

19308



Paul & Philip Gaunt Library

Christ and His Kingdom

A Review

of

R. H. Boll

by

R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol

Co-authors of "Sound Doctrine"
Volumes 1, 2, 3, 4.



LAMBERT BOOK HOUSE
Box 4007
Shreveport, Louisiana 71104

Magnolia Bible College Library
Kosciusko, Ms. 39090
LAMBERT BOOK HOUSE
Box 4007
Shreveport, Louisiana 71104

239
Nhi

7220

CONTENTS.

Boll's Program

Theories

Second Coming,

Boll's Imminency,

Intimation of Another Seed,

Kingdom to Another Nation,

Kingly Rights of Christ Jesus,

House or Tabernacle of David.

Israel and Palestine.

The Gospel Age.

The New Covenant and the Gentiles.

Daniel 8: 44.

Apostles on Thrones.

The Great Tribulation.

Some Guesses are Harmful.

The Book of Revelation.

Program of Boll's Theory

It may help the reader as he reads these pages to have in mind an outline of Brother Boll's theory of God's plan. He presents his ideas in such a disjointed and disconnected way, that it is difficult at times to follow him, or make out what he declares the Bible teaches. After reading and re-reading, and reading again and again, we have concluded that he would have us believe that God's original plan had to be modified to meet the emergency of Israel's rejection of Christ.

Here seems to be the original plan as Boll presents it:

A nation should be developed out of Abraham's seed.

Canaan was given them for an everlasting possession.

Christ was to come of the seed of David, sit on David's throne, and, through Israel as a sovereign nation, all Gentiles would be blessed.

There was no provision in the program for the Gentiles to be blessed except through national Israel.

But Israel rejected Christ, and made a revision of the plan necessary. So God offered salvation to the Gentiles as a means of provoking the Jews to jealousy. Now this coming in of the Gentiles independent of national Israel, was, according to Boll, a new development, of which the prophets knew nothing. Of this he does not leave us in doubt. Hear him: "The acceptance of the Gentiles into the church—into the favor of God as joint-sharers of the blessings of Israel's Christ—was a most terrible perplexity to all believing Jews. It was in fact a *mystery*. It had never been revealed that such a thing would happen. (Eph. 3:4-6.) That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; *that* had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed. (K. 63.) Yet God knew that Israel would reject Christ, but did not reveal it to the prophets, nor through them to the people. Had Israel accepted Christ, he would have begun his reign on David's throne and the Millennium would have been ushered in, and the Gentiles would have been blessed through national Israel.

But since Israel rejected Christ, his program now, beginning with Israel's rejection of Christ, seems to be:

The development of a ruling class by means of the gospel through the church. When the full count of the Gentiles is come in, that is, all

No one who believes the Bible to be a revelation from God doubts that Christ will come again. Throughout Christendom disciples of Christ talk and sing of the coming of Christ; and throughout the civilized world on the first day of the week they assemble to partake of the Lord's Supper, an institution through and by which they show their faith in the promise of their Lord's coming. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26). The religious people with whom Brother R. H. Boll is affiliated, and for whom he has been preaching for the past quarter of a century, are among those who observe the Lord's Supper, and yet he says: "I have made the statement—and I am not unwilling to make it again—that the professing church has virtually lost its hope of the second coming" (SC. 10). "The thought of his coming has faded out of the minds of men. . . . In fact, I believe that the whole present-day theology is unfavorable to the doctrine of the coming of Jesus Christ. Most theology has no room for it" (SC. 11).

Brother Boll does the great body of Christians an injustice; and we resent such charge which carries with it the thrust that Christians are ignorant on this point, or infidels and hypocritical pretenders, as to his coming. In observing the Lord's Supper Christians "proclaim the Lord's death till he come." Are Christians ignorant of this fact? So they are, if Boll's statement be correct; or, if they know the Bible teaches that in partaking of the Lord's Supper they "show his death till he come," but do not believe it, to that extent they are infidels and hypocrites in professing to believe it.

But hear him further, "I have made the statement—and I am not unwilling to make it again—that the professing church has virtually lost its hope of the second coming. If I could prove that she has ceased to expect Christ's coming again, it will be apparent that she has lost this hope. If I could prove that she has ceased from the desire of his coming, I could prove that hope is gone. If I could prove both, I should prove it twice over" (SC. 10). Certainly if she does not expect his coming she does not "hope" for it. He says, "If I could prove." Yes, "if"! If he could prove what he charges against those he calls his brethren he would prove that they do not believe "one of the cardinal doctrines of the New Testament," "without which the gospel is not complete" (SC. 3). "If" I could prove! Brother Boll, your "if" is neither a doubtful "if," nor is it an argumentative "if." It is an impossible "if," for it is impossible for you to prove that which is not true, and it is *not* true "that the professing church has virtually lost its hope of the second coming." Boldly we affirm that you cannot name one local congregation, or even one member of a congregation of the church of Christ, that does

not believe that Christ is coming again, and hopes for his coming. Surely you do not mean to intimate that your knowledge of the congregations for which you have labored for the past twenty years has led you to make such charge. We are wondering if your charge against those you call your brethren is not for effect, and offered as a groundless excuse on which you seek justification for your sermons and writings on your peculiar doctrine.

We would be charitable towards Brother Boll, and in such an effort are led to declare: Brother Boll has a peculiar view of what the second coming is; and he means that the church does not hope for what he calls the "Second Coming." We take it that he means that those who do not hope to see his program carried out have no hope of the Lord's coming. What is meant by "Second Coming" in Boll's theology? Does he mean by such term the coming of Christ at the last day, when the saints on earth and the righteous dead will be rewarded, and the wicked consigned to their eternal punishment—the day of the general resurrection? Indeed, no! In his theology there are different "stages" of the "Second Coming," and it takes the sum total of the "stages" to constitute the "Second Coming." Boll says Christ comes "for his saints," returns with them to heaven, where with him they abide for some years, and then "he comes with his saints"—these are the two stages, and it takes both of them to constitute the "Second Coming." To illustrate his idea, he says, relative to his trip from Louisville, Ky., to Dallas, Texas: "If, for example, I were coming to Texas and some of my friends had met me in Texarkana, and then I came on to Dallas with them, you would not say that that was two comings. So, the first stage of the Second Coming is when the Lord Jesus comes down and receives his own up. Then, after certain affairs have been attended to, he comes with them and the whole world sees his coming" (SC. 21). It is strange to us that Boll cannot see that his trip to Dallas does not illustrate his point; for in the "stages" of what he calls the "Second Coming" he has Jesus coming for his saints, and with them returning to heaven, abiding there some years, and then returning—"coming with his saints." Whereas, in his illustration he was met by some friends in Texarkana, and came right on to Dallas with them. When his friends met him in Texarkana, had he returned with them to Louisville, and remained several years, and then come to Dallas, his illustration would have fit, but there would have been two comings.

We would have you not overlook the fact that in Boll's theology, the Lord comes to "receive his own up. Then, after certain affairs have been attended to, he comes with them." When he comes to "receive his saints"—that is not the coming of Jesus, it is "the first stage of the

Second Coming." Then there is to be the appearing of the Lord Jesus "with his saints"—that is the "second stage of His coming." Between these two "stages" of the second coming there are "certain affairs" which must be "attended to," and the "certain affairs" must be attended to before there can be the second "stage" of the second coming. All this, and much more, Boll includes in the "Second Coming." If you do not believe what Boll says about the "Second Coming," then you do not believe in the second coming, neither do you hope for the "Second Coming." Boll said so! But it happens not to be so.

Brother Boll's Imminency

Brother Boll says relative to the second coming of Christ, that the early Christians "were hoping for him and they were looking for his return in the days of the apostles" (SC. 10).

The apostles *did not* expect Christ to come during their life on earth! If they believed that Christ would come during their life on earth, upon what did they base their faith? Such faith could not rest upon inspired testimony. If they wrote that Christ would come before they died, their statement to that effect was not an inspired statement, for it is a fact that he *did not* come. If the apostles or any of the other early Christians were "hoping for him" and were "looking for his return in the days of the apostles," such was not based on a correct interpretation of any statement made by an inspired man, for it is a fact that he did not come. If God led the early Christians to be "hoping for him" and to be "looking for his return, in the days of the apostles," then he led them to hope for, and to look for, that which did not take place. He who teaches that God led the early Christians to hope for and to look for the coming of Christ during the life of the apostles on earth, is guilty of declaring that God led his people to hope for, and to look for, that which did not take place. Did God deceive the early Christians? So he did if R. H. Boll is correct.

The interpretation of any passage written by an apostle, or any other inspired man, to the effect that he taught that Christ would come during the life of the apostles on earth, is a false interpretation. The fact that Christ did not come during the life of the apostles on earth is proof.

He who interprets any statement of the apostles as an indication that they expected Christ to come during their life on earth is forcing a false interpretation on such statement. This is true, or it follows that the apostles, if they expected Christ to come during their life on earth,

did not base their expectation on inspiration. But R. H. Boll declares that the early Christians were "hoping" and "looking" for Christ to come "in the days of the apostles." It must follow then that his interpretation is false.

That Peter was not expecting Christ during his life on earth is shown by the following: "I think it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me. Yea, I will give diligence that at every time ye may be able after my decease to call these things to remembrance" (2 Pet. 1:13-15). In these words Peter told his brethren that he would die; and that before his death he wished to put them in remembrance of certain things. Peter was not "hoping" for, nor was he "looking" for, the coming of Christ during his life on earth. This we know for he told the brethren plainly that he was to die. If they believed what Peter wrote to them, they also believed that Peter would die. Brother Boll declares that the early Christians were "hoping" and "looking" for the coming of Christ "in the days of the apostles." It is certain that if these Christians to whom Peter wrote believed what he said, they did not believe Christ would come during the life of Peter, and it is just as certain that if they were "hoping" for, and "looking" for, the return of Christ in the days of the apostles, they did not believe what Peter wrote.

After Jesus was raised from the dead he declared to Peter that Peter would die. Hear the language of Jesus to Peter: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. Now this he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God" (Jno. 21:18, 19). Just so certain as Peter believed what Jesus told him, just that certain is it that he believed he would die before Jesus came again; unless, indeed, Peter had the view that he would be killed after Jesus came! If Peter believed what Jesus told him, if he believed what he wrote to those who had "obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," he DID NOT hope for, nor was he "looking" for, the return of Jesus during his life on earth. But Peter DID believe that he would die before the Lord would come again, for he declared that the Lord "signified" this to him (2 Pet. 1:13-15). In the face of this Boll declares that the early Christians were "hoping" and "looking" for the coming of Christ "in the days of the apostles."

Jesus distinctly told the apostles that they were to be killed. "Then shall they deliver you up unto tribulation, and shall kill you" (Mt.

24:9). So certain as they believed the statement of Christ, just that certain is it they expected to be killed. Who but one obsessed with an over-weening desire to establish a theory would declare that Christ led them to believe that they would not die before he came again?

To the elders of the church at Ephesus, Paul said, "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts 20:29). Now, here are definite things which Paul said would come after his "departing": grievous wolves were yet, after his departing, to enter that church, not sparing the flock; and even some of those elders would apostatize and lead some astray. Paul said he knew these things would come—then he knew that the second coming of Christ would not be till after these evils and departures in that church had developed. If these elders came to Paul thinking Christ might come at any moment, they returned knowing that some other things must come first.

The Thessalonians and His Coming. There were some at Thessalonica who had concluded that his coming was imminent. In his second letter Paul sought to disabuse their minds: "Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand; let no man beguile you in any wise: for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition" (2 Thess. 2:1-3). His expression, "or by epistle as from us," shows that he thought it possible that they received their impression from his first letter. If that were so, he wanted them to understand that they had drawn a wrong conclusion, for that coming of the Lord in which we are gathered together unto him will not be till other things happen. To make the phrase, "the day of the Lord is just at hand," to read, "the day of the Lord is now present," does not help Boll one particle. The coming of the Lord here spoken of by Paul is that coming in which we are gathered together unto him (V. 1), and Boll says we are gathered unto him at what he terms the "first stage" of his second coming. The "first stage" is the coming that Boll would have us believe is always imminent. But Paul says this coming "and our gathering together unto him" will not be, "except the falling away comes first, and the man of sin be revealed." Boll would have it that this is the "second stage" of his coming, but we do not see how he could have overlooked the fact that this is the coming in which we are gathered together unto him. Surely some of Boll's admirers have had independence of thought

enough to notice this, and to wonder why he should so pervert this passage.

Had Boll lived in the days of the apostles, and taught what he now teaches relative to the coming of Christ, disturbing churches as he does now, the foregoing language of the apostle to the church at Thessalonica should have been sufficient to silence him.

Paul desired to die that he might be with Christ. That Paul was not expecting Christ to come to earth during his life on earth is shown by the fact that he desired to die that he might be with Christ. He who does not expect a thing cannot hope for it; and since Paul did not expect to be with Christ before he died, he did not, and could not, hope for the coming of Christ while he lived on earth; and was not, therefore, among those Brother Boll declares were "hoping" and "looking" for the coming of Christ "in the days of the apostles." But hear Paul: "But I am in a strait betwixt the two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better: yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake" (Phil. 1:23, 24). In this passage Paul contrasts "to depart and be with Christ," with "to abide in the flesh." To depart was for him to "be with Christ"; but for him to "abide in the flesh," was for him NOT to depart, and for him not to "depart" was for him not to be with Christ. Paul did not hope for the coming of Christ during his life on earth, and any interpretation placed on the writings of Paul to the effect that Paul taught that they were "hoping" and "looking" for the coming of Christ "in the days of the apostles" is a false interpretation.

John did not expect Christ to come during the life of Peter. So certain as John believed what he wrote, so certain as he believed what Jesus said, just that certain is it that he did not expect Christ to come to earth during the life of Peter on earth; and, not expecting such, he could not have been "hoping" and "looking" for such, as Boll declares he was! Are we certain of this? Just as certain as that the word of God is inspired; as certain as that John believed Jesus. He who declares that John expected Jesus, or was "hoping" and "looking" for him, during the life of Peter on earth, disbelieves the word of Jesus, or else has not sufficiently studied the Bible to attempt to teach God's word, or is blinded by a theory. Do you ask on what we base such strong statements? The apostle John wrote in clear, unmistakable language, declaring that Jesus said Peter was to die. Jesus said to Peter: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and I walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. Now this he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God" (Jno. 21:18, 19). John wrote this

language of Jesus, declaring that Peter was to die. It is certain then that John did not teach the disciples to look for the coming of Christ during the life of Peter; and it is just as certain that Peter did not teach the early Christians to hope for or look for the coming of Christ during his life on earth, for he affirms that Jesus "signified" to him that he was to die.

Exhortation to the Church at Smyrna. John was the last apostle to die. When he wrote the book of Revelation he was about one hundred years of age, and was the only apostle on earth. In the letter to the church at Smyrna, written by John, Jesus said some of the Christians in Smyrna would be cast into prison; but he exhorts them: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Rev. 2:8-11). Who but him who is blinded by a false theory, or obsessed by a desire to attract attention to himself by teaching something which will place him in the limelight, will declare that these Christians in Smyrna were "hoping" for, and "looking" for, Jesus in the "days of the apostles"? In addition to telling these saints in Smyrna that some of them would be cast into prison, he adds that if they were faithful throughout their lives, they would receive the crown of life. Would it not be interesting to hear Brother Boll tell just how these Christians in Smyrna were "hoping" for him, and "looking" for him, in "the days of the apostles"?

Many brethren have been carried off their feet by the teaching of R. H. Boll wholly because of the confidence they have in him. Boll has featured doctrines which have not been much discussed by disciples of Christ, and many of the brethren were not conversant with the teaching of the Scripture on such subjects. As brethren learn the truth about these subjects the teaching of Boll, on such subjects, which has caused trouble in some congregations, will be rejected, and Boll will be discredited as a teacher.

Hope of Second Coming

The hope of the second coming with Brother Boll is a desire and expectancy of his coming momentarily. Hence, if we do not desire and expect him to come today, yea, this moment, we do not hope. If he is right in thus contending, the national restoration of Israel, and the glorious reign—the Millennium—is not a matter of hope, for in Boll's program this must follow the "Great Tribulation," and cannot be momentarily expected. What, then, comes of the much vaunted hope of Israel?

If Boll is right as to what hope is, his program will kill all the hope a pious Jew might have; for, if expectation always carries with

it the idea of imminency, how can Israel hope for national sovereignty, seeing it is not imminent? For, be it remembered, Brother Boll holds that the dead saints must be raised, and, with the living saints, caught up to heaven, the world power developed, the great tribulation come, and Christ come with his saints, the battle of Armageddon occur, before the Jews can have national sovereignty. If Boll is correct, a proper understanding by them of this matter will remove it from the domain of imminency, and therefore destroy present hope.

But Boll is wrong as to expectancy. True, it is an element of hope, but does not necessarily and always carry with it the idea of imminency. We may hope for a thing when we know it cannot come at the moment. (See 1 Cor. 16:10, 11.) Paul says we plow in hope (1 Cor. 9:10). Certainly one who sows and plows in hope, does not expect the harvest to come at the moment. He knows the harvest is months ahead, yet he plows in hope. We may lend, hoping to receive (Lk. 6:34). Certainly no one makes a loan expecting the return at the moment. According to Boll, if the payment is deferred to a stated time the hope is gone.

Paul says he hoped for a resurrection of the just and the unjust (Acts 24:15). If the unjust are to be raised at the end of the Millennium, a thousand years after the resurrection of the just, according to Boll, and if hope includes the idea of momentary expectancy, how could Paul hope for their resurrection?

Paul wrote to Timothy, "hoping to come unto thee shortly" (1 Tim. 3:14). Certainly Paul did not mean to say that there was such an uncertainty about the time of his going that he was likely to start the moment he wrote. Paul hopes to send Timothy shortly to the Philippians, "So soon as I shall see how it will go with me" (Phil. 2:19-23). Here is hope, yet a period of time, described by Paul as "shortly," and "so soon as I see how it will go with me," intervening between the hope and the thing hoped for. Evidently he was waiting to see how his final trial in Rome would terminate. Here then was hope without any expectancy of immediate realization. Hoping for a thing, then, does not mean we must be expecting our hopes to be realized any moment. Indeed one may do a thing hoping to benefit generations unborn.

To prove that the apostles and early Christians hoped for the coming of Christ is far from proving that they expected him at any moment. The passages, therefore, that Boll quotes to prove that, because they hoped for his coming, they therefore expected him momentarily, are wide of the mark. They simply prove what no one disputes. The element of imminency must be in the circumstances or nature of the thing hoped for—it does not necessarily inhere in the word.

Brother Boll puts some stress on the fact that the early church was

looking for the coming of Christ (Tit. 2:11-13). But that by no means proves that they were momentarily expecting him. Peter says: "We look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13). Now this new heaven and new earth, according to Boll, is to follow the Millennium. Peter says, "We look"—looked for something which could not possibly come till at least a thousand years had rolled round. We trust that even Brother Boll is hoping and looking for a new heaven and new earth, though, if he is right, they are at least more than a thousand years in the future. In his tract, "The Second Coming," page 10, he says: "If I have to wait till the world is converted, and then another thousand years till Christ comes, I might as well stop teaching about his coming." Well, according to his theory, he will have to wait more than a thousand years for the new heaven and new earth, but we observe that he has not quit teaching about them. But he cannot say that he looks and hopes for the new heaven and new earth without destroying all the arguments he makes on "hoping" and "looking" to prove the early Christians momentarily expected Christ to come because the scriptures say they hoped and looked for his coming.

