Has the Church Replaced Israel?

Michael Vlach

Purpose: will ethnic Israel experience national salvation and restoration?

Introduction

• "'Replacement theology' or 'supersessionism' (SP) refers to the position that the church is the 'new' or 'true' Israel that replaces or fulfills national Israel's place in the plan of God.

• To be correct, SP must prove: (1) God can make multiple, eternal, unconditional promises and covenant to the nation of Israel and then not fulfill these promises to them. How can a never-lying God promise then not fulfill? (2) The church is the new Israel and that Gentiles are now part of Israel and identified as Jews. (3) Church has inherited Jewish covenants and promises in such a way that we should not expect future fulfillment for national Israel.

• NT harmonizes with OT but doesn't change its meaning. SP tampers with strongest biblical evidence: multiple explicit declarations in both Testaments tat national of Israel will be saved and restored.

• SP have made a foundational error concerning God's purpose for Israel. Not God's intention for all who believe to be part of Israel. Through Abraham the nation of Israel was a vehicle to bring blessings to "all families of the earth" (Gn. 12:2-3), but not intention all "Israel".

• **Both sides of debate admit OT predicted restoration of national Israel to her land with role to play for nations**. No dispute here. Issue: how does NT understand OT promises to Israel? SP says NT transfers, interprets, reinterprets OT promises to Israel and applies them to the church that rules out future nation. OT authors believed in future restoration but now fulfilled in a way unforeseen by OT writers.

• Nonsupersessionists (NS) say eschatological OT message is not transcended or made into something not intended.

• Main issue: "whether the Bible indicates that the NT church is the replacement or fulfillment of Israel and whether **national Israel has any future role in God's plan**."

• National Israel has a future. God will save and restore them for his glory and electing purposes (Rm. 11:28-29, 33-36). God has not rejected them! (Rm. 11:1-2).

I. **What is Supersessionism?**

- Some like term "fulfillment theology" better than SP. In the end, all the same: promises made to ethnic Israel no longer for them. They belong to another group—'new Israel'.

A. Defining Supersessionism

1. Kaiser: SP…the church, Abraham's spiritual seed, has replaced national Israel…transcended terms of the covenant given to Israel, which they lost because of disobedience.
2. Diprose: church permanently replaced ethnic Israel in working out God's plan and as recipient of OT promises to Israel.

3. Israel was to prepare the world for Christ. After Christ, no longer needed, replaced by church. Israel no longer people of God.[1]
4. Boettner: God is through with the Jews as a unified national group in evangelizing the nations.
5. SP two core beliefs: (1) national Israel has forfeited status as God's people and will never reclaim this unique role; (2) church is true Israel that has replaced superseded national Israel as people of God. Church is sole inheritor of God's covenant blessings originally given to national Israel in the OT.

B. Variations within SP

1. All believe church has superseded national Israel as people of God.
2. Punitive SP
   a. Emphasizes Israel's disobedience as reason for displacement; Israel has rejected.
   b. Martin Luther
3. Economic SP
   a. Poythress/Barth/NT Wright
4. Structural SP

II. **SP and the Future of Israel**

A. Salvation and Restoration

1. Some SP believe there will be future *salvation* of Israel (group of Jews in the end will believe) but NO SP believes there will be restoration of national Israel (saved, planted in land, given unique role to nations).

B. Moderate SP

1. Ladd: literal Israel will be saved…but church is now spiritual Israel.
2. Erickson: church is new Israel. Same with Grudem.

III. **Factors Leading to SP**

A. The Church's Perspective on the Two Destructions of Jerusalem

1. Two failed revolts evidence of Israel being abandoned. Esp. in AD 135 caused people to believe God had rejected Israel permanently.

B. Hermeneutical Issues

1. Church's use of Jewish Scriptures. Allegorical approach. Tertullian took Gen. 25 ("older will serve the younger") to mean national Israel will become subservient to the church.

