

General Topics :: Jews Against Zionism

Jews Against Zionism, on: 2007/5/12 14:22

Yep, thats what I said. There are Jews that oppose the Jewish State. They claim that the Torah forbids the formation of a Jewish state, that they are to live among the nations, they are exiled by God because of disobedience. It was because of the holocaust that the European nations demanded a Jewish state be formed.

These people seem to know more than we do, sad to say.

Check out the link: scroll toward the bottom to listen.

(<http://www.nkusa.org/activities/Conferences/2006Dec12Iran.cfm>) Jews Against Zionism

Re: Jews Against Zionism, on: 2007/5/12 14:26

Compliments, brave of you to post this.

There is a difference between anti-zionism and anti-semitism.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/12 15:18

There have always been Jews who opposed Zionism. Some Jews have seen Nazi Genocide as God's punishment for trying to establish Zion without the Messiah.

However, these particular Jews are clearly the puppets of the Iranian propaganda machine.

Re:, on: 2007/5/13 16:37

Quote:

-----However, these particular Jews are clearly the puppets of the Iranian propaganda machine.

Their office is in New York.

Re:, on: 2007/5/14 16:20

In one sense this has nothing to do with the Jewish nation, or Zionism. It has *everything* to do with the faithfulness of God, in spite of human rebellion and unfaithfulness.

The question isn't whether Zionism is right or wrong but, **"Does God keep His word?"**

He said He would punish His people by exile, and He said He would bring them back again to the land He promised to Abraham, and would there speak to their hearts.

It is true, as this group maintains, that the Jewish people were exiled for their sins, especially of rejecting their own Messiah. (Yet the Lord used even that tragic fact to cause the Gospel to spill out to the nations, as He promised Abraham, "in you shall all the nations of the earth be blessed".)

There are prophecies that Israel would return to the land. Which has happened, exactly as He said, within living memory.

I don't see how this anti-Zionist group can understand and believe the first part of this but not the latter.

Have they read in their own Scriptures? For example, in Jeremiah 30:

“And it shall come to pass in that day, says the Lord of hosts, that I will break the yoke from off their neck, and I will burst their bonds, and strangers shall no more make servants of them. But they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them. “Then fear not, O Jacob my servant, says the Lord, nor be dismayed, O Israel; for I, I will save you from afar, and your offspring from the land of their captivity. **Jacob shall return** and have quiet and ease, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with you to save you, says the Lord; **I will make a full end of all the nations among whom I scattered you, but of you I will not make a full end.** I will chasten you in just measure, and I will by no means leave you unpunished...

Yes, I know there is a spiritual interpretation, that especially comes out in verses 8-9, and that "David" is the Lord Jesus, but there is ALSO a natural interpretation. There are things God has spoken about His natural people that are not yet completely fulfilled. (An obvious one is that the present State of Israel still seems to be as Godless and rebellious as any modern nation - although there is always a "faithful Remnant". Another is that the full extent of the land promised to Abraham has not been possessed)

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/14 16:28

Art Katz has an excellent book on the entire issue of the Jew in regard to the land and God's covenantal dealings with them entitled "The Holocaust: Where Was God?" Highly recommended.

Re: extent of the land, on: 2007/5/14 16:30

Quote:
-----Yes, I know there is a spiritual interpretation, that especially comes out in verses 8-9, and that "David" is the Lord Jesus, but there is ALSO a natural interpretation. There are things God has spoken about His natural people that are not yet completely fulfilled. (An obvious one is that the present State of Israel still seems to be as Godless and rebellious as any modern nation - although there is always a "faithful Remnant". ***Another is that the full extent of the land promised to Abraham has not been possessed***)

Genesis 15:18 On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, “To your descendant I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates

Deuteronomy 11:24

Every place on which the sole of your foot treads shall be yours; your territory shall be from the wilderness and Lebanon and from the River, the river Euphrates, to the western sea.

I'm not good at history or Geography but I don't think that even Solomon's empire stretched that far. His influence did, I think, but he didn't actually rule as far as the Euphrates.

Is that correct?

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/14 16:53

Hi Jeanette,

I noticed this reference to Euphrates not so long ago, and remembered it arises in Eden (Gen 2:14).

It is similar to the imagery in this reference to 'Adam'.

Joshua 3:16

the waters which came down from upstream stood *still, and* rose in a heap very far away at Adam, the city that *is* beside Zaretan. So the waters that went down into the Sea of the Arabah, the Salt Sea, failed, were cut off; and the people crossed over opposite Jericho.

I'm sure you've seen hymns with references to 'Eden repossessed' or similar.

There is something about both cities and rivers - of spiritual significance - which cannot be ignored, I believe.

This is not to say the land is not important, but Jesus Himself said His kingdom is not of this world, and had endless difficulty in communicating the concept to those who would claim they had already understood what God had said through the prophets.

Re: rivers, on: 2007/5/14 17:46

Quote:

dorcass wrote:

Hi Jeanette,

I noticed this reference to Euphrates not so long ago, and remembered it arises in Eden (Gen 2:14).

It is similar to the imagery in this reference to 'Adam'.

Joshua 3:16

the waters which came down from upstream stood *still, and* rose in a heap very far away at Adam, the city that *is* beside Zaretan. So the waters that went down into the Sea of the Arabah, the Salt Sea, failed, were cut off; and the people crossed over opposite Jericho.

I'm sure you've seen hymns with references to 'Eden repossessed' or similar.

There is something about both cities and rivers - of spiritual significance - which cannot be ignored, I believe.

This is not to say the land is not important, but Jesus Himself said His kingdom is not of this world, and had endless difficulty in communicating the concept to those who would claim they had already understood what God had said through the prophets.

Hi again Linn

I have avoided this subject for some time because we didn't seem to be getting anywhere with our "offline" discussion. Although I have continued to ponder and pray on the issue.

I am blessed that you do acknowledge the land may be important. I didn't think you would!

You said:

Quote:
-----Jesus Himself said His kingdom is not of this world, and had endless difficulty in communicating the concept to those who would claim

im they had already understood what God had said through the prophets

Indeed He did! But that doesn't mean denying or losing sight of the temporal aspects of Truth (not saying you do, but so me here may).

Both have to be held together in balance.

Man was created to be free of both natural and spiritual worlds. - A sort of hybrid - body, soul and spirit together in one individual - unlike the animals (body and soul?) and angels (soul and spirit but no body?) That's off topic, but i find it interesting!

As I said, the main issue to me, re Israel, is that **God must keep His Word - even to a stiffnecked and rebellious people** - as we all are, when left to ourselves!

Interesting comment on significance of rivers. Although I don't remember any hymns that speak of "Eden repossessed". The nearest I can think of is where it says (in "Jesus shall reign..."?)

*"...In Him the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost"*

The city "Adam" apparently isn't the same word as the man Adam, (looked it up once, the word means meadow or field if I remember). But the river is of course significant.

Mmmm Rivers could make a good study...

Just looked up Euphrates - the word means "fruitfulness" And Jordan is "descender"

"He who humbles himself shall be exalted"? Crossing Jordan is of course symbolic of "death to self". Significant that John baptized in the Jordan...

I'm not sure if the Eden mentioned re the Euphrates is the same as where the Garden of Eden was. Depends on the changes to the geography of the earth after the Flood, I suppose. Maybe that area was more or less preserved (though there must have been huge deposits of sediment that buried the original river) in spite of the Flood.

But that is a subject for another thread maybe.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/15 9:57

Jeanette said

Quote:

-----**God must keep His Word - even to a stiffnecked and rebellious people**

I can't ignore the 'if' with which God accompanied His word. In my understanding, the 'if' also counts as part of His intentions.

On the point of the city Adam, I interpret the piling up of the waters of Jordan ('descender') as something to do with a way being made *through* all the death (descent) due to the human race - right back to the man Adam.

I notice about Euphrates that it also carries the meaning of 'send her away' in Hebrew. At first sight this may not seem to be compatible with 'fruitfulness', but if it is something to do with Eve (the mother of all living), then in the same way as a tree is at its weakest when it is fruitbearing, so is a woman. All her strength is going into the body being formed in her,

just as the strength of the tree is poured into the fruit. For Eve, this did not happen till she had left the garden of Eden, when all her strength was poured into the next generation.

I notice Euphrates is also mentioned here:

Revelation 16:12

And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.

Your comment about how its course may have changed after the flood is interesting, but its source will not have changed. This is immaterial if God is going to dry it up, to make a highway for armies to advance northwestwards.

(http://encarta.msn.com/map_701512367/Euphrates.html) http://encarta.msn.com/map_701512367/Euphrates.html

(<http://www.biblestudy.org/maps/eurphrates-river-map.html>) <http://www.biblestudy.org/maps/eurphrates-river-map.html>

EDIT:

Jeremiah 51 (NKJV)

63 "Now it shall be, when you have finished reading this book, *that* you shall tie a stone to it and throw it out into the Euphrates.

64 "Then you shall say,

'Thus Babylon shall sink and not rise from the catastrophe that I will bring upon her. And they shall be weary.' " Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.

