

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

**B0948 – November 29, 2009 – Doctrine Of Separation & Rise Of
Apocalyptic**

Alright, the first thing we're working on by way of doctrinal fallout of the Exile is the doctrine of sanctification, particularly the issue of separation from the world system. The world system is one of the enemies of sanctification and the Exile deals with it. This is predictable because the nation Israel has just been cast into foreign Gentile kingdoms and so obviously they have to face the question, "How am I going to live in this Gentile system?" It's not a Jewish system built around worship to the one true God I'm living in now, it's a pagan system, so everything that underlies my new environment is dominated by pagan ideas. How do I live *in* a pagan environment without becoming part *of it*? We gave the four basic answers that have been given. You can wholesale Capitulate to the pagan environment and just go with the flow. That's the liberal Christian answer. These people aren't really Christians, these are the kinds of people that signed on the Humanist Manifesto I in 1933, and it's really shocking to read the list of people that signed that document and what their professions were. If you read that list, which I encourage you to do, read the document itself and then read who signed the document and you'll find that one-third of them were somehow involved in Christian academics. And you ask, "How could a Christian sign on to the Humanist Manifesto?" Well, they've capitulated, they're not really Christians.

The second answer is Accommodation to the culture and this is the half-way house. On one hand I know the Bible is tugging me in one direction, but the culture is tugging in the other and I'm struggling with this tension and finally the way I answer it is to re-interpret the Bible to fit the culture. By doing that I think I've relieved the tension. And so usually the Accommodationist Christians are true Christians, it's just they think that

somehow we can bring the Bible in line with the surrounding culture and so this approach is always re-interpreting to bring the Bible up to speed with culture and when I do that I feel comfortable. The problem is it undermines inerrancy because if I've got to wait until the culture comes up with the true theory before I can interpret the Bible correctly then I no longer need the Bible.

The third approach is Physical Separation and this is a very hard line approach. There are degrees of course, but just as a general approach these are Christians that tend to freeze a culture in time and maintain that culture and call that godliness. The Amish, Monastics and other groups have taken this approach. Not many Christians gravitate to this answer but some do and so we find this phenomenon. Actually many people from our doctrinal heritage have gravitated to this answer. Our heritage is in the Plymouth brethren that came out of the Anabaptist. So if you're interested in the doctrinal roots of this church then you should do a little reading on these groups. And because this is your heritage at times you may have these tendencies to want to separate out to this degree because you get so fed up with the world.

The fourth approach is the Counter-Attack approach and this is where we don't abandon the culture but we build a distinctly biblical culture. We interact, or should, to bring biblical wisdom to cast light on the various disciplines of study whether it be science, art, music, math, whatever discipline. So we are actively engaged in culture but we give a competing answer. This approach requires diligence, thought and discipline because it's not easy to do. We don't have a lot of resources backing this kind of work and it's not a popular approach simply because it takes a lot of effort. It takes a mental mindset that on one hand I have to be in the world because if I take myself out I lose the evangelistic link, and yet on the other hand I have to give a different answer than the world lest I become like them. When you've got that as your mentality, when you've realized what you have to do to be loyal to God, then you also realize that if you pursue this you're entering directly into the conflict that is being waged. And once that conflict is being waged then comes the issue of the law and civil disobedience. That can quickly become an issue in a society dominated by pagan thought forms on the operational level. And that's where we get our examples of men like Daniel and Esther who had to take a stand on certain issues of civil

disobedience. The biblical position is not that you do this with every issue; you can't go out and fight against what's on TV, fight against what they're doing to our food, fight about everything, because if you do that then your resources are spread so thin that you can't win any battle. So you have to pick and choose according to very narrowly defined issues and concentrate your energies there. Just be aware that when you do make your stand there are consequences to what you're doing and you better be willing to put up with them. Don't just do it to make an issue. Do it because of a correct heart mentality to God and His word. We can have a wrong motive. We can have the idea that if I do this everyone will look at me, I'll get media attention and that kind of a thing and that's not a right motive.

Alright, that's what we've been over and now we want to elaborate on the answer we're giving, and the right motive behind it. Of the four answers the Counter-Attack approach is the biblical answer but behind this has to be the right motive. Some of us aren't mentally ready to go on the counter attack. So the question is what is the Proper Dynamic Behind Separating? Answer: you have to have a "long-range" faith, a vision of the future that dominates the way you think. Let me give you an illustration of this. When you have a map down in your head on the operational level that is so powerful, it is a vision that is so encompassing to the point it sketches the future, then that map in your mind has radical implications for your separating from the pagan world system in this counter-attack mode. So it starts in our mind. We mentioned Rom 12:2 in this connection because Rom 12:2 sketches for you that separation starts in our minds. If our minds are properly programmed at the operating system level with a grand vision of the future and it's a biblical vision of the future then look what it does to our behavior.

