

THREE

God's Earthly People

C. I. Scofield and the Blessing of Israel

Hilary Perry

CYRUS INGERSON SCOFIELD published the *Scofield Reference Bible* (SRB) in 1909.¹ This essay refers to the second edition, which appeared in 1917.² According to Mark Sweetnam, the 1917 edition has been “the most influential edition of this influential Bible, and, apparently, continues to be so, in spite of the increased competition from other versions and the 1967 revision.”³ SRB is a standard King James Version with extensive footnotes, cross-references, chapter-headings and sub-headings which put forward a literal interpretation of the Bible and propagate Scofield’s premillennial, dispensationalist views. Premillennialists believe that Christ will return to earth before the Millennium. Dispensationalists hold that God has administered and administers the world through varying and progressive dispensations, economies or administrations, each with its own governing principle and particular responsibility placed on humankind, which invariably fails in its task, thus incurring divine judgement and the imposition of a new dispensation. Scofield defines a dispensation as “a period of time during which man is tested in respect of obedience to some *specific* revelation of the will of God.”⁴ He recognises seven dispensations. The current Dispensation of Grace or of the

¹ It is extremely difficult to obtain a copy of the 1909 edition but it can be seen online at <http://rarebooks.dts.edu/viewbook.aspx?bookid=1385>.

² *The Scofield Reference Bible: the Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, edited by Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D.* (London: Oxford University Press, revised edition, 1917).

³ Mark S. Sweetnam, “The Scofield Reference Bible and Evangelical Thought: One Hundred Years and Counting,” in R. Todd Mangum and Mark S. Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the Evangelical Church* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2009), 202.

⁴ SRB note on Gen 1.28, 5 (Scofield’s emphasis).

Church is the penultimate one, to be replaced by the final dispensation, the Millennial Kingdom, at the Second Coming of Christ.⁵

Mark Sweetnam concludes that “Scofield and his notes have shaped the doctrinal basis of large swathes of evangelicalism.”⁶ His co-author, Todd Mangum likewise finds that it is possible to trace SRB among the original sources of theological ideas in many books about Zionism.⁷

Scofield claimed that the nation of Israel is the chief concern of the Bible from Genesis 11 to Acts 2.⁸ Even though he died in 1921 and therefore does not refer to the Jewish state established in 1948, it is interesting to compare dates and places relevant to the planning and production of SRB with the dates of the Zionist Congresses which began in 1897.⁹ According to Arno Gaebelein, Scofield first spoke to him of “a plan of producing a Reference Bible... with references and copious footnotes,” during the first Sea Cliff Bible Conference of 1901, and spoke of it again at the fourth conference in 1904.¹⁰ In this same year, 1904, Scofield and his second wife Hettie visited London¹¹ and, according to Scofield’s biographer Charles Gallaudet Trumbull also visited Montreux in Switzerland before returning to America.¹² Late in 1906, Scofield visited Oxford and then Switzerland again.¹³

Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) had published *Der Judenstaat*¹⁴ in 1896 and chair-

⁵ The Dispensations of Innocency (Gen 1.28), Conscience (Gen 3.23), Human Government (Gen 8:20), Promise (Gen 12.1), Law (Exod 19.8), Grace (John 1.17), and the Millennial Kingdom (Eph 1.10).

⁶ Sweetnam, “One Hundred Years,” 199.

⁷ R. Todd Mangum, “The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on American Evangelicalism, American Premillennialism, and Early Dispensationalism,” in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 173.

⁸ Scofield, “A Panoramic View of the Bible,” SRB, iv.

⁹ David Mendelsson, “From the First Zionist Congress (1897) to the Twelfth (1921),” *Jewish Virtual Library* (2000), <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/firstcong.html>.

¹⁰ Arno C. Gaebelein, *The History of The Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Our Hope Publications, 1943), <http://www.newble.co.uk/writers/Scofield/refbibhist.html>. Gaebelein was one of the consulting editors on the 1909 and 1917 editions of SRB.

¹¹ Gaebelein, “History.”

¹² Charles G. Trumbull, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), 88, 90, 94. According to Gaebelein, Scofield’s first visit to Montreux was in 1906 (“History,” ch. 5), but Gaebelein’s biography was first published in *Moody Monthly* magazine, in the early months of 1943, much later than Trumbull’s biography of Scofield. Joseph M. Canfield, in *The Incredible Scofield and His Book* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1988), 190–91, disputes Gaebelein’s dating, though he bases his argument on an apparent misreading of Gaebelein as saying Scofield had stayed two years in Montreux and returned in May 1906.

¹³ Trumbull, *Life Story*, 101. Trumbull states that Scofield visited the library at Lausanne, begun by Calvin. Here Canfield corrects Trumbull’s account to read “Geneva” (*Incredible Scofield*, 196). This seems more likely.

¹⁴ Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, ed. Jacob M. Alkow, trans. Sylvie D’Avigdor (New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946). Herzl wrote, “Let the sovereignty be granted us over a portion of the globe large enough to satisfy the rightful requirements of a nation; the rest we shall manage for ourselves” (92). “Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency. If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole

ed the First Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland in 1897. Two of the Congress's major achievements were the foundation of the World Zionist Organisation and the formulation of the Basle programme, which stated that "Zionism seeks for the Jewish people a publicly recognized legally secured homeland in Palestine."¹⁵ The second and third congresses were held in Basle in 1898 and 1899 and the fourth in London in 1900. The fifth, sixth and seventh congresses took place in Basle in 1901, 1903 and 1905 respectively.¹⁶ The Jewish National Fund was established at the fifth congress. While it cannot be proved that these events had any influence on Scofield, it is interesting that he was in Switzerland, albeit in Montreux and Lausanne, not Basle, in 1904 and 1906, around the time that the sixth and seventh congresses were taking place, and he could have been in London at the time of the fourth congress, or shortly after it. It could also be significant that he was working on the SRB around that time.

