

RADIO INTERVIEW



Dr. Barry Horner



*Radio Station
WNYG 1440 AM
New York and Connecticut
on*

*Iron Sharpens Iron
hosted by Chris Arnzen,*

Interview of Dr. Barry Horner on
Iron Sharpens Iron
hosted by Chris Arnzen,
Monday, March 10, 3:00 pm-4:00 pm EST
Radio Station WNYG 1440 AM in New York and Connecticut

Chris Arnzen had interviewed Dr. Horner before concerning his long-standing ministry that focuses on the seventeenth century Puritan John Bunyan, and particularly his classic allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Chris is a Reformed Baptist, which alignment tends toward amillennialism and supercessionism. Hence his focus here is upon the challenge to this eschatology which recently published *Future Israel*, by Broadman & Holman, presents. The following transcript has been slightly edited for the purpose of enhancing ease in reading without detracting in any way from the truth spoken.

By way of background, in years past Dr. Horner associated with Reformed Baptists, and at that time received considerable assistance while moving away from the environment of popular, Arminian evangelicalism. However it was John Bunyan who led him further away from necessary conformity to the *Second London Baptist Confession* of 1689, somewhat of a hybrid, and find a place of greater rest in the unalloyed Baptist *First London Confession* of 1644. So by way of clarification, while he aligns in general with the attractive, warm-hearted Calvinism of Bunyan, Newton, Ryle, Spurgeon and Lloyd-Jones, nevertheless he does not agree with systematic covenant theology or the augmenting of Christ with the sanctifying use of Moses via the Law, that Law which is said to be a creation ordinance. In mentioning this, he does intend to rile Reformed Baptists, such as Dr. Sam Waldron who was interviewed the next day in response, but rather be up front with regard to the underlying basis of the mainly critical analysis of Augustinian amillennialism that follows.

CA – Barry, what led you to write the book *Future Israel*?

BH – Chris, we have to go back a considerable period of time. The book has taken over 10 years in the writing. I'm a Christian pastor and as such I believe in the full authority of Scripture. It is the word of God, hence truthful. So I've been expounding the Bible by way of preaching for many years, and especially books such as Hosea, Zechariah, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians and Hebrews. As I have gone through this truth of God, and because I have mixed in what you have already indicated as sovereign grace or Calvinistic circles, I have been confronted by other views of eschatology that are different from what I believe Scripture says.

Because of this encounter, my own eschatology has developed over this considerable period of time, and so it has gradually come together, and now here it is in *Future Israel*.

Comment 1. The Personal Introduction of *Future Israel* provides greater detail concerning this personal eschatological pilgrimage that faced challenges and the need for refinement within a more Calvinistic environment (FI xiii-xxi).

CA – Now we have already heard the glowing response of Dr. John MacArthur to your writing of this book [which Chris had earlier read]. What have been some of the other responses?

BH – Well, to begin with, if someone is interested in the book, they should go to *Amazon.com* where you will find details about it, and you'll also read a number of reviews that are all very appreciative. Frankly I would say that 95% of the responses thus far have been deeply supportive and commendatory, though there have been others who are more critical. Especially from the Reformed camp, a number have offered their disagreements. Also some of these have been rather amusing, particularly when emotion tends to dominate rather than [cool thinking about the] truth. Presently I am watching some of the relevant blog sites and am myself planning to have a new web site available very soon called *Future Israel Ministries*. Through it I will be able to interact and put up much more about this whole vital matter which concerns Israel. But overall the response has been very good. Nevertheless I am not so foolish as to believe that this high level of acceptance will remain unchallenged. To be sure, I am going to get some heavy criticism. In fact my eldest daughter said, "Dad when this book comes out you will need to wear a flak jacket!".

CA- You have really got my interest peaked. What were some of the responses that you found humorous?

BH- Well, one man responded on a blog site that when he read the book he felt like flinging it across the room. He continued that it took him near three weeks for him to recover his sanctification.!

CA- Oh that is humorous.

BH- I was amused by it too.

Comment 2. This animated response was by Dr. Sam Waldron in his blog site named *Illumination*, the title of his response being "Future Israel by Barry Horner #1," on February 26, 2008. It is part of *The Midwest Center for Theological Studies* web site at www.mctsowensboro.org. A comprehensive collection of these responses to and reviews of *Future Israel* is to be published on the forthcoming web site www.futureisraelministries.org.

CA- What is the main thrust of Future Israel?

BH- The main thrust really is about the question of the existence of Jews and Israel today. I mean you've got the nation of Israel and you've got Jews around the world, and you've also got conflict in the Middle East over the territory of Palestine. Therefore the real bottom line issue is this. Has God covenantally [according to His promise to Abraham] and permanently [irrevocably] disinherited his people? Are they now passé, divinely regarded as *persona non grata*, and that means ethnically, nationally and territorially? Are they, in God's sight, now past history because of their sin of unbelief and so forth? Therefore has the Gentile Christian church [in the main], in having been dominant for so many centuries, become the inheritor of the promises formerly given to Israel? Is then the church the new spiritual Israel, with the result being that every Christian is now a spiritual Jew? These are the vital questions. On the other hand, has God still got in view a distinct covenantal future for the nation and land of Israel?

CA- Well just out of curiosity, since you have suggested that many, if not most, with regard to the eschatology of the Reformed camp of Christianity, regard the church as being spiritual Israel, how do you respond to I Peter 2: 9-10 "But you are A CHOSEN RACE, A royal PRIESTHOOD, A HOLY NATION, A PEOPLE FOR God's OWN POSSESSION, so that you may proclaim the excellencies of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvelous light; for you once were NOT A PEOPLE, but now you are THE PEOPLE OF GOD; you had NOT RECEIVED MERCY, but now you have RECEIVED MERCY" [NASB]. Isn't Peter now speaking to the church here as a whole, comprising Jew and Gentile?

