of God's promise of a new covenant has its accomplishment also in what is sometimes (though inaccurately) called

a 'literal sense,' in that the first to enter into that covenant belonged, by their natural descent from Jacob through Judah, to the house of Israel and house of Judah. And this 'literal' fulfillment is likewise seen in the light of the Holy Spirit's explanation through the apostle Paul that 'they are not all *Israel* who are of *Israel*' (Rom. 9:6), and 'he is not a *Jew* who is one outwardly, . . . but he is a *Jew* who is one inwardly' (Rom. 2:28, 29) that is by faith in Jesus the Messiah . . . this is strongly confirmed by the statements of Romans 11:1-7 to the effect that not all the natural seed of Abraham, but only the believing remnant of them, constituted the true 'Israel' of prophecy and promise; because of which, while it was 'literally' true that 'Israel' (as a nation) had 'not obtained that which he seeketh for,' nevertheless the prophecy and promise were fulfilled even then in Paul's day, in that 'the election hath obtained it and the rest were blinded, according as it is written' (quoting Isa. 29:10) 'unto this day' (Rom. 11:7, 8)." (Philip Mauro, *The Church, The Churches, and The Kingdom*, Culpepper, Va.: 713 S. Blue Ridge Avenue, 1936, p. 177). The "literal" Israel which did obtain it was "a remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. 11:5).

The new covenant has been made and it must have been made with those whom God planned to make it.

4. The Apostles Were Ministers of the New Covenant

but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament. . ." (II Cor. 3:5-6). Testament and covenant are used interchangeably. In Hebrews Paul discusses the old and new covenants. In 8:5 he speaks of the covenant, as also in 9:1, etc. In 9:15-17 he speaks of the first testament, or the old covenant, and the new testament. In 10:15 he speaks of the new covenant wherein there is remission of sins. We know that this is equal to the testament of 9:15 since the death of Christ which dedicated that testament in that which makes possible the remission of sins. Christ is mediator of the New Testament (9:15), or new covenant (10:24).

In II Cor. 3:5-6 the new testament is translated new covenant in such translations as: Revised Standard Version; George Swann; Twentieth Century; American Standard Version, etc.

There is sufficient proof within the passage itself, when compared with Old Testament references which it contains, to show that the term testament is used to mean the same thing that the term covenant means. Paul spoke of being ministers of the new testament (II Cor. 3:6). He then spoke of the *old testament* which Israel read until this

day, but which they do not properly understand. Exodus 34:28, which concerns the time when Moses face shone, and is referred to in II Cor. 3:7, 13, calls the ten commandments the covenant. Of course, we know that the commandments formed the basis of the old covenant. The old covenant contained more, but that was the basis of it. Paul speaks of the old testament (II Cor. 3:16), but the Old Testament speaks of the covenant, when speaking of the same thing which Paul calls testament.

Notice how clearly the two testaments are contrasted, and see that the old testament must mean old covenant.

NEW TESTAMENT

OLD TESTAMENT

Spirit giveth life	II Cor. 3:6	Letter killeth
Ministration of the Spirit	3:7, 8	Ministration of death
Ministration of righteousness	3:8-9	Ministration of condemnation
More glorious	3:7-11	Glorious
Remaineth	3:11, 13	Done away Is abolished Old Testament (3:14)

Christ is not today mediator of a covenant which is different from the testament of which He is mediator. He is the mediator of the better covenant (Heb. 8:6). In Heb. 9:15 He is called the mediator of the new testament. This testament is obviously the new covenant spoken of in Heb. 8:6-7-8, 13. So testament and covenant are the same.

The testament, with which the new testament is contrasted and which it exceeds in glory, is the old covenant. The old was "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones" (II Cor. 3:7). It was what was written in stones when Moses face shone (II Cor. 3:7, 13; Exodus 34:27-35). It "*is abolished*" (II Cor. 3:13).

This new testament, of which the apostles were ministers, is that which *gives life* (3:6); it is "the ministration of the *spirit*" (3:8); it is the "ministration of *righteousness*" (3:9). In contrast with the old which is done away, it is that which *remaineth* (3:11).

If the new testament is not now in force several disastrous consequences follow; *First*, Paul was wrong in affirming that he was an able minister of the new testament, for how could he be if that testament or covenant had not yet come into force, and if it is not even yet in force? *Second*, there is no covenant binding on man since the

old is abolished (7, 11, 13), and the new has not yet been established! *Third*, we do not now have anything that gives life or which brings righteousness if the new testament is not now of force, for it is the testament which does those things (3:6, 9).

Surely from this passage alone, even without the firm argument based on Heb. 8, 9, 10, one who does not have a veil over his heart in this matter can see that the new covenant has been established. If he does not see it it must be because, like the children of Israel, his mind is blinded (II Cor. 3:13-16). If he will lay aside his theory which demands that he contend that the new covenant has not been established, and will turn to the Lord's word in the New Testament he will have the veil taken from his heart (compare 3:16).

One need only bring certain passages before the eyes of any discerning reader in order to see that the covenant and the testament are the same. Note:

“. . . he is the mediator of the new testament. . . .” (Heb. 9:15).

“. . . Jesus the *mediator of the new covenant*. . . .” (Heb. 12:24).

He is not mediator of two different things—of a covenant on one hand and of a testament on the other hand.

He is our mediator, thus *we are members of the new covenant* when we accept His mediation. “For there is one God, and *one mediator* between God and men, the man *Christ Jesus*.” (I Tim. 2:5). He is *now* the mediator between God and man. But He is the mediator of the new covenant; thus it must be now that He is mediator of the new covenant. And since He is now the mediator of the new covenant, and we have come to Him, the new covenant is now in force.

\ This covenant is also the *everlasting covenant*. “Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through *the blood of the everlasting covenant*, make you perfect in every good work to do his will. . . .” (Heb. 13:20-21). This is the same as the new covenant, for the blood of the new is the blood of Christ, as is the blood of the everlasting covenant. The Old Covenant and kingdom could be, and were, shaken and taken out of the way, but the new kingdom cannot be moved or shaken for it is based on the everlasting covenant (Heb. 12:18-28; 13:20).

5. *The Blood of the Covenant*

Jesus said: “For this is *my blood of the new testament*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” (Matt. 26:28). “This cup is *the new testament in my blood*, which is *shed* for you.” (Lk. 22:20).

In teaching the Corinthians concerning the Lord's supper Paul repeated the same saying of the Lord (I Cor. 11:25). His blood is the blood which dedicated the new covenant. "And for this cause he is the *mediator of the new testament*, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9:15). Christ's testament did not become of force before His death (Heb. 9:16-17).

The blood which dedicated the first testament was the blood of animals. (Heb. 9:18). This blood was called "*the blood of the testament* which God hath enjoined unto you" (Heb. 9:20). Paul stated that it was "necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." (9:23). And that better blood was the blood of Jesus Christ, which cleansed or purified that of which the old was a type or pattern. (See 9:24-27). "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Heb. 10:9-10). "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Heb. 10:19-20). This makes it evident that the blood of Christ has dedicated the new covenant.

This is the reason that Paul has said that we are come "to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel." (Heb. 12:22, 24). "The blood of Abel, the first human blood that was shed, cried to God for vengeance from the ground (Gen. 4:10); the blood of Jesus Christ pleads for forgiveness in heaven (Heb. 9:12, 14; 10:19, 22)." (*Ibid.*, p. 179).

The church has been purchased with the blood of Jesus Christ (Acts 20:28). His blood has purified that of which the old was a type or pattern (Heb. 9:24-27). His blood has made possible our sanctification, and the new and living way (10:9, 10, 19, 20). Thus it is evident that since His blood is the blood of the new covenant, that the new covenant is now in force since His blood now sanctifies. The blood is of no avail to us unless it has dedicated a covenant, just as blood had to dedicate the old covenant. Since it does now avail, the new covenant must now be in force since that blood is the blood of the new covenant and not of some other covenant.

CHAPTER X

THE THRONE OF DAVID

1. The Significance of the Subject

If David's throne is now being occupied by Christ, of what significance is it? It is very important to believers of the Bible whether or not the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament predict the reign of Christ in his present kingdom (Col. 1:13), or church, as God's people are designated when viewed from the standpoint of the body of which Christ is the head (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:20-22). *It means, in brief, that the premillennialist's position is untenable.* How so? Note the following:

(1) *What premillennialists say will take place in a millennial reign of Christ on earth in person is taking place now.*

Premillennialists maintain that Christ is not now on David's throne, but that he will reign on David's throne in a millennial reign after his second advent, when he will establish the seat of his government in Jerusalem. This reign on David's throne, they argue, is not now taking place.

If it can be scripturally established that Christ is now on David's throne, its fulfillment cannot be in some future reign. If he has already ascended to David's throne, he is now reigning there, and the position is false that he will begin to reign on David's throne in some future dispensation.

It means, to put it another way, that the throne and kingdom which were promised Christ by the Old Testament prophets are fulfilled in the present throne and kingdom of Christ. Since the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament refer to the present dispensation, one must not look to the future, and to another kingdom and dispensation, for their fulfillment.

(2) *It establishes the correctness of the typical interpretation of many of the Old Testament prophecies.*

One could believe, of course, that some day the Jews might return to Palestine and there prosper as a nation, without accepting

for one moment the premillennial position that Christ is not now on David's throne but will be on that throne during a personal reign out of Jerusalem in the millennium.

Premillennialists maintain that the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament relate to Israel and will find their fulfillment in Christ's reign over Israel on earth during the millennial reign. Others, among whom the author is one, maintain that some of the prophecies of the church are couched in language which was associated with the kingdom of Israel which then existed. These prophecies, however, do not have a literal or physical interpretation—that is, they do not refer to the literal, physical nation of Israel, but to the church. It is thus maintained, for example (and this example is also accepted by premillennialists), that when David is spoken of in Ezek. 37:24 as being king over God's people at some future date, it is not David, but Christ, who is meant. In other words, although David is mentioned in the prophecy, it was not David who was meant. It was not literal David, but the literal Christ. The author goes one step further. Inconsistently, the premillennialist does not. The author maintains that, just as the literal Old Testament David is not meant in Ezek. 37:24, the literal Old Testament kingdom of Israel is not meant in Ezek. 37:24. The premillennialist recognizes that in this passage David is used, although Christ is meant, because David was a type of Christ. Premillennialists recognize that David, the king, is meant as the type of Christ, the king, and that Christ is the one really meant. But they refuse the interpretation that the kingdom mentioned in Ezek. 37:24 is a type of the kingdom of Christ, and that it did not mean literal physical Israel, but the people of God in the dispensation which was to succeed the Old Testament dispensation, of whom the children of Israel in the Old Testament were a type. Why make the king a type, but say that the throne and kingdom which are mentioned are not a type?

The reference to types and antitypes, to shadow and substance, gives the key to the interpretation of some of the kingdom prophecies; as we have shown, and shall now briefly review. The Old Testament, as the book of Hebrews shows, was filled with a number of persons, events, and institutions which were types, or foreshadowings, of New Testament persons, events, and institutions. Thus it was that sometimes the language which describes the type, something in the Old Testament, such as David, the king, or his kingdom, is used in a prophecy which has reference to the antitype, Christ and his present kingdom.

Someone may ask. "If the language of the type is used when the anti-type is really in mind, how are we to know it?" Would not

God be confusing the people, and prophecy itself thus mean nothing convincing to anyone? Let the premillennialist ask the question of himself: "If the language of the type is used in Ezek. 37:24, and David is mentioned, although Christ is meant, how are we to know it?" When he has answered that question, he has answered the question, he asks.

What is the answer?

First, it is not maintained that the language of the type is always used. There are certain definite and clear prophecies wherein it is plainly stated that the dispensation which would take the place of the Old Testament dispensation would not be like the Old Testament dispensation. (Jer. 31:31-34). Christ was often clearly predicted, without any reference to David, without the term "David" being used to describe him. When this is done, he may sometimes be referred to as David's son. (Isa. 9:6, 7) There is, for example, the clear prophecy of Isa. 53.

Second, there are a sufficient number of literal prophecies to establish that Jesus is the Messiah. Thus there are a sufficient number of prophecies to establish his authority. Once it is shown that he is the Messiah, that he is the prophet like unto Moses, we know that we must listen to him. (Deut. 18:15-18; Acts 3:22, 23). When a study of his word indicates that we must look on some of the Old Testament prophecies as clothed in the language which describes the type—David and Israel—and that they are fulfilled in him and the New Testament dispensation, that settles it. If this can be established, and the author is convinced that it can, once a person sees it he must accept it or be dissatisfied with God's arrangements. And to be dissatisfied with God's arrangements will not change these particular arrangements. To Christ and the New Testament we must hearken even in the interpretation of prophecies.

In this chapter the author makes no effort to establish these things with a multitude of different subjects and arguments. The only subject is David's throne. If it can be shown that *even one of them*, David's throne, has found its fulfillment in connection with this present new covenant dispensation, that is all that is necessary. If David's throne is the throne on which Christ now reigns, the entire premillennialist position about a millennial reign on earth on David's throne falls, and the position is established that the Old Testament kingdom prophecies have found, are finding, or will find their complete fulfillment in the present dispensation before the Lord Jesus

Christ comes in his second advent to bring salvation to those who wait for him. (Heb. 9:27.)

To the proof of the scripturalness of the position let us now proceed.

2. Literal to Be Actual?

Does a prophecy have to be literally fulfilled in order to be really fulfilled? This really amounts to the question whether or not a prophecy can be clothed in figurative or typical language—language which describes something when that something is a type, and the antitype is the thing which is actually in mind. To ask the question of a Bible student is to answer it in the affirmative.

