



Scriptures and Doctrine :: "replacement theology"

"replacement theology", on: 2007/2/24 20:00

I was watching Dr. Michael Brown speak on this:

(http://www.jewishvoice.org/TV/ram/tv865_56K.rm.ram) Dr Michael Brown on Replacement theology

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/2/24 21:15

Excellent!

Thanks for sharing this.

Re: "replacement theology" - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/2/25 13:10

Neil,

Have you encountered this theology personally? If so, how did you deal with it?

Mr. Brown makes a statement that I wrestle with: when you encounter a Jew who takes offense with Gentiles or Christians who initiated persecution of Jews, we are to apologize for them.

Now, I believe it is abhorrant to persecute anyone, even homos. Believers are never called to injure anyone for any reason. If anyone needs to be killed because of criminal behavior, this is the states' job (read Romans 13.) We do not read where Jesus or his disciples apologized to anyone for another person's ungodly behavior.....

In encountering a Jew or a black person who have complaints against Gentile or white people because of persecution or slavery, all I can say is I am sorry it happened, this is not the way all people act and believe. If you look to history you will find people in these races who worked to stop it. Have you considered that? Seems to me too many people of color like to use the race card to justify their own racist attitudes. And what is the Jew's excuse? I have not met that many, except for Neil....Regardless of your race, your church affiliation, you will always find people who will give offense and the offended will use it to justify their rejection of the gospel.

When I apologize for another's ungodly behaviors I cannot promise there will be no repeat offenses given. But if it is my own behavior that needs to be dealt with, then I am responsible and should work to eliminate it from my lifestyle. God says: "The man that sinneth, he shall die." Eze. 18:20....the NT has not changed/alterd this principle.

Any comments? Anyone else have any thoughts on this issue?

Otherwise, I enjoyed the message given on the video.

ginnyrose

ginnyrose, on: 2007/2/25 14:20

you asked

Quote:

-----Have you encountered this theology personally?

yes, right here on this forum.

Quote:

-----If so, how did you deal with it?

regard the person who wrote it as wrong, wrong-headed, wrong-hearted, and missing the mark entirely on what God has to say about the Jews.

Quote:
-----And what is the Jew's excuse?

none, except as Paul wrote 'a hardening of the heart until the full number of the Gentiles are brought in'. But the "church" hasn't helped display the Love of Jesus, here's an article I found while looking up the 14 year old pregnant article you posted.

Quote:
-----"Virginia Principal: Students' Jesus Chants Are Anti-Semitic
Saturday, February 24, 2007

VIRGINIA BEACH, Va. —

A Catholic school principal has organized sensitivity training for students who shouted "We love Jesus" during a basketball game against a school with Jewish students.

The word "Jew" also was painted on a gym wall behind the seats of Bishop Sullivan Catholic High School students attending the Feb. 2 game at Norfolk Academy, said Dennis W. Price, principal of the Virginia Beach school.

Price, who also watched the game, said the rivals exchanged chants, "Then, at some point, our students were chanting, 'We love Jesus.'"

"It was obviously in reference to the Jewish population of Norfolk Academy; that's the only way you can take that," he added.

Price said he sent a letter of apology to Norfolk. Dennis G. Manning, the academy's headmaster, declined to comment.

Several Sullivan students met with Norfolk Academy's cultural diversity club Thursday as part of a series of events aimed at promoting tolerance, Price said.

He has arranged for the Virginia Conference for Community and Justice and the United Jewish Federation of Tidewater to work with students.

A message left for the United Jewish Federation of Tidewater was not immediately returned Saturday.

Price also has consulted the Anti-Defamation League, a national group that fights anti-Semitism.

"It is important that we work harder at having students leaving here who are tolerant and understand how serious these kinds of things are," said Price, who said diversity training will be incorporated permanently at Sullivan.

connect the dots, look into your heart, do you wish to see "gay" people saved by Grace?...then I ask you this, what do think they would feel if they saw you refer them in your previous post as "homos"?

Does that reflect the Love of Messiah?

I'm glad I enjoyed the video, after my mentor, my pastor and an elder laid hands on me and prayed, the third person to lay hands on me and pray was Dr. Michael Brown.

I write all above in Jesus love, neil

Re: replacement theology, on: 2007/2/26 11:31

Hi Neil,

I've watched the clip of Dr Brown, and I hear the definition he gives for 'replacement theology' is the notion that Jews can and should be excluded from the Church because they have no further place in the economy of God.

Is this the 'replacement theology' you are objecting to?

I would too, but I'll wait for your answer.

Meanwhile, here is the context of the verse he quotes in Matthew 23. I've taken it from v 25, in the YLT, to do justice to both nouns and verbs.

`Wo to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye make clean the outside of the cup and the plate, and within t hey are full of rapine and incontinence.

Blind Pharisee! cleanse first the inside of the cup and the plate, that the outside of them also may become clean.

Wo to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye are like to whitewashed sepulchres, which outwardly indeed do appear beautiful, and within are full of bones of dead men, and of all uncleanness; so also ye outwardly indeed do ap pear to men righteous, and within ye are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.

Wo to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and adorn the tombs of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blo od of the prophets.

So that ye testify to yourselves, that ye are sons of them who did murder the prophets; and ye -- ye fill up the measure of your fathers.

Serpents! brood of vipers! how may ye escape from the judgment of the gehenna?

Because of this, lo, I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes, and of them ye will kill and crucify, and of them y e will scourge in your synagogues, and will pursue from city to city; that on you may come all the righteous blood being p oured out on the earth from the blood of Abel the righteous, unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar: verily I say to you, all these things shall come upon this generation.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that art killing the prophets, and stoning those sent unto thee, how often did I will to gather thy chi ldren together, as a hen doth gather her own chickens under the wings, and ye did not will. Lo, left desolate to you is you r house; for I say to you, ye may not see me henceforth, till ye may say, **Blessed he who is coming in the name of the Lord.'**

Re: "replacement theology" - posted by Spitfire, on: 2007/2/26 14:25

Neil, I'm not sure what your reason for starting this thread was, but I presume it was to make some folks aware of the hatred that is being harbored in the churches toward Jews. Is that right?

Honestly, I've never understood that replacement theology. It's such hogwash and I can't see how anyone could glean th at from scripture. I knew that replacement theology exists, but for some reason, even as an ignorant, baby Christian, I kn ew better. God would never forsake Israel or anyone to whom He makes a promise. I've always considered myself a Je w. I was adopted by God into the family.

I had a Jewish neighbor at one time. I witnessed to him often. He liked me. He would always have theological discussion s with me across the fence. One day, I told him that I considered myself Jewish because I had been grafted into the fami ly. He was astonished. He said he had never heard that before. In the end, before we moved away, I was able to presen t the straight on Gospel to him in his living room. He thanked me and told me he thought I was wrong. I told him, "I hope I am, because if you're right and I'm wrong, you'll be ok."

I believe we should honor the Jewish people because God loves them and the whole purpose for my salvation as a Gentile is to provoke the Jew to jealousy.

I love you, Neil. I wish I could make up for all the so-called Christians who have hurt you. I realize that the Holocaust was perpetrated in the name of Christianity, but I don't believe it could have happened if God hadn't allowed it.

Art Katz constantly talks about the responsibility that the Jews have for their own judgement. You know, he even believes that the Holocaust was just preliminary and that the Time of Jacob's Trouble hasn't actually occurred yet. He predicts a time in the future when the Jewish people will be fleeing for their lives over the whole earth. I think this mindset of replacement theology is just the demonic force that is prowling this earth waiting to pounce. The persecution you have experienced in people's attitudes is nothing in comparison to what is to come.

You can come to my house. I will hide you, because I love you and I don't care what it costs me. I'll give my life to save you. It would be a privilege. Love, Dian.

Dearest Dian, on: 2007/2/26 16:54

(I;m smiling while I write this btw)

No Christian has hurt me, not at all. True, I am wary of some in the lower case c "church" in regards towards the Jews, and do regard "replacement theology" as theological spew, at best, demonic, at its worst.

Dr Michael Brown is much more adept at refuting this foul spew than I am, that's why I posted it.

and much love to you for wanting to "hide me out", don't worry. Remember where Jesus told the disciples to sell their cloaks and buy a sword?

The Lord wasn't talking in metaphor, true that Peter, as was his wont, got a lil enthusiastic by proclaiming that he was going to buy two, to which Jesus replied, "that's enough". That bit of Scripture always makes me laugh.

The Lord wasn't talking in metaphor, and he was talking to fellow Israelites who were His followers, so.....

When I was a child in Hebrew school, I remember reading everything I could get my hands about the Warsaw Ghetto uprising. As part of our Hebrew school and Torah study, we always learned in detail about the Holocaust. Not to keep us in fear, or to make us bitter, but the term, "Never Forget" was the linchpin behind this study, because at that same time, the Six Day War of 1967 had just been fought and Jerusalem reclaimed by Israel. The Six Day War was a massive Israeli pre-emptive strike against the combined forces of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, after years of these nations and the Arab league baying for the blood and the destruction of Israel.

In that corner of the world, Israel takes Arab threats seriously, much like the situation today with Iran. Iran has threatened that they will wipe the "zionist entity" from the map "with fire". Israel gave them one warning several months ago to cease their quest for nuclear weaponry, they ignored this warning, and you will see how this situation will play out.

buy a 4 cylinder car dear sister, you're going to be paying 6 to 7 dollars for a gallon of gas after Israel denudes Iran's nuclear ambitions.

here's the wikipedia entry on the Warsaw Ghetto uprising:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Warsaw_ghetto_uprising

God bless you for worrying about me, we ain't gonna be hiding. Israel's policy is that ANY Jew ANYWHERE in the world can claim Israeli citizenship at anytime.

Wrapped in Jesus, neil

Re: replacement theology, on: 2007/2/27 6:52

bartle said

Quote:

-----Israel's policy is that ANY Jew ANYWHERE in the world can claim Israeli citizenship at anytime.

You know how slow I am, bro.... but, just *why* would you want to be in Israel for a *war*?

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2007/2/27 7:42

I know this theology is in this country, we were just talking about a church that believes in it.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/2/27 9:14

bartle,

When you are able I ask you to please respond to dorcass' earlier question:

Quote:

-----I've watched the clip of Dr Brown, and I hear the definition he gives for 'replacement theology' is the notion that Jews can and should be excluded from the Church because they have no further place in the economy of God.

Is this the 'replacement theology' you are objecting to?

Also, Spitfire you said:

Quote:

-----I believe we should honor the Jewish people because God loves them and the whole purpose for my salvation as a Gentile is to provoke the Jew to jealousy.

(Emphasis mine)

I don't think the whole purpose for your salvation is to make the Jews jealous. Part of the purpose maybe.

Re: to Neil - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/2/27 9:23

Neil, I listened to the video, and a few thoughts came to me.

Quote:

----- when you encounter a Jew who takes offense with Gentiles or Christians who initiated persecution of Jews, we are to apologize for them.

I cannot with an honest conscience include myself among the hordes of "Christians" who persecuted the Jews. Quite the contrary. During WW2 my family was committed to saving their lives - hiding them, sneaking in food, baby clothes etc (all at great personal expense). Some of my relatives lost their lives in the process. There were also many miracles that God performed on behalf of the suffering Jews. My family still carries that love. Interestingly my family was Reformed, and certainly there was never a mention of Luther's darker side. I had never heard of it. Indeed, my family acted in love - they were TRUE Christians.

I do wonder about the Dr. Brown's claim that true born-again spirit-filled Christians are becoming more and more anti-Semitic. I wonder how he arrives at this conclusion. Certainly in my own experience I see quite the opposite - even in our complacent churches. I see so much caution extended towards the Jews that sometimes I wonder if they are regarded as beyond needing salvation. After all they ARE God's chosen people. To me it is not love to view anyone as not needing to experience God's salvation and grace.

I would like to see the barriers taken down - less suspicion, less blame - on either side. After all, in Ephesians two w

read how God has made us one in Christ. May the Lord work in our lives to tear down the walls— and bring us to that place of oneness: at the foot of the cross.

No replacement! Just oneness!

Diane

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/2/27 10:36

I am not able to view the video. I do not have the right player on my computer.

I do not believe in "replacement" Theology, but I do believe in "Fulfillment" Theology. In that:

Jesus Christ, being a Jewish man, is the "True" Israel.

He is the Servant of the Lord.
He is the Seed of Abraham.
He is the Son of David.
He is The Seed of the Woman
He is the true Promised Land, and our inheritance.
He is the true Temple of the Lord.
He is the true Sacrifice
He is the true High Priest
He is the Passover Lamb
He is the Sabbath
Etc.

The Substance has come. The types and shadows have been done away with.

Why would God go back to the types and shadows of an actual temple and animal sacrifice, when their whole purpose was to point to the True Temple, and the True Sacrifice? Isn't that what the Book of Hebrews is talking about? In fact Hebrews chapter 10 condemns anyone that would leave the True and Final Sacrifice of God's Son, and go back to the types and the shadows of Old Covenant.

Has God forsaken Israel? Absolutely not! Look at the Apostle Paul, he is in Christ. He has received the Promise God gave to Abraham. Look Dr. Michael Brown, he is in Christ. He has received the Promise God gave to Abraham.

The True Land. The True Promised Land....is Christ! God has fulfilled His Covenant Promises. He cannot lie. Any Jewish man or woman who is in Christ has received the fulfillment of that Promise!

Re:, on: 2007/2/27 12:05

I hate to sound like a broken record... but the Word of Faith Movement borrows a lot from "replacement theology". While they do not adhere to "replacement theology" persay, the WOF'ers do claim the promises God made to Israel, and believe that those promises are for the Christian.

They are not. Some of the principles apply to us (honor your parents so that your days may be many, etc). But the promises made in the Law were made to the Jew. Not Christians.

This is the root of the "health & wealth" crowd. Without borrowing this from "replacement theology", the whole health & wealth doctrine would fall to pieces... as it should.

Krispy

Pour water on the fire - posted by Psalm73 (), on: 2007/2/27 12:14

Hmm, Jesus spoke well of this in the gospel of mark chapter 7 verses 5-13. But for times sake, and the sake of the evangelist, we must preach today. This is a perfect way to cut down every tradition of men. (I mean the 1534 N.T with 1525 textual variants)

Mark 7:11-13: But ye say; a man shall say to his father or mother corban; that is, whatsoever thing I offer, that same doth not profit thee.

12 And ye suffer no more that a man do anything for his father or mother.

13 Thus ye have made the commandment of God of none effect, through your own traditions which ye have ordained.

America follows after preachers who are none that doeth good, no not one. From romans 3:12-18 and there was no fear of God before their eyes.

So speak ye, so do, as they that are judged according to the law of liberty. James 2:12 (K.J

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/2/27 12:21

Krispy, what do you think about Charles Finney's work in the Oberlin Evangelist on the Promises of God (which was compiled into The Promise of The Spirit later, and was a favorite book of Keith Green and Leonard Ravenhill).

I'll specifically reference this (http://www.gospeltruth.net/1839OE/390717_the_promises_5.htm) lecture.

Quote:

----- **Some of the reasons why the promises are not fulfilled in and to us.**

6. Again, we do not receive them as belonging to us, as in the case that I have mentioned, where one supposed that the promise of the New Testament was made only to the Jews. Now multitudes seem never to have understood the promises made to individuals and to the Church under the Old Covenant, as belonging still more emphatically to the Church and to individuals under the Christian dispensation. They seem entirely to have overlooked the fact that Christ and his apostles always treated the promises of the Old Testament, as more emphatically belonging to Christians under the New dispensation. Now here is a sufficient reason for their not receiving the fulfillment of the promises, that they do not understand them as made to themselves. Consequently they do not believe nor apply them.

Do you think that Zac Poonen and Leonard Ravenhill are heavy into Replacement Theology?