BH- Well now that is a good question. I can't go into detailed exegesis. But this whole matter is dealt with in depth in *Future Israel* [FI 285-90]. The major question is this, who is Peter writing too? Even Patrick Fairbairn, and he is well known for his amillennial views, says that this epistle is written to Jews in the main. Now when you approach Peter's writing with that perspective in mind, the verses you quoted take on quite a different meaning. I can't go into more detail concerning the considerable proof available for what I say. But this question does give you something to think about, that is specifically to whom Peter, the apostle to the Jews, is addressing in his epistle.

CA- The subtitle of the book, what a provocative subtitle, "Why Christian Anti-Judaism must be Challenged". Is anti-Judaism different from anti-Semitism?

BH- Yes I have written that it is [FI xix-xx]. I think anti-Judaism is a more gentle, a somewhat softer term, and I've used it quite purposely. I think there are some, though few references made to anti-Semitism in *Future Israel*, only as the context requires [FI 382]. But, let me explain it this way. Anti-Judaism, I would say, is where you get a theological disagreement concerning the ongoing existence of ethnic, territorial and national Israel in the mind of God. It is the

conviction of some Christians who study the Scriptures and are convinced that God has given over the nation, that is He has given it over, predominantly speaking, to the Gentiles, and so it's over for the nation of Israel. Now that is theological. However you get into anti-Semitism when you move more into the ethnic, [malicious] gut level of opposition which becomes emotional and frankly is a shameful cause that has become very evident in Europe over more recent centuries. Anti-Semitism lodges deep in the core of a persons being, the result being degrees of hatred [and scorn] for the Jews. Now again I would add this, that anti-Judaism is a more temperate term, it being more essentially theological. Though I would add this qualification. I think it is possible, and I've seen this in what I've read, that you can gradually, even unconsciously glide across from anti-Judaism into anti-Semitism. And you can find gradations of this in a variety of theological authors. But there remain the essential differences as I see it.

CA- You often refer to replacement theology or supersessionism. What do you mean by these terms?

BH- Right, these terms are commonly used in the discussion of eschatology, and some of the people who would be very much opposed to what I have written don't particularly like either of these terms being applied to themselves, but especially replacement theology. I have read many [who are plainly anti-Judaic] who say that they don't believe in replacement theology. Well then we move on to the other term, supersessionism. Whereas replacement theology is saying the church has replaced Old Testament Israel, supersessionism is saying that the church has superseded Israel. Now in my reading of many writers in this regard. I have to say frankly that they do a bit of twisting and turning here. They then come up with other terms like fulfillment. So they say that the church has fulfilled Israel. Or they say that the church has absorbed Israel. Or they say that the church is a progression from Israel. Others write of transference [from Israel to the church] or the expansion [of the church by means of Israel]. So you get all these [variations on a basic point]. But here is the bottom line; it is this; for those who vie for such terms, nevertheless what is their estimate of the Jew, the nation, and the land of Israel today? Has God got any covenantal interest in these entities? Now when you go to these people they say, "No, no, that's all over." So you find out that whatever terms they use, we finally end up with the same conclusion. For these Jewish people, they say, God has now, covenantally, no place for the Old Testament nation, the Old Testament Jew, and the Old Testament land.

CA- Is your book about dispensationalism?

BH- I've read of some people on blog sites saying, "Ah, Barry is a dispensationalist." [Some come to this conclusion] through guilt by association with John MacArthur. Now I don't want to get into particulars here, though let me put it very clearly; this book is not about dispensationalism. For instance I would simply raise the question with regard to my quoting

at length from Horatius Bonar, who is certainly a great reformed, Presbyterian writer, and J. C. Ryle, such a great Anglican, sovereign grace man of God. So I would put to you the questions, "Is J. C. Ryle a dispensationalist?" or, "Is Horatius Bonar a dispensationalist?" Of course the obvious answer is "No." So we are not dealing with that. I am premillennial in my eschatology, but even that is made to be more of a secondary issue in *Future Israel*. I'm just dealing with a more bottom line question. It is, "What is the future hope of ethnic, national and territorial Israel?"

CA- You just mentioned Horatius Bonar. The book [*Future Israel*] contrasts Augustine and Calvin with Horatius Bonar and Charles Spurgeon. What is your conclusion here?

BH- Well yes, I did that purposely. Regarding Augustine, you read him, though you first have to go back before him to the plainly anti-Semitic Chrysostom. He is rabidly anti-Semitic, and what he writes about the Jews is quite disgusting. Then you are immediately followed by Augustine. He responds by saying, "Don't kill the Jews, just suppress them." That is, keep them under your heel and there they will be, in their humiliation, a witness to the fact that they have crucified their Messiah and so forth. Now you don't get any real love by Augustine for the Jews. He believed they would eventually be converted at the end of the age and then be absorbed into the Christian church. As a result they would then lose any real Jewish identity. Calvin was a little softer; he was not as bad as others, yet nevertheless you read in his *Institutes* of him being totally given over [and enamored] with Augustine. And I believe that when Calvin was in Geneva, at that time the Jews were expelled from that city. So when you read the tone of Augustine and Calvin at a tolerant best, nevertheless Calvin, [obviously following Augustine], plainly teaches that the church has become the new Israel. So [as a result] the Jew [or Jewishness] is destined to become passé. However when you read Horatius Bonar, as well as C. H. Spurgeon [and J. C. Ryle], according to the numerous quotes in *Future Israel*, you will find a totally different attitude. You will find a tenderness and a warmth and a hope [with regard to the Jew]. Just read Bonar and Spurgeon and Ryle and you will find that they don't believe God is finished with the Jews nationally and territorially. They will go back [to the land] and they are going to believe in Christ as their Messiah, [as a nation], and eventually when Christ returns, He will reign over them [in the land], and then [at that time] there will also be the surrounding, [converted] Gentile nations. It is a matter of contrasting tone that is quite obvious, I think.

CA- Going back to something you just commented on about those who believe that God is through with the Jews. I don't think I have ever heard an amillennarian or postmillennarian say that God is through with Jews.