Here are two quotes: one is from a pagan imitation of what I'm talking about and this works whether you have a biblical outlook at the operational level or a pagan outlook by the way. It's the principle of whatever map of the future is dominating your mentality, that will affect your behavior. I've deliberately picked the communists because in the past two centuries communism has been a Christian heresy. What? How can you say communism is a Christian heresy? I always thought communism was atheistic. Yes, it is, but do you have any understanding of where the power behind communism was coming from? Do you know what it was? It was a philosophy of ultimate victory. Communism has a plan for the future. And therefore if I am a communist and

I am sacrificed for communism then my sacrifice is part and parcel of seeing the plan realized; you can bomb me, torture me, kill me, I don't care because deep in the operating system I think I'm on the winning team, capitalism will be destroyed, and communism will finally triumph. In other words, communism had a vision for the future and progress for victory.

Guess where they got it. You can check this out for yourself. There are two sources, two pathways where communism got this idea. It's a fascinating story if you're ever interested in history and want to chase it down sometime. One source comes from Karl Marx back to Hegel. Hegel kept talking about these kingdoms of history. Do you know where Hegel got his idea of kingdoms and progress of history? The Bible; isn't this interesting! Two step process: Marxism came out of Hegelian philosophy and Hegel read the book of Daniel and captured the idea of progress right from Daniel 2. The other source: there were people along with Marx who were the German radicals, German radicalism. German radicalism and Daniel. So what we have in Daniel 2 is the idea that history is progressing through victory for one side or the other and it gave these people on the operational level a faith and hope in communism that radically affected their behavior.

To show you how effective this was I show you a citation from intelligence work that was done by a contractor for the U.S. Government, the Rand Corporation, who interviewed Vietnamese prisoners of war during Nam. This was done in the early days, 68-69. The B-52 terror bombings had just begun. Of course, these were powerful bombs, because the idea was you couldn't see them in the jungle so we'll just bomb the jungle, destroy everything in the jungle, maximum impact. To give you an idea of the bombs that were used what the B-52's were dropping was 1000 pound bombs that had an explosive power of something like 700-800 pounds of TNT. When those bombs went off, they would break every ear drum within half a mile. So there are thousands and thousands of Vietnamese now that are totally deaf because they have ruptured ear drums just from being near the bomb when it went off.

And you'd think this would change their convictions. Certainly bomb after bomb after bomb that these guys would give up on communism. Yet this is what the Rand Corporation found in these interviews, "The analyst found particularly remarkable... the degree to which the men do not simply 'mouth' what they have been told, but seem to have fully absorbed and assimilated

it.... Thus, what may have begun as indoctrination has become sincere conviction... and may, therefore, be virtually impossible to dislodge. The men polled here... are unlikely to change their views.... They can perhaps be killed, but they probably cannot be dissuaded either by words or hardships.” Now that’s the power of having a “long-range faith” at the operational level of your mentality. When you have a vision sketched down on that deep level it’s almost impossible to destroy, you can drop bomb after bomb after bomb on these people but that’s not going to change a thing. It’s deeply held, it has a goal to history, it’s a struggle getting there, which is where they find the meaning, and so they become deeply entrenched. And what we’re saying is whatever a person holds on the deep operational level affects very strongly his behavior.

That’s from a pagan side. Now let’s turn to a quote and show the same principle holds true for a believer. There’s a tenacity in the biblical hope of living a separate life that is just as tenacious and for this we’ll refer to the Puritans. The very hatred still today for the Puritans is a testimony to the fear these believers produced in pagan hearts. “The Puritans were the most remarkable body of men, perhaps, which the world has ever produced...Those...who formed, out of the most unpromising of materials, the finest army that Europe had ever seen, who trampled down King, Church, and Aristocracy, who...made the name of England terrible to every nation on the face of the earth, were no vulgar fanatics...People who saw nothing...but their uncouth visages, and heard nothing...but their groans and whining hymns, might laugh at them. But those had little reason to laugh who encountered them in the hall of debate or in the field of battle...crushing and trampling down oppressors, mingling with human beings, but having neither part nor lot in human infirmities, insensible to fatigue, to pleasure, and to pain, not to be pierced by any weapon, not to be withstood by any barrier.” You want to talk about strength. These people had strength almost unheard of. And why did they have it? Because they had a powerful view of the plan of God for history embedded at the operational level. They had studied Daniel 2 as well and they saw where history was going. They thoroughly believed God would bring to pass His plan for the ages. And so they’re lives reflected it. And so, just to conclude this, if you’re going to have a successful separation from worldly culture that contrasts with it sufficiently enough to present a witness, but doesn’t separate with it to the point that it’s irrelevant, and you still deal with all the big questions, you still interact with the world of ideas,