It seems to us that his theory concerning the restoration of Israel to Palestine makes it impossible for him, with his idea of hope, to hope for the second coming of Christ. In his diagram in his tract, "The Second Coming," he has the "great tribulation" immediately following the "first stage" of Christ's second coming, at which time he says the saints, both living and dead, will be caught up with the Lord. But at the beginning of this great tribulation, consequently at the time Jesus comes, Boll has unbelieving Israel in Jerusalem, and their temple rebuilt. The return of the Jews to Jerusalem and their rebuilding the temple, therefore, according to Boll, must precede the "first stage" of the coming of Christ. All this would require several years should they begin now. In other words, if Boll is correct, we cannot expect Christ to come, even in the "first stage" of the second coming, till Israel returns to Jerusalem and rebuilds the temple. There is neither indication nor proof that this will ever be done. With his idea of hope, how can he hope for a thing which his theory defers till some indefinite time? How can he be consistent and declare that the early Christians were hoping for the coming of Christ during the days of the apostles? When a man advocates a false theory he is certain to involve himself in difficulties from which he is unable to extricate himself.

Ek.

Brother Boll says, "Uniformly, when the resurrection of God's

people is spoken of with reference to the other dead, it is a 'resurrection from the dead'—Greek, 'ek,' 'out of,' or 'from among,'; a distinction which the Revised Version preserves. (See, for example, Lk. 20:35, 36.)" (R. 64.) But "ek" does not occur in verse 36. So the resurrection of God's people, when spoken of with reference to other dead, is *uniformly* a "resurrection from the dead" in Lk. 20:35! Uniformly—in one place! And the Revised Version preserves this distinction in one verse! It is true that "ek" is used in several places where the resurrection of one person is referred to, as, for example, in several passages which speak of the resurrection of Christ. But no fair minded scholar would try to establish a rule from that, for the simple reason that "ek" is left out of some passages. For examples of the absence of "ek", see Acts 17:32; 26:23; Ro. 1:4. In Acts 4:2 we find the resurrection "ek" the dead where it appears that the resurrection of all the dead is referred to. This seems to upset Boll's criticism.

As to "exanastasis" in Phil. 3:11 meaning "out-resurrection," Thayer gives no such idea—"a rising up; a rising again, resurrection." The noun form is found in the New Testament only in this place. The verb from which the noun is derived is defined by Thayer: "*To make to rise up, to raise up, to produce:* sperma, Mk. 12:19, Lk. 20:28. *To rise in an assembly to speak:* Acts 15:5. If Boll's idea is in the noun, it should also be in the verb from which the noun is derived. But any one can see that in Mk. 12:19 and Lk. 20:28 the brother was not to "out-raise" up seed to his brother. We are persuaded that there is not a shred of foundation for Boll's criticism. But it is a pre-millennium argument, though Thayer, a pre-millennialist, gives no support to the argument in defining the words.

In further support of the idea he says, "When the Lord Jesus returns, the dead in Christ shall *rise first*—that is, before anything else happens. Manifestly then the resurrection of the rest of the dead *must* be after that—how long after that we are not told here." (R. 64.) "Manifestly" Boll is wrong, for Paul is not here comparing the time of the resurrection of the saints and sinners, but another point entirely. When Jesus comes will the living saints go up before the dead are raised? Paul affirms not, that the living saints "shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep," but "the dead in Christ shall rise first"—that is before the living saints ascend—then all shall ascend together. Should saints and sinners be raised at the same moment, it could still be said that the dead saints will arise before the living saints ascend. It is a shame for a man to so twist words as Boll does here, and he would not do it had he not so much love for his theory.

Coming "for" Saints, and "with" Saints

Brother Boll contends that Christ is coming "for" his saints, at which time they will be caught up to meet him in the air, and go with him as he returns to heaven, where they remain for some years, and then the Lord comes "with them."

There is no excuse for Brother Boll to make such a mistake as he does at this point. It is a fact that when the Lord comes the saints will be caught up to meet him; but there is not the slightest intimation that they then go with him to heaven and there abide for some years, and then come "with him" at the beginning of the Millennium.

Paul declares that we are to be caught up "to meet" the Lord (1 Thess. 4:17). The phrase "to meet," used in this passage, has a very definite meaning in the New Testament usage, as is seen by reference to the only passages where it occurs. It is found in the following passages:

"Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, who took their lamps, and went forth to meet (eis apantesin) the bridegroom. . . . But at midnight there is a cry, Behold, the bridegroom! Come ye forth to meet (eis apantesin) him" (Mt. 25:1, 6). The virgins went forth "to meet" the bridegroom and to accompany him to the marriage chamber. They did not go forth "to meet" him and then make a journey with him to some distant place from which the bridegroom came, but to accompany him on his journey to the objective point to which he had started.

When Paul was making his trip to Rome the brethren came out to welcome him. "The brethren, when they heard of us, came to meet (eis apantesin) as far as the Market of Appius and the Three Taverns; whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage" (Acts 28:11-16). The saints in Rome went out some forty-three miles "to meet" Paul and accompany him into the city.

In each of these instances of the use of the phrase "to meet" (eis apantesin) it is seen that it was to accompany the one met on his way to the place to which he had started. It was not to run off with the person to the place from which he came.

There is one other place in the New Testament, and only one other, where this word is found, and that is 1 Thess. 4:17: "Then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet (eis apantesin) the Lord in the air." Not to accompany him in his return to heaven but to join him in the journey, and accompany him to the place to which he is coming. When the Lord comes "for" his saints, they will meet him, and come with him. The Lord does not return to heaven and then come again!

Not only will the living saints be caught up to meet the Lord, but also those who have died, whose bodies have been buried, and whose spirits are "with Christ," will he bring with him (1 Thess. 3:14). This is just what Paul said: "But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him" (1 Thess. 4:13, 14). All this fuss Brother Boll makes about Christ coming "for" his saints, taking them off to heaven for several years, and then coming "with" them is pure balderdash! In the same passage where Boll imagines he finds the "first stage" of the Lord's second coming, in which he comes for his saints, it is specifically said that he brings them with him.

The Kingdom

It is a little hard to follow Brother Boll in all he says (and does not say) on the kingdom question. We have felt in reading him that he has not fully revealed himself—that he purposely withholds his convictions on some points which cry for declaration. But we have no desire to do him an injustice—to do so would be worse than an injustice to ourselves—but the reader will appreciate that it is hard for one who desires to be just to be fully satisfied with his efforts in reviewing an author when some of the prominent and essential features of his program are presented in a more or less veiled form. But, in making this review, we must certainly deal with the essential features of Boll's program, no matter how obscurely he presents them, for, otherwise, it would be no review at all. And if, in reading this review, the reader should feel that we have not accurately represented Boll at some point, let him remember that our failure to so represent him, if indeed there is a failure, is due to a failure on Boll's part to present his theory clearly rather than to an effort on our part to be unfair.

It is sometimes hard to tell what he is driving at. For example:

"When John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness of Judea and announced 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' he used a phraseology which was already common and current among the Jews, and which was perfectly understood by all." He then adds: "They did not indeed understand *everything* the scriptures had foretold concerning the kingdom; and it will be seen that in certain particulars they had erred in their conception" (K. 33). Brother Boll declares that Jesus offered Israel the kingdom, but she rejected, and then he says: "Jerusalem had missed her chance. What would have happened had she un-

derstood and seized upon her opportunity?" (K. 43.) So Israel understood, and did not understand.

See how he presents himself in the following: "The kingdom of the Son of God's love into which we were translated is the realm in which the Lord Jesus Christ exercises sway and rule" (K. 66). From this it seems he has Christ reigning now, but the following sets that idea aside: "So long as Satan's throne is on the earth Christ is not exercising the government" (K. 71). Speaking of the church in Pergamum (Rev. 2), he says: "They lived in Satan's headquarters: where Satan dwells, where Satan's throne is" (R. 15). And then, speaking of the second coming of Christ, he says: "From that day on he rules as king" (SC. 27). And then again hear him: "Some say the Lord is reigning today. You are right. He is reigning in the hearts of those who have willingly obeyed him" (SC. 27). But listen again: "At his coming he will exercise the governmental authority of the kingdom" (K. 43).

Note the following: He has Israel, disobedient and rebellious, at Jerusalem, with the temple rebuilt at the beginning of the great tribulation, See R. p. 40. At that time the nations will fight against Jerusalem (SC. 27). And yet in his tract on "The Kingdom of God" he has Israel gathered during the Millennium. "In that day Jehovah gathers the remnant of his people from the four corners of the earth" (K. 31).

We cannot locate from Boll, the time of Israel's final rejection. He quotes Lk. 19:41-44, and adds, "Jerusalem had missed her chance" (K. 43). That seems final. Yet he says, "The point where he ceased to deal with Israel nationally is found at the close of the seventh chapter of Acts" (SC. 31, 32). And still he adds another date, "The last hope was staked upon the attitude of the Jews in Rome" (K. 63).

Boll's program leaves us in darkness as to who is our king. Christ is king now, but will not begin to reign till he comes again. By way of illustrating this point he recounts that David was anointed king quite a time before he began to reign. During this time David was king in name, but not in fact. He ruled over no kingdom. From this we conclude that in Boll's theory Christ is now king in name, but not in fact. In fact, he so declares: "As it would be put in legal language, the throne was his *de jure et potentia*, at first; and became his *de facto et actu* afterward; that is, it is his by right and authority at first, and in fact and act afterward" (K. 61). Yet he says: "Some say the Lord is reigning today. You are right. He is reigning in the hearts of those who have willingly obeyed him" (SC. 27).

If this is true, who is king now? Of course Jehovah rules throughout the whole universe. But it seems to us that even Boll will not say

that God's rule over the kingdoms and worlds is the same as ruling the church. This would obliterate any distinction between the church and the rest of the things over which Jehovah rules, and make all of them parts of the same kingdom. And yet, that seems to be Boll's theory; for, in speaking of the throne where Jesus now sits, he says: "That is *the Father's* throne—the eternal, universal, absolute rule over all, which no created being can exercise or share" (K. 72). "So God has a kingdom, and he is the Sovereign king. In this universal, all-embracing sense, the kingdom of God has always been, is now, and shall be, world without end" (K. 9). In that kingdom Boll says Jesus sits with the Father on his throne and reigns. See K. 72. This, then, makes the church only a component part of that universal kingdom, which always has been and always will be. This leads us to inquire: In what sense has the "little" stone been cut out of the mountain? In what sense then is the church distinct from that kingdom, and in what sense did a new kingdom begin on Pentecost? and in what peculiar sense are Christians in it? It would seem then that the "little" stone cut out of the mountain remained a component part of the mountain out of which it was cut. This leaves us in a maze of doubt as to what nature of kingdom we are and as to how this kingdom can have a distinctive existence. Again, since Boll says the kingdom began at Pentecost, in what sense did it begin then? Were not the disciples as much a kingdom, according to Boll's theory, before Pentecost as after Pentecost? If Boll always knows what he is driving at, he has a faculty of sometimes keeping others from knowing.

Nebuchadnezzar's Dream and Daniel's Beasts

Brother Boll says that the events set forth in Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's interpretation thereof have not been fulfilled. The fourth kingdom was Rome. Boll says Rome suffered not even a tremor from the church, but later enlarged her borders and finally perished in the natural course of events (K. 13, 17). But something causes the downfall of every nation, and Boll fails to tell us what brought about the downfall of Rome. He says that Nebuchadnezzar's dream showed that a world kingdom is to be destroyed by a sudden and violent impact, as a great catastrophic event (K. 14). But we are not sure of this. In fact, Daniel's interpretation seems to indicate otherwise. God's kingdom was to break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms. The Septuagint says, "all other kingdoms." The stone was to break in pieces and consume. And Rome was first broken in pieces, before finally being destroyed. There is no trace of the Roman kingdom today. Rome was not only broken in pieces, but she was destroyed. Again, Brother Boll says, and correctly we think, that the four kingdoms represented by the four beasts in Daniel 7 are the same as the four governments of Nebuchadnezzar's image. What, then, of the fourth beast of Daniel 7?

It was represented by a beast more terrible than the others. This beast had ten horns, and another beast came up which "plucked up by the roots" three of the ten horns. Here is the explanation of the fourth beast: "The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon the earth, which shall be diverse from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces." "Out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise." So it was with Rome, she divided into ten parts. Another shall arise which shall put down three of the ten kings. Brother Boll represents the fourth kingdom as a federation of ten kingdoms; whereas Daniel says the ten kings came out of the fourth kingdom. In other words, the fourth and last universal kingdom was broken into ten pieces.

But Brother Boll says "Rome is gone" (K. 17), but he says, "we have had her equivalent ever since" (K. 18). Boll is rich in groundless assertions! Who is so blind as he who asserts that there exists today, and has existed ever since the fall of the Roman kingdom, her equivalent? We know nothing today in human affairs, or since Rome's days, that is her equivalent. Certainly Brother Boll did not point out that which is the equivalent of Rome. Such an attempt on his part would have been amusing, were it not for the fact that it would have excited pity.

He says that the great beast of Revelation is identical with the fourth beast of Daniel, seventh chapter, and yet he says that the beast of Revelation is similar in some respects to all four of Daniel's beasts (K. 75). But this makes it unlike either, for these points of similarity are not found in Daniel's beasts. The fourth beast of Daniel "was diverse from all the beasts that were before it." It seems to us that in calling attention to the likeness of the beast of Revelation to the beasts of Daniel, he thereby proves it not to be the fourth beast of Daniel, for it was diverse from all others. Here are some points of unlikeness:

Beast of Daniel	Beast of Revelation.
1. Diverse from other beasts.	1. Like all the beasts.
2.	2. Seven heads.
3. Ten horns.	3. Ten horns.
4. Great authority.	4. Universal authority.
5. Another horn rises after the ten.	5.
6. Eleventh horn diverse from the ten.	6.
7. Eleventh horn puts down three horns—"kings."	7.
8. Eleventh horn speaks words	8. The beast blasphemes

against the Most High.	against God.
9. Eleventh horn wears out saints.	9. Beast overcomes saints.
10. Thinks to change times and laws.	10.
11. Continues time and times and a half time.	11. Continues 42 months.
12. Out of the beast of Daniel ten kingdoms come.	12. Beast of Revelation the federation of ten kings.
13.	13. Was worshiped.
14.	14. Received death-stroke.
15.	15. Death-stroke healed.
16.	16. A woman, a harlot, sat upon this beast and upon her head was written, Babylon.
17.	17. To buy or sell must have mark of beast.
18.	18. His number is 666.
19.	19. Turns against and destroys the harlot.
20.	20. The woman is the great city which reigns over the earth.

Between these beasts there are some points of similarity, but the foregoing contrast shows them to be very unlike in some features. The blank spaces in each column shows one to possess features not possessed by the other. From the fourth specification on, under the description of the beast, or universal kingdom, of Daniel, the beast passes out of view, and is followed by the kingdoms developed from the universal kingdom. Nothing like this in Revelation. We are at a loss to see how any one can make them the same.

But the fourth kingdom disappeared. "Rome is gone." How, then, can the "little" stone smite it? "Rome was, and is not, and shall be," says Boll. He says it is like a river which sinks and then rises. But the illustration does not fit—the river which sinks has a continuous existence, and is not diminished one whit even during its passage through the subterranean channel. Not so with Rome—Rome ceased to be. Boll is a great inventor, and apt in illustrating. Rome perished, and Boll invents another. But he cannot make it the same. He can astonish his followers like a sleight-of-hand performer can delight and astonish a crowd of children. "Now look; here is Rome. Look again; Rome is gone. Look again; here it is—same old thing." Wonderful, isn't it?

What Does Boll Mean by the Kingdom?

One of the great puzzles in reading Boll is to find out exactly what he means by the Kingdom as foretold by the prophets, and what it will be in the time in which he says Christ will sit on David's throne in Jerusalem. We will let him express himself in his own words:

"The next power and dominion to hold sway over the earth, according to Daniel, is the kingdom of God. And that kingdom of God and its coming is not represented as a development here below, but as an irruption from above, 'without hands,' that is to say, not of man's device nor of human agency. The kingdom enters in by a judicial and destructive act from on high" (K. 16).

"That this kingdom of God over Israel would extend its authority over all the nations of the earth is declared in many and plain prophecies. . . . Jerusalem once in ruins, now glorified (Isa. 4:3, 5), is seen as the city of the great king. From the ends of the earth come the nations to pay homage to her and to entreat the favor of her Sovereign. . . . Since they were first carried captive, until now, they have never again *possessed* their land. . . . But they shall possess it. . . . They cover every phase of the realization of the great promise made to Israel, involving their supremacy and sovereign place in all *the earth*. These things explain the nature of the national hope of Israel; which though in temporary abeyance, is not made void" (K. 31). "At his coming he will exercise the governmental authority of the kingdom, appointing his faithful servants to rulership and executing vengeance upon the adversaries. In this latter phase which is here seen to be deferred until the Lord's return from heaven, we recognize again the features of the Old Testament hope and promise, the very hope the disciples cherished, and which however was not to be realized just yet" (K. 43). "As son of David he was to be the Messiah, the promised king of Jacob, who should rule the nations with a rod of iron, whose righteous sway should extend from the river to the ends of the earth; in whose days the righteous should flourish, and abundance of peace till the moon be no more" (K. 47). "Upon his return he gives the faithful servants share in the rule, and executes vengeance upon all rebels" (K. 51). In the kingdom when established they will not have the Lord's Supper. "The Lord's Supper, however, is not a promise, or reward; but a means of grace until the promise is reached" (K. 53). "Israel had had a kingdom—had lost it—had promise in their scriptures that in the Messiah's day and by his hand it should be *restored* to them" (K. 56). "Still less does he say that the throne of David—which always meant simply the divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the 'house of Jacob,'

Luke 1:32, 33—was now spiritualized and removed to heaven" (K. 59). Spiritual now—outward then, he says. "In the epistles the same phenomenon of the kingdom now present in spiritual, and the kingdom yet future in outward manifestation, and its future world-rule, is found" (K. 66). "But his own throne, the Messianic throne of promise, which is peculiarly his as the Son of man, the son of Abraham, the son of David—that he shares with his overcoming church" (K. 72). "Jerusalem will be his glorious resting-place, and the center of his world-government in the age to come" (K. 80). Jews to be the evangelists: "The 'throne of David' which he occupies is the throne over Israel—the restored and exalted nation. Through her the word of the glorious King will go out into all the world; and nation after nation will come from afar to declare its subservience and allegiance to the king of Israel, and to bow in submission to him and to Israel, his nation through which light and blessings goes into all the earth. . . . Christ then, having descended and having taken his rightful throne over Israel, extends his regal authority through them over all the earth" (K. 83). The Jews will be the police force: "We must distinguish between government—the exercise of authority in maintenance of law and order—and salvation. The former must be enforced" (K. 84). "The maintenance of law and order, is not salvation or conversion. The hearts of men are not reached by outward rule" (R. 66). "Christ then . . . extends his regal authority through them over all the earth" (K. 83). Feast of tabernacles to be observed: "As to the requirement to go up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles, let that stand as it is. It will be a national requirement in the Millennial earth" (S. C. 47).

