

Review: Israelology; The Missing Link in Systematic Theology
(Ph.D. Dissertation of Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum)

Dr. Louis Goldberg, M.A.; Th. D.
Professor of Theology and Jewish Studies
Moody Bible Institute
Chicago, Illinois

Arnold Fruchtenbaum's purpose for the dissertation is to identify and systematize the doctrine of Israel through four Protestant conservative/evangelical Systematic Theologies. His further purpose is to demonstrate how Israelology fits into the "framework of a total Systematic Theology" and, determining how a theological system may lead to anti-Semitism. Pro-Semitism, or indifference to the issue.

This writer would suggest that the term Semitism be omitted because it will engender a protest from Arab peoples. They too are Semites and the better term used today is anti-Jewishness and philo-Jewishness (instead of pro-Semitism)

Because of the lack of time on the part of this reviewer (to be explained orally), it will only be possible to make comments on chapter 10 where Mr. Fruchtenbaum's purpose is to "develop Israelology on the basis of Dispensational principles in those areas where the sources have failed to do so." It is at this point which the writer hopes to make a major contribution to that school of thought. Mr. Fruchtenbaum feels that Israelology "must come just prior to Ecclesiology and follow the same development, for as Ecclesiology has been developed in its past, present and future aspects, so must Israelology." The title for the study is therefore; Israelology; The Missing Link in Systematic

Theology.

The procedure of the reviewer is to take up the different topics as they are encountered in reading chapter ten.

Review

4 Fruchtenbaum makes a valid point in indicating that national election does not guarantee the salvation of every member of the nation of Israel. This is a point that needs to be emphasized over and over again just because a Jewish person is a part of an elect people, it does not necessarily follow that such a person has atonement for his sins unless he has circumcised his heart through a substitute atonement, either through the sin offering while the temple still stood or in the era in which we live, through faith in the Messiah Yeshuah.

14 Mr. Fruchtenbaum refers to the Palestinian Covenant as the Land Covenant. He observes that since Palestine is such a familiar term, that designation will therefore be used throughout his entire work. This reviewer would suggest that we take a very definite stand in order to teach the Church today that Palestine is not the term to be used when referring to the land of Israel. Palestine or Philistia was a name used in a derogatory fashion by Emperor Hadrian after he put down the second Judean revolt. Ever since, Palestine has remained the designation of the land but Jewish people have always referred to it as Eretz Yisrael.

Furthermore, since the Palestine Liberation Organization has a charter called the Palestinian Covenant which is a sort of constitution spelling out exactly what the Palestinians want for the land between the Mediterranean and the

Jordan River. We should therefore avoid using a term such as Palestinian covenant because it can be confused with the PLO constitution. Ours is a task of teaching the Church and we should therefore apply ourselves to that task.

21 Mr. Fruchtenbaum suggests from his interpretation of Jeremiah 31:34a and Isaiah 61:9 that during the entire period of the kingdom, there will be no unsaved Jews. He suggests further that this is the reason there will be no need for one Jew to say to another, know the Lord, for they shall all know Him. He furthermore suggests, that during the kingdom the unregenerate peoples will be Gentiles.

This writer and others take exception to this suggestion for an interpretation of Jeremiah 31:34. There is no question that the New Covenant is made directly with Israel and that the Gentiles will also benefit through what has been offered to Israel (Isaiah 42:6; Isaiah 49:6). It would be more likely to assume that at least in the first generation of the kingdom, everyone will know the Lord, both Jewish and Gentile peoples. The representative of the nation will come to celebrate Sukkot in Jerusalem along with their fellow Jewish believers (Zechariah 16:16). As to what occurs after that first generation, it would be dependent upon how people respond to the preaching of the Gospel and to the explanation in particular of the sin offering offered at the Messianic Temple. Quite possibly, at the end of the thousand year reign of the Messiah, there will be many unsaved peoples, from both among the Jewish and Gentile peoples. For that reason, Satan is loosed from the bottomless pit and he will then go out to deceive the unbelievers among the nations and we would have to

assume that this would also include Israel (Revelation 20:7-9). It seems therefore a question if we can apply Jeremiah 31:34 to every last Jewish person in every generation born during the Messianic kingdom of the one thousand years.

