

## SYLLABUS FOR DISPENSATIONALISM 161

- Purpose:
- (1) To systematically study the various aspects of dispensational teaching;
  - (2) to consider the usual charges brought against the teaching in respect to its historicity and soteriology particularly;
  - (3) to compare the approach with that of covenant theology;
  - (4) to distinguish its teachings from those of ultradispensationalism.

Requirements: Dispensationalism Today will serve as a guiding text to be read carefully. Reading of the works of Barndollar, Mason, Chafer, Scofield, Talbot, Fuller, Bass, Sauer, Stam, Ironside (as listed in the bibliography) will also be required. In addition doctoral students will read and report on the works of Ehlert, Lincoln, Michelsen, Bass, Kraus. Class sessions will be discussions of these works.

Outline of course: The weeks of the semester will be devoted as follows to subjects as discussed in the following chapters of the text plus supplemental reading in the following authors.

Week	Text chapter	Supplementary reading
1	1	Chafer
2	2	Barndollar, Mason
3	3	
4		Talbot, Scofield
5	4	Ehlert, Lincoln
6		Michelsen, Fuller
7	5	Fuller
8	Exam	Fuller
9	6	
10	7	Bass
11	7	Ladd
12	8	Sauer
13	9	Kraus
14		Stam - Baker -
15	10	Ironside

- Bibliography:
- Ryrie, Dispensationalism Today, Moody Press, 1965.  
 Chafer, Dispensationalism, Dallas Seminary, 1936.  
 Barndollar, The Validity of Dispensationalism, Baptist Bible Seminary, 1954.  
 Mason, "A Review of 'Dispensationalism'" Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1957.  
 Talbot, God's Plan of the Ages, Eerdmans, 1936.  
 Scofield, Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth.  
 Ehlert, A Bibliographic History of Dispensationalism, Baker, 1965.  
 Lincoln, "  
 Michelsen, Interpreting the Bible, Eerdmans, 1963.  
 Fuller, The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism, 1957.  
 Bass, Backgrounds to Dispensationalism, Eerdmans, 1960.  
 Ladd, The Gospel of the Kingdom, Eerdmans, 1959.  
 Sauer, From Eternity to Eternity, Paternoster, 1954.  
 Kraus, Dispensationalism in America, John Knox, 1958.  
 Stam, Things That Differ, Berean Bible Society, 1959.  
 Ironside, Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth, Loizeaux.

*Baker - A Dispensational Theology*      *Grace B.C. Publications*

SYLLABUS FOR DISPENSATIONALISM 161

- PURPOSE:
- (1) To systematically study the various aspects of dispensational teaching;
  - (2) To consider the usual charges brought against the teaching in respect to its historicity and soteriology particularly;
  - (3) To compare the approach with that of covenant theology;
  - (4) To distinguish its teachings from those of ultradispensationalism.

REQUIREMENTS: Dispensationalism Today will serve as a guiding text to be read carefully. Reading of the works of Barndollar, Mason, Chafer, Scofield, Talbot, Fuller, Sauer, Stam, Ironside (as listed in the bibliography) will also be required. In addition doctoral students will read and report on the works of Bass, Ehlert, Lincoln, Mickelsen, Ladd, Kraus. Class sessions will be discussions of these works.

OUTLINE OF COURSE: The weeks of the semester will be devoted as follows to subjects as discussed in the following chapters of the text plus supplemental reading in the following authors.

<u>Week</u>	<u>Text Chapter</u>	<u>Supplementary Reading</u>
1	1	Chafer
2	2	Barndollar, Mason
3	3	
4		Talbot, Scofield
5	4	Ehlert, Lincoln
6		Mickelsen, Fuller
7	5	Fuller
8	Exam	Fuller
9	6	
10	7	Bass
11	7	Ladd
12	8	Sauer
13	9	Kraus
14		Stam
15	10	Ironside, Baker

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Ryrie, Dispensationalism Today, Moody Press, 1965.  
 Chafer, Dispensationalism, Dallas Seminary, 1936.  
 Barndollar, The Validity of Dispensationalism, Baptist Bible Seminary, 1954.  
 Mason, "A Review of 'Dispensationalism'," Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1957.  
 Talbot, God's Plan of the Ages, Eerdmans, 1936.  
 Scofield, Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth.  
 Ehlert, A Bibliographic History of Dispensationalism, Baker, 1965.  
 Lincoln, "The Covenants," Dallas Th.D. Dissertation, 1942.  
 Mickelsen, Interpreting the Bible, Eerdmans, 1963.  
 Fuller, The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism, 1957.  
 Bass, Backgrounds to Dispensationalism, Eerdmans, 1960.  
 Ladd, The Gospel of the Kingdom, Eerdmans, 1959.  
 Sauer, From Eternity to Eternity, Paternoster, 1954.  
 Kraus, Dispensationalism in America, John Knox, 1958.  
 Stam, Things That Differ, Berean Bible Society, 1959.  
 Stam, Fundamentals of Dispensationalism.  
 Ironside, Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth, Loizeaux.  
 Baker, Charles F., A Dispensational Theology, 1971.



## RESERVE LIST--DISPENSATIONALISM--119

DR. RYRIE

Allis, O. T.	Prophecy in the church (4 cop.)	RW AL5
Baker, C. F.	A dispensational theology (1 cop.)	RX80 B171D
Barndollar, W. W.	Dispensationalism (1 cop.)	RX80 B259V
Bass, C.	Backgrounds to dispensationalism (3 cop.)	RX80 B29B
Berkhof, L.	Systematic theology (5 cop.)	RN96 B45
Chafer, L. S.	Dispensationalism (5 cop.)	RX80 C34D
Ehlert, Arnold D.	Bibliography of dispensationalism (1 cop.)	RX80 EH5
Fuller, Daniel	The hermeneutics of dispensationalism (12 cop.)	RX80 F95H
Ironside, Henry A.	Wrongly dividing the Word of Truth (2 cop.)	RX80 IR6
Kraus, C. Norman	Dispensationalism in America (3 cop.)	RX80 K86D
Ladd, George E.	Gospel of the Kingdom (2 cop.)	FX42 L12G
Lincoln, C. F.	The covenants (3 cop.)	RQ70 L63
Mickelson, A. B.	Interpreting the Bible (2 cop.)	CH M583I
Ryrie, Charles	The grace of God (4 cop.)	RS52 R993G
Sauer, E.	From eternity to eternity (3 cop.)	RX80 SA8F
Scotfield, C. I.	Rightly dividing the Word of Truth (1 cop.)	CD16 SCO2R
Stam, C. R.	Ultradispensational pamphlets (1 cop.)	RX805 ST2U
Stam, C. R.	Acts, dispensationally considered (vol. 1--3 cop.) (vol. 2--2 cop.) (vol. 3--3 cop.) (vol. 4--1 cop.)	FM80 ST2A vols. 1-4
Stam, C. R.	Fundamentals of dispensationalism (1 cop.)	RX805 ST2F
Talbot, L.	God's plan of the ages (4 cop.)	RX80 T14

## PERIODICALS:

Bib Sac v. 114, 1957 (5 cop.)

# TSC Dispensationalism

1936.

Ch 1

1. Meaning - (1) dispensing (2) abrogation of existing law e.g. RC.  
or admin.

Is idea of age (SRB) OK. Yes acc to dict.

2. Who is disp. ist
  - (a) Army who trust blood of X.
  - (b) " " disclaims land of Is.
  - (c) " " keeps Sam.

### 3. Misleading ~~for~~ ideas

- (a) It is modern. Quotes Aug.
- (b) leads to disastrous consequences.
- (c) Can be prevented. & not disp.
- (d) Heresy.

Ch 2

### Creation Viewed Disp.

1. Angels
2. Gentiles Mt 25: 31-46 esp.
3. Jews. Oppn of Kg. minimize cross.  
Will have land. Meaning of intercalation.

cf. X vs.

### Ch 3 Script. Doct. Viewed Disp.

7 features of a rel.

1. Acceptable Standing before God. J- Physical birth X<sup>g</sup> - Sp.
2. Manner of life. J- Law X<sup>g</sup> - Grace. of 3rd system - Kgdon.
3. Service. J- Tab. ritual X<sup>g</sup> - gr comm. - note for Ch. p 54
4. Ground for forgiveness & cleansing. J- His certainty of future bounty X<sup>g</sup> - land share p 54
5. Human Resp. for Forgiveness & Cleansing J- sac. X - conf & inward resp.
6. Basis for Working & Prayer. J- covenants X<sup>g</sup> - Ju 16: 14
7. Future Hope. In this life J- land X<sup>g</sup> no land  
Intermediate state. J- Lk 16 X<sup>g</sup> 2 Cor 5<sup>-</sup>  
Res. - Dan 12 1 Th 4  
Eternal life - J- acceptable X<sup>g</sup> - risen X.  
Divine Kgdon J- X<sup>g</sup>.



Ch 4 Drip in light of Divine Grace.

Eph 2: 4-5. Love is compassion for sinners.  
mercy - devised the plan  
grace - outworking

Discusses 3 uncond. cov - Abr. Dav. - Mer for J. - Pleasing  
vouchsafed for ch p 87  
Group of key. - repeat  
" " grace. hel.

Cov of grace "conceivable" not not revealed.

LSC ans. change about not paying Ludi paper by why if allis  
would pay Mt 24: 20.





QUESTIONS ON BARNDOLLAR

1. What does he say are the charges against dispensationalism?
2. How does logic supposedly support dispensationalism? Evaluate this idea.
3. From his viewpoint, what is the sine qua non of dispensationalism?
4. What are the passages cited which disclose dispensational distinctions?

QUESTIONS ON MASON

1. What ideas in Augustine are akin to dispensationalism?
2. When were Ussher's dates included in the Scofield Bible?
3. What are the 8 covenants according to Mason? What is Bowman's criticism of these? What is Mason reply?

QUESTIONS ON BARNDOLLAR

1. What does he say are the charges against dispensationalism?

Disunity of Birth + people  
Several ways of sal.  
Kg of human + god  
Divinities

2. How does logic supposedly support dispensationalism? Evaluate this idea.

Law of identity ∴ Is ≠ is  
" contradiction

3. From his viewpoint, what is the sine qua non of dispensationalism?

7 steps General distinction

4. What are the passages cited which disclose dispensational distinctions?

Joh 1:17  
Act 17:30  
Rom 3:20-24  
Isa 6:1-2  
Eph 2:12-13  
Heb 1:1-2  
Zech 9:9  
Rom 2  
Mt 10:5  
Mt 24:24

QUESTIONS ON MASON

1. What ideas in Augustine are akin to dispensationalism?

2. When were Ussher's dates included in the Scofield Bible?

3. What are the 8 covenants according to Mason? What is Bowman's criticism of these? What is Mason reply?

All the way Eden called Cov. (Paul in Rom 24:1)  
Hos 6:7 Admini?



# Scopfield - Rightly Dividing

1. Jew. Gentile, Ch

Note p. 7 - Godly Jew want to hear but earthly reward was incentive to him

2. 7 Drip.

3rd is Authority or Govt.

Tribe placed at end of Grace.

3. 2 advents

What 2<sup>nd</sup> coming is it

1. HS 2. Communion 3. Death 4. To AD 5. Spread of Xnty

No emphasis on pre trib rapture.

4. 2 res.

5. 5 Judgments.

1. Sins at arm

2. Self 1611

3. work 1613

4. Nations

5. Dead

6. Law + Grace

7. 2 Testaments

Rom 7 of bel.

8. Standing + State

9. Sal. + Rewards

10. Bel. + Prof.

Conspicuous Crime - Scofield

Vol. I - with chart & disc. of drop

6 total pages

Vol. II word study of  
age, drop.

Def. Period of time during which God deals in part. way with respect to  
sin & man's responsibility.

Characteristics -

1. Man's state at beg.
2. " responsibility
3. " failure
4. " judgment

~~Drop~~ Drop? end - no stain stage

Word studies attempt to prove time as principal feature of drop.

Was Heb 11:3 to show age = drop.



Mason Bib Soc. Jan + Apr 1957

Survey of Brown first. Interpretation Apr 1916

SRB dangerous heresy - modern rel. not a variant interpretation.

Some time X's teaching in Disp like in RC., X's Sci., Mormonism.

Inter-Civilization

Errors of SRB - 7 Disp & 8 Cov  
Prop. relig. heresy - will consider symbolically.

1. Unfair to argue that esec. diff. proves doctrinal error. Baptists are divided \*
2. Disp not developed by Early
3. Civil divorce disp from prem. Acc. acc to Csm both based on covenants  
Inter Amg p 17.

JAD

No influence

Moah

an.

Is - law  
 - priesthood  
 - Kgs

Gentiles

Spirit

—

C.I.S.

Influence

Gift

Promise

Law

—

Grace

M.

Prominence of Duty & dominance of JAD

4. Chronology of SRB not imp. C.I.S. says world created in details part. \*  
 Of fact and detail chronology

I. Crit. of 7 Disp.

1. Word misused here. ≠ time. ≠ here ≠ Script. for 7. \*
2. Wrongly assumed judgments at end of disp instead of heal - sal. history.
3. Teacher diff. usage of sal. Hk 13:8 = nature of God same, but works.  
 Brown says we say God gradually grew up. Unit recognize prog of rev.

