

REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY

Text:

Introduction:

- I. It is my task to introduce and explain the doctrine of **Realized Eschatology** [RE]
- II. To do that, I want to answer five questions:
 - A. **What?** What does the terminology mean? What does the doctrine teach?
 - B. **Who?** Who has taught this doctrine?
 - C. **How?** How do Realized Eschatologists [RE's] arrive at their conclusions?
 - D. **Why?** Why have they accepted this doctrine?
 - E. **Where?** Where does this doctrine lead?
- III. It is not my primary purpose to **refute** RE, but to **explain** it. Other speakers will **examine** and **refute** the major elements of this doctrine
 - A. Note: This outline contains **rebuttal material** that I will not present

Body:

I. WHAT? AN EXPLANATION OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY

- A. What does **the terminology** mean?
 1. **“Realize”**: “1a: to bring into concrete existence : ACCOMPLISH <finally realized her goal>....” (*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, Eleventh Edition)
 2. **“Eschatology”**: “1: a branch of theology concerned with **the final events** in the history of the world or of mankind 2: a belief concerning **death**, the **end of the world**, or the ultimate destiny of mankind *specifically*: any of various Christian doctrines concerning the **Second Coming**, the **resurrection of the dead**, or the **Last Judgment**” (*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, Eleventh Edition)
 3. Other terms:
 - a. **Covenant Eschatology**
 - b. **Fulfilled Eschatology**
 - c. **Consistent Eschatology**
 - d. **Transmillennialism**
 - e. **Covenant Theology**
 - f. **(Hyper) Preterism**
 - 1) There are at least **three forms** of Preterism
 - a) **Mild**: The “tribulation” was fulfilled in the first 300 years of Christianity
 - 1] In God’s judgment on Jerusalem (AD 70)
 - 2] In God’s judgment on Rome (AD 313)
 - b) **Moderate**: The tribulation and the bulk of Bible prophecy was fulfilled by AD 70

c) **Extreme** (Consistent): All Bible prophecy was fulfilled by AD 70

2) This means we can't **lump all Preterists together** in the same bunch, and we must be very careful that we do not **misrepresent** different shades of Preterism

g. **AD 70 Doctrine**

B. What does **the doctrine** teach?

1. **All Bible prophecy was fulfilled** by the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in **AD 70** (cf. Lk. 21:22, 32; Acts 3:21)
2. Therefore, all of the following things **occurred in AD 70**
 - a. End Of The **Mosaic Law** (cf. Heb. 8:13)
 - b. End Of The "**Last Days**" {Jewish Age} (AD 30-70)
 - c. Christ's **Second Coming** (cf. 1 Cor. 15:23)
 - d. Coming Of **Kingdom In Glory & Power** (Mk. 9:1)
 - e. Coming Of **Eternal Kingdom** (Heb. 12:28)
 - f. **Resurrection** Of The Dead (1 Cor. 15:12-23)
 - g. **Redemption** Of The Body (2 Cor. 5:1-5)
 - h. End Of **The World** {Age} (2 Pet. 3:10-13)
 - i. **Perfection** Of Saints (adulthood, adoption, redemption, etc.) (1 Cor. 13:10; Rom. 11:26-27)
 - j. Final **Judgment Day** (2 Tim. 4:1)
 - k. **New Heaven & New Earth** (2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1)
3. Thus, there will be **no future**:
 - a. **Second Coming** of Christ
 - b. **Resurrection** of the dead
 - c. End of **the world**
 - d. Final **Judgment Day**

II. **WHO? A BRIEF HISTORY OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY**

A. RE was introduced into "institutional" churches of Christ in the 1970's by **C. D. Beagle** and his son-in-law **Max R. King**

1. April 22, 1971: Preacher's meeting in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio
2. May, 1971: Exchange between Ted Waller and Max King
3. July 22, 1971: Debate between Joe Taylor and Max King
 - a. Proposition: "Jesus and the eternal kingdom came in power in 70 A.D. rather than 33 A.D."
4. Late 1971: *The Spirit of Prophecy*
5. 1972: Private studies between Max King and Franklin Camp, then Robert Taylor Jr.