21 Fruchtenbaum indicates that Israel failed to keep the law under the Mosaic covenant because the people lacked the power to comply with the standards of God. It would have been good if a short notation could have been introduced to indicate that there was always a remnant in every generation of believers throughout the entire Old Testament, historical kingdom. At a later point, there is a discussion regarding the remnant, pp. 36f. The believers certainly knew the Lord but to say that the believer lacked the power to comply with the righteous standards of God might be open to question. The statement is made that the Mosaic Law does not provide for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit might miss the point that no matter what age and under whatever covenant, no one is ever born again apart from the ministry of the Holy Spirit who regenerates the heart. Furthermore, no one can ever do the work of God apart from the Holy Spirit. It is true that the Holy Spirit did not indwell the remnant of believers in the Old Testament historical kingdom, but certainly, in some way, the Holy Spirit did empower the believers to do the mighty works of God. Even for such a task as building the furniture of the Tabernacle, Bezalel was empowered by the Holy Spirit to make the artistic design in gold, silver, and bronze (Ex 31). While we may not talk in terms of indwelling, because the Holy Spirit did come and go, nevertheless we might talk in terms of the Holy Spirit enveloping the remnant of believers to preach, teach worship at the Temple, and be the witness to what the prophets were prophesying, and so on.

25 Fruchtenbaum states that the Law was never a means for salvation and that it had other purposes. Obviously, while Fruchtenbaum does not like to make distinctions such as moral, sacrificial, juridical, etc., nevertheless, we do need to recognize that in the further expansion, interpretation and application of the Law, Moses did spell out the means by which atonement can be realized in the sacrificial system, i.e., the sin offering of Leviticus 4:1-5:13. The truths regarding the principles attached to the sin offering were there as a school-master for all Israel and those who appropriated atonement personally for themselves became a part of the remnant in Israel.

58-59 Fruchtenbaum mentions Israel's rejection of its Messiah and the consequent judgment. Perhaps, it might appear to be a bit too harsh. No mention is made of the remnant that possibly swells to as much as 20 percent of the nation by the end of the first century. While the second temple was lost in 70 A.D., the bulk of the nation remained on its soil although Fruchtenbaum indicates that the Jews were dispersed all over the world. That possibly did not take place until after the second revolt in 135 A.D. and with a greater finality by the Arab invasion in the 600s. The point is that while there is justification for mentioning a judgment that was indeed harsh but we always have to balance it by mentioning the fact that there were people of Israel who did respond to the preaching of Jesus and the Apostles at a later time.

In fact, for this writer, it would appear that the numbers of believers were present in great numbers. Rabbis usually ignored the presence of Jewish believers until the number becomes great enough that they are forced to then

react. At the council of Yavneh, the insertion of the malediction against the Minim would suggest a way by which Jewish believers were put out of the synagogues . The fact that such an insertion to the Shemoneh Esre would suggest a strong reaction against an even stronger action by Jewish believers in their witness to their brethren.

What we also must remember is that the dispersion of Jewish people also had a dimension of mercy in it, even as was the dispersion to Babylon. The point of the dispersions in the 1st, 2nd, and 6th centuries was that if Israel would not listen to the message in the homeland, then in the countries of their dispersion, in the midst of their pressure and sorrow, they would be able to then hear the message and respond to it.

90-98 Fruchtenbaum labors to demonstrate that the Mosaic Law has been done away with fully and decisively once Jesus had died and particularly so once the second temple was lost. Obviously, there is hardly a Bible scholar who would debate that point.

However, Fruchtenbaum labors the point in demonstrating that the moral law, that is, the Ten Commandments, are not therefore taken from the moral of the Mosaic Law but rather, the Commandments actually reflect a moral law that existed prior to the enactment of the Mosaic Covenant. The point however is that Jesus did refer to the Commandments, all ten of them. Paul likewise referred to nine of the commandments. Their citation was precisely from the Mosaic constitution and not from an eternal moral law which existed prior to the Mosaic Covenant.

There is no doubt that there was an eternal moral law. It is just that

one would expect Jewish writers, when developing the moral law mentioned in the New Covenant would certainly have taken this from the moral element of the Mosaic Covenant. We are not suggesting that an entire packaged unit of the Mosaic Covenant existed after the destruction of the temple. What we are suggesting however is that the elements are there nevertheless and the moral therefore does appear in the New Covenant. In the same way, the sacrificial element of the Mosaic Constitution, the five offerings, sin, trespass, burnt, meal, and thanksgiving offerings, are subsumed in the one sacrifice of Jesus. The sin offering of Leviticus 4 is mentioned by Paul in II Corinthian 5:21 while the burnt offering of Leviticus 1 is graphically pictured by Paul in Romans 12:1-2.