BH- Well if you read *Future Israel* you will read all about it! I'll give you two examples. You've got the case of Albertus Pieters who is very well known as a classic Dutch reformed scholar and you can read the quotes about him. And a more recent example would be Lorraine

Boettner. Now Boettner has written a book called *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*. It is an excellent book. I have been blessed by it myself. But, he has written another book and it's called *The Millennium*, and I can quote you several writers, not just myself, who say that Boettner's comments are blatant anti-Semitism. So I've got those two quoted in the book, and there are others [who are referenced] as well. Some others, I would add, are less vociferous; they are more anti-Judaic than anti-Semitic. But nevertheless, when it comes down to the bottom line, they would also conclude that God is finished with the Jews [ethnically, nationally, and territorially].

Comment 3. Concerning the charge of anti-Semitism, Arnold Fruchtenbaum is explicit with regard to Boettner in his *Israelology* (FI 42), while Franklin Littell, in also referencing Boettner, is strongly implicit in his *The Crucifixion of the Jews* (FI 41, 259, 371). Then we also note that Boettner approvingly quotes Pieters (FI 42)!

CA- Well I have obviously heard from both of those camps, amillennialists and some postmillennialists, that God is no longer dealing with the Jews as a nation or giving them most favored nation status. But at least in contemporary reformed amillennial and postmillennial circles, I haven't heard that God is through with the Jews. Especially postmillennialists, they have a great optimistic vision for the future of the Jews.

Comment 4. The reason that Chris, and a host of those adhering to Reformed eschatology, has not heard about the denigration of Judaism over the centuries, according to Christian roots, is that of ignorance of a very unsavory aspect of church history. Amillennial eschatology, by its very Augustinian nature, does not arouse distinctive, Pauline, pro-Judaic concern.

BH- Ok lets take the end thought there and deal with it first. You are quite right when you refer to classic postmillennialism, and [in this regard] I would agree with you. Indeed in *Future Israel* I have an appendix concerning Jonathan Edwards who is postmillennial. When you read about it you will see this [pro-Judaic conviction] very clearly. [However], although he is postmillennial in terms of [contrast with premillennialism], basically he is very much of the same opinion as I am [with regard to the future destiny of the Jews and Israel]. He describes [how] Christ will return to Jerusalem, the Jews will be there and they will be converted of course. Surrounding [the land of] Israel will be the converted gentile nations. Nevertheless Edwards is postmillennial. Now there is another matter raised here and it is true insofar as it goes, [though it does not go far enough]. John Murray and others say, "Well, there is going to be a future mass conversion of the Jews." What we get here is a distinction [that often is not clearly seen]; they say that the Jews will be converted [in a national sense toward the conclusion of this age]. When you raise the question, "Has God still got a covenant interest in the Jews today?" they may or may not offer some [qualified] agreement. But when you then ask, "Has God got a covenant interest in the nation?" and, "Has God got a covenant interest in the land [of Israel]?" they usually hedge on these matters [because of the implications for

today and the future]. Now my point would be, when you are dealing with Jews, that you can't divide them up like that. In the French national assembly toward the end of the 19th century, when there was a move for greater personal freedom in France, there was a famous statement [that arose] and it came out this way; it said that, "the Jews should be denied everything as a nation but granted everything as individuals" [FI 30-31, 41]. Well, biblically that is quite absurd. That is like someone saying to you that you are an American, and I respect you for that, but you don't have a nation and you don't have a land. Well that is also absurd. So sometimes people think of Jews very glibly and in the book I try to get them to ask, "Wait a minute, what do you mean by a 'Jew'? Does not this name have ethnic, national and territorial meaning all combined into one?"

CA- You mentioned earlier, Dr. Horner, about Chrysostom and Augustine and some others who had an anti-Semitic vent if you will, and thus made some harsh statements about the Jews. Briefly what has been the Christian treatment of the Jewish people over the centuries since the founding of Christianity other than what you have already mentioned?

BH- Well of course the early church was thoroughly Jewish. What subsequently happened was partly due to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD by Titus. After this there was the Simon bar Kokhba revolt quashed by Hadrian in 135 AD [bringing about the completion of Jerusalem's devastation]. As a result the Jews fled [to outlying areas] so that you find that from the 2nd century onward the leadership of the church remaining in Jerusalem transferred from Jewish to Gentile dominance. There is significant transference here. By the time you get to the 3rd and 4th centuries this subsequent Gentile course includes [among others], as I have said, Chrysostom and Augustine. Of course [immediately preceding], the great Constantinian revolution had established sacralism [the wedding of church and state]. Hence Constantine had conquered [the Roman world], but this was by means of the sword rather than simply the gospel. And from then on you see that he [in association with Eusebius], as well, had an attitude toward the Jews that was not good [plainly anti-Judaic]. Then you move on through the following centuries, the Middle Ages, and on toward the Reformation. Now there are exceptions during this course of history, but when you consider the broad [eschatological] thrust of this extensive period, you undoubtedly discover [the perpetuation of] anti-Semitism within the Catholic church. The period of the Crusades was a particularly shameful response. The design of the church, in attempting to regain the Holy Land, was not for the purpose of reestablishing the Jews in the land of Palestine. Rather the design was for the reestablishment there of the Christian Church. As the Crusaders moved across Europe, *en route* to Jerusalem, the persecution of the Jews was horrific. When you move on to the 13th and 14th centuries and consider the Dominican and Franciscan orders within the Catholic Church, their treatment of the Jews was absolutely savage, inquisitorial and shameful. Then you come up to Luther. Now remember, and this is very important, that Luther was an Augustinian monk, and he just adored Augustine. And when you look at his eschatology and especially as it even flows on through the Lutheran Church, you will find that it follows very much the eschatology of

Augustine. I've got quotes that deal with this in depth. Again consider the Reformation. It did not really recapture a lost, early church, biblical eschatology. It essentially perpetuated that which had come on down through the centuries. For instance, the Catholic Church, in its [confessional] documents, plainly declares that it is the new Israel. Of course on through the Reformation, we repeat, there are to be found exceptions [to orthodox supercessionism]. I've quoted some of these, but you will find the general, [overwhelming] thrust to be Augustinian [eschatology]. Really, [in the main], Reformed eschatology is inherited Augustinianism [passed on] through Luther and Calvin. [In his *Institutes*,] Calvin is full of Augustine. He so loves him, and [in like manner] I've read of more modern Reformed writers who similarly boast in Augustine. However this I believe to be a fatally flawed legacy. Rather, as Reformational Christians, we should be ashamed of this eschatological inheritance [which is essentially Roman Catholic].

