



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Dispensationalism

Dispensationalism - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/18 1:53

So I don't really like to get into deep theological debates especially when I don't gain anything out of the debate, so the intentions of this thread is for information to enlighten my ignorance.

I talked with a Pastor who seems very intelligent when it comes to the bible and what not has fancy pants degrees but still is open minded to different lines of thinking. He is similar to me in this aspect that I don't ever intend to ram my belief at you but rather seek to understand why you believe a certain way. I find this to be helpful that way less people are killed and slain by harshness and theological debate.

He said he leans more towards a dispensational point of view, this got me thinking that I know very little about dispensationalism. I searched the topics thing here and what I found only seemed to confuse me so is there anyone that could in a unbiased way explain to me dispensationalism vs Covenant System?

And is there any danger to this line of thinking or fellowshiping with one that holds to this line of thinking?

All responses are greatly appreciated.

God Bless,
Matthew

Re: Dispensationalism - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2010/7/18 5:25

Marching to Zion
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ei_Hu1hcsa4

Did the Holocaust Really Happen?
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QIBA2zp992c>

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2010/7/18 5:28

some historic glossary definition

Dispensationalism - Dispensationalism is a complete system of theology that was first popularized by John Nelson Darby, 19th century British evangelist and forerunner of modern Christian fundamentalism. It divides the entirety of history into seven dispensations, or epochs beginning with the age of innocence, or Adam. According to the doctrine, we are now in the sixth dispensation, the age of the Church (the Church being those saved from the day of Pentecost until the Rapture), and are preparing to enter the seventh time period, or the Millennial reign of Christ on earth. A vast majority of dispensationalists hold to a pretribulation rapture of the Church. Additionally, they assert that Israel and the church are different groups who receive a different set of promises. Dispensationalists hold that God provided the nation of Israel with specific promises that will be fulfilled at a future time in the Jews. Accordingly, the Church has received a different set of promises than that of Israel.

The KJV uses the english word "dispensation" 3 times:

Re: , on: 2010/7/18 9:55

i first came to odds with dispensationalism when finding several things in scripture in direct contradiction of the concept. More than 30 years ago i used a Scofield (sp) Study Bible exclusively, and finally, it found it's way into the trash.

If i recall the details correctly...

IE Scofield some time during his tenure as president of Moody Bible Institute began working on this Bible, and was heavily influenced by John Darby. The Study notes in it are dispensational to the core: "God no longer does this anymore due to the fact that it's a different dispensation, and now he does this instead."

Darby was an Irish evangelist out of the Plymouth Brethren, and many forgotten scriptural truths were brought out during this movement, who some say was greater than any known reformation, at that point in time.

Somewhere close to the midpoint of that century, he invented the concept of the rapture to help fill in his misunderstandings through the dispensational outlook, out of which Christian Zionism was re-established.

Taking part in the Covenant of blood friendship says, "all that I am and all that I have is yours, even as all that you are and have is mine. I will die for you."

Arabs have a saying that "blood is thicker than milk" which denotes the solemn gravity of cutting covenant. You may share the same breast with your siblings, but when it comes right down to it, dying for blood-covenant kindred enforces covenant that much more. Genetic family ties, on the other hand, are severed in death.

Basic covenant doctrine says God always works through Covenant, and man being unable to fulfill his end of friendship by blood-sacrifice relationship has to rely on God through Jesus Christ to fulfill both man and God's cutting of Covenant. Every Covenant God has made with man finds its final and eventually total fulfillment in Jesus Christ. From the onset of time in this kosmos, God's Covenant is not several, but one thing even as God is One, and each successive compact never made the earlier Covenant agreements invalid (because God is not a man that he should lie). Rather each one re-affirms the former and establishes them in greater fullness. God will ultimately bring everything on earth to completion in Jesus Christ's headship when He returns and rules the earth. When this one Everlasting Covenant is brought to full light, it will no longer be pointed to through what He already established in Covenant...though these former covenants will still be in force.

Covenant is emphasized constantly in the Bible, and everything that is written is ultimately in relation to this one way God deals with man through the man, our Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who forever remains the same today, yesterday, and forever.

Agapeo,
g
Acts 20:32

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/7/18 11:41

I once gave a short 30-minute lecture in Bible college that gave a survey to dispensational theology. You might find it helpful:

http://www.iamadisciple.com/sermons/dispensationalism_lecture_lee_university.mp3

I don't recall everything I said about it back then, so, I'm sure I missed it on a few points. I personally disagree with dispensationalism, and while it has many wonderful points, I would agree with those who call it a "conservative heresy" within fundamentalism/evangelicalism.