The foregoing is Brother Boll's conception of the kingdom promised by Daniel (2:44), and the other prophets, and which he says will be in existence in the Millennium.

But Brother Boll says the kingdom of God exists on earth now, and that Christians are in it. The following quotations from Brother Boll will enable you to get an idea of what he calls the kingdom now in existence.

"The statement that 'Dan. 2:44 has not yet been fulfilled' does not deny that the stone which smites the image upon its feet already exists." And "has been forming throughout the present age" (K. 20). "The kingdom's insignificant beginning." "The kingdom concealed and hidden in the world." He declares that we now live in a "new and unexpected aspect" of the kingdom. "These parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king's rejection and absence from the world" (K. 38). He speaks of this present as "the church

dispensation" (K. 39). "Of the church they knew as yet nothing. . . . It meant an assembly, . . . called out and called together. The Lord spoke of this assembly—whatever it was, they did not know as yet—as a building which he would erect upon the rock, not upon Peter the man, personally, but as the representative of this great confession"—"Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God" (K. 39, 40). "The present spiritual aspect, as the kingdom shares the incognito of the king (1 Jno. 3:2) in unworldly walk, humiliation, rejection, and all the stringent spiritual requirements in order to final acceptance" (K. 41). "But this declaration he follows again with emphatic teaching on the necessity of present self-abasement and self-sacrifice" (42). The new "nation," in which there is no national distinction—"This 'nation' is of course none other than the new spiritual people whom the Lord is until yet gathering from all kindreds and tribes and peoples and tongues; who constitute the church, the body of Christ, 'where there cannot be Greek or Jew'" (K. 44). "The present, spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom" (K. 46). "As to the gradual growth of the kingdom . . . there is indeed a progressive development, an automatic growth. . . . In all stages, from seed to harvest, the growing thing is the kingdom" (K. 50). The image is to be struck on the feet by the stone, reduced to fragments, and swept away like the chaff, and "then (and not till then) the stone grew and became a mighty mountain and took possession of the earth" (SC. 22). "This is the stone which has been forming throughout the present age" (K. 20). "The Nobleman goes into the 'far country' to receive his kingdom and to return. This is the stone, 'cut out without hands'" (K. 55). "The Lord Jesus has never yet exercised the authority of David's sphere or rule." "But neither is that saying that he now sits and reigns on David's throne. David had been anointed God's king long before he actually sat upon his rightful throne over Israel, suffering indignities and persecution at the hands of Saul, and rejected at the hands of the people" (K. 60). "The kingdom as now existent in its spiritual phase" (K. 65). "The kingdom of the Son of God's love into which we were translated is the realm in which the Lord Jesus Christ exercises sway and rule. In it we now are. In it we hold citizenship. . . . 'Our citizenship is in heaven.' . . . The characteristics of this government—the essential spiritual features of this kingdom—are 'righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit'" (K. 66). "So long as Satan's throne is on the earth Christ is not exercising the government" (K. 71). The throne Christ now sits on "is the Father's throne—the eternal, universal, absolute rule over all" (K. 72). "In connection with the parable of the householder, the Lord Jesus announced to them that the kingdom of God would be taken away from them and

given to a nation that would bring forth the fruit thereof (Mt. 21:43). This 'nation' is of course none other than the new spiritual people whom the Lord is until yet gathering from all kindreds and tribes and people and tongues: who constitute the church" (K. 44).

Can Boll's kingdom of the Millennium and the present kingdom be the same? The distinguishing features of each are so different that we are unable to see much, if any, resemblance, much less are we able to discover the necessary marks of identity. Even though they had certain marks of resemblance, they would not necessarily be identical. Absolute likeness as between two black-eyed peas does not establish identity. Certainly then there can be no identity between two kingdoms so radically different. Here are some of the radical differences between Boll's kingdom that now is and his kingdom of the future: The present kingdom had an insignificant beginning—the future kingdom to be ushered in with great power and destructive force.

The present is concealed and hidden, spiritual—the future manifested outwardly, a world-kingdom. There is abasement and self-sacrifice for us now—glorious reign then.

No national distinction now—then Jews will stand out as sovereign rulers over the Gentile nations.

The form of the kingdom now is spiritual, veiled and suffering—then we will execute vengeance, suffering, on others.

Different thrones: Christ on Father's throne of universal rule now—will sit on David's throne then.

We are subjects now—rulers then.

We are citizens now—we, together with the Lord Jesus Christ, will be the reigning Christ then.

Kingdom now uses moral power—physical force then.

Citizenship in heaven now—in Jerusalem then.

Love, joy, peace, now—rod of iron then.

Spiritual sacrifices now—Feast of Tabernacles, with animal sacrifices, then.

Here are a few of the points of difference between Boll's kingdom of the present and that of the future; and, with these striking differences, it seems to us that no amount of reasoning can prove them to be the same. The one we are now in is not so much as a "vestibule" of the one that is to be established! This one seems to be only a training school in which are being developed rulers for the next. But Brother Boll is wrong as to some of the features of the kingdom now in existence.

We are not sure that we know what he means by the kingdom now being concealed and hidden; but, from the connection in which he finds

the expression, we conclude that he had in mind the leaven, which the woman hid in three measures of meal till all was leavened (Mt. 13:33). But he misses the point of comparison. The kingdom of heaven is not like the leaven in that both are hidden, but in the fact that the influence, the principle, the power, of both permeates the suitable material around them—the kingdom spreads by contact as does the leaven. Each permeates and influences only that material which is suitable to its peculiar power and nature.

We cannot indorse his idea that the church is built on Peter, whether "upon Peter the man, personally," or "as the representative of this great confession." In either case he has it built on Peter. That contradicts 1 Cor. 3:11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Savior of men, as he now is and not as he will be in some supposed future age, is the foundation of the church. Upon him as he now is, and upon none other, our faith and our hopes are based. Neither does Eph. 2:20 militate against this idea; for as the foundation of a house is that upon which the house rests, so the foundation of the apostles and prophets (the New Testament prophets) is that upon which they, as well as all other Christians, are builded. The church of the Lord Jesus Christ would have existed had Peter never lived, but it could not exist without the Lord Jesus Christ.

We are unable to determine what he means by the kingdom sharing the incognito of the king (K. 41). "Incognito: With (one's) identity concealed; esp., in a capacity other than one's official, or under a name or title not calling for special recognition."—Webster. That is its meaning as an adjective or adverb. As a noun it means, "One appearing incognito; also, state or disguise of such a one." Boll uses it as a noun. Does he mean that the identity of Christ and his kingdom is concealed, that they are now under an assumed name or in disguise to hide their identity? Such is the significance of the word in its common use. But in what way that word can be rightfully applied to Christ and his kingdom we are utterly unable to see. True, he refers to 1 Jno. 3:2 as his proof, but that text has no bearing on what he says. John says it is not yet made manifest what we shall be; but to say that we do not now know what we shall be in our glorified state is far from saying that the kingdom is now disguised or under an assumed name. However, according to Boll's idea of what the church now is, it does appear that we are under an assumed name while masquerading as a kingdom. Boll seems to think the kingdom is now in disguise, for he speaks of the present spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom. "Veiled form"—perhaps that is his incognito, the kingdom in disguise. And yet we know

as little about what he means by the "veiled form of the kingdom" as we do about his "incognito" form. We think the veil is over Boll's eyes so that he is unable to correctly discern and clearly describe what he thinks he sees.

Brother Boll draws a dark picture of the church as it is and also as Christ designed it to be, "in unworldly walk, humiliation, rejection, and suffering, and all the stringent spiritual requirements." These terms he uses in contrast with what he supposes shall be. "Stringent spiritual requirements"—stringent is a strong word. It seems to fit the feelings of those only who serve grudgingly. Jesus says, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." The truth is that life is a burden at best, and Jesus proposes to so fit us for living that the burden is lighter. Jesus relieves us of the burden of sin and guilt, and fills us with new strength, new energy, new purposes, and new hopes, which make the burdens of life correspondingly lighter. But Brother Boll, like other pre-millennialists, is pessimistic as to present conditions. And pessimism becomes such a habit of thought with pre-millennialists that Brother Boll projects his pessimism into the future and sees the Millennium, like other dispensations, end in a failure.

Intimation of Another Seed

Brother Boll says, touching John's preaching: "The announcement of the kingdom thus became the basis of the call to repentance. In it also is found the first covered intimation that God would reject the fleshly seed of Abraham if they failed to repent and would raise him up another people" (K. 35). "If they failed to repent!" How in the name of logic and respect for one's own word can Boll make such statement. Hear him, "To Isaac himself God repeated the substance of the promise made to his father: the land promise, the oath, and the universal blessing; to be fulfilled to his posterity—a sure and unchangeable promise: for it was based on the fact that Abraham *had obeyed* God's voice; which fact was in the past and could never more be undone" (K. 22).

But did the Jews repeat? Boll says that God offered the Jews the kingdom when he came, but they rejected it; and their opposition to him, the promised king, became so great, their hatred so intense, that it finally culminated in his death at their hands. Did God know they would not repent, that they would not accept Christ? Boll says that it was foreseen that they would reject him. "But it is sufficient for us to know that Jerusalem *did* reject her King and failed of her opportunity; and though the offer was made to her in good faith, her rejection of the invitation was foreseen, and made a factor of God's larger plan.

Undoubtedly she *might have* realized her ancient promise then; but God knowing that she would in no wise hear, had laid his plans accordingly from of old" (K. 44). If Israel had accepted Christ and "realized her ancient promise," what would have become of God's pre-arranged plan?

God made an "unchangeable promise . . . based on the fact that Abraham *had obeyed* God's voice; which fact was in the past and could never more be undone" that Israel should have the kingdom; but the "unchangeable promise," which was based on the fact that Abraham had obeyed God's voice, was later made conditional, Boll says, on their repentance. And if they did not repent, then God would raise up another people and give them the kingdom. But they did not repent! So then God rejected them. What more needs be said? One must needs be a mental acrobat to follow Boll, and in addition thereto have a convenient forgettery.

The Kingdom Given to Another Nation

"The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Mt. 21:43).

Brother Boll says the kingdom promised to Israel was universal sovereignty over all the world. Now was that sovereignty taken from the Jews and given to another nation? To what nation?

Brother Boll says: "This 'nation' is of course none other than the new spiritual people whom the Lord is until yet gathering from all kindreds and tribes and peoples and tongues; who constitute the church, the body of Christ" (K. 44). Does he mean to tell us that this universal sovereignty was taken from the Jews and given to the church? He said the Jews might have had this kingdom while Christ was here, but they rejected it, and the Lord gave it to another. This universal sovereignty has been taken from the Jews, but has it yet been given to that other nation? Boll would not say that; for the church, he says, does not yet possess the kingdom. That will be in the Millennium. Then the church reigns. If that is what he means, then what becomes of all his talk about universal sovereignty for Israel? If Boll is correct, the kingdom will not be Israel's kingdom then; for the Lord took it away from them and gave it to the church. He cannot from his point of view say that this "new aspect of the kingdom" is that which was given to another nation, for he gave to this other nation that which he took from the Jews. Certainly he did not take one thing from Israel and give an entirely different thing to the church. If he took universal sovereignty from Israel at that time, as Boll declares, then he gave universal

sovereignty to the church. That leaves Israel with no hope that her "ancient hope" will ever be realized. Then what about that "unchangeable promise" upon which Boll says Israel based her hope of universal sovereignty, and which, he says, will yet be realized? If the Lord takes this universal authority from the church and gives it back to the Jews that will spoil Boll's program for the church to be the rulers. If universal authority remains with the church, that spoils his program for the universal sovereignty of national Israel. He cannot save himself from the predicament by saying that there will be two universal sovereign powers, for such cannot be. If it could be so, that would spoil his theory that universal sovereignty was taken from Israel and given to the church; for in that impossible combination Israel would share equally with the church in that which had been taken from her and given to the church. Neither can he escape by saying that before the Millennium Israel will be converted to Christ and thus become identified with the nation, or church, to which universal sovereignty has been given; for in that case Israel would lose her race distinction, for in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile.

But no matter what becomes of the "ancient hope of Israel," this hope for universal sovereignty, Boll holds on to his theory that he will share with Christ in a universal reign on earth. He says: "When the Lord Jesus comes, those that have well and faithfully used their talents will receive rank and rating according to the diligence they have put into their work. The one man who had made ten pounds received jurisdiction and control over ten cities, in the parable of the 'pounds' (Lk. 19). The other man, who made five pounds, received authority over five cities, but the third, who had hidden his pound, was rejected altogether" (SC. 17, 18). Possibly Boll hopes to rule over Nashville, Tennessee, as one of the cities of his jurisdiction. Out of this hope perhaps he gets some consolation. But Nashville and Texas are rather far apart for him to rule over both.

Kingly Right of Christ Jesus

In a chapter headed "Kingly Rights of Jesus Christ" (K. 20), Brother Boll undertakes to show that the promise made to Abraham, and David focussed on Palestine, and will find their fulfillment in an earthly reign in that land by Jesus Christ, "upon whom God could and would confer all he had promised to Abraham" (K. 22). He disregards the fact that there are two promises in Gen. 12:1-3, making no distinction here between the natural and the spiritual. God did promise to make a great nation of Abraham, but not one scripture referred to by Boll

shows that God through national Israel would bless the world. And here is the crucial point in Boll's theory. It is true that God says, "I will bless them that bless thee"; but if this proves that national Israel would bless them, it proves also that national Israel would be a curse to some; for he says, "Him that curseth thee will I also curse." The facts are, God would bless those favorable to Israel, and curse his enemies—there is nothing in the passage about ruling nations. That "in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" refers not to national Israel, but to the Lord Jesus Christ, is shown conclusively by Paul's reference in Gal. 3. "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16). Brother Boll would have us believe that Paul applies this to Christ, without denying the collective significance of the term "seed," as comprising many individuals. But as concerning this scripture, that is the very thing Paul was careful to do—"He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Here he emphatically denies it includes the many, but only the one. Thus Paul limits the term "seed" to Christ, and his emphatic statement that in this passage it has not the collective significance knocks Boll's theory higher than a kite. There is not one intimation that Christ was to inherit the land of Canaan, and over it rule.

The promise to give Abraham's seed the land of Canaan was literally fulfilled: "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; Jehovah delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Josh. 21:43-45). In the farewell address of Joshua to Israel, he said: "And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, not one thing hath failed thereof. And it shall come to pass, that as all the good things are come upon you of which Jehovah your God spake unto you, so will Jehovah bring upon you all the evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which Jehovah your God hath given you. When ye transgress the covenant of Jehovah your God, which he commanded you, and go and serve other gods, and bow down yourselves to them; then will the anger of Jehovah be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from

off the good land which he hath given unto you" (Josh. 23:14-16). "And I gave you a land whereon thou hadst not labored, and cities which ye built not, and ye dwell therein" (Josh. 24:13). Jehovah fulfilled his promise to Israel, and brought them into the land; not one promise failed, not one. If it be insisted that the land covenant was to be an everlasting covenant, we reply, God specially declared that his promise relative to the land was conditional—"When ye transgress the covenant of Jehovah your God, and go and serve other gods, and bow down yourselves to them; then will the anger of Jehovah be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given you." Boll insists that they were to have the land as a permanent possession. But he himself says that since the Jews were carried into the captivity of Babylon they have not really possessed the land (K. 31). Here then is a 2500 year gap, and how much longer the gap, we know not, in which the Jews have not permanently possessed the land. If the promise required a permanent possession then it has failed. But God did not fail, but Israel did—they broke the covenant. A broken covenant is no longer a covenant. Brother Boll fails to recognize the conditionality of the promise, just as do those who deny the possibility of apostasy. Paul quotes the Lord as saying, "They continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord" (Heb. 8:9). Boll says God continued to regard them and his covenant. Paul says that because they broke his covenant he regarded them not. Most people would rather believe Paul. God brought Israel into the land, and then they were carried away into Babylonian captivity, and brought therefrom into the land again; but since that time there has not been one promise of the bringing of the Israelites into the land of Canaan. There is not a promise in the New Testament relative to the Israelites to yet possess the land.

So far as we can see rebellious Israel has never been a blessing. Since their dispersion they have been a hiss and by-word. During this time nations have risen and fallen, families have come and gone, to whom national Israel has never been a blessing. Has God's promise to bless all nations, all families, through Abraham's seed failed? If you make it refer, as does Boll, to national Israel through all ages, it has.

In Christ the middle wall, or partition, is broken down, so that now in him there is neither Jew nor Greek—all stand on equal footing. Nationally the Jews are anathema from Christ, from God, as the Gentiles had always been (Ro. 9:1-5; Eph. 2:11, 12). In olden times the Gentiles as individuals might come into covenant relationship with

Jehovah (Ex. 12:48, 49; Num. 15:14-16). So may both Jews and Gentiles now.

As the natural seed of Abraham the Jews have forfeited their rights. A new order, a new race, has taken their place. The national seed have been rejected, the natural branches broken off (Ro. 11:17-20).

The seed of Abraham were originally counted through Isaac, the child of promise (Ro. 9:6-8); they are now counted through Jesus Christ, the promised seed. "Know therefore that they that are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham" (Gal. 3:7). "That upon the Gentiles might come the blessings of Abraham in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:14). Paul shows conclusively that the promise to bless the world through Abraham was fulfilled. Read Gal. 3:13-16. Jesus died "that upon the Gentiles might come the blessings of Abraham," and this Jesus who died is the seed of Abraham through whom the world was to be blessed. In Christ, then, this promise to Abraham finds its complete fulfillment. All the inheritance comprehended in this promise made to Abraham finds its fulfillment in and through the Lord Jesus Christ, and national Israel is not even considered by Paul as having any further part in it. Read Paul's allegory in Gal. 4:21-31. Hagar, the bondwoman, "answereth to Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem that is above is free, which is our mother." Jerusalem was the capital of national Israel. What became of national Israel with her capital, Jerusalem? "Cast out the bondmaid and her son: for the son of the bondmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." So then, it is plain that whatever may yet be in store for the church, national Israel shall have no part with her. In Paul's allegory Jerusalem answers to the bondmaid, and the Jew to her children. Both the mother (Jerusalem) and the children of the bondmaid (the Jews) were cast out, and shall not inherit with the freewoman and her children. That settles the fate of national Israel, and shows that spiritual Israel, the church, becomes the heir. Paul had no rosy picture for the future of national Israel. "For we of the circumcision . . . have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil. 3:3). Israel was the very point Paul had in mind. Boll teaches the Jew to have great confidence in their fleshly connections, their national prospects. Paul had no such confidence, but rebuked certain for glorying in the flesh. In order to establish the fact that Jesus was the promised seed of Abraham, it was necessary to know him after the flesh. Yet so far as his present and future was concerned, Paul took not that into account, "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more" (2 Cor. 5:16).

There is not one New Testament promise that Jesus will reign over restored Israel in the city of Jerusalem. The Old Testament promise

concerning Christ and his kingdom find their fulfillment in the present order of things. Christ is now king, his kingdom is here; and its citizens, in sustaining his laws and in bringing people into subjection to his authority and in every way extending his kingdom, are reigning with him. These are the blessings promised through Abraham's seed, these together with his authority to judge the world are the kingly rights of Jesus. And these he will surrender up to the Father when all enemies have been put down. The last enemy is death.