you just give different answers, then to do this successfully you've got to have a "long-range faith." You've got to have embedded down at the operational level that God's plan for history is going somewhere, that there's hope for the future.

So let's talk about hope because this is where we get into the second doctrinal fallout of the Exile. We've dealt with separation which is part of the doctrine of sanctification. Now we want to turn to the second doctrinal contribution of the Exile, and that's the **Doctrine of Revelation and Inspiration**. A new kind of literature arises at the Exile to answer the need of the OT saint. To get into it let's review the doctrine. We first introduced this doctrine back at Mt Sinai; the doctrines of revelation, inspiration and canonicity. They naturally fall out of that event because at Mt Sinai God spoke verbally into history with about two million people hearing his voice. It's difficult to say that was psychological phenomena. Two million people don't share the same psychological phenomena. This was a public revelation of a publicly speaking God who stands outside of history but speaks into history. The liberal says God can't do that. God can't speak to man in any kind of coherent verbal message, there's a barrier between God and man and therefore anything man says about God is just a projection of man. And this is why when you talk to people in our culture and you talk about God or the Bible they'll always say, well you're just talking religious talk, religious mumbo jumbo and what they mean is it's nonsense, you're just projecting, you don't really know what God has said. Why the liberal says this is because he's soaked up a pagan view of language. He's noticed something correct about language, he's observed that human language is limited. We can get ourselves tangled in paradoxes, such paradoxes as the Cretan's paradox, but incorrectly they applied the inherent limitations of human language to the Creator and said, "If *we* don't have a perfect system of language then God can't either since He's subject to the same limitations we are." That's the logic they were using. But it's a logic that rejects the Creator-creature distinction and applies the limitations of language to both God and man in the same way. They make it an abstract universal applied to God and man in the same way. The biblical answer is that God made us as creatures in His image and therefore as finite images of Him we have a finite replica of His language, finite because it's created. But His language is not created. His language is and ever has been, the eternal word of God. As eternal there has always been perfect language expression between the members of the Trinity and so He has what we might call a

hyper-language or meta-language, something that functions *in* the Creator domain and *upon* the creature domain without being subject to it. It's His language that brought this domain into existence out of nothing. His speech can do that, ours can't do that and therefore His language does not suffer the impediments of our fallen, limited speech. We have to, as 21st century Christians, be very careful here with language because most evangelicals have been infected with these pagan views of language and when you are it's a short step to denying revelation and the inspiration of Scripture. To show you how precise you have to be, think about revelation and inspiration. What do we have in the Scriptures? We have God speaking in human language. He's accommodating Himself to us so we can understand. But if you're not careful you'll slip because it is human language here after all, and that's limited. But who's speaking the human language? God is, not man, and He's not limited, He's accommodating to us to reveal Himself to us. And a second thing we have in the Scriptures is that all that is needed is a verbal communication that is sufficient for God to get across what He wants to say. And we're insisting that human language is sufficient for that. Yes, it has limitations, it's not perfect, but it is sufficient for communicating truth from the mind of God to the mind of man. Therefore we insist on verbal revelation, and if you were a 19th century liberal standing on Mt Sinai you'd have a hard time rejecting verbal revelation; everyone at the base of that mountain knew very clearly what God was saying.

The second thing about revelation is that it's personal. First it's verbal, second it's personal. Obviously, if it's communicated from one Personal Mind to another personal mind then the content is personal. It's not impersonal. And therefore it demands a response, it can either be a submissive response or a rebellious response but either way it requires a response, no one can remain neutral over the issue, either you are for the word of God or you are against it.

And finally, a third thing by way of review, revelation is public history, it's not private. That's the whole purpose of the Scriptures, that these things were written down, we're not saying all of it was written down. We know there was much more revealed than was written down, but what was written down is sufficient. And so whether or not man discovers God's written word or understands it, it is a record of public history. And the most obvious picture of this is Mt Sinai - if you want to picture Charlton Heston with the

Ten Commandments up there and the nation down beneath, fine, that's an accurate picture of the public dimension of Scripture. This thing didn't happen in a corner.

