



# Truth Matters

*A Publication Discussing Matters Related To Truth Because Truth Matters*

## Scripture Reading

Week of

June 12<sup>th</sup> - June 18<sup>th</sup>



### Monday

- ❖ 2 Kings 7, 8
- ❖ Psalm 116
- ❖ Acts 27

### Tuesday

- ❖ 2 Kings 9, 10
- ❖ Psalm 117
- ❖ Acts 28

### Wednesday

- ❖ 2 Kings 11, 12
- ❖ Psalm 118
- ❖ Romans 1

### Thursday

- ❖ 2 Kings 13, 14
- ❖ Psalm 119:1-8
- ❖ Romans 2

### Friday

- ❖ 2 Kings 15, 16
- ❖ Psalm 119:9-16
- ❖ Romans 3

### Saturday

- ❖ 2 Kings 17, 18

### Sunday

- ❖ 2 Kings 19, 20

## Israel and the Church

By John G. Reisinger

*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. 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 with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt Deut 7:6-8.*

Most theologians realize that the exact redemptive words, which are used above to describe Israel as a nation, are also the exact words used to describe the Christian as part of the Body of Christ. Most theologians do not realize that every single one of those redemptive words means something entirely different when used of Israel and of the Church. This failure is the cause of a lot of very bad theological thinking.

1. Israel, meaning the entire nation, was a *holy people* before God-yet nearly everyone in that *holy nation* was lost and died in unbelief.

2. Israel, meaning the entire

nation, was *loved by God* as no other nation on earth-yet most of those very individuals who were *loved by God* were lost and died in unbelief.

3. Israel, meaning the entire nation, was *sovereignly chosen by God* to be his special people-yet most of the individuals who were *chosen by God* were still lost and perished in their sin.

4. Israel, meaning the entire nation, was *redeemed by blood* out of Egypt-yet most of those *redeemed by blood* still died under the wrath of God.

5. Israel, meaning the entire nation, was *sovereignly and powerfully called out of bondage* in Egypt-yet most of those *called ones* died as bondslaves of sin.

6. Israel, meaning the entire nation, was called *God's son* (Hosea 11:1)-yet God disowned most of these *sons of God* as being his true children.

These 'holy, loved, chosen, redeemed, and called people who were God's sons' were made up of people, the majority of whom were lost unbelievers. They nearly all died and went to hell. The very people that were spoken of as 'holy, loved, chosen, redeemed, called, and God's

son' were cast off and rejected by God. What must we learn from these facts? First of all, we must see and teach that the 'redemptive' words used to describe Israel as a nation among nations do not in any sense have the same meaning as when those same words are used of a Christian as a member of the Body of Christ.

(1) Israel was not 'holy' in the same sense that a believer is 'holy in Christ.' Holy means *separate* as well as *morally pure*. Israel, as a nation, was indeed separate from all other nations but only in a physical sense and not a spiritual sense. Israel was anything but morally pure. God could never reject the Body of Christ as He rejected Israel. He could never disown a single soul that is part of the true Holy nation, the Body of Christ that is indwelt by the Holy Spirit. The Body of Christ is holy, or 'sanctified in Christ,' in a way that Israel was never sanctified or holy. God could never say to the church, "...your eyes have seen...yet the Lord has not given you a heart to perceive and eyes to see and ears to hear, to this very day (Deut. 29:3, 4). God has given every one in the Body of Christ, 'eyes to see and ears to hear and a heart to perceive.'

... continued on page 2

## Israel and the Church

By John G. Reisinger

....continued from page 1

The nation of Israel was a rebellious nation that never really knew the Lord. They were loved, chosen, called, redeemed, and were God's son but these words can only mean in a physical sense and not a spiritual-redemptive sense. Read again those words to Israel in Deut. 29:4, "Yet the LORD hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day." Amazing! Those words could never be spoken to loved, chosen, called, redeemed sons of God in the Body of Christ since all of them "know the Lord." *"And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest" Heb 8:11.*

Now it is important that the very same nation that was not given eyes to see is the same nation that was "holy." Also, each member of the nation was "holy" by virtue of the fact he was part of the nation. This was true whether the individual was lost or saved, whether he was a believer or unbeliever.