House, or Tabernacle, of David

Brother Boll makes much of Jehovah's promise to David; and avers that this promise has not yet been fulfilled, that Christ is now at the right hand of the Father, on the Father's throne, but in the Millennium he will sit on David's throne, which will then be his by right of inheritance. Thus he would have us believe that David actually owned a throne which could be transmitted to his offspring as a right of inheritance. Well, there was a period of several hundred years in which the inheritance was of no use to anyone, for no one of David's house ruled. And, if Boll be correct, Christ's right and title to that throne has, for nineteen hundred years, been an empty honor and fruitless of any good, for he has not yet come into possession, and the throne is still unoccupied.

But his distinction between Jehovah's throne and David's throne, while necessary to his theory, directly and plainly contradicts God's word; and we cannot see how Boll can be ignorant of that fact. "And Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father; and his kingdom was established greatly" (1 Ki. 2:12). "Then Solomon sat upon the throne of Jehovah as king instead of David his father" (1 Chr. 29:23). On whose throne did Solomon sit? Jehovah's. There can be no mistake about the matter; that which was called David's throne was Jehovah's throne. Like everyone obsessed with an idea, Boll weaves in everything that he can use to construct a theory, and excludes those passages which explode his theory. And yet he claims that he has no desire to make out a theory, but wants the word of God to speak for itself, and no matter what it says he will be content. Such pious cant is usually put forward by every theorist, for only they feel the need of putting forward such claims. When any man boasts of his honesty, veracity, piety, devotion to God's word, or lack of theory, or when he makes such claims prominent—well, anybody but dupes become suspicious. A man's claims count not a fig when his course runs counter to his claims.

But has Jesus been exalted to David's throne? Let it be borne in

mind that the throne of David does not mean a material throne, nor rule in a certain city. "A 'throne' in the Bible and in common usage stands for government rule and authority" (K. 80). David's throne was the authority Jehovah gave him over his people. David did not own a throne in his own right. He ruled over Israel, not as a man who conquers a country and declares himself its king; but as God's servant, God's representative, over Israel. To him God delegated the right to rule his people. It is called David's throne solely for the reason that he occupied the place of the ruler. Christ was to be given this throne. If Christ rules over God's people today, he sits on David's throne. That he does rule God's people the scriptures abundantly declare. So does Boll. when he says we have been translated into the kingdom of the Son of God's love "in which the Lord Jesus Christ exercises sway and rule" (K. 66). "He is reigning in the hearts of those who have willingly obeyed him" (Second Coming, p. 27).

Prophets declared that Jesus was to be given the throne of David. The angel announced to Mary that her child should be called Jesus, and that the Lord God would give him "the throne of David" (Lk. 1:32). Has Jesus been given the throne of David? Boll stoutly declares that the throne has not yet been given him, but that it will be given him when the kingdom is established. Let it be borne in mind that the throne of David does not mean a material throne, nor rule in a central city. It was the authority Jehovah had given him over his people. Has Jesus been given that authority? If he has authority to rule God's people he has the authority that Jehovah delegated to David. He now reigns. Hence, he rules on David's throne.

Inspired writers use the glory of Christ and his kingdom as interchangeable terms. "Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons, worshipping him, and asking a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wouldest thou? She saith unto him, Command that these my two sons may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy kingdom" (Mt. 20:20-21). In Mark it is expressed, "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory" (Mk. 10:37). They thought that when Christ entered into his glory he would enter his kingdom, and such was the truth, or else by his failure to correct their mistake he contributed to their deception. So certain as Jesus has entered into his glory, so certain is it that he has entered into his kingdom. Has he entered his glory? "He was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory" (1 Tim. 3:16). Paul affirms that Christ "is", not shall be, the only blessed Potentate, the King of kings, Lord

of lords (1 Tim. 6:16). Again, Paul says, God has exalted him "far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion" (Eph. 1:21); and again, "He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence" (Col. 1:18).

To offset the force and plain meaning of these scriptures Boll says: "We note the peculiar fact here that the Lord Jesus is never spoken of as *the King of the church*. He is her head, her Savior, her Lord, her husband to whom she is betrothed; but is never called her King" (K. 48). Indeed! In the figure of the vine and branches (Jno. 15) he is called neither Lord nor king of the branches. Neither is he called King or head of the vineyard (Mt. 20). And he is called neither Lord nor king of the body, but he is head of the body. Will Boll say that he is not now Lord of the body, because, forsooth, he is not called Lord of the body? Has he no regard for the congruity or incongruity of ideas? The word church means "the called out," and the idea of government is not in the word. The church of Christ is a body of people "called out" by Christ. The kind of organization or government any called out body has, if any, is determined by other considerations than the word church, or "called out." When the people of this country were called out of the British Government into a separate body of people, they might have become a kingdom, as some preferred; or they might become a republic, as they actually did. But they must have some form of government, or fall to pieces. Now this body of people called out of sin—what form of government has it? Is it a democracy, or republic? Certainly not. In it Christ has all authority and in it he rules. As a government it is a kingdom. We are astonished that Boll should seek to make a point by saying Christ is never said to be king of the church! Neither is he called Lord of the church. But Boll says the church is his spouse and he is Lord over her. Certainly! And the church is his kingdom, and he is King over that. But Boll forgot to tell you that he has the church only *engaged* to Christ now! Well a man is not Lord of his bride until the marriage takes place, and that, says Boll, is yet to be. So it appears that in trying to get rid of Christ as king he has about eliminated him as Lord!

Christ was never promised any throne other than that of his father David—God's rule over his people. Touching this very promise, Peter says: "Brother, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that

neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear" (Acts 2:29-34). Christ has been "exalted," he has been glorified, and Peter makes the argument in the foregoing excerpt to prove that Jesus has been raised to sit on the throne of David. Boll says this is the import of Peter's argument, but that Peter does not say he has taken that seat. If Boll is right, then Peter was making an argument which did not remotely favor proof of the very thing David predicted, namely, that Jesus was to be raised to "sit" on the throne. In this very passage Peter says, Jesus "God did raise up" from the dead, and that he has been "to the right hand of God exalted." What was to take place when he was seated at the right hand of God? "Jehovah saith unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. Jehovah will send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies" (Ps. 110:1, 2). Paul declares this has been fulfilled: "And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus; as also it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Acts 13:32, 33). Paul affirms that something written in the second Psalm has been fulfilled, but just what is it that has been fulfilled? Hear the statement of that Psalm: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will tell the decree; Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. 2:6, 7). Peter declares that God raised up Jesus to sit on the throne of David, and affirms that he is at the right hand of God exalted; and Paul says that which is written in the second Psalm has been fulfilled, namely, that the king has been set on the holy hill of Zion. Not only has he been exalted to the right hand of God, but he is to remain there till all enemies are made his footstool (Ps. 110:1, 2). When he ascended he was seated at the right hand of the Father, in his throne; but the Father's throne was David's throne: "and Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah as king instead of David his father." Just so certain as Jehovah's throne was David's throne, just that certain is it that Jesus is now on that which was called David's throne, for he is seated at the right hand of God in his throne.

On the throne where Jesus now sits he will remain till all enemies are made his footstool. "But he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet" (Heb. 10:12, 13). "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

If Christ is now on the Father's throne as distinguished from David's throne, as Boll would have us believe, it upsets Boll's theory of his rule on earth in the Millennium, for it is there that he would have us believe that Christ will put down all enemies. Let Boll make the most of it he can—Jesus will be at the right hand of the Father till all enemies are made his footstool. Paul tells us that the last enemy is death—that this will be conquered when all are raised. Boll says: "Death, the last enemy, shall not be destroyed until 'after the thousand years are finished'" (K. 68). So Jesus is to reign where he is, at the Father's right hand till the last enemy is destroyed, and the last enemy is death (1 Cor. 15:26), and Boll says death will not be destroyed till after the Millennium. Of course Boll is wrong about Christ reigning on this earth a thousand years, and then destroying death. Jesus is to reign at the right hand of the Father till all have been raised—till death has been destroyed. Boll did not have any use for this scripture in his program. He was conscious of the passage, and sought to frustrate matters by saying there were difficulties. Well, it is one thing to be confronted by difficulties, but it is quite another thing to ignore or contradict a plain declaration of God.

Peter declares that Jesus had been "exalted to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins" (Acts 5:31). "To be" is supplied by the translators—literally, "Him God exalted with (or at) his right hand a Prince and a Savior." Prince is from *archon*, a ruler, chief, from *archo*, "to rule over."

Boll's perversion of the prophecy of Amos as quoted by James in Acts 15 is astounding. He would have us believe that James left out a phrase of Amos' prophecy and added in its stead the words, "After these things," to show that the prophecy related to the future, to the Millennium. But why did James quote the prophecy if it did not relate to the matter in hand? If it related to some period in the remote future it had no bearing on the discussion then in hand. Why did Boll ignore the context? Peter had just told how the Gentiles by his mouth had heard and believed. Then James spoke: "Brethren, hearken unto me: Symeon hath rehearsed how first God visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, 'After these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from of old'" (Acts 15:13-18). Note James' application of the prophecy, "Brethren, hearken unto me: Symeon hath rehearsed how first God visited the

Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written." Then he quotes Amos. That settles it, and all the talk Boll can do about James deliberately adding the words "After these things" cannot change the fact that James quoted that prophecy as having been fulfilled; and that settles another fact, a fact which scared Boll into such unwarranted dealings with the prophecy, and that is, that the tabernacle of David, David's royal family, had been built again. So James proves that this gathering of the Gentiles was foretold by Amos, and that the royal house of David had been built up again, that is, ONE had been exalted to rulership over God's people, that the Gentiles might come in. Boll preferred to upset James' whole argument rather than let James' application of the prophecy upset his theory.

If Boll is correct the prophecy had no bearing on the reception of the Gentiles at that time. But Boll is wrong, inexcusably wrong. How to deal with the Gentile converts *then* was the matter before the house. Peter told of his work among the Gentiles, and James said that this reception of the Gentiles agreed with the Prophets. What other prophets he had in mind we know not, but he quoted Amos to show that it was proper and right now to receive the Gentiles. Did the prophecy prove his point? He thought so, and so did all the other apostles and brethren. But Boll would have us believe that this prophecy relates to the Millennium, that then the tabernacle of David will be rebuilt and then the Gentiles will be blessed. It may seem strange to some that we prefer to accept the apostles and the whole church at Jerusalem as authorities on the application of this prophecy instead of Brother Boll, but to our minds they are better authority.

Israel and Palestine

God promised Canaan to Abraham and his seed. This promise was repeated to Isaac and Jacob. In Egypt their descendants grew to be a mighty people, but had no government of their own. Through Moses they were called out of Egypt to go into the promised inheritance. At Sinai God entered into a covenant with them. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex. 19: 5, 6). On condition that they keep his word they would be his own possession, a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. Their national existence was made conditional. In Lev. 26 Jehovah promised that they would dwell in the land safely, on conditions: "If ye walk in my statutes, and

keep my commandments, and do them" (Lev. 26:3). But if they disobeyed he would bring calamities upon them, finally scattering them among the nations. This last threat was fulfilled when they were carried into Babylonian captivity. Yet even then God promised that he would not destroy them utterly, nor would he then break the covenant. Their utter rejection would not yet happen. But even this was conditioned on their reformation!

In Deut. 6:10-15, Moses warned them that when they reached the land of Canaan they must keep God's laws, and not go after other gods, "lest the anger of Jehovah be kindled against thee, and he destroy thee from off the face of the earth." The interpretation Boll puts on these promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob makes this threat a false alarm. Hear him: "To Isaac himself God repeated the substance of the promise made to his father: the land-promise, the oath, and the universal blessing; to be fulfilled to his posterity—a sure and unchangeable promise" (K. 22). Either Moses did not have the light on these matters that Boll claims to have, or else he was making a threat that he knew would never—could never—be carried out. To Boll and his followers we put these questions: Did Moses know as much about the promises made to Abraham as Boll knows? or was Moses deliberately sounding a false alarm to frighten them? As a nation Israel has been destroyed from off the face of the earth—the threat has been fulfilled.

In Deut. 7:6-10 Jehovah reminds Israel that he brought them out of the land of Egypt because he loved them and because he would keep his oath which he swore to their fathers (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob), but reminds them that he will repay to the face those that hate him, "to destroy them."

Again Moses said, "If thou shalt forget Jehovah thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations that Jehovah maketh to perish before you, so shall ye perish; because ye would not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah your God" (Deut. 8:19, 20). "Ye shall surely perish"—"because ye would not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah your God." Again was Moses like some foolish parents, trying to frighten them with impossible things? If Boll was right, and Moses knew as much as Boll professes to know, he was just dealing in idle talk to frighten them. But the facts remain that the nations perished before Israel, and so has Israel perished as a nation. These nations perished permanently, and Israel was to perish as they did. Fearful things are threatened in Deut. 28. If they disobey they were to be tossed to and fro among all the kingdoms of earth (V. 25). Fearful calamities would befall them; "and they shall be upon thee for a sign and a wonder, and

upon thy seed for ever" (V. 46). How long? "For ever." When was the final dispersion accomplished? Verses 47-68 gives the answer. A nation from afar, whose language Israel knew not, a nation of fierce countenance, would come against them. This fitly describes Rome and her armies at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews understood not their language. The delicate woman here mentioned as eating her offspring was there, as Josephus informs us. (See "Sound Doctrine," by Nichol and Whiteside, Vol. 4.) Then the Jews that did not perish were carried away, some of them into Egypt, as Moses said (V. 68). Nothing else in Jewish history fits the details of this chapter. And this is to last *for ever* (V. 46).

Even should the Jews be gathered back to Jerusalem, as Boll says they will, some of them would now understand the language of any nation which could be brought against them. Boll's notion is, that the nation which is to be brought against them in "the Great Tribulation" is to be a federation of ten kingdoms—many languages, and not one. And the Jews having come from these various countries would understand the languages. Moses says these calamities will come upon them for ever. Boll says, "No, they have a glorious future as a nation." This covenant of blessing and cursing, given in chapters 27 and 28, is in addition to the one made at Horeb. "These are the words of the covenant which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides the covenant which he made with them in Horeb" (Deut. 29:1). And this covenant was made, not only with those present, but with those that should come after (Vs. 14-28). The only return mentioned is conditioned on their keeping the law of Moses—"commandments which I command thee this day" (Deut. 30:1-10). This condition is impossible of fulfillment now, for the law of Moses has been done away. Besides, Boll says they will be gathered back in their rebellion, a contradiction of one of the passages he relies on to prove their future restoration.

Moses set before them life and death. They had their choice. And Moses adds, "But if thy heart turn away, and thou wilt not hear, but shall be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto thee this day, that ye shall surely perish; ye shall not prolong your days in the land, whither thou passest over the Jordan to go in to possess it" (Vs. 17, 19). But Jehovah gave them the land as he promised. "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; Jehovah delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed

not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Josh. 21:43-45). So God fulfilled his covenant—promises. But Joshua told them plainly that they would perish as a nation and lose their inheritance if they turned from God. "Else if ye do at all go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you; know for a certainty that Jehovah your God will no more drive these nations from out of your sight; but they shall be a snare and a trap unto you, and a scourge in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which Jehovah your God hath given you. And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass, unto you not one thing hath failed thereof. And it shall come to pass, that as all the good things are come upon you of which Jehovah your God spake unto you, so will Jehovah bring upon you all the evil things, until he hath destroyed you from off this good land which Jehovah your God hath give you. When ye transgress the covenant of Jehovah your God, which he commanded you, and go and serve other gods, and bow down yourselves to them; then will the anger of Jehovah be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you" (Josh. 23:12-16). So even if they should perish God had fulfilled his promises. The future rested with them. But had these Jews believed as Boll does they would have believed that these threats that they would utterly perish would never be carried out.

In all that Boll says about the prophecies concerning Israel's future he ignores the conditionality of the promises. Jehovah himself says: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if they do that which is evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them" (Jer. 18:7-10). If the principle outlined in this prophecy did not apply to Israel why did God, in the very next verse say, "Now therefore, speak to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith Jehovah?"

The Jews were carried into Babylonian captivity because of their corruption and idolatry. That was a terrible punishment. But they later committed a greater sin—they rejected and murdered their Savior.

This was the extreme limit of national criminality, and they are receiving and will continue to receive the extreme limit of national punishment. In God's law the penalty for murder was death. National murder demands national death. That death has been visited upon the Jews.

In the New Testament, God's fullest and most glorious revelation to man, there is no promise that Israel will again possess the land of Palestine. In an important sense the New Testament is a commentary on the Old. God's order is, the natural first, "then that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. 15:46), and that order finds its application also in the Old Testament and the New. In the Old Testament was the natural seed of Abraham; in the New, the spiritual seed. The shadows of the Old find their compliment in the realities of the New. The Old Testament lamb finds its value and fulfillment in the Lamb of God which takes away sins. The typical is superseded by the spiritual. We are not disturbed by Boll's ranting against those who spiritualize the prophecies of the Old Testament—the New Testament does that for us. But we are surprised that Boll should call it "spiritualizing them into non-entity." Would he have us to believe that the spiritual seed of Abraham, the glorious kingdom of Christ over which he now reigns, and all the other glorious things God's children now enjoy—to all of which we think the prophecies now apply—are non-entities? With Boll nothing seems to matter except national Israel restored, and the saints ruling in a world-kingdom over the subject nations of earth. But there is no promise in the New Testament that Israel will be restored to Palestine. The weight of its teaching is against that point.

The Jews thought that favors now, as of old, would be extended to them because they were Abraham's children. John said, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Mt. 3:9). Boll himself says that in the announcement of John "is found the first covered intimation that God would reject the fleshly seed of Abraham if they failed to repent and would raise him up another people" (K. 35). The fruit of national Israel was bad and growing worse, and culminated in murdering the Son of God. The Roman armies was the axe that cut the tree down.

In the parable of the householder and his vineyard Jesus succeeded in getting the priests and elders, the Jewish leaders, to pronounce their own sentence of condemnation. See Mat. 21:33-43. Said he, "When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come, what will he do unto those husbandmen?" They replied, "He will miserably destroy those miserable men, and will let out the vineyard unto other husbandmen." Then said Jesus, "Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be

taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Will Boll say Jesus failed to do this?

Jesus settled the matter in Mt. 12:43-45. "But the unclean spirit, when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest, and findeth it not. Then he saith, I will return into my house whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man cometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation." The unclean spirit, driven out of the man, returned and found his former residence empty, swept, and garnished. Then he goes and brings seven other spirits more wicked than himself. Together they take up their abode in the man, and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first. Jesus adds, "Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation." Boll says of the Jews, "and as the leaders went so would the nation as a whole go. The end towards which they were drifting was pictured to them in 12:43-45" (K. 37). Elsewhere he makes the word generation mean race. See SC. 46. So then the last state of the Jewish race will be worse than the first, but Boll would have us believe the last state of the Jewish race will be glorious beyond description. The Lord, however, tells us that it will be worse by more than seven times, for the seven additional demons to enter were more wicked than the one formerly in them. And Boll says this was the "end towards which they were drifting." In another place Boll says, "Seven is the number of perfection and completion. Seven rounds out the cycle and compass of the whole. There are many series of sevens running through this book, and we shall have occasion to observe that in every case the seven signifies a fullness" (R. 11). So then in the last state of the Jewish nation their wickedness would reach its fullness and perfection. Not a very rosy picture—that!