Moody Bible college and Dallas Theological Seminary are the official proponents of this system today, though interestingly enough, D.L. Moody had a very dramatic debate with Darby over the issue, in which Darby left the stage in very dramatic fashion because of their disagreement.

Basically, dispensationalism has fostered anti-nomianism, cheap grace, and gave birth to the theological system that has given us the pre-tribulational rapture theory. Interestingly enough, a lot of folks who are pre-tribulational would not ascribe to the dispensational system, but, have embraced the end result of that system, though without embracing the system.

m itself. It's almost a "left-over" theology in that regard.

At any rate, I hope my lecture helps you understand in a clear and concise manner dispensationalism.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/18 15:12

CI Scofield and DL Moody had a long association which ultimately ended in disagreement but before that their alliance on dispensationalism resulted in the little rhyme...

my hope is built on nothing less
than Scofield Notes and Moody Press.

Re: Dispensationalism - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/7/18 15:46

Each of the times that the term dispensation is used scripturally it is the greek oikonomia which does not mean a division or special period of time in which God deals one way or another, but rather speaks of stewardship or administration of a particular thing that God has entrusted one with. The word appears in scripture ten total times with the other six being steward or stewardship. These scriptures, to me, seem to have nothing whatsoever to do with what we might call dispensationalism.

From what I have been able to learn it appears that Covenant theology or New Covenant theology serves as the foundation for, and is often interchangeable with Replacement Theology which I see as a gross distortion of scripture.

I am not meaning to sound trite toward those who study theology, but to me one can simply study the Word of God in prayer and take it for what it simply says without the philosophical constructs that various theological points of view bring to the table. It is meant to be a life giving word. I think theologians often turn it into a dead academic study. So in the literal interpretation aspect I probably fall more in the dispensational camp.

Re: Philologos - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/18 16:39

Most of the time I would never comment on a thread like this, but because you asked so kindly, and just wanted to understand, I will offer my obviously jaded opinion. For me dispensationalism is personal because it was how I was discipled and it was how I was kept in sin. (So my opinion is obviously coming from that point of view. And I now cannot stand the idea, I am just being honest.)

For years my hope too was built on nothing less than Scofield notes...as a result, the gospels never made a lick of sense to me and I lived in sin...grace was cheap and almost meaningless. All I ever did was explain away passages of scripture to fit into his system. I wonder if men that come up with systematic theologies ever consider the consequences of doing so?

Funny rhyme Ron, do you know who authored it?

On the outset Matthew, Dispensationalism seems harmless enough, as was stated earlier, it is a division of time into epochs where God operates in a different way in each one of them.

The area that finally got me to think that it was all rejectamenta was when Scofield basically indicated that the era of Law continued until the time of the Cross, which at some nebulous point after the cross the era of grace began. This forced me to always think that Jesus words and doctrines were spoken in the era of Law thus nullifying Jesus words and teachings for the church. I do not know if this was exactly his intention, but for me it was the result. For years I never took Jesus words seriously because they were only "spoken to Jews" in order to continue to bring them into condemnation so they would accept the gospel.

Here also is a little side tip, Scofield has a massive amount of notes in the book of Matthew...and far less in other books. The reason being is that when someone has to place an inordinate amount of commentary on any passage of scripture you can be confident that they are explaining it away. (Not always but I suspect that to be true in a lot of cases.)

Lemme give an example of the bad reasoning. The following is an excerpt from Scofield's notes found around the sermon on the mount. (page 999-1000 of the scofield version I have on my bookshelf)

"Having announced the kingdom of heaven as 'at hand,' the King, in Mt 5-7, declares the principles of the kingdom. The Sermon on the Mount has a twofold application: (1) Literally to the kingdom. In this sense it gives the divine constitution for the righteous government of the earth. Whenever the kingdom of heaven is established on earth it will be according to that constitution, which may be regarded as an explanation of the word 'righteousness' as used by the prophets in describing the kingdom (e.g. Isa. 11:4, 5; 32:1; Dan. 9:24). In this sense the Sermon on the mount is pure law, and transfers the offense from the overt act to the motive (Mt. 5:21, 22, 27, 28). Here lies the deeper reason why Jews rejected the kingdom. They had reduced 'righteousness' to mere ceremonialism, and the Old Testament idea of the kingdom to a mere affair of outward splendor and power. They were never rebuked for expecting a visible and powerful kingdom, but the words of the prophets should have prepared them to expect also that only the poor in spirit and the meek could share in it (e.g. Isa 11:4). The seventy-second Psalm, which was universally received by them as a description of the Kingdom, was full of this. For these reasons the Sermon on the Mount in its primary application gives neither the privilege nor the duty of the Church. These are found in the Epistles. Under the law of the kingdom, for example, no one may hope for forgiveness who has not first forgiven (MT. 6:12, 14, 15). Under grace the Christian is exhorted to forgive because he is already forgiven (Eph. 4:30-32)

To keep from having too long of a post I will respond to this quoted text in my next post.

