

# End Times Prophecy: Who Is Biblical ISRAEL Today? Is John Hagee Right

*End Times Prophecy*

By Larry Wessels

sermonaudio.com

**Bible Text:** Romans 9-11  
**Preached on:** Monday, February 6, 2012

## Christian Answers of Austin, Texas

9009 Martha's Drive  
Austin, TX 78717

**Website:** [www.biblequery.org](http://www.biblequery.org)  
**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers](http://www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers)

Announcer. If you would like a free newsletter on this or other subjects, just give us a call at Christian Answers. The phone number is (512) 218-8022 or you could email us at [cdebater@aol.com](mailto:cdebater@aol.com).

## Dispensationalism vs. Covenant Theology

John G. Reisinger. As you know, the subject is not one in which all Christians agree and one of the difficulties is that people don't listen to each other, they just talk past each other. And you hear two Christians talking and the one isn't listening, he's just waiting until the other guy keeps quiet because he's already got a verse to shoot back and forth and usually they just shoot verses back and forth and you'd think they had two Bibles.

I told an illustration of this and Gary asked me if I would tell it again because it illustrates the point. The pope was going to run all the Jews out of Rome and the chief rabbi very strenuously objected and so finally the pope says, "Well, we'll have a silent debate and that will settle whether you can stay or not." And so they had a silent debate and they sat down and the pope, he went like this, and the rabbi, he went like this, and then the pope held up one finger and went like this, and the rabbi held up three fingers. Then the pope took a glass of wine and blessed it and drank it and the rabbi took an apple and blessed it and ate it. And so the pope said, "You win, you can stay." And so the rabbi left and the cardinal said to the pope, "What was that all about?" He said, "Well, he won the debate obviously." He said, "What do you mean he won the debate?" And he says, "Well, I said God is everywhere and he's Jewish but he's also Orthodox because he says but God is right here. And then I said, but there's only one true God, and he's Jewish and he said, but he's in three persons." And then he says, "I took the glass of wine to show the symbolism of the communion cup, it's through the man Christ Jesus that sin is taken out of the world. And he took the apple to show that it was through another man, Adam, sin came into the world. So he's as Orthodox as we are." And the rabbi went out and they said, "What happened?" He says, "I don't know but we're allowed to stay." And they said, "What happened?" He said, "Well, the pope says you Jews gotta get outta here." And I told him, "We're staying right here." And he says, "Then he said I'll give you a week to get outta

here." And I told him we couldn't get out in three weeks. He said, "Then what happened?" He said, "I don't know, we had lunch together." So the moral of the story is Christians might as well have silent debates because they learn about each other just about as much as the pope and the rabbi understood each other.

The book of Galatians 6:16, a passage that Gary mentioned this morning, and in some camps this would be a very key verse of scripture and it is relevant, at least. Galatians 6:16, "as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." And of course, the question that is raised here and in theological circles is the question: is the church the true Israel of God or is Israel and the church two separate peoples of God? And an awful lot hinges on the answer to that question. If you believe that the church is the Israel of God, that will have a great effect on a whole lot of other things, and likewise if you believe they're separate, then you will also have a lot of things affected by that. This is one of the great gulfs between dispensationism and covenant theology and that is the doctrine of the church. It is amazing how many things and how many theological arguments really hinge on your view of what the church is.

We have a chart here that is the three basic presuppositions upon which covenant theology rests and if you get this, you'll understand covenant theology. And they believe, number 1, there is one covenant of grace. They believe there was a covenant of works made with Adam and he failed to earn life and he sinned, and then in Genesis 3:15 God made a covenant of grace with Adam and that covenant of grace runs all the way through to the end of time. What they really mean by covenant of grace when you boil it down and you pin them down, what they mean is that there's only one way of salvation and God has always saved men by that one way of salvation. And we say, "Well, we agree with you 100% on that but why call it a covenant of grace? Why don't you call it what the Bible calls it? The Bible calls it the gospel." God preached the gospel to Abraham. Because the moment you substitute the word "covenant of grace" for the word "gospel" then you get into signs and seals and babies and a whole lot of other things.