And so with that little review of the doctrine of revelation we want to move into a new kind of revelatory literature called apocalyptic. Then we'll try to answer why God spoke in this kind of way to the Exile generation. What purpose did it serve that was particularly useful for those people? The first thing we want to say is that you can count on the Book of Daniel being the focus of attack by the liberal higher critics on the university campus. I can guarantee you if your child or grandchild takes a course on the Bible as Literature at the university they're going to get this line. "Well, the Book of Daniel is a forgery written about 200BC and that all the seemingly "impressive" prophecies were written quote 'after the fact.' So Daniel isn't predicting the future as the fundamentalist says; some forger is recording what happened in history. It's just impossible that this was written in Daniel's day because the book charts so accurately the events that occurred in the Persian and Greek periods that no person could have known that kind of detail before the fact." That's the argument. Let's see how they support the argument. If we don't know why the argument is wrong then we begin to doubt the Scriptures and doubt is the opposite of faith and then our whole Christian lives are wrecked. So we want to see what's wrong with the argument.

There are two areas higher critics focus on: history and linguistics. The argument from history is that here you are, a liberal higher critic, and you don't believe God speaks into history, you believe the Bible is simply a product of some old Jewish guys who pasted it together. It's just pieces put together and they'd add a piece here and to make it fit they'd do some editing and they gradually collected these writings in three stages: the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. This is how they suppose the Jewish canon came together and the reason Numbers is in the Law is because Numbers was written early, and the reason Judges is in the Prophets is because Judges was written somewhere in the middle and so forth. This is how they interpreted the Jewish canon. It came in three stages of chronology. And then they come to Daniel and Daniel has been placed by the Jews in the section called the "Writings," the latest section, and they asked, why is Daniel placed in the "Writings" rather than the "Prophets?" Daniel should be

in the prophets if it was written early. Aha, they grandly proclaim, Daniel was not written early, Daniel was written late and that explains why it didn't make it into the Prophetic section and so Daniel comes in the 3rd century BC, not the 6th century BC and therefore Daniel is writing history not prophecy and that alleviates my problem as a liberal who rejects the supernatural.

So the whole theory these liberal critics depend on is that the three divisions of the Jewish canon was decided upon because of chronological development. If that's wrong then the argument of the critic falls. By the way, their theory that it was done this way has never been proved and there are many other much more plausible explanations for why the OT has these three divisions. One explanation is that they were not organized according to chronology but according to the dominating feature of the books. Here's Robert Gordis, a Jewish scholar and he says of the third section, the Writings, "When the full scope of Hebrew Wisdom is taken into account, it becomes clear that the third section of the Bible, the Kethubim ["writings"] is not a miscellaneous collection, but, on the contrary, possesses an underlying unity, being the repository of Wisdom...Both the composition and the rendition of the Psalms required a high degree of that technical skill which is Hokmah ["wisdom"] ...Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, obviously belong in a Wisdom collection...Lamentations is a product of Hokmah in its technical sense...The book of Daniel" and watch this, where did they put Daniel? "The book of Daniel, the wise interpreter of dreams, obviously is in place among the Wisdom books..." Why does he say that? Why is Daniel seen primarily as a wise guy rather than a prophet? Daniel prophecies, I thought Daniel would be a prophet. Jesus refers to him as a prophet. But the Jews said we recognize Daniel as a wise guy. Why? Because Daniel teaches us how to live wisely in the government of a pagan Gentile administration. Think about it. How did a Jew named Daniel survive four different Babylonian administrations and, get this, two different pagan empires? Anyone realize that Daniel served in the Babylonian Empire and in the Median Empire? You have to have a lot of political wisdom to survive one administration shift, much less four and then an empire shift. That kind of thing is unprecedented as far as my knowledge of history goes. I don't know of any person that ever did this and that would make Daniel the greatest diplomat ever to walk the planet. The only thing equivalent I know of would be to envision an American administration choosing a guy from Mexico, a non-citizen, and inviting him to be a top level administrator right up by the president, and then the guy

survives in that position through four changes in administration, four different presidencies, then get this, America is taken over by some other country and they keep this guy from Mexico up in the top level of administration. Now you're going to have to be one very smooth operator to do that. I've never heard of anything like that since Daniel. But that shows you the kind of political wisdom he had. So, it's the wisdom factor that weighed heavily in the Jews mind when they read Daniel which is why they put him in the third section, the Writings. It isn't because Daniel is late, had nothing do to with that. Daniel is right at home in the writings because of his political wisdom. And if any Christian wants to go into politics he ought to be required to study the Book of Daniel in depth because Daniel is a testimony of how to not only survive politically in a pagan system but how to thrive and bring biblical wisdom to bear on the administration your working with.