“The word ‘literal’ means according to the letter, not metaphorical. It is sometimes confused with the word ‘actual.’ A thing may be actual and not be literal. Isaiah said that Christ would be the ‘shoot’ and ‘stock’ and ‘root’ of Jesse. Was Jesus a literal ‘shoot,’ a literal ‘stock,’ and a literal ‘root?’” (Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *God’s Prophetic Word*, p. 169.) Thus when figurative language is used in a prophecy, or in any other type of passage, it has an actual meaning, but not a literal meaning. When the meaning is couched in figurative language, one misses the meaning, if he interprets the passage literally instead of figuratively.

On this subject Munro has said, the distinction some make between “the literal and the spiritual is not well founded. The spiritual is just as literally true as the physical and the material. It is perfectly correct to contrast the literal and figurative, or the physical and the spiritual. Figurative language is used in Scripture to describe and explain both the physical and spiritual. It is just as literally true that Jesus was ‘exalted to the right hand of God to be a prince and a Saviour’ (Acts 5:31) as it is literally true that he was born of the virgin Mary.” (Clayton A. Munro, *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ*, pages 38, 39).

3. Then Meaning of “Throne”

As far as the writer knows, no one maintains that the literal, physical chair or throne on which David sat is preserved somewhere and will be sat on by Christ. This is no more believed than that the statement about Moses’ seat (Matt. 23:1, 2) meant the very seat on which Moses had sat. If it did, it was a mighty big seat, for the scribes and Pharisees sat in it; or else they had to do a lot of rotating in order for all to sit a little while in it.

“By ‘throne’ is meant sovereign power and dignity. Therefore, as David was exalted to this place of power and government in Israel, so the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the seed of David, was to be raised up and exalted to a state and place of sovereign power; a king to rule in righteousness. This is all that can be meant by Christ’s sitting upon the throne of David. If it can be shown that Christ now, during the present dispensation, fills this place; that Christ now occupies the very place and position that the prophets foretold, then the millennial contention will be refuted.” (H. M. Riggle, *Jesus Is Coming Again*, pages 99, 100).

R. H. Boll, a premillennialist, states that David’s throne “always meant simply the divinely-delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the ‘house of Jacob’ (Luke 1:32, 33).” (R. H. Boll, *The Kingdom of God*, Second Edition, page 112).

It is agreed by all that by “throne” is meant sovereignty, power, rule; and that the throne of David was simply his rule, authority, or power over Israel. This is the same as saying it was over God’s people, for it was Israel then who constituted God’s nation.

4. Christ Now Has Authority Over Israel and God’s People

David’s throne was David’s sovereign power over Israel. Christ today has sovereign power over Israel (Acts 2:33, 34). Israel can know assuredly that he is both Lord and Christ. (Acts 2:36.) He is Lord at God’s right hand reigning. Israel is to know this. Thus Israel can know, and thousands of them believed and accepted in the first century the fact that Christ has all authority and power over Israel today.

David had sovereignty over God’s people or nation in his day. And Jesus Christ has authority and sovereignty over God’s people or nation today (I Pet. 2:9).

What power, more than all power which he now has (Matt. 28:18), does one think that Christ could have? Could David have had more power over God’s people in his day?

If Christ is not now on David’s throne, but will be on it later, then he must move to a throne which cannot have more power than the one which he now is on. It cannot give him more than “all power.” If he will have the same power some day on David’s throne, what is the difference between his authority now and then? If there is no difference in his power, then what difference can there be in his

reign or sovereignty? If he will have less, then it will be a comedown to leave his present throne to sit on David's throne.

5. Was Christ Promised Two Different Thrones by Old Testament Prophets?

It is maintained that Christ is not now on the throne of David, which was promised to him by Old Testament prophets, including David as a prophet. Yet it must be granted that Christ is on a throne today, which throne the Old Testament prophet David said that God would give to Christ. David wrote: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. 110:1). The rest of the Psalm describes something of his rule among, and warfare against, his enemies. In Acts 2:33-36 Peter quoted the prophecy to show that Christ's exaltation at the right hand of God after his resurrection from the dead (Acts 2:33) was the fulfillment of David's prophecy (Acts 2:34, 35). Christ's fulfillment of this prophecy was one of the evidences that enabled Israel to know assuredly that God had made him, the same Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ. (Acts 2:36).

Christ is now reigning on a throne at the right hand of God. This throne was given to him in fulfillment of the prophecy made by David in Ps. 110:1. (If this is not the throne of David, then it is evident that one must contend that the Old Testament prophets prophesied that two different thrones and kingdoms would be given to Christ.)

This is not the case, for Peter's argument in Acts 2:29-36 shows that the throne to which Christ was raised was the throne of David. He also applied Ps. 110:1 to this throne, as well as applying to it the promise God made to David that one would sit on his throne.

If one maintains that two different thrones were promised—the throne of David and the throne at God's right hand—it involves him in a contradiction with a position often held by premillennialists. Some maintain that in Mark 1:14, 15 the time was at hand for the setting up of the throne of David, but that this throne and kingdom were postponed because the Jews rejected it. But if Old Testament prophets prophesied of two different thrones, then the first century could not have been the time for the setting up of the throne of David. It could have been time only for the setting up of the throne at God's right hand, which had been promised in Ps. 110:1; for if David's throne *could* have been set up during the period of time of Mark 1:14, 15, then Christ would not have been able to receive the throne of Ps. 110:1. Thus this prophecy would have failed.

6. Why No Prophecy of David's Throne in the New Testament

If Christ is not now on David's throne, why is it that the New Testament does not give us prophecies concerning the time when Christ will sit on David's throne? "Where is any passage in the New Testament which states that Christ will at some future date, in a thousand-year reign on earth, or otherwise, take his seat on David's throne? Since the Old Testament, looking to the future, speaks about it as future, why does not the New Testament speak of as future, if it is future?"

7. Christ Is Now on David's Throne

(1) David prophesied that Christ would be raised up to sit on his throne. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." (Acts 2:30.)

(2) About what was David speaking when he said this? What did he mean? He was speaking of Christ's resurrection and exaltation to the throne at God's right hand. After stating the promise of the throne in 2:30, Peter continued: "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." (2:31). What did Peter mean by his seeing this before? He meant the promise that God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. This spoke of the resurrection of Christ, but not merely his resurrection, but what he was raised to, for after his resurrection God highly exalted him. (Phil. 2:9). "This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses." (2:32). God had said that he would raise him up to sit on David's throne, and God has raised him up. What then? "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." (2:33). The "therefore" is a conclusion. *A conclusion concerning what? Concerning the argument which has just been made, of course. What argument was that?* That God would raise up one to sit on David's throne. Christ had been raised up. And he had been exalted at the right hand of God. Was he exalted to a throne when he was exalted to the right hand of God? Yes. "For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." (2:34, 35). So he has been exalted to a throne at God's right hand. He was raised up to sit on that throne. This is evident from the fact that he was raised up and placed on that throne. But he was to be raised and placed on David's throne. Since he has been raised and placed on a

throne, it must be David's throne, for that was the one to which he was to be raised from the dead to be placed on. (2:30, 31). This throne he was placed on after his resurrection.

The throne of which the apostle spoke in 2:30, 31 was the throne of David. It was the one under consideration. The prophecy is being discussed in connection with Christ's exaltation and throne at the right hand of God. If the promise to David was not to be fulfilled until centuries later, it is strange that it would be discussed on Pentecost as if it had something to do with what was then taking place. Surely it did have something to do with it, and Peter was not thousands of years off the subject. Peter had reference to Christ being raised from the dead, and what followed his resurrection. According to Peter's inspired interpretation of the promise to David, what was to follow the resurrection was his sitting on David's throne. And what, in matter of fact, did follow his resurrection was his being placed on the throne at God's right hand. Since enthroning did follow his resurrection, and Peter said that he was raised to be enthroned on David's throne, evidently it was David's throne on which he was placed.

If the throne to which he was raised at this time (2:33, 34) is not the throne of David mentioned in 2:30, where is the indication in Peter's speech that the thrones differed? Where is there any indication that Peter spoke of one throne in 2:30 and drew his "therefore" conclusion in 2:33, 34 concerning another throne. If the subject has been switched from one throne to another, our brethren should show where Peter gave any indication of such a switch. Our brethren should point out the statement of Peter which shows it. Peter gave no indication that he meant that Christ was now exalted to some other throne than the one which he had mentioned in 2:30.

No, there is no indication of a change of thrones in Peter's sermon. Christ was raised to sit on David's throne. He was raised to the throne at God's right hand. So evidently he was sitting on David's throne to which he was to be raised.

(3) Christ evidently now had kingship over Israel because the fact that he was a king, reigning at God's right hand (2:34, 35)—which was proved by prophecy, the resurrection, the miraculous demonstrations taking place, etc.—was the reason that all the house of Israel was to know assuredly that Jesus was now Lord (2:36). Thus as Lord he had all the authority over Israel that David, when on his throne, could ever have had.

(4) Christ could not be on David's throne while he was on earth, for it was to the right hand of God that he was raised to reign.

(5) Christ could not be on David's throne before his resurrection, for the meaning of David's prophecy was that Christ would be raised from the dead to sit on David's throne. So he could not have been placed on David's throne before his death and resurrection. This means that they are wrong who assert that Mark 1:14, 15 was the offer of the kingdom over which Christ was to rule on David's throne, but that when Israel rejected it the kingdom offer was withdrawn and the church established. Acts 2:30, 31 makes it clear that Christ could not have sat on David's throne unless first his death and resurrection had taken place.

8. Christ to Reign on David's Throne While David Was in the Tomb

(1) God promised to establish David's throne forever. "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee: thy throne shall be established forever." (II Sam. 7:12-16).

Matthew Pool comments as follows on verses 12 and 13: "I will set up thy seed after thee": I will set up in thy stead and throne thy posterity, first Solomon, and then others successively, and at last the Messiah. So the following words may be understood diversely, part of his posterity in general or indefinitely taken, part of Solomon, and part of Christ only, according to the different nature of the several passages." "I will establish the throne of his kingdom": This is not meant of Solomon, for his kingdom was not for ever. And though the phrase 'for ever' is sometimes used of the time of a man's life, yet it cannot be so understood here, because the mercy here promised to David's son is of another nature, and of far longer continuance, than that which was given to Saul (verse 15), who yet enjoyed the kingdom as long as he lived. But it is to be understood of David's posterity in general, but with special respect to Christ, in whose person the kingdom was to be lodged for ever. (Isa. 9:7; Dan. 2:44; Luke 1:32, 33)." (*Commentary on the Bible*).

(2) This was to be done while David was in the tomb. "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers." (II Sam. 7:12). This point was mentioned twice by Peter on Pentecost. He mentioned it just before he stated the promise of God to

raise up one to sit on David's throne (Acts 2:29), and he mentioned it shortly after in the same line or argument (2:34). Peter quoted a prophecy of David that God would not "leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (Acts 2:27). This could not refer to David. Why? Because David had died and was buried. His flesh did see corruption, since David's tomb was still with them. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." (Acts 2:29). David had reference to what? "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." (Acts 2:30, 31). So David spoke of Christ and of his resurrection to sit on David's throne. Christ has been exalted to the throne at God's right hand. This was foreseen by David, since David said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." (Acts 2:34, 35). Christ had been exalted to heaven, but not David, for "David is not ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2:34.) Thus it shows that David had not been raised. So Christ was to sit on David's throne after David had been gathered to his fathers, and David was to still be in the tomb when Christ was raised to sit on his throne.

"So instead of Christ's sitting on David's throne after the resurrection of the righteous, this text proves that it would take place while David was still sleeping with his fathers. (Acts 2:29, 30; Psalm 132: 11)." (George B. Fletcher, *The Millennium*, p. 46).

9. Christ Now Lord Over Israel

(1) Christ's reign over Israel, the house of Jacob, was to be when he was on David's throne. R. H. Boll wrote: "The throne of David—which always meant simply the divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the 'house of Jacob.' Luke 1:32, 33." (*The Kingdom of God, Revised Edition*. p. 112). He was to reign over Israel when on David's throne, thus if he is now reigning over Israel, he is now on David's throne.

(2) Christ is now reigning at God's right hand, to which he was exalted at some time after his resurrection. The first the earth knew of this was when he sent the Spirit on Pentecost. (Acts 2:33-35).

(3) On this throne he has supreme authority over Israel. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath

made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both *Lord* and *Christ*." (Acts 2:36). This refers to the same Lord on the throne mentioned in verses 34, 35 where David said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." *Christ is David's Lord, but he is also Israel's Lord, and Israel is told to know it assuredly.*

The term "Lord" refers thus to this "Lord" of prophecy. (Ps. 110:1). In I Peter we are told to sanctify in our hearts Christ as Lord (R. V.), "in words which are used in the Old Testament of the Lord of hosts (Isa. 8:13), and his sanctification by Israel." (*Expositor's Greek Testament*). R. H. Boll states that the reference in Acts 2:23 means that Christ is universal ruler. "Peter also states that, in accordance with Psalm 110, Jesus was exalted at the right hand of God, and is as David says, Lord—David's Lord, the universal ruler—as well as Christ." (*Op. Cit.*, p. 116).

Some Israelites then submitted to Christ's Lordship, as well as afterwards. Thousands, in fact, obeyed the gospel. (Acts 2:41; 5:14; Rom. 11:5). Those who did not submit to his Lordship were numbered among his foes and cut off because of unbelief. (Rom. 11:20).