II Criticism of 8 Cov.

1. Cov - pact imposed - Csm says need add them to whom made & whether cond. or uncond
2. Brown says we have cov. only when used word. Not used of Moses \*  
 " sees 2. - old & new. yet just said <sup>law</sup> that not so called.

Csm Arg. is that Cov. Paul. doesn't use cov. as Sings does. Rm 9:4

III Kg of heaven.

1. S.R.B. fails to dist. prog + algorithmic. <sup>frustrating acc to CSM</sup>
2. " dist. Kg heav. + kg qnd. <sup>Math word ch. is used of \*</sup>
3. Eschat. works in a kind of game to people. <sup>Real + of prof. Kg too.</sup>
4. Disg. one natural + topological. <sup>CSM says Habermas does this. \*</sup>

IV Agnostic Ch.

But B.M. tends this + ultimately disp are optmints.

# Talbott - God's Plan of The Ages

- Chart -
1. Believers in Chaos 1:2
  2. "Church period" "man under grace"

Days are solar days.

Full of Satan.

Millions of yrs bet. 1:1 & 1:2

Paradise of Adam was light - Ps 104:1-2.

Gen 3:15 - Third seed of woman - virgin birth

Emphasizes monotheism p 41

Contrasts Abrahamic & Semitic laws

X Transferred Paradise to heaven.

more typological

Church age

Protective Acc.

1. Can not subj. to wrath
2. Immunity 1Th 1:10
3. 2Th 2

Is made mistake in choosing law  
Int. 25 is nation  
Meaning of giving = exchanging wives.



QUESTIONS ON TALBOT

1. What is his view of Gen. 1:1-2?
2. What is his designation for the church or grace dispensation?
3. What kind of days in Gen. 1?
4. What was the garment of Adam?
5. What is the seed of the woman?
6. What are his arguments for a pretrib rapture?
7. Who are the "nations" in Matt. 25?

QUESTIONS ON SCORFIELD

1. Where does he put the tribulation?
2. What isn't the second coming?
3. What does he say about the pretrib rapture?
4. What are the 5 judgments?
5. Does Rom. 7 relate to a believer or unbeliever?
6. What is the practical importance of "standing and state"?

QUESTIONS ON TALBOT

1. What is his view of Gen. 1:1-2?
2. What is his designation for the church or grace dispensation?
3. What kind of days in Gen. 1?
4. What was the garment of Adam?
5. What is the seed of the woman?
6. What are his arguments for a pretrib rapture?
7. Who are the "nations" in Matt. 25?

QUESTIONS ON SCOFIELD

1. Where does he put the tribulation?
2. What isn't the second coming?
3. What does he say about the pretrib rapture?
4. What are the 5 judgments?
5. Does Rom. 7 relate to a believer or unbeliever?
6. What is the practical importance of "standing and state"?





## JOHN NELSON DARBY

### I. His Life

Came from good family. Born Nov. 1800 of Irish parents in London. Entered Trinity College, Dublin in at age 15. Graduated as a Classical Gold Medalist in 1819 at age 18. Note that he had Greek, Heb., Latin as part of coll ed. Admitted to bar at age 22. Converted and abandoned legal prof after 1 year. Ordained in <sup>1821</sup> ~~1820~~ of Eng in Dublin and given a small parish. Worked vigorously. Bass p. 49. Great success among RC's esp so that 6-800 of them becoming Mns per week. This in space of 1 year. Then ordained a clergyman. Same year Archbishop issued statement which said ch of Eng allied with if not subservient to State. The low view of ch disturbed Darby who saw in it analogy--as RC to Pope, Anglican to King. Went back to ch but private study more than public ministry. After 2 years decided couldn't get anywhere by protesting and didn't feel it right to disobey so looked for fellowship that emphasized spiritual communion and exalted conception of ch. Met with few friends for Bible study and this was beg of PB.

### II. His Ministry

- A. Its motivation. Love of X. Man of great passion. Consumed with 1 desire.
- B. Its expression. Zealous in work  
Ruthless against error. Even denounced friends of long standing if that they were perverting the faith.  
Didn't get married or have children bec that couldn't after renouncing benefits of law practice.  
Life of humble service.
- C. Its characteristics.
  - 1. Absolutely scriptural.  
Demanded proof texts for everything. Applied Script to self.
  - 2. Tho active in controversy his mind was centered on X and truth of His Church. Hesitated to enter controversies but viewed it as a part of his ministry.  
Assumed prominent place of authority and may have been jealous to keep it at times.
- D. Its written form  
Began writing at age 23 for public. Lived to be 82 and produced multitude of lit. Published works number over 40 vol of 600 pp each covering eccles, doctrinal, prophetic, critical, evangelistic, apol, practical, expos, devotional, poetry, hymns. Also translated Bible. Lots of research in it the style slightly abrupt. Read from Bible. Shows vast scholarship. Knowledge of languages and phil and eccl history. Called the Tertullian of 19th century. One of his opponents said, "J.N.D. writes with a pen in one hand and a thunderbolt in the other."

### III. The Brethren Movement

- A. Beginning. In Dublin among people who belonged to Ch of Eng but who desired more intimate fell with X. JND met with some while a student at Trinity. But not until 1827 was there any serious contact while still an Anglican clergyman. Resigned 1828 or 29. Early meetings were spontaneous not protest. Private meetings at first then finally made public in 1829. JND not leader in this Dublin group.
- B. Principles.
  - 1. No organisation of a church.
  - 2. Breaking of bread on Lord's day (every one)
  - 3. Unity of all saints in Christ.
  - 4. Freedom of IS in matters of ministry.
  - 5. Association required only faith in X and consistent walk in love.
  - 6. All of this, of course, based on principles in Words.
- C. Plymouth Brethren. JND from Ireland to Oxford where there was a meeting then to Plymouth where met B.W. Newton. 1831 started breaking of bread. JND objected to denominational names and emphasized practice of NF of addressing bel as brethren. That became name of group and bec by 1840 there were 300 attending in Plymouth designation inevitably became Ply. Brethren. In Ireland called Darbyism.



- D. Growth. Many groups sprang up in Britain. One of most notable at Bristol under Geo. Muller. Appealed to spiritual unity, freedom, and spirituality principles. And personal spirituality grew under movement. 1838 work began under JND in Switserland. 7 yrs of success. JND back to Plymouth where Newton ministering. Controversy. Charged Newton with hindering freedom of HS bec he was recognized as leading brother and could be counted on to speak certain Sundays. Also diff over ch. JND pretrib and no OT saints in ch. Newton saw OT saints in ch and living saints would go thru trib. 1845 split in Plymouth and JND had 60 with him at 1st breaking of bread in his new location. Newton later repudiated his errors. Newton's assembly issued statement that it did not hold Newton's errors.
- E. Controversy. Above. Spcard to Bristol. A friend of Newton got into assembly at Bristol. Darby's followers objected. Later JND himself went to Bristol and demanded they investigate the Newton errors who now repudiated. Muller refused to do. Darby excommunicated Muller's assembly and followers. Finally Muller's assembly examined Newton's views and reserved right to admit people on basis of individual exam of orthodoxy not past association or now with Newton. This didn't satisfy. So open assembly led by Muller and closed by Darby. Exclusive waned until 1865 ff. when lots of new young men came in like CHH, Madrig Miller, Chas. Stanley. JND travelled in Ger, Italy, USA, New Zealand. JND's supremacy lessened with influx of new people. Died April 29, 1862.

#### IV. JND's Doctrinal Distinctives.

##### A. Ecclesiology

1. The Church in Ruins bec of worldliness etc.
2. The Ch distinct in this dispensation.
3. The Ch as an assembly gathering in His name.
4. The Ch as the body of X. Unity
5. X is head of Ch. Freedom of ministry of gifts as HS directs.

##### B. Eschatology

1. Literal interpretation
2. Distinction bet Jew, Gentile, and ch
3. Glories of Millennium for ch reigning and for Is restored

Ch 1

NT is not exposition of rev. completed, but records of a rev.

NT shows purposeful plan on which divine teaching was perfected.

Does Jn 17:18 include words X gave after He was glorified as well as while on earth.

Yes. Apostolic age is both history of apprehension of truth by men + a part of the history of communication of truth by God.

There is a diff. bet prog. of devt. as it actually was during the time which the NT covers + the re-presentation of it which we have in the writings of NT.

Reality of progress is very visible esp. when add OT. rev.

Stages - X in flesh

HS dispensation.

Acts is intro. to Epistles.

Doctrines

Kingdom of X in Rev.

### Principles

Unity of Divine author.

NT records facts

Doctrine was meant to be proven, not opinion.

There is orderly course of development

### Table of Contents

Intro above (ch 1)

Gospels

Acts

Epistles

Apocalypse

### Since 142-95

Word not revealed at once or to its full extent

Prog. not uniform - to all, to Abr., to <sup>the</sup> nation, all nations

In richly varied stages. ages, disp., periods of sel.

New period begins from side of God by (1) cont. certain prin. (2) annulling some (3) intro. new.

There were ages before the ages Eph 3:9; 1 Cor 2:7 + after Rev 22:5.



Gal 3

v 9. JUV - a following of bel.

v15. Law is not an addition to the promise & doesn't affect it. Disp can end the promise but fulfilled in it.

v19  $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\upsilon$  - for sake of a purpose of - Law showed something to stop over.

have inferior Acc. (1) Condemns, not justifies.

(2) temporary (3) didn't come directly but then angels. God dealt directly with Abraham, v 20.

(Collection word)  
v16 - Seed - 1 man; 1 family; 1 Person esp.  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$   
may include for ch as in 1 Co 12:12. v19  $\chi$  is seed  
with all lines of descent in view.

v24 Don't try to be. Sons of Abm by circ. but by being in  $\chi$ . Boys of HS (v27) show this,  $\chi$  is Abm's seed, so those in  $\chi$  are too.

## THE MYSTERY IN EPHESIANS 3

Charles C. Ryrie

The mystery of Ephesians 3:1-12 is a touchstone of interpretations. Amillennial eschatology is quite certain that in this passage Paul is not saying that the mystery is something that was not revealed until New Testament times but is a further revelation of the covenant promises made with Abraham. Oswald T. Allis, for instance, says: ". . . it was new and unknown in a relative sense only, being in its essentials an important theme of prophecy from the time of Abraham . . . ." <sup>1</sup> A more recent writer

---

<sup>1</sup> O. T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church, p. 97.

speaks in the same vein. "What he /Paul/ does mean is that this mystery truth, although known and written in kernel form in the text of the Old Testament, was not fully comprehended nor understood until the times of the New Testament, and so can be spoken of, relatively speaking, as being hidden." <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> W. Harold Mare, "Paul's Mystery in Ephesians 3," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, Spring 1965, p. 83.

Covenant premillennialists hold essentially the same interpretation. Payne, for instance, writes: "Second, the Greek noun musterion, 'mystery,' does not necessarily imply discontinuity. . . . A 'mystery' need not even have been unknown or unappreciated previously, except perhaps relatively so . . . ." <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> J. Barton Payne, The Imminent Appearing of Christ, p. 126. See also J. Oliver Buswell, A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion, II, 448-49.

The purpose of this sort of interpretation is to obviate the necessity of recognizing the distinctiveness of the church, the body of Christ, by attempting to show that the church was revealed, at least partially, in the Old Testament. This idea also implies, of course, that the church as spiritual Israel is the



continuation of God's redemptive program through Old Testament Israel.

On the other hand, dispensational premillennialism has insisted that the mystery is something unrevealed in the Old Testament (though now revealed) in order to demonstrate the distinctiveness of the church from Israel and to emphasize its unique place in God's program for this age. Pentecost, for instance, writes as follows: "Paul, then, is explaining, not limiting the mystery there set forth. The concept must stand that this whole age with its program was not revealed in the Old Testament, but constitutes a new program and a new line of revelation in this present age."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> J. Dwight Pentecost, Things To Come, p. 137.

---

Ultradispensationalists enter and further complicate the interpretative picture by insisting not only on the distinctiveness of the body church but on the fact that this was not revealed until sometime in the ministry of the apostle Paul. The extreme ultradispensationalist believes that the mystery was made known by Paul during his first Roman imprisonment, while the moderate ultradispensationalist holds that it was revealed earlier in his ministry--either at the time of his conversion or during the first missionary journey. Ultradispensationalists are agreed on the fact that Paul was the initial revelator of the mystery but they cannot agree among themselves as to when he first revealed it.

What is a mystery? What is this mystery in Ephesians 3? Is the church distinct to this age or were Old Testament saints in the body too? Did the Old Testament reveal this mystery? What was Paul's relation to its revelation? These are some of the questions germane to an understanding of the mystery in Ephesians 3.

#### THE CONCEPT OF A MYSTERY

In classical Greek the meaning of mysterion is something hidden or secret.