In other words, Fruchtenbaum labors long and hard to demonstrate that the packaged units of the Mosaic Covenant is finished once and for all, including the elements that make up the covenant. But when one examines carefully the New Covenant, we find some of these very elements present in the New Covenant. There is no doubt going to be a lot of room for discussion regarding this topic by various scholars and the last word regarding these issues has not been completed by no means.

96 This writer questions the judicious propriety of the person reviewing this chapter because of a reference to "those dirty C.P.s." To say the very least, this is hardly scholarly language or even language that would reflect the highest biblical ideals which believers should espouse.

131 Fruchtenbaum has an excellent discussion regarding Israel and the Church,

very carefully marking the difference between the two. His points are well taken in that one must never confuse the Church and Israel, thereby calling the Church "New Israel."

In a discussion regarding "Gentiles are spiritual Jews," Fruchtenbaum takes this argument to task, demonstrating the invalidity of such a position. However, to this reviewer, Fruchtenbaum needs to sharpen the argument a bit. Simply say that Gentile believers can become, because of their faith in the Messiah, the spiritual seed of Abraham, that is, sons of Abraham by faith (Galatians 3:29). They are not spiritual Jews but spiritual sons of Abraham and not spiritual Gentiles. At least Galatians 3:29 does not refer to the Galatian believers as spiritual Gentiles but rather, "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (Galatians 3:29).

147 In continuing discussions between Israel and the Church, Fruchtenbaum has an excellent discussion regarding the argument that in the body of Christ there is no difference between Jews and Gentiles. We must however allow for distinctions between peoples in the body. When a German or Swede believes in Jesus, that certainly does not erase their ethnicity no more than it does for a Jewish person by saying that he is no longer a Jew. In the body of Christ, there are many ethnicities, cultural differences and even means by which to contextualize theology into many different cultures without losing biblical truth.

154f Fruchtenbaum has an excellent discussion regarding the Israel of God in

Galatians 6:16. He uses a number of good sources, Dr. F. Lewis Johnson who in turn cites a number of other scholars. It would have been good to demonstrate from Heinrich Meyer's commentary on Galatians where a number of scholars are cited on both sides of the line of the argument. Meyer has made a valuable contribution to this discussion although to this reviewer there is no doubt as to the conclusion that the Israel of God are the Jewish believers within the body of the Messiah while those who "walk by this rule, peace and mercy be upon them," are Gentile believers.

168 The interpretation of Isaiah 11:11-12 might not lend exactly to how Fruchtenbaum presents it. There are obviously some honest differences of opinion. Fruchtenbaum suggests two future international regatherings but perhaps the text can best be understood that Isaiah did see a regathering from Babylon as the first regathering, which is the subject of the second part of the prophet's book (Isaiah 40-66). The second regathering is an international one and has been going on now since the 1800s. No doubt, it will continue until the day when Messiah comes to set up his kingdom on earth. This writer suggests very strongly that God will have his way in turning a nation largely in unbelief to one who will not only call for a redeemer in their time of greatest peril, and when he comes, that generation who sees him will not only recognize him as the redeemer but also as the savior and the Messiah.

171-220 Fruchtenbaum enters into a discussion regarding the remnant of Israel and the Olive Tree (Romans 9:1-11:24). While this may have its part in a total

Israelology, nevertheless this area alone could be a subject of a book itself. We all recognize that Romans chapters 9, 10, and 11 was overlooked by so many commentators and a full development of these three chapters can be a contribution in itself.

220 Fruchtenbaum provides us with a discussion on Hebrew Christianity/Messianic Jews. After discussing some of those who make distinctions between Christians and Messianic Jew, Fruchtenbaum makes a good contribution in disclaiming terms such as Messianic Judaism. It is extremely important to distinguish between Jewishness and Judaism which is crucial to Jewish believers to establish their own identity. This writer is glad for this distinction because we need to be clear theologically regarding what we believe and not be accused falsely by Jewish leaders and rabbis. The same would be true of designating meeting places of Messianic Jews as synagogues and spiritual leaders of each congregation as rabbis.

226 Fruchtenbaum is involved in a discussion as to what determines Jewishness, whether the mother or father. Obviously there is going to be some differences of opinion. For this writer, it would appear that the mother determines the identity while the father provides the inheritants rights. It would appear that for this reason, Paul had Timothy circumcised after delineating carefully who was his mother and grandmother who were Jewesses, even though Timothy's father was a Greek. For Paul, Timothy was a full Jew. The example regarding David's great grandmother Ruth does not apply to this writer's understanding because Ruth had plainly stated that the God of Israel was to be

her God so therefore we must regard her as converted and therefore has a part within the commonwealth of Israel.