Below, I shall outline three of Scofield's important assertions concerning Israel: his distinction between spiritual and earthly seeds of Abraham (i.e., the Church and Jews); his belief in the end-times return of Jews to the Promised Land; and his understanding that the blessing of Gentiles will depend on their treatment of Jews. In respect of each, I will also compare Scofield's commentary with writings by four modern, Christian Zionist authors: John Hagee,¹⁷ Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum,¹⁸ Charles H. Dyer,¹⁹ and Edward E. Hindson,²⁰ who are also premillennial dispensationalists. Fruchtenbaum, Dyer, and Hindson, along with Larry V. Crutchfield, graciously responded to my email questionnaire about SRB use, sent to eighteen American dispensationalists in April 2010. Dyer and Hindson confirmed they had used SRB early in their Christian lives; Fruchtenbaum, from a Jewish background, stated that he had read it, but not at the time of his conversion. Hagee, whom Stephen Spector dubs "one of the most dedicated and outspoken American Christian Zionists,"²¹ did not respond to my email, but he is highly influen-

finances of Turkey. We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence. The sanctuaries of Christendom would be safeguarded by assigning to them an extra-territorial status such as is well-known to the law of nations. We should form a guard of honor about these sanctuaries, answering for the fulfillment of this duty with our existence. This guard of honor would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering" (96).

¹⁵ David Mendelsson, "First Congress: Basle, 1897," in "From the First."

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ John Hagee, *From Daniel to Doomsday: The Countdown Has Begun* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999); *Jerusalem Countdown: A Prelude to War* (rev. and updated ed.; Lake Mary: Frontline, 2007); "Why Christians Should Support Israel: The Apple of His Eye..." *John Hagee Ministries*, <http://www.jhm.org/Home/About/WhySupportIsrael>.

¹⁸ Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events* (Tustin, Ariel Ministries, 1990).

¹⁹ Charles H. Dyer, *What's Next? God, Israel and the Future of Iraq* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2004).

²⁰ Edward E. Hindson, *The Book of Revelation: Unlocking the Future* (Twenty-First Century Biblical Commentary Series; Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 2002).

²¹ Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 167.

tial, especially through his organisation, Christians United For Israel (CUFI). As will be shown, many of his ideas appear remarkably similar to those of Scofield.

Hagee, pastor of the 18,000-strong Cornerstone Church in San Antonio, Texas, reaches 99 million homes each week through radio broadcasts and televangelism,²² and millions of people through books, a website, and email newsletters, and through CUFI, which he founded in 2006. CUFI and similar American evangelical Christian organisations, together with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and neoconservative figures, form the US Israel Lobby, “a loose coalition of individuals and organisations that actively work to shape US foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction.”²³ Christian Zionist organisations exert influence by lobbying Congress on behalf of Israel and mobilizing rapid member response whenever needed.²⁴

God’s Earthly and Heavenly Peoples, Israel and the Church

The claim that God has two eternally separate peoples, Israel and the Church, underpins Scofield’s entire eschatology and engenders his belief that, because God’s promises to Israel were earthly, so must they be fulfilled on earth in the establishment of an earthly kingdom in the land promised to Abraham and his descendants. The notion of the existence of two separate peoples of God appears in SRB notes from Genesis 5 onwards. In Scofield’s interpretation, Noah is “a type of the Jewish people” who will be “brought as an earthly people to the new heaven and new earth.”²⁵

Regarding God’s promise that he will make of Abram “a great nation,” Scofield creates an innovative distinction between Abraham’s earthly and heavenly descendants, putting forward an idiosyncratic interpretation of God’s promise to Abram in Gen 13.16²⁶ and to Jacob in Gen 28.14,²⁷ where their progeny is described as “as the dust of the earth”; to Abram in Gen 15.5²⁸ and to Isaac in Gen 26.4,²⁹ where the number of their progeny is described “as the stars”; and to Abraham in Gen 22.17,³⁰ where the number of his progeny is likened to both sand and stars. In none of these verses

²² Stephen Sizer, *Zion’s Christian Soldiers? The Bible, Israel and the Church* (Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 11.

²³ John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 112.

²⁴ Christians United For Israel, “About Us,” http://www.cufi.org/site/PageServer?pagename=about_AboutCUFI.

²⁵ Note on Gen 5.22, SRB, 12.

²⁶ “And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered” (Gen 13.16, KJV).

²⁷ “And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed” (Gen 28.14, KJV).

²⁸ “And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be” (Gen 15.5, KJV).

²⁹ “And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen 26.4, KJV).

³⁰ “That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the

is there any intimation of different kinds of descendants or any mention of a spiritual dimension. However, Scofield asserts in his note on Gen 15.18 that Abram's natural posterity is "the dust of the earth," that is, "the Hebrew people," whereas the phrase, "look now toward heaven... so shall thy seed be" (Gen 15.5) indicates "a spiritual posterity... all men of faith, Jew and Gentile."³¹ Scofield reinforces the idea of division between the two peoples in two subheads: "The Abrahamic Covenant: the land given; natural posterity promised,"³² and "The Abrahamic Covenant confirmed: a spiritual seed promised."³³

This separation between earthly and heavenly comparisons is unjustifiable, however, as proved in other verses not mentioned by Scofield. For example, in Deut 1.10, Moses states, "The LORD your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude." Moses here addresses the Israelites on the border of Canaan and cannot possibly be imagined to be addressing "men of faith, Jew and Gentile." The same objection applies to several other texts, none of which bears comment from Scofield.³⁴ 1 Chronicles 27.23 plainly states that it was Israel whom God had promised to increase like stars.³⁵ It seems that, to serve his thesis, Scofield imports Paul's arguments in Romans 9 and Galatians 3, where Abraham's physical and spiritual descendants are distinguished—but not in terms of dust, sand, or stars. Tellingly, Scofield refers to Rom 9.6–8 and Gal 3.6–14 in his note on John 8.37 ("I know that ye are Abraham's seed...").³⁶

Hagee likewise differentiates between sand and stars to justify elements of his advocacy of the land entitlement of modern Israel, as will be shown below.³⁷ The other modern writers do not appear to place so great an emphasis on the concept of God's separate peoples, but Fruchtenbaum's and Hindson's endorsements of rapture eschatology imply they too would accept the notion. According to Fruchtenbaum, seven stages of

heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen 22.17, KJV).