In the plural the word was used to designate the sacred rites of the Greek mystery religions--secrets which only the initiated shared. In the Old Testament the Aramaic equivalent appears only in Daniel 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:9). In the second chapter of Daniel the mystery was the dream and its interpretation; in the fourth chapter, the mystery was apparently only the interpretation, for the king remembered the dream. The secret (mystery) which the king wanted revealed was the interpretation; thus, this was the content of the mystery. It seems to be an unwarranted conclusion to say that in 4:9 "the mysterion is not something unknown (Nebudhadnezzar knows the facts of the dream) but is only something which the king does not understand."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Mare, p. 79.

---

Just because the mystery in chapter 2 was the dream and the interpretation does not require that this be the case in chapter 3. After all, the content of the various mysteries in the New Testament must be determined from the passages in which the word is used, and the content is not the same in each occurrence. Thus we may conclude that in the Old Testament a mystery was something unknown until revealed.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls the same Old Testament word, raz, plus a synonym, pelef, are used in a number of references to indicate not so much something unknown but wisdom that is far above finite understanding.

The word mystery therefore means a secret containing deep truth. In the New Testament the word mysterion occurs 27 times with both ideas of something secret and something deep. The idea of supernatural wisdom in a mystery is found in the only uses of the word in the Gospels in relation to the mysteries of the kingdom (Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10). The idea of a mystery being something secret in Old Testament times but revealed in the New Testament is clearly seen



in a passage like Colossians 1:26. Four occurrences are found in the Revelation (1:20; 10:7; 17:5,7) and the other 20 are in the writings of Paul.<sup>6</sup> All seem

---

<sup>6</sup> Romans 11:25; 16:25; 1 Corinthians 2:7; 4:1; 13:2; 14:2; 15:51; Ephesians 1:9; 3:3; 4, 9; 5:32; 6:19; Colossians 1:26, 27; 2:2; 4:3; 2 Thessalonians 2:7; 1 Timothy 3:9, 16. There is one other occurrence in certain texts of 1 Corinthians 2:1.

---

to involve some higher wisdom which God reveals.

Thus the concept of a mystery is basically a secret which only the initiated share. This includes two ideas: (1) a time when the secret was not known followed by a time when it became known; and (2) deeper or higher wisdom which is revealed to the one initiated into an understanding of the mystery.

#### THE CONTENT OF THE MYSTERY IN EPHESIANS 3

The content of the mystery is expressly stated in Ephesians 3:6: "That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." In other words, the mystery concerns Jews and Gentiles as joint-heirs, in a joint-body, and joint-sharers of the promise of Christ. That the mystery contains the fact that Gentiles are included in God's plan of redemption is clear, and most nondispensationalist writers stop at this point. But is this all there is to the mystery? If so, there is little mystery in that, for the Old Testament made this clear (Gen. 12:3; Isa. 42:6-7). If this is the mystery then Paul was wrong to label it a mystery, for it is neither something new nor some higher truth. The heart of the mystery is that there would be a "joint-body" for Jews and Gentiles. Thus the crux of the interpretation of the mystery in this passage is whether or not the one body for Jews and Gentiles is an Old Testament revelation.

A concordance examination of the use of the word body will reveal very quickly and conclusively that the idea of the body of Christ or of any body into



which the redeemed were placed is nowhere found in the Old Testament. Indeed, almost all the uses of the word body are of the physical body. The first occurrence of the word body in connection with the body of Christ is in the extended discussion of that concept in 1 Corinthians 12:12-25. The next occurrence is in Romans 12:5, and the remainder occur in Ephesians and Colossians. The concept of one body or of any body was unknown in the Old Testament.

Ephesians 3 cannot be dealt with accurately without considering some features in the extended discussion of the body in 1 Corinthians 12. Two important features of the body of Christ are detailed in verse 13. First, Jew and Gentile are not distinguished in the body of Christ. This is the emphasis of the mystery of Ephesians 3. Second, entrance into that body is effected by the baptism of the Spirit. That baptizing work did not occur in the Old Testament nor during the earthly ministry of Christ. Even after the resurrection the Lord said that it was still future (Acts 1:5). It did take place for the first time in the history of the world on the day of Pentecost (Acts 11:15-16). Therefore the inescapable conclusion is that the body of Christ did not come into existence until the day of Pentecost when the first members of that body were joined to the risen Head.

If by stretch of the interpretative imagination the body could be said to have existed before Pentecost, then it was without a head, for it was not until after the resurrection and ascension of Christ that He was made head of the body which is the church (Eph. 1:22). In His capacity as risen Head, He gives gifts (Eph. 4:9-11) which further underscores the distinctiveness of the body to this age. That body-church is called a "new man" (Eph. 2:15), not a continuation or remaking of Israel, but something new and distinct from the Israel of the Old Testament.



There is certainly continuity of the body of Christ with the redeemed of all ages simply because those in the body are redeemed people. But there is also discontinuity in that the redeemed today are in the body of Christ and not some sort of Israel. Just as the redeemed before Abraham's day (like Enoch and Noah) were not a part of Israel, so the redeemed of this age are not either. Enoch and Noah and other pre-Abrahamic saints belong to the family of God's redeemed, but they never belonged to the commonwealth of Israel. So today redeemed Jew and Gentile belong to God's family of saints, without being members of any kind of Israel. They are members of the body of Christ, a new man, entered by the baptizing work of the Spirit, and all, whether Jew or Gentile are of equal standing. This is the content of the mystery of Ephesians 3:6.

#### THE RELATION OF THE MYSTERY TO OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION

Was this mystery revealed in the Old Testament? The covenant theologian responds in the affirmative, but the dispensationalists in the negative. What does Paul say? In this passage he declares that the mystery "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" (Eph. 3:5). Covenant theologians have seized on the word "as" as proving the validity of their contention that the church was in the Old Testament, while dispensationalists have sought to explain the verse otherwise.

Before investigating the possible meaning of the "as" phrase, it is important to notice that in the parallel passage in Colossians 1:26 there is no "as." The statement there is unequivocal--the mystery was not known at all in Old Testament times. It is also rather significant that non-dispensational writers on this subject never mention the Colossians passage in connection with their discussions of Ephesians 3, for it would obviously damage their position.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> This is true of both Allis and Mare in their works previously cited.



But exactly what is Paul saying in Ephesians 3:5? First of all let it be said that even if the "as" clause means that there was some revelation of the church in the Old Testament, it does not necessarily follow that the church was in existence in those days. The second coming of Christ is revealed in a number of Old Testament passages but it hasn't come to pass yet. In fact the considerations given above concerning the body of Christ prove that the church was not operative in Old Testament times.

Second, let it be noted that the Greek word "as" has several meanings. Undoubtedly the most frequently used sense is a comparative one. If this is the use in Ephesians 3:5 then Paul is saying that the mystery was not revealed in the Old Testament to the extent that it is in the New, but it was revealed in the Old. Such an interpretation would stand in contradiction to Colossians 1:25 and the use of the word body (meaning the church) in the Scriptures.

*Concord. use of w/s  
Jn 19:33  
Mt. 6:12 (cf Lk 11:4 -  
Kai yap stoma to  
not partial forgive-  
ness)  
ATR p. 963*

But "as" has another meaning which would not impose a contradiction. It may express an adjectival or declarative force which simply means that the "as" clause merely adds additional information. For instance, "as ye suppose" in Acts 2:15 adds additional information to the sentence and can in no way be understood as a comparative. Furthermore, with a negative in the preceding clause (as in Eph. 3:5) "as" may have the meaning of "but." A clear example of this is found in 1 Corinthians 7:31. Thus Paul may very well be saying in Ephesians 3:5 that the mystery "was not made known unto the sons of men in other ages, but it is now revealed. Of course this would be in harmony with the clear passage, Colossians 1:25<sup>6</sup>.

It is true that the Old Testament testifies to the coming of Christ which is involved in the mystery since the church is His body. That the Old Testament witnesses to Him is what is meant in a passage like Romans 16:24-25, but this witness was not comprehended until the mystery had been revealed in the New Testament (cf. 1 Pet. 1:11-12). Dispensationalists do not deny that the



Old Testament predicted the coming of Messiah and blessing on Gentiles, but one looks in vain to find a revelation in the Old Testament of the body of Christ, the church, and of equality of Jews and Gentiles. Even in the millennial kingdom there will not be equality.<sup>8</sup> Covenant theologians

---

<sup>8</sup> For elaboration of this point see John F. Walvoord, The Millennial Kingdom, p. 236).

---

seem to imply that since the Old Testament foretold the coming of Christ it also revealed these other truths. The mystery in Ephesians 3 is not that Messiah would come and bless Gentiles would be blessed, but it is that Jews and Gentiles would find an equal position in the new and unique body of Christ.

#### THE RELATION OF THE MYSTERY TO THE APOSTLE PAUL

This is a favorite passage of ultradispensationalists (followers of the teachings of Bullinger, O'Hair, Stam), for in it they believe they have proof that Paul was the first to reveal the mystery of the body church to the world. Three considerations in this passage alone disallow such a conclusion.

First, Paul explicitly states that the mystery was revealed to "his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." In other words, others (plural) understood the mystery and that not through the agency of Paul but through the ministry of the Spirit. Paul did not receive it first and then reveal it to the others. They received it, as he did, from the Spirit. The ultradispensationalist's point would be proved if the text said that the mystery was revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets "by me." But it does not say that.

Second, the verb "revealed" in verse 5 is in the aorist tense. This in conjunction with the word now indicates that the revelation of the mystery was "made definitely at a former period in these /New Testament/ times."<sup>9</sup>



<sup>9</sup> S.D.F. Salmend, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, VII, 304.

This definitely contradicts the extreme type of ultradispensationalism which teaches that the mystery was not revealed to Paul until the time of this imprisonment during which Ephesians was written.

Third, in declaring that he had received this revelation, Paul gives himself no priority (v. 3). "To me" is an unemphatic form (moi) and it does not stand in a place of emphasis in the sentence. In verse 8 when he writes of his proclaiming the mystery he does use the emphatic form and places it in the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence. Thus, when speaking of receiving the mystery he gives himself no priority, while in the matter of preaching it he emphasizes the prominent part he played. The constructions ought to be reversed if the claims of the ultradispensationalists were correct.

The mystery of Ephesians 3 is the equality of Jews and Gentiles in the body of Christ. This equality and this body were not revealed in the Old Testament. They were made known only after the coming of Christ by the Spirit to the apostles and prophets including Paul but not excluding others.

# CFL - THD The Covenants

In THD reputation is on (1) basis of history & (2) basis of Script  
Disp. are NOT modes of administration of Cov of grace.

## I. Arg. fr. Script.

1. Neg - Bible doesn't reveal cov of grace + works.  
CFL accepts of us cov. only those specifically designated.  
CFL does not accept Islamic + Ahamic. I doubtful re Noahic  
Other 5 with Is - Abr, Moses, Pal, David, New

2. Moses Is + ch.

3. Moses law + grace

cf chart on p 211 relating cov. + disp.

## II. Arg. fr. ~~Script~~ History.

Pre-Ref. | Ref.

in cov.  
Thd.

Hyperius 1561

1571-1574

Olevianus 1570

Eggenius

1599-1622

Rollsch 1596

1585-1699

Castwright

Bull 1645

1585-1640

Ames 1613

1576-1638

Cocceius 1648 - Book (Summa  
1620-1669 Doctrina)

Witsius

1646

Witsius

1636-1708

CFL - disp  $\approx$  age.

Class notes - 1. lots of Script, esp. on word studies.

2. Covers many valuable stuff. - hist of cov.; law-grace.



1875	1910	1935
Restoration (of prophetic truth)	Rebellion - Revolution (with the denomination)	Reconstruction

1878- 1st Premill. conf. in USA. Looking for "any moment", imminent return as a vital doctrine. Not to bel. in it was sign of apostasy.

1886- 2nd Prop. conf - messages ed. by Needham

↑ 1st glimpse of real dispensationalism. 1878 men very cautious about 1886 men not exposed to disp. in their education or reading. Their interest was in finding out what Bible said bec. of interest in premill.

N.B. - 23 yrs before SROB

### I. Matter of Disp. Themselves.

Disp. succeed disp. 7 features in each disp. incl. judgment at end.  
Eden. Aile did, Patriarchal, Moses, X<sup>c</sup> - Frost (Sacramento, Calif.)  
Fausset recog. "parenthetical disp. of the spiritually elect ch." - Commenting on Lk 4:19.

### II. Church & This Dispensation

"Waits for her rapture."  
"Rom 9-11 is a phib. of history."  
"Disp. of the Comforter" - is ch. age.  
"No greater delusion than that Gentile ch has taken place of Is. in ky of God."

### III. The Covenants.

Cov made to Is must be taken literally & will be fulfilled literally. Psa. 89:4.  
Abr. cov is unconditional. "To think that we have taken Is's place is to be wise in our own conceits." Peter?  
Is in NT means this seed - bel. or unbel. but Abrahamian.

### IV. The Future.

Emphasized imminency. Has been a touchstone of fundamentalism.  
"The Certainty & uncertainty of The Rapture" - Certain to occur at some time, uncertain as to what time.  
Rapture (1 Th 4) & Resurr (Rev 19). Separation of saints will take place at beg. of trib.  
Mt 24 + Lk 21 not identical in that Mt 24 is future.  
Mt 24 - 4-6 - trials of early ch.  
7 - epitome of world's hist.  
8 ff - hist. of Jewish people during trib. of last times.  
Mt 25:1-13 - X's reception by the ch & rewards (14 H.)