Comment 5. It must be reiterated here that a study of church history is vital in grasping the Augustinian eschatological thrust that is so often wrongly romanticized. Frankly, even some church historians neglect to hardly mention the place of the Jews over the past two thousand years, let alone such a distasteful legacy (FI 15).

CA- You also refer to contemporary Christian anti-Judaism in the United States and the UK, especially those who hold to Reformed convictions. You have already touched on this, but why the emphasis on the Reformed church?

BH- Well, of course, because I have to confess to having had a personal interest [in this mater]. I'm very much a sovereign grace man. I'm a Calvinist. I believe in the sovereignty of grace. I will be second to no man in that. But so was C. H. Spurgeon. He was very much a man who was basically in support of what I have presented in *Future Israel*. Having mixed in sovereign grace and Calvinistic and Reformed circles, I have come up against this [anti-Judaism] in my reading, and I have read many Reformed writers. Of course there are different shades of being Reformed, as you know. In England you've basically got a broad Reformed heritage. And you've got some vociferous anti-Judaism there as well. Colin Chapman, Steven Sizer, and even NT Wright, who is probably a little calmer, yet still [a father] in that same camp. You come here to the United States. I think of O Palmer Robertson, he is Presbertyian, and a very good exegete. But when you read his book on this whole matter, *The Israel of God*, it's perfectly plain what he is saying; it is that God is finished with the nation [of Israel]. Then you've got Gary Burge from Wheaton College; he is the same. Then there is *Knox Theological Seminary* down in Florida [being quite vociferously Augustinian in its eschatology]. I've quoted them all [in more detail in *Future Israel*]. All of them [are basically] saying the same thing since their eschatology is [essentially] Augustinian. Therefore God is no longer dealing with the Jews as a nation, [and for this reason they no longer have a promised land]. For [Judaism] it is all over; [it is but a passing shadow].

CA- Hasn't there been though, in Reformed history, some [Christians showing] a very loving attitude in providing kindly treatment for the Jews. There were the puritans for instance. Then there were [some Christians of] the Dutch Reformed Church, such as in World War II, who risked their lives hiding the Jews in their homes, and so forth.

BH- Absolutely, I would agree with you, [since some were either postmillennial or premillennial]. Though again I would point out that it is relatively [exceptional] in terms of the broad sweep of the Reformed, Protestant and Lutheran churches, [especially within Europe]. Whether a more pro-Semitic sympathy comes out of Geneva, or Wittenberg, or Westminster, or the Church of England, [it remains exceptional, again throughout the broad sweep of European Reformed, Protestant and Lutheran churches], in which the major thrust is that of Augustinian, amillennial eschatology. For instance, [as an example of one of these exceptions], I have quoted a very famous Dutch reformer named Wilhelms à Brakel. Read all of the quotes there in *Future Israel*. You can [easily] see the man's gentleness [seemingly, like Edwards, as a postmillennial restorationist]; he has a love for the Jews. You easily perceive a tenderness there, but you won't find it so much in Augustine and [Calvin], and other Reformed writers of today. Frankly, in England in particular, the attitude of many [holding to Augustinian supersessionism] is rather shameful. It plainly shows when you read them.

Comment 6. Consider the comment of William Prynne, a prominent seventeenth century Puritan and staunch Presbyterian, who fell in and out of favor with Oliver Cromwell. "[I]n *A Short Demurrer to the Jews*, . . . [he] stated that the readmission of the Jews to England was against law and public welfare. . . . Prynne also declared that the Jews were the enemies of Christ, usurers, coin clippers, murderers, and crucifiers of children, 'not fit for our land nor yet for our dung-hills.'"¹

CA- Does Israel still have physical rights to the land of Israel?

BH- Now here we must go to Scripture. The Word of God must be the fundamental base of authority for us here, [not the United Nations]. We can deal with other related matters once we deal with Scripture. The Word of God seems to me to plainly say, when you go to Genesis 12, 15, 17, and on through the Old Testament, that God has covenantally, irrevocably given the land to the nation of Israel. Now of course you raise the issue with regard to today. Even so I believe [that the land] is a fundamental, non negotiable issue, even if [the Jews] have been dispersed [for centuries and a remnant has always remained in the land]. [Israel under discipline] does not alter the promise. Even if they have been disobedient [and unbelieving], it does not alter the promise. God is eventually going to save them [the Jews] so that Israel will be saved [as a nation] and then, [dwelling in the land], they will love [and serve] Christ as their Messiah.

¹ Paul E. Grosser and Edwin G. Halperin, *The Causes and Effects of Anti-Semitism*, p. 185.

CA- Where do the Palestinians come in to play [in all of this]? The Palestinians today take that title while realizing that the word "Palestinian" up until fifty years ago was meant to signify Jews. However do the Arabs in Israel today, the so called Palestinians, have rights to the land of Israel as a whole?