Re:, on: 2007/2/27 13:55

Ian... give me some time to review this, and I'll comment at a later time, ok?

Krispy

Sister Dorcas, on: 2007/2/27 15:50

this will probably be the second to last post I make for a while, I explain that in my next post in the ATF thread, but you asked:

Quote:

-----but, just why would you want to be in Israel for a war?

I didn't say I would want to be, it's just that if America someday goes the way of Germany circa 1923-1933, a Jew has a homeland to return to, rather than be rounded up and slaughtered like sheep.

and secondly, if it ever came to that, given my background in military intelligence and analysis, I might have something to offer.

But as far as going overseas is concerned I find myself drawn to either Korea or Rwanda.(most probably Korea, North Korea, when the pharaoh is gone) The Lord has not yet given me release on this yet.

love, neil

Re: replacement theology, on: 2007/2/28 8:49

Re Sister Dorcas

Neil,

Thank you. I now see what you are getting at. You know, I have terrible trouble understanding the level of anti-semitism which you perceive, as it really is foreign to my experience, apart from what happened in Nigeria when I was a teen, when one tribe was singled out for extinction.

The genocide in Biafra happened when my father was out there, with the war front crossing back and forward over the part where he worked - British bombs being dropped on his red cross-marked hospital buildings. I had the privilege to meet a young woman years afterward in the UK, who'd been one of those surgical patients, whose aunt, the anaesthetic nurse (as it happened), had stayed to give her oxygen while she was unconscious till a raid was over. Sometimes the staff had no choice but to leave the hospital to the enemy, as it advanced again. Over one period of weeks, 30,000 people a day were dying of starvation, despite the involvement of very able aid agencies. It was because of the mis-reporting of all this, that Fredrick Forsyth (whose news reports were being thrown in the bin), gave up journalism and became a novelist.

Also, many years ago in this country, I met a shining Christian nurse, who was North Korean but married to a Brit. She tried to explain to me what it was like at home, but this has begun to make sense only since coming to SI. Amazing how such an incident (one meeting) should have made such an impression on me, and I can still remember her face and smile, while many many other 'one meeting's have completely faded from memory. So, regarding the call you feel to Rwanda, or North Korea, I think I understand.

You know, you have a Korean couple leading one of the Salvation Army corps in Chicago.... maybe not too far for you to slip along and meet them? 8-)

Isn't it awesome that Diane has such a testimony of her family giving their lives to help Jews during WW2? I do hope you may acknowledge this when you have time to post, next. :-D Linn

Re: - posted by mom23beagles, on: 2007/3/5 2:18

Quote:
-----I do wonder about the Dr. Brown's claim that true born-again spirit-filled Christians are becoming more and more anti-Semitic. I wonder how he arrives at this conclusion. Certainly in my own experience I see quite the opposite -- even in our complacent churches. I see so much caution extended towards the Jews that sometimes I wonder if they are regarded as beyond needing salvation. After all they ARE God's chosen people. To me it is not love to view anyone as not needing to experience God's salvation and grace.

I couldn't agree with this more, I'm just listening to the message right now so might have more to say later. I have been attending mainstream Christian churches since I was in the womb, and have never heard one word against the Jews, or that they didn't deserve salvation, or anything remotely resembling anti-Semitism. In fact, quite the opposite. We were taught to reach out to the Jews, pray for the peace of Jerusalem, etc. Just my \$0.03 (inflation taken into account. :-))

Re: ginnyrose - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/6 5:00

Quote:

-----Quote:

Have you encountered this theology personally?

yes, right here on this forum.

He means me!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/6 5:01

Quote:

-----Honestly, I've never understood that replacement theology. It's such hogwash...

this could serve as a good definition of bigotry.

Re: what is replaced with what? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/6 11:59

I realize that a new thread has been started but I am bumping this one, because I am more comfortable with the less "charged" thread heading.

In a sense I firmly believe in replacement theology: "The old has gone the new has come". "I have been crucified with Christ, it is no longer I that liveth, but Christ that liveth in me." It is about the old man being replaced by the New: Christ – the seed promised to Abraham.

Also I believe in the replacement of the temporal with the eternal, the perishable with the imperishable, the natural with the spiritual (from 1 Cor. 15) Replacement is found in the resurrection!

But, alas, as long as this good theology is not cracked open in our hearts and consciences of man is useless, if not dangerous – merely a "theology".

This morning the Lord led me to a verse which I believe was meant to be attached to this topic. It is all about the OUTWORKING of this replaced (exchanged) life:

"Therefore, as God's chosen people, holy and dearly loved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience. Bear with one another and FORGIVE whatever grievances you may have against one another, FORGIVE AS THE LORD FORGAVE YOU...." Co.. 3:12

The Bible has much to say about this new life that Christ came to give. And that is the life that links us with the eternal city: the New Jerusalem. That is what Abraham could see: "For he was looking forward to the city with foundations whose architect and builder is God." Heb. 11:10

I do not see replacement as a matter of replacing one temporal entity with another:

"You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus for all of you who were baptized with Christ have clothed yourself with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:26 (!!)

There is no place for hostility between races in the replaced (exchanged) life!

Apart from that New Life Abraham's descendants dwell in the Jerusalem which is from below: "Now Hagar stands for Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present city of Jerusalem, because she is in SLAVERY with her children. But the Jerusalem that is from above is FREE, and she is our mother." Gal. 4:24

Am I sinning against anyone if I regard all who are saved, whether Jew or Gentile, as part of this kingdom – and nothing

g else? And if God does have a special role for our Jewish friends in a future era, surely that he can take care of it. Surely we don't need to overly strain that issue. That just seems to get us into messy quagmire and rifts. How can we know who are genetically linked to Abraham? I may very well be. And with so many proselytes having been added to Judaism over the centuries – even during Bible days, I don't think we can easily make two distinct groups of people, apart from a lot of misfires. Why! I just read on a site where the New Jerusalem was "proven" to be the Bible Belt in the USA (Wouldn't that make Abraham groan!)

Diane

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/6 12:56

Quote:

-----I just read on a site where the New Jerusalem was "proven" to be the Bible Belt in the USA (Wouldn't that make Abraham groan!)

WOW! As one brother said, "The Bible Belt holds up the pants of hypocrisy."

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/6 13:45

by roadsign on 2007/3/6 16:59:35

Quote:
-----In a sense I firmly believe in replacement theology: "The old has gone the new has come". "I have been crucified with Christ, it is no longer I that liveth, but Christ that liveth in me." It is about the old man being replaced by the New: Christ – the seed promised to Abraham.

I don't call myself a 'replacement theologian' but would prefer 'Transposition Theology'. That is my own label by which I hint at the way a tune can be transposed into another key.

Perhaps if we can gently examine some of the texts we can see where we may agree and where we may differ. Heb. 8:13 (KJVS) In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Heb. 10:9 (KJVS) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

In your understanding what is the writer referring to in these two references. The phrase 'taketh away the first, that he may establish the second' could almost be a dictionary definition of the word 'replacement'. It seems to me that Hebrews is definitely teaching that the 'second' or 'new' covenant has 'replaced' the 'old'. How do you see these passages?

edited 07/03/2007

My online dictionary...

replacement [ri#712;pl#257;sm#601;nt] noun the action or process of replacing someone or something : the replacement of religion by poetry | a hip replacement. • a person or thing that takes the place of another.

Re: - posted by mom23beagles, on: 2007/3/7 0:54

Well, this one kind of blew my socks off today as I was in the Word, and it made me think of this discussion here - what do you guys think about this verse? It's in keeping with the "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Romans 1:16):

Mark 7:25-30 (KJV):

"For a certain woman, whose young daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came and fell at his feet:

The woman was a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.

But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto

the dogs.

And she answered and said unto him, Yes, Lord: yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.

And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.

And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed."

The Life Application Bible has the following commentary about this passage:

*"Dog was a term the Jews commonly applied to any Gentiles, because the Jews considered these people no more likely than dogs to receive God's approval. Jesus, however, was not degrading the woman by using this term, but simply explaining to her **God's plan to present his message first to Jews.** (emphasis mine).*

The woman did not try to argue. Using Jesus' choice of words, she pointed out that she was willing to be considered a dog as long as she could receive God's healing for her daughter. Ironically, many Jews would lose God's spiritual healing because they rejected Jesus, while many Gentiles, whom the Jews considered "dogs" would find salvation because they recognized Jesus."

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/7 2:03

mom23beagles

This may be difficult for us dog-loving folks to appreciate ;-) but the Jews did not like dogs generally and only the 'greyhound' gets any biblical appreciation!

The name 'Caleb' actually means 'dog' and Caleb was not a bloodline descendent of Judah but a descendent of Esau who became a leader in Judah. His name may well have had a derogatory sense to it.

'dogs' was the term for those outside the covenant.

Quote:

-----It's in keeping with the "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Romans 1:16):

Yes, it is. However we need to ask the question does 'first' mean in rank or time? Does 'to the Jew first' mean that all Christians have an obligation to prioritise evangelism among the Jews, which is what some teach, or is it simply a chronological statement?

Re: I'm rather confused!, on: 2007/3/7 5:36

Quote:

bartle wrote:

I was watching Dr. Michael Brown speak on this:

(http://www.jewishvoice.org/TV/ram/tv865_56K.rm.ram) Dr Michael Brown on Replacement theology

Hi everyone

I wasn't able to play this, so don't know what Dr Brown said.

However, I'm a little confused with this discussion. What some of you seem to be talking about isn't what I thought was the main problem with Replacement "Theology".

To me there are two main aspects to "Replacement Theology":

1. The concept that "in Christ there is no Jew or Greek...but we are all one in Christ Jesus"
2. The idea that God has totally "finished with", and has no more purpose for, the Jews and the nation of Israel "after the flesh" on the world stage.

I can understand the first, and basically agree with it. That "they are not all Israel which are of Israel" has, I think, been quoted. Also the concept of the faithful remnant, and the "Israel of God - Jew and Gentile together - one in Christ. The foundations of the City in Revelation are both the 12 tribes and the 12 apostles... One City, one people in Christ.

However, I do **not** believe that God has finished with the present day Jewish nation and people. As Paul said, they are "beloved for the fathers' sakes. And I believe they are still beloved - even those who reject their own Messiah, and will in the end be lost.

The Jews, (including the unbelieving ones) and especially the nation of Israel, are still the Lord's "witnesses" in this present age - whether they like it or not!

Why else does the antichrist spirit in the world continually stir up hatred and attempt to destroy them? Hitler wasn't the first and definitely not the last. Anti Semitism is if anything on the increase. The nation is threatened on every side; many Muslims - even if they don't support terrorism - want to see Israel wiped off the face of the map.

Why, if God has no more purpose for her in the earth?

Yours in Him

Jeannette

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/7 7:46

Quote:
----- I don't call myself a 'replacement theologian' but would prefer 'Transposition Theology'. That is my own label by which I hint at the way a tune can be transposed into another key.

You are speaking my language, for sure. Might I add a few thoughts to this analogy of tonal transposition: Musicians typically don't prefer to transpose a song into another key - especially if it is one they are not familiar with. It's like trying to find your way around unfamiliar turf. We prefer our safety zones. But God doesn't oblige us by compromising.

God transposes BOTH Jew and Gentile into a brand new key - via salvation.

Here's another consideration: You can't play a tune in two keys simultaneously! And I think that this is where we get all our dissonant sounds: wanting to maintain some of the old and familiar key but also play some notes in the new tune. It is a temptation of both Jew and Gentile Christian.

Paul understood the need to let go of the old tune entirely, and even counted it as rubbish! He was bent on that new "key" - through and through!

I was circumcised when I was eight days old. I am a pure-blooded citizen of Israel and a member of the tribe of Benjamin - a real Hebrew if there ever was one! I was a member of the Pharisees, who demand the strictest obedience to the Jewish law. I was so zealous that I harshly persecuted the church. And as for righteousness, I obeyed the law without fault.

I once thought these things were valuable, but now I consider them worthless because of what Christ has done. 8 Yes, everything else is worthless when compared with the infinite value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have discarded everything else, counting it all as garbage, so that I could gain Christ and become one with him. I no longer count on my own righteousness through obeying the law; rather, I become righteous through faith in Christ. For God's way of making us right with himself depends on faith. I want to know Christ and experience the mighty power that raised him from the dead. I want to suffer with him, sharing in his death, so that one way or another I will experience the resurrection from the dead! Phil 3:4- 11 NLT

Quote:

-----Heb. 8:13 (KJVS) In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Heb. 10:9 (KJVS) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

In your understanding what is the writer referring to in these two references. The phrase 'taketh away the first, that he may establish the second' could almost be a dictionary definition of the word 'replacement'. It seems to me that Hebrews is definitely teaching that the 'second' or 'new' covenant has 'replaced' the 'old'. How do you see these passages?

It seems so obvious – in Christ we have an entirely new identity! Yet, I wonder, why is there such a longing to look back and cling to the old? I'm not speaking about Jews, but also about Gentiles.

Generally speaking the church fails to see the truth, and thus the church fails to be a witness of the New Life to the Jew. Nor can it be burdened for the Jew receiving this NEW life. Maybe that's why there seems to be such an interest in Old Covenant things, and a longing for the restoration of the old. Surely that cannot be of the Lord. It seems to be a denial of the New Covenant promises - a moving backwards.

In THAT sense I agree with Dr. Brown, that we the church have failed the Jews.

Before we condemn our Jewish friends for failing to let go of their "old tune" maybe we need to acknowledge where we also cling to an "old tune". Nationalism is just as important to Jews as it is to westerners. So is religious affiliation, identity, and practises.

Of course I am speaking of the heart dependencies here – not merely the fact that one may be a member of an institution - be it national or religious.

After all, Paul was still an Israelite. He just didn't play his tune in that "key".

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/7 10:07

Can we agree then that the New Covenant has replaced the Old Covenant and that these two covenants cannot co-exist? Paul seems to state this very plainly in Galatians 4. "For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." (Gal 4:25-31 KJVS) This is pretty strong stuff! Cast out the bondwoman and her son! The son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman! What is left of the Old Covenant after that?

By the 'Old Covenant' I mean that of Sinai, as Paul defines it above. It did and only ever can produce bondage. Not my words but Paul's.

If we are agreed that the Old/Sinaitic/Mosaic covenant is utterly obsolete and not only without value but positively bondage inducing, we need to re-examine the terms of that Covenant in Exodus 19f to see what has gone. We shall discover that that Covenant was 'land based' and formed a tenancy agreement between Jehovah and his people. eg "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." (Ex 20:12 KJVS)

This Covenant could only be maintained as a result of an integral priesthood. (Â“For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.Â” (Heb 7:12 KJVS)) The Old Covenant which guaranteed their right to the land cannot function without the Levitical priesthood. The Sinaitic Law and the Sinaitic Priesthood are inseparable. The Old Covenant operated for approximately 13-14 centuries; patchily at times. There has been no proper Yom Kippur now for over 19 centuries. There is no priest to sprinkle the blood and no mercy seat upon which to sprinkle it. The Old Covenant with all its promises and curses now stands null and void.

Perhaps we should also remind ourselves that the Old Covenant was only ever intended to be temporary; Â“Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.Â” (Gal 3:19 KJVS) We should also remind ourselves that the Old Covenant lasted from Exodus 20 to its fulfillment in Christ at Calvary. The time before that was pre-Old Covenant and the time after that is New Covenant.

Re: 'replacement theology', on: 2007/3/7 16:24

philologos said

Quote:

-----The Old Covenant with all its promises **and curses** now stands null and void.

'and *curses*...?'

'...now stands null and void.' This is a new thought. I like it.

Re: new citizenship - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/7 23:25

Quote:

-----We shall discover that that Covenant was 'land based' and formed a tenancy agreement between Jehovah and his people.