## THE NEW COVENANT

### I. The Central Question: Fulfillment

- A. Postmill--conversion of actual Jews to Christ in M preceeding 2nd advent.
- B. Amill--conversion of church during inter-advent period.
- C. Premill--still some future fulfillment required.

### II. The Analysis of the Covenant, Jer. 31:31-34

- A. The Period of the Covenant. Still future to Jer. (600 B.C.)
- B. The People of the Covenant, v. 31
- C. The Provisions of the Covenant
  - 1. Unconditional (cf. Mosaic)
  - 2. Everlasting
  - 3. Inward knowledge of God (regeneration?)
  - 4. Universal knowledge of God
  - 5. Forgiveness of sins
  - 6. Regathering, Jer. 32:37
  - 7. Indwelling of H.S., Ezek. 36:27
  - 8. Earthly blessings, Ezek. 37:20-28

### III. The New Covenant in the N.T.

- A. Uses of the phrase: Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; 2 Cor. 3:6; Heb. 8:8; 9:15.
- B. Other references to NC: Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Rom. 11:27; Heb. 8:10, 13; 10:16; 12:24 (nea)

### IV. The Relation of the Church to the NC

- A. The Church has replaced Israel as the participant in the NC  
"Right here we have the universality of the new testament. Lost among the Gentiles and turned Gentile, the gospel goes out to all nations to bring the new testament in Christ's blood to all" Lenski, Heb., 263.
- B. The NC is with the nation Israel only.  
"We enjoy indeed all the essential privileges of the new covenant, its foundation being laid on God's part in the blood of Christ, but we do so in spirit, not according to the letter. The new covenant will be established formally with Israel in the millennium." JNDarby, Synopsis, V, 329.
- C. There are 2 new covenants, one with Israel and one with the church.  
JFW, 218-9.
- D. There is one new covenant yet to be fulfilled in the future by Israel but understood now in the progress of revelation as able to be participated in by the church soteriologically.

Covenant	Focus	Revealed in progress of rev.
1. Abrahamic	Seed	Gal. 3:29
2. Davidic	Kingdom	Matt. 13; Col. 1:13
3. New	Blessings	2 Cor. 3:6

MACPHERSON

1. Tregelles said pretrib originated 1832 by Irvingites (said in 1864) (p.18)
2. Irving taught "a split Rapture which includes a Pre-Trib first stage" (40).
3. Margaret Macdonald had a pretrib rapture revelation in 1830. (58ff; 101)
4. JND visited Macdonalds, recd pretrib from Margaret, modified it, popularized it (92-94)
5. Pretrib origin has been covered up (implication--deliberately by pretribs)(99)

HUEB

1. In 1855 said pretrib came from Judzrs. In 1864 said came from demon. (14-16)
2. Thru 1833 Irvingites did not teach any moment rapture but events preceeding it (26). No rap till 10 kings set up (23).
3. Her rev.has no resemblance to pretrib or dispensational truth (67-69)
4. JND saw pretrib from 2 Thess 2 around 1830 and dispensational distinctions from Isa 32 in 1827 (pp. 56, 74).
5. MacPherson, a posttrib, has uncovered the fact that neither Irving nor Macdonald were pretribs! (66)

OBSERVATIONS

1. Tregelles' testimony arose from his prejudice against Darby (1845-47).
2. That secret rapture originated in Irvi is "a groundless and pernicious charge" (Sandeen, quoted by MacP, 32). More posttrib
3. She was confused rapturist, incld' partial rap (Mac, 94), and ch in trib (10)
4. JND does not mention pretrib rev' in his record of visit to Macdonalds; only comments on tongues which he considered false (Mac 92-93).
5. Thanks to MacPherson for uncovering the coverup!



# Questions on Fuller's The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism

## Chapter I

1. Why is Fuller so glad to see (even in ecclesiological circles) The recognition on The unity of The Bible?
2. What are 3 answers as to how this unity is to be described?
3. Why do Presbyterians have a conflict with dispensationalism?
4. " " Baptists " " " "
5. Why is The American Baptist Convention not involved?
6. What are the 2 "red herrings" Fuller speaks of?
7. Explain Augustine's famous quote.
8. What are Hodge's dispensations?
9. Evaluate the statement that a "true dispensationalist" has a different premise from a "partial" one.
10. According to Fuller, what is the essence of dispensationalism?
11. Why is Fuller dissatisfied with The term dispensationalism?

## Chapter II

1. According to Fuller, what was Darby's fundamental theme?
2. How is The evidence from Baxter used to infer that pretribulationism is heretical?  
*Irving said x was script + that's heretical*
3. What is Fuller's conclusion about The relation of Irving and Darby?  
*Irving's sup is heretical*
4. According to Fuller, why was there contention between Newton and Darby?

## Chapter III

1. How many visits did Darby make to The US + Canada? 7
2. What was The contribution of The Loizeaux Brothers on The Brethren movement?
3. Give details of Brother's contribution. *Pratt, writer Distinctive but IS + ch C.I.S.*
4. How much was he influenced by Darby. *Michigan Bible Conf*

## Chapter IV

1. According to F. what was Darby's principal influence on American prophetic teaching *any more*
2. Name some of The early prophetic teachers who formed posttrib *Casson Erdman West*
3. Why did The Michigan Conference cease - *Pratt vs posttrib p81 cap*
- 3.4. *What part did Irving have in " "*
4. What does "recrudescence" mean. *outbreak after period of quiet of something dangerous*
5. What factors accounted for it? *Reg. Sec. R.B. + Conv. Comm World War I Blackstone Joun in Cong*
6. Which members of the committee division of the S.R.B. were pretribs + which posttribs. *(Bible Inst. DTS)*
7. " " " " " " *NSRB are doing + which not.*



Chapter V

1. Who was O.T. Allis?
2. What was his (a) <sup>hermeneutical</sup> and (b) <sup>theological</sup> objection to dispensationalism?
3. State in your own words the place of the law in covenant theology.
4. What is "theological interpretation"?
5. How do you interpret Luke 10:25-37?
6. Look up one nondispensational commentary on that passage and report its conclusions.
7. Did Chafer teach more than one way of salvation?
8. What is the "new emphasis" in dispensationalism? Is it new?
9. Interact with the statement: "it is impossible to think of varying degrees of grace" (p. 164).
10. Since you have the advantage of the New Scofield, how were the notes related to Ex. 19:5; Hab. 2:4; Matt. 5-7; John 1:17; Heb. 11:39 changed (p. 172)? *of Chapter VII p. 219*
11. What are the two problems that Fuller says dispensationalists will run into if they try to agree with covenant theology on one way of salvation? *just in OT*
12. What is the test of the adequacy of a system of hermeneutics?
13. How do dispensationalists solve apparently contradictory passages?
14. How does Fuller?

Chapter VI

1. What is Fuller's test for what constitutes <sup>p. 145 however</sup> "normative dispensationalism"? *dispensationalism script.*

Chapter VII

1. What is Fuller's view of the meaning of the seed of Abraham? *p. 224*
2. What is your's?
3. What is the amillennialists?
4. What is Peter's view?

Chapter VIII

1. How does Fuller view the relation of the Mosaic covenant and the Abrahamic?

QUESTIONS ON FULLER

Chapter IX

1. In what particulars does Fuller disagree with dispensationalism's view of the kingdom in the O.T.?

Chapter X

1. What is the importance of the distinction between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God?
2. What differences of interpretation of the parables of Matt. 13 are there among dispensationalists?
3. What are the various views among dispensationalists concerning the New Covenant?
4. According to Fuller what is the meaning of (a) throne; (b) kingdom; (c) heaven? *right to rule* *reign*
5. How does Fuller's concept of the kingdom solve all the problems of dispensationalism?

Chapter XI

1. What is the usual dispensational interpretation of Acts 15:14-17?
2. What does Fuller say is the dispensationalist's chief argument for pretribulational rapture? Is it today?
3. In Rom. 11 what is (a) the root; (b) the olive tree; (c) wild branches?
4. How does posttribulationalism naturally follow from the doctrine of one people of God?
5. How does Fuller explain the promise of Rev. 3:10?

Chapter XII

1. What particular teachings of dispensationalism demonstrate the disunity of the Bible?
2. Why does Fuller's premillennialism cause him the perplexity admitted on p. 374?



## THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

### I. The Promises of the Covenant, Gen. 12:1-3; 15:18-21

- A. Personal promises
- B. The promise of a nation
- C. Universal promise
- D. Land promise

Meaning of the River of Egypt (Nile or Wadi el Arish)  
1 Kings 4:21; 8:65 (Leupold)

"The land belongs to Abram's seed only within the terms of the covenant and thus only in the seed of Abram, Christ, in whom the land-promise is transfigured into its cosmic antitype and the heirs of Abraham become the universal covenant community of the NT, there being neither Jew nor Greek in Christ" M. Kline, NBC.

### II. The Question of Conditions in the Covenant

- A. The "pre-condition" of 12:1.
- B. The "be thou a blessing" of 12:2

"The imperative, when depending (with waw copulative) upon a jussive (cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, frequently expresses also a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or in fact an intention; . . . after a cohortative, Gen 12:2" Gesenius, Kautzsch, Cowley, 325.

### III. Viewpoints as to the Fulfillment of the Covenant

- A. Amillennial.                      Community is big word  
    Conditional.      Fulfilled in Israel's history.      Fulfilled in Church.
- B. Covenant premillennial              Kingdom or redemptive purpose is big idea.  
    The covenant is an expression of the single divine redemptive purpose God is carrying out in Israel and the Church.
- C. Premillennial.
  - 1. Everlasting. Forever. Gen 17:7; 17:13, 19; 1 Chron 16:16-17; Ps. 105:9-1
  - 2. "It is true that, in the express terms of the covenant with Abraham, obedience is not stated as a condition." Allis, 33.
  - 3. Solemnization ceremony in Gen. 15.
  - 4. Reiterations to Isaac and Jacob, Gen. 17:19; 26:2-4; 28:13-15.
  - 5. Jer. 31:35-37.



## THE CHURCH AND THE TRIBULATION: A REVIEW

Charles C. Ryrie

Though posttribulationism has many advocates, it has not had many published scholarly defenses. In 1956 George E. Ladd published *The Blessed Hope*; in 1962 *The Imminent Appearing of Christ* by J. Barton Payne appeared; and the book under review, *The Church and the Tribulation* by Robert H. Gundry, was released late in 1973. Dr. Ladd's book was popularly slanted; the thesis of Dr. Payne's was never widely accepted (and is severely criticized by Dr. Gundry in an addendum); and the book under review by the chairman of the Department of Religious Studies at Westmont College attempts to be more exegetically based.

The competence of the author is unquestioned. Having been reared and widely read in the pretribulationist view, he presents it accurately though he occasionally succumbs to the temptation to argue overmuch details not widely held by pretribulationists. He is, of course, entirely capable of doing accurate exegesis.

This exegetical approach of the book tends to make it more like a maze than a guide. The discussion is overly intricate and will be difficult to many readers to analyze. Caught in this maze, some may be content to assume that they have been persuaded of the validity of posttribulationism rather than endeavoring to cut through to the heart of the arguments to test their accuracy. In other words, in reading this book one could easily become so overwhelmed by details that he could easily get himself into a position whereby he is unable to discern the validity of the conclusions.

The thesis of the book is threefold; "(1) direct, unquestioned statements of Scripture that Jesus Christ will return after the tribulation and that the first resurrection will occur after the tribulation, coupled with the absence of statements placing similar events before the tribulation, make it natural to place the rapture of the Church after the tribulation; (2) the theological and exegetical grounds for pretribulationism rest on insufficient evidence, non sequitur reasoning, and faulty exegesis; (3) positive indications of a posttribulationist rapture arise out of a proper exegesis of relevant Scripture passages and derive support from the history of the doctrine" (p. 10). We shall examine these in reverse order.



It is acknowledged by pretribulationists that a detailed theology of pretribulationism is not found in the Fathers, yet it is not conceded by all posttribulationists that imminence was not in the teachings of the early church (p. 180). In arguing against imminence Dr. Gundry asserts that "the early Christians were not so devoid of common sense as to believe that Christ might come at any moment and at the same time believe that they must first experience the tribulation" (pp. 179-80). Yet in another place he states that "an expectant attitude toward the Lord's return does not contradict a posttribulationist belief in necessarily preceding events" (p. 29). He thus denies imminency (p. 33) while allowing for it (and renaming it "expectancy") by suggesting that the fact that since the days of the tribulation will be shortened "no one will be able to calculate the end of the tribulation with certainty" (p. 42). The author's conclusion is that pretribulationism did not become known and widely held until the mid-nineteenth century (he makes no allowance for development in the understanding of doctrine). This is generally true, but the author's inference that since the historical evidence confirms posttribulationism, pretribulationist exegesis is faulty does not follow. By the same logic baptismal regeneration would be established as true since the proponents consider their opponents' exegesis faulty and historical evidence can be cited to support that error.