The second premise grows out of the first one and that is that there is one redeemed people of God under that one unchanging covenant of grace and, of course, this means that Israel is the church and that the New Testament church is nothing but the same church with the Gentiles added to it. There is one people of God. It runs through all ages under this one covenant of grace. And of course, this is where there's a great difference. We'll come back to that in just a moment.

And then the third thing is there is one unchanging canon of conduct, one standard of morality and that is the unchanging moral law of God written on the tablets of stone at Mount Sinai. And they believe that is the unchanging moral law of God, that is the one unchanging moral law. John Murray wrote a book on Christian ethics and he wrote that book to prove that there was only one canon of conduct. He said it appears there's two. For instance, how can polygamy and easy divorce be tolerated in the Old, and what he was doing in the book was trying to show that polygamy was just as sinful for David as it was for somebody in the New Testament scriptures. And that book, by the way, was probably the final push that moved me out of covenant theology because John Murray is

one of my favorite writers and he's not the kind of a guy who waits for you to criticize what he is going to say, he raises the problems and he says, "Now if I'm right, then I have to prove this, I have to prove this, I have to prove this." And he said in that book, "If I am right, there's only one canon of conduct, then I have to prove that polygamy is just as sinful for somebody in the old covenant as it is under the new covenant."

Now you can see if you look at these things, you can see why the Sabbath is such an important argument and when people argue about the Sabbath, they're really not arguing about how you actually live on the Sabbath as long as you acknowledge it is part of this unchanging canon of conduct. If we come along and say the Sabbath is not a moral law, it is a ceremonial law, we've pulled that block out and we have two canons of conduct, and we've done that, the whole system collapses. So you can see why the Sabbath is so vital to some people, not on how you live but just so you acknowledge it's part of the moral law so your whole system remains intact.

You can see why to some people separating the church and Israel is a necessity and why to somebody else it is something which is taboo. In other words, if you say there's one redeemed people of God and you separate Israel and you separate Israel from the church, again you have destroyed this system. So you can see how totally incompatible the basic presuppositions of dispensationism are concerning the church and the basic presuppositions of covenant theology. There's a gulf between the two.

Dispensationalists insist there are two peoples of God. Israel is one and the church is the other and these two peoples of God are under two different covenants and they have two different goals, and they also have two different canons of conduct. For the dispensationalist, Israel's covenant is still in effect. It includes occupying the land of Canaan or the land of Palestine and that is yet future and will be accomplished in the future. And for the other group who say, "No, that's not true, you don't understand the doctrine of the church." You can see how these things go together. If you take one, you've got to take them all if you're going to take the whole package deal.

Now Galatians 6:16 really doesn't solve the problem because it can be translated different ways, and as Gary mentioned today, this is the only place in scripture where the phrase "the Israel of God" is used and he suggested that we not use it at all. I think that was your...is that what you were saying?

Gary. Not quite.

John. Not quite. Close enough. The word can be translated this way, "as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them and mercy even upon the church of Israel." And if you translate it that way, then it's one group of people and that is the church of God even the Israel of God, meaning the same people. But it also can be translated "and" with brackets "also," and then it would read, "as many as walk according to this rule, peace on them and mercy and also upon the house of Israel, or upon the Israel of God." Pardon me. Now you have two groups of people and the one group is the church and the other group is the Jewish believers within the church. So one of these two.

Now I am not a Greek scholar in any sense whatsoever. I do know a little Greek, he has a sub shop up in Carlisle and that's about the extent. So I would never venture to give an opinion even on this subject. Martyn Lloyd-Jones says he's never known of one single doctrine that's ever been settled by the linguist, and he's probably right, and they certainly have not settled this one and they will probably argue about it until our Lord Jesus Christ comes back again.