Re: Areadymind - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/18 17:28

Flawed reasoning.

1) "In this sense the sermon on the mount is pure law..."

Scofield does not (seem) to be able to stomach the thought that the Sermon on the Mount is applicable to his life. So he comes up with a theological system that explains away conduct that is expected of him. He goes on to say that the Epistles are where the "Church" gets their 'privilege and duty' from.

In that case let us turn to the Epistles and find a privilege and duty to which we are accountable shall we? "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." 1 Timothy 6:3-5

Far be it from me to attribute the negative aspects of this warning to Scofield, I don't know anything about the man other than the notes in my Scofield Bible, however I do know that the warning seems to fit the bill most articulately in that Scofield almost always explains away submission to the words of the Lord for the church.

He is right that often the Jews rejected Christ because his standard was so high about the motive of the heart, but Jesus did not just call motives into question, Jesus clearly expects that the call to follow him will result in the rightness and correcting of the wrong motive. The "New Covenant" is a better one than the old, thus Jesus sermon is an teaching of bitter truth mixed with glorious hope.

2.) What exactly do you believe Dr.? "They were never rebuked for expecting a visible and powerful kingdom, but the words of the prophets should have prepared them to expect also that 'only' the poor in spirit and the meek could share in it." In one section of this paragraph Dr. Scofield explains away the portion of the Sermon on the Mount that, I am personally speculating, he is uncomfortable with as "Pure Law," calculated to condemn "outward righteousness." Then in the next breath, he condemns the Jews for failing to recognize that the Kingdom was for the Poor in Spirit, which was a statement made by Christ in the exact same sermon He just devalued...

3.) Are you really sure you want to go there? "For these reasons the Sermon on the Mount in its primary application gives neither the privilege nor the duty of the church." I wonder if I even need to comment on the sheer boldness of such a statement. James 3:1 comes to mind as well as Matthew 18:26.

4.) The Dr. States that Jesus was teaching that in order to gain forgiveness one must forgive first. I can see why he states that, but I do not think that is what Jesus was really getting at. It is a statement of absoluteness. The emphasis here is not on a chicken or egg thing it is a pure doctrinal statement. Ephesians 4:30-32 do not negate this principle. Not only that, proof texting the passage in Ephesians is a total dodge as Paul is saying pretty much the same thing. Being offered a "reason" to forgive others, which is a real good one, does not mean that now we have the "Grace," in this "Age of G

race," to not forgive, which is the end result of so much dispensational thinking. The fullness of what grace is able to accomplish in our lives is boiled down to a tasteless boot soup.

Do you see what he is doing here? He is de-valuing the teachings of Christ! The issue here is not either or, it is both and. Pure and simple, both teachings are of value, but if you take a, "apostolic priority" view, then the Sermon on the Mount is devalued. Whether you have been forgiven or not, the principle of unforgiveness is still true. If you are not able to forgive others, then there is an indication there that you have not been forgiven of your own sins, you have not yet received the revelation of the love of Christ in your own life, you have only made a shallow and vain confession.

This little play by play I have written out is fairly typical of the type of reasoning used in the dispensational hermeneutic. You can apply this kind of reasoning to most verses and you will not be far off from what Scofield promoted.

Re: Areadymind Personal Lesson - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/18 17:43

When I applied Scofield's hermeneutic to my scripture study when I was younger, I became a fool. Within my hands and mind I carried a self-constructed key to interpreting the scripture that made me my own little pope. Rather than wearing a dragon-fish hat, and carrying a crooked cross, I carried a hermeneutic that over-rode an attitude of humility.

When this view came into question, my response was always one of pride, ironically being religiously prideful was one of the exact things that Christ was arguing against in his sermon that was only meant for Jews (sarcasm heavy sorry). When I compartmentalized scripture, I then, like the Pope, was comfortable with always choosing the things I believed to be true or not from Scripture.

It is then no irony, that I never experienced any of the victory Christ had in store for me. It is no irony that I was living in complete defeat, and the only way I could be free from rebellious sin in my life was typically when I was under situations of hyper-accountability.