Much more important is the second aspect of the thesis. Does pretribulationism rest on insufficient evidence, non sequitur reasoning, and faulty exegesis? We shall confine our discussion to two of the most important pretribulationist arguments: the relation of I Thessalonians 4:13-18 to 5:1-10 and the meaning of the promise in Revelation 3:10.

The thrust of Dr. Gundry's attack on the pretribulationist interpretation of I Thessalonians 4 and 5 is twofold: the ease with which Paul moves from a discussion of the rapture in chapter 4 to the discussion of the Parousia in 5 demonstrates that he is talking about events that occur at the same time and not events separated by seven years. This is enforced by the use of de in 5:1 which "contains a mixture of a continuative sense and a slightly adversative sense" (p. 105). Secondly, the day of the Lord does not begin, according to the author, until the second coming; hence the rapture is posttribulationist. Both of these contentions (the continuance of the same thought in chapter 5 and the question of the beginning of the day of the Lord) rest on exegetical considerations and thus furnish good tests of the validity of pretribulationist versus posttribulationist exegesis.



If 5:1-10 is a contrasting subject from that which has been discussed in 4:13-18, then a pretribulation viewpoint is much more valid than a posttribulation one. If there is "close connection with the foregoing thought" (p. 105), then the posttribulation view seems more justified. The exegetical basis on which the decision is to be made in favor of posttribulationism is, according to Dr. Gundry, the "slightly adversative" sense of de in 5:1. While it is quite true that in the use of de a contrast is often "scarcely discernible," it is equally true that sometimes it is used "to emphasize a contrast."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 170.

Are we then left in an exegetical stalemate? By no means. Good exegesis will not fail to notice that Paul writes in 5:1 peri de and that he uses that phrase elsewhere in his writings to denote a new and contrasting subject (see I Cor. 7:1; 7:25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1; 16:12 and in the section under discussion I Thess. 4:9 and 13). So while the posttribulation contention that the same subject is being discussed in 4:13-18 and 5:1-10 might be supported by the use of de alone, it is completely nullified by the use of peri de, and the pretribulation use of the passage is thereby strongly supported exegetically. It would appear that it is not pretribulation exegesis that is faulty.

The second question raised by posttribulationism from this section is that of the beginning of the day of the Lord. Dr. Gundry contends that that day does not include the tribulation period at all; therefore, acknowledging that the rapture does precede the day of the Lord, he concludes that it is posttribulation. Isaiah describes the day of the Lord as that time when men shall go into the caves and the rocks and holes of the earth (2:12, 19). This includes the same event depicted under the sixth seal judgment as well as other judgments of the tribulation period. Dr. Gundry feels, however, that since he has demonstrated elsewhere that the sixth seal brings us to the end of the tribulation there is no support for pretribulationism in this reference from Isaiah. However, he seems not to be quite certain of this, for he wrestles with the problem of how then can people be saying peace and safety (I Thess. 5:2-3) at the coming of the day of the Lord if, in fact, that day does not begin until the second advent of Christ. He offers the suggestion that "perhaps just before Armageddon there will be a lull, a seeming end of world upheavals,



which will excite men's hopes for the peace which has so long eluded them . . ." (p. 92). But he has already diagrammed his outline of the Revelation (p. 75) as placing the bowl judgments of Revelation 16 between the fifth and seventh seals. Those bowl judgments hardly describe a "lull" which will cause men to think they are in peace and safety. If, as Dr. Gundry admits, the sixth seal is pre-Parousia, then the beginning of the day of the Lord is also. The cry of peace and safety at the beginning of that day requires that that day begin before the intense judgments of the tribulation days. It is not the pretribulational view of the beginning of the day of the Lord that rests on insufficient evidence.

The promise of Revelation 3:10 is given extended discussion (pp. 53-61). The conclusion is that the phrase tereo ek tes horas means emergence from within the hour or protection issuing in emission. Simply stated, this means that the church will go through the tribulation and emerge from it at its close at the Second Coming, but will be kept in the meantime from the testing of that time. This conclusion is arrived at by examining other possible meanings of ek and choosing "out from within" as the correct one here; by stating that tereo means "guard"; and that thus the phrase means a protection issuing in emission. Again the temptation to dismember a phrase has caught the author in an exegetical fault. For those for whom the almost tedious discussion of various shades of meaning of these and related words is unhelpful, if not meaningless, they should simply look up tereo ek in the lexicon where the specific use in Revelation 3:10 is said to mean "protect someone from someone or something".<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 822.

---

The "something" from which believers are promised protection is the "hour" of worldwide trial which is coming. Apparently recognizing the force of the total phrase ("kept from the hour") the author suggests two ways to "undercut the stress on the term 'hour'" (p. 59). One is to make the usual distinction between the events of the tribulation years and the time itself. The believer, we are told, will be present during the time but will be delivered from the experiences of that time and in this way he is kept from the hour. The other suggestion is that the hour of testing is not the entire seventieth week of Daniel (which the author considers to be yet future) but only the very last crisis at the close of the tribulation. This is consistent with his view of the day of the Lord, but no outline



of the sequence of judgments of the Revelation can confine the "hour of testing which shall come upon the whole earth" to the "last crisis." It does not seem that pretribulational exegesis is the one guilty of non sequitur.

The first part of the thesis is that "direct, unquestioned statements of Scripture that Jesus Christ will return after the tribulation and that the first resurrection will occur after the tribulation, coupled with the absence of statements placing similar events before the tribulation, make it natural to place the rapture of the Church after the tribulation." One example given of such a "direct" statement is the first harvest of Revelation 14:1-16 which "is best taken as symbolic of the rapture" (p. 83)! Other such "direct" statements are found in "chronological data in passages concerning the resurrection" (p. 151). Another "direct" statement is related to the fact that "John does not mention the Church as on earth" in Revelation 4-18 just as he does not mention the church as being in heaven, which latter omission not only cancels out the former and which "may do even more, viz., create the presumption that the last generation of the Church is still on earth in these chapters since John has described no rapture" (p. 78; See also p. 49).

Is the absence of "direct" statements of a posttribulational rapture overcome by anything that makes it "more natural to place the rapture of the Church after the tribulation" (p. 10)? A most revealing answer to this question is found in the author's discussion of a question pretribulationalists have been raising for some years and which, as far as the reviewer knows, has not been attempted to be answered in posttribulational writings until now. The question concerns populating the millennial kingdom and is simply this: since posttribulationalism teaches that "there is no reason why Jesus cannot come for His saints and continue to descend with them" (p. 159) at the second coming (thus removing all the righteous from the earth and giving them resurrection bodies), and if the judgment of Matthew 25:31-46 occurs at that time (thus consigning all the then living wicked to the lake of fire), who will remain in earthly bodies to begin populating the millennial kingdom? Acknowledging the seriousness of this question for the posttribulational position, Dr. Gundry admits: "we are forced to put the judgment of the nations after the millennium. For if it were to take place beforehand, none of the wicked (goats) could enter the millennium" (pp. 166-67). This is strange exegesis for a premillennialist (which Dr. Gundry is), for the Scripture is quite plain as to the time



of the judgment as being "when the Son of man shall come in his glory" and when he shall "sit upon the throne of his glory" (Matt. 25:31). His understanding of this verse is that there is a gap within it of the thousand years of the millennium so that the judgment of the sheep and goats comes after the millennium.

But where will believers in earthly bodies come from to populate the millennial kingdom? The author has two suggestions: either the judgment of believers will not take place until the 75 days after the second coming (Dan. 12:12) which presumably would allow for some to believe after the posttribulational rapture and then be judged all during those 75 days (p. 164), or he thinks that the 144,000 will continue as sealed unbelievers during the entire tribulation and then turn to Christ at the second coming and be those who populate the millennial earth (p. 82). Apparently he does not explain how they can be on earth during all this time and sing "a new song before the throne, and before the four living ones, and the elders" (Rev. 14:3). In summary: perhaps the clearest thing said about this question is the admission that posttribulationalism is "forced" into their possible answers.

This seems to be typical of much of the book. While the attacks on pretribulationalism are many and not at all decisive, when the author tries to fit together his exegesis into a posttribulational system, he has to force either the exegesis or the system. Let those who may feel overwhelmed by the many little points brought up in the pages of the book look carefully for an attempt to put together a posttribulational system. It is one thing to attack another viewpoint; it is quite another to build one's own. The book has much of the former, little of the latter.

Just what is the posttribulational system according to this book? This is not an easy question to answer simply because the viewpoint is not systematized, but here are some of the salient features.

The seventieth week of Daniel is yet future, and the church will be on earth during that period (p. 49). The 144,000 will be a group of unsaved people who will be supernaturally protected from dying during that period so that they accept the Lord when he comes at the second coming and be those who populate the millennial kingdom (p. 82). The 24 elders are 24 beings who lead the worship of God in heaven (p. 70). On the earth the church will not suffer the penal judgments of God but will endure persecution



from other quarters (p. 51). She will be looking for the Lord's return though it will not be imminent and yet it will be in some sense imminent since the days will be shortened and no one will be able to predict with certainty the time of Christ's return (p. 42). The day of the Lord will not begin with the tribulation or any part of it (p. 95), and yet it may begin before Armageddon because there may be a peaceful lull at that point (p. 92), which lull will fit somehow into the sequence of seal, trumpet, and bowl judgments which will find somewhat concurrent fulfillment (p. 75). The promise of Revelation 3:10 will be fulfilled when the church emerges from within the tribulation at its end. Then the Lord comes for His saints, meeting them in the air and continuing to descend with them to the earth (p. 159). There will be no formal judgment of living Israel at this point but only a purging out of the rebels and the Lord brings them toward the promised land through heathen countries (p. 168). The so-called judgment of living Gentiles (the sheep and the goats) does not take place at the second coming at all but after the millennium (p. 166). Believers will not be judged until after the millennium though they will receive their crowns of rewards at the second coming (p. 169). All of this allegedly presents a picture of the future that is "harmonistic" (p. 15), "natural" (p. 10), and exegetically preferable. But does it?



from other quarters (p. 51). She will be looking for the Lord's return though it will not be imminent and yet it will be in some sense imminent since the days will be shortened and no one will be able to predict with certainty the time of Christ's return (p. 42). The day of the Lord will not begin with the tribulation or any part of it (p. 95), and yet it may begin before Armageddon because there may be a peaceful lull at that point (p. 92), which lull will fit somehow into the sequence of seal, trumpet, and bowl judgments which will find somewhat concurrent fulfillment (p. 75). The promise of Revelation 3:10 will be fulfilled when the church emerges from within the tribulation at its end. Then the Lord comes for His saints, meeting them in the air and continuing to descend with them to the earth (p. 159). There will be no formal judgment of living Israel at this point but only a purging out of the rebels and the Lord brings them toward the promised land through heathen countries (p. 168). The so-called judgment of living Gentiles (the sheep and the goats) does not take place at the second coming at all but after the millennium (p. 166). Believers will not be judged until after the millennium though they will receive their crowns of rewards at the second coming (p. 169). All of this allegedly presents a picture of the future that is "harmonistic" (p. 15), "natural" (p. 10), and exegetically preferable. But does it?

I Problem of Disp.

- A. Slants case from first as if we are opposed to unity of Bkth. Disp's 2 purposes (S+Ch) opposed to unity. p6.
- B. Hist. pres. not disp a part. p16
- C. Disp. diff. from dividing history into periods ∴ not historical & not true. 30

II Hist. of Disp. in England.

Life of Darby. Says Darby & Irving got pietist views independently.

III Hist. of Disp. in America

JND in ~~1838~~ <sup>North America</sup> 7 yrs terms for 6 yrs total. Darby's inf. was from Brother's Prog. Conf. Liverpool.

Brothers had more influence. And in Scarsdale

IV Disp's Triumph in America

How?  
 Pugh's conf. helped tho didn't distinguish between S+Ch. ⊕  
 Post-trib entered thru Cameron, West, WJ Johnson, Brother moved.  
 Aequit helped spread. Says PB's greatly influenced CIS & SRB. ⊕  
 Read life, p.

Says Wm I helped promote Disp. ⊕

WEB's Jesus is Coming. 1<sup>st</sup> part 1878 ⊕

Bkth Schools + DTB. ⊕

V Disp's Hermeneutical Dilemma

- Can't have ch-ab dist + 1 way of sal.

Discuss Cor. Thel - Ellis vs LSC

Tries to show law & grace operate together + dispensationalists divide.

Theological interpretation.  
 LSC vs S. Presbyterianism. 1 plan of sal (Wm. Conf.) vs 2 plans (Disp.)

New Emphasis in Disp. Says 1 way of sal. Concludes LSC inconsistent p163

p164 degrees of grace.

p176 "manner" too vague a word

Tries to show that 1 plan of sal blends S+Ch. 177

Concludes English better than CIS & DTB + CLF

Test of hermeneutic is whether it shows unity of Bkth 180. Says who?

Disp. "Compunctation"



Cor. that says law could save but no one could keep. So Jesus died.

Section II - Disp as a System

VI Prelim. Probs.