IV. **SP in Patristic Era**

---

[1] Doesn't this mean SP believes in *two* people of God? Israel was God's people in OT, church is God's people today.

A. Rejection of Israel

V.

VI.

VII.

VIII. **Hermeneutics of SP**

A. SP controlled by three interrelated beliefs

1. Interpretive priority of NT over OT
2. Belief in nonliteral fulfillments of OT texts regarding Israel
3. National Israel is type of NT church

B. Interpretive priority of NT

1. Starting point for understanding OT texts (including prophecies and promises to Israel) is not OT but NT: PS: *but don't we need the NT to fully understand?*
2. NT interprets OT texts often in ways not suggested by OT texts
3. OT texts speaking of Israel's restoration should not be understood literally. If OT texts suggest this, better to read in light of NT.
4. NT priority lies at heart of SP hermeneutic

C. Nonliteral fulfillments of OT Prophecies

1. Normal reading of OT passages seems to predict future restoration of Israel
2. Amos 9:11-15 tells of day God will restore Israel to her land.
3. Zech. 14:16 says Jerusalem will be place where kings of nations come to pay homage to the Lord.
4. Joel 3:17-18, mountains of Israel will "drip with sweet wine" and the hills will "flow with milk."
5. Hard to deny OT predicts restoration of nation of Israel. But SP say they have been fulfilled in non-literal ways.
6. Basis for taking non-literally
   a. Acts 2:16-21 – Here, Peter quotes Joel 2:28-32, a text speaking of national Israel's restoration. Peter quotes it *on the Day of Pentecost* and says Joe's prophecy was being fulfilled. This shows that God's people, the argument goes, Israel, are being reshaped and constituted.
   b. Acts 15:15-18 – James quotes Amos 9:11-12. This text refers to restoration of Israel. James relates it to God's work with Gentiles. Significance? Here, non-literal, figurative interpretation is best regarding restoration of Israel. Church is Israel.

c. Rom. 9:24-26 – Paul quotes Hosea 2:23; and 1:10. Here, church fulfills promises to national Israel. Paul deliberately applies two prophecies to future salvation of Israel and applies them to the church. Prophecies of Hosea filled in Christian church.

D. Typological Interpretation

IX. **Evaluating the Hermeneutics of SP**

A. Avoid two extremes

1. Avoid thinking NT always deals with OT in straightforward, literal manner. Clearly, Matthew's quotation of Hosea 11:1 (Mt. 2:15) is not a literal rendering. Hosea passage refers to historical event of Israel's exodus from Egypt, while Matthew is relating Hosea 11:1 to Jesus. Matthew's interpretation of Hosea 11:1 is not contrary to literal meaning in Hosea 11:1, but goes beyond literal meaning in way Hosea was not thinking about Christ when he wrote what he did. Hosea 11:1 refers to historical exodus of Israel from Egypt while Matt makes typological connection between Israel and Christ. Thus, Hosea 11:1 is both, actual historical event and typologically pointing forward to Christ. **Sum: NT writers sometimes apply OT passages to Jesus in a Christological manner that goes beyond a simple literal or plain interpretation**.

2. Avoid thinking because NT writers sometimes quote OT passages in nonliteral or less literal ways, we shouldn't expect any literal fulfillment of OT promises and covenant to Israel. Matt. 3:5-6 declares that Micah 5:2 was literally fulfilled with Jesus' being born in Bethlehem. Matt. 21:4-5, the Zech 9:9 prophecy of the King's coming to Zion humbly on a donkey was literally fulfilled.