Now, Scofield is not responsible for me. I am responsible entirely to Jesus for my lack of faith. However...the fruit seems to me to speak multitudes.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/7/19 2:09

<http://www.preservedwords.com/dispens1a.htm>

The Difference Is In The Dispensations
How to make sense of the differences in the Bible

Introduction and Chapter 1a

By
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright 1997, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations are from the
Authorized King James Version of the Bible

Introduction

When a person receives the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior, he, with the Lord, also receives a desire to know more about his salvation and the one who saved him (John 15:26). This desire causes the new believer, possibly for the very first time in his life, to open the Holy Bible in a serious attempt to learn what God has to say. Once in the Scriptures the believer soon realizes that the Bible speaks of much more than just personal salvation and Christ dying on the cross; it speaks

s of God's whole program for His entire creation from eternity to eternity. It reveals what God wants man to know about God Himself, His creation, and His purpose with His creation. Unless the believer understands this and divides the Bible accordingly (2 Tim. 2:15), he may become overwhelmed by its vast scope and perplexed by its differences. All the Bible's major differences can be reconciled with some study (sometimes very little), but if the believer neglects to study and sort these differences out, he will cheat himself out of understanding not only God's plan and purpose for man in general, but also for himself in particular.

However, even though the Bible is in some areas complex and interwoven, one notable indication that it is the very word of God is the most vital and important subjects found in it are easy to understand. God has purposely made the crucial subjects of sin, man's accountability to God, Christ's substitutionary death, and personal salvation so simple a small child can understand them. He made these matters clear and easy to comprehend so any person wanting the truth about them could by faith act upon them and receive the Lord Jesus Christ as his salvation. These clear yet vital doctrines are referred to as the "simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3). Though the more complex subjects reveal more of the mind and intentions of God, knowledge of them is not necessary for one to be saved.

Needless to say, the Bible contains both simplicity and complexity by God's direction. He wanted to provide a salvation so simple that a person could understand it and get saved after only being presented with the gospel once (Acts 10:43-44, 16:31, etc.), but He also wanted some other matters more detailed and complex so one would have to labor in the Scriptures a certain degree to sort them out. In this respect some Bible subjects are so mysterious and far-ranging in their scope that no one yet has done much more than scratch the surface of the treasures within them, let alone fully grasp them. Sometimes the Lord even spoke in "parables" to purposely confound those who listen to His words with the wrong "heart" or attitude: those who don't have "ears to hear" (Matt. 13:9-15).

If a person reads the Bible very much at all he is soon confronted with various laws, judgments, ordinances, commandments, doctrines, kingdoms, covenants, testaments, dispensations, gospels, priesthoods, feasts, tribes, churches, etc., and begins to see some of the Bible's complexity. He is further introduced to events known as the Exodus, Israel's Captivity, Daniel's Seventieth Week, the Rapture, the Judgment Seat of Christ, the Tribulation, the Millennium, the White Throne Judgment, the New Heaven and New Earth, etc., that add even more to its broad variety of topics.

Once a reader gets to this point questions usually arise: Where do all these subjects belong? Do they all apply to everyone in every age? Does every precept mentioned in the Bible apply doctrinally to a Christian? What about the doctrines that appear to contradict each other? Is salvation exactly the same in every age? How is one to account for the differences? With this book we will show that the major differences in the Bible can be reconciled by rightly dividing it into dispensations and keeping the different doctrines found in the dispensations in their proper place.

In 2 Timothy 2:15 the Holy Spirit states His word has divisions and the "workman" must "study" to "rightly" divide them. When a believer obeys God's word and with study finds these divisions and applies the truths found in them to their proper place, much of the Bible's complexity disappears and many of its alleged contradictions vanish. Furthermore, many of the different manners, methods, and doctrines in the Bible which often trouble people are reconciled, and the believer begins to see the "big picture" of what God is doing.

Since properly understanding the Bible's divisions is the key to being sound in doctrine and making sense of its differences, failure to do so can lead to dangerous heresies and spiritual chaos. When a preacher or any other believer fails to rightly divide the Bible and discern its differences, he will nearly always end up wresting it. This is one reason there are so many "Christian" cults today. Instead of rightly dividing the Bible, they ignore some or all of its divisions and produce a religious system that is littered with heresies, some of them deadly. When a person takes a precept or doctrine peculiar to one dispensation and forces it to apply doctrinally to another, he ends up with a heresy every time. He may quote several Bible verses to "prove" his doctrine, but it is still a lie once it is divorced from its corresponding dispensation.

