

THE REFORMED ESCHATOLOGY OF  
SAMUEL E. WALDRON



A JUDEO-CENTRIC CRITIQUE  
BARRY HORNER

THE REFORMED ESCHATOLOGY  
OF  
SAMUEL E. WALDRON

We now consider a more recent publication, written in a popular style, by Reformed Baptist pastor, Samuel E. Waldron, titled, *The End Times Made Simple – How Could Everyone Be So Wrong About Biblical Prophecy?* The back cover commendation declares: “Piece by piece, Samuel E. Waldron strips away years of false teaching and faulty exegesis thrust upon the church to reveal what the Bible, in its own simple but profound way, says about what will happen at the end of this present age.” Then there are chapters breathtakingly titled, “But How Could Everyone Be So Wrong?” and “The Bible’s Own System,” which tempt us to express gratitude for the dawning of unparalleled illumination in the midst of such widespread eschatological darkness! It is difficult to refrain from disparaging here this obvious posturing. The inescapable conclusion is that in this volume, after generations of confusion and mystery, at last the veil has been pulled aside to reveal the truth of biblical prophecy in all of its uncomplicated clarity. However, the reality is that Bible prophecy is not so simple and perspicuous. There is much, especially in the prophets and Revelation, that, even with the employment of a right hermeneutic, is difficult to understand and so calls for humble agnosticism. Also there is much prophecy that has an inspired complexity about it that cannot satisfactorily be explained in terms of mere broad generalities and spiritual extrapolation.

So it needs to be pointed out that what we have here is, quite obviously, warmed over amillennialism that many of a Reformed Baptist persuasion profess. And from the heights of such simple eschatological purity, there rains down endless condemnation of complicated, worldly dispensationalism and premillennialism. The following quotation confirms this point in that it reflects participation in classic Augustinianism that has perpetuated the historic put-down of ethnic, national, and territorial Israel, and that in the name of Christianity.

We have been saying that the church is the *New Israel*. Now we must emphasize that the church is the *New* Israel. Though there is basic unity between the church and Israel, there is also the development, advancement, and superiority of the church over Israel. The church may be considered as the true Israel and as such the continuation of the Old Covenant people. It may also be considered to be the New Israel and as such a new beginning by God.

Old Covenant Israel did not possess the spirituality, unity, and oneness of the body of Christ. The corporate spirituality, unity, and commonality of the church did not exist in Old Testament Israel. A Jonathan and a David might hold sweet communion, but a Joab, Abner, and Saul also worshiped with them in the same congregation of Israel. There was a unity in the flesh, but not in the Spirit. There were regenerate Israelites, but never a regenerated Israel. Its

constitution was fleshly, not spiritual. What a privilege fellowship in a true church is; the saints of the Old Covenant knew only its flashes and shadows.<sup>1</sup>

Now we would agree with the principle of progression of revelation whereby the promise of the gospel in the Old Testament finds fulfillment in the New Testament. However, we would vigorously deny that inferior Israel, regarded as a mere shadow, subsequently finds its fulfillment in the superior church. There is almost a romantic blindness here concerning the visible body of Christ. Surely Joab, Abner and Saul, indeed Balam, Sanballat and Tobiah, and a host of Old Testament apostates, are easily rivaled by Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, Simon the magician, Hymenaeus and Philetus, Demas, Euodis and Syntyche, Diotrefes, and innumerable tares amongst the wheat of God's true saints. We would further agree that the Mosaic Covenant was clearly comprised, according to God's design, of shadows that made way for the substance that is in Christ (Col. 2:17). The simple reason for this is that Israel's existence in continuum is not conditioned by its participation in the interim Mosaic Covenant, but rather the abiding Abrahamic Covenant. As is so often the case with the kind of amillennial reasoning that Waldron presents, Israel's failure in general before God is attributed to its failure to abide by the conditional nature of the Mosaic Covenant.