B. New Testament Priority

1. SP that NT has priority creates more problems.

2. However, non-SP believe there is a sense NT has priority. In these ways:

a. NT progressive revelation adds to, **clarifies**, and expands revelation previously given.

b. NT is more **complete (comprehensive)** revelation than OT; offers information and insight not in OT (e.g. destination of the lost/saved etc.)

c. NT has authority to **cancel** temporary commands, covenants and institutions in OT. (e.g. food laws in Lev. 11 revoked in Mk. 7:19; Christian clearly not under Mosaic law, Rm. 10:4; Gal. 5:18; Priesthood changed as Jesus is final sacrifice for sins, Hb. 9).

d. NT **adds applications (compounds) to OT revelation**. They apply OT in ways unforeseen by OT writers (e.g. Mt. 2:15; Hos. 11:1).

i. *BUT,* does this mean NT meaning becomes OT meaning? Not necessarily. NT may be adding applications or referents or analogies.

ii. The fact that an OT promise or covenant is applied/fulfilled with the church does not mean the original referent—Israel—is no longer related to the promise.

iii. Paul clearly states in Rom. 11:26-27 that the new covenant will be fulfilled with Israel. In 11:26, Paul says "all Israel will be saved" and links this promise to Isa. 59:21 and Rm. 11:27. Thus, new covenant is in effect for the church now and will be fulfilled with Israel in the future. Both and situation.

e. NT gives correspondence and typological connections with OT. Adam and Christ are connected (Rm. 5). OT priesthood and priesthood of Jesus. Passover and death of Christ (1Co. 5:7).

f. **Thus, real sense in which **non-SP embrace NT priority**.

3. But, several ways non-SP disagrees with SP's NT priority

a. NT is the interpretive lens for understanding OT passages. The primary meaning of an OT passage is not found in the OT passage but in the NT interpretation/reinterpretation. The primary meaning is found in NT; read OT through NT lens.

i. OT texts are no longer reference points for their own meaning.

ii. Authorial intent of OT authors no longer determined by HGL hermeneutic.

iii. Thus, when one reads Jeremiah and Zech, the meaning not found in those books but must read through NT lens.

iv. SP should not defang OT but allow it to speak to about national Israel. NT *does* have authority to revoke and add referents to OT promises though.

b. Brings into doubt the integrity of the OT texts. How were they actual revelations in good faith. If NT reverses interpretation or cancels OT promises to Israel, how was God faithful?

i. How does this square with Mt. 5:18 and Jn. 10:35? And how did the content of these prophecies come to bear on the actual audience? They understood God to be promising literal spiritual and physical blessings to future ethnic Israel. Was this not deceptive to the hearers.

ii. If God is true and does not lie, how can he clearly promise some things to some people but then fulfill the promises in a different way?

c. Doesn't account for explicit promises of national Israel perpetuity. Jer. 31:35-37; the *nation* of Israel will never be cancelled.

d. The NT actually upholds Israel's expectation in the OT. **Matt. 19:28**, **Lk. 22:30** and **Acts 1:6** reaffirm the OT expectation of a future for national Israel. Does the NT *transcend* OT promises or *reaffirm* it.

C. Non-Literal Fulfillments

1. Acts 15:13-18 use of Amos 9 apparently is fulfilled in a non-literal way.

a. Vlach says initial application/fulfillment of Amos 9:11-15 with Gents today but doesn't rule out future final fulfillment with national Israel when Christ returns. Dble fulfillment

b. James doesn't say Gents fulfilling fulfills Amos 9; says "agrees" with what OT prophets had predicted about Gents in Acts 15:15. Perhaps not claiming fulfillment but principle in OT applying to Acts 15 situation. Principle? Gents one day saved without becoming Jews and keeping Mosaic law. Perhaps saying Gents shouldn't be coerced into Judaism.

c. Better interpretation though. "This" in Acts 15:15 refers to v. 14 and Gentile inclusion. Something happening Amos predicted: Gents included into people of God without becoming Jews. But this doesn't mean restoration of Davidic kingdom to Israel was being fulfilled as well in Acts 15. Main issue salvation in Acts 15, not eschatology.