SBB + LSC JFW CLF selected as normative written but still don't allow for refinement.

P 201 - wrong inf. promising disp. wrong, today's disp. wrong.

1. What does normative disp. teach.
  2. What's wrong with that
  3. How does this hermeneutic promote unity -
- linked to Abh., Mosaic, Ky. Ch -

VII Abrahamic Cor.

Lit. int. Part lit. fully argues for future lit. fully.

But seed of Abh. = Ch. now = IS now The separate in future

VIII Mosaic Cor.

Not antithetical to Abh. cor. bec. required faith for sal.

Obed. nec. will be wrought by Divin. enablement. (Disp. <sup>suggestedly</sup> says Kydon entered for Kydon <sub>entirely</sub> by legal obed.)

IX Kydon in OT

Shows own teaching re Davidic Kydon. Setting us up for NT kill!

X Kydon Presented, rejected, proposed

Own teaching. Shows we don't agree when Kydon rejected. So what?

Thus we have 2 new cor. + 2 Kydons (Ky hear. now + M) i. no unity of Bible.

Fuller says Kydon = right to rule a region + This is compatible with idea of suffering + maintain unity.

XI Parenthesis Church

Own idea of Ch argues for postalt. response.

Fuller says Rom 11 shows continuity bet. Is + Ch. 1 people of God argues for postalt.

XII Conclusion

Supra om. hermeneutical principle is 2 peoples of God. Of course this is not our only tenet.

# Brae Backgrounds to Disp.

1960

Autobiography - Disp full Edin Ph.D. Unity, imp. work. B.A., M.A. Wheaton.  
Bethel - Prof Theol.

## I Distinguishing Features of D.

A. Not merely an end-time chronology but herm. that ≠ those of historic ch.

- B. But
1. Nature + purpose of a disp.
  2. Rigidly applied literalism
  3. Dichotomy bet Is + ch
  4. Restricted view of ch.
  5. Jewish coverage of Kydon
  6. Dist. bet. law + grace.
  7. Complementarizing of Script.
  8. Pretrib.
  9. View of time, <sup>Ms</sup> eternal state - Fulfill prophecy + two Jewish
  10. Apostate ch.

## II JMD: An Estimate of The Man.

- Humble yet ruthless - man
- led + controlled others - leader
- 40 vols of 600 pp each - writer

## III Historical Backgrounds to D.

No one group started -

Dublin, 1825	Plymouth, 1831	Bristol, Muller
Ch Eng. graph, JMD 1827-8	Newton founded, JMD 1832	

JMD + Newton split over (1) Newton too much leadership (2) N not patient + dist (3) + allowed for self no. Is reb.  
Point is that P.B.'s are fighters + This continues thru S.R.B. etc. p 99

## IV JMD's Doct of Ch.

Started p 100

In Ruine (with ch). Judgment expected since all disp. close in judgment.  
His responsibility is not to react but to come out + into assembly.

Began at Pentecost 110.

Books of X. 111 HS puts us in.

Unity of ch important 120 ft. - in X, in assembly, among assemblies.

Concl. Doct of ch not so bad but practical effects are 127.



# V JND's Eschatology

A. U. Present. res. fuch.

Glory for ch in relation to Kingdom on earth & power in heaven

B. B. - m. fulfillment.

# VI Evaluation

MB 142 fr 2.

Shouldn't make doctrine a basis for fellowship (esp. protest)

" be literal. - Silly illu bottom 150.

- Note bulging middle 152

C. Norman Kraus *Disps. in America*. J. K. Press 1958

Intro - Disp = SRB system, 15 in of ultra. Steps 1909 - should have gone on, 20.  
2 ques - (1) What is Disp? (2) Why such a force?

Rise of Disp.

### I Pattern for the Ages -

lists various disp. schemes. Defines in terms of prog. rev., 43

### II Lessons of PB.

A. In USA. JWB 3x Canada 3x USA. Gudem, Moody, Brookes.

Disagreement of Newton + Triggles + Nauder.

CHM (1820-1846) influence. 49.

Says many in US tried to adapt disp. to interdenominationalism.

### III D. Norm.

Claims to be Bible but Kraus thinks it is extra Bible too.

A. Calvinism. Says Crociani ~ disp in Bible basis, typology, economy.  
" " ≠ " " had 1 cor of grace.

But disp is Calvinistic

B. Theol. Assumptions, 61 - 1. Verbal, plenary. 2. Dynamity 3. Sovereign Transcendence of God.

Standing & state = mechanistic doct. of security.

Dynamity makes disp. pessimistic (tho not defeatist).

Disp. is mechanical. Says we can't include progressive rev. ideas.

Relate of D. to Premill.

### IV Bel's' Metz. for Bible Study.

1876. Bible perfect + prophcy understandable. Annual reports pub.

by Brookes + Gudem.

### V 1<sup>st</sup> Internat'l Prog. Conference. 1878 NYC

Disp. truth only alluded to. Was a distinctive bet. Ky + cl. Kraus says this proves disp. was integral part of the conf.

1886. Disp. more prominent. Delitzsch p 94

psl in clc

### VI Decline of Niagara Bible Conf. Bce. death of Gudem + Brookes

1895 + 1897

AG + protest + West p 101.

### VII. Scorsfield's Synthesis.

K. says prog. rev. in SRB = change in HS's dealings 125.

Concl. D too literal. Disp not in Bible. Denies unity of Bible. Jesus' teachings lent to ch. Ch is ( ).



I. What is Ultra?

Def. of disp. Illus of maid. Bullinger - Companion Bible.

Tenets of ultra -

1. 4 Gospels are Jewish
2. Acts is transition bet. law + mystery. No Body ch in Acts.
3. P rec'd mystery until Roman prison + prison spirit, only valid.
4. Rev. no ref. to ch. today. 7 ch.s are Jewish ch. in Tit.
5. Body diff. from Bride.
6. Ordinances not for today.

II. 4 Gospels + relate to Ch.

Based on Rom 15:8.

HAT says Synoptics are more Israelitic. Not Jn.

Also that ultras put Mt 13 all in trib.

Ans. HAT cites Mt 16 + 18. 1 Tim 6: 3-5 + command of Tim. ag. Bullinger!  
Opt Comm. p 17-18 + 20 bottom.

III Is Ch of Acts The Body Ch.

1. Ans. HAT uses 1 Cor 12:13 + Acts 1:5. HAT no objection to "transition" if in mind of man + not plan of God.
2. Ans Ch. existed before Pent - Eph 1:13 1 Cor 15:9. Same ch as 1 Tim 3:15.
3. Ans Nothing new in message of Acts of 1:3-4 + 28:31 (key of God) if also Acts 20:25

IV When was Rev. of Negative Given?

"Bullinger + like ilk"

Before Acts 28.

1. Ans Rom 16:25 - 3 yrs before.

2. Ans Rom 12:4-5

3. Acts 5:14 - added to head must be by vesp. of HS. } Good for moderates

4. " 11:22-4

5. 1 Cor 12. Can't be body of X acc to Bullinger.

6. 2 Cor 5:16-17

7. Gal 3:26-29

8. Gal 2: 14-18 Dist. bet. J + G. abolished at cross not in prison.

9. Jn 10:16 - shows Jn. rec'd rev. before P.

10. Acts 10:34.

V Further Examination of The Epistles.

VI Is ch. Bride of Lamb.

Yes. Exh 5.

Rw 19- Bride at marriage.

VII Bag + Supper for Present Age

Sat. Then + in all disp. p 57

Really discuss water vs Spirit bag. in various passages.

Justin ATR is saying ~~Concordant~~ Venn is "Puffe = Puffe" p 66



# THE MEANING OF APOSTASY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Charles C. Ryrie

Apostasy is a subject more often discussed than defined these days. Nevertheless since the church is warned against apostasy repeatedly, it is a proper subject for discussion. First, however, a definition and some distinctions are necessary.

## MEANING AND USAGE OF WORDS INVOLVED

Apostasia. The substantive occurs twice in the New Testament (Acts 21: 21  
12; 2 Thess. 2:3). The first instance concerns a departure from the teachings of Moses and the second refers to the eschatological apostasy. In the papyri it is used in the general sense of rebellion.<sup>1</sup> Liddell and Scott give the meaning as follows: "defection, revolt, especially in religious sense, rebellion against God, apostasy . . . 2. departure, disappearance. 3. Distinguishing . . . 4. distance."<sup>2</sup> Sometimes it was used of political revolt. It is important to note that all lexicographers give the primary meaning as apostasy or rebellion and the secondary meaning as departure, which latter meaning is only found in classical Greek unless 2 Thessalonians 2:3 be a Biblical exception.<sup>3</sup>

Apostasis. This is the older substantive from which apostasia is directly derived. In the LXX it was used interchangeable with apostasia and always with the meaning of revolt (usually religious rebellion). This uniform usage in the LXX would indicate that the word came into the New Testament era with virtually the technical meaning of apostasy and exclusive of the meaning departure.

Aphistemi. The verb to stand off, withdraw from, fall away, apostatize, occurs 14 or 15 times in the New Testament (Luke 2:37; 4:13; 8:13; 13:27; Acts 5:37,38; 12:10; 15:38; 19:9; 22:29; 2 Cor. 12:8; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 2:19; Heb. 3:12 and in some texts of 1 Tim. 6:5). These



references reveal two basic meanings of the verb: (1) a personal (or in most cases physical) departure. This is the meaning in all but three references. In most instances the record speaks of a physical departure of a person from one place to another. (e.g. Lk. 2:37; Acts 22:29). Sometimes it means departure from a course of action (e.g. Acts 5:38; 2 Tim. 2:19). (2) Apostasy or departure from the faith. This meaning occurs three times and in each instance the faith involved is true faith (Luke 8:13; 1 Tim. 4:1; Heb. 3:12). In the first reference the specific object from which people apostasize is the Word of God, the seed. In the second it is the true faith or Christian doctrine, and in the third it is the living God.

#### MEANING OF THE CONCEPT

The Instances. From the word study it is obvious that apostasy is a departure. To be specific this involves two questions: (1) departure from what? and, (2) what was the nature of the previous relationship which is broken by the departure? In no instance is the first question difficult to answer. In the five New Testament references where apostasy involves religion the thing or person from which the departure is made is quite clear in the text or context. The second question is the difficult one and has a direct bearing on one's definition of an apostate. Specifically, the question is this: Can an apostate have been a Christian believer? or, to put it another way, Can a Christian apostasize? In the parable of Luke 8 it seems clear that those on the rock who receive the Word with joy but who have no root and who in time of temptation fall away (apostasize) are not genuine believers, since the test for true faith is the production of fruit which was lacking in their cases. They did believe (v. 13) but this was not a fruit-bearing faith and therefore not a saving faith. In the second instance the false teachers of 1 Timothy



4:1 are said to "depart from the faith." Whether they ever possessed (in contrast to professed) the faith is not specifically revealed in that passage. However, the false teachers described by Jude (who were likely the first to fulfill the prophecy of Paul in 1 Timothy 4) are adjudged by Jude to be unsaved. He discerns them to be without the Holy Spirit (v. 19), and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His" (Rom. 8:9b). Those who are addressed in Hebrews 3:12 are not yet themselves apostates but are professing church members who are being warned against apostasy which stems from an evil heart of unbelief. The writer obviously believes that apostasy was a very real danger for some of these readers. This is most naturally understood in the light of the Lord's parable of the sower of Luke 8:4-15. In other words, there is always the possibility of a professing Christian renouncing that which he professed. He receives the Word but since it does not bear fruit in his life his experience proves to be merely self-regeneration rather than Spirit regeneration (cf. Jas. 2:26). The fact that these readers of Hebrews are addressed as brethren does not necessarily show that they were genuine believers, for how else could a writer address the people of the church(es) even though he recognized that there were unbelievers among them? Therefore, this warning concerning apostasy is to the professing element in this group(s). The apostasy of Acts is not pertinent to this discussion since it was quite proper to apostasize from Moses to Christ. The reference in 2 Thessalonians 2:3 shows that the departure will be from God and it will be by unbelievers (v. 12).

The Definition. Thus, apostasy is a departure from truth previously accepted and it involves the breaking of a professed relationship with God.

The Characteristics. Several other characteristics of apostasy are evident in these passages.

There is an objective, well-understood, and previously believed standard of truth from which the apostates depart. This is evident in the three references where religious apostasy is involved.

The departure is willful. The very word infers it and the actions and life of apostates show it (particularly 1 Tim. 4). Thus apostasy involves both the mind and the will.

The Distinctions.

An apostate is distinguished from a professed believer who upon discovery of further truth accepts it. The apostate would reject it, rather than accept it. The volitional element of rejection is not present in the professed believer such as those of Acts 19:1-6.