(4) It cannot be urged by premillennialists that Christ cannot now be on David's throne because he is now universal ruler, and not special ruler over Israel, which special sovereignty over Israel was what was meant by David's throne. This objection will not hold for several reasons. First, we would expect the ruler of the antitype (Christ) to be greater than that of the type (David). Second, Christ does now have all the authority over Israel itself that David ever had. Third, the Bible does not teach that Christ would rule over Israel only when on David's throne. It does not teach that he would not be a universal ruler when on David's throne. If it did, then in the assumed millennium Christ would not be on David's throne, as the next point shows. Fourth, if the fact that Christ is now universal ruler—ruling over others as well as over Israel—proves that he cannot now be on David's throne, then the premillennialists will have to find some other throne for him in the millennium, for they teach that he will not only have sovereignty over Israel at that time, but also over all the nations of the earth. But that is the very sovereignty which he has now. As Boll says, he is universal ruler. (Op. Cit., p. 116). Thus their objection would keep him off David's throne in the assumed millennium as surely as it would keep him off now. If it is valid now against Christ being on David's throne now, it will be valid then against Christ being on David's throne then.

Our conclusion must be that Christ is on David's throne now, since he was to reign over Israel when on David's throne, and he now reigns over Israel.

10. Christ Is Now on David's Throne, for He Is Now
Over Jacob's House

Among other things, an angel of the Lord said unto Mary: "Thou shalt bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1:31-33).

(1) *The time when he reigns over the house is the same as the time that he is on the throne of David.* It did not teach, nor does any other passage teach, that he would reign over the house of Jacob before he reigned on the throne of David. *If he is not now on the throne of David, he is not reigning now over the house of Jacob. If he is now reigning over the house of Jacob, he is now on the throne of David.* Two dispensations are not represented in Luke 1:31-33. When on the throne of David he would of course be reigning. And that reign, verse 33 tells us, will be over the house of Jacob.

(2) *What did the house of Jacob include?* Jacob was the father of the twelve tribes of Israel. The house of Jacob means the descendants of Jacob; just as the house of David, to which Joseph belonged, meant the descendants of David. (Luke 1:27). Joseph was "of the house and lineage of David." (Luke 2:4).

The house of Israel and the house of Judah were both descendants of Jacob, and thus both are the house of Jacob. In fact, Jacob himself was first called Israel (Gen. 35:10, 21) long before the house of Israel existed and was so designated. At times, of course, the house of Jacob was distinguished as to the house of David (I Kings 12:16); the house of Israel; and the house of Judah and Benjamin, etc. (I Kings 12:19-34). The house of Jacob would be the children or descendants of Jacob, just as the children of Israel (I Kings 12:24) were the same as the house of Israel (I Kings 12:21, 24).

(3) *God promised to make a new covenant with Israel's house and Jacob's house.* "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an

husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." (Jer. 31:31-34).

The house of Judah and the house of Israel are the house of Jacob. It was Jacob's house that came out of the land of Egypt. And those who came out of the land of Egypt are said to be "their fathers"—the fathers of the house of Israel and of Judah.

This is also shown by the fact that when the division of the people took place during the reign of Rehoboam the people were called the house of Judah and the house of Israel, although Benjamin's house is also mentioned as being faithful to Judah's house. Those who were faithful to Rehoboam included also some of the remnant of the people. (I Kings 12:21-23).

The new covenant was evidently made with Jacob's house; for if Jacob's house did not embrace Judah and Israel, and the remnants of other tribes which had become identified with them, there was no one left in Jacob's house during the days of Jesus. And thus, unless Christ's reign was to be over Jacob's house, which was made up of Judah and Israel, there would be no one left in Jacob's house over whom he could reign while on the throne of David.

(4) *God kept his promise, and he did make a new covenant with Israel and Judah.* The new covenant has already been made. Jeremiah's prophecy of the covenant is quoted in Heb. 8:6-13. God took away the first covenant that he might establish the second, the new, covenant. (Heb. 10:9, 10). This covenant became of force after, not before, the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, with whose blood it was dedicated and we are sanctified. (Heb. 9:18; 10:10). Thus it is obvious that the new covenant has been made and is even now in force.

With whom was the new covenant made? The prophet stated that it would be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. (Heb. 8:8). Since the New Testament quotes it as fulfilled, it was made with those whom the prophet Jeremiah designated. The "us" with whom the covenant was made was the "brethren" who find forgiveness of sins through Christ. (Heb. 10:15, 16, 19, 20). That

the prophet's statement about sins being remembered no more is fulfilled in the New Testament is evident from the application made of the passage in Heb. 10:15-19.

That the new covenant was made with Israel is also evident from Acts, where Israel was offered and thousands accepted the covenant. The Lordship of Jesus was preached to "Jews" (Acts 2:5); "ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem" (Acts 2:14); "ye men of Israel" (Acts 2:22); "all the house of Israel." "Therefore let all *the house of Israel* know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:36). They wanted to know what to do. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2:38). About three thousand received their word and were baptized. (Acts 2:41). Men of Israel were again preached to, in Acts 3:12. "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." (Acts 3:26).

(5) *The new covenant was entered into only by those who accepted it.* God did not force the covenant on them. They did not have to accept it, and many of them did not accept it. It was not made with a person just because he was of the physical house of Israel, although it was offered to all of them, but it was made only with those who would accept it. Even Jews had to be born again. Any of physical Israel who accepted it then entered into covenant relationship with God. Any who accept it now enter into covenant relationship with God.

Many of Israel had zeal, but not knowledge, and thus they did not subject themselves to God's righteousness in the new covenant of which Christ is the center. (Rom. 10:1-4). Isaiah realized that not all would obey the gospel. (Rom. 10:16). Yet "at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." (Rom. 11:5). There were some, in other words, who were receptive to the word of God—just as there was always a remnant in Old Testament days—and thus received the new covenant when it was proclaimed. Those of Israel who did not accept it were broken off because of their unbelief. (Rom. 11:20). Gentiles, and Jews as well, who were in the covenant were in it because of faith. (Rom. 11:20). If Gentiles continue in God's goodness, if they continue faithful, they will not be cut off; but they will be cut off if they do not continue faithful. (Rom. 11:21, 22). "And they also (Jews, J. D. B.), if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again."

(Rom. 11:23.) Any and all of physical Israel can come into the new covenant at any time that they believe the gospel. It was through unbelief in the gospel that they were cut off, and it will be through belief in the very gospel which they rejected that they will be grafted in *if they abide not still in unbelief.* (Rom. 11:23).

(6) In the new covenant Christ has authority, Christ reigns over the house of Judah and of Israel. (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:5-13). He still reigns in this covenant over any and all who accept him. But Christ was to reign over the house of Jacob when he was on David's throne. (Luke 1:31-33). He had to be there to reign over Jacob's house. He started reigning over Jacob's house when the new covenant went into force. Therefore, he was at that time ruling on the throne of David.

It is true, as other New Testament scriptures show, that Gentiles are also included in the new covenant, but that does not eliminate the fact that it was made also with Judah and Israel. Furthermore, the church is spiritual Israel.

It will not do to say that there are very few of the house of Judah and Israel accepting the new covenant today, and that therefore Christ cannot be reigning on David's throne. This would be equal to saying that Christ is not now reigning in the new covenant, and that the covenant has not been made with Judah and Israel.

It has been objected by some *that the new covenant has not yet been made.* One thing showing this, it is said, is that the time has not yet come when every man knows God. (Heb. 8:11). The objector, as shown in the previous chapter, has misunderstood this passage and on the basis of his misunderstanding has concluded that the prophecy cannot have been fulfilled since his understanding of the passage has not yet been fulfilled. He is wrong. The evidence shows that the prophecy has been fulfilled and that therefore the new covenant has been made. Therefore, this verse must have been fulfilled. Not only do we know it from the rest of the things in this prophecy which have been fulfilled, but there is a fitting explanation of this passage. It is this: Under the old covenant people were born into the covenant-race and then taught. Thus there were people in that nation who did not know God. But in the new covenant one is first taught and then brought into the covenant. All in covenant relationship with God under the new covenant know God. They had to know him to enter into covenant relationship. They had to be taught of God to be drawn unto Christ. (John 6:44ff). They may need some instruction on other things, but all of them know him, from the least to the greatest.

11. Christ on David's Throne when on His Own Throne

"A careful reading of many of the prophecies of the Old Testament show that 'David' is frequently a title (since he was a type of Christ—J. D. B.) for Christ. This being true, it follows that if Christ sits upon his throne, it must be David's throne. Since 'throne' means sovereign power and dignity, Christ being by the right hand of God exalted 'when he raised him from the dead' clothed with "all power in heaven and in earth,' is sitting at God's own right hand in the heavens, 'crowned with glory and honor.' 'far above all principalities, and power, and every name that is named, both in heaven and on earth.' " (H. M. Riggle, *Jesus Is Coming Again*, page 106).

The proof that the name of David is sometimes given to Christ—thus representing the antitype (Christ) under the figure of the type (David), when literal David was not meant, and thus though the Bible actually meant someone, it did not literally mean the one mentioned, David—is found in such passages as Jer. 30:9; Ezek. 34:23; 37:24; Hos. 3:5.

David, the type, ruling over God's people is sometimes used, therefore, when Christ is meant. Today Christ has a kingdom which contains all, both Jew and Gentile, who have accepted the gospel. (Col. 1:13; Rom. 11:5, 20-23). Christ reigns in this kingdom on the throne at God's right hand. (Acts 2:33, 34). This reign is to continue until the last enemy is conquered (Acts 2:35), which last enemy is death (I Cor. 15:25, 26). "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, *then* shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (I Cor. 15:28). This means that the end has come and the kingdom is delivered up to God. (I Cor. 15:24). So he is on the throne and reigning now in the kingdom in a reign which will last until the end. He must reign until this is accomplished. (I Cor. 15:24, 25).

Since David as king ruling over God's people was a type of Christ, Christ must be on David's throne, since he is on his throne reigning over God's people. Thus Christ on his throne is what was meant when it was said that he would be on the throne of David.

Certainly it is not reasonable and scriptural to maintain that David, the *king*, was a type of Christ, but that David's *throne* was not a type of Christ's throne. No one will maintain that literal David is meant in Ezek. 37:24. Thus our premillennialist friends will not argue here that "God meant what he said and said what he meant." He did in one sense, but not in the literal sense. Thus they would not argue that the difference, on this passage, between them and those

who reject the premillennial view is between those who take a literal view of this prophecy and those who say that it is figurative or typical. They often thus argue elsewhere, but they do not so argue here.

How, then, if in Ezek. 37:24 David is used as a type of Christ, and literal David is not meant, can one argue that the throne and rule is not also used as a type of Christ's rule? How can one argue that the King David is used typically, but that the throne on which he reigns as king is not used typically? How can David, to put it another way, as ruler be used as a type of Christ as ruler, but the throne on which he rules be the literal throne on which David ruled instead of being typical of Christ's throne? Since David, the king, is used as a type, since he is the ruler, how can the throne be otherwise than typical?

How can one escape the conclusion that since David, ruling as king over God's people, was a type of Christ, Christ and his rule over God's people is the antitype? Thus how can one avoid the conclusion that since Christ sits on his throne over God's people, that this is the throne and rule of David which was pictured in Old Testament prophecy under the type of David's rule and throne?

12. *The Antitype Is Always Greater Than the Type*

In connection with the argument on David's throne being a type of Christ's throne, and thus Christ on his throne is what is meant by his being on David's throne, it is important to notice also that the antitype is always greater than the type. In other words, *the substance is greater than the shadow*. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." (Heb. 10:1).

The holy places of the Old Testament were figures of the true where Christ appears in heaven for us. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (Heb. 9:24).

The tabernacle itself was a figure, which was not as great as the reality under the New Testament. "The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only

in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by *a greater and more perfect tabernacle*, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building." (Heb. 9:8-11).

The blood of the Old Testament sacrifices was a type of the better sacrifice of Christ's blood. "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves *with better sacrifices than these*, the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. 9:22-26, 28; 10:10).

David the king was a type of Christ the King; and in line with the fact that the antitype is greater than the type, Christ is much greater than David. After David had been in the tomb, Ezekiel prophesied that "David my (God's) servant shall be king over them; . . . my servant *David* shall be their *prince for ever*." (Ezek. 37:24, 25). The one, however, who was to be King over them *forever* was not David, but Christ. (Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:31-33). Thus Christ, not David, is the one meant, and David is used simply as a type of Christ. But the type was not equal to the antitype; the antitype, Christ, was infinitely greater than the type, David.

Since David the king was a type of Christ, David's throne must have been a type of Christ's throne; for David as king or ruler is David on his throne. *One must no more expect the type, David's throne, to be identified with or equal to the antitype, Christ's throne, that he would expect David to be identical with or equal to Christ.* And yet it can properly be said that it is David's throne, in that David's throne was the shadow of which Christ's was the substance (in other words, type and antitype). It can, and must be just as proper to say this is David's throne as it is to say that Christ is the David of Ezek. 37:24, 25.

Since the type is always greater than the antitype, and it must be admitted that David's throne was a type, then *it is evident that one must contend that the antitypical throne must be greater than David's throne, which was the type.* As Christ was greater than David, so his throne must be greater than David's throne. *One has no reason to make David's throne a type which does not fit the rule that the type is inferior to the antitype.*

It is, therefore, unreasonable and unscriptural to argue, as does R. H. Boll, that Christ cannot now be on David's throne, because the

throne on which Christ now sits is vastly superior to the throne on which David sat. "The risen Lord Jesus is indeed exalted and enthroned now. But the position of authority he occupies up there was in no sense inherited from his father, David. David never occupied *that* throne, nor could have; just as it is equally evident that the Lord Jesus never yet exercised the authority of David's sphere or rule. The throne which our Lord occupies now is the all-inclusive sovereignty of heaven. It is a position of supreme authority held by him as the glorified God-man—'until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet' (but when this is accomplished, the kingdom is surrendered to the Father, instead of Christ being enthroned in Jerusalem, I Cor. 15:24-28—J. D. B.); upon which it will be surrendered (I Cor. 15:25-28). It is a joint sharing of God's throne, on which no mere creature ever yet sat nor could sit." (R. H. Boll, *The Kingdom of God*, Revised Edition, page 113). The type is inferior to the antitype, and one must, therefore, argue that Christ (the antitypical David) must be on his throne, which is vastly superior to David's (the typical throne). Instead of Boll's point being against our interpretation, one would expect such an interpretation to be right, since the antitype is superior to the type.