The promises to the nation, Israel, contained a conditional element. Of course, they were not completely dependent on human obedience. The condition of human obedience was contained in the context of God's sovereign purpose. Yet while they are to be understood within the framework of divine sovereignty, the conditional element is clear (Exod. 19:5-6). Only faithful Jews could lay claim to the promises. That there would be such the divine purpose would secure, but that all Jews would be faithful was nowhere certified (Rom. 11:3f).<sup>2</sup>

One senses that Waldron knows he is skating on thin ice here when he refers to Israel's lack of "faithfulness" to the terms of Exodus 19:5-6 with regard to the Sinaitic Covenant concerning which God said, "If you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant [the Decalogue], then you shall be My own possession among all the peoples, for all the earth is Mine; and you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Waldron seems to very much want conditionalism for Israel, but not the church.

It is granted that Israel broke the Mosaic covenant. But to suggest this brought about the permanent disenfranchisement of Israel and the appropriation of its blessings by the church, is to make Galatians 3:17 of none effect where, "the Law, which came four hundred and thirty years later, does not invalidate a covenant previously ratified by God." As we have previously pointed out in this chapter, through the leadership of Moses, from the burning bush encounter onward to Israel's redemption out of Egypt and beyond, God continually declared that His covenantal intent, according to His promise to Abraham, was to bring His people into the promised land (Exod. 3:6-8, 15-17; 6:1-9; 12:25; 13:5; 32:13-14; 33:1-3; Lev. 20:24; 33:1-3; Num. 13:27). Redemption out of Egypt did not primarily look

---

<sup>1</sup> Samuel E. Waldron, *The End Times Made Simple*, pp. 153, 157.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151. There are shades of Fairbairn's conditionalism here.

forward to the Sinaitic Covenant, which was added because of transgression (Rom. 5:20; Gal. 3:19). Thus Israel's national future was not based upon the bilateral Mosaic Covenant, but the unilateral Abrahamic Covenant, which Romans 11:28-29 emphatically upholds. Does Waldron's conditionality here concerning Israel equally apply to the continuance of an authentic Christian in the faith? It is a wonder to behold when amillennial Calvinists, who so staunchly believe in particular elective grace, whereby even saving faith is a gift, yet speak of elect Israel losing its chosen status because of conditionality!

In two chapters, 17 and 18, Waldron deals with the crucial issue concerning the relationship between Israel and the church. While there is so much that should be responded to in this regard, only two significant matters will be dealt with. At the outset, the classic premillennial position will be upheld in which the one people of God incorporates the two distinct categories of Israel and the church. Further dispensational qualifications in this regard are not considered here, and it is not necessary to do so insofar as the alleged amillennial fulfillment and absorption of Israel into the church is concerned.

A. The church is the New Israel according to church history.

The author writes, "that God has only *one people* in all ages. The promises made to Israel are fulfilled to the New Israel, the church. I have called this position the historic position of the church. . . . The eschatological viewpoint that dominated the church through the Middle ages after the demise of the early premillennialism in the 4<sup>th</sup> century was not even premillennial.<sup>3</sup> Now what almost defies understanding here is that Waldron should declare, with apparent admiration, that his eschatological perspective concerning Israel and the church is in fact according to the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, that which found particular formulation through Augustine. We do not hesitate in agreeing that, especially from the Constantinian era on through to the Reformation, and beyond, the Church of Rome gloried in its dominion as the New Israel that could not tolerate ongoing Judaism. The eschatology of Augustine in this regard is one that ought to lead to shame, not boasting. One of the unfortunate attitudes of some believers with Reformed convictions is that because Augustine became such a staunch advocate of the sovereignty of grace, and therefore profoundly influenced Luther, therefore it is assumed that in other areas of doctrine, such as eschatology, he was equally reliable and laudable. The only remedy for Waldron's void in his understanding of church history at this point is for him to read of the ethical fruit of Augustine's eschatology, even as he learned it from Ambrose, and it found such repugnant expression in the theological anti-Semitism of Chrysostom, whose mouth did not always prove to be so golden. The terrible truth is that for centuries, after the doctrine of supercessionism became established, the church acted in a manner that directly opposed Paul's admonition to the Gentiles in Romans 11:17-21.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 137.