An apostate is not the same as a New Testament heretic. The noun heretic is used only one time in the New Testament (Tit. 3:10), but the adjective is used two times (1 Cor. 11:19 and Gal. 5:20). The word means a willful choosing for one's self which results in a party division. Heresy belongs to the works of the flesh which can and often are performed by carnal Christians (Gal. 5:20). Sometimes this may be used for good so that those who are not involved in heresy will stand out in the churches (1 Cor. 11:19). Toward a heretic the Scriptures really command a surprisingly lenient attitude--admonish twice, then ignore (Titus 3:11). Apparently, then, in New Testament times the heretic was a carnal Christian who espoused error which brought factions into the church. Thus he was distinguished from an apostate who is not a Christian and whose departure was from the complete body of Christian truth which put him outside the church, rather than leaving him part of a faction within the church. In today's usage, probably heretic and apostate would be used inter-



changeably by most people.

An apostate according to the definition, would be different from a carnal Christian in that the latter is "in Christ" (1 Cor. 3:1) while the apostate is not.

#### The Concept.

Of course the concept of apostasy is not limited to the references in which the word is used. The word study serves as a guide in forming the concept which may then be used in discovering other instances where apostasy is described. For instance, it is quite obvious that Satan is an apostate. He knew the truth and deliberately departed from it (Isa. 14:12-15). The Pharisees who repudiated the Lord, though not specifically called apostates, fit the characteristics (Matt. 12:24). The man of sin is the climax of human apostasy. He must have known the truth in order to be able to set up his counterfeit religion as he will do in the tribulation days (2 Thess. 2:4). Thus any discussion of apostasy should properly include not only the passages which use the words but other passages which fit the characteristics. Other examples of apostasy in the New Testament would be the many disciples that went back (John 6:66), Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1:19,20), Demas (2 Tim. 4:10), false teachers of the last days (2 Peter 2:20,21), and the apostate religious system of the tribulation days (Rev. 17).

#### THE PRESENT APOSTASY IN THE CHURCH

While each of the many manifestations of apostasy in both Testaments is worthwhile studying, we will limit ourselves to a consideration of three forms of apostasy which are eschatological. These considerations are not the distinctive teaching of dispensationalism though undoubtedly a dispensational approach to the Scriptures sharpens the outlook toward them and gives a perception of current events which is not seen by many

Christians. The first to be considered is the contemporary apostasy in the church.

#### Scriptural Basis for This Apostasy

Relevant Scriptures are 2 Thessalonians 2:3; 1 Timothy 4:1-3; 2 Timothy 3:1-7; 2 Peter 3:3-7; 2 John 2:18-23; Jude (esp. v. 19).

#### The Time of This Apostasy

The apostasy in the church is said to occur in the last days. Several expressions are used in this connection. In commenting on husterois kairois, latter times, in 1 Timothy 4:1 Ellicott says: "This expression, used only in this place, is not perfectly synonymous . . . with eschatais hemeraiis, 2 Timothy 3:1, 2 Pet. 3:3 (not Rev.), James v. 3 (comp. kairo eschato, 1 Pet. 1:5, eschatos chronos, Jude 18); the latter expression . . . points more specifically to the period immediately preceding the completion of the kingdom of Christ; the former only to a period future to the speaker, . . . In the apostasy of the present the inspired Apostle sees the commencement of the fuller apostasy of the future. In this and a few other passages in the NT kairos appears to be nearly synonymous with chronos . . . ."4 Thus the apostasy in the church could have begun, and indeed did, when the church began, but it will increase in scope during the church age and will climax at the end. This is evident, for John wrote of antichrists in his own day (1 Jn. 2:19) and Paul looked ahead to widespread religious and moral declension in a day future to his own (2 Tim. 3:1-7).

#### The Doctrine of This Apostasy

The Source of the Doctrine. The source of this apostate teaching is demonic. The doctrines which demons teach are those which the apostates teach in the church (1 Tim. 4:1). From 1 John 4:3 it appears that the demonic spirits directly empower the antichrists as well as supply them with the source material for teaching. This is corroborated by the fact



the future antichrist is given "his power, and his throne and great authority" by the dragon, Satan (Rev. 13:2).

The Substance of the Doctrine.

a. Denial of the doctrine of the Trinity (1 Jn. 2:22-23).

"A common 'Gnostic' theory was that 'the aeon Christ' descended upon the man Jesus at His Baptism, and left Him before the Passion. Those who held such a doctrine denied that 'Jesus was the Christ'; and in so denying, denied the union of the divine and human in one Person. . . . The denial of the personal union of true manhood and true Godhead in Christ involves the denial of the essential relations of Fatherhood and Sonship in the Divine Nature."<sup>5</sup>

b. Denial of the Truth of Incarnation (1Jn. 2:22; 4:3; 2 Jn. 7).

The true union of God and man in Jesus Christ is a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith and its denial is a characteristic of apostasy promoted by antichrists.

c. Denial of Christian liberty (1 Tim. 4:3).

This takes two forms--forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats.

d. Denial of the Doctrine of the Return of Christ (2 Pet. 3:4).

The apostasy is also characterized by a denial of the return of Christ. For instance, Fosdick said, "I do not believe in the physical return of Jesus" (The Modern Use of the Bible, p. 104). In the last days the reason for this denial is laid to belief in uniformitarianism--a principle in wide acceptance today.

The Morality of This Apostasy (2 Tim. 3:2-5)

1. Love of self. God is replaced by self.

2. Love of money. This follows from the first, for if self is loved primarily then the object of life will become the gratification of

selfish desires.

3. A spirit of pride.
4. Blasphemy
5. Disobedience to parents.
6. Lack of thankfulness.
7. Lack of holiness.
8. Without natural affection.
9. Unceasing enmity so that man cannot be persuaded to enter into a covenant.
10. Slandering.
11. Lack of self-control.
12. Savagery (the word means untamed, wild, and fierce).
13. Opposition to goodness.
14. Traitors.
15. Headiness (rash, headstrong, recklessness).
16. Highmindedness (the word literally means to raise a smoke).
17. Love of pleasure.
18. Pretense of worship but lack of godliness.

#### THE APOSTASY OF THE FUTURE CHURCH

The Meaning of Babylon (Rev. 17). Babylon has a threefold meaning in Scripture. Historically, it meant the great city on the Euphrates River or the kingdom. Prophetically, it also refers to a great city or commercial empire (Rev. 18). Symbolically, it apparently refers to some aspect of Roman power (1 Pet. 5:13). Its meaning in Revelation 17 has been disputed from the beginning of Christian interpretation. Older commentators have referred it to the evil world making little distinction between the viewpoints of Revelation 17 and 18. The city and its commercial activities is the main emphasis in this view. Others have



identified Babylon in Revelation 17 with Rome; that is, with the power of imperial Rome. This identification is based on the reference to the seven hills of 17:9. Since the time of the Reformation the majority of commentators have identified Babylon with the papacy.<sup>6</sup> Some commentators do not restrict the identification to the papacy but rather see in Babylon of Revelation 17 apostate Christendom as a whole. This is the view of most dispensationalists, but it is not restricted to dispensationalists.

Torrance, for instance, whose understanding of Babylon emphasized the "evil world" aspect of it nevertheless calls it "an imitation Kingdom of God, based on the demonic trinity."<sup>7</sup> However many details one may or may not insist on in the identification, it does seem clear that mystery Babylon, the mother of harlots is a vast spiritual power so ecumenical or world-wide (including the Roman Church) that it can enter effectively into league with the rulers and forces of the world, and so anti-God as to bend its force to persecute successfully the saints of God.

#### The Characteristics of Mystery Babylon.

Certain characteristics of Babylon of Revelation 17 are specified.

1. She is a harlot (v. 1). This obviously means she is unfaithful. She professes to be a system of religious truth and is in reality one of falsehood. This is confirmed by the name she assumes--"Mystery Babylon" (v. 5).

2. She is ecumenical (vv. 1, 15). She sits upon many waters which are explained as being peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.

3. She unites church and state under her sway (vv. 2-3). By granting her favors to the kings of the earth she is able to dominate the beast (v. 3) who is the head of the Western Confederation of Nations (vv. 12-13) and whose dominion coincides with that of the whore (13:7).



4. She is a "whited sepulchre" (v. 4). Outwardly she has great grandeur but inwardly she is filled with filthiness.

5. She is a federation (v. 5). Her name is "The Mother of Harlots" which seems to indicate that she is a sort of Mother Church incorporating a number of equally false religious systems. It is because of this designation that many understand that the apostate church will be meshed with the Roman Catholic system but not restricted to it.

6. She is a persecutor of the saints (v. 6).

7. She is destroyed completely by the beast (v. 16). This probably occurs at the middle of the tribulation period. It is described as a decisive and complete overthrow of the power of the apostate religious system.

Its Relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Babylon is a system of religion. The Roman Church is likewise. Any relation to the two can only be shown by demonstrating that Babylonian religion is presently practiced by the Roman church. This has been conclusively done by Alexander Hislop in his book The Two Babylons and need not be reproduced here. Its principal feature (stemming from Nimrod's wife Semiramus and son Tammuz) was that of the cult of mother-child worship. This appeared in one form or another in Babylon, Phoenicia, Pergamos, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. It came into the experience of Israel through Jezebel and is severely condemned by the prophet Jeremiah (44:16-19, 25). The emperor Constantine, who like the Caesars was the Pontifex Maximus introduced it into the Christian church when he sanctioned Christianity in 312. Pagan Romans kept right on worshipping their mother-child god and following the same rituals of Babylon under the name of Christianity. The similarities to that which is perpetuated by the Roman church are too clear not to see Rome as the pillar church in the final form of apostate Christendom (17:9,10).



Its Relation to the Contemporary Ecumenical Movement. With such a view of prophecy it is understandable why many evangelicals view with alarm the ecumenical movement in Protestantism to say nothing of the more recent softening of the Roman Catholic line. This is viewed as a likely basis for the final apostate church. Therefore, it is not surprising that evangelicals are wary of trends in this direction. For instance, The Sunday School Times reported on the recent Christian Education Convention of the NCC held in St. Louis, February 11-14, 1963 as follows: "Here was co-operation, of course, but the NCC's spokesman told pastors something more than co-operation among the churches is desired: there must be unity of being, "one fellowship, holding one faith, preaching one Gospel." This will mean not several congregations in the neighborhood, but one. Is it strange, in view of this, that evangelicals are wary of the ecumenical movement?"<sup>8</sup> The conclusion is well taken.

Some evangelicals today are inclusivists while others are very much separationists, and the dispensational element does not necessarily figure in the difference. However, it may figure in the motive in the case of separationists.

The arguments for inclusivism are several.

1. The example of the Lord preaching in the temple is often used (and likewise the earliest missionaries including Paul). However, such an argument has an illogical reduction; namely, how to explain the eventual separation of Christianity from Judaism.

2. Union is the summum bonum for Christian activity. Doctrine, therefore, has to be subordinated, for whenever a doctrinal divergence appears the disputants are encouraged to subordinate their differences and find the least common denominator in order that the union be not impaired. Union is important, but never on a slipshod basis. "We may



indeed be right and the other fellow wrong, but we dare not press our rightness to the point where his wrongness has not room."<sup>9</sup> The danger is that the church may stand for less and less in order to be more and more widely merged."<sup>10</sup>

3. Bigness is better than smallness. But is this always true? Our Lord's band of disciples was not very big or influential. Indeed, bigness becomes an end in itself. Of course per se there is nothing wrong with being big, but it does not guarantee that a better or more efficient job will be done (witness big government) and it usually kidnaps those who are involved in it. There is nothing like the attractiveness of a big church with its multitudinous boards and agencies--especially for officials who are in them. A worldwide church soon and easily becomes a dream and a goal. The spread of Christianity throughout the first century world was accomplished by the activities of local churches. The inclusiveness trends toward union and bigness are suspect for these reasons in the eyes of many Christians, and particularly so when doctrinal compromise is involved.

The picture of an apostate church is in the Scriptures and the picture of contemporary ecclesiasticism is beginning to coincide with it. It is this that makes some fearful not only of what is to come but also of the trends leading to it.

#### NOTES

1. Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, pp. 63-69.
2. Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 218-9.
3. Cf. E. Schuyler English, Re-Thinking the Rapture, pp. 67-71.
4. C. J. Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, p. 54.
5. B. F. Westcott, Epistles of John, p. 75.
6. Calvin, Institutes, IV, 2:12. Cf. Dante, Inferno, Cant. xix, 109-117 who referred it to the Rule of Rome under worldly and tyrannical popes.
7. T. F. Torrance, The Apocalypse Today, p. 115
8. The Sunday School Times, March 9, 1963, p. 2
9. "Are Denominations a Sin?" C. Stanley Lowee, Action, January 1963, p. 11.
10. Ibid., p. 17.



## A Critique of Dr. Charles C. Ryrie's Analysis of Ultradispensationalism

In a new book by Dr. Charles C. Ryrie of Dallas Theological Seminary, entitled Dispensationalism Today, the doctrinal position of the Grace Gospel Fellowship is discussed. There are fourteen pages used to present, discuss, refute and to expose certain basic weaknesses which he sees in the position. Dr. Ryrie does not go into any detail but he is to be commended for his restraint in using wild, hysterical language which excites the reader and rouses an emotional prejudice. He is factual and gracious when he acknowledges that the GGF position recognizes the clear distinction between Israel and the Church, Christ's Body and interpretes the Bible literally (p 192). These two points are considered by Dr. Ryrie as two of three marks of the "sine qua non" of Dispensationalism (pp 43-47). In spite of this he states "Dispensationalists believe that there are some very basic errors in the ultradispensational system and therefore they reject the system as diverse from their own and REJECT ANY IMPLICATION THAT THE TWO ARE SIMILAR" (p 198) (emphasis mine).