Re:, on: 2007/5/15 18:49

Quote:

-----Dorcas said:

Jeanette said

Quote:

God must keep His Word - even to a stiffnecked and rebellious people

Quote:

-----I can't ignore the 'if' with which God accompanied His word. In my understanding, the 'if' also counts as part of His intentions

You mean that some of His promises are conditional? But not all. The promise to Noah never again to bring an universal flood for example. I thought that the promise to Abraham re the land was of this kind, not conditional, no "if" Though I may be mistaken, will have to check...(it's getting a bit late to do it tonight)

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/17 7:38

Jeanette said

Quote:

----- thought that the promise to Abraham re the land was of this kind, not conditional

I agree, but, when they returned from Egypt, wasn't that God's word fulfilled?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/17 10:09

According to Wikipedia, Zionism is:

"national liberation movement, a political movement and an ideology that supports a homeland for the Jewish people in the Land of Israel, where the Jewish nation originated over 3,200 years ago and where Jewish kingdoms and self-governing states existed up to the 2nd century CE. While Zionism is based in part upon religious tradition linking the Jewish people to the Land of Israel, the modern movement was originally secular, beginning largely as a response to rampant anti-semitism in Europe during the 19th century. After a number of advances and setbacks, and after the Holocaust had destroyed Jewish society in Europe, the Zionist movement culminated in the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948."

I have no problem with Jews wanting a homeland. In fact, I strongly support Israel's right to exist. They are a strong ally of America and we should always support them in their time of need.

But spiritually speaking, I am very cautious when Christians use the Bible to support Zionism. Zion is mentioned in the OT many times referring to Jerusalem and specifically the area of the Temple, but in the New Testament we see that Zion is fulfilled in Jesus and the New Covenant.

Look at Hebrews 12:18-24 (NASB)

18For you have not come to a mountain that can be touched and to a blazing fire, and to darkness and gloom and whirlwind,

19and to the blast of a trumpet and the sound of words which sound was such that those who heard begged that no further word be spoken to them.

20For they could not bear the command, "IF EVEN A BEAST TOUCHES THE MOUNTAIN, IT WILL BE STONED."

21And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, "I AM FULL OF FEAR and trembling."

22But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels,

23to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of the righteous made perfect,

24and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood, which speaks better than the blood of Abel.

Did you see how the writer of Hebrews used Zion in verse 22, he used it in a spiritual way to refer to the New Covenant. He does the same thing with 'city of the living God' in calling it the 'heavenly Jerusalem'.

This modern form of Zionism is simply Jews wanting to reclaim their former Judaism and for some they don't even want that...they just want a country to live in run by Jews.

Why would we ever encourage anyone to reclaim their false religion? Specifically, why would Christians ever encourage Jews to reclaim their former ways under Judaism with a Temple, sacrifices and feasts...all those were fulfilled in Jesus.

Re:, on: 2007/5/17 19:02

Quote:

dorcass wrote:
Jeanette said

Quote:

----- thought that the promise to Abraham re the land was of this kind, not conditional

I agree, but, when they returned from Egypt, wasn't that God's word fulfilled?

Hi, only just noticed this.

I've been trying to look it up, but as usual time has beaten me, so excuse the lack of accurate Bible references)!

The territory promised to Abraham was (East to West) from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, and North to South from the Arabah to...?. I don't think Israel went as far as that under Joshua or in the time of the Judges or King Saul.

After the return from Egypt the conquest was only partial, *at least* until the time of David, and even then I'm not sure if it was complete.

David conquered an area near the Euphrates, or possibly as far as the river, when he defeated King Hadadrezar (1Chronicles 18) but it doesn't seem that this area has ever actually formed part of Israel proper - apparently this area was at most composed of vassal states. I don't know if this counts or not, as fulfillment of the original Promise. Personally I think not, but don't have enough information to be sure.

Maybe someone with a better memory for historical and geographical details can help clarify this?

Maybe it helps to notice that God said to Abraham that He had (already?) given him and his descendants this land as a *permanent* possession. Yet Abraham himself never actually possessed any of it, except for a burial plot, which he actually bought with money!

The spiritual significance of this is *huge*, (but off topic!)

in Him

Jeanette

Re:, on: 2007/5/17 20:15

Quote:

JaySayed wrote:

According to Wikipedia, Zionism is:

"national liberation movement, a political movement and an ideology that supports a homeland for the Jewish people in the Land of Israel, where the Jewish nation originated over 3,200 years ago and where Jewish kingdoms and self-governing states existed up to the 2nd century CE. While Zionism is based in part upon religious tradition linking the Jewish people to the Land of Israel, the modern movement was originally secular, beginning largely as a response to rampant antisemitism in Europe during the 19th century. After a number of advances and setbacks, and after the Holocaust had destroyed Jewish society in Europe, the Zionist movement culminated in the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948."

Hi Jay

It wouldn't be the first time in world history (nor will it be the last) where secular or pagan political forces are used by the Lord to carry out HIS plans. Cyrus in ancient times, and Winston Churchill during WWII, are examples of leaders who probably didn't know the Lord, yet He used them.

Quote:

-----I have no problem with Jews wanting a homeland. In fact, I strongly support Israel's right to exist. They are a strong ally of America

and we should always support them in their time of need.

IÂ'm not sure if I agree with this reason (which is political rather than spiritual!) for supporting them!

Quote:

-----But spiritually speaking, I am very cautious when Christians use the Bible to support Zionism.

It depends on how one defines "Zionism" (see below).

So you think that the spiritual truth of the New Covenant somehow cancels out God's promises to "Israel after the flesh"?

Why should it? Surely both truths can exist together, without the slightest conflict.

The superseding of the Old Covenant by the New concerns religious ritual, and the righteousness of God, wholly fulfilled in Jesus. I don't see how it has any bearing on the land question.

Quote:

----- Zion is mentioned in the OT many times referring to Jerusalem and specifically the area of the Temple, but in the New Testament we see that Zion is fulfilled in Jesus and the New Covenant.

But GodÂ's promise of the land is unaffected by this wonderful spiritual truth - as said above.

The word Zionism is surely only a convenient handle for the movement? You could just as well call it Jewish nationalism

Quote:

----- Look at Hebrews 12:18-24 (NASB)Â...

Did you see how the writer of Hebrews used Zion in verse 22, he used it in a spiritual way to refer to the New Covenant. He does the same thing with 'city of the living God' in calling it the 'heavenly Jerusalem'.

Of course, that's obvious! But how could that truth cancel God's promises concerning the land?

Quote:

-----This modern form of Zionism is simply Jews wanting to reclaim their former Judaism and for some they don't even want that...they just want a country to live in run by Jews.

ThatÂ's probably true, but what difference do their motives make?

Quote:

-----Why would we ever encourage anyone to reclaim their false religion? Specifically, why would Christians ever encourage Jews to reclaim their former ways under Judaism with a Temple, sacrifices and feasts...all those were fulfilled in Jesus.

I wouldn't want to encourage that either. If some Christians do so they are wrong.

I honestly donÂ't understand why you are connecting this with support of their claim to the land the Lord promised them! :-?

Personally I'm not interested in what form modern Zionism takes, whether it is right or wrong, or whether its proponents have a political or religious agenda or both. **All IÂ'm interested in is the fact that the Lord is going to fulfil His Word** concerning a stubborn and rebellious people, yet who are still Â– in some sense - His in a way that other peoples are not.

The New Covenant is on a different level, the spiritual. Of course, spiritual and physical interact, but emphasising this spiritual truth at the expense of Israel after the flesh, is like saying that we *already* have our resurrection bodies, or that the Millennium is already here, or Jesus has already come. (Full Preterists apparently believe this, but no-one else as far as I know!)

Spiritually the New Creation IS in the here and now, brought into being via the New Covenant, but not yet fully manifested

d. As Hebrews says, the Father *has* put all things under Jesus' feet, but we do not yet see all things under Him.

Spiritually it is only in Christ that Jews or anyone else can be part of God's true people, but physically and nationally Israel, and the land promised to Abraham, are still very significant and special – their very existence a witness to God's power upon earth, and His workings in the affairs of men.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/17 22:44

Very well stated LittleGift. As Art Katz has pointed out, the literal fulfillment of the prophecies regarding Israel in the land has chiefly to do with the glory of God. For such will be a tangible expression of God's glory, as through Christ He will rule the nations with a rod of iron, with Jerusalem being exalted above all nations with all the nations bringing their glory in to it.

For such will demonstrate that He indeed is the faithful God who has mercy upon whom He has mercy. And one of the chief expressions of that mercy is that He has elected one nation out of all the nations of the world to inherit a certain geographical piece of land. And for what reason? As He says time and time again, for no reason whatsoever. For it was not that Abraham or his descendants were great people. Far from it, they were the least of peoples. But God chose the weak and despised thing, the very thing that nobody else would choose, and chose to exalt them and give them these promises which He intends to keep.

This also says much of God's sovereignty and His lordship. For we as the nations have been deceived into thinking we draw the borders on the map. But God has said no, that He shall have none of this. But rather, it is He who has authority alone to do this. It is He alone who determines the nations, their locations, and their durations. He is the one in control.

And the tangible expression of His position as Lord of all the earth is that He has decided that the descendants of Abraham shall dwell forever in the land that the Canannite, Hittite, Ammorite, Jebusite, etc., all thought as theirs. But boy, were they ever in for a rude surprise when the armies of Israel crossed the Jordan! Can you imagine it? It would be as if I knocked on my next door neighbors house tomorrow morning and said, "Excuse me, God has determined I am to live here." My neighbor would surely protest, and not leave without a fight. But you know what, if God is indeed the Lord of the whole earth, then He alone has authority to determine these things.

Amen!

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/18 10:28

Jeanette said

Quote:

-----Yet Abraham himself never actually possessed any of it, except for a burial plot, which he actually bought with money!