d. Point: Jews shouldn't require Gents to be circumcised and become Jews become OT predicted Gents would be saved without being Jews. Thus, *initial fulfillment* of Amos 9. But initial fulfillment doesn't mean *exhausted fulfillment.* Gent salvation has been fulfilled but not future restoration of DK to Israel. Still to come (Ac. 1:6). Does this mean national Israel being restored? Not necessarily.

e. Rom. 11:25-27, "mystery" of Gentile salvation would precede salvation and restoration of national Israel. Gent salvation doesn't mean now part of new Israel. When Israel saved as nation, Gents get even more blessings (Rm. 11:12).

f. NT quotes OT doesn't mean full fulfillment. Pete quotes Joel 2 in Acts 2 because certain events of that day were being fulfilled (e.g. pouring out of HS, Ac. 2:17). But cosmic signs not fulfilled. DOL is future (1Th. 5:2; 2Th. 2:2; 2Pt. 3:10). Progressive fulfillment. Already/not yet.

g. Just because some facets fulfilled of Joel 2 prophecy in Acts 2 doesn't mean complete fulfillment. If DOL is future fulfillment, so can Israel restoration. Whole Joel 2 prophecy not fulfilled.

h. In Rm. 9:24-26, Paul shows God in sovereignty can take disobedient people and make them his people, and quotes Hosea 2:23, 1:10. So parallel in this sense: God elected Gents like he elected Jews.

i. Maybe saying 'people of God' now includes Gentiles. Isa. 19:24-25 and Zech. 2:11 predicted Gents would be people of God without becoming Israel. Romans shows that while Gents are now people of God, later told God hasn't rejected his people whom he foreknew (11:2). Both Gents and Israel people of God.

D. Types and Typological Interpretation

1. SP says Israel finds fulfillment in antitype the church. No continuing relevance for Israel. Israel caterpillar and church butterfly. But if true, we'd expect to see no NT discussion about future for national Israel. We do! Mt. 19:28, 23:39; Acts 1:6; 3:19-21; Rm. 11 speak of restoration of national Israel.

2. What about temples? Yes, believers are referred to as temples (Eph. 2:21; 1Co. 3:16). But other passages refer to future literal temple in Jerusalem. In Mt. 24:15, Jesus relies on Daniel 9:24-27, referring to prophetic event taking place in temple in future Jerusalem. Also, in 2Th. 2:3-4, 'man of lawlessness' will take his seat in the temple of God located in

Jerusalem. Also, Rev. 11:1-2 refers to future temple (unless you are hard preterist). Thus, the temple in the NT can refer to (1) Jesus, (2) the church, (3) the body of believer (4) future temple in Jerusalem. Context determines which.

3. Types are legit; "typological interpretation" is not.
4. There are certainly connections between Israel and the church. "People of God" language used for Israel in OT now used for church in NT (i.e. Rm. 9:24-26).
5. Take Hebrews. True Mosaic covenant would come to end (Jer. 31:31-34)—it was temporary and conditional covenant. Since Levitical priesthood linked to MC, that too gave way to superior priesthood of Christ. Literal interpretation here. Doesn't mean all of OT is types and shadows. Many NT passages rely literally on OT: (1) abomination of desolation in Mt. 24:15→Dn. 9:24-27; (2) "new heavens and new earth" in 2Pt. 3:13→Isa. 65:17/66:22.
6. Avoid two extremes: no types in OT and everything in OT types, pics and shadows.