6. July 17-20, 1973: Debate between Gus Nichols and Max King in Warren, Ohio
 - a. Proposition #1: “The Holy Scriptures teach that the second coming of Christ included the establishment of the eternal kingdom, the day of judgment, the end of the world, and the resurrection of the dead, occurred with the fall of Judaism in 70 AD.”
 - b. Proposition #2: “The Holy Scriptures teach that the second and final coming of Christ, including the resurrection of all the dead, the day of judgment, the end of the world and the delivering of the kingdom of God to the Father, is yet future in relation to us today.”
7. 1975: Written debate between Jim McGuiggan and Max King
 - a. Proposition #1: “The New Covenant was not completely established until the fall of the Jewish commonwealth in A.D. 70.”
 - b. Proposition #2: “The vision and message of the book of Revelation relates to and was fulfilled in the fall of the Jewish commonwealth in 70 A.D.”
 - c. Proposition #3: “The scriptures clearly teach that the second coming of Christ is yet future.”
 - d. Proposition #4: “The New Testament teaches there is yet to be a day in which all the dead will be raised to life. And that they with the people yet alive on that day will be judged relative to where they shall spend eternity.”
8. Jan. 3, 1977: Northeast Ohio Bible College (later known as: Northeast Ohio Bible Institute)
9. 1982 (?): Written debate between W. Terry Varner and Charles Geiser
 - a. Proposition #1: “The Bible teaches that the resurrection of the dead occurred in the first century and was spiritual in nature.”
 - b. Proposition #2: “The Bible teaches that the second (final) coming of Christ took place at the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.”
 - c. Proposition #3: “The Bible teaches that the Law of Moses was abolished before the destruction of Jerusalem as God’s acceptable Law for the Jews.”
10. 1987: *The Cross and the Parousia of Christ* (See Gibson, “The 70 A.D. Doctrine Examined,” and Varner, 2-12)
- B. Today, it is being advocated in “institutional” churches of Christ [?] by **Don Preston, Ed Stevens, Charles Geiser, Tim King, et al.**
- C. It is being advocated in some “conservative” churches of Christ by **Sam Dawson, Wayne Petty, Oscar Miles** (until he dissociated himself) and **others** who want to “fly below the radar”
- D. But this doctrine is **much older**:
 1. In the 1930’s **C. H. Dodd** (1884-1973) taught that the “**final events**” were fulfilled in the **personal ministry** of JESUS (Cates, 18)
 - a. His teaching was first described as “**Realized Eschatology**”
 2. In his book *Christ’s Second Coming Fulfilled* (1917) the Universalist **Marion Morris** taught:
 - a. The **last days** were the last days of Judaism

- b. The **old and new covenants overlapped** from Pentecost to AD 70
 - c. **Kingdom** began on Pentecost but came in power and glory in AD 70
 - d. **Redemption of the body** was the redemption of the church
 - e. **Redemption** was consummated in AD 70
 - f. **The end of the world** was the destruction of Judaism in AD 70 (Varner, 44-51)
3. In his book *Christ Came Again* (1900), William Urmy taught:
- a. **Rev. 1:7** refers to the publicity of the Parousia
 - b. The **Lord's Day** (Rev. 1:10) was the "day of the Lord"
 - c. The **Day of Judgment** came in AD 70 but judgment is continuous or progressive throughout the history of man
 - d. **Death and Hades** were abolished in AD 70 (Varner, 51-54)
4. In his book *The Great Day of the Lord* (1894), Alexander Brown taught:
- a. The destruction of the **heavens and the earth** (Rev. 20:11-15) was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
 - b. The **judgment scene** (Mt. 25:31-46) was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
 - c. In the first century, the **resurrection** of the just and the unjust was **about to come** [*mello*] (Acts 24:15) (Varner, 57-61)
5. In his book *The Parousia of Christ* (1879), Israel Perkins Warren taught:
- a. The **Second Coming** was "a now existing fact" to be preached
 - b. **"Till He come"** (1 Cor. 11:26) does not imply that the Lord's Supper should not be observed this side of AD 70 (Varner, 54-57)
6. In the 19th century, various **Universalists** taught:
- a. The **Second Coming** occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem
 - b. The **Day of Judgment** was the destruction of Jerusalem
 - c. The **resurrection of the dead** is not a bodily resurrection (Varner, 37-44)
7. In his book *The Parousia* (1878, 1887), James Stuart Russell taught:
- a. The **Parousia**, the **resurrection**, the **judgment**, and the **last day** took place in the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
 - b. Paul believed that he would be **alive** at the **coming of the Lord** (1 Th. 4:13-17) (Varner, 66-73)
 - c. Russell appears to be **the "father"** of this doctrine. At least, he is frequently quoted by RE's
8. In his book *Misplaced Hope: The Origins Of First And Second Century Eschatology* (2002), Sam Frost "makes a substantial cast that **realized eschatology was the prevalent view in the early church** until perhaps 140 A.D." (Bold emphasis added, Dawson, 449-450)
- a. *Sam Dawson*: "Decades ago, I concluded that **you could prove anything from the church fathers**, both sides of any controversial issue (including preterism). Why not, they were just as susceptible to