The hope therefore that Israel will be restored to Palestine, and enjoy a glorious period of unparalleled blessings under the reign of righteousness, grows out of a misunderstanding and misapplication of Old Testament prophecies, and is in direct conflict with the Savior's picture of their future.

The Gospel Age

Brother Boll's theory is that there are at least five "ages" or dispensations, namely, Patriarchal, Jewish, Church, Kingdom (Millennium), and the age after the Millennium. He refers to the present age as the "church age" (K. 38), "the present age" (K. 68). He quotes with

approval an excerpt from Daniel Sommer, in which Sommer speaks of the "Gospel Age," and "Millennium Age." In Boll's program, the Millennium is followed by a period, or age, in which the Devil is loosed and allowed to deceive the nations. He does not name this dispensation. It lasts till the final judgment of Rev. 20. We do not know who is to rule then, for the Devil will be turned loose to work his will to the limit of his ability; and Boll says, "So long as Satan's throne is on the earth Christ is not exercising the government" (K. 71). True, Boll says that at that time Christ is King, his kingdom is in existence, and he and his rulers are here on the earth, with Jerusalem as their capital. Try to visualize the condition existing then, according to Boll's theory: Satan turned loose, with no restraint thrown around him, Christ not exercising the government. Satan has free reign.

But this distinction between the "church age," or "gospel age," and "Millennium age," or "kingdom age," is not only without foundation, save in the highly pitched imagination of pre-millennialists, but is, so it seems to us, in direct conflict with God's word. The Great Commission seems to be final. In that Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Mt. 28:20). Literally, "And, lo, I am with you all the days till the completion (or consummation) of the age." Thus the Great Commission recognizes but one age in which its provisions are to be operative. During this age the people are to be taught, baptized, and taught to observe all things commanded. If the Great Commission is in force in this age, it will end with this age. Russell sought to avoid the force of the universal evangelization required in the Great Commission by saying that the Lord is not now trying to convert the world, but is only gathering the elect few to assist as rulers in the Millennium. Boll believes the same thing. He says, "Israel's hardening is limited as to extent and as to time: . . . until the full count of the elect Gentiles shall have come in" (K. 28). That can mean but one thing, namely, that God has a certain number of Gentiles that he wants converted during the "church age," and that the gospel is to be preached to them and Israel is to remain hardened till the "full count of the elect Gentiles" is obtained. Boll says he repudiates every distinctive doctrine of Russellism! But then, of course, this is no longer a distinctive doctrine of Russellism since Boll has adopted it. But it is none the less contradictory of the Great Commission. "Make disciples of all the nations" (Mt. 28:19), "Preach the gospel to the whole creation" (Mk. 16:15). "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations" (Lk. 24:47). And this must continue "all the days, until the completion of the age." When this age ends the Great Commission ends. Boll says this age ends at the Millen-

nium. Then what is to be preached during the Millennium? They cannot preach the Great Commission—it ends with this age. They cannot preach that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, for Boll says he is not there at that time, but seated in Jerusalem, here in this earth. They cannot preach that the Lord's Supper should be observed, for that was to be observed "till he comes"—and Boll says he comes and will be here during the Millennium. They cannot preach about the second coming of Christ; for that will be a past event, says Boll. They cannot preach as did Peter in Acts 2, when he said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet"; for he will not be at the right hand of the Father then, says Boll, but here on earth. They cannot preach as did Peter in Acts 3, when he said the heavens must receive Christ "until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets"; for he has left heaven, says Boll. They cannot preach that Jesus has gone to prepare a place for us; for he is not gone, but right there with them, says Boll.

THE JEWS AND THE GREAT COMMISSION

It may astonish some to know, that if Boll is correct, the Great Commission was never intended for the Jews. The Great Commission was to be preached to all the nations, and Boll says the Jews were not reckoned among the nations. Hear him, "Moreover Israel is not in this judgment; for it is 'the nations' that are here judged before the King; which term is elsewhere translated 'Gentiles,' and always means *the nations* as distinguished from Israel, who are 'not reckoned among the nations'" (K. 84). We think Boll himself will be surprised to learn that he has theorized the Jews out of the provisions of the Great Commission. We wonder what he means by his discourses to the Jews, in the Jewish Mission in Dallas, Texas. But we opine that he said not one word about the Great Commission in his discourses to them. Nations are frequently referred to in contrast with the Jews, but Mark's account of the Great Commission shows that "nations" here includes the "whole creation," and Luke's account includes the Jews in "all nations," for the apostles were to preach to "all nations" beginning at Jerusalem among the Jews. But, if Boll is correct, and of course he is not, no man is carrying out the Great Commission when he is seeking to make disciples among the Jews. Boll is wrong in making an iron clad rule to always distinguish between the Jews and the nations. The Jews were a nation (Jno. 11:49-52; Acts 26:4, 5; Jno. 18:35). Even Boll knows this and makes reference to the Jews as a nation (K. 61). Well, they

were one of the nations of the inhabited earth at that time. And the fact that the Great Commission began to be operative at the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ and is to continue to the end of the present age makes this age, or dispensation, the last dispensation, or age—the last days.

LAST DAYS

The Bible makes it plain that this present age, or dispensation, is "the last days." Peter on Pentecost quoted Joel as saying, "It shall be in the last days, saith God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts 2:17). Hence, these days are the last days—the last dispensation. If we were to deal with this text as Boll did with the prophecy of Amos as quoted by James in Acts 15, we would say that Peter deliberately added the phrase "the last days" as a substitute for Joel's "afterwards" to show conclusively that we are now living in the last days, or that this is the last dispensation. The same phrase is used in 2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:3, and it is evident to any reader that the "last days" of these passages cannot refer to any time after the present dispensation. John says, "Little children, it is the last hour" (1 Jno. 2:18). "Hour" is here used for a period of time. We are now living in the last hour, the last age. But this age will have an end—what then?

In his explanation of the parable of the tares and the good seed, Jesus says, "The harvest is the end of the world," marginal reading, "the consummation of the age." At the completion of this age, then, the harvest comes, in which the wicked will be destroyed, and "then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. See Mt. 13:24-30, 30-43. And let it be noted that both the good seed and the tares are sown and reach their maturity during this age—they both grow together till the harvest. And let it be noted, too, that from the end of this age "the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," and not in the kingdom of David restored as Boll would have us believe. The order of this parable is: The kingdom of heaven is here. Good seed and tares are sown—the children of God and the children of the Devil. The harvest is the end of the age. In the harvest the wicked are gathered out of the kingdom and destroyed, but the righteous shine as the sun in the kingdom of the Father. Thus both the wicked and the righteous are disposed of at the end of this age. And this harmonizes perfectly with 1 Cor. 15:23-28, where Paul declares that when all enemies are destroyed, then will Christ deliver up the kingdom to the Father. "But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall

deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For, He put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him."

Boll seeks to avoid the force of this passage by saying, "In the English the word 'then' may mean either 'at that time' or 'next after,' next in order." But in the Greek these ideas are distinguished. The Greek word 'tote' expresses the idea of 'at that time'; but in *enumerations*, where *sequence* is expressed, the Greek has 'eita' or 'epeita.' It is that latter word which is employed here, in 1 Cor. 15:23, 24. A stricter rendering of these two verses would be—"Christ the first-fruits; *after that* they who are Christ's at his coming. *Afterwards* cometh the end when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father." The length of time elapsing between the items enumerated by 'eita' and 'epeita' cannot be judged from these words themselves, but must be learned elsewhere. But 'eita' and 'epeita' indicate that the events *follow one another in order*" (K. 68).

We do not intend to allow Boll to muddle this text in any such unscholarly way, nor to escape by such easy method. Let his definition of *epeita* stand. Let it express mere sequence—the next thing in order, and what have we? Christ comes, the next thing in order is "the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom of God." With this meaning other uses of the word agree. In the same chapter, and in discussing the appearing of Christ after he arose Paul says, "He then appeared to Cephas, then (eita) to the twelve; then (epeita) he appeared unto above five hundred brethren at once . . . then (epeita) he appeared unto James; then (eita) to all the apostles." In giving a brief outline of his history in Gal. 1 and 2 Paul says, "I went away into Arabia, then (epeita) after three years I went up to Jerusalem. Then (epeita) I came into the regions of Syria and Cillicia, then (epeita) after the space of fourteen years I went up to Jerusalem." Leave the time limit out of the word entirely if you prefer, and it changes the sense not one whit. Paul here gives the order of his journeys and no journey comes between the one and the next. One event is mentioned, then the next one in order is mentioned.

So Christ comes, and the next thing in order is the end. But make the time between his coming and the end when the kingdom is delivered up as long as you like, and what has been gained? The next thing in order after his coming is the end. But Boll would not have it thus: With him the next thing in order after he comes is the destruction of the world-power, then a resurrection, then the thousand years reign, then the judgment of Revelation 20, before the kingdom is delivered up.

With him the next thing in order is not the end. But here is what Boll says: "The order is: Christ first, *then* (next) they that are his at his coming. *Then* (next in order) the end when all is subdued, and the last enemy shall have been destroyed (which Rev. 20:7-14 shows to be *after the 1000 years*). He delivers up the kingdom to the Father" (SC. 44). Such juggling of the word of God to save a wild speculation is unworthy of any man making any sort of claims to Christianity. Then, when his perversions are shown up and he is held up in his true light, for him to pose as a pious martyr is revolting. So it is clearly revealed that this age is the last age, so far as God's dealings with man on this planet is concerned.

WHEN HE COMES

"And to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus" (2 Thess. 1:7,8). It may be argued by Boll that this punishment is visited on the wicked who are alive when Jesus comes, but the text includes all those who know not God and obey not the gospel. Besides the Bible speaks of the day of judgment. This is certainly a judgment visited on these wicked people, and the following speaks of the judgment: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment" (2 Pet. 2:9). Even should Boll try to make this day of judgment mean a period of time, or dispensation, it does not fit his theory; for he has the righteous judged in this age, before the Millennium, and the wicked judged in the age following the Millennium. With him there will be at least two days, or ages, of judgment, with one day, or age, of a thousand years, intervening. "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" (Mt. 10:15). Fallen angels are "kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6). "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh the judgment" (Heb. 9:27). The judgment is to take place when Jesus comes.

"But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats" (Mt. 25:31-33). But Boll says this is not the final judgment. He argues that no resurrection is here mentioned, and that it is the nations that are

to be judged on the single point of their treatment of his brethren (SC. 42). But he errs, not taking into account the lesson that Jesus in his discourse was seeking to enforce. He had just given two parables, the parable of the virgins, and the parable of the talents, in which he sought to impress upon the hearers the value of diligent service, and the sin of negligence. And then he shows how the diligent and the negligent will fare in the judgment. Why should he in this place mention all other actions, good and bad, when he was seeking to impress a particular lesson on them? The righteous had fed the brethren, the wicked had done nothing to them. The wicked nations are not charged with any unjust treatment of his brethren—they had simply neglected duties. Just a little attention to this point would have saved Boll from an interpretation that any man should be ashamed of; and Boll would not have been guilty of such interpretation had not his theory demanded it. But he says the resurrection is not mentioned. We presume that he considers that as conclusive proof that none occurred. Well, let him search the book of Revelation and he will not find any mention of "the first stage" of Christ's coming, in which he says the dead saints will be raised, and, together with those living, will be caught up with the Lord in the air. Yet he would have it that that event occurred just before the "Great Tribulation" mentioned in the third chapter of his tract on "The Second Coming." Why does he not seize on this silence to prove that no such event will occur? Besides, Jesus plainly says to those on his right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Mt. 25:24). Mind you, Boll has him here dealing with nations, or governments—not individuals. Is it possible that some of these Gentile nations—governments—are to inherit the kingdom, and that God has had that kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world? What kingdom did God prepare from the foundation of the world for these good Gentile governments? According to Boll, Christ and the saints will inherit the kingdom which is to have its beginning at the beginning of the Millennium, and the good Gentiles will inherit one prepared for them from the foundation of the world! Two kingdoms, eh? And the wicked Gentile governments will depart into "eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels!" The good Gentile governments will have eternal life in a kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, and the wicked Gentile governments will have eternal punishment in the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels! Who but a man intoxicated with the ferment of his own imagination, mixed with Russellism, would make himself so ridiculous as Boll has done in seeking to avoid the force of this passage? Notice the con-

nection in which the passage comes. In the parable of the virgins, the wise virgins enter and the foolish are left out when Jesus comes; and in the parable of the talents, the faithful servants are rewarded and the slothful servant is cast out when the Lord returns. Following these two parables the judgment is described in plain language—the Son of man comes in his glory, on the throne of his glory; all nations are assembled, the good separated from the bad. And this is, of course, in perfect harmony with the other scriptures.

“Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment” (Jno. 5:28, 29). Boll says this does not say that all are raised at the same time. It does say, “The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.” They all come forth in the same hour. But in commenting on this Boll says: “John 5:28 does not require the meaning that within one and the same hour the righteous and wicked are raised. . . . Moreover it is worthy of note that John uses “hour” in a dispensational sense here” (R. 64). Let Boll make “hour” represent a period of time of any length he pleases, it helps him not. With him the righteous are raised in the age preceding the Millennium, and the wicked are raised in the age following the Millennium age. By no sort of twisting or juggling of words can he make the “hour” in which all are raised include two periods or ages, with the Millennium age of a thousand years between. Only by scrapping and suppressing scriptures can he break the force of this and other passages.

With Boll the last day does not come till after the Millennium. Yet Jesus says, “And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one that beareth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. . . . No man can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day. . . . He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day” (Jno. 6:39, 40, 44, 54). Four times in this chapter Jesus unqualifiedly affirms that the righteous will be raised at the last day. Heart-broken Martha said of her brother Lazarus, “I know that he shall rise in the resurrection of the last day” (Jno. 12:48). The righteous, then, are raised in the last day, and Boll says they are raised before the Millennium. The last day, then, according to Boll, is followed by a thousand years, or 365,000 other days!

The effort Boll makes to offset this by reference to 1 Thess. 4:13-17

is rather lame. Paul was seeking to comfort the Thessalonians concerning some of their number who had fallen asleep. The spirits of the dead are with the Lord, and God will bring them with him when he comes, at which time their beloved dead will be raised, and, together with the living saints, will be caught up to meet the Lord, and with him come to the judgment. The condition or fate of the wicked was not here under consideration, and was not mentioned. Hence, Paul does not say they arose, neither does he say they were left in their graves. He was not seeking to teach a lesson on the resurrection, but rather using the fact that the righteous dead would be raised, and, together with the living saints, be caught up with the Lord, to comfort the sorrowing Thessalonians. There was no occasion for him to mention the wicked, either dead or living, and so he did not. Had he been obsessed with Boll's theory he would have injected the whole plan into his talk, whether it served his purpose or not.

The New Covenant and the Gentiles

No one realizes just how vague and indefinite Brother Boll is on some points till he makes an earnest effort to thoroughly understand his position. Some expressions of his need to be subjected to a chemical analysis to discover everything they contain. Take the following sentence: “It,” the new birth, “is the universal requirement of acceptance with God, and characteristic of the New Covenant which now in its principle applies to the church, and which the Lord will make with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ‘after those days’” (K. 54). What does he mean by saying that the New Covenant now in its principles applies to the church, and that the Lord *will make it* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah? Of course, in Jeremiah's day, long before Christ came, the making of the covenant was future, and Jeremiah said “will make.” In Paul's day, he quotes this prophecy, as having been fulfilled. But Boll has it yet future. He says that the principle of the New Covenant applies to the church, and the Lord will make it with Israel and Judah. So, then, the New Covenant has not really been made—it applies now to us only in principle. But there is a difference between a principle and the laws based on that principle, between the principle of a covenant and the conditions of that covenant. Boll's idea then is that the principle of the covenant now applies to the church, but the covenant promised has not yet been entered into. So we have no New Covenant yet! It has not yet been made! Only the principle applies to us! We have preached for years that the New Covenant is in existence, that in the New Testament we

have its provisions revealed, that, in fact, the New Testament is the New Covenant. Now to hear that we have no New Covenant, no New Testament, that we have only the principle upon which the New Covenant is to be enacted, is certainly a new thing amongst those who claim to be Christians only. This is such an unheard-of thing amongst professed gospel preachers it was hard for us to believe that Boll really meant what he said, but further reflection on the whole scope of his teaching leaves no doubt in our minds. He meant what he said. Read the whole paragraph on page 63 in his book on the Kingdom. He tells us that no revelation had ever been made that Gentiles would enjoy blessings on an equality with the Jews. "But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed" (K. 63). If no prophecy contained any promise for blessing the Gentiles except through restored Israel, of course Jewish prophecy mentioned no such provisions. The covenants therefore spoken of by Jeremiah could not be made with Gentiles as such—it must be made with restored Israel, and through Israel extend its blessings to the Gentiles. Israel has not yet been restored, and consequently the New Covenant has not yet been made! We are left to guess what will be the nature and provisions of that New Covenant yet to be made; but if it relates to national Israel restored we are left to conclude that it will contain provisions for the conducting of that national government in the Millennium, through which Boll says, all nations (Gentiles) are to be blessed.

But is that covenant in force now? Has it been made? Paul declares that Jesus is mediator of the New Covenant. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant"; "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant" (Heb. 9:15; 12:24). No possibility of failing to understand such plain statements. Jesus IS mediator of the new covenant. Not only so, but the apostles were ministers of the new covenant. "Who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant" (2 Cor. 3:6). But the existence and force of this new covenant hinges on the authority of Christ and the merits of his blood. The blood of Christ is the blood of the New Covenant (Heb. 10). To deny the existence of the New Covenant, as Boll does, is to virtually deny the power of the blood of Christ.

Men approach God only by mediation. But if the New Covenant has not been established, as Boll says, then Christians are not in that covenant, and since Jesus is mediator of the New Covenant, they are without a Mediator, and cannot approach Jehovah.

But Boll is wrong, as usual, in saying that the prophecies contained

no provisions for blessing the Gentiles except through Israel restored. "Then opened he their minds, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written . . . that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:45-47). Jesus here affirms that the scriptures taught that salvation should go to the nations through preaching the gospel to them. This agrees with Matthew's account of the Great Commission—"make disciples of all the nations." It agrees with Mark's account—"preach the gospel to the whole creation." And this command to carry the gospel to the nations was not given to restored Israel—no hint is given that these blessings were to go to the nations through restored Israel. And Jesus virtually affirms that it had been written that the gospel should go to the Gentiles independent of national Israel, restored or otherwise. In saying, "Thus it is written," Jesus must have had in mind the prophecies of Isaiah (2:2, 3) and Micah (4:1-4). Both prophecies relate to the same things. We quote Micah: "But in the latter days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and peoples shall flow unto it. And many nations shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem" (Mic. 4:1-2). Mountain signifies kingdom or government, house signifies family. The mountain of Jehovah is Jehovah's kingdom; the house of God is God's family, God's church (1 Tim. 3:15). Kingdom and church are the same. So then many nations will come to the church or kingdom to learn of God's ways, and to walk in his paths. "For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem." And Jesus said that "it is written" that this should begin at Jerusalem and go to all nations. In view of this world-wide evangelism, foretold by the prophets and commanded by Jesus to be carried on to the end of this age, we lose patience with the silly twaddle of Boll, who affirms that the prophets never spoke of any blessings to the Gentiles except through restored Israel, then hangs their restoration on a doubtful "if." But the foregoing does not exhaust the evidence on this point.