So, when Abram went on his initial journey, had children; eventually Jacob's sons sold Joseph into Egypt, where do you think they were living?

I have always been under the impression that Abram literally walked into the land, and to all intents and purposes, it was his. OF COURSE he didn't have a big enough company to spread out over the whole area, but, he lived in peace there.

More, he was not interested in the possession as modern Israelis are today, according (again) to the writer of the Hebrews in 11:10 for he waited for the city which has foundations, whose builder and maker God.

Re: Abraham's possession of the land?, on: 2007/5/18 17:03

Quote:

dorcass wrote:
Jeanette said

Quote:

-----Yet Abraham himself never actually possessed any of it, except for a burial plot, which he actually bought with money!

So, when Abram went on his initial journey, had children; eventually Jacob's sons sold Joseph into Egypt, where do you think they were living?

I have always been under the impression that Abram literally walked into the land, and to all intents and purposes, it was his. OF COURSE he didn't have a big enough company to spread out over the whole area, but, he lived in peace there.

My point was that he didn't *own* the land - except for the burial plot. He sojourned there, travelling around, as a nomad and a hieftan, much, I imagine, as the Bedouin do today. None of the rest of the land was actually his, though he walked in it and lived in it and believed in the God Who had given it as a *permanent possession* (Genesis 17:8, 48:4).

Quote:

-----More, he was not interested in the possession as modern Israelis are today, according (again) to the writer of the Hebrews in 11:10 for he waited for the city which has foundations, whose builder and maker God.

Surely Abraham was interested in the fulfillment of God's promise, for His glory, as both I and King Jimmy have said. No one is denying the spiritual truths of the New Birth and "Jerusalem above". But Abraham also believed in God, who promised a literal, physical land as a possession for his literal, physical descendants!

Why do you have a problem with that aspect of what God said?

This fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham has both spiritual and physical aspects. Both are true, not just one. To focus on either the physical or the spiritual aspect at the expense of the other is error. Some Christians and Jews, as you have said, err in emphasising the physical aspect, as if Jesus hadn't died to set us free from the Law, and bring Jew and Gentile together into His Kingdom. Others err in denying the physical aspect, as if only the spiritual existed.

God is God of the whole *earth*, not only the spiritual realms, or spiritual truths. Physical and spiritual interact, none is complete without taking the other into account also.

If you concentrate on the spiritual aspect and ignore or deny the physical you are dangerously near the Gnostic idea that matter is of no importance at all, or even evil.

I hope this hasn't been put too harshly, it's not meant that way, but it does concern me very deeply that some Christians seem unable to appreciate that the issue of Israel and the Jews is to do primarily with GOD - His Word, His honour, His glory.

Remember how Moses pleaded His honor when God threatened to destroy the people because of their rebellion? (Exodus 32:9-13)

I think that the denial of His Word concerning His earthly people is also a form of antisemitism, if only a mild form; but the central issue is that GOD HAS SAID...

Yours in Him

Jeanette

Re:, on: 2007/5/18 17:15

Quote:

-----I said:...the issue of Israel and the Jews is to do primarily with GOD - His Word, His honour, His glory.

Remember how Moses pleaded His honor when God threatened to destroy the people because of their rebellion? (Exodus 32:9-13)

Looking at this reference again I think it's a key to so much:

﻿9﻿ And the Lord said to Moses, "I have seen this people, and behold, it is a stiff-necked people; ﻿10﻿ now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; but of you I will make a great nation."

﻿11﻿ But Moses besought the Lord his God, and said, "O Lord, why does thy wrath burn hot against thy people, whom thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? ﻿12﻿ Why should the Egyptians say, 'With evil intent did he bring them forth, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth'? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. ﻿13﻿ **Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou didst swear by thine own self, and didst say to them, 'I will multiply your descendants as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants, and they shall inherit it for ever.'**" And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do to his people.

(Revised Standard Version)

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/19 15:48

Hi Jeanette,

Quote:

-----and they shall inherit it for ever.

This is the end of Exodus 32:13.

I'm going to re-open an old thread of mine on whether there is a difference between 'for ever' and 'everlasting', which philologos kindly answered.

I notice that Young chooses 'and they have inherited to the age;' This is more in keeping with my understanding; namely, that the earth will end. Now, where will 'Israel' the country be, in the new earth?

I still feel there is a great deal of scripture to be explored to account for the many times God refers to the 'whole' world.

KingJimmy's allusion to 'the nations', does not necessarily imply a lot of separate countries. That is what we are used to on the earth today, but, there is no reason to assume, during a time of world peace, that national boundaries would either be of importance, or, that people of one nation or another, would be required to live on the land associated with their nationality.

In the background of this discussion is the truth of Ruth and Rahab in the genealogy of Christ, and the fact that any gentile could become a Jew by joining themselves to their religious practices.

Also, I am continually noticing how Paul, again and again, changes the terms of engagement under the New Covenant, from what they were under the Old. From 'He is a Jew who is one inwardly' to 'children of Abraham' being those who 'believe', there are many other claims he makes, which I find militating against hanging on too hard, to ANYTHING from the Old Covenant.

But I'm listening. I do know that when anyone posts something in this discussion which hits my spirit as 'the truth', I will receive it. But so far, all I hear is words that have passed their use-by date. And this is not a form of anti-semitism. Jews have only one way into the blessing of God, and that is through faith in Christ Jesus. This is the thesis in Romans 9.

They can reclaim the land in hope, but they will die misbelieving, if without Him.

I have a lot more Old Testament reading to do before I can adequately expand with Bible verses to back up my reasoning.

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/20 10:42

Here is the thread

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id6425&post_id132002&order0&viewmodeflat&pid0&forum36#132002) 'Is 'everlasting' meaningfully different from 'eternal'?'

I've put a question there.

(Moderator edit: Reconfigured the link here to make the page more presentable)

Re:, on: 2007/5/22 18:14

Hi Linn

I have been wondering whether to respond to your recent post or not, as I don't want to get back into arguing mode! You seem to keep misunderstanding where I'm coming from, and I don't know what to do about it!

Disagreements I can usually cope with but complete misunderstanding I can't :(And there are at least three misunderstandings in the one post!

Anyway, here's an attempt to respond to the first two parts (and at least one of the misunderstandings) of your post.

Quote:

-----Dorcas said:

Quote:

and they shall inherit it for ever.

This is the end of Exodus 32:13.

I'm going to re-open an old thread of mine on whether there is a difference between 'for ever' and 'everlasting', which philologos kindly answered.

I notice that Young chooses 'and they have inherited to the age;' This is more in keeping with my understanding; namely, that the earth will end. Now, where will 'Israel' the country be, in the new earth?

I haven't looked at that thread yet, but think that for ever - literally "unto the age" as you said - is probably used more loosely in Scripture than our English concept of "forever". In the Scriptural context it probably means while the earth *in its present form* remains. As God said after the Flood; that the seasons, and day and night, will not cease "while the earth remains". Yet John saw that in the New Jerusalem there is no night!

So the simple answer to your question "where will 'Israel' the country be, in the new earth?" is "I don't know, because all will be changed."

But I thought this thread was about Israel *in the present time*, while this old earth still exists, and before Jesus returns. So why bring up the question of the new earth?

Quote:

----- "In the background of this discussion is the truth of Ruth and Rahab in the genealogy of Christ, and the fact that any gentile could become a Jew by joining themselves to their religious practices.

I'm not sure where this fits in. Even to begin a discussion on "Who exactly is a Jew?" depends on whether we're talking about the natural or the spiritual. The answer to the spiritual question is easy, and one you would agree on, (Romans 2:28-29 "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is circumcision that which is outward in the flesh; 29 but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the letter")

But the natural question is more difficult, I'm not sure of the answer. Perhaps it's a bit like the question "Who is an American?" Many nations have emigrated to the States over many years, yet they are now all Americans!

Who belongs to "spiritual Israel" isn't in dispute, and isn't the issue under discussion, as far as I know.

The question of who comprises the nation of Israel, or what exactly makes a person a Jew in the natural, is relevant, but maybe not vital to the discussion of "Zionism" etc?

Ruth and Rahab, as far as I can understand, came to belong to both natural and spiritual Israel - true believers in the God of Israel but also absorbed into the Jewish nation.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: "everlasting", on: 2007/5/22 18:30

Quote:

dorcias wrote:

Here is the thread 'Is 'everlasting' meaningfully different from 'eternal'?'

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id6425&post_id132002&order0&viewmodeflat&pid0&forum36#132002) 'Is 'everlasting' meaningfully different from 'eternal'?'

I've put a question there.

Just had a look at the thread, some good comments, that I'd like to look at when its not so late at night.

The thought that eternal is essentially different to everlasting... Yes, I suppose it has to be, as "everlasting" is bound by time and space, while eternal isn't...

But, as said, I don't think it's relevant to the subject of this thread!

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/23 7:52

Hi Jeanette,

Quote:
-----In the Scriptural context it probably means while the earth in its present form remains. As God said after the Flood; that the seasons, and day and night, will not cease "while the earth remains". Yet John saw that in the New Jerusalem there is no night!

So the simple answer to your question "where will 'Israel' the country be, in the new earth?" is "I don't know, because all will be changed."

It is a pleasure to agree on this, with you.

The reason I bring up the matter of the new earth is that there are Christians who do not believe it in the 'new earth'. They don't believe '.. earth' will flee 'away at His presence', or

Psalm 102

25 Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens *are* the work of thy hands.