No where in this discussion, however, it would seem to this writer, does Fruchtenbaum enter into the discussion as to whether a Gentile believer can convert and become a Jew or Jewess. In the state of Israel, such a practice has produced a sharp reaction. Many of the elders have made statements that if Gentile believers convert through rabbinic means to become Jews or Jewesses, this becomes a lie. Many times in the process of the conversion, the candidate is asked as to whether he believes that Jesus is both human and divine and some have become less than honest in facing up to this question. For this reason, some of the elders have even withheld communion to those who have taken this step because they feel that such "converts" are living a lie and have therefore a poor testimony to the rabbinical authorities. When these authorities find out that they have been tricked because the candidates have not faced the questions honestly, such candidates therefore have a very poor testimony. The Messianic Jewish community will then have a poor testimony likewise.

235 The doctrine of the Israel of God is once again mentioned, taking up three pages. This is a topic which had already been discussed and except for perhaps two or three lines referring back to the discussion already, should not be repeated again.

239f Fruchtenbaum provides us with a good discussion regarding the practice of Hebrew Christianity/Messianic Jewishness. He emphasises the freedom to choose or not to choose these practices. He has a good discussion which forms the basis

for contextualizing practices from the Jewish background that will bring forth better New Testament truths. This is an area where there have been violations of Biblical truths. But at the same time, opportunity is provided for Jewish believers to either adapt Jewish practices in conformity with New Testament Theology or these Jewish practices can be adapted to present New Testament truth. Fruchtenbaum takes Juster to task for his statement, "I am not particularly inspired by the Jewish engentity of one who gives up the sabbath. For me it is a part of New Covenantal Jewishness." The Jewish believer has the freedom to choose how much or how little of the Jewish background he wishes to adopt. There is always a certain amount of danger that some Jewish believers express when they insist upon observing the Shabbat and then look down on other Jewish believers who for one reason or another do not worship on the Shabbat. This carries with it a subtle danger whereby if some Jewish believers observe the sabbath so as to please God then in what aspect do other Jewish believers not please God because they happen to worship on the first day of the week?

245 Fruchtenbaum at this point enters into an extended critique of Dan Juster's, Jewish Works. It would appear to this reader that the space given over to such a subject is not that germane to the entire aspect of Israelology. Perhaps this is an area that can be taken up in a separate book and discussed more at length so that there can be opportunity for Juster to also reply and both Fruchtenbaum and Juster can interrelate to each other on a very important topic. It just seems to this reviewer that too much space has been set aside in this work to take up an argument line upon line with Dan Juster when the space for the general, overall theme can be best used for other purposes. In particular,

almost the entire paper by Dan Juster on "The Torah and Messianic Jewish Practice" has been reproduced and this reviewer questions whether it is judicious to reproduce this entire paper in the overall emphasis on Israelology. Similarly, what is the point of also reproducing the entire paper by the Greek Community Church of Los Angeles condemning the establishment of Messianic Jewish congregations? It might be good to bring out a few points in order to deal with some material but why reproduce the entire material? If Fruchtenbaum wishes to deal with this issue, this too can then be the subject of still another book. We all have to remember, however, that of the making of books there is no end!

340 While Fruchtenbaum deals with the problems Jewish believers face, why do we need to reproduce an entire outline of the book of Hebrews? I know that the writer wishes to be thorough in dealing with all aspects of the problems Jewish believers face, but it would seem that the space could better be used to single out specifics rather than deal with an entire book and every aspect of the argument of the book of Hebrews.

388. The same would be true for the book of James as with the book of Hebrews. It is best to pick out the specifics that have to do with Jewish believers and their problems rather than go into the family of James or specific problems which all believers face whether they are Jewish or Gentile, or a discussion on the use of the tongue which affects all believers, not just Jewish believers.

407 The same would be true of Peter. Why enter into a discussion regarding

husbands and wives? Is this germane to the discussion of Israelology?