Luther was very much an enthusiast Augustinian monk, though here we are not considering the reformer's inheritance of gospel doctrine but rather an eschatology that has continued to result in despite being inflicted upon the Jews by those who claim to have been saved by a Jew. So Waldron needs to read much more comprehensively on this matter, and it is for this reason that the *Annotated Bibliography in Future Israel* has been included (FI 361-377). How could it be that, after the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), in which the mother Jewish church in Jerusalem saw the light concerning gospel grace being freely outpoured toward the Gentiles, and readily acknowledged liberty in this regard, yet within one hundred and fifty years the Gentile children turned on its mother and arrogantly declared that she must conform to their dictates?

One other matter in this area of history that begs for a response is the reference to the eschatology of C. H. Spurgeon. A quotation is given, drawn from Iain Murray's *The Puritan Hope*, in which the great Calvinist preacher is obviously disavowing an aspect of dispensationalism, generated by John Nelson Darby, that is distinct from classic or historic premillennialism. This leads Waldron to accept Murray's mistaken inference that Spurgeon made no distinction of any sort concerning Israel within the people of God. Hence, in a book proposing simplicity in the matter of the future, all we can say is that here this author is the bearer of great confusion. The truth is that Spurgeon, as a covenantal premillennialist,<sup>4</sup> in believing that there was only one redeemed people of God since the Fall, nevertheless also believed that there was to be an ongoing distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians in a future earthly millennium under the reign of Jesus Christ from Jerusalem. This is made abundantly clear in *Future Israel* [11-13], even though in no way could Spurgeon be designated as a dispensationalist. As a further example, consider Spurgeon's comment on Zechariah 2:1-5.

I am not given to prophesying, and I fear that the fixing of dates and periods has been exceedingly injurious to the whole system of premillennial teaching; but I think I clearly see in Scripture that the Lord Jesus Christ will come—so far I go, and take my stand—that he will come personally to reign upon this earth. At his coming it appears clear to me that he will gather together the Jewish people, that Jerusalem shall become the metropolis of the new empire which shall then extend from pole to pole, from the river even to the ends of the earth. If this be a correct interpretation of prophecy, you may read the whole of this chapter through and understand it; you have the key to every sentence: without such a belief; I see not how to interpret the prophet's meaning.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This is the term of Dennis Michael Swanson in his definitive study, *Charles H. Spurgeon and Eschatology: Did He have a Discernable Millennial Position?* The Master's Seminary, California. Internet sourced, *The Spurgeon Archive*, <http://www.spurgeon.org/eschat.htm>. Here also the deficiencies of Murray's study are clearly stated.

<sup>5</sup> C. H. Spurgeon, *The C. H. Spurgeon Collection*, 10:604, Ages Software CD

We should also add that reference to Murray's representation of premillennialism is obviously slanted in this regard, downward that is; in contrast this author presents a somewhat romantic Scottish partiality toward postmillennialism. Unfortunately the premillennial Bonar's and M'Cheyne, etc. became tainted through guilt by association with Edward Irving. They participated in the eclipse of the postmillennial hope of previous centuries that had begun to wane. However for a more balanced representation of Puritan millennialism, refer to Crawford Gribben's doctoral thesis, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology, 1550-1682*, in which he details Scottish "embryonic postmillennialism,"<sup>6</sup> both moderate and radical, as well as a more balanced representation of the considerable and varied premillennial influence within the seventeenth century.

B. The church is the New Israel according to Scripture.

There are six lines of argument that are presented to prove that the church is the true and new Israel of God. We deal with these briefly or refer to more detailed considerations of these matters in other writings.