26 **They shall perish**, but thou shalt endure: yea, **all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed:**

27 But thou *art* the same, and thy years shall have no end.

28 The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee.

So, when I'm writing on the internet, I like to make clear as much as possible of my thesis, because I believe it's important for everything to cross-reference as much as possible within scripture.

This is the main reason I don't see the modern Israel as more than men's attempts to bring fulfilment a word of God which is mainly of carnal significance in this day. Of course God knew there would be a modern Israel. Of course He is still waiting for all who should be saved to be saved from amongst those who consider themselves Jews (of whatever origin). Of course He is defending His Name, whether in Israel or elsewhere. But, He does it according to His own counsel. That's why more Christians are dying for Christ today than in any other century. This is *not* what a carnal man would call 'salvation'. Just as the 'Israel' which exists in territorial terms is a distinctly different one from that proclaimed by the writer of Hebrews in chapter 11.

A huge amount of prophecy is being fulfilled through the existence of the modern Israel, but I believe the interpretation of its existence is not necessarily the fulfilment of the much quoted promise that Abraham's descendants would return to the land God promised him.

I also believe there is a huge amount of emotional flotsam and jetsam around the matter of Israel's existence, which is borne out of the rejection of Christ by 'His own', and the fact that observant Jews are brought up on a studied misinterpretation of their own scriptures, which leaves them ill-equipped (like those of us who have no such background) to comprehend the gospel apart from the Holy Spirit's enlightenment.

I've run out of time on this session, but I've said enough anyway.

Thanks for continuing to engage on this, as it is definitely an important matter to dig out of scripture with as much coherence as is possible.

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 13:06

Quote:

----- Dorcas said: It is a pleasure to agree on this, with you.

The reason I bring up the matter of the new earth is that there are Christians who do not believe it in the 'new earth'. They don't believe '.. earth' will flee 'away at His presence'

Hi

It would be far less confusing if you only disagreed with what I actually said, not with what I didn't say! :-?

Wouldn't it?

I'm glad we agree on something too, but still get the impression that you are not actually *hearing* what is being said (although I'm sure you are listening, or trying to listen). Perhaps you are fixing your attention so much on what *others* have thought on this subject, and missing what I'm saying? As you said above, "there are Christians who do not believe it in the 'new earth'", but I happen not to be one of them!

Can't we leave "them" to get on with it and just discuss the present issues? Especially as I keep thinking you are arguing against me when maybe you aren't!

And where is everyone else? For example, I wanted some feedback on the question of whether the promise to Abraham

m re the land had been fulfilled yet or not. Because that is the one thing I know of that might convince me that God has already fulfilled all His promises to "Israel after the flesh" after all.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/24 16:57

LittleGift said

Quote:

-----It would be far less confusing if you only disagreed with what I actually said, not with what I didn't say!

Wouldn't it?

Put another way, if I say something which you agree with, why comment on it at all? :-?

Quote:

-----I wanted some feedback on the question of whether the promise to Abraham re the land had been fulfilled yet or not. Because that is the one thing I know of that might convince me that God has already fulfilled all His promises to "Israel after the flesh" after all.

I'm working on it.... ;-)

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 17:12

Quote:

dorcas wrote:
LittleGift said

Quote:

-----It would be far less confusing if you only disagreed with what I actually said, not with what I didn't say!

Put another way, if I say something which you agree with, why comment on it at all? :-?

I don't understand what you mean! It's not to do with whether we agree or not...

What I was trying to say is that it's confusing if you, in a reply to me, argue against a position I don't actually hold! Such as the one mentioned in the last message, about the new heavens and new earth.

Or if you state something that I already believe and understand and agree with you on, as if I *don't* believe or understand or agree! Such as the New Covenant.

Someone else - *please* help us to understand one another!!!

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 17:16

Quote:

-----Someone else - please help us to understand one another!!!

Girls, Welcome to Christianity :-P

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 18:29

Quote:
-----LittleGift wrote:
What I was trying to say is that it's confusing if you, in a reply to me, argue against a position I don't actually hold! Such as the one mentioned in the last message, about the new heavens and new earth.

Or if you state something that I already believe and understand and agree with you on, as if I *don't* believe or understand or agree! Such as the New Covenant.

For example, from that previous post:

Quote:
-----You said: Also, I am continually noticing how Paul, again and again, changes the terms of engagement under the New Covenant, from what they were under the Old. From 'He is a Jew who is one inwardly' to 'children of Abraham' being those who 'believe', there are many other claims he makes, which I find militating against hanging on too hard, to ANYTHING from the Old Covenant.

Who's hanging on to anything from the Old Covenant? I'm not, and haven't noticed anyone else on this thread or similar ones, doing that.

I carefully avoid using the word "covenant" in this connection, for this very reason that the Old Covenant is fulfilled and ended in Jesus. Isn't that what you would also say?

I don't mind you saying it, but why keep saying it as if I don't know it and you have to explain it to me?

Quote:
-----Jews have only one way into the blessing of God, and that is through faith in Christ Jesus. This is the thesis in Romans 9. They can reclaim the land in hope, but they will die misbelieving, if without Him.

Of course, who is disputing the fact?

It's not really anything to do with the blessing, or otherwise, of God, but everything to do with the fact that God keeps His Word, no matter what man does!

If He has said something then it will come to pass. To me that is the only issue worth discussing!

The only relevant questions therefore are: **what exactly has God said re "Israel after the flesh", and has it fully and finally come to pass yet?**

On this hinges whether modern-day "Zionism" is in any way justified or not - in its aims if not its methods.

By the way: Abraham used the wrong method to fulfill God's promise when he took Hagar to wife; but the Lord fulfilled His promise anyway.

With us or without us, God always keeps His Word.

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 18:33

Quote:

Compliments wrote:

Quote:

-----Someone else - please help us to understand one another!!!

Girls, Welcome to Christianity :-P

That's all very well, and thanks for popping in again (after all you started this thread!)

But is this helpful? :-P

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/25 16:55

LittleGift asked

Quote:

-----what exactly has God said re "Israel after the flesh", and has it fully and finally come to pass yet?

I realise that 'Israel after the flesh' is not a much-used phrase in scripture. It appears here:

1 Corinthians 10:18

Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

In Paul's time, 'Israel after the flesh' was not saved by partaking from the sacrifices of the altar, and he longed for them to come into the adoption (Rom 9:4).

The phrase 'Israel after the flesh' has been used by others (than Paul), and I think you are using it in this (modern) way also. This means something very different from Paul, and wrests it away from its scriptural context.

Please, you'll have to bear with what I express in response. :-)

When I hear the name 'Israel', I first of all think of Jacob, the man of flesh, whom God re-named after his encounter with Him, Israel - a prince. Then, I think of the spiritual man rather than the man of flesh. So when I get to 'Israel after the flesh', I think of those descendents of Israel - the spiritual man - who hoped to inherit the promises made to him through Isaac.

What I have not determined in my own mind from scripture yet, is whether these promises retained the one to Abraham about the land. After all, not only did Abraham live there, but his descendents have already returned there once. This is the big story of the first few books of the Bible. But, not only were they not the 'generation' which left Egypt, but they did not appreciate the importance of driving out all the inhabitants of the land, so as to possess it fully.

I take this as an indicator of the impossibility of the task to fallen man and also see it as the reason they imagined this is what the Messiah would come to do. When He came, and did not, I think we are left with a real question about whether God, having given something better - the kingdom of God within believers - believes there is any more for Him to do in respect of 'the land'. Having said this, I do accept all prophecy about His (Jesus') return, and Jerusalem being the place He has chosen on earth.

(NKJV) Hebrews 1:1 - 4

God, who at various times and in various ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by *His* Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of *His* glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when

He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become so much better than the angels, as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

I confess I had not noticed your *not* using the word 'covenant'. So then, if you are not considering *old* Israel's return to Abraham's land as the fulfilment of God's covenant with Abraham, in what context do you see it?

(As far as I can gather, you see it as something separate from the New Covenant, from all you *have* said....) Please clarify this.

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/26 5:30

Hi Jeanette,

I know you have not had time to answer my last post, but overnight, something about Abraham only owning a burial plot in the land, connected with another scripture I noticed a while back. It is this:

Genesis 50:2

And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father. So the physicians embalmed Israel.

Here are three more portions of scripture which make me wonder what God meant when He promised Abraham his descendants would be given a land which he had not yet seen, and which, Paul strongly implies, link the fulfilment of this to the New Covenant.

Galatians 3:1

O foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed among you as crucified?

2 This only I want to learn from you: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

3 Are you so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are you now being made perfect by the flesh?

4 Have you suffered so many things in vain -- if indeed *it* was in vain?

5 Therefore He who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you, *does He do it* by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? --

6 just as Abraham "believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."

7 Therefore know that those who are of faith are sons of Abraham.

Romans 4

11 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,

12 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.

13 For the promise that he would be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

Galatians 4

28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac *was*, are children of promise.

29 But, as he who was born according to the flesh then persecuted him *who was born according to the Spirit*, even so *it is* now.

30 Nevertheless what does the Scripture say? "Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman."

31 So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free.

Please, therefore, answer with your context for Abraham's descendants inheriting geographical Israel - apart from the C

hurch.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/27 14:15

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

As Art Katz has pointed out, the literal fulfillment of the prophecies regarding Israel in the land has chiefly to do with the glory of God. For such will be a tangible expression of God's glory, as through Christ He will rule the nations with a rod of iron, with Jerusalem being exalted above all nations with all the nations bringing their glory into it.

