

. . . A secondary problem is the act of taking verses out of their context; however, the paramount problem lies in basing presuppositions on a hyperliteral interpretation of certain passages of the Bible."

-- William E. Cox, *Amillennialism Today* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 13, 18.

2. Floyd S. Hamilton

"So far, we have been pointing out the difficulties and contradictions into which we are plunged if we accept the literal interpretations of all the Old Testament prophecies as the proper method of interpretation. But if we reject the literal method of interpretation as the universal rule for the interpretation of all prophecies, how are we to interpret them? Well, of course, there are many passages in prophecy that were meant to be taken literally. In fact a good working rule to follow is that the literal interpretation of the prophecy is to be accepted unless (a) the passages contain obviously figurative language, or (b) unless the New Testament gives authority for interpreting them in other than a literal sense, or (c) unless a literal interpretation would produce a contradiction with truths, principles or factual statements contained in non-symbolic books of the New Testament. Another obvious rule to be followed is that the clearest New Testament passages in non-symbolic books are to be the norm for the interpretation of prophecy, rather than obscure or partial revelations contained in the Old Testament. In other words we should accept the clear and plain parts of Scripture as a basis for getting the true meaning of the more difficult parts of Scripture. . . .

"But the greatest help in the interpretation of prophecies is in the instances in which the New Testament declares prophecies to have been fulfilled in other than a literal way, by some even in the life of Christ or in the Apostolic history."

-- Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial faith* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1942), pp. 53-54.

3. Charles C. Ryrie

"Dispensationalists claim that their principle of hermeneutics is that of literal interpretation. This means interpretation which gives to every word the same meaning it would have in normal usage, whether employed in writing, speaking, or thinking. This is sometimes called the principle of grammatical-historical interpretation since the meaning of each word is determined by grammatical and historical considerations. The principle might also be called normal interpretation since the literal meaning of words is the normal approach to their understanding in all languages. It might also be designated plain interpretation so that no one receives the mistaken notion that the literal principle rules out figures of speech. Symbols, figures of speech and types are all interpreted plainly in this method and they are in no way contrary to literal interpretation. After all, the very existence of any meaning for a figure of speech depends on