But we can draw from this passage of scripture that there is a group of people that Paul calls the Israel of God. Who are they? Are they the church or are they the believers in that Galatian church? If you go to Romans 9:6, we read here that there is such a thing as a true and false Israel, and in Romans 9:6, "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel." So we're going to come back to this in a minute but for now here is two groups of people who both can be called Israel. The label Israel applies to both of them, the saved ones and the unsaved ones are all Israelites, part of the nation of Israel. Now in this passage of scripture the Gentiles are not being considered at all. This is not contrasting Jews and Gentiles, it is contrasting here two kinds of Israelites, the saved and the lost or the natural and the spiritual, or the non-elect or the elect. That's the comparison in this passage of scripture.

Now go to Romans 11, beginning to read at verse 1. By the way, I should note this before we move to Romans 11, that Galatians 6:16 and the phrase "the Israel of God" has far more implications for a dispensationalist than it does for a non-dispensationalist. If it means the Jewish believers in the Galatian church, then the non-dispensationalist loses one of his proof texts, but he just loses one of his proof texts for what he believes. If it means the church, the whole church, then the dispensationalist has lost his position of the separation of Israel and the church. So one has far more to lose than the other one does and that's why you'll find almost 100% of those who are dispensationalists will hold that this means the Israel of God equals the Jewish believers in the church. The other side will have some people who will agree with that who are non-dispensational, namely people like Dr. Gary Long. So it is a problem text and it cannot be conclusively used by any group absolutely to prove their point of view, so we are not going to even attempt to use that as a proof.

The second thing, we come to the book of Romans 11, beginning at verse 1, "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace." Now I'm going to raise some questions and you think about them. I'm not really sure about them but there are some things that make me raise them and make me think that possibly they're right.

First of all, in verse 1 when it says "Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. I also am an Israelite." I don't think there's any question that when Paul says, "I am an Israelite," that he means, "I am a physical Jew. My parents were Jewish. I was born in the Jewish nation." The question is in the beginning of the verse, "Hath God cast away his people?" Does that mean the same thing necessarily? Is he saying, "Has God cast away the nation of Israel, the Israelites? That can't be because I'm an Israelite born of the seed of Abraham." In other words, is this saying here, "Has God cast away the nation of Israel?" Or is it saying, "Has God cast away his election of grace?" And that's the question that isn't going to be answered with this one verse of scripture but it's going to be answered someway through Romans 9:10 and 11.

In verse 2, "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." Now Paul now defines the phrase "his people" with something else. He says, "By 'his people,' I mean the people that God has foreknown." And then he says in the end of that, "What? Don't you hear that the scripture saith that Elijah makes intercession against Israel?" Now against whom is Elijah making this intercession? Is he making it against God's people whom he foreknew or is he making it against the nation of Israel irrespective of whether they had been foreknown by God or not? And this phrase "his people whom he foreknew" I think is a very important qualification in what Paul is saying here. So was Elijah's intercession against the people God foreknew? I don't think so.

Verse 3 he says, "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life." Is there a natural Israel who are and can be labeled "his people whom he foreknew"? Is verse 3 talking about people whom God has foreknown and who are his people or is he talking about a nation that totally rejected the gospel and crucified the Lord of glory?

Verse 4, "what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." Is the 7,000 like Paul, the true "his people whom he foreknew," or is the rest of the nation equally part of "his people whom he foreknew"? Is there any definition here, any clarification that the phrase "his people whom he foreknew" is using foreknowledge in exactly the same way he's already used it in Romans 8?

Is his people whom he foreknew in verse 5? "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." Is "his people whom he foreknew" the election of grace only or is "his people whom he foreknew" the nation of Israel per se?