In view of this, it is essential that every believer keep in mind that God spoke the words recorded in the Bible in "sundry times and diverse manners" (Heb. 1:1): to different people at different times. Thus the Scriptures were not written only for believers in the present Church Age, they were written for believers (and unbelievers) of all the ages. In short, the Bible was written FOR everyone for their learning (Rom. 15:4) but not addressed TO everyone in every age for doctrine. True, every verse in the Bible applies doctrinally somewhere, but many verses found in it do not apply doctrinally today. Of course, any Bible passage can be used inspirationally in any dispensation to help teach a present truth, but doctrine is another matter. For instance, most will agree the laws God gave to Israel through Moses do not apply doctrinally to Christians. The Israelites had strict religious, social, and dietary laws they had to comply with (Lev. ch. 1-15), but none of these laws, as laws, apply to believers today (Col. 2:14). A Jew at that time even had to have a human priest to work in his behalf towards God; today, every Christian is a priest himself (1 Peter 2:9). If one doesn't rightly divide the word of truth he ca

n't help but wrest it, no matter how "sincere and devoted" he is.

Concerning the dividing of the Bible into dispensations, even the most liberal Bible readers (who often criticize "dispensationalism") will acknowledge at least one division in the Scriptures: the division between Malachi and Matthew dividing to Old from the New Testament. This division is so obvious that even an atheist can find it. Anyone who has read the Bible much at all knows the Old Testament is different from the New Testament and by doing so he admits to two dispensations. This makes him a "dispensationalist" whether he refers to himself as one or not. If these critics would study their Bibles a little more and believe what they read, they would find at least six more important divisions, each one revealing vital lessons.

A very large work would be required for one to try to exhaustively categorize and reconcile every difference found in the Bible, thus this is well beyond the scope of this relatively small book. The main purpose of this book is to present to the reader in a concise manner the principal and most important divisions of the Bible by examining its covenants and dispensations.

In addition, since the subject of personal salvation from sin is the most important and relevant issue to a sinner in any dispensation (and also probably the subject that causes the most debate and controversy among professing Christians to day), we will also look at the dispensations from this perspective. In the first chapter we will briefly examine each covenant and its accompanying dispensation, noting the major elements of each; then in the following chapters we will take on the crucial subject of personal salvation in the different dispensations and examine the differences between them in this context.

<http://www.preservedwords.com/dispens1a.htm>

A great read to understanding that dispensations are not of the devil, but of God in His dealing with man.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/7/19 9:39

Just a quick note: The heart of the dispensational system ends up creating "two peoples of God." The first people in God's dealings with mankind is the Hebrew nation. God deals with them from Abraham to the death of Christ, and then will deal with them yet again as His people from the time of the pre-tribulation rapture until the end of the 1,000 year reign of Christ. The first people are concerned with the "kingdom of God." The second people of God would be His "spiritual Israel," also known as "the Church," which God is dealing with from the time of the resurrection of Christ, until the pre-tribulation rapture of the Church, and then in eternity. These people are part of the "kingdom of heaven," which stands in contrast with "the kingdom of God." The kingdom of heaven is spiritual, dispensationalists teach, whereas the kingdom of God is earthly and physical.

As a result of these distinctions, two peoples of God are created, with two different purposes and promises that while running parallel to each other in history, have little to nothing to do with each other. One is seen as possessing a works based salvation, the other grace based. One is seen as bound by the law, the other is seen as anti-nomian. One is conditioned based salvation. The other is eternally secure.

Though of course dispensationalist teachers will disagree on some of these points, especially the 'progressive dispensationalists' ones, the old school of Darby and Scofield represent this classic system. There are some hyper-dispensationalists who create another dispensation within the church age, starting with the apostolic ministry of the apostle Paul, who they see as having a revelation that no other apostle before him ever had. As it is, most dispensationalists create two dispensations within the church age as it is. One is the apostolic age, the other being the laodicean age they say we live in now.

Be fair warned, as brother Jeremiah pointed out, dispensationalism is a system of theology that will leave you spiritually bankrupt. You may become an excellent student of the Scriptures through this system. But by embracing it, you will almost certainly embrace a defeated, sub-standard, and sub-apostolic lifestyle that knows nothing of the power of God, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, or the abundant, victorious Christian life. In my honest opinion, I believe the system as a whole to be heresy, and it should be banished from the minds of anybody who considers themselves evangelical.

Re: Dispensationalism - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/19 11:05

Matthew said, "I searched the topics thing here and what I found only seemed to confuse me so is there anyone that could in a Unbiased way explain to me dispensationalism vs Covenant System?"

I am sorry bro that I am not able to be unbiased...It is a topic I am a bit too passionate about. I hope that you are able to appreciate my honesty about it though.

