

1

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



2

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



3

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Response to Kingdom Now Problem Passages**

1. Passages from Christ's ministry
2. Passages from Acts
3. Passages from Paul
4. Passages from the General letters
5. Passages from Revelation
6. Miscellaneous Arguments



4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

- a. David's Throne is Earthly
- b. A Davidic heavenly Throne changes its original meaning
- c. No NT verse places Jesus currently of David's Throne
- d. The Davidic Throne comes into existence only after the Times of the Gentiles have run their course
- e. A present Davidic Throne misunderstands the mystery nature of the Church
- f. A present Davidic Throne misunderstands the parenthetical nature of the Church



5

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Stephen Nichols**

"The Dispensational View of the Davidic Kingdom: A Response to Progressive Dispensationalism," in The Master's Perspective on Biblical Prophecy, ed. Richard L. Mayue and Robert L. Thomas, Master's Perspective Series (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002), 54.

"Although the progressive dispensationalists are careful to express their commitment to a future for ethnic Israel and a future, literal fulfillment of Israel's covenant promise, these views concerning the inaugural fulfillment of Old Testament promise, especially that of the Davidic covenant, and the redefining of the present form of the church mark an aberration from normative dispensationalism. The consistently held offer, rejection, postponement, and fully future fulfillment of the Davidic kingdom is absent from their teaching."

6

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Stephen Nichols**  
 "The Dispensational View of the Kingdom: A Response to Progressive Dispensationalism," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 7 (Fall 1996): 238.

"From the perspective of dispensational tradition, the current landscape of progressive dispensationalists appears to be a different terrain. The view of the offer, rejection, postponement, and fully future fulfillment of the Davidic kingdom and the corollary view of the church as something different and distinct is and has been the consistent view of normative dispensationalism. By viewing the present form of the church as an inaugural stage of the Davidic kingdom with Christ seated on the Davidic throne in heaven, the progressive dispensational position has distanced itself from this distinguishing feature of dispensationalism. *The* distinguishing feature of dispensationalism, i.e., the consistent distinction between Israel and the church, is all but absent. Consequently, the legitimacy of calling PD part of the dispensational tradition is questionable."

7

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning on David's Throne?**

"Many who are classic dispensationalists—and even those who are not dispensationalists at all—question why those who no longer believe in the foundational essentials of dispensationalism still want to be part of the dispensationalism family. This is truly something not yet revealed."



Robert Lightner, *Last Days Handbook* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), 211.

8

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning on David's Throne?**

"The term used by those who still wish to be called dispensationalists but who do not believe some of the basic essentials of dispensationalism. They do not believe God has a program for Israel and one for the church. They believe that Christ is presently on the throne of David in heaven and the Davidic kingdom is being fulfilled now in part."



Robert Lightner, *Last Days Handbook* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), 233.

9

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"Progressives are very set on finding various periods within the history of dispensationalism where there have been changes made or developments. They like to talk about the initial period. They like to talk about the classical period and the essentialist or revised period. I personally do not wish to get involved in that kind of breakdown of category. I do not think that is genuine at all. I think that this is an attempt to pave the way for their defense of their own system. What they're really wanting to say is that since dispensationalism has changed from year to year or decade to decade, why get so excited about this new change that we are introducing?"

10

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"Our change is just like the other changes. Dispensationalism has always had various people believing certain things about it within dispensationalism. There has been change; therefore, this is just another one of those changes. However, I do not believe the changes are the same at all. To be sure, dispensationalists have always differed, Dr. Walvoord differs at points with Dr. Chafer, Dr. Chafer differs at points with Dr. Ryrie, Dr. Ryrie with Dr. Pentecost, but the core beliefs of dispensationalism *have not changed since Darby.*"

11

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"The core beliefs involved are what Ryrie calls the *"sine qua non,"* which simply means the most essential, bedrock, bases for dispensationalism. First, Ryrie proposed that the *sine qua non*, the least common denominator, the most basic beliefs, involve distinction between God's program with Israel and His program with the Church. The first distinction is one part of the sine qua non. A second would be that the view of the distinction between those two programs is based on a literal hermeneutic consistently applied to Scripture."

12

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"The third *sine qua non* is that God has introduced these various economies—dispensations—in the history of time so as to bring the most glory to Himself. God's major purpose in the world as He implements His sovereign plan is to bring glory to Himself. Certainly, there are other purposes but dispensationalists have always believed the overriding one is for God to bring glory to Himself. In progressive dispensationalism all three of these basic essentials, which Ryrie pointed out and that have been believed from the beginning of the dispensational emphasis, have been rejected."

