

## **Dispensationalism**

### *{Part 6}*

#### *Salvation in Dispensationalism*

---

Intro:

Does Dispensationalism teach the same doctrine of Salvation as those of us who hold to Covenant Theology?

Especially with regard to the Salvation of the OT people.

This is what we will consider in this evenings study.

Ryrie argues strongly that Dispensationalism has been treated unfairly in this area.

He quotes a number of Reformed writers who say that Dispensationalism teaches a different way of Salvation for OT saints.

Q. Is this true?

Q. Does Dispensationalism teach a different way of Salvation for the OT people of God?

Ryrie Complains on page 106:

“Antidispensationalists will not even allow the dispensationalist to speak of less or more grace in various dispensations; it has to be an all or nothing proposition”

He quotes Daniel Fuller who rightly said:

“It is impossible to think of varying degrees of grace, for God either is or is not gracious”

Ryrie quotes James in support of his position.

Jas 4:6 But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble.

But this refers to Sanctification rather than Justification!!

He quotes Scofield:

“The point of testing is no longer legal obedience as the condition of salvation, but acceptance of rejection of Christ.”

Ryrie:

“Anti-dispensationalists are never quick to allow for refinement in the statement of dispensationalism.” – pg 107

Q. How do we refine Scofield’s statement?

**It needs to be rejected, not refined!!!**

Again he quotes Scofield: “Law neither justifies a sinner nor sanctifies a believer.”

This is blatant Antinomianism!

The Law does sanctify a believer!!

Rom 7:22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

Speaking of the covenant position he says

“Nothing could **seemingly preserve** the unity of the bible better than to say that all people are saved in **exactly the same way in all ages.**” - Pg 113

Speaking of the reformed view of salvation he says

“These statements alone do not seem to be too inaccurate until one realises that covenant theologians always **include faith in Christ in their concept.**” - Pg 114

Q. What about:

Psalm 2: 1-3; 6-7; 12.

He says:

“It is very difficult, if not impossible, to prove that the average Israelite understood the grace of God in Christ.” - Pg 114

He is right! So what does that prove?

Again speaking of the covenant view he says “The assumption is that everything about salvation must be the same; therefore, the conscious object of the faith of Old Testament saints must have been Christ.” – pg 114

He poses the question:

“But under the law did not Moses see Christ (Heb 11:26-27)? Yes, if Christ means the individual we know as Jesus Christ. But it likely refers to Moses himself.”

Read Hebrews 11: 26-27

He quotes the New English Bible in support of his position which says “Decided that the temporal wealth of Egypt was far less valuable than “the stigma that rests on God’s anointed.”

He continues

“Even if Moses understood about the coming Christ, did the average Israelite?”

Turn to Acts 17:30

“Additionally, one must consider Acts 17:30, which calls Old Testament days ‘times of ignorance’.”- Pg 115

He quotes the Dallas Seminary Statement of Faith:

“We believe .... that the principal of faith was prevalent in the lives of all the Old Testament saints. However, we believe that it was **historically impossible** that they should have had the conscious object of their faith the incarnate crucified Son, the Lamb of God.” Pg 116

Q. What about the possibility of God’s grace?

Note,

The amount of information does not make it any more historically possible!!

He quotes 1 Peter 1:10 and says:

[This] does not mean that there was no grace before the coming of Christ, but it does mean that there was grace that was never known or experienced by Old Testament saints in their lifetimes.” – pg 116

He writes:

“Under the law God provided a way whereby people could be eternally acceptable before Him.”

Read Hebrews 10: 1-4

“It is also compatible to say that the revelation of **the means of eternal salvation was through the law and that that revelation (though it brought the same results when believed)** was not the same as the revelation given since the incarnation of Christ. Thus, the revelation concerning salvation during the Mosaic economy did involve the law, though the bases of salvation remained grace” - Pg 117

“The sacrifices were part of the law; the keeping of them did not save, any **yet a person could respond to what they were taught so as to effect eternal salvation.**” – pg 117

He quotes a number of passages in Leviticus in which he says

“In none of these passages is there any indication that the effectiveness of the sacrifices depended on the spiritual state of the person offering them.... the face value interruption of these passages assigns a genuine atonement for sins to the sacrifices simply because they were offered.” – pg 118

**Read Isaiah 1: 11-20**

He writes:

“Today a person’s sin must be viewed in direct relationship to God, and the efficacy of the offering of Christ affects a person’s spiritual relationship with God.”

**Read Psalm 51:4**

Again he says:

“Those sacrifices were inadequate to remove absolutely and finally the spiritual guilt of a person before God.”

They could not remove at all!! Never mind absolutely.

Of the understanding of the OT people he writes:

“However, it cannot be implied that the Israelite understood what that final sacrifice was. For if he had sufficient insight, to the extent of seeing and believing on the finished work of Christ then he would not have had to offer the sacrifices annually, for he would have rested confidently in what he say in the prefiguration. If the sacrifices had given a clear foreview of Christ, the offerer would have understood the truth of a completed atonement and would not have had any consciousness of sins every year.” - Pg 119

**Contrast his comment on page 120 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. {where his reasoning is much better}**

He goes on to say:

“But, since the scriptures say that he did have consciousness of sins (Heb 10:2), **he must not have seen very clearly** ‘the same promise, the same Saviour, the same condition, the same salvation’ as the believer today sees.” – pg 119

“Jesus Christ was not the conscious object of their faith.” – pg 119

**He quotes John 1:21 and 7:40 and 1 Peter 1:10-11 and says**

“These passages make it impossible to say that Old Testament saints under the law exercised personal faith in Jesus Christ.” – pg 120

Now,

We have already quoted psalm 2.

Note also:

Job 19: 25-26

What about Isaiah 53?

And Isaiah 59: 20