³¹ Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 24. Interestingly, Scofield posits a third way in which the promise is fulfilled: "through Ishmael."

³² Subhead to Gen 13.14, SRB, 22. Ref. Gen 13.16.

³³ Subhead to Genesis 15, SRB, 23. Ref. Gen 15.5.

³⁴ "Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever" (Exod 32.12, KJV); "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the LORD thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Deut 10.22, KJV); "And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the LORD thy God" (Deut 28.62, KJV); "Their children also multipliedst thou as the stars of heaven, and broughtest them into the land, concerning which thou hadst promised to their fathers, that they should go in to possess it" (Neh 9.23, KJV).

³⁵ "But David took not the number of them from twenty years old and under: because the LORD had said he would increase Israel like to the stars of the heavens" (1 Chr 27.23, KJV).

³⁶ Note on John 8.37, SRB, 1127. See below.

³⁷ See "The Land," below.

the Rapture of the Church are described in 1 Thess 4.16–17.³⁸ Hindson cites four texts as proof of the Rapture of the Church.³⁹ He states that, in Revelation, “dispensation-ists” (who are pretribulationists in their view of eschatology) see two distinct groups of people: “Jews on earth and Gentiles in heaven.”⁴⁰

In addition to remarks based on the text of Genesis, Scofield develops the concept of God’s separate peoples in commentary on other parts of the Bible. Three SRB subheads to Leviticus read, “The relationships and walk of God’s earthly people,”⁴¹ and Scofield’s Introduction to 1 Chronicles posits the “blessing of God’s earthly people in connection with the Davidic monarchy.”⁴² In his Introduction to the Psalms, Scofield makes a stark distinction between the “earthly” and “heavenly” peoples, averring that “the imprecatory psalms are... a cry appropriate and right in the earthly people of God and based upon a distinct promise in the Abrahamic Covenant... but a cry unsuited to the church, a heavenly people who have their place with a rejected and crucified Christ.”⁴³ Scofield also claims in his note on Hab 3.1 that Moses prayed for an earthly people whose dangers and blessings were earthly whereas Paul prayed for a heavenly people whose dangers and blessings were spiritual.⁴⁴ Scofield asserts in his note on John 8:37 that Christ himself contrasts Abraham’s “seed,”⁴⁵ that is, Abraham’s natural posterity, “the Israelitish people and Ishmaelites,” with Abraham’s “children,”⁴⁶ that is, Abraham’s spiritual posterity, “all who are ‘of the precious faith of Abraham.’”⁴⁷

According to the SRB note on Hos 2.2, Israel is Jehovah’s restored and forgiven earthly wife, whereas the Church is “the Lamb’s heavenly bride.”⁴⁸ This assertion is repeated in the note on Rev 19.7, where Scofield states that “The Lamb’s wife is the ‘bride,’ the Church, identified with the ‘heavenly Jerusalem,’”⁴⁹ to be “distinguished from Is-

³⁸ Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 98–99.

³⁹ Hindson, *Revelation*, 12. The texts are John 14.3; 1 Thess 4.16–17; 1 Cor 15.51–53; Rev 19.7–9.

⁴⁰ Hindson, *Revelation*, 8. The term “pretribulationist” indicates the belief that the true church is to be raptured (caught up to heaven) before the onset of “the Great Tribulation,” a seven-year, or three-and-a-half-year, period of intense suffering before the Second Coming of Christ. Unbelievers, including Israel and Gentiles, who are “left behind,” are to suffer all the rigors of the Tribulation, which culminates in the attack of Antichrist on Israel, the coming of Christ and the Battle of Armageddon. Interestingly, Scofield holds that the Tribulation will last for three-and-a-half years (SRB notes on Dan 9.24 [914], and Rev 7.14; 13.37). He also asserts in his note on Rev 7.14 that this will be “distinctively ‘the time of Jacob’s trouble’ (Jer 30.7).” He cites Enoch as a type of those to be caught up (SRB note on Gen 6.9 [13]), and those in the Ark rescued from the flood, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, as types of the remnant of Israel who will come to faith after the rapture of the true church (SRB notes on Gen 6.14 [13] and Dan 3.17 [903]).

⁴¹ Subheads to Leviticus 18, 19, and 20, SRB, 150–2.

⁴² Introduction to 1 Chronicles, SRB, 456.

⁴³ Introduction to the Psalms, SRB, 599.

⁴⁴ Note on Hab 3.1, SRB, 957.

⁴⁵ John 8.37 (“I know that ye are Abraham’s seed...”).

⁴⁶ John 8.39 (“Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham”).

⁴⁷ Note on John 8.37, SRB, 1127.

⁴⁸ Note on Hos 2.2, SRB, 922; refs John 3.29; Rev 19.6–8; Hos 2.23; Rev 19.7.