BH- You mentioned a point that I was going to make anyway and it is, as you say, that fifty years ago the Palestinians were the Jews and the Arabs were called Arab settlers. Well that's changed, and it changed principally after the Six day War [of 1967] as well as the Yom Kippur war of 1973 and onwards. It was then that the Arabs realized, especially the pan-Arab nations, [that their military efforts to displace Israel were failing]. All the [major] wars fought against Israel have been fought by the pan-Arab nations, not really the Palestinians. But after the Six Day and Yom Kippur wars, there was a change [of strategy] and a [new] cry for a [Palestinian] nation. There had never been a concerted plea for a [Palestinian] nation before [by the Palestinians], and furthermore [the Palestinians] had never before had a nation, because Palestine had belonged, much earlier, to Syria which of course was part of the Ottoman Empire. When the Second World War was over, Britain had the spoils of that region, along with France, and then it was finally handed over to the United Nations [when Britain resigned from its mandate responsibilities]. However the question remains, do the Palestinians have the right [to Palestine as a whole]? Of course they have rights. If you ask, do they have rights to a [Palestinian] nation and the land of Palestine [as a whole or in part], I say no. And they have never had such a right to a nation there. But go back to some of the early Zionist writers and you will find that they had a most loving interest in the [rights of] Arab settlers [in Palestine], in anticipation of the formation of a Jewish nation. [Even now], there are Arab citizens in Israel, as well as Christians [who own title to land]. I grant you that on both sides of the fence [concerning the Israeli/Arab conflict, there have been some very horrific reactions, [though more so from the Arabs]. Nevertheless the Arabs have rights, [but the Jews have a divine, historic right to the land as a nation]. One [further] point I would make is that in fact the Palestinians do have a land, and it is called Jordan. The original plan was that that would be their land. The Jews are not welcome into Jordan today, but that is the land of the Jordanians [who are in fact themselves also Palestinians or Arab settlers]. But you say, "Are they not presently in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? Well, I would frankly say that Israel could run those areas much better [that is peaceably and efficiently and productively] than ever the Arabs have done. I think the proof is the turmoil and terrorism that you see in the Gaza strip today. It's horrific what is going on there [and a shame to the Arab cause]. So yes, the Palestinians do have rights, that is human and citizenship rights. But I don't believe for a moment that they have national rights. This whole conflict could have been resolved much earlier [if the Arabs had not been so intransigent, wanting all of Palestine]. For instance, consider one example [of such a conflict being resolved] with regard to the separation of Pakistan from India. The British, [in overseeing India as a colony], negotiated independence in that region. So you had two nations formed that necessitated some racial exchange. However a [Hindu/Muslim] conflict was [to a degree] resolved. Now the Jordanians [as Arab settlers]

have a land, and this is the land which the Palestinians should be able to inhabit [alongside of their Jordanian brethren]. Now there are problems here, I know. However the Arabs and the Palestinians do not have a right to Palestine. Of course this a biblical conviction, and its fundamental to this whole matter.

CA- In what way is Romans 11 significant in your whole presentation?

BH- Well of course this is the great passage in the New Testament [dealing the present and future destiny of Israel]. This is the classic passage. I mean if you are dealing with all these issues you have got to carefully look at Romans 11. I would add a few more thoughts on this. Firstly, when you read Romans 11 realize this you are reading an epistle written by a converted Rabbi. Paul is a messianic Jew. He writes with a vast Jewish background, in fact he opens up in Chapter 11 and says, "I too am an Israelite." He doesn't say "I was an Israelite." Rather he says "I am [in the present continuous tense] an Israelite." And then he says that he is "a descendent of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." And going back to your previous question [about the land], he speaks here of [belonging] to the tribe of Benjamin, which is not only a demographic statement, but also a territorial statement. The tribe of Benjamin had a distinctive territory [allocated by God]. Now I don't doubt that Paul had that in mind as well. But [further], when you read the 11th chapter of Romans it is vital to remember that you are reading Paul as essentially addressing Gentiles and he is warning them not to mistreat [or demean] the Jews [after the manner of Augustinianism]. He is saying that you have got to love [and respect] them. Of course he goes on to include the fact that that "all Israel will be saved." I believe that anyone, after a *prima facie* reading of this [passage] would agree that when Paul says that "all Israel shall be saved," he is speaking of an eschatological saving of the nation of Israel as a whole. But [consider] verse 28, which is such a climatic, key verse as far as I am concerned. Here Paul makes plain, and I have written a whole chapter about this 28th verse, that from the standpoint of the gospel, they, that is the unbelieving Jews, are enemies [of God] for the sake of the gentiles. But from the standpoint of God's choice, that is His choosing of them as a nation, they, the present unbelieving nation of Israel, are beloved for the sake of the fathers {Abraham, Isaac and Jacob}. Now when Paul speaks here of the unbelieving Jews, clearly he has in mind the unbelieving nation, and yet [at the same time] he says that they are beloved by God. So I would suggest this, that the nation of Israel today and the [dispersed] Jews yet remain, covenantally, God's beloved enemies. But one day they will be saved as a nation *en masse* [and be distinguished in the future messianic kingdom as Jewish Christians.

CA- Dr. Horner, one thing that I have heard from those who are amillennialist and postmillennialist is that they are somewhat confused over why they would be charged as being [anti-Judaic and] anti-Semitic, particularly by dispensationlists. I know that you are not a dispensationlist, but the confusion is because the dispensationlist, [being] pre-tribulationist, will be typically thrilled with the anticaption of Jews returning to Israel and they are thrilled to death with that, in fact they raise money for it. There are ministries that raise money to get

Jews out of different countries in Europe, so that they can be flown to Israel and be established there in the promised land, if you will. But, those very same people, the dispensationalists, believe that the fate of the Jews in Israel is not a pretty one. Two thirds of the Jews are going to be slaughtered according to the escatology of dispensationalism. Can you explain that?