1. The term "church/congregation" (*ekklēsia*) is often used in the Greek Septuagint to describe the "congregation" (*qahal*) of Israel, and thus such an association

argues forcibly for the unity of God's people. It certainly refutes the strange statement often hears from Dispensationalists that *the church is not in the Old Testament*. This does not mean of course, that we should simply equate the church in the New Testament with the church in the Old Testament or Israel. It does suggest, however, that they are not two distinct and separate peoples of God.<sup>7</sup>

However, consider Earl D. Radmachers' doctoral conclusion in this regard.

The *ekklesia* is never contemplated as a spiritual fact, independent of spatial and temporal limitations. Finally, as was the case in the classical writings, there is no evidence whatever that the word acquired a specifically religious connotation in the Septuagint. All uses of the word never go beyond the simple meaning of *an assembly*. Thus, there is no place for reading the church back into the Old Testament on the basis of the prevalent usage of *ekklēsia* [in the Septuagint].<sup>8</sup>

Therefore Waldron's reference to Acts 7:38 in this regard, as though Stephen's description of "the congregation [of Israel] in the wilderness" has some Christian church association or even allusion, is without foundation, as George Eldon Ladd

---

<sup>6</sup> Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology, 1550-1682*, p. 103, 109.

<sup>7</sup> Waldron, *End Times Made Simple*, pp. 139-140.

<sup>8</sup> Earl D. Radmacher, *The Nature of the Church*, pp. 122-123. Support in this regard is also quoted from B. H. Carroll, *Ecclesia-The Church*, p. 44.

confirms,<sup>9</sup> and the same is equally true with regard to the reference to Hebrews 2:12 (cf. *ecclēsia*, Acts 19:32).

2. The Old Testament people of God became so through God's electing, redeeming, covenant-making activity. The New Testament church became so through God's electing, redeeming, covenant-making activity in Christ. Therefore, Waldron concludes:

How many elections, redemptions are there? Ultimately, there is just one (Rom. 3:25; Acts 4:12). The election and redemption of Israel was typical of the election and redemption in Christ. There can, then, be ultimately only one people of God.<sup>10</sup>

Here is the logical fallacy of the undistributed middle. However, to understand this improper argument, consider the following syllogism. A man is elected, redeemed through Christ's new covenant. A woman is elected, redeemed through Christ's new covenant. Therefore a man is identical to a woman! Now both the man and the woman are saved on the same basis, yet there remains distinction within their unity in Christ (Gal. 3:28). In the same way the Bible repeatedly teaches that both Jew and Gentile are ultimately saved according to an identical election and redemption through Christ's new covenant. Nevertheless, this in no way eliminates diversity within this unity, as with natural and wild olive branches, belonging to the one tree (Rom. 11:17-23).

3. The New Testament directly asserts that the church is the true Israel of God. Five passages of Scripture are offered as proof, although only one uses the term "the Israel of God."
  - a. I Corinthians 10:18. It is interesting that the NASB translates the literal "Israel after the flesh" as simply "the nation of Israel," and the ESV as well as the NIV, "the people of Israel." We could also literally translate "carnal Israel," which in turn indicates "unbelieving, unregenerate Israel." As a people and nation. All this being true, it is difficult to understand how Waldron equates this reference with proof, in quoting Charles Hodge, that since there is an inferential distinction concerning "Israel after the Spirit," or "the spiritual Israel" or "the true people of God," then somehow this spiritual Israel is basically the same as the church. This is simply grasping at straws. As *Future Israel* (FI 291-309) explains in greater detail, but especially with reference to Romans 11:28, "Israel after the flesh" still retains a measure of covenantal recognition from God as His "beloved enemy." And the "remnant according to God's gracious choice" (Rom. 11:5), which could

---

<sup>9</sup> George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 117; also Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, II, p. 69.

<sup>10</sup> Waldron, *End Times Made Simple*, p. 140.

rightly be designated as “Israel after the Spirit,” nevertheless retains the distinction of being associated with the natural olive branches that shall ultimately be part of saved national Israel’s fullness (Rom. 11:12, 23, 26).