A key point! (also expounded in the "Killing in war is not a sin" thread)

Today I discovered something in Scripture that I can't believe I missed for so many years. Paul speaks in Philippians about forgetting the past, and I had never connected that reference with the verses that preceded them - those about his former Old Covenant blessings:

Â“ Â…Â… I press on, that I may lay hold of that for which Christ Jesus has also laid hold of me. Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended; but one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forward to those things which are ahead, I press toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus.Â” Phil. 3:12
Â– 14 NKJV

Paul wanted to move ahead Â– towards the prize of the UPWARD CALL (or heavenward in the NIV) And he wanted to let go of the things that would hold him back to his past (the earthly) To him it was worth losing his entire heritage for the sake of Christ. That would have included his confidence in the flesh, identity as an Israelite, meticulous observance of the law, legalistic righteousness. Clearly, his Hebrew connections were not important to him Â– in comparison to Christ.

Note what Paul adds: Â“Therefore let us, as many as are mature, have this mind; and if in anything you think otherwise, God will reveal even this to you.Â”

This is not inferior thinking, as we sometimes are led to believe. It is mature thinking!

I wonder if one of the reasons that the scribes and Pharisees, and other Jews were reluctant to accept Christ, was because they just could not let go of the things that defined them as a people. It was just too high a price to pay. It was death.

I remember the challenge in my own family Â– when we, the descendants of Dutch immigrants began marrying English people (as they were called). It meant that the Dutch heritage was in danger of disappearing forever. But alas, the Dutch are hardy people and those among the relatives who have even a sprinkling of Dutch in them, still refer to themselves as Dutch. There seems to be something really neat about having that Â“specialÂ” identity Â– and not just being a Canadian Â“muttÂ”.

Paul goes on to say, "But our citizenship is in heaven. And we eagerly await a Savior from there, the Lord Jesus Christ."

What does this say about land?

Quote:
----- We should also remind ourselves that the Old Covenant lasted from Exodus 20 to its fulfillment in Christ at Calvary. The time before that was pre-Old Covenant and the time after that is New Covenant.

I'm confused about this. Really, one is not in the New Covenant UNTIL they themselves, personally are in Christ. I am concerned about preachers and teachers who proclaim to their entire congregations an all-inclusive dispensation of grace, when in actual fact, only FEW are living in grace. The rest are still in bondage to law (flesh) – whether they are of Jewish descent or not. (Rom. 7) Well, that's the way I see it anyway....

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/8 13:57

I think we need to ask the question what happened at Sinai and why was it so? The Sinai Covenant was presented to the gathered refugees from Egypt with the following words: "Now therefore, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant, then you shall be a special treasure to Me above all people; for all the earth is Mine. And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." These are the words which you shall speak to the children of Israel. (Ex 19:5-6 NKJV) There is a key observation we should make here. This was to be a conditional covenant as expressed in the words "if... then". In computer language terms this is a classical "if...then" statement. The event will only take place if the conditions are fulfilled. This means that if the gathered people had not fulfilled the conditions the event would not have taken place i.e. the Sinaitic Covenant would not have been activated. Where would that have left the people at the foot of the mountain? Let me spell that out.

it would have left a people who were...NOT a special treasure to Me above all people...and a people who were...NOT a kingdom of priests and

NOT a holy nation.

We really need to think about this and answer carefully because whatever the Sinaitic Covenant did to this people was only ever intended to be temporary. This, as I have said previously, is plainly stated in Galatians: "What purpose then does the law serve? It was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was appointed through angels by the hand of a mediator." (Gal 3:19 NKJV) The Sinaitic Covenant then was "added". Added to what? It was added to the promise and was designed to be in force "till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made". The plain reading of this shows that there was a time when the Sinaitic Covenant did not exist, then a period when it would exist, and then another period when it would no longer exist. The time period of the Sinaitic Covenant was from c1500 (some would say a little later) until it was terminated at Calvary. During the time of its authority it promised blessing and threatened curses on those who were joined to that Covenant. It is no longer an option; it is now 2000 years past its sell-by date. It has had no jurisdiction for 2000 years.

It looked forward to the time when the Seed should come and the Seed having come it has fulfilled its purpose and is now null and void. "But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterward be revealed. Therefore the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal 3:23-25 NKJV) Please note the 'no longer' in verse 25.

So, if the Sinaitic Covenant is 'no longer' current we must strike it from the statute books and see where things stand without it. There were Covenants before Sinai and after Sinai, but when the scripture speaks of the Old Covenant it is referring to Sinai. In fact, continuing our computer illustration, there were nested covenants; the Davidic covenant was a covenant which arose from within the Old Covenant period and in strictly physical terms petered out with the Babylonian exile of 587 BC.

If we remove the Sinaitic Covenant from the statute book we shall need to see what was in existence prior to it; that to which Sinai was "added". What would have been the condition and expectation of the people at the foot of the mountain if the Sinai Covenant had never been activated. Because this may be the condition of the people now that the Sinai Covenant has been terminated.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/8 14:58

Quote:
-----What would have been the condition and expectation of the people at the foot of the mountain if the Sinai Covenant had never been activated. Because this may be the condition of the people now that the Sinai Covenant has been terminated.

Hmm.. That is something to think about. I guess there are two routes of thinking dealing with the Sinai covenant in my mind. One being it's relation to Isreal and the other being in relation to sin. I've put much more thought into it's relation to sin than I have to Isreal. The above is almost a puzzling statement to me, so I am going to have to put more thought into it.

I've been peppered with the 'normal' view of Isreal and end times events so it's going to take me some time to understand the "replacement" side of this argument. Hopefully I can grasp both sides and be able to judge between the two.

How is the below verse dealt with in the "replacement" view of scriptures? I know this is one that is used from the "other" viewpoint.

Rom 11:25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

Rom 11:26 And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:

Rom 11:27 For this my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

Rom 11:28 As concerning the gospel, enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, beloved for the fathers' sakes.

Rom 11:29 For the gifts and calling of God without repentance.

Re: "that would be me", on: 2007/3/8 17:36

indeed.

Quote:
-----"Acknowledge and take to heart this day, that the LORD is God in heaven above and on the earth below. There is no other. Keep His decrees and commandments which I am giving you today, so that it may go well with you and your children after you and that you may live long in the land that the LORD your God gives you for all time."

Deuteronomy 4:39-40 (yes..NIV)

.....**"for all time".**

Quote:
-----"For you are a people holy to the Lord your God. The LORD your God has chosen you out of all the peoples on the face of the earth to be His people, His treasured possession."

Deuteronomy 7:6 (yes again, NIV)

then we come to Chapter 13 of Deuteronomy or dare I call this book "elleh haddebarim", which means in Hebrew "These are the words". and Chapter 13 spells out what must happen to the false prophet, which is how the Pharisees viewed J

Jesus and crucified Him **for your sake**.

But then Gamaliel (in Acts) saw thru the mist, saw the Sovereign Nature of God and told the Sanhedrin and Pharisees, and all others who wanted to persecute the embryonic early Church, that if these people are phonies and false, they will die out on their own, but if this is of God, and you fight against it, you will be futilely fighting against God. That's where the Roman persecution began, and when Satan saw that wasn't working, the enemy went to work on Constantine, and that Roman emperor decreed that "Christianity" will now be the official imperial religion and the world was plunged into darkness.

God prophesied the Diaspora in Deuteronomy 28:63-68. I'm tired, I need to nap before work, so I trust anyone can reference their Bible, but then in Deuteronomy 30:4-6, God said:

Quote:
----- "Even if you have been banished to the most distant land under the heavens, from there the LORD your God will gather you and bring you back. He will bring you back to the land that belonged to your fathers and you will take possession of it. He will make you more prosperous and numerous than your fathers. The LORD your God will circumcise your hearts and the hearts of your descendants, so that you may love Him with all your heart and with all your soul, and live".

Why is it so difficult to grasp the positioning of "ingrafted vine"? You who draw nourishment from the Vine?

How was it that a rag tag band of lightly armed Jews were able to not only roll back the British Empire but also horde upon horde of Arabs bent on their destruction? and this very day, why do you think it is that the foreign nation with the most NASDAQ listed companies is Israel?

There are no accidents in the Economy of God, is it no accident that at its height the British Empire lost millions of its sons in the senseless trench warfare of WW1, and hence denuded the imperial aspirations of the Empire? accident?, miscalculation? or God's will?

Who knows what will happen to America in the Persian Gulf, may God have mercy.

Is it an accident that from every war modern day Israel has fought since 1948, the "hornet" proceeded the Israeli Defense Forces and crushed numerically superior Arab armies?

Whether it be called "replacement" or "transpositional" theology, it's wrong, there's an arrogance, a haughtiness built into such thinking, Paul warned Gentile believers about this theo-arrogance, and I won't quote it now, because I grow tired...so, believe what you must.

We all see thru a glass darkly, Neil

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/8 18:52

“And thou hast known to-day, and hast turned back unto thy heart, that Jehovah thy God, in the heavens above, and on the earth beneath—there is none else; and thou hast kept His statutes and His commands which I am commanding thee to-day, so that it is well to thee, and to thy sons after thee, and so that thou prolongest days on the ground which Jehovah thy God is giving to thee— all the days.”
(Deut 4:39-40 YNG)

If this really did mean 'for all time' must we charge God with unfaithfulness for the periods of time when the initial recipients of the promise were banished from the land?

“For you are a holy people to the LORD your God; the LORD your God has chosen you to be a people for Himself, a special treasure above all the peoples on the face of the earth.” (Deut 7:6 NKJV)

But this was part of a Covenant which has now been 'replaced'. The Sinaitic Covenant was temporary... until the Seed should come.

Quote:
----- "Even if you have been banished to the most distant land under the heavens, from there the LORD your God will gather you and bring you back. He will bring you back to the land that belonged to your fathers and you will take possession of it. He will make you more prosperous and numerous than your fathers. The Lord your God will circumcise your hearts and the hearts of your descendants, so that you may love Him with all your heart and with all your soul , and live".

But again this was given during the administration of a Covenant which has now ceased to operate. If I find some laws that George III passed on the American Colonies and then try to observe them in the present day US, I will be sharply reminded that 'things have changed'.

Quote:
-----Whether it be called "replacement" or "transpositional" theology, it's wrong, there's an arrogance, a haughtiness built in to such thinking, Paul warned Gentile believers about this theo-arrogance, and I won't quote it now, because I grow tired....so, believe what you must.

There is no point in calling me 'arrogant' just because I don't agree with your interpretation.

The Sinai Covenant is no more.Â“For you have not come to the mountain that may be touched and that burned with fire, and to blackness and darkness and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet and the voice of words, so that those who heard it begged that the word should not be spoken to them anymore. (For they could not endure what was commanded: Â“ And if so much as a beast touches the mountain, it shall be stoned or shot with an arrow.Â” And so terrifying was the sight that Moses said, Â“I am exceedingly afraid and trembling.Â”)
But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are registered in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than that of Abel.Â” (Heb 12:18-24 NKJV) We no longer come to that mountain! Not Jews and not Gentiles. Â“For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but a new creation.Â” (Gal 6:15 NKJV)

forgive me, on: 2007/3/8 19:47

I didn't mean to seem to be calling YOU arrogant.....no no no, not my meaning, but the way I see it, there is an inherent implication of superiority, of "trans....positioning" one's self in the Kingdom of Heaven in the theory of replacement theology, or transpositional theology.

what about this: if you worship a god, that can make irrevocable Covenants, revocable, what makes you so sure, that He won't revoke the New Covenant and give it to the Muslims?

But forgive me if it seemed as if the dialogue was personal, believe what you want, I just think you're wrong, in fact I know you're wrong, we do not worship a fork-tongued god, and you as an ingrafted vine find nourishment in the same life-giving Sap, and when the Church REALLY becomes what it was called to be, the Jewish people will be made envious of so great a salvation. But with 400 different denominations, many many apostate cults, the cult of Mary at Rome and a most unsavory history regarding the Jewish people, the lower case c "church will continue with its impotent witness to the Jewish people's, UNTIL the full number of Gentiles is brought in.

Besides, I just got done writing my ex-RM commando buddy, who THANK GOD, just got back safely from shepherding news crews around Baghdad, and I want to bring Giuliano for holiday in the UK, the City, many he can witness the Royal Marines in training, a jaunt to Cardiff, a jaunt to the Hebrides, and then cap it off with a stay at my friends Inn in the Scottish Highlands.....why would I want to insult you?, I want to get inside your library so I can "borrow" some books. (laughing) So hide your missionary biographies when I come a calling. (teasing)

neil

Re: forgive me - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/9 1:59

Quote:
-----I didnt mean to seem to be calling YOU arrogant.....no no no, not my meaning, but the way I see it, there is an inherent implication of superiority, of "trans....positioning" one's self in the Kingdom of Heaven in the theory of replacement theology, or transpositional theology.

Personally I feel no sense of superiority to anyone.. Jew, Muslim, Wordling.

Your "I know you are wrong" just sets your witness against mine. There are a few logical possibilities here. You are wrong, I am wrong or we are both wrong. What is not possible is that we can say such opposite things and both be right. At least one of us is wrong here.

Some of your 'facts' are quite clearly wrong. Your statement that we have 'institutional anti-semitism' is completely inaccurate and I can't imagine where you have got the idea from other than the reaction that the Israeli nation state is right in all it has done and therefore all others must be wrong.

Quote:
-----what about this: if you worship a god, that can make irrevocable Covenants, revocable, what makes you so sure, that He won't revoke the New Covenant and give it to the muslims?

The Old Covenant was made between God and men, the New Covenant is between the Father and the Son. There will/can be no failure of the New Covenant.

“Then said God, Call his name Loammi: for **ye are not my people**, and I will not be your God. Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.” (Hos 1:9-10 KJVS) Somewhere in the middle of that statement, for an indefinite period of time, the northern tribes of 'Israel' were 'no longer' the people of God. God had revoked the contract as a result of their failure to keep the conditions.

The prophecy of verse 10 has been fulfilled..“But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: Which in time past were not a people, but **are now the people of God**: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.” (1Pet 2:9-10 KJVS) The church of Jesus Christ is now 'the people of God'.

Re:, on: 2007/3/9 3:10

To Philologos:

As usual, we disagree.....

Replacement Theology teaches that the Church is the replacement for Israel, and that the many promises made to Israel in the Bible are fulfilled in the Christian Church, not in Israel.

So, the prophecies in Scripture concerning the blessing and restoration of Israel to the Promised Land are "spiritualized" or “allegorized” into promises of God's blessing for the Church. **Major problems exist with this view, such as the continuing existence of the Jewish people throughout the centuries, and especially with the revival of the modern state of Israel. If Israel has been condemned by God, and there is no future for the Jewish nation, how do we explain the supernatural survival of the Jewish people as a distinct people group (unheard of in History of any dispersed people group) over the past 2000 years despite the many attempts to destroy them? How do we explain why and how Israel reappeared as a nation in the 20th century after not existing for 1900 years?**

The view that Israel and the Church are different is clearly taught in the New Testament. In this view, the Church is completely different and distinct from Israel, and the two are never to be confused or used interchangeably. We are taught from Scripture that the Church is an entirely new creation, that came into being on the Day of Pentecost, and will continue until it is translated to Heaven at the Rapture (Ephesians 1:9-11; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17). The Church has no relationship to the curses and blessings for Israel. The covenants, promises, and warnings are valid only for Israel. **Israel has be**

en set aside in God's program during these past 2,000 years of dispersion.

After the Rapture (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18), God will restore Israel to the primary focus of His plan. The first event at this time is the Great Tribulation (Revelation chapters 6-19). The world will be judged for rejecting Christ, while Israel is prepared through the trials of the Great Tribulation for the Second Coming of the Messiah. Now, when Christ does return to the earth, at the end of the Tribulation, Israel will be ready to receive Him. The remnant of Israel which survives the Tribulation will be saved and the Lord will establish His kingdom on this earth with the capital as Jerusalem. With Christ reigning as King, Israel will be the leading nation, and representatives from all nations will come to Jerusalem to honor and worship the King - Jesus Christ. The Church will return with Christ and will reign with Him for a literal thousand years (Revelation 20:1-5).