13

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"At least two of them, have been categorically rejected. Namely, a distinction between God's program for Israel and the Church has been blurred, and the concept of a literal, consistent, interpretation has been replaced by a complementary hermeneutic. The third has been rejected, the glory of God as the primary purpose of God. It has been replaced by a Christological salvific purpose. The salvation of sinners has been the primary purpose of God, progressives say. So it is a salvific purpose rather than a doxological, glory to God purpose that includes salvation."

14

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," *Conservative Theological Journal* 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"I think that progressive dispensationalists have made this classification of initial, classical, and essential in order to simply argue that there have been these spurts of growth, development, and change; therefore, their view is just another one. I want to categorically reject that thesis because I think there is a world of difference between various differences within the system and altering the foundation of the system. I liken the three essentials, or *sine qua non*, as the foundation upon which dispensationalism rests. You can't be a dispensationalist without these essentials, in my opinion."

15

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," Conservative Theological Journal 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"The other changes, the differences between how to interpret the New Covenant, for example, and whether or not the Tribulation is another dispensation or a thousand other things such as that, I liken to moving furniture around a room. It doesn't affect the system. In fact, it's healthy to have differences as to where this piece of furniture belongs and that one, and you may get tired of it being this way, so you shift it. That doesn't affect the structure of the house. But the dispensational house is built upon the foundation of the three essentials I just named, and progressive dispensationalism is attacking these essentials."

16

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Robert Lightner**  
 "Progressive Dispensationalism," Conservative Theological Journal 4, no. 11 (March 2000): 47-49, 54.

"That is a world of difference between any change, any development that has ever taken place since Darby. So, it's not fair, it's a misrepresentation to say that here's another development just like all the other ones. No, it *is not* like all the other ones. It is **drastically different** from all the other ones because it attacks the foundation upon which the system has been built. That is different from moving the furniture around to different places in the dispensational house, or to carry it through more literally the household, the economy, the stewardship. . . . I am not manufacturing these doctrines. These are the core beliefs of progressive dispensationalism and are at great variance with normative dispensationalism."

17

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
 (Acts 2)



- a. David's Throne is Earthly
- b. A Davidic heavenly Throne changes its original meaning
- c. No NT verse places Jesus currently of David's Throne
- d. The Davidic Throne comes into existence only after the Times of the Gentiles have run their course
- e. A present Davidic Throne misunderstands the mystery nature of the Church
- f. A present Davidic Throne misunderstands the parenthetical nature of the Church

18

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**The Coming Kingdom**  
Chapter 18



**Dr. Andy Woods**  
Senior Pastor – Sugar Land Bible Church  
President – Chafer Theological Seminary

19

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Acts 2**



- I. 2:1-4 – The falling of the Holy Spirit
- II. 2:5-8 – The manifestation of the gift of tongues
- III. 2:9-12 – Those present from the known world
- IV. 2:13-15 – Too early for drinking
- V. 2:16-21 – Manifestations taught in the OT (Joel 2)
- VI. 2:22-35 – Christ as the source of the manifestations
  - ◆ 2:22 Miracle worker
  - ◆ 2:23 Rejected by Israel
  - ◆ 2:24-29 Resurrected (Ps 16:8-11)
  - ◆ 2:30-32 Davidic descendant (Ps 132:11)
  - ◆ 2:33-35 At God’s right hand (Ps 110:1)

20

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

**Acts 2**



- VII. 2:36 – Conclusion
- VIII. 2:37 – Conviction
- IX. 2:38-41 – Exhortation
- X. 2:42-47 – The first church meeting

21

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Darrell Bock**  
Darrell Bock, "The Reign of the Lord Christ," in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 49–50.

"Having mentioned the need to call on the Lord, Peter turns to recent events. He recounts Jesus' ministry in death but notes the death is not able to hold him (vv. 22–24). Peter goes on to note that such impotency for death was predicted in Psalm 16, the second Old Testament citation in Acts 2 (vv. 25–28). The text is clearly presented as having been fulfilled in Jesus' resurrection. The psalm 16 citation leads to the mention of David and a defense of the fact that a resurrection understanding of the text cannot refer to David, since he is buried (v. 29)."

22

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Darrell Bock**  
Darrell Bock, "The Reign of the Lord Christ," in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 49–50.