For such will demonstrate that He indeed is the faithful God who has mercy upon whom He has mercy. And one of the chief expressions of that mercy is that He has elected one nation out of all the nations of the world to inherit a certain geographical piece of land.

(The above quote is from KingJimmy's post early in this thread.)

Excuse me for slipping in here at this late point with a comment.

Why, then, does the Holy Spirit say in one of the New Covenant apostles, "But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly..." (Heb. 11.12)?

Not an earthly homeland, but "a Heavenly."

All that truth that God sowed to Abraham and Israel, He sowed it in seed form. What is the fruit of that seed? The Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of the Heavens. The New Creation.

"The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" (Lk. 16.16).

You mean God is unfaithful then? He promised them that earthly piece of geography and now He's going back on His word? No, far from it. "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. 15.46). When God brings forth and gives the fruit of the seed He planted, and which He intended in giving the seed, He is anything but unfaithful.

We-- both Jew and Gentile-- are living in New Covenant days. It is a spiritual reality-- the Kingdom of the Heavens (which God has ordained to fill the Heavens and the whole earth as well)-- that the promises to Abraham and His Seed spoke of.

I wish we all could be as bold and as brave as the apostles were, and accept their interpretation of the Old Testament scriptures. All Old Testament scriptures are to be interpreted and understood in the greater light of the New.

For example, I am a Gentile. But I am of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I am therefore of the seed of Abraham. "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. 3.7).

You mean then that that land over there is mine? That physical land? (Or a little postage stamp parcel of it, at least.) You have to agree with this logic. Because God promised that land to the seed of Abraham. "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made..." (Gal. 3.16). And I because of my faith am of the seed of Abraham.

But the apostle says this Seed speaks of Christ. "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (3.16).

That land is Christ's land, and those who are in Him.

But what, really, is this speaking of? According to the apostles, it is speaking of our heritage in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus, of the Kingdom of God, of the New Creation, and it is for the Jew and the Gentile together. For because of what our Lord Jesus Christ accomplished at the cross, there is now NO DIFFERENCE between Jew and Gentile (Rom. 3.22, 10.12, Eph. 2.15, Acts 15.9).

I know we find that hard to believe. What about that great edifice of theology that has been constructed by certain teachers who hold otherwise? But I think I'm going to go out on a limb, and believe the apostles, and build on the foundation of the apostles. No difference, they clearly say. "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" (Rom. 10.12). God has the same riches of His grace and glory for both.

For, either He has that little land of Palestine, that little piece of geography, for both Jew and Gentile believers (both being the seed of Abraham) or... He has ANOTHER, a Heavenly heritage, for both Jew and Gentile believer. Which, then, is the correct view?

God is not cross-eyed, as some of our teachers try to persuade us, one eye operating independently of the other: that He has one purpose for the Jews, and another for the Church (which has wrongly come to be considered a Gentile institution). No, God has binocular vision: With "both" eyes He sees one purpose for all the Seed of Abraham, whether Jew or Gentile, creating in Himself of twain one new man, and giving them together the whole of a NEW CREATION of the Heavens and the earth... "which things the angels desire to look into!" For, it's "the meek" (whether Jew or Gentile) who "shall inherit the earth."

So Jesus, help us Lord, to come up higher, and to see Thy purposes from a higher vantage point. The old creation, and the old creation man, is decaying and crumbling all around us right before our eyes. Grace our eyes to see, Lord! Anoint our eyes with eyesalve, dear Lord, that we might SEE-- whether beloved Jew or beloved Gentile-- might see the New Man, and his new heritage in the Kingdom of God... NEW heavens and a NEW earth, "in which righteousness is at home." Amen.

AD

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/27 15:31

Quote:

Why, then, does the Holy Spirit say in one of the New Covenant apostles, "But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly..." (Heb. 11.12)?

Without attempting to go point-by-point through your message, I'll just express my general concern with what you have said. Nowhere in the New Testament is the thought of a heavenly inheritance divorced from a geographical association. The heavenly city is indeed a heavenly city that will be manifest here on the earth... "thy kingdom come thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

Our heavenly hope is not some ghostly pie-in-the-sky inheritance way off yonder. As Revelation 20-22 makes it quite clear, our heavenly hope will find its expression here on earth. This heavenly hope will have a tangible manifestation here on earth, with Jerusalem as the capital of the world. From there Christ will reign over the nations, and believers with Him. Such is why Christ says that when the rewards are given, some will rule over 10 cities and another 5. These will be actual cities in the world.

edit We must be careful when interpreting the New Testament not to interpret it in such a way so as to render the promises made to the Old Testament fathers to be null and void through some ghostly spiritualized interpretation- an interpretation the apostles never dreamed of or taught. Our hope is heavenly because there is no way for the literal promises of the prophets to be fulfilled apart from the realities of heaven being established in the earth.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/28 1:20

Hi Jimmy...

(I hope my interruption won't prevent Linn and Jeannette from carrying on their conversation. My apologies again.)

But first, let me say that, as someone who just very recently was a newcomer to this site, and feeling my way around, you were one of the first I felt I made a connection with, Jimmy. And I much appreciated that. It was on your thread about there being no denominations in Heaven. I found I was agreeing fully with what you were saying. I was glad.

One of the most cherished hopes of my heart is to see the Day when true brethren "dwell together in unity." I don't mean by compromising, or by agreeing to disagree, or by the false ecumenical unity (so-called) that's gaining such momentum these days, but rather because we have entered together fully into the Lordship and Mind of Christ. And I fully believe our Lord Jesus Christ has the power to bring this to pass. In fact it's integral to the New Covenant, and I believe He is working diligently to bring His people into this One Mind, till there shall go forth One Sound from the mouth of Christ... "like the Voice of many waters." It's THIS, we are told in John 17, that will cause the world to believe.

But here's an area here, where it's plain we are not in agreement. I went out for a while earlier and prayed about it. Lord, what am I to do? Is it scriptural debate You want me to get into at this time?

And I felt I was to just let it go for now. Not that I have any question about what I put forth on my post, and there is much more I could bring forth along that line. It's just that... I am so hungry for God these days, for the Living God, for His Presence... not just because of my own afflictions: I need Him so deeply in my life for the sake of those around me... and where IS He?

Like Job. "O that I knew where I might find Him! ...Behold, I go forward, but He is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him: On the left hand, where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him: He hideth Himself on the right hand, and I cannot see Him..."

I want to SEE Him!

I want to be a Finder, not just a Seeker!

But (for me, anyway) the relationship I'm longing for with Him, it's become such a difficult thing to find. Such a difficult thing. So much so that sometimes I feel like just giving it all up. I know I can't do that. I pray He won't let me do that. But I think it comes almost as a temptation to me to just bury myself in good religious things, in Bible study and Scriptural debate and exegesis and so on, all things which I love dearly.

But is that where I am going to meet God? Is that what God is looking for from me at this time? Am I filling my life with those things when He is saying, "Seek ye My face"? When He is saying, "Listen for the Whispers of My Spirit, and obey My Spirit: He alone can lead you to the Desire of your heart"?

So... see where I'm at? Where is MY Peniel? I desperately need a new encounter with God. I'm so hungry for this. And that's the one thing I hold tight to: if the hunger for this is in my heart, I have to believe He has it for me. "Blessed are those who do hunger and thirst after (the God of) Righteousness, for they shall be filled."

...We live in such dark days. I believe this means there is before us a Great Light about to shine. There is going to be such an illumination of Truth as never before in the history of the Church. In that Light we shall see light, and be of one mind. I am sure of it.

Sorry if I am kind of off topic here. But I pray the Lord bless you, brother, (and all of you) and meet you in your seeking.

AD

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/28 6:41

ADisciple,

Thank you much for your Christ like character :) Blessings to you as well.

Re:, on: 2007/5/30 13:55

Quote:

dorcass wrote:
LittleGift asked

Quote:

-----what exactly has God said re "Israel after the flesh", and has it fully and finally come to pass yet?

I realise that 'Israel after the flesh' is not a much-used phrase in scripture. It appears here:

1 Corinthians 10:18
Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

In Paul's time, 'Israel after the flesh' was not saved by partaking from the sacrifices of the altar, and he longed for them to come into the adoption (Rom 9:4).

The phrase 'Israel after the flesh' has been used by others (than Paul), and I think you are using it in this (modern) way also. This means something very different from Paul, and wrests it away from its scriptural context.

Hi again

Still haven't had time, or the mental and spiritual concentration, to answer your recent posts, so just a quick reply to this.

You don't think I should use the expression "Israel after the flesh" in this context? So I'll say "physical Israel" (as opposed to spiritual Israel) instead.

Is that OK?

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/30 19:22

LittleGift said

Quote:
-----You don't think I should use the expression "Israel after the flesh" in this context? So I'll say "physical Israel" (as opposed to spiritual Israel) instead.

Hi Jeanette,

It's ok for you to wait till you have time and energy.

This topic has been discussed in different ways here (on SI) before. I hadn't thought about it properly - by which I mean, really thinking through what I meant by - for instance - 'Israel' - or, 'the Jews'.

I'm still not quite sure what those terms mean in scripture, and I know 'the Jews' has come to mean a much larger group than just those physically descended from Abraham. This is one reason I have questions about who *you* mean should have a right to live in the land now called Israel.