Boll's argument can be applied with equal force, and scripturalness, against the idea that Christ in a millennium will be on David's throne on earth. But, of course, it has neither force nor scripturalness. It could be applied, however, against David's throne being a throne in a millennium with Christ reigning on earth from Jerusalem, for the following reason: *The supposed throne in the millennium will be vastly different and vastly superior to David's throne in Israel.* How so? First, it will be greater *geographically*. David's was limited to a small country, but Christ's throne in the millennium, they teach, will have headquarters in Jerusalem, but extend far beyond Palestine in that it will embrace the world. Did David ever have such a rule? *Second*, it will embrace far more than the nation of Israel in that *it will embrace Israel plus all nations.* David never had such a rule on his throne. David's literal throne never exercised such authority. R. H. Boll himself wrote that "the throne of David, which always meant simply the divinely-delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the 'house of Jacob.' (Luke 1:32, 33)." (*Ibid.*, page 112). How, then, can David's throne mean Christ's rule not only over all the nation of Israel, but over all the nations of the earth? David's throne never included that authority and rule. And the only way that the premillennialists themselves can justify applying the term "David's throne" to Christ's throne over all the world in the millennium would be to maintain that the antitype is greater than the type, and, therefore,

Christ's rule on David's throne was greater than David's rule. *They must argue that Christ on David's throne includes much more than David being on David's throne ever included.* And when they argue this, they are granting that Christ's throne (Christ on David's throne) must include more than David's literal throne included. And when this is argued, the point that Boll made on page 113 of his book is, in principle, surrendered; for it would undermine the idea that David's throne in a millennium could include more authority, and more nations, than did David's throne in Palestine while David lived. *Third*, the rule in the millennium will be vastly different from David's throne in that David ruled over mortal human beings only, and Christ is assumed to rule over immortal, resurrected human beings as well as mortal ones in the millennium. Where did David ever have such a rule? *Fourth*, the power which Christ will have in the millennium will be vastly superior to the power that David had while on his throne.

If all these things, in the thinking of the premillennialist, can be included in David's throne in the assumed millennium, then David's throne must be vastly different and vastly superior to David's throne under the Old Testament. *And thus the same argument, in principle, which is used against Christ being on David's throne now because his throne is exalted far above David's, they must let fall to the ground, for it can be used with equal force against the premillennial interpretation of David's throne.*

To turn Boll's arguments against his own interpretation of David's throne, let us note: *First*, David never occupied *that* throne, above described, which Christ will, according to Boll, occupy in the millennium. *Second*, "No mere creature ever yet sat nor could sit" on such a throne as the millennial throne. *Third*, no such throne as the millennial throne could be inherited by Jesus "from his father, David"; for David never had such a throne as that. "David never occupied *that* throne, nor could have;" so it is evident that in the millennium the Lord Jesus will not exercise the "authority of David's sphere or rule." *Fourth*, "The *throne of David*, however, is his own peculiarly as David's Son; the throne which is his by right of human descent as David's 'righteous branch.'" (R. H. Boll, *Op. Cit.*, pages 113, 114). But what right of human descent could give anyone authority to rule on such a throne as the premillennialists say that Christ will rule on in the millennium? In our description of what they consider the throne in the millennium it is made evident that David never sat on such a throne. How, then, could it be Christ's by right of descent from David? David never had such a throne, so how could Christ inherit such a throne from David? David never had such a sphere of

authority as they say Christ will have in a millennial reign on earth, so how could Christ's reign at that time be the same as the sphere of authority which David exercised over Israel?

The premillennial interpretation of David's throne is undermined by the arguments used by the premillennialists against the position that Christ's present exalted throne cannot be the throne promised him under the promise of David's throne. And to this be added the argument, already presented, that the antitype must be greater than the type. Just as much as Christ is vastly superior to David, just so Christ's throne must be vastly superior to David's throne.

David on his throne was a type of Christ on his throne. Christ is now on his throne, for he reigns (Acts 2:33, 34) in his kingdom (Col. 1:13). David ruling over God's people was a type of Christ ruling over God's people. Christ is now ruling over God's people. So we must conclude that Christ is on David's throne.

13. Christ a King and Priest on His Throne

(1) *The prophecy.* "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6:12, 13).

(2) *The fulfillment.* Christ is that Branch (Isa. 11:1; Rom. 15:12), and is doing that work. Note:

First, the holy temple of the Lord, the church, was built by Christ on "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2:20). Obedient believers are built as living stones into this growing temple of the Lord. (Eph. 2:21-23; I Pet. 2:5). Of this temple Christ became the chief corner-stone *after* the rejection by Israel. (Matt. 21:42, 38, 39, 45; I Pet. 2:7, 8). But they could not have been built as God's temple on this foundation until after Christ had been put in as the chief cornerstone; but after this was done, he, in harmony with Zech. 6:12, 13, began building the superstructure of God's temple. When the last person, who is converted, is built into this temple, it will be completed.

Second. Add to this the fact that Christ did sit on the throne at God's right hand *after* his ascension. (Acts 2:30-35). So as king he is building God's temple. Anyone who maintains that the church is

not the temple of the Lord mentioned by Zechariah, but that it is the material temple which Israel had, is committed to the position that Jesus will rebuild Israel's physical temple, something for which there is no New Testament authority. Christ could not be priest over *that* temple. (Heb. 8:4). On the authority of the New Testament, we do know that the church is the household, or temple, of the Lord. (Eph. 2:19, compared with I Tim. 3:15; I Cor. 3:9, 16; Eph. 2:20-22). And we know that of it Christ is the builder.

Third, Christ was to be king *and* priest on his throne. Christ is priest on the throne now. "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." (Heb. 8:1). This is the throne on which he sat after his ascension. (Acts 2:33, 34; Heb. 1:3, 13). Christ is king over his kingdom (Col. 1:13), and he is priest on the throne. So Zech. 6:12, 13 is fulfilled.

Fourth, while on earth, when the law of Moses was binding, Christ could not be a priest, for he was not of the priestly tribe. (Heb. 7:11-19; Heb. 8:4). If any premillennialists maintain that he will be priest on his throne in the millennial reign, Heb. 8:4 defeats them. They may reply however, that the law of Moses has been taken away (Col. 2:14), and that, therefore, he can be a priest on earth during the millennial reign. This, it must be pointed out, runs contrary to another position which their interpretation of prophecy forces them to take when they are consistent. Some of the same prophecies which they interpret as proving that Christ will reign on David's literal throne on earth over literal Israel, also mention the presence of the sacrifices, priesthood, and ceremonies of the Levitical priesthood. Thus if the literal kingdom is restored to Israel, the literal Old Testament system of priesthood, ceremonies, and sacrifices will be restored. Thus the law regulating them will be restored. And it would then follow that since Christ was not of the priestly tribe, he could no more then be a priest while on earth than he could have been during his personal ministry on earth. Thus it would follow that during the millennial reign, as pictured by premillennialism, Christ could not be *king and* priest on his throne.

Fifth, since Christ cannot be priest and king on his throne on earth, his throne must be in heaven. Thus we find not only do the Scriptures teach that Christ could not be priest while on earth, but they also teach that he is priest in heaven for us. "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God." (Heb. 4:14). Christ, our high priest, is entered "into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (Heb. 9:24, 25). "We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand

of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." (Heb. 8:1). There he as priest is enthroned. (Acts 2:33, 34; Rev. 3:21). "Let us therefore come boldly unto *the throne of grace*, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. 4:16).

Now let us present *some syllogisms on the above passages*. These syllogisms we take from Foy E. Wallace, Jr., in the *Neal-Wallace Debate*, page 169.

"(a) Zech. 6:13; Heb. 8:1. '(1) Christ is priest now. (2) But he would be priest on his throne. (3) Therefore, he is on his throne now—*his* throne, not the Father's.' " Of course, it can be called the 'Father's throne' in the same sense that the kingdom of God, in which we have an inheritance, is also the kingdom of Christ. (Eph. 5:5.) Also in the sense that David's throne can also be Christ's throne.

"(b) Heb. 4:14; 9:24, 25; 8:1. '(1) he is priest on his throne. (2) But he is priest in heaven. (3) Therefore, *his* throne is in heaven.'

"(c) Heb. 8:4. '(1) If he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all. (2) But he would be a priest on his throne. (3) Therefore, *his* throne cannot be on earth.'

"(d) Zech. 6:13. '(1) He would rule on his throne while priest. (2) He is priest on his throne now. (3) Therefore, he is ruling on *his* throne now.' "

14. *David's Throne Was on Earth*

Premillennialists maintain that Christ cannot now be on David's throne, because Christ is now on a throne in heaven. David's throne was never in heaven, but was on earth. Therefore, Christ must sit on a throne on earth in order to be on David's throne. The reply to this objection is as follows:

First, David's throne was Jehovah's throne, because God gave it to him. It was Jehovah's throne, for through it he ruled his people on earth. (I Kings 1:46-48; 2:12; I Chron. 29:23). Thus the throne, although on earth, was Jehovah's and Jehovah's rule over his people.

Christ is on his throne, as proved elsewhere in these articles; but he is also on the Father's throne. (Rev. 3:21). On this throne he rules over God's people who are on earth. God has delegated rule to Christ and rules through Christ. (I Cor. 15:24-28).

There is no need for the throne to be on earth for Christ to have authority over God's people; and he has all the rule over God's people today that David ever had.

Second, as has been shown from Zech. 6:12, 13, Christ is king and priest on *his* throne. He is king and priest not on a throne on earth, but on one at God's right hand. (Acts 2:33, 34; Heb. 1:3, 13; 8:1, 4).

Since David's throne was a type of Christ's throne, and since Christ is now on his throne, and since he could not be priest and king on his throne on earth, Christ's throne must be in heaven; and that is the throne which was spoken of under the type—David's throne.

Third, as elsewhere shown, the type is always inferior to the antitype; and thus one would expect that Christ's throne (the antitype) would be far superior to David's throne (the type). Thus it should be the occasion of no surprise that the place from which Christ rules is far superior to the place from which David ruled—Christ's in heaven, David's on earth.

Fourth, Ps. 110:1 is fulfilled in Christ's elevation to the throne at God's right hand. (Acts 2:33, 34). Turning to that Psalm, we find that Christ rules in the midst of his enemies, and that he conquers his enemies on earth. But the fact that his throne is at God's right hand does not keep him from reigning over God's people and conquering his enemies. So why insist that Christ cannot rule on David's throne in heaven, since David's throne, after all, was only David's sovereignty over Israel. And on his throne at God's right hand he is King, he is Lord, even over Israel. (Acts 2:33-35).

Fifth, David's throne was no more on a transformed, new earth than it was located in heaven at the right hand of God. Why not argue that Christ's throne on a new, transformed earth would not be the same as David's throne on the first earth which was not in such a condition?

Sixth, Why not argue that Christ's throne then could not be rightly labeled David's throne, since David never ruled over resurrected, immortal beings, as premillennialists argue that Christ will reign over, in addition to human beings who are corruptible, in a millennial reign in person on earth?

Seventh, why not argue his millennial throne, as pictured by premillennialists, cannot be David's throne, since David's throne was only over the nation of Israel (R. H. Boll, *The Kingdom of God*, page 112), while Christ's millennial throne will be over Israel *and* all the other nations of the earth?

Eighth, why not argue that it cannot then be David's throne, since David reigned according to the laws of the Old Testament,

while Christ's reign cannot be according to those laws because Christ could not then be a king and priest on his throne; also because pre-millennialists recognize that the kingdom promised by the Old Testament prophets was not to be identical with the Old Testament kingdom. Furthermore, those laws were spoken to the fathers in times past, and for times past, and not to us (Heb. 1:1, 2), or to any people in any future dispensation on earth.

David's rule was over a people on earth; Christ's reign is over a people on earth. His authority over God's people is just as definite as was David's, although his throne is at God's right hand. His is a rule over a people on earth, regardless of the location of the throne on which he sits.

The important thing is not the physical location of his throne, but the fact of his authority.

15 Christ on His Father's Throne and Not on His Own Throne Now

It is sometimes objected that Christ is not on his throne, but is on his Father's throne. *If this argument is sound, Christ will not be on his own throne in the millennial reign;* and thus their own position is destroyed. It will be David's throne and not Christ's. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on *his* throne." (Acts 2:30). Thus it cannot be Christ's throne, as Boll thinks, in the millennium. (*The Kingdom of God*, pages 113, 114). *Christ will never reign on his own throne,* for Boll believes that after the millennial reign Christ will surrender the kingdom to the Father.

The argument is not sound, for Christ is now reigning on the throne at God's right hand. (Acts 2:33, 34; Heb. 1:3, 13; I Cor. 15:24-28). *It is Christ's throne, for it is Christ's kingdom.* Since we are in the kingdom of God's dear Son, Christ, he is reigning in his kingdom. (Col. 1:13).

Also we know that something can be God's and Christ's at the same time. Paul said that unregenerate men have no inheritance in the kingdom of God and of Christ. (Eph. 5:5). The gospel is "the gospel of Christ" (I Thess. 3:2), "the gospel of God" (2:2, 8, 9), and "our gospel" (II Cor. 4:3). "God, who hath called you unto *his* kingdom and glory." (I Thes. 2:12). Also the throne can be Christ's throne and David's throne. *Even David's throne was Jehovah's throne.* When Solomon was on *his* throne (I Kings 1:37, 47), Solomon

was on *David's* throne (I Kings 1:35; 2:12) and on *Jehovah's* throne (I Chron. 29:23), which was also the throne on which David had sat. Thus when Christ is on David's throne he is on Jehovah's throne; and when on Jehovah's throne he is on his throne, the throne of David, which was promised to him.