error as human beings are today. So quotes from such men cannot be used to substantiate the truth on any subject.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 450)

- b. W. Terry Varner disagrees: “*The Apostolic Writings* at the close of the first century and the beginning of the second century bear witness to the *fact* that the early Christians of this time, **yet looked for a future second coming....**” (Bold emphasis added, 81-82)
- c. W. Terry Varner: “*The Apostolic Writings* at the close of the first century and the beginning of the second century bear witness to the *fact* that the early Christians of this time, **yet looked for a future resurrection of the dead....**” (Bold emphasis added, 85-88)
- d. W. Terry Varner: “*The Apostolic Writings* look for **a future judgment day of all mankind....**” (Bold emphasis added, 91-92)
 - 1) Note: Varner quotes different “Church Fathers” to support each of these statements
- e. See Almon Williams, “AD 70: The End?” *The Doctrine of Last Things*, Florida College Annual Lectures, 1986, 216-219

E. So while Realized Eschatology may be **relatively “new”** to us, it has been around a **long time**

III. **HOW? THE ARGUMENTATION OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY**

A. **The “Last Days” Referred To The End Of The Jewish Economy**

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. *Max King*: “Applying the **last days** to the **Christian age** is a misapplication fostered by a misconception of such terms as ‘**this world**’ and the ‘**world to come**.’ While Pentecost, in a sense, was the beginning of the Christion [*sic*] dispensation, yet the New Testament writers often spoke of it as a world or age to come, because the Jewish age had not ended at the time of their writings. Therefore, statements such as ‘**this world**’ are interpreted as meaning **this present material world** rather than [*sic*] **the Jewish age**, and the ‘**world to come**’ is interpreted as meaning **what follows the end of this present material world** rather than **the new heaven and earth**, or **Christian age** that followed the end of the Jewish age.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, 79)
- b. The “**last days**” refers to **the end of the Jewish economy**
 - 1) Syllogism: Jesus was **God’s spokesman** during the “**last days**”
 - a) *Major Premise*: Jesus was **God’s spokesman** during the “**last days**” (Heb. 1:1-4)
 - b) *Minor Premise*: Jesus was God’s spokesman during His **Personal Ministry** before Pentecost (Mt. 17:5; Jn. 12:48)
 - c) *Conclusion*: Therefore, the “last days” **began before Pentecost**
 - 2) Syllogism: Jesus was **manifested in “these last times”**
 - a) *Major Premise*: Jesus was **manifested in “these last times”** (1 Pet. 1:20)

- b) *Minor Premise:* Jesus was “**manifested**” during His **Personal Ministry**, before His death, burial, resurrection, and ascension (Jn. 2:11)
- c) *Conclusion:* Therefore the “**last times**” must have **begun before Pentecost**
- 3) Joel prophesied that the “**last days**” would be characterized by **miracles, signs, and wonders** Joel 2:28-32
 - a) Peter declared that Joel’s prophecy began to be fulfilled on **Pentecost** Acts 2:16-21
 - b) If we are **still in the “last days”** today, why are **true miracles not being performed** by God’s people?
- 4) Jesus said that “**this age**” (the last days) would be followed by “**the age to come**” Mt. 12:32
 - a) This demonstrates that the “**last days**” **did not extend until the end of time**