BH- Well lets take you last point first. I mean, this is really a question of exegesis. That point about the slaughter of Jews especially deals with Zechariah. Now, I haven't got the time to go over that now. But my point to the amillennialist is to expound Zechariah, and especially chapters 12 -14. Now I remember one reformed writer saying that if he was to argue the premillennial case, then he wouldn't go to Revelation 20, but rather Zechariah 14. Now again, I can't go into the details there. However, going back to what you said earlier. I actually never said that I was dispensational [or not]. I ducked that question because *Future Israel* is not about that. It's not dealing with that. I will confess to you that maybe I might be called a progressive dispensationalist in a particular sense. That is, I believe that there is only one redeemed people of God. The Old Testament believer and the New Testament believer will only be saved through [faith alone in] the merits of Christ's shed blood. However, I believe that in the one people of God, I think it is very evident in Scripture that you can diversity within that unity. A man and a woman may be one in Christ Jesus, but the diversity is that one remains a man and the other remains a woman. And so in a church, it is made up of the diversity of different spiritual gifts that makes up the one body of Christ. So I believe, and an appendix on Jonathan Edwards in *Future Israel* bears this out, that eschatologically there will only be one redeemed people of God on planet earth, on a renewed planet earth, if you like. But, that one renewed people will include the distinction between the saved Gentile and the saved Jew. I cannot for the life of me see any reason why that is not possible. After all, I can assure you that [in the coming Messianic kingdom], we will not be just homogenous, [clone-like] believers. Moses will be there and he will be Moses, and Elisha will be there and he will be Elisha. [David will be there as well.] And we will have our distinctions [both in character and office] there, and I believe there will be distinctions between Jew and Gentile yet under the glorious reign of [the Jewish] Christ.

CA- Can you understand the confusion that some who are amillennial or postmillennial might have over the fact that they are being targeted with [anti-Judaism or] anti-Semitism and yet there seems to be a glee that the Jews are returning to Israel? Not that the knowing of their fate is causing the glee, but rather the glee at this being a sign of the end times that seems to supersede [concern for] the dread and terror of their fate.

BH- Let me give one illustration of the problem here. Lets go back to 1967 and the Six Day War. There is bloodshed and great fighting going on and eventually the Israelis capture the old city [of Jerusalem]. They [also] capture the Wailing Wall. How can anyone not be moved by that. I can quote you from Dr. Martyn Lloyd Jones, who a year before he died was interviewed by Carl Henry in *Christianity Today*. And he said that this was one of the most

significant events that has happened over the preceding centuries [FI 224-25]. So how can you not be moved when these events happen, [notwithstanding the fact that bloodshed is involved]. I've quoted J. C. Ryle in this regard, and his perception here is very interesting. The reason is that he writes just before the upsurge of the Zionist movement [in Europe]. He speaks very clearly [and expectantly] about the return [of the Jews] to the land [of Israel]. As a matter of fact he even speaks about them going back in unbelief. And yet that is what has happened [in the first half of the twentieth century. I do not know how a person who has a love for the Jews, even in their unbelief, cannot be astonished and amazed at what is happening here. You are turning away from what is just staring you in the face. One other thing I want to add as well is this. You spoke about amillennialists being charged with anti-Semitism. I really haven't done this overall. [Many are anti-Judaic and some are anti-Semitic. I have provided abundant evidence of this in *Future Israel*.]

Comment 7. To suggest that amillennialists are being "targeted with [the charge of anti-Judaism and] anti-Semitism" is to suggest an unreasonable assault. Certainly, without apology, in *Future Israel* a serious challenge has been presented along with substantial evidence. Nobody likes to have an aspect of their heartfelt doctrine questioned. It is a painful process that often triggers strong reaction. However, let me remind those with an Augustinian eschatological lineage of the barrage of criticism against premillennialism and dispensationalism that has come forth from Reformed writers such as Adams, Allis, Grier, Hendriksen, Hoekema, Horton, Reymond, Palmer Robertson, Riddlebarger, Sproul, Strimple, Venema, Waldron, Waltke, etc. In general, they are all amillennial, anti-Judaic in various ways, and not tepid in their criticism.

CA- Dr. Horner, I didn't say that you did [make the charge of anti-Semitism].

BH- Well ok, though some do react this way. I'm just trying to clarify that point. You've got to read the evidence in *Future Israel*, and when you read who I've quoted there and what they said, [you will understand that the charge of anti-Semitism is sometimes applicable]. And these instances are found somewhat within the broad spectrum of Reformed or reformational Christian faith. There is no question about the fact that they are saying ugly [disparaging] things. And the further point I am making is that what they are saying is a result of their eschatology. In other words, if you have a bad ethical result, it cannot come from a good eschatology. A good eschatology will result in a good ethical result. Look at all the movements for the evangelism of the Jews. Where do they come from [in the main]? They have come, very broadly speaking, from those who have an eschatological hope for Israel. The amillennialist, the Augustinian, he may say that he wants to see the Jews saved, but he never really has started any great agency that especially focuses upon evangelistic outreach to the Jews. The reason is that such an initiative does not fit in with his eschatology.

CA- There is the ministry of *Christian Witness to Israel* [having Reformed sympathies], I believe.

BH- Yes, however the eschatology of *Christian Witness to Israel*, [especially in its formative years], is very much along the line I take in *Future Israel*. This agency does not originate from amillennialist [Augustinian] sources at all. The *Christian Witness to Israel* [in England, founded upon the union of the *International Society for Evangelisation of the Jews* (IJS) and the *Barbican Mission to the Jews*] is not amillennial at its roots, [but restorationist concerning the Jews and the land of Israel].

CA- I would agree with you that there is a sad lack of zeal for the evangelization of the Jews within Reformed circles, I'm not denying that, though I wouldn't necessarily jump to the conclusion that anti-Semitism is the motive there. But one thing I have found interesting, and perhaps you can clarify here as to whether it is true or not. I'm not an expert on church history. But [this concern] stretches the imagination. I have heard that [some of] the earliest dispensationalists actually held somewhat to a form of anti-Semitism. They so separated the Jews from the church that they did not believe that Jews would ever inherit heaven.