Both the Old Testament and the New Testament support a Premillennial / Dispensational understanding of God's plan for Israel. Even so, the strongest support for Premillennialism is found in the clear teaching of Revelation 20:1-7, where it says, six times, that Christ's kingdom will last 1,000 years. After the Tribulation the Lord will return and establish His kingdom with the nation of Israel, Christ will reign over the whole earth with Jerusalem as His capital, and Israel will be the leader of the nations. The Church will reign with Him for a literal thousand years. The church has not replaced Israel in God's plan. While God may be focusing His attention primarily on the church in this dispensation of grace, God has not forgotten Israel, and will one day restore Israel to His intended role for the nation He has chosen (Romans chapter 11).

God bless,

Stever

P.S. I will answer your comments about the covenants made to Abraham by God in other posts.

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----I didnt mean to seem to be calling YOU arrogant.....no no no, not my meaning, but the way I see it, there is an inherent implication of superiority, of "trans....positioning" one's self in the Kingdom of Heaven in the theory of replacement theology, or transpositional theology.

Personally I feel no sense of superiority to anyone.. Jew, Muslim, Wordling.

Your "I know you are wrong" just sets your witness against mine.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/9 4:40

Quote:
-----Stever on 2007/3/9 8:10:09
To Philologos:

As usual, we disagree.....

Â“For there must also be factions among you, that those who are approved may be recognized among you.Â” (1Cor 11: 19 NKJV)

Quote:
-----Stever on 2007/3/9 8:10:09
Replacement Theology teaches that the Church is the replacement for Israel, and that the many promises made to Israel in the Bible are fulfilled in the Christian Church, not in Israel.

This is the 'strawman' definition. Just set up to be knocked down.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/9 8:17

BTW some might like to listen to T Austin Sparks on a related topic.
(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid35>) The New Israel.

Re: better? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/9 8:22

The Tension Over What's Better

This morning I bumped into an interesting comment that Jesus made. First he says:

“No one tears a patch from a new garment and sews it on an old one. If he does, he will have torn the new garment, and the patch from the new will not match the old. And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine will burst the skins, the wine will run out and the wineskins will be ruined. No, new wine must be poured into new wine skins.” Luke 5: 36 - 38

Jesus' next statement caught my attention (added only in Luke):

“And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, 'The old is better.' ” :39

What is the old wine, and in what ways does it seem better?

Compare that with the better “wine” as describe in Hebrews:

we are confident of better things in your case—things that accompany salvation. Hebrews 6:9
“...a better hope is introduced, by which we draw near to God. Hebrews 7:19

“... Jesus has become the guarantee of a better covenant. Hebrews 7:22

But the ministry Jesus has received is as superior to theirs as the covenant of which he is mediator is superior to the old one, and it is founded on better promises. Hebrews 8:6

It was necessary, then, for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these sacrifices, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. Hebrews 9:23

You sympathized with those in prison and joyfully accepted the confiscation of your property, because you knew that you yourselves had better and lasting possessions. Hebrews 10:34

Women received back their dead, raised to life again. Others were tortured and refused to be released, so that they might gain a better resurrection. Hebrews 11:35

God had planned something better for us so that only together with us would they be made perfect. Hebrews 11:40

...to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks a better word than the blood of Abel. Hebrews 12:24

In view of all these "better" promises, why would the old wine still seem better?

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/9 8:57

Quote:

-----In view of all these "better" promises, why would the old wine still seem better?

He may 'say' that it is better but he may just be expressing his comfortable prejudices. The new is always unpredictable. .. and we humans love to think we can control things.

Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/3/9 9:07

hi diane, i never really looked at that scripture.but it brings to mind Jesus' first miricle of turning water into wine....in this instance the new was definately better than the old. sometimes i think we are one dimensional in our approach to scripture. many truths are multifaceted.....on the replacement debate i wonder if this picture fits.....the ship that the jews were riding on has capsized but the hull is sticking out of the water,with everybody huddled in wet blankets. the new "ship" is close by with christians and jews on it and they motion to the capsized crowd to come aboard.they either wont or cant for several reasons.1-we're not doing agood enough job,2- we're not operating under the annointing,3-they are blinded,4-we got impatient and shot at them with our flare-guns,5-tons of weird reasons.....and so on...if i need to be rebuked so be it but at this stage of this debate this is how i see it

Re:, on: 2007/3/10 2:11

Philologos posted:

The church of Jesus Christ is now 'the people of God'

Stever's response:

I agree with your statement above,at the present moment in history. However if you are saying that God is finished with the Jews as a race, as a specific people, and as a specific Nation, then I have to disagree with you. God has caused blindness to come upon the Jews, but He is surely not through with them by any means.

Were the people that believed God and in His promise of the Messiah to come (Â“the seed of the womanÂ”) that lived before the cross saved by their faith and belief in God?

The answer is yes.

Hebrews 9:15 in the KJV states:

15.And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Hebrews 9:15 in the New living Bible gives us a better understanding:

15. That is why he is the one who mediates the new covenant between God and people, so that all who are invited can receive the eternal inheritance God has promised them. For Christ died to set them free from the penalty of the sins they had committed under that first covenant.

Hebrews Chapter 12 tells us about the cloud of witnesses that watch us in the race. The names of some of the witnesses are listed in Chapter 11 and are all old Testament Saints, who believed God, and who had faith in God's promise of the seed of the woman (Prophesized in Genesis 3:15). This faith, this saving faith is what saved them all. Some of the names listed are: Abel; Noah; Abraham; Sarah; Rahab, Gedeon, Barak, Samson, Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: etc. etc. etc.

When Christ ascended to Heaven, He took captivity captive with Him. He took all of the souls, that had died before the cross and had believed God, and had faith in God's promise of the Â“Seed of the WomanÂ”, who were residing in Abraham's bosom to heaven with Him.

Psalms 68:18 gives us the Prophecy in the Old Testament of this event:

18. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.

Ephesians 4:8-10 records the fulfillment of the above prophecy in the New Testament:

8. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

9. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?

10. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)

We are told in the New Testament, after the Gospels, and after Christ's ascension, that "to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord". This is revelation knowledge, provided to us by Paul (2 Cor 5:8). Now, after the Cross, when any believer dies, he/she goes directly to heaven, to be with the Lord. Before Christ's final payment for sin, this was not possible, and hence the reference to Abraham's bosom (also known as Paradise) by Christ when He told the parable of the rich man and the poor man (Lazarus) in Luke 16:20-31).

Christ promised the thief on the cross who believed on Him---"today you will be with me in Paradise" (Abraham's bosom).

Job, one of the oldest books in the Bible, gives us understanding of God's promise to believers before the Cross—"25. For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: 26. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: 27. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me

When Christ came the first time He only read part of Isaiah 61, and then closed the Book. Out of the entire Chapter He read merely the first 1 ½ verses

" 1. The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;

2. To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord"

He left the following out, that refers to His Second Coming (Coming again, as found throughout the New Testament) and His 1,000 year reign on the earth:

, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn;

3. To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified.

4. And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations.

5. And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers.

6. But ye shall be named the Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves.

7. For your shame ye shall have double (Double means forgiveness); and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore in their land they shall possess the double: everlasting joy shall be unto them. 8. For I the Lord love judgment, I hate robbery for burnt offering; and I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them. 9. And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed. 10. I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels. 11. For as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth; so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations.

I find this to be interesting Scripture that to me describes Christ's death and resurrection, and His return to the earth, to be spent with the Jews, for their promised 1000 year reign with Messiah:

Hosea 5:14-15 & 6:1-2

5:14. For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah: I, even I, will tear and go away; I will take away, and none shall rescue him.

5:15. I will go and return to my place, till they acknowledge their offence, and seek my face: in their affliction they will seek me early.

6:1. Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up.

6:2. ***After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.***

One day is to the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day- this refers to prophetic time- Christ is away for two thousand years, and will return to the earth for 1,000 more—the "Millennial Kingdom" that has been promised to the Jews. After that we know from Scripture that He creates a New Heaven and a New Earth for all those that believe on Him—the Jews, the true vine, and the grafted on branch- the Gentile Church.

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S It also says in Scripture that the "Saints" come with Christ at the second coming. All of the "Saints", that have believed God from the beginning, will come with Him in their new, glorified bodies (like Christ's) to rule and reign with Him. The Jews that have come to belief in their Messiah during the Tribulation, and others that are not Jews, but have come to belief in Him as well, will enter into the thousand year reign in their bodies of flesh and blood. Christ will rule and reign with a "rod of iron" (Palms 2 & Revelation 2).

Re: gloves off Ron, on: 2007/3/10 4:34

you wrote:

Quote:

-----Your statement that we have 'institutional anti-semitism' is completely inaccurate

Ron, either you are in denial, or you are blind to history, or you just crept out of the British-Israelism camp and decided that the replacement theology/"transpositional theology" was more acceptable than dwelling to creep into, in either case you are blind to the realities of the last 1600 years of history regarding the institutional anti-semitism that has been spearheaded and fostered by the lower case c "church", whether it be Rome or any of the other apostate hell bound chunks of the Body of Christ

I talked at length with few other pastors I know and respect in regards to replacement theology and there take was twofold, it is in error and it fosters a sense of superiority that some NEED to feel, and this is underlined by your last statement:

Quote:

-----The church of Jesus Christ is now 'the people of God'.

Sit in your library and entertain this delusion, I'm sure it's a comfortable, self-satisfying and self-righteous place to perch, May God have mercy on you.

Re: No church can claim the Covenant promises - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/10 9:19

Quote:

----- the church of Jesus Christ is now 'the people of God'.

The word "church" here should be Church (capital C), and I assume that is what Ron meant.

I feel that many misunderstandings are rooted in a false understanding of the New Covenant. And that is the root of error, including anti-Semitism. I see this faulty thinking expressed in the rite of infant baptism. It is regarded as a covenant symbol (taken from the OT covenant promise). Mind you, it is easy to challenge that position using the book of Hebrews. After all, God's covenant people, Israel, did not "enter his rest" (New Covenant) because of unbelief. Of course, that would not be applicable to Joshua, Caleb, and maybe a few others.

This same reality exists in all groups (denominations) under the umbrella of Christianity – be it Baptist, Pentecostal, or whatever. There is always a remnant of Covenant people among them. Typically most of the non-converted members view themselves as saved, but really are living vicariously on THE faith of true believers. (I've been there myself.)

I think that Dr. Brown has a valid point when he said (taken from his site):

If God could forsake Israel, in spite of His unconditional, everlasting promises, then He could forsake the Church! If God could replace Israel, in spite of His unconditional, everlasting promises, then He could replace the Church! So, if you hold to a theology that says, "God has forsaken physical Israel," or "The Church has replaced Israel," you had better be extremely careful.

Here, the word Church should be written as: "church" (small c) In fact, I'd say that the church (as we use the word) has NEVER been the recipient of the Covenant promises. The Covenant promises do not apply to Christendom. They only belong to those who have died – that is to the old man and are living the New Life in Christ. Those are scattered here and there.

The true Church, as far as I have come to believe has NEVER been an organized entity in itself. Churches don't get saved, people do. In fact, when people organize, they typically become a church – containing a mixture of wheat and tares.

No church has a right to claim something on behalf of ALL its members and descendants – creeds, baptism (infant or adult), notwithstanding.

I'm not convinced that Dr. Brown fully understands the difference between New Covenant people and the church. In fact when he said, "even true born again and spirit filled Christians" are growing more anti-Semitic, I believe he is referring to those who CLAIM to be born-again/spirit filled – but are not.

"Do not take the name of the Lord, your God in vain."

What a practical commandment! It means don't claim something about yourself that is not true. Look at the trouble that has been caused because of the violation of this command – be it by Israelite, Jew, or by Gentile! Scripture is replete - from cover to cover - with this command spoken in all kinds of ways through all kinds of warnings. The need for that is most relevant today. After all, people groups (referring to themselves as the church) have always had a tendency to slip - just like ancient Israel did.

The epistle to the Hebrews is a warning to the church:

"We do not want you to become lazy, but to imitate those who through faith and patience inherit what has been promised." (the New Covenant promises) Heb. 6:12

"Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts as you did in the rebellion, during the time of testing in the desert." Heb. 3:3

This verse surely applies equally to the church as it did to the Jews in Paul's day. The church, like ancient Israel, has tasted many wonderful blessings of the Spirit over the centuries. But that doesn't mean its members are all saved or that it

hey understand the New Covenant promises. As Jesus said, "And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, 'The old is better.'" Lk. 5:39

Diane Eaton

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/3/10 11:15

Quote:
-----Sit in your library and entertain this delusion, I'm sure its a comfortable, self-satisfying and self righteous place to perch, May God have mercy on you.

"Self righteous"
"Blindness"
"Deceit"
"Delusion"

Denial ...

It is enough Neil, more than enough. You have proven that you can no longer give place to contrary opinion without resorting to accusations and assumptions. You have no other considerations than your own as it pertains to others here, have no apparent desire to reconcile with others and have been causing a great deal of strife by targeting those you disagree with.

You are accountable for your words and owe a debt to this community for the same similar bitterness and accusation to another brother here.

We have been more than patient with you. May the Lord open your eyes and root out the bitterness in your heart.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/3/10 12:03

Stever,

There is some unfinished business that you need to address;

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=14600&forum=36&start=50&viewmode=flat&order=1) Melchizedek - who was he?

Towards the bottom of the page. You are being held accountable for your words there and have yet to rectify the situation. It was asked of you to address it in more than one place, this is your last opportunity, do not ignore it.

Re:, on: 2007/3/10 12:24

Bartle said:

Quote:
-----talked at length with few other pastors i know and respect in regards to replacement theology and there take was twofold, its in error

Big Deal!! I can find Pastors to agree with me too, does that make it right? The Word of God is the final authority, NOT what I read in the headlines or on CNN.

When Jerusalem fell in 70AD the Temple was destroyed, the Jewish nation scattered into heathen nations a sword was drawn out after them, ever since that time the Jew have gone thru much trouble and anguish, why? Because they rejected their Messiah in the last days. God gave them 40 years to make up their minds to receive Christ, but they continued offering abominations of sacrifices to God. And thus christ words came to pass:

Matthew 23:38 Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.

Consider:

Isaiah 66:3 He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations.

There is no such a thing as Replacement Theology, if anything, the Jews replaced God for gods, and idols, "Yea, they have chosen their own ways".

I am NOT anti semitic, I am just putting the TIME of what you believe to be future bible prophecy in their prespective place, in the past.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/10 12:46

Quote:
----- there is no such a thing as Replacement Theology, if anything, the Jews replaced God for gods, and idols, "Yea, they have chosen their own ways".

My personal feeling is that this is a view through natural eyes, and not through the eyes of faith. It seems like a pronouncement of a final verdict: guilty. It does nothing to break down the walls we are encountering here. Aren't we to be ministers of reconciliation? Why can't we examine what God DID -- even those years following Pentecost, prior to 70 AD? Consider all those Jews who were added to the Kingdom! And look what they inherited as a result! Maybe we should make a list -- there's plenty to draw from in the epistles.

Neil will correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems like underneath all the doctrinal debate there is another dimension: an honest grief that is the result of hearing over and over again, either in words or in attitude -- "Tough cookies for you! Your ancestors blew it, and now, you are second rate (and I'm first rate)."

If we haven't been there, how can we know how we would respond?

"Therefore, as God's chosen people, holy and dearly loved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience." Col. 3:12

What is the "therefore" referring back to?

Diane

Re:, on: 2007/3/10 15:03

Quote:
-----Why can't we examine what God DID -- even those years following Pentecost, prior to 70 AD? Consider all those Jews who were added to the Kingdom!