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. RE’s argumentation on the “**last days**” is based on **several assumption:**
 - 1) They assume that the “**last days**” always refers to the **end of the Jewish economy**
 - 2) They assume that the “**last days**” always **means the same thing** in every context
 - 3) They assume that the “**last days**” = the “**last times**” = “**this age**”
 - 4) They must assume that the “**last day**” (Jn. 6:39-40, 44, 54; 11:24; 12:48) is **not really the “last day”**
 - 5) They assume that all of the NT books were **written before AD 70**
- b. The expression the “**last days**” does not always refer to **the end of the Jewish economy**
 - 1) See Appendix A: “The Last Days”
 - 2) Chart: “Last Days”
 - a) **Jacob** prophesied what would befall his sons “**in the last days**” (Gen. 49:1); but he prophesied of many things that occurred long **before** AD 30-70 (cf. Gen. 49:3-4, 7, 10, 13, 16)
 - b) So the “**last days**” does not always refer to **the end of the Jewish economy**
 - c) Chart: “General & Special Meanings”
 - d) Several passages that speak of the “last days” could refer to the time until the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, but they could also apply to a time after that destruction (cf. 2 Tim. 3:1, 5; Jas. 5:3; 2 Pet. 3:3)
 - 1] If one **limits the “last days”** in these passages to a **timeframe before AD 70**, he does so for some reason

other than **any clear indications in the context** of these passages

3) Chart: “Latter Days”

- a) **Balaam** prophesied of what the Jews would do to the Midianites in the “**latter days**” (Num. 24:14); but he prophesied of some things that occurred long **before** AD 30-70 (cf. Num. 24:17-19)
 - 1] This prophecy was partially fulfilled when **David** conquered Moab and Edom (2 Sam. 8:2, 14)
 - 2] This prophecy has its ultimate fulfillment in **Christ**
 - a] **Edom** (Amos 9:11-12 & Acts 15:16-18; cf. Obad. 17-21)
 - 1} The **Herods** were **Idumaeans** (descendants of Edom/Esau)
 - 2} Disciples from **Idumaea** followed Jesus (Mk. 3:8)
 - 3} **Manaeen**, who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, was a member of the church in Antioch (Acts 13:1)
- 4) With respect to Joel’s prophecy (Joel 2:28-32), the Hebrew text says “**afterward**” and the LXX says “**after these (things).**” So how do RE’s know that “**last days**” doesn’t just mean “**afterward**”?
- 5) Joel’s prophesy does not say that **the last days would end** with “the coming of the great and awesome day of the Lord” (Joel 2:31; Acts 2:20)
- c. Joel prophesied that miracles, signs, and wonders would be poured out **before** the coming of the day of the Lord (Joel. 2:28-31); but he did not say anything about **how long they would continue**
 - 1) He said that miraculous power would be poured out “**in,**” not “**throughout**” the last days
 - 2) Other NT passages indicate that **miraculous power would cease**
 - a) Paul says that spiritual gifts would **cease** when the “**perfect**” **came** 1 Cor. 13:8-13
 - 1] If the “**perfect**” refers to **completed revelation** (cf. Jas. 1:25), then the **spiritual gifts** which were in part **ceased when revelation was completed**
 - 2] If the “**perfect**” refers to **Christ’s Second Coming**, then it seems to me that Paul should have said that those things in “part” would **continue** until the “perfect” comes
 - b) The NT indicates that from Pentecost onward **miraculous power** was imparted in two ways:
 - 1] **Holy Spirit baptism** (Acts 2:1-4; 10:44-48)
 - 2] The **laying on of hands** by the apostles (Acts 8:14-18; 19:1-7; 1 Cor. 12:10)
 - 3] Note: During His Personal Ministry, Jesus enabled the apostles and the seventy to perform miracles (cf. Mt. 10:1; Lk. 10:9)