X. **The Hermeneutics of Nonsupersessionism**

A. The starting point for Interpretation is the Passage itself

1. Primary meaning in any Biblical passage is in the original passage itself.
2. NT writers make analogies/illustrations/applications from OT that OT writers could not have known. They may make commentaries on OT passages that gives more understanding of OT passages. But these only *supplement* and *harmonize* OT revelation, not change or alter the meaning differently than OT intended. God may do more, but never less.
3. Feinberg says major difference between dispys and non-dispys is how they approach the OT texts. "Non-dispys begin with the NT teaching as having priority and then go back to the OT. Dispys often begin with the OT, but wherever they begin they demand that the OT be taken on its own terms rather than reinterpreted in the light of the NT." This does not mean OT priority over the NT, just original intent of OT passage.
4. The NT *builds* on OT revelation concerning the nation of Israel but NT doesn't transcend or alter original intent of the authors. This helps us answer charge that NT is silent on national Israel's restoration. OT has already revealed God's plans on this matter, no need for info to be repeated. It should be assumed unless NT explicitly says otherwise.
5. The church is more central in NT because it has become central in salvation history. But why should a clear OT teaching have to be repeated? Shouldn't they be assumed unless abrogated? If NT explicitly rejects OT institution, it is cancelled. But if he says it once in OT, why must he repeat it to be operative? This isn't argument from silence. God broke silence in OT!

B. Unconditional Promises Are Not Canceled by Progressive Revelation

1. Progressive revelation cannot negate unconditional promises to Israel. A prophecy given unconditionally to Israel may be fulfilled in church if NT *applies* it to the church, it must also be fulfilled to Israel.
2. Non-SP deny NT reinterprets OT. If NT can reinterpret OT to evaporate plain promises, doesn't this violate Mt. 5:18 ("until heaven and earth pass away…") and ("Scripture cannot be broken")?
3. NT does not change the meaning of OT texts. It is not contradictory revelation. He was then deceiving OT prophets. [Side note: SP's compare OT as scaffolding and NT as structure; Dispy's compare OT to foundation and NT as structure.
4. Ladd says NT at times reinterprets OT. Feinberg calls him out on this. How can God be truthful and change the meaning of His promises?

C. Israel is not a type

1. A type is person, thing or institution in OT that prefigures something greater in NT (e.g. Adam was type of Christ; Levitical priesthood type of Jesus' priesthood).
2. Both SP and non-SP's embrace types. But latter doesn't embrace typological interpretation. SP says Israel type of Christian church and physical land type of Christian spiritual blessings.
3. Israel and the land are not types for two reasons: (1) These two are not inferior that need to be transcended by greater spiritual truths. (2) the promises are *unconditional*, and thus can't over ride.
4. There *are* some connections between Israel and the church. There are analogies but doesn't mean church supersedes Israel.

D. Multiple Fulfillments and Applications of OT Promises

1. OT texts that speak of Israel's restoration are related to the church by NT authors (Acts 2:16-21→Joel 2:28-32; Ac. 15:15-18→Amos 9:11-12). This doesn't mean church is complete fulfillment of the OT promises with Israel. Double fulfillment…one for church in present and one for national Israel. E.g Acts 2:16-21 refers to church and 28:32 refers to Israel.
2. So, NT doesn't give *different meaning,* or cancel it, just gives different application that OT writers didn't see. Expansion to church doesn't mean national Israel excluded.

E. Christ and the OT

1. Non-SP are Christocentric. Christ is the focal point of both Testaments. Everyone one of God's promises are 'yes' in Him (2co. 1:20). OT points forward to Christ; NT says Jesus is hope of the OT. Christ is the fulfillment of the Mosaic Law (Mt. 5:17). He is the ultimate Israelite (Mt. 2:15→Hos 11:1). All of the unconditional covenants (Abrahamic, Davidic, New) find their fulfillment in Christ. Jesus is the fulfillment of the OT.

2. But this doesn't mean that specific OT promises, prophecies and covenants somehow disappear into Christ. Wrong when Riddlebarger says: "OT prophecies concerning Israel 'vanish' in Christ, who has fulfilled them."

3. True Christcenterdness is accurately understanding his word. If it teaches future restoration of Israel, how can we say we'll not believe this because not CC enough?

XI. **Theological Arguments for Supercessionism**

- Five primary arguments to support SP

A. Permanent Rejection of the Nation of Israel (Mt. 21:43)

1. "The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing its fruit."