After plowing through the material regarding Israel in the Present, this reviewer suggests strongly that something should be said regarding the pre-state Israel and how God worked in His providence to bring about the modern state of Israel. I think that if we can demonstrate that God has been working for more than one hundred years in His providential rule among the nations, arranging the circumstances so that on an ever increasing basis, more and more Jewish people emigrated to the land of Israel long before a state ever came into existence. The fact that there were 650,000 Jewish people in the land when the state became a reality, does this not therefore suggest that God has design in history to accomplish His purposes? This in itself would be a strong answer to the Covenant Theologians who would not be able to argue against God's work in history in such a manner.

485 Fruchtenbaum mentions that according to Zechariah 13:8-9, two-thirds of the Jewish population will be destroyed in the persecutions of the Tribulation and that the remaining one-third become believers and therefore all Israel and this remnant of Israel are one and the same. This reviewer, however, would make a strong case, although not taking up a lot of space at this point, that many of the two-thirds could die as martyrs. Many of the two-thirds could have heard the message of the two witnesses as well as the 144,000 and have become believers. Those believers among the two-thirds who died will be then resurrected, along with Gentile believers who will be martyred, at the coming of Christ to earth to begin the Kingdom. We need to recognize that there are Tribulation saints, martyred for their faith but then are raised from the dead.

These Tribulation saints are not a part of the Church who this reviewer feels is removed from this earth at the Rapture.

489 I perhaps may have missed the Tribulation saints. You have the Rapture of Church saints and the resurrection of Old Testament saints after the Tribulation, but maybe I did miss somewhere any emphasis to the saints who died naturally or were martyred during the Tribulation.

493 While you have answered the Covenant Theologian by rebutting him, indicating that the burden of proof is up to him regarding the 1000 year reign, he in turn will come back with his arguments and it will not be long before we will have a pro and con which will end up nowhere. I think that attention should be paid as to the background for 1000 years and why Peter calls this a thousand years is as a day and a day is as a thousand years (II Peter 3:8). This reviewer feels that the answer is to be found in how the Jewish people themselves understood the length of the kingdom. Such information is contained in the Apocalyptic literature. II Enoch states that there was a belief in a world history of 1000 years each, making up a period of 7000 years. The seventh thousand is the time of rest while the eighth thousand is the time of not counting, endless, with neither years, nor months, nor weeks, nor days, nor hours (II Enoch 32:2-33).

The book of Jubilees indicate that those who are born during the kingdom will have their days lengthened to one-thousand years (Jubilees 23:26-27).

Furthermore, in response to Peter's declaration, Jubilees seems to indicate the clue, "Adam died...and...he left 70 years of 1000 years; for one-thousand years are as one day in the testimony of the heavens and therefore was it written concerning the tree of knowledge; 'On the day that you eat thereof you shall die.' For this reason, he did not complete the years of his days; for he died during it (Jubilees 4:30). The point here is that while Adam lived for 930 years (Genesis 5:35), yet he is regarded as not living out his day or 1000 years.

This reviewer has a major paper along these lines which was read at the Evangelical Theological Society some years ago. It was interesting to hear the awed response of the Covenant Theologians, not realizing that this formed the background for Peter's statement. Therefore, it would appear to this reviewer that we have a tool to defend what John declares to be the length of the Messianic Kingdom of 1000 years.

496 Once again, the reviewer will certainly agree that in the first generation of the kingdom, everyone in Israel will know the Lord. Children however born to that first generation of Israel will need to be reached with the Gospel message and the children's children as well as their children and succeeding generations will need to hear the Gospel message and make a decision to be born again. This reviewer does not feel that Jeremiah 31:34 can be applied to every last generation of Jewish people born during the kingdom without their having made a decision to come to faith. Therefore, the statement that "Jewish mission and Jewish evangelism will not be needed in the Messianic kingdom, because every Jew will know the Lord from the least to the greatest," is open to serious

challenge. This is true also of future generations of Gentile peoples. One of the functions of the saints from the Old Testament, the body of Messiah, and tribulation saints will be to aid in the preaching of the Gospel.

Fruchtenbaum picks up this subject of the national regeneration as it is covered in a number of the major and minor prophets. Certainly this can be applied to the first generation but this reviewer again raises the question as to whether the prophet intended this to be applied to every generation of Jewish people born in the Messianic Kingdom.

501 Again, the interpretation of Isaiah 11:11-12:6 comes up once more. Fruchtenbaum insists that Isaiah's mention of a first regathering as untenable when applied to the return from the Babylonian captivity. Isaiah however does not identify where the first regathering comes from. It is only the second regathering that Isaiah indicates it to be an international regathering. The interpretation of Isaiah 11 is open to a lot of differences of opinion.