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

Quote:

dorcass wrote:

LittleGift said

Quote:

-----You don't think I should use the expression "Israel after the flesh" in this context? So I'll say "physical Israel" (as opposed to spiritual Israel) instead.

Hi Jeanette,

It's ok for you to wait till you have time and energy.

This topic has been discussed in different ways here (on SI) before. I hadn't thought about it properly - by which I mean, really thinking through what I meant by - for instance - 'Israel' - or, 'the Jews'.

I'm still not quite sure what those terms mean in scripture, and I know 'the Jews' has come to mean a much larger group than just those physically descended from Abraham. This is one reason I have questions about who *you* mean should have a right to live in the land now called Israel.

I'm not sure about the last point either, but, as I said before, it may be something like the fact that we all see ourselves as having a national, cultural or racial identity, even when our actual racial origins are mixed. The USA is a prime example of many races and nationalities coming into one nation. Indeed, a nation more conscious of their national identity than most!

With Jewish people there's also the religious identity. The question whether someone who forsakes Judaism is still a "proper" Jew, or someone who comes fully into Judaism from another race is a Jew.

Maybe circumcision, being the special covenant sign with Abraham, is the criterium, but that would include Arabs etc, (descended from Abraham, but not by Sarah) and exclude women, so that doesn't quite fit either!

But I'm not sure if it makes any big difference to what's being discussed. Because *God knows who they are*, (physical AND spiritual "Israel") even if we don't. And that's the important thing. Spiritual Israel is the greater, and lasting Truth, (though I can't accept that it therefore negates the present reality of physical Israel).

There was always an element of this, spiritual, Israel - the true nation, faithful to the Lord - even in OT times. God even threatened to destroy everyone else and make Moses' family only, into the great nation He had purposed (Exodus 32:10).

Indeed the majority of the unfaithful part of the nation was lost when the Assyrians invaded. The "faithful remnant" of the ten tribes had already joined with the southern kingdom of Judah, (rejecting golden calf worship) at the time of the split through Jeroboam, and afterwards.

I hope to get around to answering other posts here tonight, but there was one thought I can mention, that came when "chewing on" this subject yet again.

I realised that one of the keys to understanding Scripture (this and other topics, especially eschatology (Last Days) is to understand something of ***the relationship between time and eternity, and how one affects and also doesn't affect, the other.***

Not saying I understand this very well either, but am pondering, as I think it's very relevant to the misunderstandings we've had, (also expressed by AD and others) and to the understanding of the subject discussed here.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/31 6:14

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

You don't think I should use the expression "Israel after the flesh" in this context? So I'll say "physical Israel" (as opposed to spiritual Israel) instead.

Is that OK?

Perhaps I might be at little extreme, but is anyone else reminded of Gnosticism by this distinction between physical and spiritual? Can physical and spiritual truly be separated? Aren't there both carnal and spiritual elements to both Gentile and Hebrew believers?

It is easy to lose sight of the distinctions between Gentile and Jew in Scripture. The same passage that tells us that there is no difference between Jew and Greek in Christ, also says that there is no male or female. Would we carry through with this logic and suggest a "neutering of gender" as well? Of course not.

Perhaps there is a deeper meaning to the whole "Spiritual Israel" that sits beneath the surface of the obvious. I offer this merely as a consideration.

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 7:17

Quote:

CJaKfOrEsT wrote:

...Perhaps I might be at little extreme, but is anyone else reminded of Gnosticism by this distinction between physical and spiritual? Can physical and spiritual truly be separated? Aren't there both carnal and spiritual elements to both Gentile and Hebrew believers?...

I am reminded very much of the Gnostic idea that the spiritual is the only thing that really exists, and that the physical is merely a "shadow", either non-existent or of no account or even evil in itself.

I think we would almost all agree that the OT ritual and sacrificial systems are now obsolete, having been fulfilled in Christ, (the writer to the Hebrews uses the philosophical concept of "shadow and substance" in explaining this).

But to assume that therefore *all* is fulfilled, including God's purposes for physical Israel, does not follow.

Especially because of the miraculous survival of the Jews as a nation, in exile for nearly 2,000 years, and their return to the land. (Even if it was through the misguided zeal of certain parties to bring about the fulfillment of prophecy) and survival against all the odds.

Still more is the hatred of Israel and the Jews, to this day, witness that God has not yet played out all His purposes with the physical nation and people (whoever they are)!

Thank you for your thoughts - much to ponder but no time just now

in Him

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/31 9:56

LittleGift said

Quote:

-----But to assume that therefore all is fulfilled, including God's purposes for physical Israel, does not follow.

Hi Jeanette,

I hope you are clear that I do not dispute God is not finished with physical Israel - either the people or the places?

What I am *most* unsure about, is that the current, obvious, (carnal) interpretation of the promise - the return of *any* who wish to be associated with 'Israel' to a land now called 'Israel' - is what God *intends at this time*. As I've said before, I believe He knew what would happen - the creation of the modern Israel - and I believe He is defending His Name through the protection He gives Israel, *for His own purposes and according to His own counsel*. But, for the New Testament to make sense - especially in its remarkable absence of comment on that promise to Abraham - there has to be more than had been revealed by the time Moses died.

Again I draw to your attention this verse, with the question of why Paul would refer to the world rather than 'the land' (presumed to be 'of Israel', as previously defined?)

Romans 4:13

For the promise that he would be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

Galatians 1

11 But I make known to you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man.

12 For I neither received it from man, nor was I taught *it*, but it came through the revelation of Jesus Christ.

If you are able, please explain how physical Israel - separate from Christ - qualify to inherit the physical promise made to Abraham?

The verse you mention (Ex 32:10) which I had not noticed properly before, would have excluded all but one descendent of Levi (Moses) of Israel's children. Not only did Abraham have to send Hagar and Ishmael away, but also his descendants through concubines.

It is Moses who reminds God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel - at which point we see that Easu's descendants also have been, (technically, in the legal sense) excluded also.

This is why (imo) the literal inclusion of known gentiles or previously excluded descendants of Abraham - Christians of all kinds of natural descent including Asians and Arabs (and no doubt many other ethnic groups) - in 'the Church', is the only way to make sense of 'one fold and one Shepherd'. (John 10)

Contrary to some, who believe that 'The Lord is my Shepherd' is an Old Testament concept, I believe Jesus brought it right into the New Covenant by referring to Himself as the good Shepherd. He is very specific about who are sheep, and they are known of Him and He of them.

How then, can anyone who does not know His voice, be a partaker in the promise of receiving 'the land'? The question goes hand in hand with Moses' statements and song in Deuteronomy 31 and 32. So where is the promise of a *third* (time of) entering into 'the land'?

Re: Spiritual maxims - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/5/31 10:20

Hi ADisciple,

Had to echo this;

Quote:

-----Thank you much for your Christ like character :) Blessings to you as well.

Likewise and sideways as well wanted to come along side you here for a moment. Initially dropped out of this early on after the first few posts, seeing it as perhaps mildly interesting at best but ultimately fodder for ... carefully will put it ... of what matter is this? That there are Jews against Zionism especially under this regime or in collusion with them, the *of course* of the whole thing struck me more than anything. But likewise and perhaps due to a certain promise I had made to more fully explore the whole area of so called "Replacement Theology" of which I would consider myself quite the novice as I haven't paid that much focused attention on it. Whatever it 'means' or however the definitions are supposed to go was taken back a bit even this morning to find scriptures coming up in prayer in this regard ...

Quote:

-----But what, really, is this speaking of? According to the apostles, it is speaking of our heritage in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus, of the Kingdom of God, of the New Creation, and it is for the Jew and the Gentile together. For because of what our Lord Jesus Christ accomplished at the cross, there is now NO DIFFERENCE between Jew and Gentile (Rom. 3.22, 10.12, Eph. 2.15, Acts 15.9).

I know we find that hard to believe. What about that great edifice of theology that has been constructed by certain teachers who hold otherwise? But I think I'm going to go out on a limb, and believe the apostles, and build on the foundation of the apostles. No difference, they clearly say. "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" (Rom. 10.12). God has the same riches of His grace and glory for both.

No difference.

Taking into account the comments from others here as well ... perhaps what I would be forwarding is *distinction* on the one hand but even these are made null and put under, nationalism, dare I say ... 'heritage'? if I could use it very loosely and bring it all to bear on just the crucible of the matter? That in the Lord there is no difference ... How incredibly redundant! But I just don't know of any other way of putting it and it seems there is this great effort affront to undo that which was brought together.

And the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. Mar 15:38

Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the holy places by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh, and since we have a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Heb 10:19-22

None of these verses are what came to mind nor is it an attempt at proof texting anything, what I did find in the 'classic' accident this morning was the aforementioned thoughts and opening into the middle of Acts chapter 13. For the nervous, have long ago abandoned this is a particular ... proving of anything, even to myself, on these odd occasions it is always to back up to some point of context and also beyond the starting point to how many ever chapters that will keep the focus or where it may change.

But I was reading them with the thinking of this 'dividing' or rather the dismantling of that between the Jews and the Gentiles as a backdrop through about the first part of chapter 16. It is an interesting section to take note of it, the use of the "God fearing" - Proselytes, even the Pharisees "who believed". Another was the "joy" that the news was welcomed by the apostles and disciples that all these 'outsiders' were coming into the Kingdom, there is no hint of 'nationalism' or their rights of Jewishness, jealousy's. Quite a bit more but thought I would just throw it out there for consideration.