- c) There are only **two cases of Holy Spirit baptism** mentioned in the NT, and when Paul wrote Ephesians (AD 61-63), he mentioned **“one baptism”** (Eph. 4:5)
 - 1] This has to be **water baptism** since Paul alludes to it elsewhere in this letter (cf. Eph. 5:26)
 - 2] Therefore Holy Spirit baptism was **no longer available**
 - 3] So miraculous power **could not be imparted** by this means
- d) Only **the apostles** could **impart spiritual gifts** through the laying on of hands (Acts 8:14-19; 19:6; Rom. 1:11)
- e) When **the last apostle died**, spiritual gifts could no longer be imparted through the laying on of hands
- f) When **the last person with spiritual gifts died**, spiritual gifts ceased to exist
- 3) So the conclusion that we should still be performing miracles if we are still in the last days is a ***non sequitur***
- d. There is evidence in Jewish apocalyptic, that the Jews conceived of the **“two ages”** as referring to **This World** vs. **Eternity**, not (or at least not exclusively) **The Jewish Age** vs. **The Messianic Age**
 - 1) 2 Enoch 66:6 [A]: ⁶ Walk, my children, in long-suffering, in meekness, honesty, in provocation, in grief, in faith and in truth, in *reliance on* promises, in illness, in abuse, in wounds, in temptation, in nakedness, in privation, loving one another, till you go out from **this age of ills**, that you become **inheritors of endless time**. (R. H. Charles, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2004, 2:468)
 - 2) 2 Enoch 65:8-10 [A]: ⁸ There will be **one aeon**, and all the righteous who shall escape **the Lord’s great judgement**, shall be collected in **the great aeon**, for the righteous **the great aeon** Will begin, and they will **live eternally**, ⁹ and then too there will be amongst them neither labour, nor sickness, nor humiliation, nor anxiety, nor need, nor violence, nor night, nor darkness, but great light. ¹⁰ And they shall have a great indestructible wall, and a paradise bright and incorruptible, for all corruptible things shall pass away, and there will be **eternal life**.
 - 3) 2 Enoch 65:8-10 [B]: ⁸ And all the righteous shall be collected together in **the great age**, and age and age of the righteous shall be collected together, and they shall be **eternal and incorruptible**. ⁹ And thenceforward there shall be no labour amongst them, nor sickness nor humiliation, nor anxiety *nor* need, nor night nor darkness, but **great, endless, and indestructible light**. ¹⁰ And **the great paradise** will be their shelter and **eternal dwelling-place**, and they shall no more bear the injuries (lit. lawlessnesses) of those on earth. The Lord will send down great destruction on to earth and **the earth’s whole composition shall perish**. (R. H. Charles, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2004, 2:468)
 - 4) 2 Enoch 50:2 [A]: ² I see all things. Now therefore, my children, in patience and meekness spend the number of your days, that you **inherit endless life**.

- 5) 2 Enoch 50:2 [B]: ² And now, my children, spend the number of your days in patience and gentleness, that you inherit **the endless age that is to come**.
- e. After citing these passages and others from Jewish apocalyptic, Kittel concludes:
 - 1) “The two αἰῶνες here are **the time between the creation and conclusion of the world and the endless eternity** which follows ([2 Enoch] 65:3ff.), though this temporal dualism is interfused with the spatial dualism between the visible world and the invisible, between this world and the world to come.” (Bold emphasis added, TDNT, 1:206)
 - 2) “In its view of the two aeons **the NT is in essential agreement with 1st century apocalyptic**. The framework of eschatological notions is broken only by the fact that the αἰὼν μέλλων is no longer merely in the future. Believers are already redeemed from this present evil αἰὼν (Gl. 1:4) and have tasted the powers of the future αἰὼν (Hb. 6:5). If according to the teaching of Jewish and early Christian eschatology **the resurrection of the dead implies the transition from the one aeon to the other and the beginning of the new and eternal creation**, the new aeon has begun already, though as yet concealed from the eyes of men, in and with the resurrection of Christ, inasmuch as this is the beginning of the general resurrection (1 C. 15:20, 23).” (Bold emphasis added, TDNT, 1:207)
- f. The expressions “this age” and “the age to come” are **never used in the same context** with the expression “the last days”; so we need to be very careful not to make **unwarranted assumptions** about how (or if) these terms **relate to one another**
- g. If there was going to be an “**age to come**” following “**this age**,” why should we believe that the “**last days**” refers to “**this age**” and not the “**age to come**”?
 - 1) In other words, if there are only two ages, “**this age**” and the “**age to come**,” “the age to come” would be **last**; so why wouldn’t it be the “**last days**”?
- h. There are some NT passages that just **do not “fit”** the idea that “this age” = The Jewish Age and “the age to come” = The Messianic Age
 - 1) Mk. 10:30: Do we have “**eternal life**” now?
 - a) Several NT passages describe “eternal life” as a **present possession**
 - 1] Chart: “Eternal Life: A Present Possession”
 - b) Other NT passages describe “eternal life” as a **future possession**
 - 1] Chart: “Eternal Life: A Future Possession”
 - c) So how do we **harmonize** these two different concepts?
 - 1] Chart: “Eternal Life: A Present Possession” (How?)