- b. Romans 2:28-29. Waldron fails to acknowledge the commonly recognized problem that his interpretation presents concerning the immediate context of Paul’s revived esteem for “the Jew” in Romans 3:1-8 which immediately follows (FI 255). In so doing he expresses his premature desire to move on to Romans 9:6-8, whereas he should have considered Paul’s questions: “Then what advantage has the Jew? Or what is the benefit if circumcision? Great in every respect” (Rom. 3:1-2). The conclusion then is that a true Jew is one circumcised of the heart and therefore, according to identification with Israel, circumcised of the flesh. A true Gentile is also circumcised of the heart (Rom. 2:26). He is engrafted into the root of Abraham through faith (Gal. 3:26, 29), as a wild olive branch (Rom. 11:17-21), while yet remaining a Gentile (Rom. 15:27; I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28)
- c. Romans 9:6-8. The exegesis here is wholly inadequate. Waldron’s problem is a misunderstanding as to the definition of an “Israelite.” Hence, “they are not all Israel who are descended from Israel,” or, “they who are of the totality of [present national] Israel are not [all true] descendants of Israel [Jacob].”<sup>11</sup> From the outset, let us clear away a common misunderstanding. Paul is *not here*, by implication, indicating that a real Jew at heart now has no national connection with the previously listed blessings of vs. 4-5; further, he is *not here* teaching that there are, along with believing Gentiles, only “spiritual” Jews in that they are descendants of Abraham by faith alone. Paul is *not here* saying there is a more broad, encompassing understanding of what it is to be a Jew. The Gentiles are not in mind here; they are not mentioned until v. 24 where Paul writes of, “us [the Roman congregation as a whole], whom He [God] also called, not from among Jews only, but also from among Gentiles.”<sup>12</sup> Quite the opposite, the Apostle is saying there is a

---

<sup>11</sup> Here the second and third instances of “Israel” in Romans 9-11 both refer to national Israel, though with a distinction. “[T]hey are not all Israel” refers to the present inclusive nation; those “who are descended from Israel” comprise the remnant about to be described, 9:27; 11:5, as part of the eventual “fulfillment” or “all Israel” of 11:12, 26.

<sup>12</sup> Phillip Mauro is mistaken in writing: “This Scripture [Romans 9:6-8] gives us, in addition to the important truth that not all Israelites are included in the “Israel” of God’s prophetic purposes, the closely allied truth that “the children of God,” that is, those who are saved by the gospel, are “the children of the promise” (definite article in the original); and that they are “counted for the seed” (of Abraham).” *The Hope of Israel: What Is It?* p. 204. Grover Gunn is likewise incorrect when he makes the same inclusive generalization: “The spiritual seed of Abraham are all those who truly share Abraham’s faith (Rom. 4:11-12), and these alone are the seed of Abraham in the most fundamental

more narrow, restrictive focus that finds, as John Murray puts it, “an ‘Israel’ within ethnic Israel.”<sup>13</sup> Carefully consider the context of the following vs. 7-13. The Jews boasted that they were of the descendants of Abraham (Matt. 3:9; John 8:39) while Paul makes it disturbingly clear that you may be born of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob and not be an Israelite! Indeed the forthcoming Moslem claims to be a descendant of Abraham as well! A real Jew must be defined in sharper terms with regard to “the fathers,” cf. v. 5! Moo explains: “Paul is not saying ‘it is not *only* those who are Israel that are Israel,’ but ‘it is not *all* those who are of Israel that are Israel.’”<sup>14</sup>