⁴⁹ Refs Rev 21.9; Heb 12.22, 23.

rael, the adulterous and repudiated ‘wife’ of Jehovah, yet to be restored (Isa 54.1–10; Hos 2.1–17), who is identified with the earth (Hos 2.23). A forgiven and restored wife could not be called a virgin (2 Cor 11.2, 3) or a *bride*.⁵⁰ For Mangum, it is in such an assertion that Scofield reveals his hermeneutical approach: “the dichotomy between two peoples of God forms a theological template through which Scripture is read.... This dichotomy takes precedence even when the result is different persons of the Godhead taking on two different ‘wives,’ one earthly and one heavenly.” It “indicates the level at which [his] theological presuppositions are exerting influence.”⁵¹

Scofield also asserts that the four gospels show “a group of Jewish disciples, associated on earth with a Messiah in humiliation,” whereas the epistles show “a Church, which is the body of Christ in glory, associated with Him in the heavenlies.”⁵² This distinction illustrates Scofield’s notion that the dispensation of grace does not begin until the crucifixion.⁵³ Further, Scofield avers that, although “king” is a “divine title,” Christ is “King of the Jews, not King of the Church, of which he is LORD and Head.”⁵⁴ Israel in the wilderness was “a true ‘church’” but it is never called a church in the land,⁵⁵ and it was in striking contrast with the New Testament *ekklēsia*. The only common feature is that “both were ‘called out’ by the same God.”⁵⁶

Scofield claims that Christ differentiated between Israel and the Church in two parables in Matthew 13. The metaphor of the treasure is made to apply to the lost tribes of Israel and Israel’s restoration, and that of the pearl to the true church.⁵⁷ Scofield avers that Christ, having given himself for the pearl, is now preparing it for presentation to himself; it is in this sense that the pearl represents the true children of the kingdom, the Church.⁵⁸ In fact, the kingdom of heaven is likened to a merchant seeking a perfect pearl rather than to the pearl itself. Similarly and equally unjustifiably, Scofield asserts that “in the great field, the world He [God] sees the redeemed of all ages, but especially His hidden Israel, yet to be restored and blessed.”⁵⁹

Scofield also posits a differentiation between “the last days” relating to Israel and “the last days” relating to the Church.⁶⁰ Scofield states that “afterward” in Joel 2.28 means “in the last days,” and that this “has a partial and continuous fulfilment during the ‘last days’ which began with the first advent of Christ... but the greater fulfilment

⁵⁰ Note on Rev 19.7 (Scofield’s emphasis), SRB, 1348.

⁵¹ R. Todd Mangum, “The Theology of *The Scofield Reference Bible*,” in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 111, 112.

⁵² Introduction to the Four Gospels, SRB, 990.

⁵³ See note on Exod 19.8, SRB, 94.

⁵⁴ Note on Matt 2.2, SRB, 995, ref Ps 110.16.

⁵⁵ Note on Acts 7.38, SRB, 1158.

⁵⁶ Note on Matt 16.18, SRB, 1021.

⁵⁷ Notes on Matt 13.44 and Matt 13.45, SRB, 1017.

⁵⁸ Note on Matt 13.45, SRB, 1017.

⁵⁹ Note on Matt 13.37, SRB, 1017.

⁶⁰ Note on Acts 2.17, SRB, 62–63.

awaits the ‘last days’ as applied to Israel.”⁶¹

Scofield claims that it is not “taught in Scripture” that “the Christian inherits the distinctive Jewish promises.” As the “heavenly seed of Abraham,” the Christian “partakes of the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant,” but “Israel as a nation always has its own place, and is yet to have its greatest exaltation as the earthly people of God.”⁶² Stephen Sizer argues that this concept is “in plain contradiction to passages such as John 10.16 and Rom 11.24 (regarding the one flock and one olive tree), neither of which, interestingly, warrant any comment by Scofield.”⁶³

The concept of two distinct peoples of God is also found in the structure of Scofield’s dispensational system. The fifth dispensation, the Dispensation of Law, and the seventh, the Millennial Kingdom, concern God’s earthly people, the Jews. However, the sixth, the current Dispensation of Grace or Church Age, represents a “parenthesis” between them.⁶⁴ This dispensation concerns God’s heavenly people, the Church, to be raptured to heaven before the start of the Great Tribulation, which will precede Christ’s return and especially afflict Israel.

Scofield claims that, when Christ first appeared to the Jews, the Davidic kingdom should have been established, but God knew beforehand that both king and kingdom would be rejected and that the Church Age would ensue. He asserts that, because God’s unfulfilled, earthly promises to Israel under the Davidic Covenant have never been abrogated, they will be fulfilled at Christ’s Second Coming by the establishment of an earthly kingdom in the land promised to Abraham and his descendants, confirming Israel’s national regathering, conversion and establishment in peace and power.⁶⁵ Thus the final Dispensation, the Millennial Kingdom, is the Davidic kingdom.

Hindson and Fruchtenbaum concur with Scofield on this point. Hindson holds that, following the second coming, Jesus Christ will reign on earth for one thousand years (a millennium) while Satan is bound in the “abyss” and that, during this time God’s promises to Israel will be fulfilled. “The Messiah shall reign from Jerusalem over all the earth in peace, blessing, and prosperity (Rev 20.1–6; Isa 2.2–4; 9.6–7).”⁶⁶ Fruchtenbaum also sees the seventh dispensation as the Millennial Kingdom, the promised re-establishment of the Davidic throne.⁶⁷

⁶¹ Note on Joel 2.28, SRB, 932. Scofield refers to his note on Acts 2.17.

⁶² Note on Rom 11.1, SRB, 1204.

⁶³ Stephen Sizer, “The Elevation of National Israel to a Superior Role over the Church,” in *Cyrus Ingerson Scofield (1843–1921): The Author of The Scofield Reference Bible*, chapter 5, section 8, *Christ Church Virginia Water*, <http://www.christchurch-virginiawater.co.uk/articles/scofield1.html>.

⁶⁴ Cyrus I. Scofield, *What do the Prophets Say?* (Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company, 1918), 79.

⁶⁵ Note on Acts 1.11, SRB, 1148.

⁶⁶ Hindson, *Revelation*, 13.

⁶⁷ Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 6, 269.