The second argument, the linguistic one we'll cover briefly. We're still working with the date of Daniel. Is Daniel writing history or prophecy? And here the higher critics, who come off so smooth on PBS, here they're arguing from linguistics that Daniel is late. Higher critics of Daniel have long pointed out that vocabulary, syntax, literary style and proper names reflect a later time period. In other words, let's say Daniel used a Greek word known only to have been used in the 3rd century BC. Then if that were the case that would show clearly that Daniel was probably written in the 3rd century. If Daniel used a word for a musical instrument that was only used later on then that too would show that Daniel was probably written much later. However, none of these kinds of linguistic arguments have been able to hold up under close scrutiny. Any time a vocabulary word has been turned up by archaeology it has been shown to be used over a number of centuries including the 6th century. Anytime an instrument thought to be used only in a later century has shown up, the evidence shows it was used earlier as well and so forth. These kinds of arguments have been used both historically and linguistically but none of them have held up.ⁱ

Now the other side: what kind of evidences do we have that indicate Daniel was written early and Daniel is in fact predicting the future? There are evidences of an early writing of Daniel. For example, at Qumran two fragments of Daniel manuscripts have been found, one in Cave I and the other in Cave IV. These date from the 2nd century BC which makes the date

of writing that higher critics claim, 165BC, highly unlikely since they were evidently already well-circulated and accepted by that time.

And secondly, if Dan 2 and 7 sketch the four successive kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome, still higher critics have to explain how, if Daniel or some forger wrote the book in 165BC, how did he so accurately portray Rome before Rome existed? So you still have to explain how the four kingdoms in these visions can be scrunched into just three. In other words, you might be able to explain the first three kingdoms but not the fourth. So this counter argument is saying that if you date Daniel at 165BC that's not late enough; it would have to be much later to account for the detailed descriptions of the fourth kingdom, the Roman Empire. So apocalyptic literature as we see in the Book of Daniel has come under a lot of attack but the attacks don't have any good evidence when seriously evaluated.

So let's finish out the issue of apocalyptic literature. Why did God begin to speak in symbols and all this weird stuff? Let's think of the historical context in which this new literature was given. It was the time of the Exile. Put yourself in their shoes. You're an OT Israelite, your nation has just been militarily destroyed, and you've been dragged hundreds of miles from your home and planted in a new land. You may have had 20 or 30 family members killed, you don't know where they are, you may be the only person that survived from your family, and this is difficult stuff to think through. Today, if you want a modern parallel talk to some of the few remaining survivors of the Holocaust. Some of them they interviewed so you can get their videos; they have hundreds of hours of this stuff and if you watch these the survivors tell you how after the whole thing was said and done you had kids with no fathers, and no grandfathers. So if there was an old man who survived and he happened to live in your village then he was the grandfather of every kid in the whole village. And so these old men would load their pockets with candy because every kid in that village needed a grandfather and he was it and you can hear these kids tell the story of how they'd all walk down the street holding hands with this one old man. These kinds of stories under countless scenarios are what come out of that terrible destruction of human life. So you can imagine the people that survived and went into Exile could easily get depressed. The heartache alone can cause you to collapse and have cardiac arrest. These people didn't even know the extent of what had happened until years later. They had no idea of the extent of the destruction.

And so in a situation like that, when you begin to realize the fullness of what happened what do you need? When everything about life is darkness what can help? A glimmer of hope. You've got to know that there's some light at the end of the tunnel. If there's not why go on living?