- d. Philippians 3:3. Refer to *Future Israel* (273-279).
  - e. Galatians 6:16. Refer to the separate review of *The Israel of God in Prophecy* by Hans K. LaRondelle, also *Future Israel* (FI 263-269).
4. The characteristics and privileges of Israel are assumed by the church. We are told that, “[t]he massive evidence for this is easily summarized by way of the following table,” namely alleged similarities between “Old Israel or Church” and “New Israel or Church.”<sup>15</sup> Some of these comparisons concern typological features of the old Mosaic covenant that certainly do find their antitype in the new covenant in the blood of Christ. For instance the Mosaic kingdom of priests (Exod. 19:5-6) prefigures Christians as a kingdom of priests (I Pet. 2:9). In this regard such shadows do prefigure the substance that is in Christ (Col. 2:16-17). Nevertheless, as we have elsewhere argued, these temporary Mosaic features are in no way to be equated with a similar temporary or shadowy regard for national and ethnic Israel. However here we again find the logical fallacy of the undistributed middle, previously demonstrated in point two, page 6, of the six points by which Waldron attempts to demonstrate that the Church is the New Israel. Consider the following further examples. Old Israel is designated as elect, beloved, called, Church, flock, holy, etc. New Israel is designated as elect, beloved, called, Church, flock, holy, etc. Consequently, the Church or New Israel

---

sense of the term (John 8:39; Rom. 9:6-7; 2:28. Only these will inherit the promises of the covenant in terms of real spiritual rest and an eternal inheritance.” *Dispensationalism, Today, Yesterday, And Tomorrow*, p. 234.

<sup>13</sup> Murray, *Romans*, II, p. 9. Walter Gutbrod similarly states: “[W]e are not told here that Gentile Christians are the true Israel. The distinction at Romans 9:6 does not go beyond what is presupposed at John 1:47 [concerning pious Nathanael].” “Ἰσραήλ” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, III, p. 387.

<sup>14</sup> Moo, *Romans*, p. 574. Also Fred Zaspel notes that the previously listed Jewish blessings [vs. 4-5] are not expounded here by Paul as being “now realized in the church; . . . they belong to Israel; . . . they have not become ineffectual for them; they offer no less a real hope today than ever.” *Jews, Gentiles and the Goal of Redemptive History*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

having the same characteristics, it therefore is alleged to have assumed the identity of the Old Israel. Furthermore, and the inference is obvious, the New Israel has now taken over from the Old Israel. However, such an argument is fundamentally flawed, as has already been indicated concerning the use of “church” in the Septuagint. In simplest terms, when the comparison of two items results in some common features, these do not prove similar essential identity. For instance, a dog has four legs; a cat has four legs; therefore a dog is a cat! Therefore, to suggest, as Waldron does, Old Israel had twelve patriarchs; New Israel has Twelve Apostles; therefore New Israel is identical to Old Israel is simply fallacious nonsense.

5. Classic passages of Scripture that describe the relation of the church and Israel clearly teach unity and continuity. But why is there such a seeming aversion to the truth that unity could also incorporate diversity?
  - a. Galatians 3:29. Refer to the separate review titled, *The Reformed Eschatology of Hans K. LaRondelle*.
  - b. Romans 11:16-24. Refer to *Future Israel* (FI 253-290).
  - c. Ephesians 2:11-24. Refer to *Future Israel* (FI 269-275).
6. The Scriptures teach the eschatological unity of the people of God. So Waldron maintains that the climax of history is, according to the Bible, one people of God, but especially in a homogenous sense. Yet again there is the misguided assumption by Waldron that, in the unity of the eternal state, any accommodation of diversity is somehow less than God’s intended perfection. We repeat that in the nature of the Godhead there is a unity of essence with a personal diversity. Even heaven itself has holy angels who are quite distinct from redeemed sinners. Thus the concept of the family of God is harmonious with the unity, incorporating diversity, that the human representation of a Christian husband and wife portrays (Gal. 3:28).
  - a. Matthew 8:11-12. Here the Son of God declared that, “many will come from the east and west, and recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom will be cast out into the outer darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” Thus Waldron concludes:

Gentiles are saved and drawn into the kingdom of heaven. Jews—the children of the kingdom—are cast out. This implies, of course, that saved Jews remain

in. Gentiles and Jews are, thus, one with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the eschatological kingdom.<sup>16</sup>

However, as Trench rightly comments concerning these verses, here “because of their unbelief, they, the natural branches of the olive tree, should be broken off, and the wild olive should be grafted in (Rom. 11:17-24; Acts 13:46; 19:9; 38:28; Matt. 3:9).”<sup>17</sup> This being so, we should not divorce this witness concerning the Gentile Centurion’s faith from the more comprehensive picture of Romans 11:23, where “God is able to graft them [the severed wild olive branches] in again.”