510 I am only raising a question here with tongue in cheek regarding the return of Israel and its prophetic development regarding the possession of the land. Fruchtenbaum has made a very strong point in indicating that the Mosaic Law is no longer valid for today, including however one talks about the elements that make up that covenant; the moral, sacrificial, and etc. However, in order to demonstrate in accordance to the Abrahamic Covenant that Israel is to be restored to the land, reference is made to the Mosaic Law, Leviticus 26:40-45.

If the Law is completed, then how can we use the Law for what pertains to today regarding the Law of Christ, much less regarding the future restoration of Israel? But this reviewer is only speaking with tongue in cheek!

The rest of the passages regarding restoration does deal with many citations from the prophets.

514 In dealing with the Davidic Covenant, and the differences between II Samuel 7 and I Chronicles 17, it would be good to indicate how the prophet did put a curse on the line of Solomon by the time we come to the end of the first commonwealth (Jeremiah 22:28,30). Therefore, when we finally come to the end of the second temple period in the first century, Jesus, born to Mary, has the right to sit upon the throne of David. What is interesting here is that Mary is the one who gives Jesus the identity, with David through another line other than Solomon. However, it is Solomon's line through to Joseph who gives Jesus the inheritance right to sit upon the throne of David. However because of the curse, Jesus could not be biologically related to his foster father Joseph.

560 Fruchtenbaum enters into a serious discussion regarding the Church as the bride of Christ. There is no doubt that we need to demonstrate that the Church is different from Israel but this reviewer questions seriously whether one should go into a long discussion regarding the Church in an emphasis on Israelology. Just an observation!

565 The same would be true regarding anti-Semitism. While certainly there is a place to mention something regarding anti-Semitism, nevertheless this topic in itself is so broad, with many different ramifications, this reviewer then also wonders why one need a long discussion regarding anti-semitism, remembering the main thrust of Israelology. Perhaps such a lengthy discussion of such a topic could occur in an appendix to the subject of Israelology.

588f Fruchtenbaum enters into a discussion in how the New Testament uses the Old Testament. It would appear to this reviewer that such discussion including how one shall treat prophetic passages should be considered in a first chapter dealing with the introduction. This should lay the ground work for further discussions on what Covenant Theologians do with prophetic Scripture as well as how Dispensationalists handle them.

593 It would appear further to this writer that dealing with Systematic Theology, the Doctrine of God, Christology, etc., should not really be a part of this paper on Israelology. I think that such a dissertation stands on its own merits. If it is necessary to point out how Israelology fits into the rest of the doctrinal topics, this too should be handled in the introduction and then the writer should procede to deal with what is Israelology on its own basis.

Conclusion

First of all, this reviewer would like to commend Fruchtenbaum for a very good contribution regarding Israelology. This is the first extensive treatment

of this particular subdivision under theology that this reviewer has ever seen and therefore this material should be an excellent work.

Secondly, and no doubt Fruchtenbaum is aware of this concern, chapter ten certainly needs to be cut down considerably. A number of areas have already been mentioned as perhaps not germane to the considerations of Dispensationalism. If there are areas that the writer would like to present, then this information can be contained in an appendix, topics such as anti-Semitism, etc. Furthermore, the long parts of this chapter that deals with an intensive outline of the Jewish-Christian letters and Revelation need not be taken up in this chapter. Only what perhaps is germane to Israelology should be considered. This would indeed shorten the chapter considerably.

Third, this reviewer has read page after page after page after page of assertions by the writers regarding the interpretation of many of the prophetic passages. In page after page of this material, there has not been one citation from other writers who have taken different positions on the interpretation of prophetic passages. To further enhance the contribution of this chapter, this reviewer strongly urges Fruchtenbaum to pursue this suggestion. Or else, the interpretation will end up as distinctively what Fruchtenbaum thinks about these chapters and from a dissertation point of view, it would appear that the advisor and other professors need to remind the writer that a scholars interpretation of Scripture must also be compared with what others have said regarding their interpretations and what is perhaps the best interpretation from the writers point of view. From this reviewers view point, it would appear that this would be one of the major areas for additional involvement.

However, this reviewer is not "angling" to take on the task of being the mentor for Fruchtenbaum!

It has been a privilege for this reviewer to work through Fruchtenbaum's contribution. To be assigned such a task is an honor whereby he can become the advisor and mentor to many of the younger scholars who are coming up in the ranks.