There are four areas where Dr. Ryrie believes there is basic weakness and failure in the GGF position. There are really only two, since the last three all deal with the interpretation of certain passages. In the next few paragraphs the writer of this paper would like to review the statements and conclusions of Dr. Ryrie.

The first "error" which Dr. Ryrie deals with is in the realm of a right concept of a dispensation. He approaches this problem by quoting his own definition of a dispensation. He neither quotes a definition nor even intimates what a member of the GGF might believe about a dispensation. In fact, Dr. Ryrie has taken the position of the covenant theologian, which to him is unfair. He had stated earlier in his book that a single sentence definition of dispensationalism is inadequate. He speaks rather about a complete definition and description of the concept (p 22). He has therefore become inconsistent and unfair thus far in his discussion. Dr. Ryrie has judged us according to his definition and not by a complete "concept" of a dispensation.

He states also in this area that we fail to recognize that the distinguishableness of a dispensation is related to what God is doing, NOT NECESSARILY to what He reveals at the time and LEAST OF ALL to what man UNDERSTANDS of His purposes (p 198). But earlier in his book, Dr. Ryrie gives three primary characteristics of a dispensation and all three were necessary then. Please note these characteristics: 1) a change in God's governmental relationship with man, 2) a resulting change in man's RESPONSIBILITY, 3) corresponding REVELATION necessary to effect the change. Therefore, it DOES matter what God reveals at the time of a change in dispensation. It DOES matter what man understands of His purposes. How could God expect man to obey and be responsive if there was not revelation? How could man be a faithful steward without understanding this new thing God now requires? The answer is obvious. Dr. Ryrie is inconsistent and unfair in his deduction here.



Dr. Ryrie believes that the day of Pentecost was the beginning of the Body of Christ. He states that whether Peter and the others "understood" it then DOES not determine the beginning of the dispensation. But if there are at least two parties involved in a dispensational arrangement- God and His steward or stewards- it is imperative that God REVEALS His will and that the steward KNOWS and UNDERSTANDS His Lord's delegated duties.

There is a question asked in this section which I would like to answer. Dr. Ryrie asks : Is something distinguishably different being done since Paul came on the scene that was not being done from Pentecost to the time of Paul? (p 198) My answer is yes. Please consider the following points.

- A) There were NO Gentiles saved until after the conversion of Paul. This is true inspite of the interpretations that claim the so-called great commissions found in Matt. 28:19,20; Mk. 16:15,16 ;Lk. 24:46-48; John 20:21; Acts 1:8 with the emphasis on "all nations", "all the world", among all nations" and "unto the uttermost part of the earth" gave Peter and the others a world-wide ministry. There is certainly something distinctive about the fact that they did NOT go to any Gentile until after Paul. They did not go to one Roman soldier stationed in Jerusalem.
- B) Peter states in Acts 15:7 that God chose him to be "the" mouth to speak to the Gentiles. There were not 12 mouths commissioned, only one. This did not happen in Matt. 28:18-20 but after Paul's conversion. James agrees in Acts 15:14 by stating how Peter ministers to Gentiles and it is the FIRST time this has happened.
- C) Until this vision of Peter's in Acts 10, he considered it "unlawful" for him to come to those of another nation. (Acts 10:28) Peter at this time considered himself a "Jew" rather than some other name as believer or disciple. Peter goes to Cornelius on the basis of the vision, NOT any Great commission. Peter receives here no rebuke for not having gone to them before.
- D) Those in Jerusalem who heard of Peter's Gentile ministry rebuked him and became satisfied on the basis of his explanation. It was then, not in Acts that they said "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life".(Acts 11:18) Their conclusion seems to say "and not before".
- E) Those of the persecution were "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only". (Acts 11:19b) These are strange ways for those who seemingly have had a world-wide ministry from Acts 1.
- F) Paul, in his first missionary journey, is the one who opens a "door" of faith unto the Gentiles.(Acts 14:27) God opened the door of course, but He used Paul as His steward and DOORMAN.



G) As far as the record in Acts goes, Peter's ministry to Cornelius is the First and Last ministry of ANY of the Apostles to any Gentile. This is distinctive in relation to the Apostle Paul.

H) Paul alone makes the claim of being an "Apostle of the Gentiles"  
Acts 14:27 with Romans 11:13, I Tim. 2:7 and II Tim. 1:11 bear this out.

In Dr. Ryrie's final statements in this section he seems to think that we hold a theory of a Gentile-Body of Christ, and our position is wrong because there are Jews in today's church. If this is his logic, then the Body of Christ did not begin before Paul because there were NO Gentiles in the "church" before Paul. It is scriptural and sensible to call the believers before Paul "a Jewish church".

The second area which Dr. Ryrie deals with is "Erroneous Exegesis of Key Passages". It is too bad that there is nothing original given here. If one would read Dr. Ironside's booklet Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth and Erich Sauer's The Triumph of the Crucified, the same material could be read. There is no fresh approach to their problem.

Of all the six passages listed in this group, only Ephesians 3:1-12 could be listed as a "key passage". We are said to be artificial and unnatural in dealing with Gal. 1:13; I Cor. 15:9; and Phil. 3:6 where Paul mentions persecution of the church of God. Two other passages in Acts are mentioned- Acts 5:11,14; 11:24 where believers are said to be added to "the Lord". To Drs. Ryrie and Ironside, this must mean :added to the Body of Christ.

The word "church" is found 24 times in Acts. To say each instance refers to the Body or to a local church which is part of the Body of Christ is foolish. The nation Israel is called a church in Acts 7:38, but they are not the members of the Body of Christ. In Acts 19:32,41 a mob of rioters is called a church. But they are not in the Body of Christ even though Luke calls them a church twice. In Acts 19:39 a governmental body is called a church, but this does not make them part of the Body. A church is mentioned in Psalms 22:22 according to Hebrews 2:12 but this is Israel, not the Body of Christ. The word church cannot automatically make the group named a member of the Body of Christ.

When Paul persecuted the believers in Acts 8 and 9, it does not hold true that they were members of Christ's Body Church just because Christ said "Why persecutest thou me?" (Acts 9:4) If this is true, it proves too much. In Matt. 25:31-46 Jesus gives a parable about the sheep and goat nations and their relation to the ones called "my brethren".



The sheep nations are admitted into the kingdom on the basis of their treatment of Christ. When they fed, gave food, clothed, sheltered, visited and comforted the brethren, Jesus said "ye have done it unto ME". According to Dr. Ryrice, these brethren must be in the Body of Christ because the sheep nations ministered to CHRIST while ministering to the brethren. This is good material for a post-tribulational rapture when dealing in such deductions.

It has already been shown that the believers before Paul were all circumcised disciples. Since there were NO Gentiles saved before Paul, the church then could quite naturally be called a Jewish church. There is more FORGE used in making the Body of Christ exist before Paul than Dr. Ryrice lets on. How could you have the Body of Christ exist before the salvation of Gentiles? By way of definition Paul says the Church is a JOINT-BODY, Jews AND Gentiles having equal blessings in the Gospel. You Cannot have a joint-body in the historical record of Acts until AFTER the conversion of Paul. Remember, only Jews were added to the Lord in Acts 5.

In the second part of this section Dr. Ryrice quotes from Erich Sauer for a statement on Ephesians 3:1-12. Even Sauer says that Paul had a special task of proclaiming the mystery among the nations. But what is so special about Paul if he preaches the same as the 12? If they all had the same commission and calling, what could be special? Sauer also says that Paul is the chief herald of the gospel to the peoples of the world. How could this be if they were all ministers to the world with the same truth? Since Dr. Ryrice has quoted Sauer to speak for his position, let me quote from Dr. Scofield's Bible notes.

"The Epistles of the Apostle Paul have a very distinctive character".  
 "Through Paul alone we know that the church is not an organization but an organism, the body of Christ; instinct with His life, and heavenly in calling, promise, and destiny. Through him alone we know the nature, purpose, and form of government of local churches, and the right conduct of such gatherings. Through him alone do we know that 'we shall not all sleep' that 'the dead in Christ shall rise first' and that the living saints shall be 'changed' and caught up to meet the Lord in the air at His return." "Paul converted by the personal ministry of the Lord in glory, is distinctively the witness to a glorified Christ, Head over all things to the church which is His body, as the Eleven were to Christ in the flesh, the Son of Abraham and of David." "In his writings alone we find the doctrine, position, walk, and destiny of the church" (pp 1189,1252)

Four times these notes make reference to the knowledge which Paul knew "alone". These words of course did not come from O'Hair, Stam or Baker but from the Scofield Reference Bible.



In Dr. Ryrie's third section he deals with other passages that speak of the mystery. Two passages are mentioned in the Gospel of John: 10:16 ; 13:-16:33. He says that Jesus taught the truth of the mystery to the Jews in John 10. It was because of this teaching that there was a division among the Jews.(10:19) The Passage has more "sense" to me when we look at it from the standpoint of the kingdom of Christ. Jesus called His people "the lost SHEEP of the house of Israel". (Matt. 10:6; 15:24) Those who trusted Him were called My sheep. Now Jesus tells the crowds(not just disciples) that He has "Other" sheep. Those other sheep are the nations who will share in the Kingdom with Christ and Israel(Matt. 25:31-46) They are the blessed of the Father. The Kingdom was also prepared for THEM.(25:34)

If Jesus taught the mystery in John 13-16, then He had to be teaching it in John 6:56 because the "I in you" and the "Ye in Me" is taught. "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him". Here the teaching is not restricted to disciples . He taught this in a synagogue.(6:59)

Dr. Ryrie says that the church then started on Pentecost. He further states, "That they may not have understood it we do not question, but the dispensation began when God began to do His distinguishably different work, not when or if ever man understood it."(p 203) Dr. Ryrie again becomes inconsistent with the words of another chapter. In discussing the Law of Moses in chapter two, he states that the law was a new thing introduced at that time. "It also means that the responsibility upon mankind was conformity to that code- again a new responsibility, for prior to the giving of the law man was obviously not held responsible for something that did not exist".(p 37) The revelation of the mystery must be understood in order for God's stewards to carry out His will and Purpose. When God changes relationship, He makes it KNOWN through a revelation. Man is not responsible for something which does not exist. Man's responsibility changes through this revelation which effects the change.

If Jesus taught as much about the mystery as Drs. Ryrie and Ironside and others claim- why all the admission that the Apostles did NOT understand. IF Jesus taught about this age in Matt. 13; about the church in Matt. 16 and 18 ; about the mystery in John 6,10 and 13-16; about the church age during His forty days before ascension and went back to glory after this- why were they still so ignorant? Why would Jesus leave the message of the Gospel in the hands of men who DID NOT UNDERSTAND God's purposes. And Dr. Ryrie says it doesn't matter if they ever did.

NO !! God does not do business like this. Every dispensation started with God's people fully aware that there was a change. Adam knew it when he sinned. Abraham knew when he started for the land of Promise. Moses and Israel knew when they went "under Law". THE reason Dr. Ryrie has Peter all mixed up is because the revelation was not yet given until Paul. Peter lived, ate, worshipped and preached like a Jew because that was all the revelation he had.



The final point which Dr. Ryrie discusses, is the "baptism 'in' the Spirit". He contests that we give the Scripture an artificial understanding by making two baptisms: one for Pentecost and one for Paul in I Cor. 12:13.

The word 'saint' does not always have the same people of God in view in all the Scriptural references. The word 'gospel' does not mean the same good-news in every occurrence in the Bible. The word 'church' does not mean the Body of Christ in every instance. It should not be shocking to find that the word 'baptism' does not refer to water all the time or that there are more than two baptisms relating to Christ and the Holy Spirit but distinct from each other.

If these two references are identical, then Dr. Ryrie has proved too much. He now has an Old Testament prophet teaching the truth of I Cor. 12:13 and Eph. 3:6. There does not remain any mystery to the mystery in other ages. John the Baptist is now the prophet of the Body of Christ.

Since John preached to the nation Israel only, we also have the problem of robbing Israel of her baptism and giving it to the church. Dispensationalists try to keep the distinct promises and blessings of the church and Israel separate. Dr. Ryrie has given the theme of John's preaching to the church of another dispensation. He leaves the baptism of fire for Israel and gives the baptism of the Spirit to the church. He becomes as guilty in interpretation as the Covenant theologian who takes the blessings for the church and leaves the curses for Israel.

Sound Bible teaching should not make these promises of Israel refer to the Body of Christ. John came on the scene to make way for the Messiah of Israel, not to begin or introduce a new revelation. He came to prepare for the filling up of prophecy, not lay the ground work for a new dispensation, distinct and different from the plans God had to and through the nation Israel. The ministry of Jesus was "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24). John's calling and ministry was also to Israel. John baptized that Christ should be made manifest to ISRAEL.

*Jerry W. Steubi*  
 314 Lake Hills Rd.  
 Michigan City, Indiana  
 46360