The premillennialists maintain that in the millennium it will be the kingdom of God, the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of David, since Christ was to rule over the people on David's throne. When they explain how all this could be—if there were to be a millennium like they picture—they have explained how the throne today can be Christ's, God's, and David's.

To illustrate again: The church is Christ's church. (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:21, 22; Rom. 16:16; Acts 20:28) and God's church (I Cor. 1:12). But it is the same church.

God has subjected the kingdom of Christ, but he has not subjected himself to Christ. (I Cor. 15:27).

"There are many ways in which the reign of David bears a striking resemblance to the reign of Christ over the kingdom of God. First we learn that both David and Christ were prophets. Acts 2:30 speaks of David saying 'Therefore being a prophet.' The Psalms of David abound in prophecies about Christ. We are told in Acts 3:22 and 7:37 that Jesus Christ is the Prophet spoken of by Moses in Deut. 18:15. Jesus was the greatest of the Prophets but David was a great prophet." (H. C. Heffren, *The Mission of the Messiah*, p. 14).

Although it was not his regular function, David did at some time perform the function of a priest (2 Sam. 6:18; I Chron. 16). Christ is our high priest forever.

David was king, and so is Christ. The promise, however, concerning David's fleshly descendants, and his earthly throne, was conditional. David told Solomon to keep Jehovah's commandments, "that the Lord may continue his word, which he spake concerning me, saying, *If* thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel." (I Kings 2:4). ". . . if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but *if* thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." (I Chron. 28:9). Solomon evidently did not keep the Lord's commandments. "Wherefore the Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast *not* kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee. and will give it to thy servant." (I Kings 11:11). However, it was not to be done during his lifetime, and one tribe was to be

left to "thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, which I have chosen." (I Kings 11:13). Later it was written: "Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only. Also Judah kept not the commandments of the Lord their God, but walked in the statutes of Israel which they made. And the Lord rejected all the seed of Israel. . . ." (II Kings 17:18-20). Again it is written: "And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." (Ezek. 21:25-27.)

The throne of Christ, however, is not temporary. It was to have "no end" (Lk. 1:32,33). "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom:" (Heb. 1:8). This is just as the prophet Isaiah had foreseen (Isa. 9:6-7).

His authority is not only over fleshly Israel (Acts 2:36), but also over the Gentiles (Rom. 15:12), since all authority has been given unto Him (Matt. 28:18).

Christ's superiority to David is just as one should have expected, since the antitype is superior to the type.

CHAPTER XI

THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID

Essential to the premillennial position is the idea that the tabernacle of David has not yet been rebuilt. If it has been rebuilt Christ is now king on David's throne and the kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament find their fulfillment in the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col. 1:13). It is maintained by the author that Acts 15 and other passages show that the tabernacle of David is rebuilt in the present reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. James applied Old Testament prophecy, concerning the rebuilding of David's tabernacle, to the present dispensation (Acts 15:13-18).

This, however, is denied by some who even go so far as to maintain that the present blessing of the Gentiles is not even the subject of Old Testament prophecy. Let us prove all things and hold fast to that which is good (I Thes. 5:21) while we subject this passage to a close examination.

1. No Old Testament Promise Concerning the Present Day Blessings Extended to Gentiles?

R. H. Boll takes a position which would logically lead him to conclude that *the saving and blessing of Gentiles today through the gospel of Christ is not a subject of Old Testament prophecy*. "That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; that had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed." (R. H. Boll, *The Kingdom of God*, 2nd, p. 120). If this be true, what follows:

First, *that the Messianic days which we have been under for around two thousand years are not the Messianic days of Old Testament prophecy*. These present Messianic days are days in which there is no difference between Jew and Gentile, and the Gentiles are being blessed without any national restoration of Israel. The church-age, which we are now in, is not the subject of Old Testament prophecy, according to this statement of Boll. For if it was the subject of

prophecy then it would have been known that the Gentiles would be blessed in Messianic days before any national restoration and exaltation of Israel. Boll's statements made the promised Messianic days equal to the time of the national restoration and exaltation of Israel. Today in the glorious gospel dispensation Gentiles are blessed, and Israel has not undergone a national restoration and exaltation, so evidently these present days were not the Messianic days of prophetic promise.

Second, it also follows that the distinction between Jew and Gentile will be re-introduced in the Messianic days, and thus one of the outstanding characteristics of the gospel age will disappear. Today there is no difference between Jew and Gentile in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:27-29). Gentiles are fellow-members of the body, fellow-heirs, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel (Eph. 3:4-6). In the Messianic days to which Boll looks forward, Israel as a nation will be exalted, and the Gentiles will be blessed only through and "in *subservience* to Israel."

Boll has drawn some wrong conclusions from Ephesians 3:4-6. In quoting it, on page 120 he leaves out a qualifying phrase which modifies the rest of Paul's statement concerning the Gentiles. Paul did not say that it "was not made known unto the sons of men." He said: "was not made known unto the sons of men, *as it hath now been revealed.*" (Eph. 3:5).

2. Is James Quoting Amos Only?

R. H. Boll assumed that James was quoting Amos and Amos only, and on the basis of this he concluded that James added it to what Amos had said. "The fact is significant, however, that the prophet Amos from whom James quotes this, never used those words at all. . . . James *purposely* added these words, as summing up the teaching of *the prophets* on the point in hand. . . . it is *James* who added this, for the line is not found in Amos, nor in any of the prophets. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 122).

James did not say that he was quoting Amos. It is true that much of it is found in Amos, but it is not true that the context permits one to think that he is quoting Amos and adding to what Amos or any of the prophets said, when he said: "After this I will return."

James expressly said that he was not referring to only one prophet. "And to this agree the words of the *prophets.*" (Acts 15:15). *James was using words from the prophets, plural, and not from a prophet, singular.*

Why, then, when one fails to find all that James said in one of the prophets, such as Amos, must one conclude that James has added something to what one prophet said. James stated that he was using the words of more than one prophet.

James also stated that what he had in mind was *written* in the words of the prophets. "And to this agree the words of the prophets; *as it is written*. . ." And he followed this statement immediately with "After this I will return. . ." But premillennialists maintain that this was not written in the words of the prophets. At least R. H. Boll does. *James said* "as it is written, after this I will return. ." and *Boll said* that it was not written. It was not only not written but it was not the gist of anything that the prophets had said, since Boll said that it was added by James and that it was not in any of the prophets.

As a matter of fact, we can take written words of the prophets, and the ideas expressed in those written words, and put them together to say just what James said. And James evidently put together written words for he said that he was giving written words of the prophets which applied to the taking out of a people from the Gentiles for God's name. And the places from whence we take these words will be from passages which deal with the same theme. This is the judgment of God on Israel for her sins, and then the gathering of the children of Israel into His favor—at least the gathering of those who would accept Him. In Jeremiah 12 God describes His forsaking of "mine house, I have left mine heritage; I have given the dearly beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies." (12:7). After a time of punishment He said, "And it shall come to pass, *after that I have plucked them out I will return, and have compassion on them, and will bring them again, every man to his heritage, and every man to his land. And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, the Lord liveth; as they taught my people to swear to Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But if they will not obey, I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation, saith the Lord.*" (Jer. 12:15-17). Amos speaks of the same thing. He speaks of the Lord's destroying the sinful kingdom, except that he would not utterly destroy them (9:8-10). Then he stated that He would raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, etc. (9:11-12). They were, just as Jeremiah said, to be planted on their land after he had brought them out of captivity (9:14-15).

Jeremiah and James use almost identical words. "After that I have plucked them out I will return," God said through Jeremiah (12:15). "After this I will return," God said through James in referring to what was written in the words of the prophets (Acts 15:15).

God said, in other words, that after He had visited punishment on the house of Israel, that He would return and rebuild the tabernacle of David. It was *after this*—after his punishments on Israel which were stated by Old Testament prophets—that God would rebuild the tabernacle of David. It was not after the new covenant days, and the calling of the Gentiles, that God would rebuild David's tabernacle. And this having been done—God having punished them for the sins which such as Amos and Jeremiah denounced them for—God was now rebuilding David's tabernacle.

Putting together, then, words of the prophets Jeremiah and Amos, and perhaps the words of other prophets are included for we know not how many of the prophets James had in mind, we find the words which James said were written, and which he quoted.

Perhaps someone will say that James quotes Amos only, but that he quotes Amos as simply one sample of what the prophets had to say about the matter. If this be so, it is still true that the essence of what Amos said is contained in James' statement. It would still be true that the prophets did speak of the present blessing of the Gentiles. However, James did not say that he was quoting Amos only. Instead he stated that written words of the *prophets* were in agreement with this matter and then he quoted words the essence of which can be found in Amos and Jeremiah.

There are words of the prophets written, other than those of Jeremiah and Amos, which show that the Gentiles were to seek the Lord. "And in *that day* there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; *to it shall the Gentiles seek*: and his rest shall be glorious." (Isa. 11:10). Words of prophets which James quoted stated that the tabernacle of David was to be rebuilt in the future (future from the time that the prophets spoke) that the Gentiles might seek the Lord (Acts 15:16-17). Christ is that root of Jesse and today the Gentiles seek Him. Paul showed this when he proved from Old Testament prophecies that the Jew and Gentile should receive one another even as Christ had also received them. He proved from Old Testament prophecies that the Gentiles were to receive mercy of God, and he showed that these promises applied to the present dispensation of mercy. *So Paul proved by Old Testament prophecies the same thing that James proved.* "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written. . ." Paul then quotes at least four Old Testament statements to show that God had planned to extend mercy, which was being extended during the gospel dispen-

sation, to the Gentiles. And the fourth quotation is as follows: "And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust." Paul went on to say that he was "the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 15:8-9, 12, 16). Christ, then, is the root of Jesse whom the Gentiles seek in this present age. But Isaiah said that it was to be "in that day" (Isa. 11:10), and the context is applied by the premillennialists to a future dispensation. Yet, the Gentiles now seek the root of Jesse. They were to seek Him "in that day." So evidently that day has come. *Thus Paul and James agree, and agree with the prophets, that the present dispensation is the one in which the prophets had prophesied that the Gentiles would seek the Lord.*

3. After These Things I Will Return

James answered, saying, Brethren, hearken unto me: Symeon hath rehearsed how first God visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And *to this agree the words of the prophets*; as it is written, After these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen; and I will build again the ruins thereof. And I will set it up: *that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from of old.*" (Acts 15:13-18).

(1) *R. H. Boll's comment.* "This passage has been given two interpretations; the one referring it to the present time, the other to the age to come. The critical words upon which the question of the meaning turns are in the first line of James' quotation from 'the prophets':—'*after these things I will return.*' By some these words are taken to have no *special* significance, being regarded as only a part of James' quotation from Amos 9, probably referring to some matters of which Amos had previously spoken, and having no special bearing in the connection in which they occur here. The fact is significant, however, that the prophet Amos from whom James quotes this, never used those words at all. They are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek Version ('Septuagint') of the Old Testament. James *purposely* added these words, as summing up the teaching of *the prophets* on the point in hand. This being the case the words are to be regarded as meaningful, and are not to be slurred as though they were only meaningless introductory formula, but are to be given their full weight of meaning in the connection in which James brings them forward.

“James had just mentioned the fact that God had visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name. Then he adds (and it is *James* who added this, for the line is not found in Amos, nor in any of the prophets)—‘After these things I will return.’ This points forward to a time subsequent to the taking out from among the Gentiles of a people of God’s name. According to this the prophecy of Amos still awaits its fulfillment.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 121-122).

Boll is making the point that the prophets said that after God had visited the Gentiles to take out a people for His name, then He would then rebuild the tabernacle of David. For he stated that “James purposely added these words (‘after these things I will return’ J. D. B.), as summing up the teaching of the prophets on the point in hand.” He thinks that the phrase is to be taken “strictly, and in connection with James’ preceding statement that God had first visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His own name. . .” (*Ibid.*, p. 122). In other words, the prophets said that after the gospel dispensation in which the Gentiles are taken out on the basis of equality with the Jews—for this is what was taking place and was the thing which occasioned the discussion in Jerusalem—that God would then build the tabernacle of David.

(2) *This is in violent contradiction with Boll’s position that the present taking out of Gentiles on an equality with the Jews is a thing unknown to the Old Testament prophets.* “The acceptance of the Gentiles into the church—into the favor of God as joint-sharers of the blessings of Israel’s Christ—was a most terrible perplexity to all believing Jews. It was in fact a *mystery*. It had never been revealed that such a thing would happen. (Ephesians 3:4-6). That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; *that* had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed. But Israel was not restored; yet the Gentiles are coming in, being admitted *upon equal terms* with believing Jews, to equal share and right with them of the promises.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 119-120). In other words, Boll is saying that it had not been revealed that the Gentiles would be blessed, and on equal terms with Israel, before Israel’s national restoration. That has not yet taken place, so it was not revealed in the Old Testament prophets that the present gathering of the Gentiles was to take place in the gospel age.

If this be true, then how could James say that the words of the prophets agree to what Peter said about the Gentiles being taken out

as a people for God's name in this present dispensation before Israel's national exaltation? If this was not mentioned by the prophets, if it was a complete mystery, how could the prophets say that after this mystery, this taking out of the Gentiles, that God would return and build David's tabernacle? How could James sum up the teaching of the prophets on the point in hand if the prophets taught nothing on the point in hand?