Quote:

-----One of the most cherished hopes of my heart is to see the Day when true brethren "dwell together in unity." I don't mean by compro

missing, or by agreeing to disagree, or by the false ecumenical unity (so-called) that's gaining such momentum these days, but rather because we have entered together fully into the Lordship and Mind of Christ. And I fully believe our Lord Jesus Christ has the power to bring this to pass. In fact it's integral to the New Covenant, and I believe He is working diligently to bring His people into this One Mind, till there shall go forth One Sound from the mouth of Christ... "like the Voice of many waters." It's THIS, we are told in John 17, that will cause the world to believe.

Speaking the same heart language here brother ...

Quote:
-----But (for me, anyway) the relationship I'm longing for with Him, it's become such a difficult thing to find. Such a difficult thing. So much so that sometimes I feel like just giving it all up. I know I can't do that. I pray He won't let me do that. But I think it comes almost as a temptation to me to just bury myself in good religious things, in Bible study and Scriptural debate and exegesis and so on, all things which I love dearly.

But is that where I am going to meet God? Is that what God is looking for from me at this time? Am I filling my life with those things when He is saying, "Seek ye My face"? When He is saying, "Listen for the Whispers of My Spirit, and obey My Spirit: He alone can lead you to the Desire of your heart"?

So... see where I'm at? Where is MY Peniel? I desperately need a new encounter with God. I'm so hungry for this. And that's the one thing I hold tight to: if the hunger for this is in my heart, I have to believe He has it for me. "Blessed are those who do hunger and thirst after (the God of) Righteousness, for they shall be filled."

Ah brother, your heart my friend. Be greatly encouraged and ever so patient, waiting ...

Heb 10:37 For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.

Prayer brother ...

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/31 11:16

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:
I think we would almost all agree that the OT ritual and sacrificial systems are now obsolete, having been fulfilled in Christ,(the writer to the Hebrews uses the philosophical concept of "shadow and substance" in explaining this).

But to assume that therefore *all* is fulfilled, including God's purposes for physical Israel, does not follow.

What then do you make of Jesus' statement, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Mt 5:18)? Could the "shadow and substance" concept be pointing towards the need for the "horse" to be put before the "cart", regarding grace and law?

To say that sacrifice systems are now obsolete ignores two things; Firstly, to ignore God's statement to Hosea, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." of which Jesus exhorted the Pharisees to "Go and learn what this means", when he quoted it. And do **we** truly know what it means? Secondly, to ignore sacrifice is to ignore Christ's ultimate sacrifice, which the inferior, dare I say "shadow", sacrifices point toward.

To add the "rituals" to this irrelevance, is to ignore the purpose of these rituals. If the rituals are looked at as vehicles of salvation, then they merely become idolatry. If however, they are used as God intended them, to dramatise and cause the participant to be a part of the dramatisation of the ultimate themes that they point toward, then they can be of benefit.

Consider communion and baptism. What is communion, but a reenactment of a portion of the passover, when the Jews

commemorate the day that a spotless lamb was slain in order to redeem their firstborn? In participation of this "ritual" a plethora of symbolism is brought to our attention, and through our participation we can receive revelation that goes beyond what comes in through our "eyes and ears". Every sense participates in these events, communicating something of the character and nature of God Himself, as the Lamb who was slain.

Quote:

Especially because of the miraculous survival of the Jews as a nation, in exile for nearly 2,000 years, and their return to the land. (Even if it was through the misguided zeal of certain parties to bring about the fulfillment of prophecy) and survival against all the odds.

I wonder if you have read Art Katz' book on the Holocaust (link offered in an earlier post)? I realise that you have said that you don't have much time, but may I suggest that you read this appeal, that is intended for Israel and is heavily rooted in Scripture, before allowing your opinions to set too firmly? I personally found that there was much that I thought I knew about this topic before I read this book, which was mere presumption.

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 13:04

Shalom~Shalom y'all .

Hey, I'm just spectating on this thread and just 'praying' we don't have a little roasted sheep for dinner.

Seems everyone has an opinion - yup we all do.

The only thing I'd like to see is not necessarily consensus on this, cuz until The LORD Comes, we'll hardly see that - but where do we get or should we get our 'opinions' From ?

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/31 13:42

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Ah brother, your heart my friend. Be greatly encouraged and ever so patient, waiting ...

Heb 10:37 For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.

Prayer brother ...

Thanks, Mike, for your encouraging words. Appreciate Jimmy, too, for his gracious words.

I look to the Holy Spirit to bring us all into a greater clarity as to these things. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about it all, and a lack of Holy-Spirit inspired revelation.

As I mentioned in my earlier post I have a question as to what degree I am to be involved in scriptural debate, etc. at this time. I hope I can be sensitive to make comments when led. I have appreciated the SI site in a lot of ways.

But I want to keep my ear tuned to what the Lord is saying, and to how He is leading, and be careful not to get sidetracked. I am aware He is doing "a new thing" in the earth. I really want by His grace to be part of it. How we need that "circumcised" ear in this hour!

AD

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 13:56

Quote:

CJaKfOrEsT wrote:

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

I think we would almost all agree that the OT ritual and sacrificial systems are now obsolete, having been fulfilled in Christ,(the writer to the Hebrews uses the philosophical concept of "shadow and substance" in explaining this).

But to assume that therefore *all* is fulfilled, including God's purposes for physical Israel, does not follow.

What then do you make of Jesus' statement, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Mt 5:18)? Could the "shadow and substance" concept be pointing towards the need for the "horse" to be put before the "cart", regarding grace and law?

To say that sacrifice systems are now obsolete ignores two things; Firstly, to ignore God's statement to Hosea, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." of which Jesus exhorted the Pharisees to "Go and learn what this means", when he quoted it. And do **we** truly know what it means? Secondly, to ignore sacrifice is to ignore Christ's ultimate sacrifice, which the inferior, dare I say "shadow", sacrifices point toward.

To add the "rituals" to this irrelevance, is to ignore the purpose of these rituals. If the rituals are looked at as vehicles of salvation, then they merely become idolatry. If however, they are used as God intended them, to dramatise and cause the participant to be a part of the dramatisation of the ultimate themes that they point toward, then they can be of benefit.

Consider communion and baptism. What is communion, but a reenactment of a portion of the passover, when the Jews commemorate the day that a spotless lamb was slain in order to redeem their firstborn? In participation of this "ritual" a plethora of symbolism is bought to our attention, and through our participation we can receive revelation that goes beyond what comes in through our "eyes and ears". Every sense participates in these events, communicating something of the character and nature of God Himself, as the Lamb who was slain.

Hi Aaron

I must admit that I don't always follow what you are really saying!

Or did you miss that I said re the OT ritual law and sacrifice: "having been fulfilled in Christ"? He fulfilled the Law in every detail, both the moral law and what the ritual and sacrificial law really **meant**. Which to me is the main message of Hebrews, and which I thought we mostly agree about?

Yet you seem to be saying the same thing as I said, (or at least *meant* to say), as if you disagree with me.

Of course the OT symbolism is wonderful, as long as it's understood to be only symbolism.

Or do you believe in things like transubstantiation and baptismal regeneration????

Perhaps my use of the word "obsolete" was misleading? I meant that these things are *no longer binding or necessary to salvation*, (to take away sin etc). This includes all the non-moral part of the Law of Moses. It is no longer a sin to eat pork, and touching a dead body or certain animals, doesn't make one ritually unclean for example.

Do you agree or disagree with that?

Quote:

Quote:

Especially because of the miraculous survival of the Jews as a nation, in exile for nearly 2,000 years, and their return to the land. (Even if it was through the misguided zeal of certain parties to bring about the fulfilment of prophecy) and survival against all the odds.

I wonder if you have read Art Katz' book on the Holocaust (link offered in an earlier post)? I realise that you have said that you don't have much time, but may I suggest that you read this appeal, that is intended for Israel and is heavily rooted in Scripture, before allowing your opinions to set too firmly? I personally found that there was much that I thought I knew about this topic before I read this book, which was mere presumption.

Sorry, I haven't been able to afford any books lately, just paid car and house insurance for the year! Maybe soon? I would really like to get the book if possible.

I'm not sure my opinions are "set too firmly" or not, because until recently I had the idea that anyone who doubted that God still, at the present time, (at least until the return of Christ) has a purpose for physical Israel was deep into "replacement theology" and therefore not worth bothering about! Especially as most of those I came across who openly taught this were also in error in other ways.

The fact that those who seem otherwise "sound" can believe similar things was an eye-opener, and made me begin to examine these matters more closely.

Especially when someone said in a pm that God had finished with Israel (can't remember the wording, but something like that), and it brought forth such a strong reaction, that seemed nothing to do with me! It was as if the Holy Spirit within me was *grieving* at the saying.

It was quite different to the experience when He is challenging me personally about something (I usually know when I'm wriggling and "kicking against the pricks")! It was so strong, yet I had never personally felt *that* strongly about the matter.

The Lord was dealing with something in me, but not to do with the Israel question, but over the tendency to be too argumentative. Using a doggy illustration, I've always had difficulty in "letting the bone go" when the Master says "drop it!"

Even now I have to be very careful, so if I suddenly stop responding to some posts that's probably why!

In Him

Jeannette

Re: Zion - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/5/31 15:33

Quote:
-----Sorry, I haven't been able to afford any books lately, just paid car and house insurance for the year! Maybe soon? I would really like to get the book if possible.