Paul quotes Moses as prophesying that disobedient Israel would be provoked to jealousy by the obedience of people other than the Jews (Ro. 10:19), and Paul applies that prophecy to the obedience of the Gentiles. Yet no prophecy related to blessing the Gentiles except through restored Israel! Now read Ro. 10:20, 21: "I was found of them that sought me not; I became manifest unto them that asked not of me.

But as to Israel he saith, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." At the very time Isaiah represents others as coming in, he represents Jehovah as saying to Israel, "All day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." So the prophets foretold that Gentiles would be blessed while Israel was in disobedience.

According to Boll no Old Testament prophecy refers to the present "church age"; for he says, "But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed" (K. 63). So if Boll is correct the prophets spoke nothing concerning a time in which the Gentiles might be blessed independent of "restored Israel"—all their messages related to "restored Israel"! But that raises a question in your mind, if you will read Acts 17:11, 12. Paul was seeking to convert the people of Berea. They were open-minded, yet cautious. So they searched the scriptures (the Old Testament) to see if Paul was preaching the truth, and this search led them to believe. The question is: If Boll is correct in saying the prophets always spoke of those blessings through restored Israel, how could searching the prophecies convince them that Paul was right? They were testing his preaching by the Old Testament. If these Old Testament prophecies always spoke of blessings through Israel restored, and Paul preached salvation independent of restored Israel, a study of the prophets would have convinced them that Paul was wrong. Evidently somebody is wrong about this matter.

No one can say that the gospel, in its present principles, commands and provisions for salvation, has any dependence on national Israel restored. To preach this gospel Paul was called, "separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures" (Ro. 1:1, 2). Paul understood that the gospel which he preached "unto obedience of faith among all the nations" had been "promised afore through his prophets."

But the mystery that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs (Eph. 3:1-7). It does not mean as Boll would have us believe, that nothing had ever been said about it in the prophets. The most that can be said as to what a mystery is, is that the people do not understand it. That which is not understood is a mystery. John saw One in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks holding seven stars in his hand (Rev. 1:12, 13). John saw this vision, but he did not know what it meant, so, to him it was a mystery. Then the Lord said to him, "The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and

the seven candlesticks are the seven churches" (V. 20). Before John understood the meaning of what he saw it was a mystery; after it was explained, it was no longer a mystery. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah was a mystery to the eunuch even while he was reading it, for he did not understand of whom the prophet was speaking (Acts 8:29-35). It was not a mystery to Philip, for he understood it; and it was not a mystery to the eunuch after it was explained to him. This shows that a prophecy is a mystery to any one who does not understand it. So the prophecies concerning the reception of the Gentiles was a mystery, for they did not understand them.

Even a thing revealed may be in part a mystery, because our finite minds cannot fully comprehend it. After showing us that the relation of Christ and the church is as the relation of husband and wife, Paul adds, "This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church" (See Eph. 5:22-23). This relation of Christ and the church, though revealed, is a mystery and will continue so to be as long as we tabernacle here, for we cannot fully comprehend it.

Again, Paul tells us that God "was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory," yet he says, "Great is the mystery of godliness." (See - Tim. 3:16.) Though Jesus walked amongst men and the fullest possible revelation had been made concerning his person and his mission, these matters were still a great mystery because finite minds cannot comprehend the Infinite. Yet Boll says a mystery in the Bible sense is simply a secret, hitherto unrevealed. He is wrong again, as usual.

So then a matter may be revealed, but if the matter is for any reason not understood it is a mystery. Many of the prophecies were mysteries till they could be viewed in the light of their fulfillment. That was true of prophecies concerning the Gentiles. This is set forth by Paul in Ro. 16:25, 26. "Now to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through the times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith." Paul here tells us plainly that this mystery "is now manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known." Though it had been revealed in the scripture of the prophets it was a mystery to them, for they understood not the prophets, till they were fulfilled; and then by the scriptures of the prophets they could point it out, or make it known, in order to obedience among

the nations.

In commenting on the parables in Matthew 13, Boll says: "These then are *mysteries* of the kingdom. Now a 'mystery' in the Bible sense is simply a secret, hitherto unrevealed; a new thing, therefore, never before made known to the sons of men. . . . Never before were these facts concerning the kingdom, set forth in these parables, divulged: they were absolutely *new*" (K. 38). He is wrong as to mysteries, but his theory necessitated his definition. It is true that this spiritual kingdom had not been fully revealed in the prophets, but to say that the prophets had said nothing about it is going beyond the facts. We have already shown this. Even in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew there are facts to show that he is wrong. Jesus said to his disciples: "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given (V. 13). To the disciples then were revealed the mysteries of the kingdom, but not to the others. To the others they were still mysteries. "But to them that are without all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand" (Mk. 4:12). So after they heard the parables these things were still mysteries to them because they did not understand. But with Boll's idea that a mystery is a thing not announced, not heard of, then after the people heard the nature of this spiritual kingdom set forth in the parables it was no longer a mystery to them. A mystery, therefore, is not a thing never heard of, but a thing not understood. So Boll's proof that the prophets had never announced anything about this spiritual kingdom is not proof.

But there is another point in this chapter bearing on the question. To the disciples it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom. And Jesus said to them, "For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" (V. 17). How in the name of reason and common sense could these prophets and righteous men have desired to see and hear what these disciples saw and heard if nothing had been revealed about them? Where did they get the idea that there would be such things to see and hear as the disciples saw and heard? But Boll was seeking to present a theory hitherto unheard of among the brethren, namely, that the present order of things, this spiritual reign of Christ, is a matter concerning which the prophets spoke nothing. But he is wrong at this point as we have already seen and will see yet more.

In the first and second chapters of Paul's letter to the Romans, he proves that both Gentiles and Jews are under sin, and both alike stand in need of salvation through Christ. Was this a matter of prophecy?

Hear Paul: "But now apart from the law a righteousness of the law hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction" (Ro. 3:21, 22). Here Paul plainly affirms that this new order comprehends both Jew and Gentile without distinction, and that it had been so testified by the law and the prophets.

Even Boll forgot himself long enough to betray himself. Hear him: "Then he went into Galilee; and there follows in Matthew's record a significant quotation from the prophets, the purport of which is that the Lord, rejected by his people, would go to the borders of the nations ('Galilee of the Gentiles') so that the people who there sat in darkness might see his light" (K. 37). See Mt. 4:12-16. So then Isaiah had prophesied blessings on the Gentiles aside from national Israel, Boll himself being witness.

But why dwell on this point at length? Simply because the ideas herein combatted are pillars of Boll's theory, without which his theory falls to the ground, and because his position on these points is so radically opposed to the whole spirit and teaching of the New Testament. Is it a small matter with you that all the blessings promised to the Gentiles through the prophets were to be enjoyed through national Israel restored? Is it a small matter with you that the New Covenant has not been made, but will be made with the Jews? Is it a small matter with you that the prophets spoke nothing concerning the spiritual kingdom over which Christ now reigns? If all these things are small matters with you, then you are not in position to appreciate this chapter.

Daniel 2:44

"And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." In this passage God promised to set up a kingdom which would stand for ever. This promise is found in Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuchadnezzar saw a great image with head of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs and feet of iron and clay. As to the meaning of this, there is no dispute. Nebuchadnezzar (or his kingdom) was the head of gold; after him came another kingdom, which was evidently the Medo-Persian kingdom, for it immediately followed the Babylonian kingdom, by conquest; and following the Medo-Persian kingdom, by conquest, was the Macedonian kingdom—the third kingdom of the image. The fourth kingdom, corresponding

to the legs and feet of the image, was Rome. In the days of those kings—kingdoms—God promised to set up a kingdom. That the Roman kingdom was in existence when Christ was born, and has long since passed away, is not a question. It must follow, then, that the kingdom promised has been set up, or the promise of God failed.

When Jesus opened his ministry, among his first utterances is found the declaration: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. 1:15). The time is fulfilled for what? The thing that he announced—the kingdom of God. Paul says, "When the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman" (Gal. 4:4). Fullness of time for what? For God to send his Son into the world—Jesus came when the time was fulfilled for his coming. He did not come before the time for his coming was fulfilled, neither did he tarry till past the time. And when he came and began to preach, the time was fulfilled for another event—"the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." The time is fulfilled for what? The kingdom of God. This announcement was made in the early period of Christ's ministry, the time during which Brother Boll says Jesus was offering the kingdom to national Israel, and, according to Boll, before he began to talk about what Boll terms the new and spiritual phase of the kingdom. Boll says the Jews were not ready for their national kingdom to be restored. But Jesus says the time was fulfilled, things were ready, for the kingdom which he came to establish. He did not then come to restore national Israel to sovereignty. The time was fulfilled for the establishment of what kingdom? The kingdom of God. Daniel said that the God of heaven would set up a kingdom during the last universal world-power. All recognizes this last world-empire as Rome, and Rome was then in power. The time, therefore, foretold by Daniel had come—"the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." That which Mark calls the kingdom of God Matthew calls the kingdom of heaven.

Immediately following the imprisonment of John the Baptist Jesus entered Capernaum, and began preaching, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mt. 4:17). Having made disciples, he chose twelve from the number and sent them forth to preach: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mt. 10:7). When in Cesarea Philippi he promised to Peter the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," declaring that what he bound on earth would be bound in heaven (Mt. 16:16-20). We would have you note that the promise was that the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" were to be given to Peter. Have they been given? All understand, of course, that "key" is the symbol of authority. The apostles were to be given the authority to bind the laws of the "kingdom of heaven" on the people. A pertinent question just here is: Has such binding been done?

If, yes, has that kingdom been established?

That the apostles received power to bind and loose, by the authority of heaven, is declared (See Lk. 24:46-49; Acts 2:1-40). On the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ they bound on the people the conditions of entrance into the kingdom of heaven. If this is not true, then they had other authority, power, "keys," than that promised them; for they did bind on that occasion. But that with which they were to bind was the "keys of the kingdom of heaven."

Let it be kept in mind that in all the teaching of Christ there is not one intimation that he would establish, or that he came to establish, a material kingdom. Though he declared himself a king there is not one time found an expression which can be twisted so as to make it appear that he thought himself to be a super-man, of the German boast, with designs to establish a material, earthly kingdom. If the Jews expected such a kingdom, Christ is not responsible.

Brother Boll thinks that, if Jesus did not come to establish the kingdom the Jews were looking for, he should have enlightened them. Does Boll think that they, with their minds made up, would have accepted any explanation he would have given? He did seek to enlighten them, but said their eyes were closed and ears stopped. If people do not want to see can you make them see? Had he made the fullest possible explanation to them, they would have hated him the more. But he did set forth the principles of his kingdom in a series of parables, and Boll twists it into a new phase of his kingdom. Even the disciples had their hearts so set on other things that they did not comprehend him when he told them that he must be killed and rise to life again; and, though he taught them the principles of his kingdom, their theory about a world-kingdom came to the front again, and they said, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" As it was impossible, till they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit, to set the apostles fully right on the matter, think you the unbelieving Jew would have been enlightened?

MARK 9:1

In Mark 1:15 Jesus said: "The kingdom of God is at hand." In the sixth chapter is found a record of his visit to Cesarea Philippi, the place where he promised to the apostles the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In the ninth chapter, verse one, he says: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." What kingdom? "The kingdom of God." The kingdom promised by Daniel, the kingdom John the Baptist and Jesus had announced, "at hand," the kingdom he bade the twelve apostles to preach "at hand"

—the only kingdom God had promised. When did Jesus say that kingdom would come? He said it would come before some of the ones who were then present died. It must follow: If the kingdom promised has not come some of the people who were present when Jesus spoke this language are yet living; or if they have died, and the kingdom has not come, the promise of Christ has failed! But more, Christ promised that the kingdom of God would come “with power.” But do you ask if the kingdom of God has come? Do you question the promise of Christ? or do you think some of the people who were present when Jesus made this statement are still living? So certain as those who were present when Jesus made this promise have died, so certain as he stated a truth, just that certain is it that the “kingdom of God” has come; and this is the very kingdom the evangelist Philip preached in Samaria (Acts 8), Paul preached in Corinth (Acts 19); it is the same kingdom into which Paul says Christians have been translated (Col. 1:13). Do you reply that the kingdom does exist, and that we are in it, but that it is now a “veiled, suffering form of the kingdom”—that it has not come “with power.” But Jesus said that some of the ones who were in the company he was addressing would not die till after the kingdom of God came “with power.” Did Paul say the “kingdom of God” is promised? No! He said: “The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power” (1 Cor. 4:20). Jesus promised that some of the people present while he was speaking (Mk. 9:1) would live to see the “kingdom of God come with power,” and Paul declares that Christians are in the kingdom, and that the kingdom is “in power.” This is the kingdom—the stone—which smote the feet (Rome) of the image of Nebuchadnezzar. Rome divided into ten provinces, and has long ago been destroyed. Rome no longer exists. What more need to be said?

LAST DAYS

“And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem” (Isa. 2:2-4). See also Micah 4:1-3. “The mountain of Jehovah’s house.” “Mountain” means simply the kingdom, as is shown by verse three, “Let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah.” This kingdom was to be established in the “latter days.” What “latter days”? Paul speaks of a period which was evidently future from the time he wrote as “latter times”—“in the latter times some shall fall away from the faith” (1

Tim. 4:1). To what “latter days” do Isaiah and Micah make reference? We are not left to guess about the matter, for it is declared to be the time when “all nations shall flow unto” the kingdom. Can “all nations” enter the kingdom now?

During the personal ministry of Jesus he circumscribed the activities of the apostles, confining their labors to the house of Israel (Mt. 10:5, 6). At that time the kingdom was “at hand.” After his resurrection he commanded them to go to “all the nations” (Mt. 28:19), to “the whole creation” (Mk. 16:15), and to begin this work in Jerusalem, in which city he commanded them to tarry till they received power. “Thus it is written,” said Christ, “that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem” (Lk. 24:46, 47). Jesus said it was “written.” Where was it written? What prophets spoke of these things? The gospel, the perfect law of liberty, was to begin in Jerusalem, and the prophets had so foretold. Jesus had explained the prophecies to his disciples, and then told them that the preaching of the gospel, beginning at Jerusalem, was the fulfillment of these prophecies. What prophecies? None other than Isaiah 2:2-4, and Micah 4:1-3 are so specific—“the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” Of course if the law went forth from Jerusalem, it began to be announced there. Preaching the gospel to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, is therefore the fulfillment of the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah. In Jerusalem, on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, Peter, in the first complete gospel sermon, quoted from Joel, and declared that Pentecost was in the “last days.” In Jerusalem on that day there were Jews “from every nation under heaven . . . and proselytes.” They were to begin in that city, and go to “all the nations.” It is the time to which Isaiah and Micah made reference when the kingdom of God would be established, and the law of God would go forth from Jerusalem. The kingdom of God was established. See it begin, small at first, like a mustard seed, only a few citizens; but it is to grow, the blessings of this glorious reign of God in the hearts of men is for “all nations.” It does not grow by means of carnal weapons. There is no marshaling of a great body of men with the destructive weapons of the Roman army or of modern armies. It is like the leaven in the meal. They go forth with the word of God, preaching Christ, love, joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit. Following the first presentation of the claims of King Jesus and the principles of the kingdom of God, three thousand came under the sway of the scepter of him who rules on David’s throne, and became citizens of the kingdom of God. The leaven works—the seed grows—the stone

increases. Hear Peter again as he lifts his voice at the beautiful gate of the temple, and declares that the people had through ignorance killed Jesus, the Prince of Life, but that the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob had raised him, and glorified him. Many of the people with glad hearts accept the rulership of the king on David's throne; the kingdom increases, the leaven works, the seed grows, and the number came to be about five thousand. Soon the heralds of the kingdom are found in Samaria, then in Cesarea among the Gentiles; then they go to Corinth, Rome, Ephesus, thence on and on till every nation, every creature under heaven, heard the glad news. The kingdom of God had been set up, all nations were flowing into it.

Apostles on Thrones

To the apostles Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Mt. 19:28). There are three things mentioned in this passage, namely, In the regeneration Jesus would be on the throne of his glory, and at that time the apostles would sit on twelve thrones, and while sitting on these thrones would judge the twelve tribes of Israel. If it can be determined when the "regeneration" is, it will settle the time as to when the Son of man is on the throne of his glory, and also the time when the apostles would sit on the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Regeneration is a translation from the Greek word *palingenesia*, and is defined by Thayer: "new birth, reproduction, renewal, re-creation." The question arises: Do we now live in the "regeneration"—the time of the "new birth," the period of "re-creation," or is this to be a future period? The term "regeneration" occurs in only one other place in the New Testament, and is there used by Paul: "He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Tit. 3:5). In this passage Paul affirms that God has "saved us, through the washing of regeneration." This settles the fact that we are now living in the period of "regeneration," "the new birth," "the re-creation." Those who are Christians are spoken of as "new creatures (Margin, "a new creation")" (2 Cor. 5:17). All in Christ are a "new creation"—regenerated ones. It follows then, that this is the period, or time of regeneration, or new birth. This settles another fact, and that is, that this is the time Jesus is sitting on the throne of his glory, and still another, that this is the time the apostles are sitting on the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. He who contends otherwise is forced by

logic to declare Christians are not a new creation, not in Christ, not born again, not regenerated, not saved; and all that in the face of Paul's affirmation that God "saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

A statement similar to the one quoted in the foregoing from Matthew is given by Luke: "But ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Lk. 22:28-30). In this passage Christ locates the "table" in the kingdom—"at my table in my kingdom"; and when they "eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" they were to be upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. To the Christians at Corinth Paul wrote, giving instructions as to their conduct at the "table of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:14-22). Even Boll says "the Lord's supper is 'The Lord's table' indeed, because he ordained it; and there his disciples by faith hold 'mystic, sweet communion' with their absent Lord" (K. 53). Since they had the Lord's table then, and ate and drank thereat, the time when the apostles were to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel had come.

JUDGING

What is meant by the term "judging"? A judge may declare what the law is, or pass sentence. That the apostles have declared what the law is no one disputes; and they have passed sentence, in that they have told us the characters that shall be saved and those that shall be lost. The decrees ordained by the apostles, the church concurring, was their judgment, or decision, respecting the Gentiles (Acts 15). In fact, James, in giving his decision in the matter, said, "Wherefore my judgment is" that we write so and so. He again refers to this action as "giving judgment" (Acts 21:25). This decision was as much a judgment on the Jewish Christians as on the Gentiles. In fact, the whole decision was rather aimed at those Jewish Christians who were troubling the Gentile Christians. The statement of James proves this: "My judgment is that we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles turn to God" (Acts 15:19). Paul judged the wicked person in the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 5:3).

Sometimes a person by superior conduct judges, or condemns, another. It is thus that the uncircumcision might judge the circumcision (Ro. 2:27). In obeying God, Noah condemned the wicked world (Heb. 11:7). It is in this sense that "the men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment," and "the queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment," "with this generation, and shall condemn it" (Mt. 12:41,

42). Certainly this does not mean that the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba will sit on judgment thrones at the judgment and pass sentence of condemnation on the people who lived while Jesus was here. By their conduct they condemn the indifferent and disobedient. In this sense we are judging, and will judge.