On the other hand, if the prophets taught something on the point in hand it is not true that the prophets always taught (*Ibid.*, p. 120) that the Gentiles were to be blessed after, *not before*, Israel's national restoration and exaltation.

(3) As will be later pointed out, the phrase "after these things I will return" is not an irrelevant introduction, but reference is therein made to the fact that the restoration of David's tabernacle would take place after God had visited certain judgments on Israel.

(4) Boll's position makes James' words, in verse 15, as more than irrelevant, They are actually misleading. "And *to this* agree the words of the prophets . . .", according to Boll, has reference to something to which the prophets never agreed. The "this" to which James had reference was the present visitation of God to the Gentiles "to take out of them a people for his name" (Acts 15:14). But Boll said that the prophets taught nothing of this, for it was all a mystery, utterly unrevealed. The prophets, according to Boll, agree only to a future blessing of the Gentiles through, and in subservience to a restored and exalted nation of Israel.

(5) James, according to this, is not even on the subject of the present calling of the Gentiles. For James has reference to what the prophets taught, and they taught nothing about it, according to Boll. So how could he have reference to the point under consideration. And yet, James' argument is to the effect that what is now taking place is in agreement with the prophets. But James was hundreds of years off the subject for the prophets did not speak of the gospel age but of a future millennial age, if Boll is right.

But let us notice some additional things about "after these things."

4. *After This or After These Things*

(6) There are some, as we have seen, who say that James added the words "after this I will return," and that they are not a part of the words of the prophets which were written. (R. H. Boll, *Ibid.*, pp. 121-122). Such cannot be the case, for James said, "and to

this (the calling of the Gentiles, J. D. B.) agree the words of the prophets; *as it is written*, After this I will return. .” James said that the words of the prophets agree to this; he states that it is written; and then gives some of those words of the prophets. James stated that it was written. R. H. Boll, through a failure to notice closely the passage’s meaning, stated that “after this I will return,” was not written but was an addition made by James.

(7) As has been shown elsewhere in this chapter, James is not quoting from Amos only. Almost the identical words are found in Jeremiah 15:15. James’ quotation of them is as exact as many of the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament.

(8) G. C. Brewer has shown that the essence of “after this I will return” is found even in Amos. “It is true that James does not quote Amos verbatim as we read those verses in our translations, nor is his expression an exact translation of the Greek or Hebrew (of Amos, but it is not necessary to say that James is quoting Amos only here, J. D. B.); but it is about as nearly accurate as the average quotation from the Old Testament which is given in the New Testament. There is not enough difference to justify the charge that James added a *thought* not contained in the original. ‘After these things’ are the words that James is accused of adding. In some translations the expression is ‘after this’, ‘afterwards’, ‘in that day’, etc. The words in the Greek are: *en te hemera ekeine* (‘in that day I will return’). In the Hebrew the words are: *ba yom hahu* (‘in that day’). If we say, as the *Word and Work* does say, that James added the words ‘After these things’, we will also have to say that he eliminated the words ‘in that day’; thus we make James guilty of taking from the word of God and also of adding to that word, which he was strictly forbidden to do (Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Prov. 30:6).” (*Gospel Advocate*, 1944, pp. 578-579).

(9) Besides, if R. H. Boll is right in another one of his positions, how could James say that God had taught that after the calling of the Gentiles that He would rebuild the tabernacle of David. Boll stated that what was taking place was a mystery to the Jews for it had never been revealed. It is true that it had not been revealed in its fullness, as we have brought out elsewhere. But Boll continued: “That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery, *that* had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed. But Israel was not restored; yet the Gentiles are coming in. .” (*Ibid.*,

p. 120). Thus, according to Boll, the present coming in of the Gentiles in the gospel dispensation was unknown to the prophets. In other words, the gospel dispensation was unknown to the prophets for the equality of the Jew and Gentile in the church is one of the essential and distinctive characteristics of the gospel age. This involves Boll in two serious difficulties. *First*, it means that the gospel age was not predicted. But James stated that what was then taking place in the gospel age was in agreement with written words of the prophets (Acts 15:14-16). There is no way out of this difficulty except by surrendering either what Boll has said or what James has said. *Second*, if the prophets did not tell of the present blessing of the Gentiles under the gospel dispensation, if the only thing they tell of is the blessing of the Gentiles in some dispensation still future, and in subservience to Israel, then the prophets could not have taught that after the present calling of the Gentiles God would rebuild the tabernacle of David. They could not have said God would do anything after the present gospel age, if they did not mention the present gospel age. Of course, if they skipped over the gospel age, and referred to something still future, then that would be bound to take place after the gospel age.

(10) After all, this point may be briefly disposed of by noticing the contrast between James and Boll, the existence of which Boll does not seem to realize. Once seeing it, surely he would give it up. No uninspired sincere teacher would want to consciously contradict an inspired apostle. Boll is saying that "after this I will return" is not a part of the written words of the apostles, but are statements of James which were not written at the time they were uttered. (*Ibid.*, pp. 121-122). James said that he had reference to *words of the prophets* (not James' words) *which were written*. "And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, after this I will return. . ." (Acts 15:15-16). *James said they were prophets' words. Boll said they were James'. James said they were written. Boll said they were not, but were now spoken by James as words of his own.*

(11) "After this" does not have reference to something God will do in the future *after* the present dispensation in which Gentiles are called. "After this" had reference to something which was in the past at the time James spoke. After God had accomplished His purposes and chastisements on Israel, which had been referred to in the prophecies in the contexts of the statements James quoted, God would rebuild the tabernacle of David and call the Gentiles.

5. Does It Make Any Difference Anyhow?

Boll has said: "The question as to which of these conceptions is the correct one, therefore, hangs on whether the words, 'After these

things I will return' are to be taken strictly, and in connection with James' preceding statement that God has first visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His own name; or whether they are simply an irrelevant introduction. I do not think needful to decide that here. In either case and by either view, James' point would be that the reception of Gentiles as Gentiles is according to, and not against, the scriptures. In the one case the rebuilding of David's tabernacle would refer to the present exaltation of Jesus, David's Son, as the living assured Heir of David's throne; in the other case the passage quoted by James has reference to the future actual realization of the Old Testament hope of Israel and of the hope of all the world through them in the world-rule of Christ on David's throne, as the context in Amos 9 indicates. The two interpretations converge upon the point that in Messianic times (whether now or future) Gentiles as such are to be admitted to Israel's covenant blessings. And this we all believe and know." (*Ibid.*, p. 123). Boll has not reasoned well in the above paragraph, for it is a matter of importance as to which position is right. Note:

(1) How can the present reception of the Gentiles be according to the Old Testament scriptures if it was not mentioned therein, if it was a complete mystery? How can it be according to the scriptures when the Old Testament scriptures teach the blessing of the Gentiles, according to Boll, only after Israel's national exaltation? (*Ibid.*, p. 120).

(2) If Christ's present exaltation is what is described by Amos as the rebuilding of David's tabernacle, irreparable damage is done to the premillennialism argument. It shows that David's tabernacle was a type of the church. It shows that the literal rebuilding of the nation of Israel was not contemplated by the prophets, for the prophets are in agreement with Amos in this matter. That Boll believes that Amos' statement refers to the building of David's throne on earth and Israel's being restored and being the channel of blessings to the Gentiles, is shown by Boll's reference to "the future actual realization of the Old Testament hope of Israel . . ." etc. Thus if it refers to Christ's rule on David's throne, and if that is realized, according to the interpretation which Boll rejects, in the present exaltation of Christ, then the Davidic promise is realized in the present dispensation. And yet, Boll inconsistently thought that it was not needful to decide as to which it meant.

A further indication, that it is very important which interpretation is adopted, is shown in the verses which follow Amos' statement about the rebuilding of David's tabernacle. "I will bring again the captivity

of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities. . . . I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given to them . . ." (Amos 9:15-15). Thus if the rebuilding of David's tabernacle is being fulfilled in Christ's present exaltation and work, the prophecy of Amos is clothed in the language of types, and one should not expect literal Israel to be restored to her literal land any more than he would expect David's literal tabernacle to be restored.

(3) Boll has, in the paragraph quoted above, forgotten for the moment his definition of David's throne which he used in connection with his argument that Christ is not now on David's throne for the one on which he now sits is too highly exalted. (*Ibid.*, p. 113). There he stated that David's throne "always meant simply the Divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel." (*Ibid.*, p. 112). If it always meant that, and if it must therefore mean only and simply that for Christ while on David's throne, then how can there be a time of "world-rule of Christ on David's throne?" (*Ibid.*, p. 123).

6. James Spoke of the Same Thing of Which Peter Spoke

The context, as well as express statements, show that James had reference to the same thing to which Peter had reference, and not to something which was to take place, according to the premillennial theory, hundreds of years later.

(1) *Peter spoke of the gospel dispensation.* "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." (Acts 15:7-11). Neither Jew nor Gentile could bear the yoke of the law of Moses (15:10, 5). Both had to be saved by grace—purified by faith—believe the gospel. It is evident Peter spoke of the gospel dispensation.

(2) *James stated that what Peter said was in agreement with the prophets.* In other words, the gospel dispensation was not, as some maintain, a new and unexpected, or unpredicted, aspect of God's work. When James spoke he said: "Men and brethren, hearken unto

me: *Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets;*" (Acts 15:14). To what agree the words of the prophets? To this. What is *this*? What Peter said. What did Peter say? The things, mentioned above, which concern the gospel dispensation.

There are three witnesses presented to show God's attitude toward the Gentiles; witnesses which show that God did not intend for the law of Moses, as some contended (Acts 15:1, 5), to be bound on the Gentiles. (a) The witness of God in the miraculous work of the Spirit on Cornelius' household (Acts 15:8). (b) The miracles and wonders which God had wrought, showing His approval of Paul's work by backing it with His power (Acts 15:12). God would not have thus backed Paul's work if God had not approved Paul's teaching that the law of Moses was not to be bound on the Gentile Christians. (c) The testimony of prophets. The final proof, and one which would be very convincing to Jews, was that the prophets had taught that the Gentiles were to be received (Acts 15:14-17).

(3) James said that the prophets bore witness to what Peter had said was taking place, and he drew his conclusion on the basis of the prophecy. The prophets had said that God would visit the Gentiles and take out a people for His name. James used this prophecy as evidence that the prophets bore witness to what was then taking place. Of course, it was not as fully revealed by the prophets, as it is now, about the equality of the Jew and Gentile. (Eph. 3:4-6).

After stating the gist of what the prophets had said about it, James then drew his conclusions. *First*, one of the conclusions is made before the main one concerning the Gentiles is delivered. That was that God foreknew His work from of old. Evidently James referred to the work then being done since that was the work of God which was then under discussion. *Second*, "Wherefore my judgment is, that we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles turn to God." (Acts 15:19).

Note, then, the context of the statements from the prophets found in Acts 15:16-17. (a) To this, what Peter said about God taking out a people for His name from among the Gentiles, agree the words of the prophets (15:15). Then James quotes something of what the prophets have said. "To this agree the words of the prophets; *as it is written. . .*" *What was written*, and what James quoted, was a sample of what the words of the prophets said about "this" to which Peter made reference. What James quoted evidently had reference to his statements that the prophets had words which agreed with what Peter

said in verse 14. (b) After quoting some words from prophets James drew a conclusion. His conclusion was connected with the quotations or words of the prophets which immediately preceded James' "wherefore" of verse 19, which evidently announced his conclusion based on what had gone before.

What reason, then, can premillennialists give for maintaining *that the words of the prophets which James quoted refer not to what he mentioned in the very breath in which he referred to the present calling of the Gentiles, nor were these words related to the conclusion which James drew after he quoted the words.* Instead they are off that subject by hundreds of years, and had reference to a reign after His second advent, and not to the gospel dispensation. To put it more briefly: "And to *this* agree the words of the prophets. . . (What comes in here is not related to the preceding phrase nor to the following conclusion, J. D. B.) *Wherefore* my judgment is. . ." (Acts 15:15-19).

Is that not very strange? The words of the prophets which come between the above "this" and the "wherefore" are related neither to the "this" nor the "wherefore." So James stated that the prophets agree to this, but then quotes the prophets concerning something else (a millennial reign on earth, not to the gospel dispensation) and then draws his conclusion concerning the present situation. The prophets agree with "this," "wherefore" my conclusion is that we do not bother the Gentiles. But the words of the prophets which James actually quoted are said to be neither proof of "this" nor the basis on which the "wherefore" conclusion is drawn!! This is the position of some premillennialists.

7. James Did Not Say Anything About Circumcision

The objection has been raised that James' quotation of words from the prophets cannot have reference to the situation under discussion because the quotations give nothing about the Gentiles being able to come into covenant relationship with God without being circumcized. Nothing is said in these words about their being on an equality with the Jews. Thus it had nothing to do with the issue, the argument continues, because he does not mention this issue. Instead, it is argued that James' argument is pertinent only in re-assuring the Jews that God has not forgotten or overlooked the prophecies promising glories to Israel.

(1) If this is the correct interpretation of James' use of the words from the prophets, what follows? *It follows that when the*

tabernacle of David is rebuilt that Gentiles will be circumcized and keep the law of Moses. This was the subject under consideration, this was what the Jews were disturbed about. They were disturbed, Boll says, because the reception of the Gentiles under the gospel dispensation was a complete mystery. The prophets had taught them, he continues, that it was only after Israel's national restoration and exaltation, and only through and in subservience to restored Israel "that the Gentiles were to be so blessed." (*Ibid.*, p. 120.) Thus, on Boll's interpretation, combined with the above objection which we did not find in Boll's book, James is re-assuring the Jews that the present influx of the Gentiles on a basis of equality, without having to subject themselves to Israel and the law of Moses, would not continue but that the time would come when the tabernacle of David would be rebuilt. Then the Gentiles would be circumcized, obey the law of Moses, and be blessed through and in subservience to Israel.