I am not blind to this Diane. I can't include everything in a post, it would take up space and people may as well read a book.

I was responding to a post, it may look final, but there was a future for the Jews, as God drew them out of every country and yes, many were saved on the day of Pentecost, and many more afterwards.

It's an exhaustive work to go into such detail regarding this subject, it CAN'T be said in just a few words, precept must be upon precept, otherwise someone will come back with a question to try to trip you up if you don't have all the answers together.

It's like the world asking a baby Christian, "Ok, where did Cain get his wife"? It's not a question of interest, no one really wants to know. It's a question to trip you up, no one has an answer. We have theories, but none are present in the text.

It's like this subject, it can't be said in one breath. The reason why this is so, is because everyone is DEAD set in their belief that Israel is God's chosen people. So a lie told enough times becomes a truth. So you can't convince the hearers with just a word. Jesus had a hard time convincing His hearers in His day, why? because they had their own preconceived ideas of how the Kingdom of God was going to come. He told them, it's not going to come by observation, your NOT going to see it, because it's within you., That was a foreign teaching to them, they couldn't accept it.

The Church gets so caught up in teachings that it only takes a radical move of God to convince them otherwise.

Diane, can you see my heart in all this? I am not angry at you, I am angry at the devil.

Re: when we must choose our words - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/10 15:38

Quote:

----- It's an exhaustive work to go into such detail regarding this subject, it CAN'T be said in just a few words, -----

Are the blessings of God so complicated that we are left to default to the more obvious: the negative: the judgments, the condemnations, the thorns, the bad history, etc? Does doing that produce the fruit of righteousness? (That goes back to our thread "negative x3")

We just lost Neil, and I am quite upset about that. edit:I pray God will work in our precious brother -- maybe through some patient and understanding Christians in his life.

I admit that I've been overly harping against negativity and need to be quiet now; but I must admit, in my experience I haven't see anyone come closer to God by emphasizing the negative, or trying to convince someone how wrong they are. That seems to work in reverse.

Quote:

-----Diane, can you see my heart in all this? I am not angry at you, I am angry at the devil. -----

I believe I am reading you, as you probably gather from my posts. Yet sometimes I think that doctrinal discussion, in itself, is a smoke screen for something else entirely: the wounds of the heart.

What is our role regarding that?

(See, it's not always a matter of what we say, but what we fail to say)

Diane

Re:, on: 2007/3/10 16:50

Quote:

-----Are the blessings of God so complicated that we are left to default to the more obvious -----

They are not complicated at all, however, we make them so.

I was thinking about poor Jeremiah today how he spoke positive to the people, but they looked at it as negative. He told them in essence, "Go to Babylon and all will be ok, just don't go against the word of the LORD". Yet they continued to rebel (I am not talking about the Jew here, but us in general).

Negative is good. When I got the strap, though it was negative to me, it produced positive results.

But I do understand what your saying, it's the "harping" on the negative that is disturbing. I hope I am correct in feeling that from you?

I never got to know Neil(Bartle), but I don't like to see anyone go or be banned from a site.

You know what would be nice? a voice chat room. Wishful thinking, eh? :-)

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/10 19:47

Compliments,

Quote:

-----it's the "harping" on the negative that is disturbing. I hope I am correct in feeling that from you?

You are correct. Perhaps it's an issue of amplifying the negative at the expense of the positive (ie something that can bring about change for good). Now I'm going to eat my words and include some very negative material - mainly to add in another perspective of Jewish suffering:

I just read in Michael Crichton's book "State of Fear" about the flourishing, unchallenged science (really a pseudoscience) of eugenics at the beginning of the 20th century. The Americans were concerned about what kind of immigrants would enter their country and wanted to develop a way of sifting out the "feeble minded", and useless breeds, yes including Jews. Blacks were also "proven" scientifically to be inferior.

According to Crichton, among those who supported eugenics were Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Winston Churchill, the Supreme court justices Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis Brandeis, Alexander Graham Bell (who invented the telephone), H G Wells, and George Bernard Shaw. Research was backed by the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations. Research work was done at Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Johns Hopkins. Legislation to address the crisis (of "dangerous human pests") was passed in states from New York to California. (I know that Canada was not exempt)

The practice passed into Germany and flourished there. It ultimately led to the holocaust.

"After WW2, nobody was a eugenicist, and nobody had ever been one."

Such closet "skeletons" ought to expose a wider dimension of human depravity - it's in our own civilized society - the outcome of trying to make a "pure" nation without God as our Lord.

Diane

Re: 'replacement theology', on: 2007/3/12 7:58

Stever wrote

Quote:

-----**When Christ ascended to Heaven, He took captivity captive with Him.** He took all of the souls, that had died before the cross and had believed God, and had faith in God's promise of the "Seed of the Woman", who were residing in Abraham's bosom to heaven with Him.

Dear Stever,

I have never heard this interpretation cobbled together from scripture.

What is more mystifying, or, revealing, is that you have quoted from the places where 'captivity' is mentioned in scripture - the psalm and Paul's quotation of it - and even Christ's own reading from Isaiah which He follows up with

Luke 4:21

And he began to say unto them,

"This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

but, having presented something other right at the start of your post, any reader who knows the scripture less, might be beguiled into thinking you had just expounded a widely accepted truth.

This I contend, that you have, rather, *muddied* the waters of understanding.

In simple English 'He took captivity captive' is a complete and finished sentence, which need have nothing added to it.

The verb is 'took captive'. The noun is 'captivity'.

What is 'captivity'. It is what you do to someone when you put them in prison, or keep them under house arrest, or what you do to an animal which is taken from its natural habitat in the wild, and made to live in a much smaller enclosure than it should have for its own health and survival. That's why you have to bring it food there... because it is not free to get its own. Same goes for prisoners.

Jesus has this to say about the behaviour of unclean spirits. Note how the person's life (body) is described as the dwelling place (house).

Matthew 12

43 When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none.

44 Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth *it* empty, swept, and garnished.

45 Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: **and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.**

46 While he yet talked to the people,

I've underlined 'people' to say this was to be common knowledge amongst His followers. Luke also quotes this wisdom Jesus has imparted.

So, when Jesus said (Isaiah 61)

'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;'

this was the ministry upon which He was about to embark amongst the lost sheep of the house of Israel - deliverance to those held captive by evil spirits, sickness, mental illness, unhealed wounds (the list could go on to cover any outworking of sin in human life (Mark 2:5 - 10), the remedy for which is to **come to Him**.

Mark 2:9

Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?

There is a grand assumption in the gospel, that those who believe God, are healed (This is a spiritual truth - Heb 10:14) from their sin, their sicknesses and therefore, from being under His wrath when they are judged. But, how many people really let go of the captivity in which they were bound, despite giving mental and verbal assent to the truth of the gospel.

Is being freed an option only?

Or is it a fundamental command from God, without which one cannot really be counted as a sheep of the fold who is free to go out and in, and find pasture?

John 10:9

9 I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.

Acts 17

30 And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:

31 Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath or dained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all *men*, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

The promises of Isaiah 61 which Jesus began to read, are a single sentence until the end of v 3. I admire your nerve in putting a gap there, which you say will last 2000 years, but this is not at all in the spirit of the word of God.

Today is the day of salvation and still is.

Isaiah 61:8

... and I will make an everlasting covenant with them

was still in the future to Isaiah, but, it has happened by now.

Bearing in mind the picture Jesus gave of a person as a dwelling place, could just as easily be about people's lives, as about geographical places..... :-D

Isaiah 61:4

And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations.

Re: Clarity of verse, on: 2007/3/12 9:03

Stever said:

Quote:

-----When Christ ascended to Heaven, He **took** captivity captive with Him

Linn, just as a side bar regarding Stevers statement, it would probably be best to quote the actual verse as it doesn't say, "Took", but rather "led".

Compare the Old and the New:

Psalms 68:18 Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them.

Ephesians 4:8 Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

Re: 'replacement theology', on: 2007/3/12 10:22

Compliments said

Quote:

-----Linn, just as a side bar regarding Stevers statement, it would probably be best to quote the actual verse as it doesn't say, "Took", but rather "led".

I stand corrected and am grateful to you for it. :-)

Your point - in bringing me back to the words of scripture itself - reminds me directly of something I noticed not long ago, of the Lord's attitude to Satan, during His temptations.

Matthew 16:23

But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

Mark 8:33

But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

Luke 4:8

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

What I saw is, that Jesus was well aware and never faltered from the REAL order in Creation. He was *entirely* clear about His authority over Satan, and had absolutely no intention of moving a muscle which would indicate a split-second of weakness or doubt of the reality of His being the Word made Flesh. He literally NEVER gave way to him .

This ties in completely with the victory He won on the cross, by which He could command 'captivity' to follow, and it simply had to obey.

I know there is a picture of the conquering army leading vanquished hosts in chains, which is also a historical reality. But the reality that Jesus LED captivity, is in far more absolute, because it is in the spiritual dimension. Not that we are not all spiritual. But the challenge for a man and woman who believe in Jesus Christ, is to live out that same sonship -as He demonstrated - without flinching.

The weapons of our warfare are ... MIGHTY... (2 Cor 10:4 - 6).

Re: "replacement theology" - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/12 11:18

I waded into this discussion carefully, as it is an extremely volatile one. Some messianic commentators have gone as far as to say that it is one of the most important, and the neglect of it, is to open oneself to deception.

As a gentile, I have trouble reconciling that God has replaced the Jewish people with the church, as His chosen people, but see that we have been grafted into the Hebrew vine. Paul seems to imply that this has occurred in order to provoke the Jews to jealousy, in order to see a remnant return. I have been accused of both over emphasis of Israel and antisemitism when sharing my views on this subject. This amount of misunderstanding around the issue makes me wonder if it is one that Satan is begging that we avoid.

I have actually written a piece on all this, along with it's end time implications, that I am awaiting some confirmation from some sources quoted before publishing. Art Katz, in his book (http://www.benisrael.org/site_content/writings/frmst_writings.htm) The Holocaust: Where Was God deals with this issue in a very balanced way, making sure to not allow Israel's national sins to be ignored, while pointing to God's future restoration, and the conditions thereof.

I find it interesting that I have finally found a point of doctrine that I disagree with Mike and Ron B on. And considering that I put a lot of weight on it, it is a little disappointing. I also find it interesting that this topic seems to have marked Neil's departure, and this seems to be the only topic that I agree with him on.

Ohh, there is a great deal of irony floating around, and my concern is that if this is as great a topic as I believe that it is, then we are in danger of becoming irrelevant as a community, if it is not reconciled. Ohh, that I am wrong in this matter, as this would truly be a tragedy.

Re:, on: 2007/3/12 12:21

Aaron said:

Quote:

-----while pointing to God's future restoration,

What I would like for you to do, my brother is to pull the scriptures from the bible that are used to support a future restoration. If you don't mind. Lets examine them. :-)

This subject and all subjects relating to the last days etc.. is not my number #1 choice. I would rather study the love of God and the joys of union in Christ. I've said many times to the LORD, "Why do you show me this, give this to someone else who has a mind for it, who loves talking about eschatology" I avoided the Revelations, don't like reading it, don't like talking about it. But here I am. The more I get into this though, the more I see Jesus high and lifted up, and I guess that is a good incentive to studying this.

I am very much into "time" statements and "wording" that the holy writers of the bible are writing. I don't read the Newspapers or watch the news for signs, I leave that to Rexella and Jack.

So bring on those verses and let's get into this brother.

Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/3/12 13:45

hi, I was wondering the significance between "took and or led". to me it could say either. I look at this through Luke 16:23, and the fact that Jesus told the thief "today you will be with me in paradise". Which tells me Jesus descended to that realm and got, took, retrieved, or led the patriarchs out of there. is this correct?David

Re: 'replacement theology', on: 2007/3/13 8:43

Hi David,

Quote:
-----the fact that Jesus told the thief "today you will be with me in paradise". Which tells me Jesus descended to that realm and got, took, retrieved, or led the patriarchs out of there. is this correct?

Some people believe this is what is meant by Peter's statement:

1 Peter 3:19

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;

At the moment, I don't have an opinion about what Peter was referring to, but, with regard to 'led captivity captive', I have *always* heard that (in my spirit....)(not heard it expounded though), as being the *entity* of captivity... a spiritual force which is able to overcome people on the inside of their lives. This is where people remain imprisoned by fears, wounds, hope deferred, and that sort of thing. I'm not sure one could say this of the patriarchs, as Jesus Himself corrected His confederates with

Matthew 22

29 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.

30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

31 But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying,

32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? **God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.**

I am reminded of this

Psalms 133:3

As the dew of Hermon, *and as the dew* that descended upon the mountains of Zion: for there the LORD commanded the blessing, *even life for evermore.*

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/13 9:01

Quote:

Compliments wrote:
This subject and all subjects relating to the last days etc.. is not my number #1 choice. I would rather study the love of God and the joys of union in Christ. I've said many times to the LORD, "Why do you show me this, give this to someone else who has a mind for it, who loves talking about eschatology" I avoided the Revelations, don't like reading it, don't like talking about it. But here I am. The more I get into this though, the more I see Jesus high and lifted up, and I guess that is a good incentive to studying this.

The "love of God" and the "joys of union" find ultimate expression in eschatology. As I mentioned, this is a topic that I have waded into, but may I suggest that the Prophetic Books of the Bible (ie, Isaiah to Malachi) particularly the minor prophets open up much on this topic. Revelation makes a lot more sense in the light of the OT prophets, as a lot of the symbol

s used find their explanation here.

I for one wrestle with a temptation to over emphasise eschatology, and therefore humbly decline to offer specifics at this point on time. Having said all this, I firmly believe that there is incredible importance to understanding eschatology, and that the role of Israel, as a nation, is of great importance.

Regarding the Van Impes, let's just say that they and I would disagree on much. And with Art Katz, I heard him say that he had a "studied disinterest in the end times", but then he went on to major in it. Go figure. I guess one can put it down to God and His sense of humour.

Re: 'replacement theology', on: 2007/3/14 17:35

CJaKfOrEsT said

Quote:

-----... but see that we have been grafted into the Hebrew vine ...

Hello Aaron,

Would you please explain this further?

Please also make reference to those who are not and never will be grafted into anything of God (- meaning His death, His resurrection, sonship or eternal life)?

I'm not asking for copious scripture... just a bunch of keys. 8-)

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/15 9:56

Quote:

dorcac wrote:

I'm not asking for copious scripture... just a bunch of keys. 8-)

I'll try my best;-). I believe that it is Romans or Hebrews that mentions how the gentiles are the wild olive vine, and the Jews are the cultivated. It goes on to say that we should get too cocky because it would be easier to regraft in the cultivated branches, who had been pruned, than for us to be grafted in in the first place.

Israel is the chosen people of God. Part of the "choseness" (if that is a real word) is to have it's majority slain through chastening, while a remnant shall be preserved. To say that the church has taken Israel's place, as God's chosen people, is as much an error as to say that Israel will be spared, out of a sentimental pact from God.

Israel is God's chosen people, and we have been grafted into that. However, only a remnant of Israel will be spared, just as many of us gentile believers will also fall away.

I hope that helps:-)

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/3/16 7:59

Aaron, thank you. I have a few comments and a question.

Okay; more truthfully, more than one question ;-)

Quote:

-----Israel is the chosen people of God. Part of the "choseness" (if that is a real word) is to have it's majority slain through chastening, while a remnant shall be preserved. To say that the church has taken Israel's place, as God's chosen people, is as much an error as to say that Israel will be spared, out of a sentimental pact from God.

Israel is God's chosen people, and we have been grafted into that. However, only a remnant of Israel will be spared, just as many of us gentile believers will also fall away.