Are there two kinds of foreknowledge where it has two purposes and two goals? Does God foreknow non-elect people? Does Romans 8:29, go over there for a moment, you're familiar with it, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate." Does Romans 8:29 mean the same thing as Romans 11:2, "his people whom he foreknew"? "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate." Is Paul talking about the same thing, the same kind of foreknowledge, and is he talking about the same people? Or in Romans 8, is he

talking about all of the people of God whom God has foreknown and over here he's talking about the physical nation of Israel?

In Romans 8:29 and 30 when you go down there as compared to Romans 11:1-5, you have his people implied and that's the church, this is all the election of God's grace whom he did foreknow, he did predestinate and so on. He foreknew these and all of these he predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ. All those he called and this is regeneration, and those he called, every one of those, only those he justified and those he justified he also glorified.

Now when we go over to Romans 11:1-5, we read about his people. Is that natural Israel whom he foreknew, or are they predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ? No. Were they called? Yes, but not regenerated. They were called out of Egypt, called out of bondage but they weren't regenerated by the Holy Ghost. That's not effectual calling. Were they justified as those were in Romans 8? No. You see, everybody who is foreknown in Romans 8 is going to be justified but if we take this and make this natural Israel, then we're going to have people who are foreknown who are not going to be justified, who are not going to be called, who are not going to be glorified. That's enough, thank you.

Look at Romans 8 for just a moment, beginning at verse 28 and this is one of those great sweeping statements of Paul. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." Paul, how can you make such a statement? How can you be so dogmatic? How can you be sure that everything without exception is going to work together for good to them that love God? If you take that verse by itself and put it on a wall plaque, it's a platitude. But if you put the theological foundation of Paul's argument underneath it, it becomes a soft pillow for a weary head and a sorry heart. How do we know for sure that all things will work together? Well, for, here's the argument in verse 29, "For," or because, "For whom he did foreknow," which means fore-love or choose, "he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." He also glorified them. "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called." You are called because you're predestinated. Then he called all of those, only those, "whom he called, them he also justified." Every soul who is called in the sense of this text is always justified because this is effectual calling, "and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The only place that Paul jumps from justification to glorification without mentioning sanctification. It's not because he doesn't believe it but because of the argument and the point he's trying to make it's a done deal. If you're in the first link, you're going to be in the last link. And if you want to understand this passage of scripture, read it backwards and say, "Who is the man gonna be who's gonna be glorified in heaven?" Why, the man who has been justified. "Well, who's gonna be justified?" The man whom God calls. "Well, who does God call?" All those he purposed to conform to the image of Christ. The first step in that conforming purpose is calling them out of ignorance and unbelief. "Well, who's the man who's been predestinated?" The man who has been foreknown.

Verse 31, "What shall we then say to these things?" What things? The fact that God is for us in a way of electing grace, that he's foreknown us, he's called us when we were dead in trespasses and sin. "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" For us in what way? In a way of effectual calling. In a way of justification. In a way of electing grace.

"He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Would God keep back the second best after he's given us the first best? Absolutely stupid. Can't possibly be.

Verse 33, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God," the highest authority in the universe speaking, he's the one, "that justifieth." If he's justified us, then who can overturn his word? "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" Some of you remember when Nixon was impeached. He destroyed 18 minutes of a tape. He should have destroyed the whole tape and that's what God did with us. He didn't destroy 18 minutes of man, he destroyed the tape and burned it up and there is no evidence whatsoever against us. We can never be impeached. Impossible.

"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" Who can condemn a Christian? Can Christ condemn him? No, he's the one "that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God." What is he doing there? He's the judge. He's the only one who can condemn you, he's the only one who can save you. And what does he do there? He "maketh intercession for us." Is he going to plead out of one side of his mouth that we be saved and plead out of the other side of his mouth that we can be condemned? Impossible. We have the third person of the Trinity in verse 26, the Spirit helps our infirmities, and the second person of the Trinity is at the Father's right hand making intercession for us. I think we're going to make it. Isn't that right?