- b. John 10:16. Jesus Christ declared that, “I have other sheep, which are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will hear My voice; and they will become one flock with one Shepherd.” Waldron comments: “There shall be one fold of both Gentile and Jewish sheep.”<sup>18</sup> We would happily agree here except that he would undoubtedly believe that in the “consummate kingdom” as he puts it, or the glorious new heavens and new earth, Gentile and Jewish identity will have been eliminated. However, in parallel with John 11:52, we would believe that this ingathering of the Gentiles into the rich root of the olive tree (Rom. 11:17) in no way eliminates diversity within the unity of God’s people as one flock. Possibly Jesus is alluding to Zechariah 14:9; cf. Ezek. 34:11-31; 37:21-24, in which case the alleged passing identity of national and ethnic Israel as a shadow is quite unthinkable. In other words, this one flock shall be the seed of promise according to Abraham, both “a great nation” and from “all the families of the earth” (Gen. 12:2-3).
- c. Hebrews 11:39-40. “All these [heroes of faith previously described], having gained approval through their faith, did not receive what was promised, because God had provided something better for us, so that apart from us they would not be made perfect.” Waldron writes: “Here, then, is an explicit statement that all of God’s people in both the Old Testament and New Testament will enjoy the eternal inheritance together.”<sup>19</sup> Whether we define “us” here with reference to Hebrew Christian addressees or Christians in general, we happily accept Delitzsch’s conclusion: “The saints, then, of the Old Testament march henceforth at equal pace with ourselves in the perfect way of salvation.”<sup>20</sup> However, this in no way eliminates diversity within this

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>17</sup> R. C. Trench, *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, p. 142.

<sup>18</sup> Waldron, *End Times Made Simple*, p. 148.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>20</sup> Franz Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, II, p. 294.

unity, especially with regard to those eschatological passages that anticipate the future millennial reign of Christ who shall reign over regenerate Israel and the surrounding regenerate Gentile nations (Isa. 60:1-4; 62:1-12; Mic. 4:1-5; Hag. 2:1-7; Zech. 14:16-21).

- d. Revelation 21:9-14. Concerning the New Jerusalem described here, Waldron expounds:

In the New Heavens and New Earth, there is one city, one bride. Its gates bear the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. Its foundations bear the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Symbolism could not more clearly teach the eschatological unity of the people of God of the church and Israel.<sup>21</sup>

Yes, as Isaiah 65:17-18 declares, "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; . . . For behold, I create Jerusalem for rejoicing." There will be one city from where Messiah will gloriously reign, that is from the glorified Jerusalem of Zechariah 14:9-11. Then shall the previously humiliated Jew, in relation to the Gentile, discover a reversal of former roles. Then there shall be a glorious diversity in unity. "Behold, I am going to save My people from the land of the east and from the land of the west; and I will bring them back and they will live in the midst of Jerusalem; and they shall be My people, and I will be their God in truth and righteousness. . . . It will yet be that peoples will come, even the inhabitants of many cities. The inhabitants of one will go to another, saying, 'Let us go at once to entreat the favor of the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts; I will also go.' So many peoples and mighty nations will come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem and to entreat the favor of the Lord. 'Thus says the Lord of hosts, 'In those days ten men from all the nations [Gentiles] will grasp the garment of a Jew, saying, 'Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you'''" (Zech. 8:7-8, 20-23).



---

<sup>21</sup> Waldron, *End Times Made Simple*, p. 149.