(2) God loved Israel as he loved no other nation. Amos 3:2 says of Israel, "You only have I known [loved] of all the families of the earth." The word *know* means *loved* or *chosen*. God *loved the people of Israel* in a way He did not love the other nations and yet most of those 'loved' were reprobates.

(3) Israel was *chosen* by God to be his special nation. Amos 3:2 applies here also. However, the very same people that were *sovereignly chosen* were also *rejected and cast off*. Again we must remember that every individual Israelite could say, "God loved me and chose me in a way he did not love or choose the Egyptian. He sovereignly chose me to be a part of his special nation." He could say that whether he was lost or saved, a believer or an unbeliever. Obviously most of the Israelites were not chosen unto salvation.

(4) Israel was *redeemed by blood* out of Egypt. Most of that first generation of redeemed people perished in unbelief in

the wilderness but none-the-less every single one of them was part of the "redeemed people of God."

(5) Israel was sovereignly and powerfully *called of out bondage* to the Egyptians and experienced genuine freedom. Each individual member of that nation was personally called by God into the experience of freedom whether he was lost or saved, a believer or unbeliever, but many of those called people were rejected by God.

(6) God calls the nation of Israel 'my son.' *"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt."* Hos. 11:1. This is one time that one of *God's sons lost his sonship* and was totally disowned and cast out by his Father.

Now it should be easy to see that all six of these redemptive words do not have the same redemptive meaning when they refer to Israel as a nation as they do when applied to the Church as the Body of Christ. Both Covenant Theology and Dispensationalism will give these words the same meaning in both testaments. They will build a whole doctrine of 'the redeemed people of God' on Israel's physical redemption from Egypt. They mix apples and oranges. They treat mere physical types as if they were spiritual realities. Here are some clear biblical facts.

ONE: An Israelite was considered 'holy' and accepted within the camp of Israel by virtue of his birth. He could say he was *chosen by God*, but those same words mean something entirely different when they are applied to a Christian. Every Israelite was chosen but not chosen unto salvation. He could not say these words: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph 1:4). The words 'holy' and 'chosen' mean two different things when applied to Israel and the Church.

TWO: An Israelite could testify he was loved and chosen, but it did not mean

what John 13:1 says, "...having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." Nor was an Israelite 'chosen to be saved through sanctification of the Spirit' as recorded in II Thess. 2:13. The electing love of God that choose us unto salvation is not the same electing love that choose Israel to be a special nation among all the nations.

THREE: The redemption by blood on Passover night is not the same as redemption by the blood of Christ shed on the cross. One redemption was physical, based purely on physical birth, and by the blood of an animal. The other is spiritual, based on God's personal election to salvation, and the precious blood of Christ. Again, I remind you that every Israelite was 'redeemed' regardless of his spiritual state.

FOUR: The calling by God that brought Israel out of Egypt is not the same as Romans 1:7 and other passages. Israel was 'the called' in a national sense but we never think of them as 'the called of Jesus Christ, beloved of God, called to be saints' (Romans 1:6, 7). Being delivered from the bondage of Egypt is not deliverance from death and sin.

FIVE: The sonship of Hosea 11:1 is a national status among nations and not at all the same as John 1:12 and I John 3:2. No true spiritual 'son of God' ever perished and yet most of the entire nation of Israel perished. If our sonship in Christ is in any sense the same as Israel's sonship then we are of all men most miserable.

I trust you understand the importance of seeing that each of these redemptive words mean something entirely different when used of Israel as a nation and a Christian as a member of the body of Christ. All of these when used of Israel are indeed a 'type' of the realities we have in Christ, but they are only types. When anyone tries to build a theology of the church, law and grace, or any related subject on Israel's 'redemption' it can only lead to utter confusion.

... continued on page 3

## Israel and the Church

By John G. Reisinger

....continued from page 2

It is easy to produce verses that show all six of these redemptive words being applied to an Israelite but not once will the word 'justified' follow any or all of these words. However, the exact opposite is true of a child of God. Why is the justification of every loved, chosen, and redeemed elect sinner absolutely certain? Because all who, in Christ, are loved, predestinated, and called will, yea must, be justified (Romans 8:29, 30). The Israelite could be loved, chosen, redeemed, and called and still not be justified. The exact opposite is true in the New Covenant. God's electing love will always, without a single exception, lead to effectual calling, and that calling will always lead to sure and certain justification. These things are certain wherever there is a true atonement.