The Land

The land and Jerusalem are constant themes in Scofield's commentary.⁶⁸ Scofield asserts that the Abrahamic Covenant, including the land-gift, is unconditional⁶⁹ but that the so-called Palestinian Covenant⁷⁰ was conditional, its violation resulting in Israel's dispersion.⁷¹ He avers that "the gift of the land is modified by prophecies of three dispossessions and restorations," and that two of these have already occurred. Israel will be restored from her current third dispersion at Christ's return as King under the Davidic Covenant.⁷² Significantly, Scofield asserts that "God's directive will for his covenant family is to be in Canaan,"⁷³ and that, for believers, the heavenlies referred to in Ephesians parallel "Canaan in Israel's experience."⁷⁴ "The divine order is... Israel in her own land, the centre of the divine government of the world and the channel of divine blessing; and the Gentiles blessed in association with Israel."⁷⁵ The "general theme" of Ezek 47.13–48.35 is "Israel in the land during the kingdom-age."⁷⁶

The perspective of those living after 1948 inevitably differs from Scofield's, though there are suggestions that Scofield had Zionist tendencies and was at least acquainted with wealthy American Zionists, including Samuel Untermyer. In 1900, according to David Lutzweiler,⁷⁷ or 1901, according to Joseph Canfield,⁷⁸ Scofield became a member of the Lotos Club of New York, an institution which sought to promote social intercourse between proponents of literature, science, and the fine arts. Canfield argues that Scofield's literary output would hardly have merited his membership at that time and that Untermyer, a member of the Literary Committee at the time of Scofield's application to join this club, would not have been interested in what Scofield had so far produced. Canfield states that that "a possible clue" to Untermyer's unlikely support for Scofield may have been "Scofield's 'postponed Kingdom' theory," which "was most helpful in getting Fundamentalist Christians to back the international interest in one of Untermyer's pet projects—the Zionist Movement."⁷⁹ David Lutz holds that Scofield was involved in a conspiracy with Untermyer and other prominent and wealthy Zion-

⁶⁸ References occur in notes on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 Chronicles, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Zechariah, Acts, Romans, Ephesians, and Hebrews.

⁶⁹ Note on Gen 12.1, SRB, 20.

⁷⁰ Subheads to Deut 29, SRB, 248; and Deut 30, SRB, 249; and note on Deut 30.3, SRB, 250.

⁷¹ Introduction to Deuteronomy, SRB, 216.

⁷² Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 25.

⁷³ Note on Gen 46.3, SRB, 65.

⁷⁴ Introduction to Ephesians, SRB, 1249.

⁷⁵ Note on Isa 13.1, SRB, 724–5; cf. notes on Acts 2.14, SRB, 1150; Acts 3.21, SRB, 1153; Rom 11.26, SRB, 1206.

⁷⁶ Section head (capitals) over Ezekiel 40, SRB, 885.

⁷⁷ David Lutzweiler, *The Praise of Folly: The Enigmatic Life and Theology of C. I. Scofield* (Draper, VA: Apologetics Group Media, 2009), 138.

⁷⁸ Canfield, *Incredible Scofield*, 174.

⁷⁹ Canfield, *Incredible Scofield*, 174, 175.

ists “to inject Zionist ideas into American Protestantism.” He also claims that Scofield accepted their financial backing.⁸⁰ However, Lutzweiler, while acknowledging that “the Lotos Club in Scofield’s day had a very strong presence of dedicated Zionists, of whom Samuel Untermeyer was only one,”⁸¹ nevertheless states that “there is, as of this writing, no documentary proof uncovered of any explicit connection between Scofield and the powerful people—especially the world’s most prominent Zionists—who were among the hundreds of members listed in the directory of The Lotos Club.”⁸²

One definition of Christian Zionism is “the doctrine that the return of Jews to the ‘Promised Land’ fulfils biblical prophecy and will inaugurate the end times.”⁸³ For pre-millennialists, the Great Tribulation and Antichrist’s invasion of Israel must precede Christ’s Second Coming, thus the area must be populated in advance by Jews. Organisations like Hagee’s CUF have strong eschatological reasons for urging support for Israel.

Hagee asserts that God’s promise to Abraham was literal and unconditional and that “the title deed to the Promised Land” is to “a very literal land.” This “title deed” was passed from Abraham to Isaac and then to Jacob. Hagee expands the concept of sand and stars representing God’s earthly and heavenly peoples, already posited by Scofield, to refute the suggestion that “God’s promise to Abraham was not a promise of literal land, but a promise of heaven.” Interpreting Gen 22.17,⁸⁴ he states that “stars, as light, rule the darkness, which is the commission of the Church.” They are heavenly, not earthly, and “represent the Church, Abraham’s *spiritual* seed.”⁸⁵ Conversely, the sand is earthly and represents “the multitudes of people from Abraham’s seed—both Jews and Arabs.” Having surprisingly acknowledged Arabs as descendants of Abraham, Hagee immediately states that “God gave to the Jewish people a physical land whose literal boundaries are given in Genesis 15.18–21. It is a specific land with Jerusalem as its capital city forever... Israel has been given an earthly kingdom with an earthly Jerusalem now located in Israel. The church has been given the New Jerusalem located in heaven.”⁸⁶

Hagee’s claims concerning the meanings of sand and stars draw the same objections as do those of Scofield and also merit further specific criticism. Being light is not the

⁸⁰ David W. Lutz, “Unjust-War Theory: Christian Zionism and the Road to Jerusalem,” in *Neo-Conned! Again: Hypocrisy, Lawlessness, and the Rape of Iraq. The Illegality and the Injustice of The Second Gulf War*, ed. D. L. O’Huallachain and J. Forrest Sharpe (Norfolk, VA: Light in the Darkness Publications, 2007), 147.

⁸¹ Lutzweiler, *Praise of Folly*, 138.

⁸² Lutzweiler, *Praise of Folly*, 139.

⁸³ Edward Kessler and Neil Wenborn, eds, *A Dictionary of Jewish-Christian Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 452–53.