2. (1) Israel has been permanently rejected as people of God. (2) the "nation" to whom the kingdom would be given is the church."

B. Application of "Israel" Language to the Church (Key texts)

1. Galatians 6:16 – Many systems divide over this verse. SP says chief witness that Church *is* Israel of God, the heir to Israel's covenant promise. (1) *Kai* (and) before 'Israel of God' means 'even.' NIV says this. Paul clearly calls church Israel of God and promises given to OT Israel now given to NT church. *One* group in v. 16. All believers are Israel of God. (2) Context: purpose of book is unity (chaps 3-4), why end book separating Jews and Gents?

2. Rm. 9:6 ("not all who are descended from Israel are Israel.") Paul is making distinction between ethnic Israel and spiritual Israel. Grudem: the true children of Abraham are not ethnic Jews but those who trust in Christ.

3. Rm. 2:28-29 – here, SP says Jew can mean Gentile church member. A true Jew has inward commitment to God. "Jew" no longer refers to ethnic Jews only; broadened to include all believers.

4. 1Pt. 2:9-10 – explicitly shows OT term for Israel now used for NT church. Peter identifies church as Israel. Church has become true Israel of God.

5. Gal. 3:7, 29 – Gents are sons of Abraham. All NT believers are Abe's seed in spiritual sense. NT church identified as true Israel.

C. Unity between Jews and Gentiles

1. Eph. 2:11-22 – Gents used to be excluded from citizenship of Israel (2:12), now fellow citizens (2:19). Logic of this passage against future role for national Israel. No separate purpose here. Why bring them together only to separate them again. Going backward. Scaffolding all over again.

2. Rom. 11:17-24 – Gents are fellow sharers in olive tree that is Israel (v. 17). They have become Israelites.

D. Church's Relationship to the New Covenant (Heb. 8:8-13)

1. Author quotes Jer. 31:31-34, primary OT text describing NC. Thus, NC finds complete fulfillment in the church. Originally addressed to Israel and fulfilled in church.

E. New Testament Silence

1. No NT proof of national Israel restoration in NT. Not one passage saying earthly reign before appearing. No earthly king over restored nation of Israel!

XII. **SP and Romans 11:26**

A. Central question: "Has God rejected His people?" (11:1)

B. Moo says Romans 11:25-32 is the climax to all of Romans 9-11. Center of this passage is v. 26, "And in this way all Israel will be saved."

C. What is meaning of "all Israel" and what is the timing of Israel's salvation.

D. SP give three interpretations of "all Israel

1. All elect (Jews and Gents); Calvin

2. All elect Jews throughout history; purely ethnic; no Gents in view (Berkhof/Hoekema/Hendriksen). [*Neither of these two views see Israel as a generation of Israel in the future]*

3. Future large scale conversion of the Jews into the Christian church. Merkle says this is by far majority view. Common in CH. Today, Moule, Murray, Morris, Bruce, Grudem, Moo. This is a national *salvation,* not a national restoration. No earthly restoration of Davidic kingdom, rebuilt temple, or special role of Israel.

XIII. **Evaluating the Theological Arguments of SP**

A. National Israel's Permanent Rejection (Mt. 21:43)

1. Some say "you" refers to current leaders of Israel, not the nation as a whole. But Mt. 23:37-38 and Luke 19:41-44 says Jesus rejection applies to whole Jewish nation.

2. Vlach's view: KoG would be taken from current unbelieving nation of Israel and given to future nation of Israel that would believe. Though there is current judgment (37-38), hope in v. 39 when another nation will cry out in acceptance of Messiah. This group is "all Israel" in Rom. 11:26 and those who "look on Me whom they have pierced" in Zech. 12:10.

3. Even if nation refers to church, doesn't rule out future restoration of Israel. We know kingdom program includes both. Mt. 21:43 doesn't prove no future nation of Israel.