Matthew Also asked, "And is there any danger to this line of thinking or fellowshiping with one that holds to this line of thinking?"

I have done nothing but fellowship with thousands of people who hold to this view, It never harms me in any way, I just grieve for them when I see their defeated lives and lack of faith and hope in the words of Christ. It sends me to prayer all the time that God would bring revival, and in so doing that He would abolish the systematic theologies of men...

A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump...

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/19 11:59

I didn't plan on studying it, from what I understand of it, it is a way of man breaking up the bible into different parts and reading the bible I have always viewed God's People (Israel and those that come to Christ in repentance) as in a dispensation of God's Grace to all that are His.

A dispensation of the Law was an act of Grace that Israel had to keep them from certain things for their protection such as Don't eat pork, this law was given for two reasons to my understanding the pagan nations in the area ate pork and so God wanted His consecrated people separate, two pork couldn't properly be cooked at that particular time saving the Israelites from disease and sickness.

The Law to me was a marvelously gracious thing to God's people just like a Father that sets up certain rules for his child, God as a Good Father did the same for His People.

Though I see the "divisions" in the scripture I don't see them as changing God's Grace towards His people. I view Salvation not as a plan, division, scheme, law, or anything and nothing less than the Person Jesus Christ who if you study Scripture Learn HE is eternal and active in the Godhead from the beginning of the beginning. So breaking up scripture can help in understanding scripture but for me its all one in Spirit and that is the Spirit of Christ Jesus.

If dispensationalism concern is to make the bible easier to understand though, then they may rethink their charts and graphs confused the heck out of me. I will just have to see what this pastors views really are by fellowshiping with him and testing every spirit my own in general but also his, he seems as one who wants to know Christ like me. Thank you for all your responses any more would be greatly appreciated still.

God Bless,
Matthew

Re: , on: 2010/7/19 14:24

Dispensationalism; Reply to mguldner: I agree whole heartedly that a lot of what is taught about Dispensations is just some Bible scholar trying to catch the wind! If you read it, and look at the Charts with an astute eye you will find lots of contradictions to scripture, doctrine that actually separates the Jew and Gentile, at the time when God has joined them together, as you said. The dispensation of Grace is the Nt and the Law is Ot, John the Baptist was the cutoff point. Luke 16:16; The law and the prophets were until John...." You are correct that none of those eras/dispensations showed another way of salvation, (John 14:6) although many teach precisely that. ...even to the point of insisting that God separates the Jew and Gentile at the Rapture and leaves the "martyred saints" outside the body of Christ. Missing both the Marriage Supper and the Judgement Seat of Christ. You say WHY? They proclaim that they are not part of "the body of Christ." God says not to "split asunder" what He has joined together (Matt.19:6)----but instead they contradict God (Ephesians 2:11-17) and they in fact do just that, so it is impossible to explain to any one today what the "Israel of God" is, (Gal.6:16/KJV Bible) Although you stated it earlier by saying what the body of Christ is. Believe me when I say to you... that knowledge is hard to come by in a church teaching "Dispensations." My Best Tractsman

Re: , on: 2010/7/19 14:58

KingJimmy; Good words, forewarned is fore armed! What is really most horrendous is their misuse of Hebrews 10:26-29 to try and teach that a man can be washed in the Blood of Jesus Christ, with "all" his sins forgiven, and then he can die and go to Hell. What Heb.10:26-29 is talking about is an OT Jew, like those in John 6:66 that were offended at Jesus Christ and "went back"...the only problem was that the blood of their "temporary covenant (Heb. 9:20/Exodus 24:8) did not Perfect forever."("No more sacrifice for sin) The perfect sacrifice is mentioned in Gen.22:8, "God will "provide Himself" a Lamb." (Heb.10:14) "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive!" They have taken the Blood of Jesus Christ and put it at the level of the blood of bulls and goats. (Hebrews 9:11-14) It is no small wonder that so many people think that they can lose their salvation. "Unto him that loved us and "washed" us from our sins in His own Blood." (Rev.1:5(c) Tractsman

Re: , on: 2010/7/19 15:17

"Precious footnotes, How they linger!

Re: , on: 2010/7/19 15:19

I heard a wise preacher say about those that would box God in. (Dispensations) God will ooze out that box!

Re: - posted by Axe1338, on: 2010/7/19 15:35

Dispensationalism has several problems, namely its Israel-centered hermeneutic. This creates two different people of God as opposed to one, namely, the elect. Ephesians 2:11-22 clearly states that the distinction between Jew and Gentile no longer exists, what does a dispensationalist do with that verse? Scripture must be read with a Christ-centered hermeneutic and that alone.