'Part of the "choseness" (if that is a real word) is to have it's majority slain through chastening,'

Brother, I think I know what you're trying to say here, but I wouldn't call it chastening if the end is death. This is not what is meant by:

Hebrews 12:7

If you endure chastening, God deals with you as with sons; for what son is there whom a father does not chasten?

'while a remnant shall be preserved.'

OK. But, just as Abraham, before either Covenant existed, was counted righteous through believing God's Personal word to him personally, surely this is a basic requirement to be counted as part of 'Israel', today?

Adherence to a form of religion based on a misinterpretation of Old Testament scriptures - the scriptures from which the gospel was preached by the first (Jewish by first birth) Christians - will not save them.... will it?

Am I right to assume you are taking for granted that those who will be 'spared' from the slaying, will be those who **also believe**?

Hebrews 3

18 And to whom did He swear that they would not enter His rest, but to those who did not obey?

19 So we see that they could not enter in because of **unbelief**.

'To say that the church has taken Israel's place, as God's chosen people,'

Surely? **Peter** who preached to Cornelius was not limiting the conditional 'choseness' he quotes from Exodus 19, to Jewish Christians, in his letter (1:1:20 - 1:2:12).

The significance of his mention of 'Gentiles' (v 12) marks the Church out as 'Israel' more than ever, since it comes from the lips of the man given the unenviable role of being the little rock on which the Church was (to be) built - by Jesus Himself.

EDIT: This adds to the significance of Jesus giving him a new name, and what that new name was, especially in the light of the 'living stones' analogy Peter uses, which is totally endorsed by Paul's words:

1 Corinthians 3

9 For we are God's fellow workers; you are God's field, God's building.

10 According to the grace of God which was given to me, as a wise master builder I have laid the foundation, and another builds on it. But let each one take heed how he builds on it.

11 For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

Ephesians 2

19 Now, therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God,

20 having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone,

There were both Jews and gentiles in both the Corinthian and the Ephesian churches, just as there must have been in those scattered to whom Peter was writing. How have we ended up with an interpretation that assumes Peter was writing to Jewish Christians only?

'is as much an error as to say that Israel will be spared, out of a sentimental pact from God.'

I agree that old Israel was and is not spared, time and time again, much of which is predictable from Moses' prophecies in Deuteronomy, and many other prophets' words, because God is after truth in the inward parts.

Therefore Paul reiterates the meaning of true Jewishness in God's sight, in Romans 2:29. But, if true Jewishness - by God's definition - the revelation of His own nature in a man born from above - resides in the Church, then while Israel transformed (through second birth) remains Israel under the New Covenant and, this grace is extended to gentiles also (under the New Covenant - remembering Israel under the Old Covenant was bound to accept those who wanted to join themselves to God's people from out of any other nation eg Ruth and Rahab, who are in Christ's human genealogy), then why should this lead to *any* controversy?

I am genuinely mystified.

We cannot exclude any verse of scripture from our understanding.

Just as Peter's mention of 'Gentiles' sets the Church forth clearly as 'Israel', so do Paul's writings (at the end of Galatians 6), particularly in Ephesians 2:14 and Romans 11:26.

This is enough controversy from me for now. :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/16 10:10

Quote:

-----I believe that it is Romans or Hebrews that mentions how the gentiles are the wild olive vine, and the jews are the cultivated.

Still hoping that we can discuss this in a gentle fashion. Don't worry about not agreeing with me on all points... I don't agree with myself all the time!

This is introduced almost as an axiom but I would like to examine it more carefully. Just what is that root? You say 'the jews' but 'jews' demands a definition and the problem is that we don't have one such definition but many, so we have to ask what kind of 'jews'? Technically of course however you interpret the root it is long before 'jews'.

I think it refers to Abraham rather than to a race. It also refers to Abraham in a special sense; Abraham is the father of all believers. It is right and proper that Paul should warn his Gentile readers against any kind of Gentile chauvinism but he is surely not advocating 'Jewish' chauvinism? The theme of Romans is that the gospel of Christ is 'the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes; to Jew first and also so Greek'. The theme is underlined twice by the repetition of a choice phrase; Rom. 3:22 (KJVS) Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for **there is no difference**:

Rom. 10:12 (KJVS) For **there is no difference** between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. The context of each of these instances is 'faith'. The Rom 10:12 shows that we cannot disengage Romans 9-11 from the rest of Paul's argument. This is integrated revelation.

Abraham is the archetypal believer; he sets the pattern for all who believe unto salvation. As Paul makes clear in Galatians the interesting thing about Abraham's justifying experience was that it took place before he bore the marks of covenant; when he was just an individual, and an uncircumcised individual at that. Although the relationship between God and the descendants of Abraham has a family theme that covenant of promise was specifically repeated making him the God of Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob. Not just the God of Abraham's family but the God of Abraham's believing family. In fact members of Abraham's family who were not believers are excluded from that covenant and promise eg Ishmael and Esau.

Seen in this light the root is not racial but faith based. Their racial roots have no power to guarantee an inheritance of the promise. This is part of the radical preaching of John Baptist too; 'Therefore bear fruits worthy of repentance, and do not begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father.' For I say to you that God is able to raise up children to Abraham from these stones.' (Luke 3:8 NKJV) The authentic olive of Israel was not those who had the right genealogy but those who obeyed and believed; 'And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while still uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all those who believe, though they are uncircumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also, and the father of circumcision to those who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of the faith which our father Abraham had while still uncircumcised.' (R

om 4:11-12 NKJV)

The Romans 11 passage makes it plain that insertion and removal from that authentic Israel is faith-based. Unbelief will yet remove those who had believed from the olive, and faith will add those who were Jewish unbelievers (and thus broken off) into the olive. The irreducible minimum criteria is faith; this is the whole theme of Romans.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/16 10:31

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Still hoping that we can discuss this in a gentle fashion. Don't worry about not agreeing with me on all points... I don't agree with myself all the time!

I have intentionally avoided any detailed answers/explanations, as I strongly believe that the Lord would have me give emphasis to other areas at present. My comments about finding something to disagree with you about, is that I have found that I agree with much that you have to say. However, I knew that we'd have to reach this point, due to our differences of opinion regarding Katz, Bonhoeffer, Barth, etc.

Perhaps, God willing, there will be a time to dive into this theme in a more involved way, but alas this is not now. My initial comments were a bewildered, dare I say, "protest" in the light of Neil's rather forced departure. Considering that we had finally found an issue that we seem to agree on, it was quite sad to see him go, so suddenly.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/16 11:25

Quote:

-----Neil's rather forced departure

i was away preaching over the weekend so this took me by surprise too. :-(

Re: replace or include - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/17 22:39

Quote:

----- Perhaps, God willing, there will be a time to dive into this theme in a more involved way , but alas this is not now.

In God's timing, I trust. Of course, with the severance, opportunities for clarification and restoration are lost. It's not unlike a death, only when a person dies, at least their name remains - on a tombstone.

This topic has been a real eye opener for me. By learning more about anti-Semitism as it relates to the relationship of the historical church with the Jew over the centuries, I can understand a bit of the way Neil sees things. I can see why the words, "Replacement theology" could have a distasteful ring to it - when it is so enmeshed with hatred towards the Jews. So, defending the one (its biblical meaning) is essentially equated with defending the other (hatred).

His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this ONE body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. Eph. 2:15

Maybe "Inclusive Theology" is more accurate - but, oh my, wouldn't that term raise some hackles!

Sidenote: What does "the dividing wall of hostility" Eph. 1:14 mean - theologically, and in its outworking?

Diane

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/5/11 9:59

I said I would post in this thread, here, p3 'What is a lie?' in General Topics, because 'replacement theology' was broached to me at a wedding I attended two weeks ago tomorrow.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=16646&forum=35&start=20&29) https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=16646&forum=35&start=20&29

After the wedding, I had a dream which gradually rose more and more to my consciousness, and which is finally going to drive me to a study I've never done before, on what may be the reason Jesus said

Matthew 10:6

But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

Matthew 15:24

But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

I don't for one second believe that who are called 'the Jews' in a general way according to modern usage - rolling up ethnicity, religiosity and personal preference for being so identified - under one very loose title - are excluded from embracing the New Covenant.

But, scripture makes historical distinctions, which I need to research.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/11 11:32

Quote:

-----Sidenote: What does "the dividing wall of hostility" Eph. 1:14 mean - theologically, and in its outworking?

It is a reference, by means of an illustration, of the barriers between Jew and Gentile which are broken down in the gospel.

The Temple had a

(http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/2/20/Temple_inscription_in_greek.jpg/250px-Temple_inscription_in_greek.jpg) barrier which excluded Gentiles from the Holy Place. This picture shows a piece of masonry from Herod's temple with words banning Gentiles from passing this barrier 'on pain of death'. It separated Jew from Gentile.

The word 'partition' in "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;"

(Ephesians 2:14 KJVS) is the Greek word for a 'hedge' and is the word used in... "Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:"

(Matthew 21:33 KJVS) God had 'hedged' in his 'peculiar' people and expected fruit from them. The hedge was broken down in the cross so that there is no longer separation into Jew and Gentile. Theologically, the dividing wall was the Law.

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 12:28

Quote:

-----God had 'hedged' in his 'peculiar' people and expected fruit from them. The hedge was broken down in the cross so that there is no longer separation into Jew and Gentile. Theologically, the dividing wall was the Law.

Wowzers, those were beautiful words that you put together there Phil.

To rebuild that hedge means that what Christ accomplished on the cross by taking the two (Jew and Gentile) and making

g one new man (In Himself) so making peace would have to be destroyed if God is to plant a vineyard, hedge it in, dig a winepress, build a Temple in the state of Israel.

Well, thats blasphemy!!

God is not the author of confusion. He said thru Paul, that there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile. Did God speak thru any of the prophets saying that there is going to be a distinction in 2000 years between the Jew and the Gentile?

I believe I read someplace that God made a NEW Covenant. New contracts always have new rights and stipulations, it included all nations, not just one in particular. Sounds like the covenant that God made with Abraham, that all the nations of the earth would be blessed.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/11 16:15

One of the dangerous of Christian Zionism is that a good number of Christians come away with a false belief that Jews can be saved through Judaism because they are 'God's chosen people'.

Opponents like to use the phrase 'Replacement Theology', but in truth it is 'Fulfillment Theology'. The OT points to Christ. He is the fulfillment. All those who are in Christ (those and those alone) are God's chosen people.

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/5/13 11:54

Jay said

Quote:

-----Opponents...

Um.... could you please give a little more definition to 'opponents'? Thanks.

Also, your use of the very old phrase 'God's chosen people' sent me scurrying for the Bible references to it. Very very interesting.... because it doesn't actually appear in that form.

God chose individual people again and again, and when He spoke in Exodus 19 (quoted accurately in 1 Peter 2), it is completely conditional on *all* the people obeying His commandments.

Then, looking at 'have chosen', it is clear God chose Judah for the sake of David, and, at the pleasure of His own good will, He chose Jerusalem to put His name there.

At no time did He overlook sins of any or every kind.

Re: Replacement Theology - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/13 14:12

There have been some very wise and insightful and helpful remarks on this thread, and I will just add a bit.

If replacement theology means that God has replaced Israel with the Church, that doesn't get it right.

"God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew" (Rom. 11.2).

And in fact the first church was composed of people who were Jews after the flesh (Acts 2.5).

But what God did do was-- and I like the "transposing" idea-- He transposed the Olive Tree of Israel into a higher octave. From the Old Covenant into the New Covenant. It's still the same Olive Tree, but called now The Church (sorry to mix the metaphors). The New Covenant is for the Jew first, and also for the Gentile.

And in this transposing process, God broke off the unbelieving branches from the Olive Tree, and grafted in the wild beli

iving branches, so that now the Olive Tree is composed of believing Jews and believing Gentiles. There is "no difference" between them now in this New Creation Man. (And the words "no difference" are used three or four times in the New Testament relative to Jew and Gentile. That's a strong emphasis. This has already been pointed out in an earlier posting on this thread.)

And then, in due time, Paul tells us, God will graft in again a great multitude of these "natural branches." "And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again" (Rom. 11.23). And this, he says, when it happens, shall be so wondrous a thing that he calls it "life from the dead" (Rom. 11.15). An even higher "octave" that all the branches both Jew and Gentile shall enjoy together in God's time!

...I am at times perplexed why Jewish people (and even many Christians now) cleave so tenaciously to the false hope that God still has something for natural Israel on Old Covenant terms. Why? This is so short-sighted. Why would they sell themselves short of the awesome promises of the New Covenant? (Can it be they simply are not seeing the unsearchable riches of the New Covenant, and the New Creation?)

But it does seem they have a very difficult time surrendering their earthly identity. Even though Paul (himself a Jew) counted it all DUNG that he might win Christ.

Yet these days even Jews who turn to Christ still want to be called "Messianic Jews." Am I then, a "Messianic Gentile"? No, I am just a plain ordinary "Christian." Oh, is that all? What a let-down.

...I share these things almost reluctantly. I know this whole subject can become a very emotionally charged issue, and can cause such misunderstandings, and bitterness. It needs to be handled with sensitivity and gentleness and grace. To say the things I have said above... at one time I was accused of being anti-Semitic for saying such things. Exactly the opposite is the truth. It's LOVE for those people, the love of Christ, that compels us to say them. God has nothing LESS for them than He has for us, and you feel JEALOUS for them that they don't get misled by the short-sighted teachers who would turn them aside from their heritage in Christ!

AD

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/5/13 15:07

AD,

Your reference to previous posts made me to turn back the pages. Thank you for your very gentle exposition.

I'm now referring (without quoting the whole paragraph from p7), to something philologos said, as a springboard to an alternative thought.

Quote:

-----I think it refers to Abraham rather than to a race...

I certainly agree it is not 'a race'. And I see what you are saying about the centrality of 'faith' like Abraham's. But, is this not also 'faith like' Christ's?

For the purpose of understanding the olive tree, I see the legal status of 'the Branch' (Zech 6) as we have been discussing in 'Jacob or Heli', as being in the same picture as 'planted in death' (or grafted into death) - as the corn of wheat - enabling Him who was 'cut off' ('but not for Himself' Dan 9), to become that 'tree' from whence 'the root' now grows.

That's the *thumbnail* which makes sense to my understanding.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/13 17:27

Dorcas, by saying 'opponents' I was referring to anyone who believes that Israel is separate and distinct from the Church and that God has a separate plan for them.

I wrote:

Quote:

-----All those who are in Christ (those and those alone) are God's chosen people.

You replied:

Quote:

-----God chose individual people again and again, and when He spoke in Exodus 19 (quoted accurately in 1 Peter 2), it is completely conditional on all the people obeying His commandments.

1 Peter 2:9-10 says,

"But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy."

God does choose individual people again and again, but the whole of the chosen are a people.

Also note that in 1 Peter 2:7-8, "So the honor is for you who believe, but for those who do not believe, "The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone," and "A stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense." They stumble because they disobey the word, as they were destined to do."

To those who believe will not be put to shame, but to those who do not believe they will stumble. Look at the beginning of verse 9, "But you Peter says there will be some who disbelieve and are put to shame, but you are different. You are a chosen people.

It is biblical to say that Christians are God's chosen people, created in Christ Jesus to do good works.

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/5/14 15:32

Jay said

Quote:

-----by saying 'opponents' I was referring to anyone who believes that Israel is separate and distinct from the Church and that God has a separate plan for them.

Thanks. I find it astonishing that anyone reading scripture can think this. There is not even historical precedent *within scripture* for it!

Jay quoted the apostle Peter's

Quote:

-----**Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people**; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy."

Reading this again I am completely sure that Peter was not referring only to Jewish Christians here.

Quote:

-----God does choose individual people again and again, but the whole of the chosen are a people.