That's the context that God reached down to man and spoke a particular kind of literature we call apocalyptic. Apocalyptic literature is basically stuff like Daniel, Ezekiel and Zechariah. It's not the apocrypha, the apocrypha is the stuff the Roman Catholics pronounce as canonical in the 1500's. The Jews never accepted those books, Protestants don't accept those books. We're not talking about those books. We're talking about apocalyptic - in the OT Daniel, Ezekiel and Zechariah, in the NT the book that is apocalyptic literature is Revelation. The style of all these books is the same. They all involve a dream and a vision and in the dream and the vision the author of the text is the observer to the vision, and it's interpreted for him by an interpreting angel. In almost every case there's an interpreting angel involved in the apocalyptic literature. The apocalyptic literature emphasizes themes that were not emphasized before the kingdoms fell, back when the kingdoms were in decline, the kingdoms divided. Then we talked about prophetic literature. In the OT what is the function of a prophet? If people would be clear about this it would really answer the question, do we have prophets today? The answer is we don't, the gift of prophecy is not functioning today. This is another big bone of contention between the cults that believe the gift of prophecy continues and God re-established it for the Church, because to justify their beliefs they have to have a new revelation coming through a prophet. The Roman Catholic Church in principle believes in the continuing gift of prophecy because of the institution of the papacy, the authoritative word of the pope. Protestants do not believe in the continuation of the gift of prophecy and here's one reason why: the charismatic movement is sort of half way between Protestantism and Catholicism, you've got these unstable elements in it. The charismatic movement is unstable here because they're talking about the gift of prophecy. Well, if they were consistent, and the gift of prophecy is continuing we should be adding Scripture, because that's what the prophets were supposed to do.

The gift of prophecy is looked upon in the OT as the classic writings of the prophets. These guys generated infallible, inerrant Scripture; that's their function. Why? Because they're bringing a lawsuit against the covenant

breaking nation of Israel. They're functioning as prosecuting attorneys against Israel and yet at the same time they're bringing indictments and pronouncing judgment. They always bring in a final note of hope, that yes, God is going to discipline you for violating the terms of the Mosaic Contract, but God is eventually going to restore you under the terms of the Abrahamic Covenant. So God's promises to Israel will be finally resolved and it will justify God's sovereign word. That's the role of the prophets, and that's the prophetic literature that we studied in the Kingdom Divided and the Kingdom Decline.

In the Exile there's still prophets writing, and in the restoration there's still some prophets writing. Ezra and Nehemiah are books that are written, there's Zephaniah, Malachi, so there are prophets writing then too. But sandwiched into all this period of time is this apocalyptic literature and if you look at the content of the apocalyptic literature, (forget now the style, we talked about the style, the style is it's dreams, visions, weird symbols, and all the rest of it) and purpose of the literature it is to assure believers, to give hope to believers.

In that sense the apocalyptic literature differs from prophetic literature. If you observe the book of Revelation what do you notice about the first three chapters? It's all about the Church. Thinking in terms of the OT, what type of literature is that? Is that apocalyptic or is that prophetic? What is the content of those churches? Who is acting almost like an inspecting general in Rev 2-3, He comes walking into these seven congregations and He says you've done this good but you've done this bad. That's much more like the OT prophets. So the first three chapters of Revelation tend to be kind of like, in style, OT prophetic literature. But starting in Rev 4 and moving on through the rest of the book it's very apocalyptic. There is no address condemning the Church, there's no address that chews people out; it's all the story of persecuted saints living in a pagan society that is going to be judged and the final terminating act of history. That's how the end of the OT interplays with the end of the NT. That's why when you look and see the Exile you see two doctrines, the doctrine of sanctification and the doctrine of revelation/inspiration, that's the connection. The doctrine of separation addresses the issue of believers living in a pagan land, how they live in a pagan society. Obviously in order to do that they need extra support. The extra support comes out of this apocalyptic literature.

That's what the visions of apocalyptic literature provide. They give you hope. We like to know all the details, what corresponds to what kingdom; that's a study in itself and we've done a little of that. But don't lose the big picture. Apocalyptic literature cuts pagan power down to size. Apocalyptic literature says God has the final word in history. Pagan kingdoms are a dark tunnel but at the end there is light. The apocalyptic idea is that there's a plan of God for history and His plan controls pagan man's plan. So when paganism starts to threaten me as an individual believer I look in back of the paganism through my apocalyptic revelation and I understand, aha, the plan of God Most High envelops man's plans and that enables me to relax because I know the end of history, I have read the last chapter, I know how it's going to turn out. And that immediately brings peace of mind.

Alright, next time we'll move on to the last event in the OT, the restoration. There's a partial restoration and a couple of doctrines there, then we'll have some appendices on the OT that deal with the millennium and the questions of a post- and pre-millennialism and that will bring us to the NT and the arrival of the King.

ⁱ For a treatment of the arguments cited in this lesson and some others by liberal higher critics see Leon wood, *A Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 19-23.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2009