REIGNING

It is through the grace of Christ and his righteousness, and not through compulsion, that Christ reigns now. Of course, back of this is his authority. Christians who overcome and are helping to extend his kingdom are reigning with him. Those who assist in extending a kingdom and in maintaining its laws are factors in the rule and government of that kingdom. The over-coming Christian is doing that very thing in Christ's kingdom. "Already ye are filled, already ye are become rich, ye have come to reign without us: yea and I would that ye did reign, that we also might reign with you" (1 Cor. 4:8). Paul here first speaks in irony—"ye have come to reign without us." He spoke this to those who antagonized him. They thought that they were reigning in his absence in that they were running things pretty much to suit themselves. But when he said, "I would that ye did reign," he gives them to understand that they were not reigning. Had they been extending the kingdom of Christ and bringing men in subjection to him, they would have been reigning. But by their conduct they were hindering the extension of Christ's kingdom and stirring up rebellion in those already his subjects. Hence, Paul said, I wish ye did reign, for then we (apostles) would reign with you. The apostles were Christ's mouth-pieces, his law givers, and in that way they reign with Christ. Had the ones Paul reproved at Corinth been extending the kingdom of Christ and his laws, they would have been reigning with Christ, and in that way the apostles would have been reigning with them.

Christians reign in this life. "For if, by the trespass of one, death reigned through the one; much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ" (Ro. 5:17). Of course this reigning is done on this earth, under the heavens.

With the foregoing facts before us why should any one try to build a theory as to any supposed future reign? Can such theory contribute to any one's present good or happiness? It is certain that the desire to reign over ten cities with a rod of iron cannot aid one in cultivating the necessary graces of gentleness, meekness, long suffering, and forbearance. As such prospect does not appeal to many Christians it could not stimulate such to more faithful service. But it must be acknowledged that there is in some an incurable mania for ruling somebody.

This thought is peculiarly alluring to some preachers, and conditions contribute to its cultivation. They go and preach; sinners reject their preaching, scoff at their sermons, and sometimes persecute them. What more natural that some temperments should silently threaten: Never mind; some day I may be sent to this place to reign over you. Billy Sunday, a pre-millennialist, said at Pittsburg, "Perhaps the Lord will say to me, 'Bill, you go back and reign over that Pittsburg bunch.'" Such prospects seem to be alluring to pre-millennialists, for they all hold up the rule of the saints as a prominent, if not essential, feature of their program for the future. Brother Boll is no exception to the rule, but his writings prove it just the same, for in his three booklets the rule of the saints in the Millennium is mentioned something like one hundred and fifty times. But the idea of some day being able to reign over people and bring them to justice does not appeal to some people.

The Great Tribulation

Brother Boll has a period of time immediately preceding the Millennium which he designates, "The Great Tribulation." This "Great Tribulation" will follow the taking up of the disciples, says Boll, so that the church will not pass through this "Great Tribulation." With him the great tribulation is a definite period of time yet to be, to which he applies the statement in Revelation concerning the great tribulation and also a statement of Christ about the tribulation as recorded in Matthew 24, Luke 21, and Mark 13. But the statements of the Lord do not fit Boll's idea of things; for Jesus there admonished the disciples to flee from Judea to the mountains when the tribulations there mentioned are closing in upon them. According to Boll, there will be no disciples in Judea or anywhere else on the earth when this tribulation begins. Yet Jesus exhorts them to flee with haste, and to pray that their "flight be not in the winter, neither on a sabbath"—"Not in the winter," because of the exposure to which they would be subjected; "neither on a sabbath," because the Jewish authorities would allow no journeys on that day. These facts upset Boll's theory that the tribulation spoken of by the Savior apply to Boll's "Great Tribulation"; and renders void his application of the phrase "immediately after these days," as applying to the coming of Christ immediately after Boll's "Great Tribulation." Besides the circumstances of this discourse plainly set aside Boll's idea that this discourse of the Savior referred to any supposed tribulation yet to be.

With natural pride the disciples said to Jesus, "Teacher, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!" Jesus replied:

"There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down" (Mk. 13:2). Over on the Mount of Olives the disciples asked him, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" (Marginal reading, "the consummation of the age") (Mt. 24:3). Or as recorded by Mark, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" (Mk. 13:4). Luke's report is the same as Mark's. The things "to be accomplished," referred to in the second question, were the things Jesus had just predicted, namely, the complete destruction of the temple buildings. But Matthew records the second question in these words: "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world" (or age)? So if we allow these writers to interpret each other the coming of the Lord and the end of the age there referred to was nothing more nor less than the coming of the Lord in his destructive judgment upon Jerusalem. But are these destructive judgments, which were sometimes visited upon cities and nations, ever referred to as a coming of the Lord? To this question the scriptures give a plain answer. To Babylon Jehovah said: "They come from a far country, from the uttermost part of heaven, even Jehovah, and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land" (Isa. 13:5). Here Jehovah told Babylon that he would come to her with weapons of indignation. This destruction would be brought upon her by the Medes (V. 17). So Jehovah plainly tells Babylon that he would come to her in this destructive judgment; and in figurative language he describes to them the darkness of the outlook to them in that hour: "For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in its going forth, and the moon shall not cause its light to shine" (V. 10). This dark hour for Babylon, described in this figurative language, may help us to understand a like figurative description for the darkness which would come upon Jerusalem (Mt. 24:29). The darkness here described is yet upon the Jews. Again, the Lord said to Egypt: "Behold, Jehovah rideth upon a swift cloud, and cometh unto Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall tremble at his presence; and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it" (Isa. 19:1).

The judgment of Jehovah upon Israel of old, which came upon them in their being carried into Babylonian captivity, is referred to by Isaiah as "the day of visitation," that is, the day in which the Lord visited them in that calamitous judgment. To the Jews Jesus said, "And when he drew night, he saw the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon

thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation" (Lk. 19:41-44). So the destruction of Jerusalem is referred to as "the time of thy visitation," that is, the time in which the Lord would visit them in destructive judgments. So the tribulation spoken of in Matthew 24 is not yet to be.

Some Guesses Are Harmful

In an effort to defend Brother Boll, it has been said that his theories are only a lot of harmless guesses; but is that correct? It depends on what is involved in a guess as to whether or not it is harmless. The foundation upon which a person bases his guess may, in some of its features, be directly antagonistic to the Bible and God's plan of the gospel; and herein is where Boll's guesses are harmful. Here are some of the harmful errors on which Boll's guesses are based, namely, that—

Daniel 2:44 has not been fulfilled.

Jesus came to establish a world-empire instead of a spiritual kingdom.

His kingdom will begin in the Millennium.

He is now training and testing men for rulers. This fills men who think they belong to this class with a feeling of self-importance.

The New Covenant has not yet been established, but will be in the Millennium—in some vague undefined way it applies to us now in principle.

That no prophecy of the Old Testament applies to the present order of things.

That James erred in applying the prophecy of Amos to the conversion of the Gentiles.

That some of the prophecies concerning Babylon have not been fulfilled, and, according to Boll, some of these prophecies are bound to fail. This discredits God's word.

That only a definite number of people can be saved in this present dispensation. This theory antagonizes the whole plan of world-redemption through Christ, as set forth in the New Testament.

That everything finds its climax in the Millennium, and it ends in a failure. So all God's plans and prophecies find their climax in a failure.

Guesses that involve all these things cannot be harmless, but are wrong and harmful at every point and angle.

Paragraphs

If Jesus offered the Jews sovereign dominion during his earth-life, they could have made out a case of high-treason before Pilate, and Pilate, as a Roman officer, would have found him guilty, but himself said, "I find no fault in this man."

If Brother Boll is right on the kingdom, then it is strange that no charge of high-treason was lodged against them at Phillippi (Acts 16), nor at Ephesus (Acts 19), nor before Caludius Lysias (Acts 22:26-29). He found Paul "accused about questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds." Evidently no charge of preaching treason was lodged before him. He was charged before Felix with being "a mover of insurrection among all the Jews throughout the world." But Paul said, "Neither can they prove to thee the things whereof they now accuse me" (Acts 24). And Paul called on his accusers to name one thing that might be considered an offense by Felix.

Before Festus they could make no case. Paul said, "nor against Caesar have I sinned at all" (Acts 25:1-2). Festus could not even frame an accusation worthy of presenting to Caesar (Acts 25:13-22).

Festus and Agrippa found in Paul nothing worthy of death or bonds (Acts 26:30-32). Paul was not preaching the supremacy of national Israel.

It is held that Jesus arose with immortalized body, and that with that body as it was during the forty days will he return. It appears that no one should dogmatically so assert. There are indications to the contrary. John says it does not yet appear what we shall be, but when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. John saw him during the forty days. He knew just how that body looked. Yet he says, though we shall be like him, it does not appear what we shall be. Paul was blinded by his dazzling glory. Even Moses' countenance, after being with Jehovah, was so bright Israel could not look upon his face.

In an important sense the Lord is always present, and yet there are occasions when his presence is so pronounced and his hand so manifest in some particular work, blessing, or disaster, it is said he comes on such occasions. Just here pre-millennialists are not very discriminating—like all other theorists they find proof in passages that have no bearing on the question.

David prayed for the Shepherd of Israel to "come to save us" (Ps. 80:1, 2). "Oh when wilt thou come unto me" (Ps. 101:2). Certainly he was here praying for the Lord to bless and comfort him. "If

a man love me he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (Jno. 14:23). Certainly this is not the coming at the end of the age.

Brother Boll thinks that Jesus referred to his "second coming" when he said to Thyatira, "That which ye have, hold fast till I come" (Rev. 2:25). Yet in the same chapter the Lord said to Ephesus, "Repent and do the first works; or else I will come to thee, and will move thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent" (V. 5). Again, in the same chapter he said to Pergamum, "Repent therefore; or else I come to thee quickly, and I will make war against them with the sword of my mouth" (V. 16). In the third chapter he said to Philadelphia, "I come quickly" (V. 11). Certainly these comings do not refer to his coming at the end of the age. Then to Laodicea he said, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (V. 20). Also to the church at Sardis he said, "If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee" (V. 3). Six times in these seven letters the Lord speaks of coming; why then should Boll pick out one as applying to the last coming? We do not believe the Lord deceived those good people at Thyatira by leading them to believe his last coming might occur while they lived. The Lord will come again to judge the world, but not every coming mentioned refers to that event.

IT IS FINISHED

Jesus said just before his death, "I have glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do" (Jno. 17:4), evidently referring to his work on earth. But, according to Boll's theory, such was far from the truth, for, according to his theory, he had failed to bring about Israel's restoration, the center and circumference of Boll's theory; which would require a thousand years to accomplish. Indeed, if Boll is right, his real earth labors had hardly begun. Was Jesus deceived in thinking that in his short ministry he had finished his work, when in fact the Father had at least a thousand years of work for him on earth?

Brother Boll says that Jesus cannot rule on the earth, cannot sit on David's throne, so long as the Devil's throne is here. That is singular. David sat on that throne and exercised its authority while the Devil's throne was here. Can the reader figure out what is the matter that Jesus Christ cannot do the same thing?

With Brother Boll the "first resurrection" is like the "second coming," in that they both have "stages." He has some raised at the "first stage" of the "second coming," and others raised at the "second stage"

of the "second coming"—"first stage" of his "second coming," and "second stage" of his "second coming"; also, "first stage" of the "first resurrection" and "second stage" of the "first resurrection." These "stages" are pure inventions to meet the demands of a theory. So it seems to us. What theory is it that cannot be sustained by such inventions?

Brother Boll is wrong in thinking that it was God's original purpose to bless the world through national Israel. It is true that Jesus came of the seed of Abraham and of the royal family of David, according to the flesh. In that way, and in no other, so far as we can discover, was it God's purpose to bless the world in this age through Israel, and in that sense Israel has served her purpose. Christ came; the church was built, not as a temporary substitute for God's original plan, but as the fulfillment and consummation of his plan to bless the world. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which for ages hath been hid in God who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph. 3:8-11. God's eternal purpose, then, was that through *the church*, and not through national Israel, should be made known the manifold wisdom of God.

If Brother Boll is correct as to the prophets, Jehovah deceived the Jews in that he led them to believe that, at the first coming of Christ, their kingdom would be restored, Christ would sit on David's throne in Jerusalem, and a glorious era would be ushered in. The Lord also deceived the church at Thyatira in leading them to believe that he might come while they lived, if Boll is correct. Can any one believe that God so dealt with man, that he was the direct cause of a deception that worked the Jews up to such high hopes, and then so disappointed them that they could not believe? According to Boll, what they were looking for was exactly what God had promised in all the prophecies, and the thing that was given was a thing that never had been revealed! If Boll is correct, no wonder, as Boll says, they could not believe—what God had promised made it impossible for them to believe in what he actually gave! And yet Boll would have us believe that Jehovah to "save his face" offered them "*in good faith*" that which he knew they would not accept, and gave in its stead that which he certainly knew they would reject! All his blatant and dogmatic assertions on this point seem to us to be the slanderous ebullitions of a blasphemous blatherskite. Thus

will speculative theories lead men of otherwise good intentions to indulge in arguments that are a reflection on Jehovah, just as the speculative theories of the Jews led them to reject and crucify their Lord.

Brother Boll says: "Upon the new earth are nations still, but nations now of men redeemed, resurrected, living in a blissful social organization and intercourse of which we are not able to conceive. The Holy City is their Sanctuary. Thither they come continuously, and they bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it" (K. 78). Also he says: "In that new earth there are peoples and nations, redeemed for ever, and leading a glorified existence—yet distinct from the Bride, the Lamb's wife herself who has her abode in the city with which she is identified. . . . The redeemed nations of the new earth walk by the light of the city; and their kings bring the glory and honor of the nations into it, as the sacred tribute and sacrifice of praise. But none have access into it, . . . save those whose names stand written in the Lamb's book of life" (R. 72). In the new earth the Christ (Head and Body) dwell in the new Jerusalem, and the redeemed nations over which they rule will not be admitted into that city. Who these redeemed nations are, he has not told us, but, although redeemed and cleansed by the blood of Christ, they will not be allowed to associate with the church class; but must contribute to the glory and honor of the church class. This is Russellism thinly veiled—a grossly materialistic conception of eternity, but in keeping with Boll's conception of the Kingdom of Christ.

Immediately following the Millennium Brother Boll has a period of time in which trouble prevails because of the loosing of Satan; then comes the last resurrection, and judgment of the great white throne; then comes the new heaven and the new earth. The New Jerusalem then comes down out of heaven. His statements concerning conditions in the new earth are rather mystifying. Hear him: "As a consequence of the descent and presence of this new Jerusalem in the midst of the new earth and its inhabitants, all evil is for evermore banished" (R. 70). No evil, then, is to be in the new earth. Yet he says: "21:27 implies that even then there are beings whose names are not among the redeemed; and 22:15 plainly says so" (R. 72). These statements are contradictory.

"The Book of Revelation"

Of the book of Revelation, Brother Boll says, "No other New Testament book comes so near being shunned as though it were perilous ground." On the other hand it may be as truthfully said that no other New Testament book is so assiduously studied by theorists and upon no

other New Testament book has so many wild theories been built. And the fact that so many wild theories have been constructed out of the symbols and prophecies of Revelation has led some thoughtful people to conclude that, since these theorists do not agree among themselves, each contending the other wrong, the study of Revelation cannot be very profitable. Theorists make much ado about it being a revelation, a book to be understood, etc. Well, it is not so hard to understand what is in the book, but to outline a course of events here on earth corresponding to those symbols is another matter. Do these theorists understand the application? Hear how Boll talks about theorists: "At the sight of what the interpreters, who have sought for 'fulfillments' in the annals of past history, have done with (and to) these trumpet-judgments one turns away disheartened. I will not take time to present the wonderful guesses, the follies and foibles, and endless, pitiful contradictory puerilities so many of them have offered us; and which, I make free to say, would, if accepted, make the book of Revelation practically worthless. With great and learned labor, with all sorts of hermeneutical devices, jacks and blocks and tackles, they make historical events fit to the word of prophecy or vice versa. . . . Were it not that most of the current commentaries and interpretations of Revelation were of this sort it would not be worthy of notice" (R. 36).

Of the contents of The Revelation Boll says, "Things that *must* come to pass, inevitably *must*, and there is no help for it" (R. 2). If that statement is correct, there is not a conditional prophecy in the book. And this Boll would have us believe, for he continues thus: "Here we are not in the realm of 'conditional prophecy,' such as described in Jer. 18:7-10. The conditions that demand the coming of these events have already long ago, and irrevocably been fulfilled; the die is long since cast; the whole matter is settled and certain: these are things that *must* come to pass" (R. 2). Well, this leaves no room for any persons or people, mentioned in this book, to change their ways for the better or for the worse. The whole thing, like a moving picture, is on the film and is only waiting to be reeled off. Where, then, is freedom of will for any of the people or nations concerned?

Only one theorist at a time understands the book of Revelation, and he is certain all others are wrong. But if some theorist by the merest chance should be right, there is no way for him or any one else to know that he is right till the events occur. Yet every theorist of this much abused book is so certain of the correctness of the program he outlines that it would seem that each one will be disappointed unless Jehovah takes his theory as a chart to go by in working out the course which he has outlined in symbols!

But even Boll does not claim to understand everything in Revelation. Hear him: "We do not attempt to settle the question as to what or who these four 'living ones' are. It is not needful to an understanding of this book that every such question be settled, and every detail and symbol understood" (R. 24). It would seem then, that any question which he cannot settle is not necessary to be understood. If *he doesn't* understand it, it is not necessary to be understood. And yet, though he does not understand who or what these four 'living ones' are, they so resemble the cherubims of Ezekiel's vision (Ezk. 10) "we are justified in calling them that" (R. 25). But no man is justified in making an application of any scripture while confessing he does not understand it. To do so is the veriest recklessness in handling God's word, and shows such an one to be an unsafe teacher of God's word. But this is characteristic of theorists.

Boll says the four horses in Rev. 6:1-8 are the same as those in Zech. 6:1-8 (R. 29, 30). Are they? In Rev. 6:1-6, the first horse was white; the second, red; the third, black; and the fourth, pale. In Zech. 6:1-8, the first horses were red; the second, black; the third, white; and the fourth, grizzled. In Rev. 6:1-8 there was one horse of each color; in Zachariah there were horses of each color. In Rev. 6:1-8 each horse had a rider, and nothing is said about chariots; in Zachariah the horses are in chariots, and nothing is said about riders. Yet in the face of this Boll dogmatically affirms they were the same. It must be so to fit his theory, and he hesitates not to so affirm of them. Of course there is no speculation in his theory—of course not! Boll is quite certain that nothing represented in this vision of the horses and riders could relate to anything before John saw the vision—with him everything in the book from chapter 4:1 is future as to the time John wrote (R. 23). Let the reader keep this in mind.

When the fifth seal was opened, John "saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a great voice saying, How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:9-11). This then comes before the "first stage" of Christ's second coming, for at that time the dead saints are to be raised, and with the living saints caught up with the Lord. But as a matter of fact, this book of Revelation is strangely silent as to Boll's "first stage" of Christ's coming. Boll has the "first stage" to occur immediately before the "Great Tribulation."

Boll would have us believe that what John saw in chapter 7 is a parenthetical statement (R. 33) taken out of its regular place some-

where else. To let it stand where it is, as it comes between the opening of the sixth seal (Rev. 6:12-16) and the seventh seal (Rev. 8:1-2), would upset his theory; for these companies came out of the great tribulation, and, according to Boll, "the Great Tribulation" does not begin till after the opening of the seventh seal. There is nothing in Rev. 7 to show that John would have us believe that the events there recorded are deliberately mentioned out of their regular order. Why, then, should Boll dogmatically affirm that it does describe events out of their historical order? There is only one reason—his theory demands it. And yet he has no theory to support! No, no, not he—theories and speculations are not in his line. What man in his right mind can believe it?