Re: Axe1338 - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/19 15:36

"Scripture must be read with a Christ-centered hermeneutic and that alone."

This is exactly right. Anything less is shadows and grasping. Thank You Axe...

Re: , on: 2010/7/19 16:33

Reply to axe1338: Axe-actly right! Ephesians 2:11-18 is the answer to those who would split the body "asunder." If you disagree with them they accuse of being a preterist (I don't know what that is either) but they (preterists) don't believe in the 1000 year reign of Christ, so I know that I don't belong in that camp! When St.Paul talks about the temple of God, does he ever call it a building? They even have animals killed and offered in the Kingdom Age, I just haven't quite been able to swallow that yet, especially since God was already sick of them all the back in Isa. 1:11/Hebrews 10:6, He can do it if He likes, I just think that it is a thing of the past, and the animals in the kingdom age are all tame. God will sort it out. Tractsman

Re: - posted by Axe1338, on: 2010/7/19 20:20

Thank you for the feedback brothers, I just would like to add that there are many great bible teachers who hold to a dispensational view. So we can't throw out the baby with the bath water.

Re: , on: 2010/7/20 1:07

now is a hermeneutic available for sale on Ebay, and what brand do i look for? meaning which one is better, and what should i expect to pay?

Re: Natan - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/20 2:18

Ha...No because no one would buy it.

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/20 4:33

Yet Another question someone might help me with was Watchman Nee and Witness Nee dispensationalism. I ordered a bible New Testament only for Free from a website because who can turn down a free bible right? It's call the recovery version if anyone is curious, but it has charts of the different dispensations and what not and has tons of study notes, the reason I ask about Watchman Nee and Witness Nee is because Witness Nee seems to be the founder of this version or at least he is the one that explains it in the beginning of the bible. Any help on this would be appreciated THANKS!

God Bless,
Matthew

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/7/20 6:20

I say this in all seriousness brother, but you should burn that copy of the Bible. Witness Lee is one of the greatest heretics of our generation.

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/20 6:25

Wow burning a bible that is pretty serious brother, I will take your advice though what made me leary of the whole thing was it seems Witness Nee's words and study notes were more than the very Word of God.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/7/20 11:39

Witness Lee has practically deified himself in his teachings, and has created a church that centers itself around him, and Watchman Nee. Watchman Nee needs to be read with a grain of salt. Witness Lee needs to be avoided altogether.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/20 13:32

Quote:
-----Each of the times that the term dispensation is used scripturally it is the greek oikonomia which does not mean a division or special period of time in which God deals one way or another, but rather speaks of stewardship or administration of a particular thing that God has entrusted one with.

I have often thought of dispensation when I hear Americans refer to Kennedy Administration, or the Obama Administration. That is a pretty good use of the idea of oikonomia.

The BlueLetterBible shows the use of oikonomia, literally house-rule, in
<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsg3622&t=KJV>

Quote:
----- but to me one can simply study the Word of God in prayer and take it for what it simply says without the philosophical constructs that at various theological points of view bring to the table. It is meant to be a life giving word. I think theologians often turn it into a dead academic study. So in the literal interpretation aspect I probably fall more in the dispensational camp.

This is exactly what some who are called 'theologians' do.

In fact, no one is absolutely 100% literal in their interpretation. It is all a matter of degree.

and BTW for many years I was a card-carrying Scofield-ite. I used my loose-leaf Scofield Reference Bible right through 3 years of Bible College. (and I still have it here, right in front of me, on my Bible Bookshelf!) I was reckoned something of a specialist on the Pre-Trib, Pre-Mill model. At a time in my life I began to read my Scofield more carefully and found myself saying... but I'm not convinced. That's where I stand in relation to most eschatology time schedules... but I'm not

convinced.

Re: - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/20 13:42

"At a time in my life I began to read my Scofield more carefully and found myself saying... but I'm not convinced. That's where I stand in relation to most eschatology time schedules... but I'm not convinced."

I am in the exact same boat...same story.

Re: - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/7/21 1:05

"Thank you for the feedback brothers, I just would like to add that there are many great bible teachers who hold to a dispensational view. So we can't throw out the baby with the bath water."

Like I said before, I have and still fellowship with many people who hold to this systematic theology.

It is just my hope and prayer that people would more prayerfully consider the implications of teaching this structure before they just run like the wind with it Axe.

My Scofield Bible is buried under four feet of dirt in the middle of nowhere...