⁸⁴ “Blessing I will bless you, and multiplying I will multiply your descendants as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore.” No citation given by Hagee, but this appears to be from the New King James version.

⁸⁵ Hagee, *Daniel to Doomsday*, 137–9, (Hagee’s emphasis).

⁸⁶ Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 202.

unique task of the Church. Isaiah 42.6 and 49.6, though often applied by Christians to Christ, may both be interpreted as indicating Israel's role as a light to the nations.⁸⁷ In such a strict division between stars and sand, the identity of Arab Christians and Messianic Jews within the Church becomes questionable. Apart from total disregard for modern political implications and lack of concern for non-Jewish inhabitants of Israel, the Occupied Palestinian Territories and the wider Middle East, Hagee's choice of Gen 15.18–21, where the declared extent of the land-gift is at its widest, incurs problems within the biblical text itself. Firstly, Jerusalem is not mentioned in Gen 15.18–21 and certainly not as “a capital city forever.” Its inclusion is surely an indication of a political agenda. Secondly, different areas are promised to Abraham and his descendants in different verses even within Genesis,⁸⁸ and, as David Holwerda notes, appear in other biblical books too, sometimes in very detailed and complex format.⁸⁹ Thirdly, as Sizer remarks, some areas within the general “river of Egypt to Euphrates” region are biblically designated as not available to Israel. God will not give any of Seir, the land given to Esau's descendants, the Edomites, to the Israelites,⁹⁰ nor any of the land of the Moabites and

⁸⁷ “I am the LORD, I have called you in righteousness, I have taken you by the hand and kept you; I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations” (Isa 42.6, NRSV); “He says, ‘It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth’ ” (Isa 49.6, NRSV).

⁸⁸ For example, an unspecified area, “this land,” is given in Gen 12.7; 24.7; 35.12; “all these lands” are given in Gen 26.3; and the area given is limited to what Abram can see in Gen 13.15, and to land on which Jacob is lying in Gen 28.13. In Gen 17.8 and 48.4, the land given is limited to Canaan.

⁸⁹ David E. Holwerda, *Jesus and Israel: One Covenant or Two?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1995), 89, n. 8: “I will set your borders from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the Euphrates” (Exod 23.31a, NRSV); “Command the Israelites, and say to them: When you enter the land of Canaan (this is the land that shall fall to you for an inheritance, the land of Canaan, defined by its boundaries), your south sector shall extend from the wilderness of Zin along the side of Edom. Your southern boundary shall begin from the end of the Dead Sea on the east; your boundary shall turn south of the ascent of Akrabbim, and cross to Zin, and its outer limit shall be south of Kadesh-barnea; then it shall go on to Hazar-addar, and cross to Azmon; the boundary shall turn from Azmon to the Wadi of Egypt, and its termination shall be at the Sea. For the western boundary, you shall have the Great Sea and its coast; this shall be your western boundary. This shall be your northern boundary: from the Great Sea you shall mark out your line to Mount Hor; from Mount Hor you shall mark it out to Lebo-hamath, and the outer limit of the boundary shall be at Zedad; then the boundary shall extend to Ziphron, and its end shall be at Hazar-enan; this shall be your northern boundary. You shall mark out your eastern boundary from Hazar-enan to Shepham; and the boundary shall continue down from Shepham to Riblah on the east side of Ain; and the boundary shall go down, and reach the eastern slope of the sea of Chinnereth; and the boundary shall go down to the Jordan, and its end shall be at the Dead Sea. This shall be your land with its boundaries all around” (Num 34.2–12, NRSV); “Every place on which you set foot shall be yours; your territory shall extend from the wilderness to the Lebanon and from the River, the river Euphrates, to the Western Sea” (Deut 11.24, NRSV); “Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses. From the wilderness and the Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, to the Great Sea in the west shall be your territory” (Josh 1.3–4, NRSV).

⁹⁰ Deut 2.5.

Ammonites, given to the sons of Lot.⁹¹ These areas correspond to the modern regions of the Negev and Jordan;⁹² thus modern Israel is in breach of this stipulation concerning the former area.

Hagee regards the establishment of the State of Israel as the fulfilment of prophecy. “More than 2,600 years ago the prophet Ezekiel prophesied the resurrection of Israel from the Gentile graves in the lands to which she had been scattered, predicting the rebirth of Israel, which took place on May 14, 1948.”⁹³ Hagee claims, from Gen 13.14 and 15.18,⁹⁴ that Christians should support Israel because “all other nations were created by an act of man, but Israel was created by an act of God.”⁹⁵ “The Royal Land Grant” was given to Abraham and his seed through Isaac and Jacob with an everlasting and unconditional covenant⁹⁶ and the Davidic Covenant granted “the Jewish right to own and possess the land of Israel forever.” At the Millennium, “the seed of Abraham will be given that land, (Israel), down to its last square inch.”⁹⁷

Like Scofield, Hagee ignores the fact that the Abrahamic Covenant has two sides and that obedience was expected from Abraham’s physical descendants. Several English translations include the phrases, “as for me” and “as for you” (Gen 17.4 and 9), terms denoting the mutuality of the covenant, rendering the Hebrew emphatic pronouns, *אני* and *אתה*; Abraham is to direct his children and household to keep the way of the Lord by “doing righteousness and justice *so that* the Lord would bring about for Abraham what he had promised him.”⁹⁸ As Gary Burge remarks, “... the land is not a possession that may be enjoyed without reference to God. Possessing this land is contingent on Israel’s ongoing faithfulness to God and obedience to his law.”⁹⁹

Like Hagee, other modern Christian Zionist writers see the establishment of the state of Israel as fulfilment of prophecy. Hindson states that the great end-times regathering has already begun “since 1948.”¹⁰⁰ Modern Israel is viewed as once again a nation in her own land.

⁹¹ Deut 2.9, 19.

⁹² Sizer, *Zion’s Christian Soldiers?* 87–88.

⁹³ Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 129; ref. Ezek 37.