Just in case, here is what Aaron was alluding to;

(http://www.benisrael.org/writings/online_books/holocaust_where_was_God/shoah_contents.html) The Holocaust: Where Was God?
By Art Katz

All of his books are available to read freely online;

(http://www.benisrael.org/writings/onlinebooks_main.html) Online Books

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 15:50

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Just in case, here is what Aaron was aluding to;

(http://www.benisrael.org/writings/online_books/holocaust_where_was_God/shoah_contents.html) The Holocaust: Where Was God?
By Art Katz

All of his books are available to read freely online;

(http://www.benisrael.org/writings/onlinebooks_main.html) Online Books

OH! I didn't realise the were free online books, thought they were printed!

Are his books in print as well? If I get on with this one I may try to get something of his in print sometime. Reading off a computer screen is a bit of a strain after a while.

Thanks

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/31 15:54

Hi Jeanette,

When I mentioned God having cast off His people Israel, I was not excluding the rest of the verse, in which He receives back those who believe.

Romans 11

15 For if the casting away of them *be* the reconciling of the world, what *shall* the receiving *of them be*, but life from the dead?

I believe it is an assumption, that inheriting the land (again) without Christ, is possible, without the 'receiving of them' into the olive tree.

When God bore them on eagles' wings out of Egypt, it was to **Himself**, primarily. The rest (promised land) was to follow on their obedience only. I have a huge problem with the existence of anti-Semitism being blamed on the historic church, when - no matter who has 'done' the anti-Semitism - it is a direct fulfilment of prophecy given to / by Moses. Jews need to own up to this, in my humble opinion, whether they believe in Jesus or not. Just as Peter exhorted them to save themselves from their untoward(God) generation in his day, the same applies now. We all - Jew and gentile alike - have to make our responses to God in the light of Christ, whatever the consequences of obedience to Him. We know what the disobedience of unbelief will cost us - peace with God and eternal life.

Katz - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/5/31 15:55

Quote:

-----Are his books in print as well? If I get on with this one I may try to get something of his in print sometime. Reading off a computer screen is a bit of a strain after a while.

Hi Sister, yes! Both! You might have to do some digging around the site there, I don't recall if there is a place for ordering

g. They should be available through some of the mainstream places I would imagine.

Understand about the online reading ... I guess I have gotten somewhat used to it in many ways, still prefer something a bit more ... mobile though :)

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 16:07

Hi again Linn

Just a couple of answers to your last post, (don't know when I'll get around to the others!

Dorcas wrote:

Quote:
----- If you are able, please explain how physical Israel - separate from Christ - qualify to inherit the physical promise made to Abraham ?

Spiritual people inherit the spiritual promise; physical people inherit the physical promise. Even though the physical promise was also given to Abraham, he himself didn't inherit it (he only wandered around in it, as a sojourner). But he was enabled by faith to transcend the physical and believe in and inherit the spiritual promise.

But this in no way denies the existence and fulfilment of the physical aspect. I don't understand why you think it does!

Abraham was only a sojourner in the physical land, but he fully entered into the spiritual promise, first by faith, then in fulfillment. As Jesus said "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad".

Quote:
----- This is why (imo) the literal inclusion of known gentiles or previously excluded descendants of Abraham - Christians of all kinds of natural descent including Asians and Arabs (and no doubt many other ethnic groups) - in 'the Church', is the only way to make sense of 'one fold and one Shepherd'. (John 10)

This refers to "spiritual Israel" only. How can this deny the lesser promise to natural Israel?

Quote:
----- Contrary to some, who believe that 'The Lord is my Shepherd' is an Old Testament concept, I believe Jesus brought it right into the New Covenant by referring to Himself as the good Shepherd. He is very specific about who are sheep, and they are known of Him and He of them.

How then, can anyone who does not know His voice, be a partaker in the promise of receiving 'the land'?

How can they not, if God says so! You still seem to be mixing two different things as if they are one.

Quote:
----- The question goes hand in hand with Moses' statements and song in Deuteronomy 31 and 32. So where is the promise of a third (time of) entering into 'the land'?

The promise was that the Land was given, *permanently*, (at least as far as we can understand permanency) to a certain group of people. Who exactly they are, or whether it is a first, second, third etc entering in isn't the point.

Again I say, **God always keeps his Word**. To focus on the people, who they are and if they are saved or not, is in some sense missing the point.

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re: Katz, on: 2007/5/31 16:25

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Quote:
-----Are his books in print as well? If I get on with this one I may try to get something of his in print sometime. Reading off a computer screen is a bit of a strain after a while.

Hi Sister, yes! Both! You might have to do some digging around the site there, I don't recall if there is a place for ordering. They should be available through some of the mainstream places I would imagine.

Understand about the online reading ... I guess I have gotten somewhat used to it in many ways, still prefer something a bit more ... mobile though :)

Thanks again.

I've just copied and pasted the whole book into Word for easier reference (phew!) It's possible then to highlight and annotate if liked, to help remember key points.

In Him

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/5/31 16:32

LittleGift said

Quote:
-----To focus on the people, who they are and if they are saved or not, is in some sense missing the point.

Obviously, I don't believe it is missing the point, because the original promises were always conditional.

I don't see how you can separate the promise of the land which was conditional on obedience, from the fulfilment of all scripture referring to Christ, as if His physical descent from David is of no import. This is why Peter turns to David's own words in Acts 2.... *because* His kingdom, Peter now realised, was not 'of this world'.

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 19:05

Quote:

dorcass wrote:
LittleGift said

Quote:
-----To focus on the people, who they are and if they are saved or not, is in some sense missing the point.

Obviously, I don't believe it is missing the point, because the original promises were always conditional.

What specific conditions did God give to Abraham re the land? I honestly can't remember any at the moment.

*
Quote:
-----I don't see how you can separate the promise of the land which was conditional on obedience, from the fulfilment of all scripture referring to Christ, as if His physical descent from David is of no import. This is why Peter turns to David's own words in Acts 2.... *because* His kingdom, Peter now realised, was not 'of this world'

Sorry, I don't know what you mean by this, or what makes you think I'm "separating the promise of the land ...from the fulfilment of all scripture referring to Christ" :-?

I was talking of the spiritual as being different from the material or physical, and saying that *both* are valid, not the spiritual only.*

****another addition! I thought you were missing the point because to me the main point is, as said before, that *God always keeps his Word* ****

In Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/31 20:00

Acts 1:6&7 Jesus was asked about restoring the earthly Kingdom to Israel. When? Jesus didn't say that the Church had replaced those promises, but says, *It is not for anyone to know the time (only the Father knows).

When Jesus said, My Kingdom is not of this world, He was not talking about the Earthly Kingdom reign of Christ when He takes the throne of David. The Kingdom not of this world would never need to be restored to begin with.

In the OT there are two comings of Messiah, one of King and one of redeemer. The Jews who missed the mark were looking for the Earthly Kingdom and KING, rejecting Jesus Christ, redeemer...the Lamb of God, who came in all humility, the suffering servant, taking our sin upon Him. A King could not have done that.

When He comes again with His Saints, the Church, now called out with a Heavenly Calling, conforming us to His Image, will reign and rule with Christ for 1000 years when He will come in ALL HIS GLORY. :-)

Re: Discovery in Hebrews 11 I'm so excited!, on: 2007/6/2 5:39

No time to share this now, but I was reading Heb 11 this morning, and suddenly saw a whole new angle! Not only showing where Linn (Dorcas) and others are probably coming from but how the physical and spiritual aspects of the Promise to Abraham tie together!

Will get back later, but just had to bump up this thread ready.

Of course you may not get it (as I didn't until now).

Clue, the word "Jerusalem" means "twin city of peace"

WATCH THIS SPACE!

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/6/2 5:44

Hi Jeanette,

I thought you would like to know that I don't have a problem with Jerusalem being part of the fulfillment of prophecy.

My difficulty is with the hope maintained by some, that the old boundaries given to Abraham or Joshua, should be redrawn, and 'Jews' - whether believing or not - contained therein.

Re:, on: 2007/6/2 6:02

Quote:

dorcac wrote:

Hi Jeanette,

I thought you would like to know that I don't have a problem with Jerusalem being part of the fulfillment of prophecy.

My difficulty is with the hope maintained by some, that the old boundaries given to Abraham or Joshua, should be redrawn, and 'Jews' - whether believing or not - contained therein.

But the "boundaries given to Abraham or Joshua" **are** a part of the fulfillment of prophecy, just as much as Jerusalem!

Anyway, have to go!

More anon as they say

Jeannette

Re: Jews against Zionism, on: 2007/6/9 15:14

Hi Jeanette,

I've just been looking for references to 'the everlasting covenant', and since Young sticks rigidly to the definite and indefinite article ('the' and 'a' or 'an') I thought I'd look him up first. Fascinating!

He uses the phrase 'age-during' for 'everlasting' and it comes after, not before 'covenant'.

The earliest mention of the covenant is Genesis 9, and it is with man and all flesh on the earth. Before you read it, do a search in a NKJV or KJV for 'the covenant'.... *then* look up Genesis 9, please.

I posted in another old thread called 'Israel' in News and Current Events, today, with something the Lord showed me in Hebrews, sparked by my recent reading of Galatians, to see what Paul had to say about the promise to Abraham.

I'll be interested to hear your thoughts, if you find time to read these references. I know you are busy, and I am too right now, but I hope we will continue to study this and share our findings with each other.

I know I haven't shared mine on these points, but I'll be happy to do so first, if you prefer.