

I have also had contact with individuals who detested what they call "Dispensationalism," among whom I found a fault that may be found in either group, a fault of making agreement on minor issues more important than personal relation to Christ. I think, however, that this particular fault is more apt to be found with this group than the other, though sometimes found in both. I was once associated for a time with a group which ~~seemed to feel that their group~~ which gave me the impression *That* ~~of holding that~~ the Reformed faith consisted ^S of a thousand different points, and that if one differed ^S on any one of these he ^{is} ~~was~~ already almost outside the pale. ~~This is in~~ This can become, in ~~my~~ my opinion, an extremely serious error. God wants us to put our stress on the matters that are clearly taught and stressed in His Word and to be tolerant and ^{toward} charitable of those who differ on matters on which the evidence is less clear.

The fact that I feel that such a division is an erroneous one is made clear by the fact that the errors that I find on the one side are very often found on the other side. As corresponding to the over-emphasis ~~overemphasis~~ overemphasis on the figurative, people ~~xxx~~ who call themselves "Dispensationalists" often tend to lay too much emphasis ~~xxx~~ on types. ^{is. Because} I do not know why this is, ~~because~~ ^T there are definite types and symbols and allegories in the Scripture. Yet ~~xxx~~ it is very easy to go to an ~~xxxxx~~ extreme on this, and find them where ~~God has not placed them~~ they are not intended at all.

A clear example of this in my opinion is considering Joseph a type of Christ because he married a Gentile ~~gentile~~ wife. Christ did not ~~xxx~~ marry a gentile ~~Gentile~~ wife. The church is made ~~xxxx~~ up ~~of~~ both of Jews and Gentiles. ~~There~~ There is no statement anywhere that Joseph is a type of Christ. This ~~xxx~~ sort of interpretation, while used with caution, it can be valuable