Yes. But when 'the Jews' refer to themselves as a chosen race, they are excluding all gentiles. That's why it was informative to look for the phrase, 'chosen people'.... because the only way to make sense of it as Peter is using it, is to include

gentiles as *the sons of God* which believers become through new birth. And the only way to make sense of it in the Old Testament is in the context of faith and obedience to God's word, which is many times characterised by the acts of individuals, rather than the whole nation (who regularly get into trouble with God). Then, all God's historically chosen individuals *and* those born again, are included in Hebrews 11:40 - *God having provided something better for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us.*

I had another thought today about the thumbnail in my previous post, which is that 'the root' is one picture which corresponds to Jesus Christ being the chief corner of the *foundation* of the Church.

Re:, on: 2007/5/14 16:37

When I hear "Replacement Theology", it seems many people think the Church replaced the promises to Israel. According to Romans 11, after the fullness of the gentiles have come in, then Israel will be saved. Acts 1:6&7, Peter asked Jesus about when the Kingdom will be restored to Israel...Jesus didn't say it wouldn't or that it has been replaced with the Church, Jesus said it is not for us to know the time of that event. It seems as though the ones who believe in this kind of Replacement Theology are anti-semitic. Replacement/Reconstruction/Dominion Theology all go together, and many false prophecies have sprung from these beliefs, believing we are going to be restored back to what Adam & Eve were before the fall. Even if Adam & Eve never sinned, they were never considered co-heirs, or promised to be Glorified together with Jesus Christ. The first man Adam was a living soul and made from the dust/earth...earthly. The second man Adam, is a life giving spirit and Jesus Christ is heavenly.

We will be like Him, for we will see Him as He is. Bone of His Bone and Flesh of His flesh. A NEW Creation as never before. :-)

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/14 16:54

Quote:

-----Reading this again I am completely sure that Peter was not referring only to Jewish Christians here.

I agree, he is referring to all who have faith in Jesus--whether Jew or Gentile.

Re:, on: 2007/5/14 17:55

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

When I hear "Replacement Theology", it seems many people think the Church replaced the promises to Israel. According to Romans 11, after the fullness of the gentiles have come in, then Israel will be saved. Acts 1:6&7, Peter asked Jesus about when the Kingdom will be restored to Israel...Jesus didn't say it wouldn't or that it has been replaced with the Church, Jesus said it is not for us to know the time of that event. It seems as though the ones who believe in this kind of Replacement Theology are anti-semitic. Replacement/Reconstruction/Dominion Theology all go together, and many false prophecies have sprung from these beliefs, believing we are going to be restored back to what Adam & Eve were before the fall. Even if Adam & Eve never sinned, they were never considered co-heirs, or promised to be Glorified together with Jesus Christ. The first man Adam was a living soul and made from the dust/earth...earthly. The second man Adam, is a life giving spirit and Jesus Christ is heavenly.

We will be like Him, for we will see Him as He is. Bone of His Bone and Flesh of His flesh. A NEW Creation as never before. :-)

Hi Katy, welcome to SI (is that your real name? Or did you just get it from the "Katy" books - I loved them as a child, although, not being American, it took me a long time to find out that a katydid was a kind of grasshopper)

You might be interested in the thread on "Jews against Zionism" in the General Topics section. https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=16797&post_id=130980&order=0&viewmode=flat&pid=130962&forum=35#130980

Excuse the long addy, I don't know how to make it brief! You can cut and paste, or look up the title in Search.

Blessings

jeannette

Re: "replacement theology", on: 2007/5/15 11:35

Katy-did said

Quote:

-----It seems as though the ones who believe in this kind of Replacement Theology are anti-semitic.

It is only if semites are excluded from the Church, that this can be considered anti-semitic, and who would want to exclude them? Certainly no-one who reads the New Testament with basic understanding.

Anti-semitism may well be a real force in many parts of the world, but I (for one) am most uncomfortable with *current* accusations of anti-semitism *against the Church*. There is no need for it. There is no *sense* to it.

'Christians' who are racist show themselves in need of their mind being renewed and bringing it into line with scriptures such as

Revelation 5:9

And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of **every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;**

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/15 13:57

Quote:

-----It seems as though the ones who believe in this kind of Replacement Theology are anti-semitic.

Not all of us, I assure you. ;-)

Re: Thanks Ron - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/15 14:40

Quote:

----- Theologically, the dividing wall was the Law

Thank you Ron for answering my question, "What is the 'wall of hostility'?"
The answer seems to be obvious in scripture.... yet....

That raises questions in my mind:

Was it only God, through the covenant law, who had caused the division referred to in Eph. 2?

Or was it not also the Jewish religious leaders

who were going overboard in their "separation" theology (ex the inscription on the stone) - ie the practice of ADDING laws?

Is there a good site in the Web that sheds some light on the history of this "wall of hostility"?

Is there a modern-day parallel? Ex: Religious rituals/ behaviors/ practises that are exclusive?

- those organizations who HAD the wonderful blessings, but became religious and separatist....

... things we do to make it hard for "outsiders" to become one of us, to understand the Good News, etc?

Would it be appropriate to make that parallel?

It sure seems like there are a lot of "walls of hostility" around - even among God's "replacements"
- walls that can only be broken down through Christ - making them one.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/15 17:53

The giving of the Law, and this was God's doing, put a barrier around the covenant people of Israel. It separated them, the original meaning of 'sanctify' and set them apart as God's particular treasure. Although the whole world belonged to him he chose to make the Sinai Covenant people a holy (separated) people and a kingdom of priests.

That sense of separation has been one of the causes of anti-semitism down through the ages. The people of the Covenant 'dwelt alone' and such people make other people nervous.

This exclusivity of this covenant had responsibilities as well as special privileges. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." (Amos 3:2 KJVS) That is to say, that greater revelation brings greater responsibility and the danger of greater judgement. (cf James 3:1 (NKJV) My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment.)

Their failure to live up to the greater revelation brought the 'curse of the law'. In that sense the score which the law kept was a constant indictment to the people of the Covenant and hence Paul says "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" (Colossians 2:14 KJVS) The 'us' here is the Sinai Covenant people.

Did the Pharisees add to the 'barrier'? In practical terms they did and they despised any Gentile access to the Temple site which was why they filled the Court of the Gentiles with a market. In the terms in which the scriptures speak however I think it is God's hedge that is in focus rather than that of the Pharisees.

Re: the hedge - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/16 8:19

Quote:

----- God had 'hedged' in his 'peculiar' people and expected fruit from them.

I had never thought about the "wall" as a "hedge", that is, a positive gift for Israel - but, ... dah... it's in scripture: "the law is holy" Rom. 7:12 .

"Is the law sinful? Certainly not!" Rom. 1:7

I assume that this "hedge" was also created so that Israel could be a light to the world. (verse?) Ex: Rahab "got it".

Quote:

----- their failure to live up to the greater revelation brought the 'curse of the law'. In that sense the score which the law kept was a constant indictment to the people of the

In Romans we see WHY this "hedge" was useless:

because apart from Christ all are "slaves to sin." Rom. 6:20 Sin made that "hedge" (law) useless.

Sin made that "wall" a source of divisiveness and hostility - (an indication that Israel had failed to live up to the greater revelation).

How was this "curse" manifested? (nothing different than we see today)

Failure to consider others
Neglecting the oppressed, the needy, the hungry, fearful, lonely,
Divisiveness in worship rituals (1 Corinthians)
Selfish ambition
Discord
Legalism
straining gnats
symptoms of divisiveness – fractured unity:
religiosity (a self-focus)
favouritism
disunity
domination
avenging – "enemies"

– "For he himself is our peace, who has made the two one by destroying the barriers... – Eph. 2:14
– "In HIM you are being built together to become a dwelling in which God lives by his Spirit." Eph. 2:22

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/16 9:25

Quote:
----- – "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" (Colossians 2:14 KJVS)
The 'us' here is the Sinai Covenant people.

Just them? So then, Rom. 7 does not apply to us: – "we have been released from the law.. –" :6. I guess I had assumed that there is an aspect of God's law that is universal – and we too cannot keep it apart from the new life in Christ ruled by the Spirit. I wonder why Paul makes such a point of the Old Covenant law even in his epistles to gentile believers.

Who are the – "Sinai Covenant people" today? Surely we can't refer to those who are referred to as – "Jews" in the sense of those who adhere to Judaism, or an Israeli (political identity). And with genetic lineage to Jacob uncertain... – Also, the Jews have been welcoming proselytes for centuries.

What is a Jew?

It seems that today the – "dividing wall of hostility" (anti-Semitism) is far removed from a linkage to the Sinai Covenant Law, or even the issues in Paul's day – as there is no Temple, no sacrifices.... I think that there are other factors that fuel anti-Semitism.

Sorry for my confusion.... There just seems to be so many hazy ideas floating around in my mind.
Diane

Re: anti-semitism?, on: 2007/5/16 20:03

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Quote:
----- – "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" (Colossians 2:14 KJVS)
The 'us' here is the Sinai Covenant people.

Just them? So then, Rom. 7 does not apply to us: "we have been released from the law..":6. I guess I had assumed that there is an aspect of God's law that is universal – and we too cannot keep it apart from the new life in Christ ruled by the Spirit. I wonder why Paul makes such a point of the Old Covenant law even in his epistles to gentile believers.

Who are the "Sinai Covenant people" today? Surely we can't refer to those who are referred to as "Jews" in the sense of those who adhere to Judaism, or an Israeli (political identity). And with genetic lineage to Jacob uncertain... Also, the Jews have been welcoming proselytes for centuries.

What is a Jew?

It seems that today the "dividing wall of hostility" (anti-Semitism) is far removed from a linkage to the Sinai Covenant Law, or even the issues in Paul's day – as there is no Temple, no sacrifices.... I think that there are other factors that fuel anti-Semitism.

Sorry for my confusion.... There just seems to be so many hazy ideas floating around in my mind.

Diane

Hi Diane

Just a few thoughts, summarising where I've got to so far on the matter:

1. Spiritually the New Birth brings us into the "Israel of God", Jew and Gentile together, and this means the "dividing wall" is removed.

Here the temptation is for one group to exalt themselves proudly against the other. Jews because of their special place in sacred history, non-Jews because most Jews rejected their Messiah, while many Gentiles received Him. In the latter case it is an aspect of anti-semitism.

2. Politically, (though it's actually a spiritual thing too) Satan hates Israel and the Jews, (whether born again or not) because of what they represent. For whether they acknowledge the God of their ancestors or not, and whether they like it or not, they are witnesses, by their very existence, of the truth of God's word, and His fulfilled promises. Also, I would think Israel is unpleasant reminder to Satan of the One who came from that nation, and who "bruised his head", in spite of all his attacks and temptations.

Therefore Satan aims to destroy Israel, as he has done throughout their history (through such men as Haman, Herod, Hitler and others). In the end he will move all nations to rise against Israel and fight against her.

Here the temptation is for some - even some Jews - to deny that modern Israel has *any* special place any more in God's plan for the nations. The idea that *God* was fulfilling His Word in 1948 is rejected by those who hold this view. Even though Scripture shows that He often uses men and political situations (as Satan does also) to bring about His will among nations.

This is also a form of anti-semitism, or perhaps more correctly anti-Zionism.

Of course some Jewish people use their fancied superiority to push a political agenda, (even though the Lord said it is *not* because of their righteousness but because of His great Name that He still keeps, and will keep, His Word concerning them), but this doesn't make any difference to the broader picture.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 12:53

Jeannette: Thank you for your recommendation to read the article you posted. I haven't read it yet, but would like to ask you, do you believe in the 1000 Year Millennial Kingdom Reign when Jesus will fulfill the promises to Earthly Israel and take the Throne of David? Do you believe the Church has a special calling out to reign and rule with Christ during that time? I do know Isaiah 14 has not been fulfilled, as the world or earth does not or has never (Yet anyway) had peace (the whole world or earth is at rest)..yet. Satan, who set's his throne above the stars (I believe this is referring to anti-christ against Israel) and a great statement from Jesus in Revelations ...(the Root and Offspring of David, Bright and Morning Star) (Stars have always been associated with Israel, Judges 5, and Joseph's dream, etc,) would be something only Jewish people would pick up on. We are, as the Body of Christ considered Abraham's seed, Christ, but the Root and offspring of David is referring to KING.

Hope I haven't confused you too much.

Looking forward to your answer.

In Christ

Katy-did..(nick name)!

:-)

Re:, on: 2007/6/1 17:49

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

Jeannette: Thank you for your recommendation to read the article you posted. I haven't read it yet, but would like to ask you, do you believe in the 1000 Year Millennial Kingdom Reign when Jesus will fulfill the promises to Earthly Israel and take the Throne of David? Do you believe the Church has a special calling out to reign and rule with Christ during that time? I do know Isaiah 14 has not been fulfilled, as the world or earth does not or has never (Yet anyway) had peace (the whole world or earth is at rest)..yet. Satan, who set's his throne above the stars (I believe this is referring to anti-christ against Israel) and a great statement from Jesus in Revelations ...(the Root and Offspring of David, Bright and Morning Star) (Stars have always been associated with Israel, Judges 5, and Joseph's dream, etc,) would be something only Jewish people would pick up on. We are, as the Body of Christ considered Abraham's seed, Christ, but the Root and offspring of David is referring to KING.

Hope I haven't confused you too much.

Looking forward to your answer.

In Christ

Katy-did..(nick name)!

:-)

Hi Katy. I've only just noticed this! Can you pm me (private message) about it, so I don't miss it again?

If possible could you put the questions one at a time, rather than all together in a jumble (Or it seems like a jumble at the moment! It's late at night here, and I can confuse myself very well indeed without any outside help - even in the daytime!)

Although the simple answer to most of your questions is probably "I don't know"! Bible interpretation of "Last Days" issues such as the Millennium for example, is very difficult because so much of the books that deal with it (Daniel and Revelation for example) is symbolic, or the time scale of events isn't necessarily in chronological order.

The point is, *are we ready* for Jesus' return? rather than "how what when and where". Although I think we should have some idea of that too, so we can recognise what's going to happen when it does.

Thanks

Blessings

Jeannette :-D

PS it wasn't an article but the thread on "Jews against Zionism" which quickly became yet another discussion on the place of Israel in God's purposes.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/6/2 0:44

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

Here the temptation is for some - even some Jews - to deny that modern Israel has *any* special place any more in God's plan for the nations. The idea that God was fulfilling His Word in 1948 is rejected by those who hold this view. Even though Scripture shows that He often uses men and political situations (as Satan does also) to bring about His will among nations.

This is also a form of anti-semitism, or perhaps more correctly anti-Zionism.

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

I do know Isaiah 14 has not been fulfilled, as the world or earth does not or has never (Yet anyway) had peace (the whole world or earth is at rest)..yet.

Jeannette,

Your probably going to think that I am stalking you here, but this issue is one of such incredible importance, that to miss this is to potential miss the crux of the heartbeat of the very character of God. So far I have been intentionally vague, hoping that you will examine what has been put before you, and draw your own conclusions.

You seem to have the idea that the issue of rejecting Zionism is to ignore God's involvement in the events of 1948. This is not the case. It is more a matter of correctly interpreting what God was actually fulfilling, by His establishing of a political sphere within the land that He has chosen for His chosen people. Many assume that this was the promised return to the land, as spoken by the prophets, and will ultimately usher in the return of the Lord. The basis of this assumption is that they read a portion of Scripture (unaware of where it specifically is, myself) that apparently implies that He will return with in a generation of Israel's restoration.

Could it not be said that Israel could have made such an assumption when Ezra and Nehemiah restored the Hebrew nation, and rebuilt the temple? The problem is, the prophets pointed to an ultimate fulfillment, where the Law would go forth out of Zion, and the swords would be beaten into plowshares, because men would not learn war anymore. Obviously this did not occur, and so this could not have been such an ultimate fulfillment, which means that there must have been another to follow.