What's Paul doing here? Well, he's showing this, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation," can this, can this? No. Nothing can ever tear out somebody who is in a redemptive covenant relationship with God. Impossible. Absolutely impossible. You can never ever be in a saving, redemptive, covenant relationship with God and ever be cast off and ever be lost.

And what's the obvious question? What about Israel? Were they not cast off? Was God unfaithful to his covenant? And that's what Romans 9 begins to answer, that most obvious question. If Romans 8 is the highest assurance that nobody can be in a saving, covenant relationship with God and ever be torn away, then what about the nation of Israel? Did God not go back on his word? Did God not go back on his covenant promises to Israel if he's cast them off? Now listen to me carefully. Is Romans 9 and 11, is it saying absolutely not, God has not been unfaithful? The covenant promises are still in effect and they will be fulfilled in the future, is that what Romans 9 through 11 is saying? Or is Romans 9 through 11 saying, of course not, God has not gone back on his covenant promises because God has never made any spiritual unconditional saving promises to any person, Jew or Gentile, apart from repentance and faith? Which one of those two things is

he saying? What's his answer? In both ways his answer is, "No, they can't be lost if they're truly in saving covenant relationship with God." The question is: has God ever promised a Jew or a Christian parent any spiritual blessing unconditionally irrespective of personal repentance and faith? And it seems to me that's Paul's answer. It seems to me that's his answer.

Verse 1, "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel." Many perished. Why? Because they were not of the election of God's grace, because they did not repent and believe the gospel. Don't blame that on God. Don't blame that on God's covenant.

"For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sara shall have a son." A woman too old to have a child, a man too old to beget a child and a miracle is going to take place. The Holy Ghost is going to enliven the body of the man and enliven the womb of that woman and they're going to make love in faith and then beget a child and he's going to be a miracle born child. Is that right? If you're a Christian here tonight, that's what's happened to you. God came. In the same sense that he came to Sarah and enlivened her womb, he came to you and enlivened your heart and made it possible for you to do something which you could not do with the deadness of your heart in your unbelief. Is that right?

"And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac." You get back there with Sarah and Hagar and all that, you might have a little bit of confusion but when you get down to Rebecca, she had twins even by our father Isaac, "(For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand," might be demonstrated, might be proven to be true that it's "not of works, but of him that calleth;) It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." What's he trying to prove? What's the whole gist of this when you go through from Romans 8 to Romans 9? What's he saying here? That the grace of God has nothing to do with birth. There is no saving covenant promise of God to Jew or a Gentile irrespective of repentance and faith. Before they're born, Jacob and Esau both covenant children, if you please, both having a believing father, both signed and sealed with the so-called covenant, and one was rejected and the other saved. I know one covenant child that God didn't love, his name was Esau.



What's his point here? His point here is God has never promised anybody, Jew or Christian parent, a spiritual blessing unconditionally independent of faith and repentance. He has not gone back on his unconditional promise because he didn't make an unconditional promise independent of repentance and faith.

Look at Romans 9:22, "What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." He's talking here about the nation of Israel. Look at the next verse, connect verse 22 with 23, "the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?"

Well, whatever Romans 11 may or may not predict and I would agree with Gary that it predicts a great ingathering of Jewish people who are going to be blessed with the gospel in the future, and I also agree with him that they're going to be blessed with the gospel and be brought in and baptized into the body of Christ. It's going to happen in this age of grace as we refer to that. There's one olive tree. There's one dispensation of grace. There's one people of God and that people of God are the election of God's grace. And God has one eternal purpose and that is to bring that one people whom he has chosen to faith by one eternal gospel which is unchangeable.

Now the question that I have and I'm throwing some stuff out to you, the question I have is: who are "his people whom he foreknew"? And I can't get that anyway to include anybody who's not one of the election of God's grace. It seems to me that Romans 8 is talking about exactly the same thing.