Of course there were some Israelites that truly believed and were truly redeemed. But there were very few. However, that is not the point. Every Israelite was loved, chosen, redeemed, and called, just by being a part of the chosen nation but that in no way meant the same thing to him as it does to us under the new covenant.

The failure to see this clear truth is one of the glaring self-contradictions in both Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology. The words *God will be their God* can never be applied in a redemptive sense to any nation or individual that is cast off by God: and (1) Israel, as a nation was cast off in respect to their special national status (Mt 21:33-46), and (2) many baptized children of godly parents have perished in hell. When the above words are taken in the spiritual sense of the New Testament, they mean certain salvation and absolute security for all who are 'in the covenant.'

I repeat, Israel was indeed 'called' out of Egypt by God's grace and power, but the word *called* does not mean the same thing as it does in Romans 1:7. Every single Israelite was 'redeemed' by blood

out of bondage in Egypt, but most of them perished in unbelief. The 'redemption by blood' in Exodus twelve is not the same 'redemption by blood' as that in Ephesians 1:7. One is a type and the other is the reality even as physical Israel is the type and the church is the reality.

Both Covenant Theology and Dispensationalism are constantly forgetting the above truth by mixing apples and oranges. They use typology as if it were the reality of the thing typified. Dispensationalism will build a doctrine of 'carnal Christians' on the *fact* (?) that Israel in the wilderness was a 'redeemed people.' Since they applied the blood to the doorposts 'in faith,' they were truly 'saved.' In other words, they had enough faith to be 'redeemed,' but not enough faith to 'enter Canaan' and enjoy a 'victorious life.' Here is the Dispensational view as set forth in the *Scotfield Bible*:

Kadesh-barnea is, by the unbelief of Israel there, and the divine comment on that unbelief (Numbers 14:22-38; Deut 1:19-40; I Cor 10:1-5), invested with immense spiritual significance. The people had faith to sprinkle the blood of atonement (Ex 12:28) and to come out of Egypt (the world), but they had not faith to enter into their Canaan rest. Therefore, though redeemed, they were a forty-year grief to Jehovah.

Covenant Theology does exactly the same thing. Teachers of this system will vehemently reject the clear truth that Sinai was a legal covenant simply because it is impossible for God 'to put a *redeemed* people' under a legal covenant, and Israel was truly redeemed-and by 'redeemed,' the covenant theologian means *saved*. One group is just as bad as the other in their use of typology. The following is from a widely used commentary on the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, question 43, that is dealing with the preface to the Ten Commandments. Written by G.I Williamson, it amazes me that brilliant and godly men cannot see

the implications of their theological system.

When God delivered his people out of slavery in Egypt, it was not because they had kept the ten commandments. No, He first delivered them, and then gave them the Ten 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 already had been SAVED*. And this is exactly the way it is in the life of a Christian.

I doubt that any Covenant Theologian, including Mr. Williamson, would say, "I believe that every single Israelite that left Egypt in the Exodus was a justified believer in Christ." However, their system of theology is forced to *treat* the Nation of Israel as if that were the case. Williamson's statement is arguing a key theological point and he is treating typology as absolute fact. He totally equates Israel's *physical* salvation with the *spiritual* salvation of the Church in his argument. Williamson would never say, "The Exodus experience was equal to true justification by faith for every single Israelite that was involved." However, he must actually treat them that way in his theological system. This is his primary argument for rejecting the Mosaic Covenant as a legal covenant of works.

*The New Geneva Study Bible* does the same thing. "Although the Covenant at Sinai required obedience to God's laws under the threat of his curse, it was a continuation of the Covenant of Grace (Ex. 3:15; Dt. 7:7, 8; 9:5, 6). God gave the commandments to a people He had already redeemed and claimed. (cf. Page 30).

We must see that Israel as a nation was not in any sense the Body of Christ. She was a type of that Body. None of the redemptive words used to describe God's special relationship with the physical nation of Israel have the same meaning as when they are applied to the church.