Re: - posted by jwlassi (), on: 2010/7/31 22:13

In any case, the point is not to cling to a covenant theology or a dispensational theology, but a biblical one. There is much in dispensationalism that rings true to scripture, however, there is also much truth to covenant theology views. There is a compromise view which I believe allows for humility, and also doesn't try to solve the entire bible.

It becomes dangerous when we try to place forms that are too restrictive on our theology. It becomes so linear, that like much of what was said earlier on this post, the proponent of "x" theology becomes more proficient at explaining away other scriptures rather than actually forming useful conclusions with the entirety of scripture.

May we be a people who cling not toward a particular theology, but to his word, regardless of our understanding (or lack of understanding) of it.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/8/15 23:24

Quote "In any case, the point is not to cling to a covenant theology or a dispensational theology, but a biblical one. There is much in dispensationalism that rings true to scripture, however, there is also much truth to covenant theology views. There is a compromise view which I believe allows for humility, and also doesn't try to solve the entire bible.: Unquote

"This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you." John 15:12 (KJV)

"But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another". Gal 5:15 (KJV)

I can understand that Christians who have suffered from church teaching on dispensationalism that is not Spirit led, would, on finding Spirit led covenant teaching, wish to throw out all the things they had been taught, AND visa-versa.

But I believe that both teachings have been given to us, His church from the Spirit at a particular time in history, and both teachings MUST and CAN be reconciled for the sake of the unity of the church. It is easy now to look back on those saints who sought God faithfully and received these wonderful revelations and to point out all their faults (faults which they themselves would be the first to admit).

Those who have been offended should seek to forgive their brothers, not to call them heretics. They should instead find a way to understand their teachings in the new light that Christ has given them, and so gain their brother.

Neither Covenant teaching nor Dispensationalism have all the answers to what the bible teaches, but I have found that an application of BOTH of them to bible study opens up the word to me and is my daily spiritual food. Those who hold firmly just to one teaching in fact have an inherent fear of the other, that it will detract from the grace he has received and from the glory of Christ. But I believe it is God's wisdom to give us such seemingly different doctrines so that we might learn

to love one another. This Jesus commands us.

Can I give an example of my approach, which you probably use already.

I am currently studying Jeremiah chapter 30. As I read, I ask myself three questions:

1. What is God saying about the things actually happening there at Jerusalem.
- 2 What is God saying in these verses about Christ and His church and to me in particular, a christian.
- 3 What is God saying about The future Messiah and His people Israel in the last times.

Some verses apply to all three questions, some to only one, but a full understanding of all scripture requires all three.

I find the Psalms especially should be read this way ie How they apply to David, to Christ at His first coming, to Christ at His second coming, to the christian and to the Jewish remnant.

So I beseech you by the mercies of God to be reconciled.

I am also posting this on a "dispensational" web site

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/8/16 21:13

jwlassi wrote:

Quote:

-----In any case, the point is not to cling to a covenant theology or a dispensational theology, but a biblical one. There is much in dispensationalism that rings true to scripture, however, there is also much truth to covenant theology views. There is a compromise view which I believe allows for humility, and also doesn't try to solve the entire bible.

As I mowed my lawn tonight I began to think on these things as I am about to begin a 12 week teaching series on the covenants of God. What is quoted above is, in my opinion, absolutely correct. I am not a theologian and never attended a seminary, and as such have never studied much that the "great theologians" wrote. I have spent 30 years in the Word of God apart from the influences of these views. I am not implying that it is somehow bad to study their viewpoints. I just never have. As a result, everything I read from them naturally gets filtered through a grid that is not shaped like any of them. Some things stick, and others pass through.

It is true that God has dealt with man in different ways at different times in history. There was a period of time when God dealt with man by law. There is a period of time in which we live when grace is extended to whosoever will. There is a coming time of judgment when the Lord returns. If one wants to call these dispensations, then I guess I am a dispensationalist. But these times center around covenants that God made with man. He is a covenant God and deals with us through covenant. If this is covenant theology, then I guess I believe in covenant theology. But really, I hold to neither one of these established "theologies" and my only purpose in studying them at all will probably be to educate myself so that I can know where another person is coming from in a conversation.

I am a firm believer in studying the Word of God out of the foundation of a real and vibrant relationship with God through Christ. I believe in allowing the Holy Spirit to teach me. I benefit from the teachings of other men and women of God, but I do not espouse the teachings of any of them. The purpose of the Word of God is not so that we can establish theological philosophy and try to win others over to our way of seeing it. The purpose of the Word of God is to transform us into His image. I am not minimizing study, but recognizing the purpose for it. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needs not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.