Now one of the problems with dispensationalism and covenant theology is the way they use the Old Testament scriptures, especially in relationship to the nation of Israel. Next chart. Deuteronomy 7:6 and 8, "For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. 7 The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out," redeemed you, called you out "with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt." And then in the book of Hosea 11:1 it says, " When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." All of that and nearly every one of them went to hell. Nearly every one of them was lost. When you take any of these redemptive words and apply them to the nation of Israel as if they meant the same thing that they mean when they're applied to the church, you're taking typology and using it as if it was reality.

Next chart. The nation of Israel was a holy nation as a nation, even though most of them were lost. They were loved by God as a nation as no other nation was. Most of them were lost. They were chosen by God as a nation out of all the other nations. They were redeemed by God, by the blood of the Lamb. They were called by God out of Egypt. All

of these words are in Deuteronomy 7 and they were God's son, and yet even though they were God's son, they were still as lost as could be, most of them. All of these redemptive words mean something different when they're applied to a Christian. All six words may be applied to Israel but there's one thing that will never be applied to Israel and that is the word justified. You will never read that when you read about all of these things. These loved ones, chosen ones, redeemed ones, they're described for us in scripture and you see that both covenant theology and dispensationalism want to treat these redemptive words as if they had the same meaning when they are applied to a Christian as they do to an Israelite.

In the book of Hebrews 3, you have these people described. Now remember these words. Remember how God describes them: loved, chosen, called, redeemed, and yet look what he says about them in the book of Hebrews 3, beginning to read at verse 17. "But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?" Is he talking about the people with whom he made an unconditional covenant? Is he talking about people whom he foreknew as his people?

"And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached," the same gospel, "as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." Yes, they had the covenants, they had the promises, they had circumcision, they had a knowledge of the law but they didn't have a heart to believe God.

Look at one more passage where God describes them. Deuteronomy 29:4, verse 3 to pick up the context. "The great temptations which thine eyes have seen, the signs, and those great miracles: Yet the LORD hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day." God can never say that about the church. He can never say that about a Christian. Now every Israelite whether he was saved or lost was part of that holy nation. Every Israelite whether he was saved or lost could say, "God loved me in a way he didn't love that Egyptian. He redeemed me by blood in the way he didn't redeem that Egyptian." He could say that whether he knew the grace of God or not because these things were typical, they were types of the reality. Israel is not the church, never was the church but she was a type of the church but in no sense whatever was she the church.

God can never say of the body of Christ or do to the body of Christ what he did to the nation of Israel, so as they say, every Israelite was loved and chosen. This is important because of some of the implications that grow out of it. This is from the Scofield Reference Bible and here's the dispensational view when it describes Israel's rebellion in the wilderness. Kadish Barnea is by the unbelief of Israel there and a divine comment on that unbelief, Numbers 14:22-38, and so on, invested with immense spiritual significance. The people have faith to sprinkle the blood of atonement, Exodus 12:28, and to come out of Egypt, the world, they had not faith to enter into their Canaan rest therefore though redeemed, they were a 40 year grief to Jehovah. That's the source of your carnal Christian

doctrine. They were saved because they had faith to put the blood on the door but they didn't have enough faith to enter into the victorious life. But you see, that's treating the Israelites' redemption as if it was the same as our redemption. When they were loved by God, that's not the same as the everlasting love of God to his elect. When they were chosen as a nation, that's not the same as being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. When they were redeemed by blood, that's not the same as being redeemed with the precious blood of Christ. Two totally different things.

And you use this and you build a false doctrine, but it's not just dispensationalists, covenant theologians do the same thing. This is from G. I. Williamson, a Presbyterian who wrote a commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith and also on the Catechism. When God delivered his people out of slavery in Egypt, it was not because they had kept the 10 Commandments. No, he first delivered them and then gave them the 10 Commandments. So they were not expected to try to keep the law in order to be saved, rather they were expected to do this because they were already saved. And this is exactly the way it is in the life of a Christian. Now if you would say to G. I. Williamson, "Do you believe that every single Israelite without exception who came out of Egypt was saved, justified?" He'd say, "No, no, no, no." But he treats it that way. He treats it that way. They were not saved. They were brought out of Egypt, they were redeemed by the blood of the lamb but most of them were unbelievers according to Hebrews 4. Am I with you? All right.