(2) If this be true, James still quoted no words of the prophets which said that the Gentiles would finally be circumcized and keep the law of Moses. If James' words, in order to apply to the present discussion—the one then taking place in Jerusalem—had to mention circumcision, and say it was not binding, then why would they not have to mention the same things if they referred to a future binding of the law of Moses on the Gentiles when the tabernacle of David was rebuilt? If the absence of such statements *keep it* from being applied to the present, the same absence keeps it from being applied to a condition in the future when circumcision would be bound on the Gentiles.

(3) The words which James quoted did not teach that the Gentiles were to be circumcized when the tabernacle of David would be rebuilt. Perhaps James is showing that God said that He would call the Gentiles; and since He did not specify the exact way, and did not say that they would have to be circumcized; and since He had as a matter of fact, through Peter's and Paul's work, shown that they did not have to be circumcised; it was in harmony with the prophets for them to be called. It was in agreement with the prophets not to circumcize them.

(4) If James' statement cannot refer to the present, when he quoted the words of the prophets, then to what prophecies did he refer when he said that what Peter said was in harmony with the prophets? What prophecies say expressly that the Gentiles can come in without being circumcized; without becoming Jews? Unless such prophecies can be shown, one cannot use the argument, with which this section of our chapter was introduced, against the *quoted* words applying to the

present situation. That would be saying that there are no prophecies which prove the point under consideration. Thus there would be no prophecies to which James could refer when he said that "to this agree the words of the prophets." (Acts 15:15).

Thus, again, the same argument which they use to prove that the quoted words of James cannot refer to the present issue about the Gentiles coming in, because circumcision is not mentioned, would prove that no words of the prophets referred to the present situation. Thus James was wrong in saying that it was in harmony with the prophets, since, on this argument, for it to be in harmony with the prophets it would be necessary for some words of the prophets to be produced which expressly stated that the Gentiles could come in without circumcision. And Boll's statement on page 120, above quoted, does say that no words of the prophets referred to the present calling of the Gentiles. Although I am sure that Boll did not realize what his statement leads to, it does lead to the logical conclusion that James was mistaken in saying that any of the words of the prophets referred to what Peter had said. For he said "the observant reader will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed." (*Ibid.*, p. 120). The observant reader will conclude that unconsciously Boll flatly contradicted James when he said, about the present calling of the Gentiles which Boll said is not mentioned by the prophets, that to this agree the words of the prophets.

(5) The fact of the matter is that the equality of the Jew and Gentile in the new covenant was not revealed by the prophets as it is now revealed through the apostles (Eph. 3:4-6). Paul did not say that it was not revealed at all; he did not say that nothing was revealed about it; but that the equality of Jew and Gentile was not revealed by the prophets *as* it is now revealed by the apostles. Thus there were no prophecies that fully revealed this thing. Yet the prophets did show that the Gentiles were to be called. Their calling was in harmony with the words of the prophecy which James quoted. And that type of words were the only type of words of the prophecies which James could quote, for the equality of the Gentiles was a mystery which had not been fully revealed in the past. To settle whether or not they were to be circumcized when called could not be done by quoting words of the prophets. Instead it was settled by the way in which God, as a matter of fact, had called the Gentiles. Exactly how He planned to do it was revealed in the way that He did do it through Peter and Paul.

James did not say that the non-circumcision of the Gentiles and their equality with the Jews was fully revealed by the prophets. How-

ever, the calling out of the Gentiles for a people for His name, *which was then going on*, was in harmony with the words of the prophets. "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, *to take out of them a people for his name*. And to *this* agree the words of the prophets; *as it is written* (thus what is written and what James now states as words of the prophets written, are words of the prophets which are in agreement with the calling of Gentiles, J. D. B.). After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: *that* the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the *Gentiles*, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." (Acts 15:14-17).

The full details of how this was to be done—as to their not being circumcized, and as to the equality of the Jew and Gentile—was not detailed by the prophets. But they did show that God would call the Gentiles. God had given Christ, and the apostles, sufficient credentials to show Israel that they were messengers from God. The prophets had agreed that God would call the Gentiles, and the apostles were sent by God under the new covenant to call them. The fuller revelation of the New Testament shows some details concerning the calling which were not fully revealed in the Old Testament. But God was now calling Gentiles, as the prophets said that He would (to this agree the words of the prophets, said James), and God showed the *how* and the equality of the Gentiles by the events which took place in connection with Cornelius' household, and the work of Paul and Barnabas.

Thus James had reference to the general fact that God would call the Gentiles, and not to the details, for the prophets do not reveal the details. Since this was not revealed in detail by the prophets, James could not have been saying that it was revealed by the prophets in detail. But the prophets agreed to the main thing, which was the calling of the Gentiles. God in the actual calling of the Gentiles revealed the *how* and that there was no distinction between Jew and Gentile. "God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:8-9).

Hackett, in his *Commentary on Acts*, also agrees that the words from the prophets, which are quoted by James, are pertinent. "The foregoing citation from Amos was pertinent in a twofold way: first, it announced that the heathen were to be admitted with the Jews into the kingdom of Christ; and, secondly, it contained no recognition of circumcision, or other Jewish ceremonies, as prerequisite to their reception."

Olshausen suggested the following with reference to the question as to how the quotation of the words of the prophets bore on the question of the reception of the Gentiles. "The opposite party did not object to the reception of the Gentiles considered in itself; the only question raised was about the conditions of the reception, but the passage says not in express terms, that the Gentiles were to be received without the observance of the law and circumcision. Probably, however, James drew his conclusion from the silence of the passage quoted, which does not at all declare that the Gentiles were first to become Jews in order to gain admission into the kingdom of the Messiah, but rather describes them as seeking the Lord in the character of Gentiles." (*Commentary on Acts*).

Hengstenberg thought that the "quotation acquires significance, only when connected with the declaration of God, made not verbally but virtually in the communication of the Holy Ghost to the Gentiles." (Quoted by Olshausen). However, God did make it verbally in that through it He definitely taught Peter that the Gentiles were not common or unclean. Peter learned the lesson and by inspiration of the Lord showed that God now made no distinction between Jew and Gentile, but that both were to be saved by the gospel (Acts 15:7-11). Hengstenberg's thought is that the prophets said that the Gentiles would be called, and God in actually calling them—in fulfilling these prophecies—did not bind the law of Moses on them, therefore no one had the right to bind it. So God said that He would call them; God was calling them through the work of Paul and Peter; and in calling them demonstrated how He had always planned to call them, although He had not revealed to the Old Testament prophets the exact "how."

David Lipscomb commented that the Jews had "interpreted it to mean that the earthly tabernacle would be rebuilt, and they (Gentiles) would become Jews in this. In the light of what has now happened, he sees that it means they were to come *as Gentiles*; and so James now states the case, and, as God has received them, that settles the question for us."

Although James quoted from more than Amos, Amos does tell about much of it. On the passage from Amos, Lechler commented that Amos speaks "first, of the fall of the Jewish church and the abolition of its temple service; it, next, conveys the promise that God will build a new church on the ruins of the old, and gather together in it all the Gentiles; it lastly, sets forth that this church shall receive salvation only through the name of the Lord which should be called upon it, i.e. on which it would believe (Ap. Past.)." And James showed that the "word of God" in the writings of the prophets agreed

with the "work of God" which was being done through such as Peter and Paul.

(6) Some have argued that when James said "to this agree the words of the prophets" that James referred to what Peter had said (15:14, 15), and that the next phrase "as it is written" and the quotation which follows about David's tabernacle refer to the millennium. There is no indication at all that James said that the words of the prophets agreed to the subject under consideration, and then in the middle of a sentence, without any indication of a change, started to talk about something else.

The objector may reply that this must be the case for the words which James quotes do not mention circumcision. The sufficient answer is: What words of the prophets do mention the Gentiles not being circumcized, which words these say James referred to in the first part of verse 15, but did not quote. So the objection that says the words which he quotes are not on that subject, will logically say that the words to which he referred to in the first part of the verse are not on that subject. This would be to say that James was wrong about it.

Notice how closely all that James said ties in with the present situation which was under discussion in Jerusalem: 15:14 referred to the work being done in the gospel dispensation; 15:15a referred to words of the prophets which agreed with this work; 15b gives some of the words of the prophets, which were written, and James' statement "as it is written" is a continuation of what he has been saying in 15a; 15:19 draws a conclusion from what has gone before, and applies the conclusion to the present situation. Our premillennial friends yet think that the words which are written and which James quoted are not the same as the words of the prophets which he referred to in 15:15a. James changed the subject from the gospel dispensation to the millennium without any indication that he was changing the subject, and he did it in the same breath in which he spoke of the gospel dispensation, and in the same sentence. *How can they get this change of subject between 15:15a "to this agree the words of the prophets;" and 15:15b, "as it is written"?* There is no room at all between these two connected statements and thus no room in which to change the subject.

8. The Tabernacle of David

The tabernacle of David is usually thought of as being used in Old Testament prophecy as a type of tabernacle or kingdom of Christ.

David was a type of Christ (Ezek. 34:23, 24). And David's tabernacle is regarded as a type of Christ's tabernacle. John Gill stated that some Jewish writers understood the term to mean the kingdom of the house of David (*Commentary*, on Acts 15:16). If this is its meaning then Christ in His tabernacle or kingdom is what is meant when 'the tabernacle of David' is referred to in Acts 15:16. Since Christ now rules in His kingdom at God's right hand (Acts 2:30-36; Col. 1:13; Acts 15:24-28), the tabernacle of David has been rebuilt.

"The words, 'I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen' do not refer to a future Davidic kingdom. The house of David, the mighty kingdom of David and Solomon, had sunk to the level of a lowly 'booth' (cf. Isa. 1:8 where the same word occurs; it has no connection with the Mosaic tabernacle)." "The word 'tabernacle' in Isa. 16:5 is not the same as the one used by Amos. It is the ordinary word for 'tent' (*ohel*); and it does not necessarily suggest, as does the word 'booth', the lowly estate to which the glorious house of David had been reduced." "When Immanuel-Jesus, the Son of David, was born in Bethlehem, He was heralded and acclaimed by angels; and the incarnation of the Second Person of the trinity as David's Son was the beginning of the raising up of the fallen booth of David. And when David's Son rose triumphant over death and commissioned His disciples with the words: 'All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth,' He claimed a sovereignty far greater than David ever knew, or ever dreamed of possessing. So, when Peter and the other apostles declared that God had raised up Jesus and 'exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour' (Acts 5:31), they were insisting that the mighty acts which they were enabled to perform were the direct exercise through them of His sovereign power." (Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945, pp. 148-149).

The rebuilding of the tabernacle of David was evidently not a rebuilding of the Mosaical system, but the restoration of a king to David's throne. And that Christ is now on David's throne we have shown in another chapter. The Mosaical system will not be rebuilt. Its mediator, Moses, has now been replaced by Christ (Deut. 18:15-18; Acts 3:22-26). The old Covenant was to pass away, and it has passed away (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:5-10:16). Its sacrifices have ceased for the Lamb of God has been offered once for all to bear the sins of the world.

With this position J. W. McGarvey is in harmony.

"The prophet (Amos, and as pointed out elsewhere in this booklet, Jeremiah also, J. D. B.) had in previous verses predicted the

downfall of the Jewish kingdom, which would be the overthrow of the tabernacle or house of David, whose descendants were the reigning kings; and in verses quoted he predicts the rebuilding of the same, which could occur only by some descendant of David again ascending the throne. But after that downfall, no man of David's race became a king until Jesus was enthroned in heaven. This, then, was the rebuilding of the ruins, and it was to be followed by 'the residue of men,' that is, the Gentiles, seeking after the Lord, as Gentiles had been doing ever since Peter's visit to the house of Cornelius." (*A New Commentary on Acts*. Dallas 8, Texas: Eugene S. Smith, Publisher, Vol. II:66).

To this agrees Hackett in his *Commentary on Acts*. "I will rebuild the tabernacle of David which has fallen, i.e. will restore the decayed splendor of his family, to wit, in the person of His Son after the flesh (Rom. 1:3), in the Messiah represents the family as having fallen into such obscurity as to occupy the humble abode of a booth or tabernacle. The next words of the text describe the same condition still more strongly."

9. Was This the Tabernacle of David?

It is generally assumed, without taking time to prove it, that the tabernacle of David is the kingdom or house of David. There are some who maintain that it is not. This position will be presented for the reader's consideration.

Jamison-Faussett-Brown wrote that "Some understand 'the tabernacle of David' as that which David pitched *for the ark* in Zion, after bringing it from Obbedom's house. It remained there all his reign for thirty years, till the temple of Solomon was built; whereas the 'tabernacle of the congregation' remained at Gibeon (II Chronicles 1:3) where the priests ministered in sacrifices (I Chronicles 16:39). Song and praise was the service of David's attendants before the ark (Asaph, etc.): a type of the gospel separation between the sacrificial service (*Messiah's priesthood now in heaven*) and the access of *believers on earth* to the presence of God, apart from the former (cf. II Sam. 6:12-17; I Chron. 16:37-39; II Chron. 1:3)." They did not accept this interpretation.

Tabernacle means *tent* or *booth*, as Jamieson-Faussett-Brown state in commenting on Amos 9:11.