⁹⁴ “And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever” (Gen 13.14, KJV); “In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates” (Gen 15.18, KJV).

⁹⁵ Hagee, “Why Christians.”

⁹⁶ Hagee, “Why Christians.” Refs Gen 12.1–3; 13.14–18; 15.1–21; 17.4–8; 22.15–18; 26.1–5; and Ps 89.28–37.

⁹⁷ Hagee, *Daniel to Doomsday*, 268.

⁹⁸ Gen 18.19, NRSV, my emphasis. KJV gives a similar rendering: “For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.”

⁹⁹ Gary M. Burge, *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to “Holy Land” Theology* (Grand Rapids: SPCK and Baker Academic, 2010), 4–5.

¹⁰⁰ Hindson, *Revelation*, 12. Refs Ezek 20.34; Isa 43.5–6.

Dyer admits that “in one sense the Palestinians have a legitimate claim to at least part of the land” because “some families who were driven off their land in 1948 and 1967 had lived there for centuries.”¹⁰¹ He also acknowledges anachronistically that “the Bible commands Israel to treat with fairness and dignity those non-Israelis [*sic*] who live in their midst.” Citing Ezekiel, he says that Israel’s blessings cannot come at others’ expense and that the land must be divided.¹⁰² However, he concludes that “the ultimate biblical solution is to distinguish between individual rights of ownership and the overarching issue of national sovereignty. God expects the Jewish people to respect the individual ownership rights of all who live in the land, including those who are not Jewish. But God granted national sovereignty of the land to the Jewish people.”¹⁰³ Dyer also avers that “since Israel is in the land right now, God must have a purpose for them being there even if they are not there in obedience.”¹⁰⁴

Fruchtenbaum echoes Scofield’s opinion that the Great Tribulation is centred on Jerusalem and the Holy Land, and involves “the people of God who will have returned to Palestine in unbelief.”¹⁰⁵ He sees two regatherings of Israel. The first, prior to the Great Tribulation, has been happening since 1948 and is in unbelief in preparation for judgment. Only the second regathering¹⁰⁶ will be in faith, in preparation for millennial blessings.¹⁰⁷

Blessing Israel

Scofield writes that Gen 12.3 (“I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee”) “has been wonderfully fulfilled in the history of the dispersion. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew—well with those who have protected him.” He adds that the future will still more remarkably prove this point,¹⁰⁸ a reference to his interpretation of Matt 25.31–46, which contains the assertion that the living nations are judged according to the way in which they have treated “those whom Christ here calls ‘my brethren.’” Scofield identifies Christ’s *brethren* as “the Jewish Remnant... during the tribulation.”

The King James translation of Gen 12.3 reflects the Hebrew verbs מְבָרֵךְ and מְקַלֵּל, each of which contains a second person masculine singular object.¹⁰⁹ Genesis 12.3 LXX contains a singular object, σε, pertaining to each of the two verbs, εὐλογούντάς and καταρωμένους.¹¹⁰ This implies that these blessings and curses apply to Abraham person-

¹⁰¹ Dyer, *What’s Next?* 69–70.

¹⁰² Ref. Ezek 47.22.

¹⁰³ Dyer, *What’s Next?* 70.

¹⁰⁴ Dyer, *What’s Next?* 85.

¹⁰⁵ Note on Rev 7.14, SRB, 1337.

¹⁰⁶ Ref. Isa 11.11–26.6.

¹⁰⁷ Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 295.

¹⁰⁸ Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 25.

¹⁰⁹ ואברהם מְבָרֵךְ וּמְקַלֵּל אֲרָרָה Gen 12.3.

¹¹⁰ καὶ εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογούντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι: Gen 12.3 (LXX).

ally. Sizer states that “there is no indication in the text that this warning of cursing was ever intended to extend beyond Abraham. The promise, when referring to Abraham’s descendants, speaks of God’s blessing them, not other nations blessing the Jews.”¹¹¹ Sizer also notes that Scofield does not comment on Gal 3.16, 28–29, where Paul identifies Christ as the “seed” of Abraham, and states that the promise of blessing to the Gentiles depends upon faith in Christ, not upon their treatment of the Jews.¹¹²

Hagee’s interpretations of Gen 12.3 are very similar to Scofield’s but embellish them. Hagee asserts that “God has promised to bless the man or nation that blesses the Chosen People,” and that “history has proven beyond reasonable doubt that the nations that have blessed the Jewish people have had the blessing of God; the nations that have cursed the Jewish people have experienced the curse of God.”¹¹³

Hagee describes a visit he made to the Berlin Wall. He emphasises the contrast between West Berlin as “an oasis of boundless abundance created by risk and the reward system of capitalism,” and East Berlin as “a barren desert with nothing to offer but empty promises.” He recalls his response to a German tour guide who questioned him about God’s intentions. It was to be noted that:

What a nation does to the Jewish people, God will do exactly the same to them.... God allowed the Russians to build barbed-wire fences around the German people to hold you as prisoners with machine guns and German shepherd attack dogs because the German people did exactly the same thing to the Jews at every death camp. You did this at Dachau and Auschwitz, and for every Jew who died, you will have to answer to God.¹¹⁴

This seems to imply that Hagee holds the Communist, Marxist, and officially atheist East Germany solely responsible for the atrocities. He does not explain why West Germany enjoyed such opulence but seems implicitly to attribute divine favour to the capitalist system. Perhaps his case might be influenced by the fact that it was the West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer who negotiated the payment of reparations of \$822 million with the Israeli government in February 1951.¹¹⁵

Hagee states that “Jesus considered the Jewish people His family.” He inserts a parenthesis within the text of Matt 25.40, asserting that Jesus’s brethren were solely the Jewish people and that “Gentiles were never called his brethren.” Hagee ignores verses

¹¹¹ Sizer, “The Elevation of National Israel.”

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Hagee, “Why Christians.”