Next chart. This is from the Geneva Study Bible. It does the same thing. Although the covenant of Sinai required obedience to God's law under the threat of his curse, it was a continuation of the covenant of grace. If you want to write down those references, you write down those references and see where it talks about a covenant of grace. If you want to talk about a stretch of a misuse of scripture. You see, you can't have a covenant of works after Genesis 3:15 in covenant theology, so you come to Mount Sinai, it has to be an administration of the covenant of grace. But it can't, it's a legal covenant so he says it's a continuation of the covenant of grace. God gave the commandments to a people he had already redeemed. Yes, he had already redeemed them physically out of Egypt and, yes, it was very gracious of him to redeem them, but that's not the same as saving them, that's not the same as justifying them by grace through faith.

Another 10-12 minutes, all right.

It seems to me here's some of the failures in our thinking. I think we fail to see how totally the old covenant is as nothing but preparatory. Its function was preparatory and that now we have the fulfillment and the going beyond it. But this is a total thing. Today some of the big words are continuity, discontinuity, and I read books after books after books and continuity, discontinuity. There was a whole book published in honor of Dr. Johnson with some essays on this from all kinds of points of view. It must be great to have people write books in your honor. My, oh my, oh my. But this is a bit of an oversimplification but not totally. It really there's 100% continuity and there's 100% discontinuity. In what sense? What are we talking about? If we're going to talk about covenants and God's covenant relationship, we're talking about 100% discontinuity, an

old covenant is done, finished, kaput in its entirety, and everything that covenant brought into being, a people, a priesthood, a sacrificial system, a theocracy, laws governing it, all of that is finished. If we're talking about the one unchanging purpose of God in calling Abraham, in calling the nation of Israel, in making a covenant of David, if we're talking about the one unchanging purpose of God in sovereign grace, it's 100% continuity. God has never changed his purpose. He has one chosen people. He's going to bring that people to faith in this one everlasting gospel. I think we fail to see the totality of this. The old covenant, the Decalogue, Judaism, theocracy, 100% gone. 100% continuity in God's purpose.

The second thing I think is we fail to see that the church is not in any sense whatsoever the show doing the intermission between the halves of a football game. I used to get so provoked when I hear people preach about this parenthesis, and it always reminded me, you know, they said, "Boy, wait until the time clock begins to run again." And it always reminded me of being in a football game, you know, where the band is playing and nobody is paying any attention because what until the second half takes place and everybody is waiting for the second half. Let me tell you something, God's never done anything more great or more glorious than he has when he created the body of Jesus Christ. And whatever there is in Romans 11, whatever is in the Jewish nation, it's not going to eclipse the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ as the shepherd of the sheep and the church of Jesus Christ. Nothing's been postponed. Everything is right on schedule. Isn't that right?

There's just this one chart yet and then we'll finish. You have in Exodus 19, better look that text up. Look up Exodus 19 and hold your finger there and go back to 1 Peter 1. The book of Exodus 19, beginning to read in verse 3. "And Moses went up unto God, and the LORD called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself." And every theologian almost will stop here and say, "Now, you see, this proves this is grace." Well, of course it was very gracious of God to bring them out of the land of Egypt. It was a wonderful blessing. It was a great blessing for God to give them a covenant of works to kill their self-righteousness but in order to do that, it had to be a covenant not of grace but a covenant of works to kill their self-righteousness.

Verse 4, "Now therefore, if," if, "if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then," on the grounds of that obedience, "then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Some dispensationalist way back, not recently, said that Israel should have never entered into this covenant because they traded grace for law, as if they had a choice in this. And then the other group, they go to the other extreme and they say this isn't a covenant of works at all, this is just a continuation of the covenant of grace. That's just the other extreme. But it seems to me that here you have one thing that isn't in verse 4, they are not justified. They never kept the covenant. They never believed the gospel.