- d) Paul said that those who seek for “**eternal life**” would be given “glory, honor, and **immortality**” (Rom. 2:6-7). Do we have **immortality** now? (cf. 1 Cor. 15:53-54)
- 2) Lk. 20:34-35: Is there no **marriage** or **death** now? Are we like the **angels** now?
 - a) Chart: “Lk. 20:34-35”
 - b) Chart: “This Age & The Age To Come”
- 3) Jn. 12:25-26: If “**this world**” is the **Jewish Age** that ended in AD 70, are we **where Jesus is now**?
- 4) Tit. 2:12-13: If the “**present age**” is the **Jewish Age** that ended in AD 70, does this passage **apply to us** today?
- 5) Jas. 2:5: If “**this world**” is the **Jewish Age** that ended in AD 70, is James only talking about the **poor of the Jewish Age**?
- i. If “**this age**” refers to the **Jewish Age** which ended in AD 70, there are **several questions** that need to be answered:
 - 1) Since God’s holy prophets prophesied of the Christ “since **the world** (*aion*) began” (Acts 3:21), are there **no Messianic prophecies before the Jewish Age** began at Sinai? (cf. Gen. 3:15; 12:3; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; 49:10)
 - 2) In the Great Commission, did Jesus promise to **be with the apostles** only to the end of the Jewish age? (Mt. 28:20)
 - 3) Is Satan merely the **god** of the Jewish age? (2 Cor. 4:4)
 - 4) Did Jesus give Himself for our sins to “**deliver us from this present [Jewish] age**”? (Gal. 1:4)
 - 5) If there are only two ages, “this age” and “the age to come,” what are the past “**ages**” (1 Cor. 2:7; 10:11; Eph. 3:5, 9; Col. 1:26; Heb. 9:26) and “**the ages to come**”? (Eph. 2:7)
 - 6) Did first-century Christians wrestle against the **principalities, powers, and rulers** of only the Jewish age? (Eph. 6:12)
 - 7) Was it only **the rich** in the Jewish age who were not to be haughty? (1 Tim. 6:17)
 - 8) Were Christians to **deny ungodliness and worldly lust** only in the Jewish age? (Tit. 2:12)
 - 9) Was Jesus **God’s spokesman** only in the Jewish age? (Heb. 1:1-2)
 - 10) Could people **call on the name of the Lord** only in the Jewish age? (Acts 2:16-21)

B. The Law Of Moses Continued In Effect Until AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. Syllogism #1: Jesus did not come to **destroy the law** but to **fulfill it**
 - 1) *Major Premise*: Jesus said that the law would not pass away until **all was fulfilled** (Mt. 5:17-18)
 - 2) *Minor Premise*: All the law and the prophets were **not fulfilled before AD 70** (Lk. 21:22)