B. Application of "Israel" Language to the Church

1. Gal. 6:16 – Israel of God is referring to Jewish Christians. (1) Copulative ("and", AV, NASB etc.) more probable than explicative ("even", NIV). (2) Context (Judaizers rebuked but then Paul is sure to commend the *true* Jewish Christians, not attacking them. Further, why make such a humongous theological statement right at the end of the letter). (3) No other passage identifies Israel as the church. Paul always refers to Israel as ethnic Jews. One exception? Probably not.

2. Romans 9:6 – There is an Israel within ethnic Israel. That subcategory is not believing Gentiles but believing Jews. Distinction not between the church and ethnic Israel but between ethnic Israel and Christian Jews. Not all Jews will inherit God's promises.

3. Romans 2:28-29 – Again, Jewish Christian in view. Ethnic Jews subject of broader context in Rom. 2:17-3:20. Vvs. 28-29 difficult. Does it include Gents?

4. 1 Peter 2:9-10 – Letter may have just gone to Jews, not Gents. God's people can include Gents obviously while ethnic Israel remaing distinct (e.g. Egypt). Church doesn't equal Israel. Point: as Israel was people of God by virtue of right relationship, church people of God in the same way.

5. Gal. 3:7, 29 – Being a son of Abraham doesn't make one a Jew. Abe was a believer before he was circumcised (i.e. recognized as a Hebrew); we are his children based on his faith. Seed of Abe used in four ways: (1) biological kids (2) Messiah (3) righteous remnant of Israel (Isa. 41:8, Rm. 9:6) (4) believing Jews and Gents (Gal. 3:29).

C. Unity of between Jews and Gents

1. Ephesians 2:11-22 – SP says Gents are participants in commonwealth of Israel. No. (1) Being near to something does mean equal identity. (2) He made Gents and Israel "one" but avoids title Israel. (3) the one new man is built on foundation of NT apostles. Israel not a NT identity. Rooted in OT. (4) They "share" with Israel, equal gospel footing, but sharing does not mean incorporating. Regarding gospel, Gents and Israel equal. Still ethnic distinction. Paul still speaks of Jews and Gents (Rm. 1:16; 9:24; 1Co. 1:24; 12:13; Gal. 2:14-15). All kinds of distinctions: parents children, elders/non-elders, men/women. In regard to salvation, there is **one people of God. Jews and Gents equal.** But doesn't mean no distinctions between the two.

2. Romans 11:16-24 – Olive tree is place of blessing. Root of olive tree is Abrahamic Covenant. How does Jew and Gent relate to this covenant? 11:17 says some branches broken off (unbelieving Jews). Gents are wild olive branch grafted into olive tree. In 11:18, Gents aren't to be arrogant against natural branches (Jews) since God can graft them in again (v. 23). This will happen according to v. 26. How does this support SP? One tree but the branches are wild and natural. There is unity and diversity. How does Gentile inclusion (predicted in Gen. 12:3) void national Israel's relationship with Abe Covenant? Israel will be grafted back in. When? Rom. 11:26 in Second Coming.

D. New Covenant Fulfilled with the Church

1. According to Heb. 8, if NC made with Israel but fulfilled by church, church must be new Israel. Answer?

   a. Church indeed participating in NC but NT also links future salvation of Israel with NC. Rom. 11:27 is reference to NC of Jer. 31:31-34. First part of v. 27 refers to Isa. 59:20-21 second part to Jer 31:34. Church in NC, someday, national Israel will too.

b. NC has an already/not yet aspect to it regarding fulfillment. Forgiveness etc. experienced now. Physical blessings future. Fulfillment of NC not all or nothing. Part now, final fulfillment later (Israel saved, land etc.).

c. NC texts in OT didn't exclude other groups. Isa. 52:15 says Servant will sprinkle many nations.