BH- However Chris, let me say it again that *Future Israel* is not about dispensationalism. I know something of the matter you are raising here. Dr. Arno Gaebelein and some others were, [for a time influenced by the fraudulent *Protocols of Zion*], and so write some things [that were anti-Judaic], though this is really quite immaterial to what I am saying. [Being very exceptional] it has nothing to do with the main issues of *Future Israel*. Unfortunately, and I've got to add this here as well, in Reformed circles, a considerable amount of their understanding of dispensationalism is quite contorted. If someone wants to call me a progressive dispensationalist, I am not particularly concerned. I don't accept all of Clarence Larkin and some of the things put forward in the original *Scotfield Bible*. And most people I know, John MacArthur and others, wouldn't do that either. [Much mischaracterization of dispensationalism by Reformed Christians is in fact the employment of a straw man, even a parody] However, *Future Israel* is not about this anyway. Again I go back to my quoting of Ryle and Bonar, these men as well as Spurgeon, they are all not in the slightest dispensationalist [in their eschatology]. So I am using them, and you see, I'm in their camp.

CA- What is your view of the sacrificial system returning to the nation of Israel?

BH- Well, again I would strongly recommend exegesis in this regard. When people raise this question, I say to them, first of all, tell me what is your whole exegesis of that major section at the end of Ezekiel there, [that is chapters 36-48]. You get this question about sacrifices raised without dealing with careful study of [the whole portrayal of] Israel there. Now go back to it and consider the details of the temple and all that's going to come about there, then I will begin to listen to you. You get these broad extrapolations from Ezekiel and the [building of the temple] there, and then the subsequent, [driving] question as to whether sacrifices will be

offered at that time? The question is, what does the whole of the text say [in all of its details]? And I am readily saying there are difficulties there. However, I would suggest that the person whose approach here is with a basic literal, grammatical, historical hermeneutic will certainly conclude that a historic eschatological temple is in view. I believe that [such an approach] has fewer problems to deal with concerning [all of] the text than those who are amillennial and, [with one broad abstract stroke] pass over so much and generalize with a few overall statements, and not deal with the particulars. For either side here it is not easy. But to get back to your question, it has been suggested as a possibility that [the sacrifices mentioned in Ezekiel] may be memorial sacrifices. [It seems that there will be some type of memorial in the future Messianic kingdom when Christ is present (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:16)]. However I cannot be absolutely sure. I believe that this still fits within a right understanding of literal interpretation of the text here, where some would demand meaning to the letter. So I go back to those who raise these questions. First let me see your exegesis of Ezekiel 36-48, the whole section there, and then we will get down to this particular matter. [Are all 378 verses here simply about the future glory of the church as the new spiritual Israel? I think not!]

CA- Yes, but it seems to many who are not premillennialist that it would almost be a blasphemous mockery of the once and for all sacrifice of Jesus Christ to be happy about the future return to the [Jewish] sacrificial system.

BH- One of my favorites who voices a consideration of matters of this kind is, once again, Horatius Bonar. [He would never for a moment demean the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ's atonement]. He wrote a book in the 18th century called *Prophetical Landmarks*. So you should get hold of it. As a matter of fact, this book, in total, will be up on my new web site, *Future Israel Ministries*, that will soon be accessible. Read there where he deals with this [and other related matters] in a most judicious and careful way. He faces some of the questions you have asked, so don't jump to conclusions as some do about these issues. I've met many come forth with the questions you have asked, yet they don't look at the broad, [controlling] context. What about Ezekiel 36- 38 which just precedes the revelation of the temple in Ezekiel 40-48, [and especially the vision of the valley of dry bones]? However enough said

CA- Do you think there can be a danger of catering to the sinful pride of the Jews regarding their ethnicity?

BH- Well yes. You raised this issue, I think, earlier, and it is a good question about the fact that some Christians do go to extremes in exalting in some of the facts concerning [the birth, growth, and struggles with the Arab world, of] the nation of Israel today. What do they say about these struggles that the Israelis have had with the Arab nations, and so forth? They go to extremes. You've got what is called Dual Covenant Theology that says that the Jews will be saved separately, according to their faithfulness to Torah quite apart from the New Covenant. That is absolutely unbiblical. The Scripture plainly tells us that our savior said to the Jews that,

“except you believe that I am He, you will die in your sins” [John 8:21, 24]. This I believe to be a vital concern, while some also go to extremes [in downplaying the priority of proclaiming the gospel to the Jews. They just want to be their friends.] However what I am trying to do here is set a right biblical balance about these matters. And Bonar and Ryle and Spurgeon, [of course along with Paul], will all give you a sense of proportion here. They are good men to read in these matters and they will help you a lot.

CA- You have appendices dealing with Jonathan Edwards who has been mentioned earlier, also JC Ryle, likewise mentioned earlier and Melanie Phillips. Why are these people so important?

BH- Well Edwards of course was postmillennial, so while I am premillennial in my own eschatology, we are still saying basically the same things with regard to the future of Israel as a nation. Ryle is well known [and beloved] in Reformed circles. He wrote a book called *Coming Events and Present Duties*. It is difficult to get hold of in the US. A lot of Reformed people haven't a clue as to what Ryle has written [concerning his premillennialism]. I'll endeavor to get that up on the forthcoming new web site as well. So when you read it, [you will discover that] he is very firm [with regard to his basic eschatology]. He is right down the line on this. Yet again, as you well know, he has this style [of writing] that is so attractive. Melanie Phillips is a most interesting person. She is a Jewess and not a Christian. She is a feature writer for the London *Daily Mail*. She went to a meeting in London in which Jews and Christians were getting together to discuss how they could have more friendly relations. So when she went there, she was anticipating that the problems they would discuss would be about the seeming endless tensions that face the Israelis and Palestinians. This would surely focus on the Gaza Strip and West Bank regions., but particularly the claims of the Palestinians. However she tells us that when she talked with the Christians and their views about these issues, they said, “look our basic problems are not with the Palestinians and tensions with the Israelis. Our real concerns are based upon theology. As a result she was stunned and found out more about what she had been told. These Christians explained to her that their real concerns were based on the fact of their belief in supersessionism whereby the Christian church had superceded Israel, so that the church had become the new spiritual Israel. The Christians were saying that this was the real root of their beliefs concerning Israel. Melanie was shocked because she found the problems that [the very existence of the nation of Israel raised] were rooted in theology and not just in the societal tensions between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

Comment 8. It is mentioned in *Future Israel* (FI xviii) that a leading Reformed publisher had told how consideration was being given to the publication of Ryle's *Coming Events and Present Duties*. Later, that publisher, in fact being *The Banner of Truth Trust*, advised that it would not proceed with this project. One can only wonder as to the reason why here.