¹¹⁴ Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 235.

¹¹⁵ Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion*, trans. Peretz Kidron (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), 198; “Jesus considered the Jewish people His family. Jesus said (Mt 25.40) “Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren (the Jewish people... Gentiles were never called His brethren), ye have done it unto me” (Matt 25.40 with interpolation by Hagee, “Why Christians”).

such as Matt 12.50, which states that “whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.”

Dyer avers that “God unquestionably holds Israel accountable for obedience to His covenant.” However, “God holds non-Jews accountable for their treatment of Israel—apart from Israel’s spiritual condition.” God promises “to punish the nations that had mistreated the Jews when they were under God’s judgment.”¹¹⁶ Dyer states that “as the nations have treated Israel, so will they be treated in kind by Him.”¹¹⁷ Because God promised Abraham that he would bless or curse those who blessed or cursed him, “our job... is to make sure we’re a blessing to the Jewish people. Biblically speaking,... we do need to support Israel’s right to exist as a nation.”¹¹⁸

Fruchtenbaum asserts that the grounds of the eschatological judgment in Matt 25.31–46 will be “Pro-Semitism” or “Anti-Semitism” during the Great Tribulation, the Jews being “Christ’s *brethren*.”¹¹⁹ The charges in the indictment will be scattering the Jews during the Tribulation, parting the land during the Armageddon campaign and selling the Jews into slavery. “Each Gentile... will be judged on the basis of his participation or his refusal to participate in these deeds.”¹²⁰ Believers, represented by the pro-Semitic sheep of the parable, will resist Antichrist and “populate the Gentile nations in the Messianic kingdom.”¹²¹ Answering a feasible charge that this interpretation implies salvation by works, Fruchtenbaum asserts that, since believers alone will oppose Antichrist’s anti-Semitism, it is their belief, not their pro-Semitism, which will earn them entry to the kingdom and also to eternal life. Unbelievers, the antisemitic goats, having joined Antichrist in his programme of Jewish destruction, will demonstrate their lack of belief through their antisemitic acts and will go to hell.¹²²

Conclusion

True to Scofield’s statements in his seminal work, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, that more than half the contents of the Bible relates to the Israelites, who have “a very *distinct* place in the dealings and counsels of God” and “a unique covenant with Jehovah,” and that “other nations are mentioned only as they touch the Jew,” much commentary in SRB concerns Israel and its prophesied revival and re-establishment under Christ’s earthly rule in the Millennial Kingdom.¹²³

¹¹⁶ Deut 30.7.

¹¹⁷ Obad 1.15.

¹¹⁸ Dyer, *What’s Next?* 84–85.

¹¹⁹ Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 259–60, Fruchtenbaum’s own emphasis.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 259.

¹²¹ Ibid., 260.

¹²² Ibid. 260–61.

¹²³ Cyrus Ingersoll [sic] Scofield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: Being 10 Studies of the More Important Divisions of Scripture* (Windber, PA: Classic Reprint Press, 2007; original printing 1885), 11 (Scofield’s emphasis).

While a secular Jewish state is not explicitly advocated or even mentioned in SRB, Scofield's text contains seeds which were ripe for later germination in the works of later Christian Zionist writers. The four Christian Zionist authors discussed here share many concepts with Scofield, and Hagee echoes some of his vocabulary—even though tracing precise influence remains difficult. As Sweetnam states, “we cannot simply point to someone who is saying the same thing as Scofield and assume they are saying it because they were influenced by Scofield.”¹²⁴ Scofield himself states that his commentary comprises the results of fifty years of Bible study¹²⁵ and thinkers such as John N. Darby, James Brookes, and Arno Gaebelein, may also have directly influenced the modern writers. The latter [i.e., the modern Christian Zionists] were of course subject to many other influences.

Nevertheless, Scofield's commentary has been very popular. According to Mangum, Scofield aimed to provide readers with a clear application of biblical teaching and this made the notes influential and helpful to the Christian public.¹²⁶ Since the commentary was attached to the biblical text itself, it was a relatively cheap and practical tool for personal Bible study, the first of its kind. The “pragmatic usefulness” of SRB “made room for its dispensational distinctives to gain influence.”¹²⁷

It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that SRB played some part in the development of the eschatology of Hindson and Dyer, who both used it as young Christians. Of Hagee, one can only infer Scofield's direct influence. Fruchtenbaum's treatment of eschatological issues seems to develop in directions which do not entirely reflect Scofield.

Mangum states that Scofield “provided exegetical rationales for a general belief that ethnic, national Israel would be revived in the last days.” He suggests that “it was only a matter of time before someone would come along seeking to correlate his general ideas more specifically with current events—SRB in one hand, newspaper in the other.”¹²⁸ Mangum's observation is borne out in the writings of the four modern authors. Hagee makes the strongest claims concerning the eternal, physical nature of the “land-grant” to Israel and the status of Jerusalem. He also utilizes powerful historical references to support his argument concerning the consequences for those who either “bless” or “curse” Israel. Hindson and Fruchtenbaum refer directly to the establishment of the state of Israel as part of the end-times regathering, though Fruchtenbaum's opinion of 1948 is more nuanced than Hindson's. Dyer discusses Palestinian rights but concludes that Israel is entitled to ultimate sovereignty over the land and to Christian support. Scofield did not specify when or how Israel was to be restored, but the works of the four modern Christian Zionists, whether directly influenced by Scofield or not, clearly

¹²⁴ Mark S. Sweetnam, “The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on British Premillennialism,” in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 143.

¹²⁵ “Introduction,” SRB, iii.

¹²⁶ Mangum, “Theology,” 127.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 133.

¹²⁸ Mangum, “The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on American Evangelicalism, American Premillennialism, and Early Dispensationalism,” in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 175–6.

interpret the establishment of the State of Israel as the realisation of the dispensational schema which Scofield had popularized in his influential SRB.