2. Romans 11:26 –

a. First view: "Israel" can't be church as other 10 references clearly to ethnic Israel in Romans 9-11.

b. Second view: too obvious…all elect Jews will be saved? Duh.

c. Third view: massive Jewish salvation but not restoration. But v. 27 is linked to NC of Jer 31:31-34 and promises God made with Abraham and David. If there is a salvation based on OT promises, why not restoration based on OT promises.

3. NT silence

a. NT writers were Jews. No need to reiterate OT promises.

b. NT not silent (Ac. 1:6; Mt. 19:28).

E. Conclusion: Since OT clearly predicted restoration of national Israel, burden of proof is on SP to prove this has been cancelled.

XIV. **God's Future Plans for the Nations**

A. There will be regeneration of the earth (Mt. 19:28) and restoration of all things (Ac. 3:19-21).

XV. **A Case for the Restoration of National Israel (part 1)**

A. The Bible Explicitly Teaches the Restoration of Israel

1. Deut. 30:1-6 – This includes spiritual salvation and a physical restoration. After period of banishment the nation will be saved and restored to the promised land. Some say this was fulfilled in Joshua's day (Josh. 21:43-45). "Everything was fulfilled."

2. But Josh 21 can't refer to entire fulfillment because Israel hadn't been banished yet, which must come before Israel's salvation and restoration. God's plan for restoration is reaffirmed in Jer. 16:14-15! Also see Ezek. 36:22-30 and Ezek. 37:21-29 and Jer. 30:1-3 and Isa. 66:22 and Joel 3:20 and Zeph 3:20 and Rom 11:26. The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable (Rm. 11:29). This is historic view of the church.

B. The Bible Explicitly Promises the Perpetuity of the Nation of Israel

1. Jer. 31:35-37 – states impossibility of Israel being forsaken forever by God.

C. The NT Reaffirms a Future for National Israel

1. Matt. 19:28/Lk. 22:30 – Explicit evidence Jesus expected a restoration of national Israel.

2. Matt. 23:37-39/Lk. 13:34-35 –

3. Acts 1:6-7 – (1) apostles fully expected a restoration of national Israel (2) Jesus does not rebuke them. Jesus (v. 3) had spent 40 days with them speaking about KoG. Unlikely they would have badly after this teaching. Jesus focused on rebuking false teaching, so surely he would have done this had they been in error.

D. The NT Reaffirms the OT Promises, and Covenants Are still the Possession of Israel

1. Rom. 9:3-4 says that the covenants and promises of OT still possession of national Israel. Speaks to 'my countrymen by physical descent.' Much belongs to them. If these things belong to the church, why does Paul say they belong to Israel?

2. NT prophecy affirms a future for Israel

   a. What Jesus says in Matt. 24:15-20 is consistent with what Jesus says in Dan. 9:24-27. But if EI has no significance, why mention Judah, Jerusalem and the temple?

   b. 2 Thess. 2 – temple is a Jewish object. Why mention temple if all given to church?

   c. Luke 21 – verse 24 speaks of restoration of Israel. "Until" suggests limit to judgment on Israel discussed in 21:24. Punishment of Israel has a limit. Should be connected to Rom 11:26.

   d. Rev. 7:4-8 foretells sealing of 12 tribes during tribulation.

E. NT keeps Israel and Church distinct

1. Israel used 73 times in NT. All refer to ethnic Israel.

2. In Acts, Israel found 20 times and church 19; always distinct.

F. Doctrine of Election Ensures Israel's Place in God's Plan

1. God can not and will not replace Israel (Rm. 11:1-2). Now we can be sure of our own election. God faithful to Israel, us too.

Conclusion:

- Yes, several Israelite images used for church as well. But Isa. 19:24-25 already said non-Jews would inherit imagery and titles used to describe Israel. Doesn't mean Israel replaced.
- Big issue with SP: in effort to show unity in salvation of Jews and Gents, concluded this excludes special role for Israel in the future.