"The crucial linking allusion appears at this point. Peter notes that David was a prophet. Not only was David a prophet, he was the conscience beneficiary of an oath God had made to him that "one of the fruit of his [David's] loins" (KJV) would sit on his throne (Acts 2:30). The term *kathisai* (to sit), which is reintroduced in the citation of Psalm 110 (note *kathou*, "sit," in v. 34). The allusion in verse 30 is to Psalm 132:11, a Psalm which is strongly Israelitish and national in tone (see vv. 12–18). The Psalm in turn is a reflection of the promise made to David in 2 Samuel 7, especially verse 12. This 2 Samuel passage is better known as the Davidic covenant. What is crucial is that David's awareness of this covenant promise is immediately linked to his understanding of the resurrection in Psalm 16, which in turn is immediately tied to the resurrection proof text of Psalm 110 (vv. 31–35)."

23

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Darrell Bock**  
Darrell Bock, "The Reign of the Lord Christ," in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church*, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 49–50.

"*Being seated on David's throne is linked to being seated at God's right hand.* In other words, Jesus' resurrection-ascension to God's right hand is put forward by Peter as a fulfillment of the Davidic covenant, just as the allusion to Joel fulfills the new covenant. To say that Peter is only interested to argue that the Messiah must be raised misses the point of the connection in these verses and ignores entirely the allusion to Psalm 132 in the Davidic covenant. This passage and Luke 1:68–79 also counter the claim that no New Testament text asserts the present work of Jesus' as a reigning Davidite sitting on David's Throne. The throne on which Jesus is said to sit is the one promised to David's descendent through the Davidic promise of 2 Samuel, which was initially passed on through Solomon. Jesus sits here as David's promised Son on David's promised Throne. This fits Old Testament imagery as well. The idea of sitting describes the idea of rule, as the parallelism of Jeremiah 22:30 shows. As the Davidic heir, Jesus sits in and rules from heaven."

24

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---



**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



25

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



26

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Luke 1:32-33**

**"He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give Him the throne of His father David; and He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and His kingdom will have no end."**



27

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Alva J. McClain**  
 Alva J. McClain, *The Greatness of the Kingdom: An Inductive Study of the Kingdom of God as Set Forth in the Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959), 282.

“The ‘throne of David’ here is not God’s throne in heaven, nor is the ‘house of Jacob’ a reference to the Christian church. As Godet rightly observed: ‘These expressions in the mouth of the angel keep their natural and literal sense. It is, indeed, the theocratic royalty and the Israelitish people, neither more nor less, that are in question here; Mary could have understood these expressions in no other way.’”

28

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Luke 1:54-55**

“He has given help to Israel His servant, In remembrance of His mercy, As He spoke to our fathers, To Abraham and his descendants forever.”



29

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
 Zane C. Hodges, “A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2,” in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 173-74.

“All should acknowledge that the throne of David is inseparably wed to Israel’s kingdom, which we have been discussing. From the very beginning of his two-volume work, Luke makes this concept plain. Thus, when the angel Gabriel made his thrilling declaration to Mary, he states of Jesus, “Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bring forth a Son, and shall call His name Jesus. He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God will give Him the throne of His father David. And He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there will be no end” (Luke 1:30-33). This is the only explicit reference to David’s throne in Luke or Acts until we reach Acts 2:30. Together, the two texts constitute Luke’s only direct mention of a “throne” associated with King David.”

30

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 173-74.

"One should specifically note here that in recording what Gabriel said Luke cites words that completely ignore any suggestion of universality of dominion of that throne. Gabriel does not say that Jesus will rule all mankind from David's throne but simply "the house of Jacob." Luke does not make the slightest intimation that by sitting on this throne Mary's son will gain universal dominion. Of course, he will have such dominion from David's throne, as various Old Testament passages make clear. But obviously this fact is not part of Luke's theme here. Gabriel's announcement focuses very narrowly on the Jewish nature of David's throne. Nor is such an emphasis accidental in this context. Mary's Magnificat relates God's mercy to her with His mercy to Israel (Luke 1:46-55; see esp. vv. 54-55). Similarly, Zacharias' Benedictus is totally focused on what God is doing for Israel through the advent of His Son (vv. 67-79)."

31

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 173-74.

"Accordingly, when we read Luke 1 we are inhaling the very atmosphere of Old Testament Jewish expectation. We hear from the lips of Mary and Zacharias those grand hopes for national deliverance that were so inextricably bound up with the expectation of the divine king who would rule "Jacob" from David's throne. This is what we have here—and nothing more. Despite this fact, progressive dispensationalists assert that the Lord Jesus even now is reigning from David's throne, although national Israel has experienced none of the deliverance of which Mary and Zacharias spoke so glowingly in this context. Were it not for the fact that serious men have proposed this view, it might well be dismissed out of hand. According to the understanding of the Old Testament saints, who Mary and Zacharias represent so effectively, the throne of David could mean only one thing—the earthly throne that began with the reign of David himself and was passed down to his physical descendants who sat on it."