We are justified according to 1 Peter. Look at 1 Peter 2:9, "ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." That calling there is effectual calling, not calling out of Egypt. In 1 Peter, we are the people of God. Every single one of those blessings that Israel never inherited because she never kept the covenant are the very blessings that we have tonight.

We are a peculiar people. By the word peculiar doesn't mean funny in the head. Some of you are that too. The word peculiar is a very interesting word. If your husband said to you, "That woman of mine is the most peculiar woman I've ever known." If she understood the New Testament, that would be the highest compliment he could ever give her. Back then they measured a thing in terms of cows. That's what the word comes from. Cows, cow value. I'm really helping now, aren't I? The more cows you had, the more wealthy you were and when you bought something, you bought it in terms of so many cows, and what the man is saying is the pekos value of my wife is the highest possible value of anything. She's the greatest treasure that I have. She's the thing above all and that's what we are. We are God's special treasure.

Now we are a peculiar treasure, that's what we're promised. We're a peculiar people. They were promised to become a kingdom of priests or a royal priesthood, as it says in 2 Peter. Or you could translate that "kings and priests." But you'll notice that every single blessing that was promised to them upon the grounds of obedience to the covenant, we inherit those things tonight. We are a true holy nation. They were a holy nation as among other nations, set apart as no other nation was, but we're a holy nation set apart in Jesus Christ.

Did Israel ever inherit these blessings? No. Why? She never kept the covenant. Why do we inherit the blessings? Because one kept the covenant in our place. The glory of the new covenant is not that God has gone soft or that God has lowered the standard. The glory of the new covenant is that he has given one in our nature to take our place, to live under the very law and then die under its awful curse after he's fulfilled every one of its demands, and we have tonight given to us every blessing the law promised and Jesus Christ has endured every curse that threatened and we can sing it as well, "It is well with my soul."

I would answer the question, "Hath God cast away his people whom he foreknew?" Absolutely not and he never will. How we relate the future in Romans 11, I honestly am not sure. I make a distinction in my thinking between Israel as a nation, a theocracy, a covenant nation and Israel as an ethnic people beloved by the fathers or for the fathers' sake and that can be a capital "F" and a small "f." And it seems to me that if Israel, ethnic Israel as a people, if they are not loved by God in some way to this day, there's no reason for them being on the face of the earth. When the king said, "Give me one proof the Bible is true," and the man answered, "The Jews," I think he was right, and every time those Jews whip those Arabs, I get out my Charles Larkin charts and go over them one more time.

Let's pray.

*Our Father, we are not sure what your program is for everything but we're sure that it's good, it's holy, it's just and we're sure that you will accomplish all that you've set out to do. We would differ in some of our convictions here tonight but our affections are in the same person, our Lord Jesus Christ, and we know not what the future holds but we know who holds the future, and regardless of what view we may take, we can sing from our hearts, "Jesus is coming to earth again, what if it were today?" We can sing that with joy. We can sing that with hope. We can sing that with assurance. Bless our minds and our hearts and if we've said anything tonight that's contrary to your word, I would ask that the wind might blow it away just like the wind blows away the chaff and the Holy Spirit would make us forget that we ever heard it, and that which is of truth, help us to gather it into our hearts and make it a part of our life and our thinking. And we shall praise you for Christ's sake. Amen.*

Announcer. Check out our websites: [biblequery.org](http://biblequery.org), this site answers 7,700 Bible questions; [historycart.com](http://historycart.com), this site reveals early church history and doctrine proving Roman Catholicism is not historically or doctrinally viable; [muslimhope.com](http://muslimhope.com), this site is a classic refutation of Islam, a counterfeit religion created by Mohammad.

Free newsletters are also available.