What the four trumpets mentioned in chapter 8 are Boll does not know; but he says "it would not add much to our understanding of the book as a whole" (R. 38), if we did understand it. There it is again—what he can fit into his theory is plain, and what does not form a part of his theory—well, it is not necessary that we understand that! But just how did he learn that to understand about these four trumpets would not contribute to an understanding of the book as a whole? Who said so? Boll! No other authority is cited.

But he tells us what the locusts are that follow the fifth trumpet, though if John knew he did not tell us. Those locusts, Boll declares, are "an irruption of evil spirits from beneath, demons of the pit, let loose in judgment upon the world" (R. 39). When these locusts come, if they are not what Boll thinks, his preconceived opinion may blind him, as in the case of the Jews who rejected Christ because he did not fit their theories. It is safer not to form a theory as to what they are—one will be in a better frame of mind to recognize them when they come. The mistake and fate of the Jews should admonish one not to theorize on prophecies.

The horses of the armies following the sixth trumpet were not real horses, so Boll informs us—there were too many of them, and they were too frightful, to be horses—they were only forces of evil, 200 million (R. 39). Should we not vote Brother Boll our thanks for telling us that which John did not tell?

"Suddenly the scene changes. *Jerusalem* now is the place: disobedient unbelieving Israel is there again, and their temple is rebuilt" (R. 40). Thus he has the Jews restored to Jerusalem in their rebellion. But is Boll certain of this? He affirms it outright, but is he certain of it? He has told us that the land promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was a sure and "unchangeable promise" (K. 22), and that Christ inherited the throne of David and the land promise, and that he would

reign on David's throne in Jerusalem. Again, "But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel, and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed" (K. 63). He also told us that the things in Revelation were unalterably fixed, that they *must* be; and yet after all this, and much more, and after saying that Israel is restored in chapter 11, he ends all these long arguments and dogmatic assertions with an—"If." "If ever the Jews get control of Jerusalem again, they will of course rebuild their temple at once" (R. 40). "If"! And his whole theory hinges on the restoration of the Jews to their ancient home. "If"! and thus his laboriously erected plan glides away on a little "if" into the realm of dream-theories. "If"! Thus he confesses, what all Bible students have known, that he is not certain of his own theory. "If"! Thus he goes over the country stirring up confusion and strife over "unchangeable promises" and over matters that are "certain and settled," all of which end in an "if." "If"! If Boll had not used that "if" where he did, he would be better pleased with himself when he reads this. And, too, those who have placed their confidence in him as such a wonderful Bible teacher would have more confidence in his ability. "If." Yes, by that "if" he confesses that he has presented only a wild speculative theory. "If"! Why did he say it? Just this: In an unguarded moment he gave expression to a doubt that lies deep in his heart.

Again Brother Boll finds another parenthesis, "the great parenthesis." He says, "Any attempt to bring these visions of chapter 12, 13 and 14, into direct connection and sequence with the rest violates the structure of the book." These chapters, he says, are "in no direct sequence with what precedes or follows" (R. 43). He is sure that we cannot understand Revelation unless we recognize this portion as parenthetical; yet, according to him, it covers the whole period from chapter 4:1 to the end of chapter 19. Nothing, then, in these chapters must ante-date chapter 4:1, nor follow chapter 19. Indeed he has already told us that everything from chapter 4:1 is future as to the time John wrote, all was to happen after John wrote. *Boll himself does not believe that.* Here is proof definite and conclusive.

The twelfth chapter opens with a sign in heaven: a woman about to be delivered of a man-child, with the great dragon standing by to destroy the child. Who was the man-child? The man-child was born and caught up into heaven and the woman fled into the wilderness, after being pursued by the dragon. What was that woman, and what was the man-child? Says Boll, "This mystic man-child is not simply the Child that was born at Bethlehem, but the Christ as including both

himself, the Head, and the Church, His spiritual Body, which is one with him" (R. 44). Now, Christ had been born before John wrote. Had the church come into existence before John wrote? But who was the woman? Boll answers: "It was *not the church* that brought forth the man-child, of course; but of Israel, both ideally and literally, sprang Christ, and the church which is his body. . . . Israel brought forth the Christ and the church" (R. 44). Had this woman been delivered of the man-child when John wrote? Boll says the church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ (K. 20). Yet he says that everything from chapter 4:1 happened after John wrote. Why should any man be so reckless? One thing is certain: No thoughtful person will be carried away with such froth.

THE SPIRITUAL MOTHER

And Israel gave birth to the church.—Boll. Reader, had you ever wondered who your spiritual mother is? Well, you've found her now—disobedient national Israel, rejected of God, is the mother of us all! But the dragon sought to destroy the man-child. Well, if Boll is correct (and he is not), the mother also turned on her own offspring, and God rejected her for such unnatural crime! And that murderess is our mother—the mother of the spiritual body of Christ—and she hates her offspring yet. Well, who is that woman? If John knew he did not tell us? "Secret things belong to God," and everyone who respects God's silence will let the matter rest with God till such time as he sees fit to reveal it. A devout student of God's word will respect God's silence as much as his voice.

THE COMPOSITE CHRIST

Boll tells us that the child is "the Christ as including both himself, the head, and the church, his spiritual body, which is one with him" (R. 44). "That the man-child of chapter 12:5 is none other than the Christ; but not the individual Christ alone, but his body, the church, also, seen as connected with him" (R. 79). "The Christ," then, is the head and the body, or church. That is Russellism pure and simple. Hear Russell:

"Although the Lord considers us individually, and in many respects deals with us individually, yet our standing before the Father is not so much as units, but as members or parts of a unit, which unit is Christ, the head and body." Again, "When the great Prophet and Life-giver, the great Priest after the order of Melchizedek (Christ, head and body, complete), stands forth to bless the world" (Russell, in *At-One-Ment*, pp. 215, 218).

"Christ, head and body, complete."—Russell.

"The Christ, then, is the head and the body, or church."—Boll.

Did anyone ever see that idea before Russell put it forth? In our reading we never saw it till we found it in Russell's works. And yet Boll does not hold to one distinctive principle of Russellism. But, then, we are reminded that since Boll adopted this it is no longer peculiar to Russellism!

Again: "Even the Gentile contingent sprang out of Israel's covenant-promises" (R. 44). But how did "the Gentile contingent" spring "out of Israel's covenant-promises," if Boll is correct in saying, "But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subversion to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed" (K. 63). But Boll declares that the restoration and exaltation of national Israel has not taken place. Then we are forced to inquire: How did Gentile Christians spring out of Israel's covenant-promises if all taught the Gentiles were to be blessed through national Israel?

But this child was caught up to God's throne. With Boll this is the taking back of the church to heaven with him at the "first stage" of his second coming; for, you remember he said that the child is Christ and the church. "The Great Tribulation" immediately follows the taking up of the church, according to Boll's program. Then he tells us that the Jews, already gathered back to Jerusalem, will on account of their sufferings, seek the Lord. Yet he says, "If ever the Jews get control of Jerusalem again," etc.

Then Boll makes an attempt to explain the beast of Rev. 13. (See R. 44-46.) He identifies this beast with Daniel's fourth beast (Dan. 7). For a fuller discussion of the beast see this tract, page 19. There were only four beasts, four universal world kingdoms; and Boll says the fourth was Rome, and "Rome is gone" (K. 18). And yet he says this fourth beast of Revelation "is the fourth beast himself" (R. 46). It is Rome revived again, he says. And yet he says, "and not the fourth beast (Rome) as it was and passed; nor yet a new, a different, a *fifth* one (for there were not to be five, only four world-powers)—but the fourth one 'in the latter time of his kingdom,' revived and returned in Satanic power" (R. 46). Is that clear to you? If not, perhaps this will help: "The fourth beast of Daniel's vision is unquestionably and admittedly Rome, and Rome has long since passed away" (K. 75). The fourth beast, then, died. So the beast of Revelation is "not the fourth beast (Rome) as it was and passed." All four have gone. And yet another comes up, but it is not a fifth one—there were only four—and it is not the fourth one that passed away. Yes, it is the fourth one.

Can you understand that? Neither can we.

Concerning Babylon he says, "The student of the old prophecies concerning Babylon may have been impressed by the actual *non-fulfillment* of some of the predictions concerning Babylon's sudden, utter, and eternal overthrow" (R. 54). This he says to prepare the reader to believe that Babylon may be rebuilt. There is no "may be" about it. If some of the prophecies concerning Babylon have not been fulfilled, then Babylon *must* be rebuilt, or else prophecies fail. Yet he says, "Whether old Babylon be rebuilt *or the equivalent of it*," etc. (R. 55). So then Boll is doubtful whether all the prophecies concerning Babylon will ever be fulfilled. But we have no doubts concerning the prophecies and the future of Babylon. God says, "It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation" (Isa. 13: 17-22). "Thou shalt be desolate for ever saith Jehovah" (Jer. 51:26). If Boll is right, some of the prophecies concerning Babylon are bound to fail. Some of them he says have not been fulfilled; so if Babylon is never rebuilt these prophecies fail. But Jehovah says: "Thou shalt be desolate for ever." "And I will render unto Babylon and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea all their evils that they have done in Zion in your sight, saith Jehovah. Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain, saith Jehovah, which destroyest all the earth; and I will stretch out my hand upon thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and will make thee a burnt mountain. And they shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, nor a stone for a foundation; but thou shalt be desolate for ever" (Jer. 51:24-26). So if Babylon is rebuilt this prophecy of Jeremiah fails. And if Boll is correct other prophecies will fail if it is not rebuilt. Boll's theory concerning Babylon denies the truthfulness of Jeremiah's prophecy, and Jeremiah's prophecy upsets Boll's theory. It is Boll against Jeremiah and Jeremiah against Boll. We shall not lose any sleep watching to see who is right. But we are astonished that any man will be so audacious as to construct a theory that gives the lie to some of God's prophecies! It would not be so bad were it not that others, like young birds with open mouths, are ready to swallow such pernicious poison.

But who is the harlot of Rev. 17? And what is Babylon? If the Lord explained these things to John, he did not require John to tell us. If the Lord had wanted us to know, he would have told us. Let us have enough regard for God to respect his silence. To add a guess where God is silent looks too much like adding to the sayings which are written in "this book."

The book of Revelation is filled with symbols and figures of speech. It has many interpreters. They do not agree in their theories. Every

theory finds its climax in the Millennium, and they do not agree as to the Millennium, nor as to what the binding of Satan means. If there should come a thousand years of the most glorious things that the wildest imagination can picture, theorizing will not change it, nor help us to enjoy it. Then, our theories are most likely to be wrong—in fact they are all wrong except the one the theorist himself is advancing, the theorist themselves being judges.

In the Old Testament there were many, many prophecies concerning Christ, and no devout Jew understood them. The Ethiopian Nobleman, reading a prophecy concerning Christ that seems perfectly plain to one who knew its fulfillment, was puzzled and asked Philip, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other?" To us, in the light of their fulfillment, the prophecies concerning the Prophet and the Messiah seem perfectly plain. Yet the student of the prophecies amongst the learned and devout Jews thought they referred to two persons, instead of one. A delegation was sent to John, inquiring of him if he were the Christ. "I am not the Christ," he said. "Art thou the prophet?" He answered, "No." Thus they distinguished between Christ and the prophet. They thought they had the prophecies concerning Christ and the kingdom figured out, and their theories so benumbed them that their ears were stopped and their eyes were closed, and they believed not when the prophecies had been fulfilled before their eyes. Thus we see how blind a person becomes who builds theories on unfulfilled prophecies, and what havoc such theories work with one's salvation.

And why should a man build theories as to the Lord's future program? He cannot know that he is right. Why disturb the peace of the churches with fine-spun theories that end with an "if"? If a man's love for the church is greater than his vanity, he will not disturb the churches with his theories. If Boll's entire theory could be true, what blessing comes to the church or humanity by parading it, and featuring it to the disruption of congregations? Study the prophecies? Certainly; learn all about them you can. But when tempted to theorize, be admonished by the blunders of the Jews, and remember that God will not take your theory as a guide in fulfilling the prophecies. The Jews builded theories on the prophecies, but God's fulfillment of these prophecies demolished their structure and they went down with it. If a man is not admonished by his own limitations and the fate that befell Jewish theorists, his case is hopeless—he is smitten with an incurable mania.

Why cannot men be content with facts, without building theories on them? Darwin as a scientist discovered many valuable things about

nature; but he was not content with discovering facts—he must construct a theory about these facts. Here harm began. And the evil that Darwin as a theorist has done far out-weighs the good that Darwin as a scientist ever did.

But there is a type of mind that seems incurably inclined to speculate. Years ago the following dialogue took place on the campus of the Nashville Bible School, between one of the authors of this book who is designated as B, and another student who is designated as A.

A. "What's your theory about the Millennium?"

B. "I haven't any."

A. "Didn't you ever think about it?"

B. "Yes, I've thought about it some."

A. "And didn't you ever come to any conclusion?"

B. "Absolutely none—I've never learned enough about it to come to any conclusion."

A. "Well, I'm not that way. When I run up on anything I've *just* got to take a position on it."

B. "I'm different—I can get a few facts about a thing, and stick them away in a pigeon hole of my mind, thinking I may some day get enough facts to form some connected ideas, and keep them there indefinitely."

That student was not the author now under review. But he was the representative of a type—the speculative type.

This is the type of mind that makes financial plungers and gamblers out of men of the world. In world affairs they serve no useful purpose, but are rather a menace. When such become Christians the gambling, plunging, risking spirit makes them speculators in religious futures. They pit the peace of the church against the outcome of their theories, "railing in matters whereof they are ignorant." The gambling spirit, restrained by their religion from dealing in financial hazards, finds expression in speculating on religious futures. And, in this, there being more at stake, it is correspondingly a greater menace than in worldly (civil) affairs. In both realms it is blind to the evils it brings; and in neither case would it succeed without its dupes.

But what about the Millennium? We have no theory, and have never seen one that did not have in it insurmountable difficulties. Boll says there are difficulties in Revelation. But he undertakes to surmount them, and construct a definite program. His theories may be as good as any so far as we know (they are all worthless), and it may be the furthestest from right so far as he knows. One of the main pillars of his theory, without which his theory falls to ruin, tapers off into an "if." When an architect and builder is not sure of his structure,

thoughtful people will beware. One peculiar feature about the speculators is that every independent thinker amongst them constructs a theory of his own, and depends, for his followers, on that peculiar type of people, who, like young birds in a nest, are not able to gather for themselves, but swallow whatever is dropped into their mouths.

Boll's theory seems to be a sort of patch-work from Russell's vagaries, Blackstone's speculations, some vagaries of others, with a few touches of his own. Blackstone held that the kingdom was offered the Jews by Jesus in person, but, as they rejected it, Jesus gave the church as a substitute till the kingdom of the Millennium. To this Boll assents, with some modifications. Russell claimed that the Christ who shall reign in the Millennium is composed of Jesus as the head, and the body which is the church. Boll adopts this idea of Russell. Russell claimed that only a definite number is to be gathered before the Millennium. This elect class, together with Jesus the head, will be the reigning Christ in the Millennium. Boll agrees with this, for he tells us that Israel's conversion is to be deferred, or, which amounts to the same thing, the hardening of Israel is to continue "until the full count of the elect Gentiles shall have come in" (K. 28). "That the 'new song' of 5:9, 10, views the work of purchasing unto God with his own blood men out of every nation as finished. The selection is seen as completed; the full number of the chosen ones seen as constituted a kingdom of priests unto God, and as reigning on the earth. This then prophetically foreviews the time when God shall have done visiting 'the Gentiles' (the nations) to *take out of them* a people for his name" (R. 78). These statements need no comment—the doctrine is one with Russell's idea. This can be said: With their idea of the Millennium, it is logical to conclude that there is to be a definite number converted during the "church age"; for if to each Christian there is to be assigned a definite number of cities over which to rule, as there will certainly be a limitation to the number of cities then existing, there also must be a limitation to the number of rulers. So if Russell and Boll are right the Lord is not trying to convert the world now; he is only gathering and "testing" a definite number now to be rulers then.

The provisions of the Great Commission cannot be harmonized with such theory. World evangelization is outlined there to continue during the present age. But it seems strange that any one should have to argue with a professed gospel preacher that God would now have all men to come to repentance. But this theory necessitates that idea, and the daring of Russell and Boll is equal to it.

Boll's kingdom in the Millennium is nothing more than a civil power, justly administered. As a government it is not concerned about

the salvation of its subjects. "We must distinguish between government—the exercise of authority in maintenance of law and order—and salvation. The former must be enforced; the latter is ever a matter of individual choice and acceptance" (K. 84).

He says also that the kingdom could not be established while Satan's throne is here, and while the Beast (a world-empire) is here. But in the Millennium he says "every rival power is destroyed . . . and all things are ready for the great step" (R. 62). Had Jesus made the claim before Pilate that he was seeking to convert the Jews so he could set up such a government as Boll has outlined, with Jerusalem as its capital, in the sight of the Roman government he would have been guilty of high-treason and Pilate could not have said, "I find no fault in this man." At present Jesus is exalted to heaven. If Boll's theory of the Millennium is true, the Lord's taking the throne will look more like his second humiliation than his exaltation.

Why should the Lord give a period of time so arranged that nothing but a lot of spineless people could possibly be developed, and then turn the Devil loose on people who knew nothing of his ways and who are not prepared to resist him? "But these must be tested," says Boll; and the Lord turns the Devil loose on them. What advantage, then, has the Millennium? Boll says the Millennium "will be a time of world-conversion" (R. 66). And it seems that when Satan is loosed they turn away in multitudes. "Satan meets with a success far too great," so Boll says. And then, with this dark picture, after all his talk about the glories of the Millennium and its being the climax of all that went before, Boll says, "It ends with a failure, like every other dispensation" (SC. 40). So that is Boll's judgment on all the works of God on the earth. He ends his long drawn out argument with an "if," and writes "Failure" on the end of Jehovah's work on earth. We are glad Jehovah did not say that, and no one who stands with uncovered head in the presence of Jehovah's majestic glory would think of writing "Failure" on the consummation of God's works.

The foundation of the whole Millennium theory is found in Rev. 20:1-6. And Revelation is admittedly a book of symbols and figures. Why literalize these? There are insurmountable difficulties as we have seen, and the thoughtful can easily discover others.

Boll condemns every other theorist on Revelation except the "futurist." And he mentions this as a point in their favor. "The 'futurist' interpretation, though not free from difficulty, has this in its favor, that it requires no trimming, or manipulation of the word of God. The futurist is not obliged to discover or to manufacture resemblances between the prophecy and the course of past history" (R. 75). And

sure enough that does make the work lighter—the futurist, not being bothered with any facts of history at all, can manufacture history to suit himself—and the same Boll does! It seems that he had it in himself to theorize and he deliberately selected the plan wherein he would not be bothered with trying to make history fit his theory, but could invent events to suit his theory. No, sir; the futurist is not obliged to manufacture resemblances between the prophecies and the course of past history. All he has to do is to manufacture future events to fit his theory! But even then he does not know that he is right, and must end his argument with an "if."