32

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 173-74.

"No one was entitled to sit on that throne unless he was, in fact, of Davidic lineage. Thus, Luke tells us carefully that Gabriel was sent to "a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David" (v. 27). So also Zacharias confirms that God "has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of . . . David" (v. 69). It was common Jewish belief that is expressed in the question of John 7:42: "Has not the Scripture said the Christ comes from the seed of David and from the town of Bethlehem, where David was? There is not the slightest shred of evidence that the throne of David has ever been conceived as anything other than the earthly seat of authority where David reigned and where only his physical descendants could legitimately reign. The term "throne of David" simply refers to this—nothing else. . . ."

33

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 173-74.

"However, progressive dispensationalists, in spite of consistent usage of the Bible, are not deterred from declaring that, even today, Christ is reigning from the throne of David. But this means that they must apply the term throne of David to what is actually the throne of God! And they feel the freedom to do this even in the absence of a single text that explicitly makes this identification. The result is a view that would have shocked any biblically literate Old Testament Jew—and should shock New Testament exegetes today."

34

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
 (Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. **Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs**
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



35

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Acts 2:30**

"And so, because he was a prophet and knew that GOD HAD SWORN TO HIM WITH AN OATH **TO SEAT one** OF HIS DESCENDANTS ON HIS THRONE."



36

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



37

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Verse:	Acts 2:30	Acts 2:34
Psalm	132:11	110:1
Verb:	<i>Kathizō</i>	<i>Kathēmai</i>
Kind of verb:	Transitive	Intransitive
Translation	To seat or place	To sit

38

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 175-76.

"But unless Bock is reading the Greek text in the form found in the Majority Text (not likely, to be sure), there appears to be a translational gaffe here that slightly overstates the similarity between verses 30 and 34. As you read the modern editions of the Greek New Testament, the verb *kathisai* in verse 30 is not to be read as intransitive ("to sit") but as transitive ("to seat"; cf. the NIV here). In verse 34, however, the intransitive sense "to sit" is correct, even though a slightly different Greek verb is involved. But, in view of the difference in verbs, Bock is not technically accurate when he states that the former verb is "reintroduced" in the quotation from Psalm 110. Clearly this would be quibbling were it not for the fact that Bock is trying to make these verses parallel by appealing to the use of a single verb in the same sense in both verses."

39

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. **The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones**
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



40

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 176.

"Technical considerations aside, the use of a verb for sitting proves nothing about whether or not the two thrones are to be identified. What else does one do on a throne? Suppose that one states, "Mr. Smith is destined to sit in the governor's chair in Austin and currently is sitting in the chair of the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court." Would anyone ever conclude from this that the words "sit" and "sitting" intimate that the two chairs in question are identical? Obviously not."

41

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. **Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience**
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



42

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Levitical Feasts (Lev. 23)			
Feast	Season	Purpose	Type
Passover	Spring	Redemption	1 Cor. 5:7
Unleavened Bread	Spring	Separation	John 6:35
1st fruits	Spring	Praise	1 Cor. 15:20
<b>Pentecost</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Praise</b>	<b>Acts 2:1-4</b>
Trumpets	Fall	New Year	Matt. 24:31
Atonement	Fall	Lev 16	Zech. 12:10
Booths	Fall	Wilderness provision	Zech. 14:16-18

43

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



44

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 176.

"It is perfectly safe to say that no one in Peter's day could have been expected to glean from his words that somehow the throne of David and God's extraterrestrial throne were to be identified. For that idea to be clear, it would have to be stated directly. But Peter does not do that here, nor does any writer anywhere else in the New Testament. What is truly relevant is Bock's observation that the quotation found in verse 30 comes from a Psalm (132) "which is strongly Israeliteish in tone." This, of course, is precisely what we saw in connection with Luke's first reference to the throne of David in Luke 1:28-33. The true character of the Davidic throne is that it is indeed Israeliteish in tone, and hence "earthly." Nothing indicates that such characteristics can be applied to the celestial throne of God."

45

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



46

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 176-77.

"And even if it is, "linking" is not equivalent to "identification." Bock's argument contains a logical fallacy. Bock has rested much on the idea of "linking" without acknowledging that two things can be linked without any necessity that they be equated. Certainly there are various senses which the throne of David can be linked with God's celestial one. After all (as Paul teaches us in Romans 13) all earthly power proceeds from God in heaven. If anyone is entitled to occupy David's throne in a future day, it would certainly be David's descendant who now occupies the right hand of the throne of God."