We find also, in 1948 that many prophetic conditions were not met, including there being a holocaust where 1/3 of the world's Jewish population perished, when the prophets told us that 2/3 would die. I highlighted the portion of Katy-did's post, because this statement serves as a "smoking gun", although none of her statements can be separated from each other.

It is within the scope of prophetic interpretation that God could be involved in the establishment of the Zionist state, as He was directly involved in the raising up of Assyria for the invasion of Israel. Consider the fact that God actually sent a reluctant prophet into the Assyrian capital, and that prophet's reluctance was rooted in the fact that he knew that if the Ninevites repented in response to his warnings, then God would spare them from His impending wrath. You can draw your own conclusions as to the relevance of such a comparison being made;-).

Again I recommend the

(http://www.benisrael.org/writings/online_books/holocaust_where_was_God/shoah_contents.html) Holocaust Book. Or even an article that I wrote called

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id16522&forum36&14) The Cleansing of the Sanctuary. To be honest, there is much that I could amend in this article, having seen much to add to this understanding of Israel and the church, in the past month or so, but it serves as a good primer.

It is possible that the churches very integrity could be made or broken over its comprehension of its place in this cosmic drama. To miss this, could mean to miss the very intention of God in His grafting of the Gentiles into His Hebrew vineyard.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/6/2 1:06

Quote:
-----LittleGift wrote:
The point is, *are we ready* for Jesus' return? rather than "how what when and where". Although I think we should have some idea of that too, so we can recognise what's going to happen when it does.

Just an addendum to my previous post, it isn't a matter of "how what when and where", but "why". To us has been given the mysteries, amongst them the mystery of Israel, that we may be stewards of them. It is a cop out to ignore the mysteries based on their "mysteriousness", for as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "who has known the mind of the Lord the we may instruct Him? But **we have the mind of Christ.**"

To ignore the issue of Israel, and its component in eschatology, even to ignore eschatology itself, is to risk neglecting a component of what God has revealed to us by His Spirit. Could this constitute a possible "burying of the talent" that God has given to us? (Mat 25:24-30)

Quote:
-----The secret *things* belong unto the LORD our God: but those *things which* are revealed *belong* unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.
Deut 29:29

Re: Terms, spiritual definitions - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/6/2 9:52

Quote:
-----What is a Jew?

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; *neither* is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is* that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.
Rom 2:28,29

Re:, on: 2007/6/2 12:44

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Quote:
-----What is a Jew?

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; *neither* is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is* that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.
Rom 2:28,29

Hi Mike

You are right of course. I quoted or referred to this scripture fairly recently on the same context - probably in another thread, or in a pm...

But, until the Lord returns, and *all* things are finally summed up in Him, there are two aspects to consider: two Israels, not one, two Jerusalems, not one, two chosen peoples, not one.

Iâ'm beginning to believe that this is connected to an important spiritual principle of its own, that is much broader than the Israel question itself:

But these *thinks* take so much time. I wanted to look at and respond to another of your posts on the "Jews against Zionism" thread, but just haven't been able yet.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/6/2 12:49

Hi Aaron, here is an attempt to respond to your last posts.

Quote:
-----CJaKfOrEsT wrote
LittleGift wrote:
Quote:

Here the temptation is for some - even some Jews - to deny that modern Israel has any special place any more in God's plan for the nations. The idea that God was fulfilling His Word in 1948 is rejected by those who hold this view. Even though Scripture shows that He often uses men and political situations (as Satan does also) to bring about His will among nations.

This is also a form of anti-semitism, or perhaps more correctly anti-Zionism.

Quote:
----- Katy-did wrote:
I do know Isaiah 14 has not been fulfilled, as the world or earth does not or has never (Yet anyway) had peace (the whole world or earth is at rest)..yet.

Jeannette,

Your probably going to think that I am stalking you here,

No, actually I don't! I was waiting for a response to my request to simplify things, but you seem not to have read it! :-P I downloaded, and copied and printed the whole of your transcript of Jacob Prasch's "The Future History of the Church", and understood it, but I often can't understand your style of writing for some reason!

Quote:
----- but this issue is one of such incredible importance, that to miss this is to potential miss the crux of the heartbeat of the very character of God. So far I have been intentionally vague, hoping that you will examine what has been put before you, and draw you own conclusions.

Mmm, so vague that I still don't know if you fundamentally disagree, or if you agree but think I've missed something!

Quote:
----- You seem to have the idea that the issue of rejecting Zionism is to ignore God's involvement in the events of 1948.

I think it is, for some people, but have no idea where you personally stand on this.

Quote:
----- This is not the case. It is more a matter of correctly interpreting what God was actually fulfilling, by His establishing of a political sp here within the land that He has chosen for His chosen people. Many assume that this was the promised return to the land, as spoken by the prophets, and will ultimately usher in the return of the Lord. The basis of this assumption is that they read a portion of Scripture (unaware of where it specifically is, myself) that apparently implies that He will return within a generation of Israel's restoration.

Do you mean Jesus' words (in Matthew 24, I think) "This generation will not pass away until these things are fulfilled"?

Interpretation of this depends on what is meant by "generation", and whether it means the whole of what Jesus was telling them or only a part. The New Testament believers thought it meant *all* would be fulfilled, including Jesus' return, in their lifetime, or before the last apostle, who had seen Jesus in the flesh, died. And of course, in 70 AD part of this pa

ssage – the warning of Jerusalem's destruction - was fulfilled (unless there is another fulfilment still to come?) But the rest wasn't fulfilled then, as Jesus still hasn't returned (full Preterists think He has!)

Quote:
----- Could it not be said that Israel could have made such an assumption when Ezra and Nehemiah restored the Hebrew nation, and rebuilt the temple?

Of course, they probably did! (see what I wrote above on "this generation...")

Quote:
----- The problem is, the prophets pointed to an ultimate fulfilment, where the Law would go forth out of Zion, and the swords would be beaten into plowshares, because men would not learn war anymore. Obviously this did not occur, and so this could not have been such an ultimate fulfilment, which means that there must have been another to follow.

Exactly! I have never denied this fact. There are, no doubt, many Biblical prophecies that haven't been fully fulfilled yet. In the present context, there is, for example, the one about *all* nations coming against Jerusalem. 70 AD could have been a partial fulfilment, (as could the earlier Assyrian invasion in the time of Hezekiah).

Quote:
----- We find also, in 1948 that many prophetic conditions were not met, including there being a holocaust where 1/3 of the world's Jewish population perished, when the prophets told us that 2/3 would die. I highlighted the portion of Katy-did's post, because this statement serves as a "smoking gun", although none of her statements can be separated from each other.

It is within the scope of prophetic interpretation that God could be involved in the establishment of the Zionist state, as He was directly involved in the raising up of Assyria for the invasion of Israel. Consider the fact that God actually sent a reluctant prophet into the Assyrian capital, and that prophet's reluctance was rooted in the fact that he knew that if the Ninevites repented in response to his warnings, then God would spare them from His impending wrath. You can draw your own conclusions as to the relevance of such a comparison being made.

True, did I say that 1948 was the ultimate fulfilment? I do believe it was an important step towards the ultimate fulfilment. Which is probably the main reason it's significant in the purposes of God on the earth. I haven't studied or thought this aspect through yet, as you obviously have, but that doesn't mean my conclusions would necessarily be different from yours.

I still don't know if we agree or not so far! :-?

Quote:
----- Again I recommend the Holocaust Book. Or even an article that I wrote called The Cleansing of the Sanctuary. To be honest, there is much that I could amend in this article, having seen much to add to this understanding of Israel and the church, in the past month or so, but it serves as a good primer.

I downloaded and have started to read the Holocaust book. It reminds me to pray for the writer to. Until joining SI, I never heard of him!

Quote:
----- ***It is possible that the churches very integrity could be made or broken over its comprehension of its place in this cosmic drama.*** To miss this, could mean to miss the very intention of God in His grafting of the Gentiles into His Hebrew vineyard.

You could be right there. A similar point is made in "the Future History of the Church" – that this was one of the 3 divisions that would come in the Church, and has already come. Joining SI has made me aware of this as never before!

Quote:
----- LittleGift wrote:

Quote:
----- The point is, are we ready for Jesus' return? rather than "how what when and where". Although I think we should have some idea of that too, so we can recognise what's going to happen when it does.

Just an addendum to my previous post, it isn't a matter of "how what when and where", but "why". To us has been given the mysteries, amongst them the mystery of Israel, that we may be stewards of them. It is a cop out to ignore the mysteries based on their "mysteriousness", for as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "who has known the mind of the Lord that we may instruct Him? But we have the mind of Christ."

To ignore the issue of Israel, and its component in eschatology, even to ignore eschatology itself, is to risk neglecting a component of what God has revealed to us by His Spirit. Could this constitute a possible "burying of the talent" that God has given to us? (Mat 25:24-30)

I don't quite understand what point you are making. Are you speaking generally here? Personally, I love seeing some thing of the "mystery" as the Lord reveals it to my heart – even if my *mind* takes a while catching up – let alone being to explain it to others! I'm certainly not aware of doing a "cop-out", or ignoring "the mysteries based on their "mysteriousness", or "neglecting a component of what God has revealed to us by His Spirit".

Quote:
-----The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.
Deut 29:29

AMEN! Except that this was, of course, originally spoken of physical Israel re the *written* Law. Although that doesn't of course exclude the rest of us. As is written, "to the Jew first".

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: (Mike), Definitions etc, on: 2007/6/2 14:36

LittleGift wrote:

Quote:
-----But, until the Lord returns, and *all* things are finally summed up in Him, there are two aspects to consider: two Israels, not one, two Jerusalems, not one, two chosen peoples, not one.

I'm beginning to believe that this is connected to an important spiritual principle of its own, that is much broader than the Israel question itself:

I started a new thread on this, because it is such a broad principle. "Binocular vision - Hebrews 11. https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=17225&post_id=134162&order=0&viewmode=flat&pid=0&forum=36#134162

Jeannette

P.S. Mike, It just occurred to me that saying "You are right of course" may have sounded a bit patronising. What I meant was that I agree with your answer to "what is a Jew"!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/6/2 16:25

Quote:
-----two chosen peoples, not one.

??

Ephesians 2.
" He made ONE new man out of the two." 2:16

... one body....

"One" seems to be a key word in Ephesians.

Who were the two spoken about in Ephesians?

Diane

Re:, on: 2007/6/2 16:44

Quote:

roadsign wrote:

Quote:

-----two chosen peoples, not one.

??

Ephesians 2.

" He made ONE new man out of the two." 2:16

... one body....

"One" seems to be a key word in Ephesians.

Who were the two spoken about in Ephesians?

Diane

The two spoken about in Ephesians are Jew and Gentile, one in Christ. Here the two groups are indeed one, as you say.

But what I called the two groups of "chosen" people are the physical and the spiritual. The spiritual people are those spoken of in Ephesians 2, the physical are the Jews. (Is it possible to belong to both categories? The answer maybe depends on one's definitions and use of words?)

The spiritual aspect is the greater of course, and the way of being "chosen" is the spiritual birth, rather than physical birth or religious protestantism mode of entry to the other category.

And for certain, as Ephesians says, there is no longer any "middle wall of partition" between born-again Jew and Gentile.

Hope that makes my meaning clear. It's sometimes difficult to know how to express things in words that make sense to others.

Blessings

jeannette

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/6/2 22:56

Romans 3:19-31 Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

The Law brings those that are under the Law to Christ. The Holy Spirit brings us to the knowledge of sin and to Christ. All have sinned and fall short of the Glory of God.

The Law cannot save to the utmost, only Christ can save and He nailed the Law to His Cross that all might be saved by Grace through Faith. That is the Jew by Faith and the Gentile through Faith. The Jew by their faith which originates in God and the Gentile through the Faith of Jesus Christ that is born again in us.

Galatians 2:14-17 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

The Jews were and are saved by repentance and believing in Christ and being baptized with water. Salvation by faith.

The Gentiles are saved by believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and through the Faith of Jesus Christ are born again by Incorruptable Seed which is Christ the Word of God. Salvation through Faith.

Romans 3:29-31 Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision (((by))) faith, and uncircumcision (((through)))

faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.
Yet in Christ there is neither Jew or Gentile, for we since the Cross are all baptized into one Spirit, not water.

1Cr 12:13 For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Jhn 3:5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter in to the kingdom of God.

The living water He wanted to give the woman at the well.

Jhn 4:10 Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.

Jhn 4:11 The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?

Jhn 7:38 He that believeth on Me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

The Incorruptable Seed of God the Father and river of Living Water Himself, Jesus Christ, that is our salvation, the mystery hidden until it was given to Paul by Jesus Christ Himself.

Colossians 1:26-28 Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

We are not Hebrew Christians. We are son's of God by the Christ-One that is in us, Christ-ones by The Son of God Himself, not Jews or Gentiles.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/6/3 0:30

Quote:
-----P.S. Mike, It just occurred to me that saying "You are right of course" may have sounded a bit patronising. What I meant was that I agree with your answer to "what is a Jew!"

No worriess ... never would have occured to me.

Re:, on: 2007/6/3 6:32

Quote:

Christinyou wrote:
Romans 3:19-31 Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

The Law brings those that are under the Law to Christ. The Holy Spirit brings us to the knowledge of sin and to Christ. All have sinned and fall short of the Glory of God.

The Law cannot save to the utmost, only Christ can save and He nailed the Law to His Cross that all might be saved by Grace through Faith. That is the Jew by Faith and the Gentile through Faith. The Jew by their faith which originates in God and the Gentile through the Faith of Jesus Christ that is born again in us.

Galatians 2:14-17 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

The Jews were and are saved by repentance and believing in Christ and being baptized with water. Salvation by faith.

The Gentiles are saved by believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and through the Faith of Jesus Christ are born again by Incorruptable Seed which is Christ the Word of God. Salvation through Faith.

Romans 3:29-31 Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision (((by))) faith, and uncircumcision (((through)))

faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.
Yet in Christ there is neither Jew or Gentile, for we since the Cross are all baptized into one Spirit, not water.

1Cr 12:13 For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Jhn 3:5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

The living water He wanted to give the woman at the well.

Jhn 4:10 Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.

Jhn 4:11 The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?

Jhn 7:38 He that believeth on Me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

The Incorruptable Seed of God the Father and river of Living Water Himself, Jesus Christ, that is our salvation, the mystery hidden until it was given to Paul by Jesus Christ Himself.

Colossians 1:26-28 Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

We are not Hebrew Christians. We are son's of God by the Christ-One that is in us, Christ-ones by The Son of God Himself, not Jews or Gentiles.

In Christ: Phillip

Hi Phillip

AMEN to all of that!

Just wondering though, are you responding to what I said, or to someone else, or in general?

I only ask because I get the impression that you maybe wrote this because you *think* you disagree with me 8-)

In fact you are talking about the most important (and also everlasting) of what I call "the two Israel's" - the spiritual one.

So I agree!

In Him

Jeannette

Re: , on: 2015/10/29 17:30

Diane always had such a good way of putting things.

"Am I sinning against anyone if I regard all who are saved, whether Jew or Gentile, as part of this kingdom and nothing else? And if God does have a special role for our Jewish friends in a future era, surely that he can take care of it. Surely we don't need to overly strain that issue. That just seems to get us into messy quagmire and rifts. How can we know who are genetically linked to Abraham? I may very well be. And with so many proselytes having been added to Judaism over the centuries, even during Bible days, I don't think we can easily make two distinct groups of people, apart from a lot of misfires. Why! I just read on a site where the New Jerusalem was "proven" to be the Bible Belt in the USA (Wouldn't that make Abraham groan!) "

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?forum=36&topic_id=15106&post_id=118884&viewmode=thread&order=0#118884

Re: , on: 2015/10/29 17:44

Why are you dragging up ancient posts to support your opinions that most Christians oppose?

Re: , on: 2015/10/29 17:56

I brought up a conciliatory remark from Diane, because I think we should remember that we love the Lord and each other.