This explanation of the tabernacle of David makes it quite a fitting type of the church, especially when the relationship of the Gentiles to it is concerned. Concerning this, and how it fits in with

the subject under discussion in Jerusalem in Acts 15, the following is quoted from George B. Fletcher, *The Millennium* (Swengel, Pa.: Bible Truth Depot, 1944, pp. 45-47):

“For a proper understanding of Acts chapter fifteen, and particularly the words of James in verses 13-18, we must remember that the Jerusalem conference had to do wholly and solely with ‘THE CONVERSION OF THE GENTILES’ (v.3), which was not only a new thing, but an astonishing thing to the Jewish believers. The conference was not occupied with some *future* work of God, but with what He had *at that very time* begun to do. The visitation of the Gentiles, beginning with Peter at the house of Cornelius, and continuing through Paul and Barnabas in various places in Asia Minor, was the subject and *only subject* considered at that conference. In view of this fact, the words ‘after this’, do not specify a period of time subsequent to this gospel dispensation (as supposed by some) but to a period *subsequent to the time when Amos the prophet spoke them*. The apostle James is not giving, in verses 15 to 17, a prophecy of his own; but that of Amos, and is stating the substance of other Old Testament prophecies, that likewise had their fulfillment in these gospel days, such as those referred to by Paul in Romans 15:8-12. And we ourselves are proof of the correctness of this interpretation. The Tabernacle of David was reared again that ‘the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and *all the Gentiles*’ (Acts 15:17). Are we Gentiles? Have we sought the Lord, and found Him? Then the Tabernacle of David is reared again, and the prophecy is fulfilled; for a cause always precedes its effect.

“The reference to ‘the tabernacle of David’ is literally ‘the tent of David,’ and refers to David bringing the Ark from the house of Abed-edom into the city of David ((II Samuel 6:12), which was Zion (II Samuel 5:7). There it was placed in ‘the tent that David had pitched for it’ (I Chronicles 16:1), amidst great celebration (I Chronicles 15:25 to 16:3). The remarkable significance of this great historical event was that it constituted a decided break with the Levitical ordinances given through Moses, in that the Ark of God’s presence was no longer in the Holy of Holies of the Tabernacle of the Wilderness, which was then at Gidcon, but in the tent or tabernacle of David on Mount Zion. This remarkable suspension of the system of worship of the Law was a fore-shadowing of that of the Gospel. This is the foundation of many references in the Psalms and the prophets of Zion as the dwelling place of Jehovah, and is what gives to the terms ‘Zion’, and ‘Mount Zion’ their high spiritual significance.

“David, a type of Christ, was permitted to give in the tabernacle, pitched by him on Mt. Zion, a wonderful foreshadowing of the worship

by prayer, preaching, and song which characterizes the gatherings of God's people during this gospel dispensation. That spiritual worship was not continued in the reign of subsequent kings as history records. A fearful decline set in and continued to the end of the kingdom era. But Amos, in the days of Uzziah, delivered his famous prophecy concerning the raising up of the Tabernacle of David (Amos 9:11,12), and all the apostles, elders, and people assembled at Jerusalem, accepted it as decisive of the question as to whether the Mosaic ritual was to be imposed upon Gentile converts. The question before the Jerusalem conference in Acts 15 was, *must the ritual law of Moses be imposed upon Gentile converts?* The apostles answered, that inspired prophecy declares the kingdom of Christ is not to be a revival and extension of Mosaicism, but on the contrary a restoration of a Tabernacle of David. And since in *that* sanctuary the Mosaic ritual had no place, so it can have no claims in the Christian Church. There in Jerusalem itself, within sight of the temple where the ritual of the law was still performed, the whole body of the church repudiated its claims, and adopted the *Tabernacle of David* as the Divinely appointed model for all Christian practice and institutions." This idea is well worth weighing.

10. Questions on Acts 15

(1) Some maintain that the church age was not predicted by Old Testament prophets. How can this be harmonized with James' statement that the words of the prophets agree to God's taking out of the Gentiles from His name in this present dispensation? (Acts 15:14-15).

(2) What was the purpose of the building of the tabernacle of David, mentioned in verse 16? Does the "that" in verse 17 introduce that purpose?

(3) Did the tabernacle have to be rebuilt in order that Gentiles might enter?

(4) If so, if it has not been rebuilt how can the Gentiles enter?

(5) Since the Gentiles are entering is it not evident that the tabernacle of David has been rebuilt? "James quotes Amos to prove that God had promised to rebuild the tabernacle of David *in order that the Gentiles or the heathen or the residue of men might seek the Lord*. Therefore, the fact that Gentiles are now seeking and finding the Lord proves that he has done just what he promised: rebuild the tabernacle of David and threw open the door to the Gentiles. If there is yet no restored tabernacle of David, then there is yet no calling of the Gentiles." (G. C. Brewer, *Gospel Advocate*, 1944. p. 579).

(6) What prophets tell of the gospel work of which Peter spoke in Acts 15:7-11, 14, 15? (a) If the answer is "None," then it is a clear contradiction of James who stated that the words of the prophets agree to what Peter said about God calling the Gentiles (Acts 15:14-15). (b) If they cite some words of the prophets which agree with this, the following question is in order. What prophecies refer to the Gentiles, and it was the calling of the Gentiles which was under consideration, and to their calling now instead of after the national restoration of Israel (according to the premillennial theory). The point here is that prophecies which they cite as referring to the calling of Gentiles now will be found generally to refer to what they call the millennial kingdom.

This means that the premillennialists will be forced to accept the position of R. H. Boll that the church age with its blessings for the Gentiles is not the subject of prophecy; or they will often find themselves applying to the present age prophecies which, according to their position, apply to a future millennial kingdom.

Furthermore, if prophecies do refer to the present "church age" it is not true, as some premillennialists maintain, that the kingdom was offered to Israel, and when she rejected it the church was established while the kingdom was postponed. For if the church was predicted by the prophets then, according to the premillennial theory, the church would have to come before the kingdom. Thus the kingdom could not have been established in the first century, for if it had been there would have been no room for the church.

(7) Did James' reference to, and quotations from, the prophets have any references to the question under consideration concerning the Gentiles?

If premillennialists answer yes, they surrender their position.

If they answer no, they are affirming that James announced his subject as dealing with the Gentiles in the present dispensation; of announcing that the prophets agree to it; and then quoting from the prophets words which have no application to the present situation. Note: James stated that Peter had told how God was taking out of the Gentiles a people for his name. He then stated that the words of the prophets agreed with it, as it is written. He then quoted words of the prophets. Unless they apply to the subject on which Peter spoke, James changed the subject without any indication that he was so doing. He changed it in the middle of a sentence.

Then James continued and drew a decision (verse 19 "wherefore") from what he had said, but the decision, according to the

premillennial view, is not based on the words which James quoted from the prophets and which made up much of his speech.

(8) Did James say that the work which Peter was doing, in calling out Gentiles, was in harmony with Old Testament prophecies? The answer must be, "Yes," for "to *this* (verse 14) agree the words of the prophets." (Acts 15:15).

What words of the prophets, since James said that some do, apply to the present calling of the Gentiles, if the words which James quoted do not do so?

What words of the prophets apply more plainly to the present calling of the Gentiles, than the ones which are used by James? Unless they can find some that are more appropriate than the ones which James uses, they must say that there are no such words (and contradict James' statement that there are such words) or they must grant that James' words are applicable to the present calling of the Gentiles.

Of course, they are applicable anyhow, for, as we have shown, James applied them to it.

In his list of Old Testament passages, which are Messianically applied in Rabbinic writings, Alfred Edersheim lists Amos 9:11. "Amos 9:11 is a notable Messianic passage. Thus, in the Talmud (Sanh 96b) where the Messiah is called the 'Son of the Fallen,' the name is explained by a reference to this passage. Again, in Ber. R. 88, last three lines (ed. Warsh. p. 157a), after enumerating the unexpected deliverances which Israel had formerly experienced, it is added: 'Who could have expected that the fallen tabernacle of David should be raised up by God, as it is written (Amos 9:11) and who should have expected that the whole world should become one bundle (be gathered into one Church)? Yet it is written Zeph. 3:9. Comp. also the long discussion in Yalkut on this passage (vol. ii, p. 80a and b)." (*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II:734-735).

CHAPTER XII

WHY NO NEW TESTAMENT PROPHECIES OF A JEWISH KINGDOM?

The Old Testament is full of kingdom prophecies. If the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col. 1:13), which is set forth in the New Testament, is not the fulfillment of the Old Testament kingdom prophecies, why is not the New Testament full of prophecies of such a kingdom in the future? The New Testament is a clearer and fuller revelation than the Old, so why does it not contain prophecies of such a kingdom, or say that the kingdom prophecies have not been fulfilled, if they are to be fulfilled in the future?

The Old Testament promised another prophet, like unto Moses, and Christ that prophet has come (Deut. 18:15-18; Acts 3:22). Christ promised that the Spirit would come and guide certain individuals into all truth (John 16:7-13), and this has been done. But where, in the faith once for all delivered to the saints (Jude 3), do we find anything in this "all truth" that says Christ is to again come to earth and rule on it.

The Old Testament promised another covenant (Jer. 31:31-34), which has been fulfilled in the New Testament (Heb. 8:5). But where does this new covenant promise that there is to be another covenant on earth?

The Old Testament promised another kingdom. There is a kingdom set forth in the New Testament (Col. 1:13), but where does the New Testament promise another kingdom on earth? It looks forward to the eternal reward in the eternal kingdom in heaven (II Pet. 1:11). The Old was shaken and taken out of the way, but the new is not to be so treated (Heb. 12:27-28).

No kingdom prophecies are found in the New Testament, such as are found in the Old, since the New fulfills the Old, and looks forward to heaven instead of to another kingdom on earth.

This book draws to a close. The subject has not been exhausted, of course, but enough has been said to enable us to see at least some of the principles of the interpretation of Old Testament prophecy,

which the New Testament endorses and which, therefore, we are safe in following and unsafe in ignoring. May the reader prove all things and hold fast only to that which is good.

As we close this book no effort will be made to summarize the points which have been established. Instead we shall simply state the conviction under which this book has been written. That conviction is that little difficulty need be encountered concerning the kingdom question if one will be content to let the New Testament interpret Old Testament prophecy. Try it and see.

SCRIPTURE INDEX

PASSAGE	PAGE	PASSAGE	PAGE
Exod. 12:5	8	Isa. 59:20,21	97,98,99
Deut. 32:43	101	Isa. 60:3,7,13,21,22,23	42,43
I Sam. 10:3-6	8	Isa. 60:3,12,14-16	50
I Kings 8:9,21	107	Isa. 66:24	51
I Kings 12:21-23	133	Jer. 1:11-14	19
Psa. 16:5	38	Jer. 8:9-12	108
Psa. 18:49	101	Jer. 10:16	38
Psa. 110:	78,79	Jer. 30:9	136
Psa. 110:1	144	Jer. 31:31-34	133,135,107
Psa. 117:1	101	Jer. 33:15-18,21,22	43
Psa. 119:57	38	Jer. 51:19	38
Psa. 142:5	38	Ezek. 34:23	136
Isa. 1:9,27,28	95	Ezek. 34:23,24	167
Isa. 11:9-14	51	Ezek. 37:24	21,88,136
Isa. 11:10	152-101	Hosea 1:10	93
Isa. 11:	102	Hosea 1:22-23	57
Isa. 29:13,14	69	Hosea 2:23	93
Isa. 49:26	51	Hosea 11:1	57
Isa. 49:22-23	48,49,50	Joel 2:32	77
Isa. 52:15	104	Zech. 9:9	70,71,72,73,74
Isa. 53:	76,82,83	Malachi 4:5-6	11
Matt. 1:21	1	Matt. 21:4-5	69,70,71,72
Matt. 2:15	57,58,59,60	Matt. 21:43	37
Matt. 2:23	7	Matt. 26:28,29	24
Matt. 3:9	6	Mark 9:11	32
Matt. 3:1-3	60,61,62	Luke 1:17	32
Matt. 4:13-17	62,63	Luke 1:31-33	132,135
Matt. 8:11	37	Luke 3:2-6	13
Matt. 11:4-5	63,64,65,66	Luke 4:17-21	73,74,75,76
Matt. 12:15-21	66,67,68,69	Luke 24:25-27	76
Matt. 15:7-9	69	John 1:29,36	8
Matt. 17:10-13	12		

SCRIPTURE INDEX

PASSAGE	PAGE	PASSAGE	PAGE
John 3:1-5	3	Rom. 15:27	104
John 4:19-24	3	Rom. 16:25-27	105
John 16:12-13	22,23	I Cor. 6:19	36
Acts 2:16-17	77,78	II Cor. 6:16	36
Acts 2:30-36	78,79	Gal. 3:26-29	33,36
Acts 2:33,34	144	Gal. 5:6;6:15	35
Acts 2:42-47	4	Gal. 6:16	33
Acts 3:18	79,80	Eph. 2:12	37
Acts 3:24	81	Eph. 2:12-23	34
Acts 4:24-30	81,82	Eph. 2:19-21	36
Acts 8:30-35	82,83	Phil. 3:3-9	35
Acts 13:23	83,84	Col. 1:13	37
Acts 13:46-47	84,85	Col. 2:11	35
Acts 15:16-17	85,152	Heb. 1:1-2	17,18
Rom. 1:1-3	87	Heb. 8:5	52
Rom. 2:28-29	88	Heb. 8:5-13	135
Rom. 3:21-24	89,90	Heb. 8:6-8	108
Rom. 4:13	38	Heb. 8:7,13	112
Rom. 4:16-17	89,90	Heb. 9:8-18	46
Rom. 9:25-26	93	Heb. 9:15	119
Rom. 9:2-8	91	Heb. 10:22	52
Rom. 11:7-10	96	Heb. 9:24-28	2
Rom. 11:26-27	97	Heb. 12:22	35
Rom. 15:3	99	Heb. 12:24	119
Rom. 15:8	100	I Pet. 2:5	36
Rom. 15:12	101,102		
Rom. 15:20-21	104		