47

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 176-77.

"Indeed, the writer of Hebrews presents our Lord as seated "at the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Heb. 1:3) where He is "waiting till his enemies are made his footstool" (Heb. 10:12-13). It is most certainly not while He is on the heavenly throne that He achieves the victories associated with the Davidic throne in Luke 1 (see earlier discussion). On the heavenly throne He simply waits for that. But His presence on God's throne is a guarantee that someday He also will sit on David's throne as Victor over all of Israel's enemies. This is the true link between the heavenly and earthly sessions of Christ. But the idea that the two thrones can in any sense to be equated is illusory. It is not supported by any hard data at all."

48

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---



**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



49

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Acts 2:33**

“Therefore having been exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He has poured forth this which you both see and hear.”



50

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 177.

“Yet even apart from this consideration, Bock misses the point of the quotation from Psalm 110 in Acts 2. As verse 33 makes clear, the real link is with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is a well-confirmed New Testament teaching that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the *direct consequence* of our Lord's ascension to the Father. According to John's Gospel, the Lord informed the disciples, “it is to your advantage that I go away; for if I do not go away, the helper will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to you” (16:7). Earlier He had also said, “and I will pray to the Father, and He will give you another helper, that He may abide with you forever” (14:16).”

51

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 177.

"Our Lord's return to the Father and His intercession there are necessary to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Thus, in Luke-Acts the gift of the Spirit is termed "the promise of the Father" for which the disciples must wait until after Jesus' ascension to Heaven (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4). Bock labels Psalm 110 a "resurrection proof text." However, it is not an explicit statement of the resurrection since the resurrection is not mentioned in the Psalm. It does prophesy enthronement at God's right hand. The point of Peter quoting Psalm 110 is simply this: the seated Christ is the source of the Spirit's outpouring. By His intercession He has secured what God the Father promised. This is precisely what Acts 2:33 states: "therefore being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He poured out this which you see and hear."

52

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
 (Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



53

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**  
Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 178.

"This precise point—the ascension—is in view in Acts 2:34: "For David did not send into heavens, but he says himself . . ." It is simply incorrect to treat Psalm 16 as linked with Psalm 110 by asserting that both are resurrection proof texts. Psalm 16 is, but Psalm 110 is not. Rather, Peter quoted each Psalm with its own quite distinct emphasis in support of two different elements in his presentation."

54

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**Is Jesus Now Reigning from David's Throne?**  
(Acts 2)

1. Lack of harmony with earlier information in Luke about the Davidic Throne
2. Acts 2:30 & 34 employ different verbs
3. The mere activity of sitting is not enough to equate the thrones
4. Failure to factor in Peter's Jewish audience
5. Linking is not the same thing as equating
6. The point of the Acts 2 sermon relates to the source of the Spirit and not the Davidic Throne
7. Linkage fails to allow each Psalm to have its own distinctive input



55

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 172, 178.

"The kingdom was not restored, and it is quite wrong to identify the throne of David with God's extraterrestrial throne. . . . A contemporary movement within dispensationalism that calls itself "progressive dispensationalism" has taken a novel tact in regard to Israel's kingdom. Their analysis, however, remains inchoate, their efforts to elucidate notwithstanding. . . . We conclude, then, that Bock's linkage between the two quotations breaks down under scrutiny."

56

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

---



**Zane Hodges**

Zane C. Hodges, "A Dispensational Understanding of Acts 2," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. John R. Master Wesley R. Willis, Charles C. Ryrie (Chicago: Moody, 1994), 172, 178.

"And his next statement is an enormous leap into thin air: "In other words, Jesus' resurrection-ascension to God's right hand is put forward by Peter as a fulfillment of the Davidic covenant, just as the allusion to Joel fulfills the new covenant." The argumentation that has led up to this conclusion proves (as we have seen) absolutely nothing that even impinges on the identification Bock wishes to make. . . . Acts 2 will remain a focal point in dispensational discussion, as well it should. But classic dispensationalism can treat this text straightforwardly and with a minimum of complexity. Progressive dispensationalism, on the other hand, is forced to rely on intricate, subtle, and ultimately invalid arguments."

57

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CONCLUSION

58

Seven horizontal lines for writing notes.

- Response to Kingdom Now Problem Passages
1. Passages from Christ's ministry
  2. Passages from Acts
  3. Passages from Paul
  4. Passages from the General letters
  5. Passages from Revelation
  6. Miscellaneous Arguments
- 

59

Seven horizontal lines for writing notes.