CA- How do you suggest that Christians support Israel, because it is not, I think an easy matter to understand fully, that is exactly how one is to do that. To give you an example Dr. Horner, I know of politically conservative orthodox Jews who are Zionists, yet they despise the government of Israel since they believe it to be a socialist government that is actually atheistic and stripping religious Jews of their civil liberties.

BH- Of course you are right here about what is a minority. If you go over to Israel you'll find there is a considerable number of very conservative Jews and they are committed to a more biblical and rabbinic Old Testament perspective. You've got a much larger secular part, especially in the government. I have no question about that. You've also got numerous political groups, and of course the Jews broadly break up according the Ashkenazic and Sephardic groups based upon European origins. The main point I believe is, and I have experienced this to be true, that if Jews sense my interest in and sympathy for them, if they find out that I am a Christian and I have a certain regard for them biblically, that God hasn't finished with the Jewish people in present and future history, a door opens for friendly conversation.. But imagine going to a Jew and telling him, "I'll tell you the good news that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, Israel's Messiah, so that if you believe in him your sins will be forgiven and you will be reconciled to God. By the way, also when you become a Christian, your Jewish identity will be nothing; you will lose that and be absorbed into the Christian church where everyone will be a spiritual Jew." You can imagine how you would never be likely to advance with that sort of evangelism. Whereas you will find that Paul goes around saying "I am an Israelite, I am a Jew," you see, and he maintains his Judaism. It is for this reason he gains entrance into synagogues, and so forth. But in the main I'm saying, and again I've found this to be true, that when the Jews are unbelieving and they don't believe in Jesus as their Messiah, yet when they know you have a compassion for them, a love for them, an interest in them, a biblical interest and so forth, then they will be far more likely to talk with you. And at this point, incidentally, this is what we find Paul is saying, especially to Gentiles, in Romans 11.

Comment 9. It is true that at the founding of the modern state of Israel there were many communist Jews who came to Israel desirous of forming a socialist society, especially by means of kibbutz structures This may be the reason that the USSR voted in favor of the new nation in the United Nations. However the evolution of Israel's democratic parliamentary government, along with an independent judiciary, represents a moving away from socialist totalitarianism.

CA- I'm not doubting that there are people who are amillennial and postmillennial who have told Jews to give up their Jewish identity when they became Christians. But, I have never heard any that I respect say that in the camp of Reformed theology.

BH- Well, I can only say again, read *Future Israel*. There you can read the quotes. Though [it is important to] read all of it. I would say this Chris, that maybe one of the reasons you don't hear [about the concerns that *Future Israel* raises] is because they don't come up as a serious consideration [in your Christian community]. They are not vital [because Israel is not presently relevant in the mind of God]. Remember this, that when Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, went out [on all of his missionary journeys], he always went to the synagogue [and the Jews] first. He says in Romans 1:16 that the gospel is for the Jew first and then the Gentile. So he goes out to a city in Asia Minor or Europe, and in the synagogue he presents the gospel after which he is thrown and often beaten up. Then he shakes the dust off his feet, [condemns the Jew's unbelief] and declares that he will now go to the Gentiles with the gospel. Alright, Paul then goes to the Gentiles and usually gets a better [hearing and] harvest. Then a church is formed. Eventually he goes on to the next town. But to whom does he first preach? He goes back to the synagogue. At every town that Paul goes to in Asia, in Europe, indeed wherever he travelled, he first goes to the Jews in their synagogues. Even in his final journey to Rome, upon his arrival there he first rests for three days and then calls together the elders of the synagogue. Then he preaches to them [Jesus as the Christ], the hope of Israel. For Paul the Jews [always] had a distinctive place even though he was the apostle to the Gentiles. I've been in Reformed Baptist and Sovereign Grace and Reformed Presbyterian churches. I know these people, and this [Pauline passion] is [evidently] not a concern because they don't talk about [God's beloved enemies]. They are not [of heartfelt interest] to them. However look at Bonar and Ryle and Spurgeon and you will find this to be an issue, it is very important. The whole New Testament essentially is a Jewish book. Even Luke aside, though probably he was a Jewish proselyte, the whole of the New Testament was written by Jews.

CA- I am curious as to whether you have read a book by Baruch Maoz, who is a Reformed Baptist pastor in Tel Aviv. It is called *Judaism is not Jewish*. Have you ever read it?

BH- Yes I have [read *Judaism is not Jewish* which is a friendly critique of the Christian Messianic movement]. I know Baruch and I have had some back and forth with him on eschatological matters. You read his writings and discover that he believes that the land of Israel belongs to the Jews according to biblical right. On the other hand he associates with Reformed Baptists and those with similar Calvinistic convictions, a large number of whom would align with Augustinian amillennialism. At times he seems to be between a rock and a hard place. I have had interaction with him by email and dealt with some of these issues in detail. However they were personal communications. Nevertheless he seems to sit in the middle, trying to straddle two things [because of his Reformed Baptist alignment. Baruch is a Jew and Christian pastor who lives in Israel. There he preaches, though doubtless his congregation also believes that [according to Scripture], the land belongs to Israel [according to divine right]. To hold an Augustinian eschatology in such a setting would be difficult [except one is a Palestinian Christian].

CA- Actually Baruch is postmillennial.

BH- Yes that is right. Baruch would especially love the appendix in *Future Israel* that considers Jonathan Edwards' postmillennial eschatology and the distinctive future that he envisages for saved Israel.

CA- Thank you so much for being on our program today Dr. Horner. I hope you come back very soon. Your web site, for those who are listening, is www.bunyanministries.org.