

DOES JOHN MACARTHUR  
RIDE THE  
REFORMED FENCE?

BY  
HERSHEL L. HARVELL JR.

[www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html](http://www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html)

(Reformed on the Web)

## DOES JOHN MACARTHUR RIDE THE REFORMED FENCE?

---

MacArthur has been very open about his belief in a premillennial reign of Christ. He asserts that a true believer in Reformed theology must be a premillennialist. In other words he has it all figured out. He asserts that the gospel is to all and saves all who come to it, but then he separates the Jewish believers from the church. He claims that God must give them all that he promised in the natural.

It is evident that John MacArthur and all the dispensationalists like him have a form of religious pluralism. They deny the very work of Christ on behalf of the Jew and the Gentile alike. They assert that God has a different plan for Jews and Gentiles. If one believes in Christ then he is part of the church, but later on, they assert, that the Jew will not be part of the body of Christ.

All dispensationalists admit that there will be a tribulation and that in that tribulation the Jewish people will again believe and come to God. Dispensationalists declare that these Jews are not the body of Christ but become a separate group of people, who get to live in the natural land promised to Abraham in the middle east.

But to assert that anyone from the time of the cross can believe and not be part of the body of Christ is to err into today's postmodern philosophies of religious pluralism. "O," they declare, "you are misrepresenting us. We believe that the Jews must believe in Christ and that there isn't any way to God, except through him." If this is the case, then why do dispensationalists assert that Jews who believe during a tribulation and in a so-called millennial kingdom are not part of the body of Christ, but instead they get to go stay in the natural land which was promised to Abraham and his seed? In these things the dispensational community contradicts themselves. For if they believe and come to God without Christ, then is this not religious pluralism? But if they come to God through Christ how say the dispensationalists that they are not part of the body of Christ? If one would take the promises given to Abraham and rightly interpret them with the New Testament they would see that the seed that is promised the land is not any particular ethnic group,

but is many nations. Let me give some scripture to back this up.

Genesis 17:5-8 states:

*“Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.”*

First notice that Abraham is here promised the land. But when did Abraham ever possess it? Also notice that the seed here shall possess the land. Who is the seed? The seed are many nations, not just one nation. Some would object and say that the seed of many nations would be through Ishmael and Isaac, but the scripture does not conclude this:

*Genesis 17:18-19 “And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and **thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.**”*

Notice here that the covenant promise is not through Ishmael, but is through Isaac. Also if one will examine this covenant one would see that God gave the sign of circumcision to Abraham as a covenant sign between God and he.

But who is the seed? Let's look at Romans 4:8-17.

*“Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: And*

*the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also **walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham**, which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise, that he should be the **heir of the world**, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (As it is written, **I have made thee a father of many nations**,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.”*

Notice here that Paul gives a commentary on Genesis 17. Paul declares that the promise does not come on just the circumcised [Jews], but also comes on all those who walk in the same steps of faith as that of Abraham. Paul even goes on to declare the same thing that God declared in Genesis 17 and that is that Abraham would become the father of many nations, not just the father of one. Notice also that God through the Spirit which was in Paul, defined the land promise **as the world** and not just a little portion of land in the middle east. Does the scripture not teach that the meek shall inherit the earth?

Let's examine [2 Corinthians 4:18](#):

*“While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.”*

Here Paul plainly declares that those who are of faith are not looking at the natural things, but they are looking at the eternal things. This is very significant when we examine the next portion of scripture.

Let's look at [Hebrews 11:8-10](#):

*“By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: For he looked for a city which*

*hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.”*

Notice here that Abraham went out by faith into a place which he should receive as an inheritance. But when did Abraham ever receive the land as an inheritance? He even had to purchase a portion of it in order to bury his wife. But look at what Abraham was looking for. He had an eye of faith and was not looking at the natural things as the dispensationalists of today are, but he was looking at the eternal things, for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

Look at the next portion of scriptures in [Hebrews 11:13-16](#):

*“These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.”*

Notice here that all those who had faith died not having received the promises, but were persuaded of them, embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on this earth. The scripture declares that they who profess such things profess that they seek a country. They are not seeking just any country over in the middle east some where, but are seeking a heavenly country. This is a better country, where God himself dwells and will be in a heavenly city.

So you see here that the earthly land was just a type of the heavenly land to come. The Passover was a type of Christ our perfect Passover. The priestly garments of linen breeches was just a type of our righteousness. The oil to light the most holy place was just a type of the light [church] to come because we are the light of the world. There is no need for a temple for we are the temple of the living God.

It is a shame that dispensationalists cannot see these things, but deny the very purpose for which Christ came. As the Davis Dictionary states:

*“The epistle [Hebrews] is the only one in which the title of priest is applied to Christ, though of course the substance of the doctrine is*

elsewhere taught: *it represents Christianity as the completion and goal of the old dispensation*: the clear announcement of that way of salvation previously taught by type and ritual.”

So as I stated with my title, *Does John MacArthur ride the Reformed Fence?* He claims to be reformed in his doctrines of salvation, but then he denies everything that Christ has done and denies what he has brought his people to — an eternal heavenly inheritance and not an earthly one. If Christ came to die for his people [which he did], and he has exalted them into heavenly places, [actual Greek-into the heavenlies], then why oh why is MacArthur and all his dispensational buddies trying to place believing Jews back into the natural things of this life? This is a repudiation of Romans 8 which speaks of our groaning within ourselves waiting for the redemption of our bodies. We are waiting, wanting to be delivered from these natural things, but MacArthur and his dispensational buddies must love the natural things and must not have faith to see the things that are eternal.

If you like MacArthur please do not get made at me. I myself love him, but I think that he is riding the Reformed Fence. He wants to look Reformed in order that he might be able to get the support from both sides. If you don't like what I have said then pray for me and I will be praying for thee.

Hershel Lee Harvell Jr.

See Kim Riddlebarger's Reply to MacArthur's Premillennialism:

<http://kimriddlebarger.squarespace.com/a-reply-to-john-macarthur/>