- a) Several OT prophecies were fulfilled **after the cross**
 - 1] The **resurrection** of Jesus (Psa. 16:8-11; cf. Acts 2:25-32)
 - 2] The pouring out of **the Spirit** (Joel 2:28-32; cf. Acts 2:16-21)
 - 3] The **gospel call** of the Gentiles (Amos 9:11-12; cf. Acts 15:13-17)
 - 4] The **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Dan. 9:24-27; Mal. 3:1-3; 4:1, 5-6)
 - 5] The cessation of **animal sacrifices** (Dan. 9:27)
 - 6] The end of **Israel** (Dt. 32:20-29)
 - 7] The **resurrection of Israel** (Dan. 12:1-3) (Dawson, *Essays on Eschatology*, 63-64)
- b) **All that was written** was fulfilled in the **destruction of Jerusalem**
- 3) **Conclusion:** Therefore, **the law of Moses did not pass away until AD 70**
- b. **Syllogism #2:** The law would not be destroyed until **heaven and earth passed away**
 - 1) *Major Premise:* The law would not be destroyed until **heaven and earth passed away** (Mt. 5:18)
 - 2) *Minor Premise:* The **heavens and earth passed away** in the **judgment on Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Mt. 24:35; Mk. 13:31; Lk. 21:33)
 - 3) **Conclusion:** Therefore, the law of Moses **did not pass away until AD 70**
- c. **Paul's allegory** in Galatians 4 indicates that there would be an **overlapping of the covenants** (Gal. 4:21-31)
 - 1) *Max King:* "The purpose of Paul in this allegory was threefold: First, to show that Abraham had two sons which **existed side by side** for a time in the same household. This is a truth that is vital to the teachings of the New Testament, and will be a key factor in the study and application of prophecy. Much misapplication of scripture can be attributed to a failure to recognize this simple but vital truth. These two sons **are typical of the two Israels of God**, one born after the flesh (old covenant) and the other born after the Spirit (new covenant). But that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is fleshly; and afterward that which is spiritual. **Ishmael was the first born and, as such, had the right of primogeniture**, a right he maintained at the birth of Isaac, and even thereafter UNTIL he was cast out or disinherited." (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 29-30)
 - 2) *Max King:* "Abraham had *two* sons, and there was no *gap* between them. **They overlapped a little**, but Isaac 'came on' when Ishmael 'went out.' **The son born of the spirit was given the place and inheritance of the son born of the flesh.** Hence, this simple allegory (Gal. 4:21-31) establishes the 'Spirit of Prophecy,' confirming

prophecy's fulfillment in the spiritual seed of Abraham through Christ (Gal. 3:16, 26-29), and **beyond the fall of Jerusalem these prophecies cannot be extended.**" (*The Spirit of Prophecy*, 239)

- d. **Present tense verbs** (2 Cor. 3:11; Heb. 7:12, 18; 8:13; 10:9; 12:28) indicate that the old law/old covenant was in the **process of disappearing** but **not abrogated** before the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70

1) **The Greek present tense indicates ongoing action**

- a) *William H. Davis*: "Only in the indicative mode in Greek do the tenses show time absolutely. **The main idea of tense is the 'kind of action,' the state of action.** Even in the indicative time is a secondary idea. **Continued action, or a state of incompleteness, is denoted by the present tense**—this kind of action is called *durative* or *linear*. **The action of the verb is shown in progress, as going on.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 25)

- 2) Thus, the old law/old covenant was in the **process of disappearing** when these passages (2 Cor. 3:11; Heb. 7:18; 8:13; 12:28) were written

- 3) **Max King**: "The words 'ready to vanish away' are very significant in this passage [Heb. 8:13], showing that the old dispensation continued several years after the cross. Its final end came with the fall of Jerusalem ... and this event marked the passing of heaven and earth." (*The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 184-185)

- e. Jewish Christians **continued to observe** the law of Moses until AD 70

- 1) Peter and John **went to the temple** at the hour of prayer (Acts 3:1)
- 2) Paul had **Timothy circumcised** (Acts 16:1-3)
- 3) Paul cut his hair and **took a vow** in Cenchrea (Acts 18:18)
- 4) Paul **kept a Jewish feast** in Jerusalem (Acts 18:21)
- 5) Paul wanted to be in Jerusalem for **Pentecost** (Acts 20:16)
- 6) Paul **sponsored four men** who had taken a vow (Acts 21:20-26; 24:18)

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. Response to Syllogism #1 on Mt. 5:17-19:

- 1) Did Jesus **do** what He **came to do**?
 - a) If He **did**, then the law and the prophets **could be destroyed** after they were **fulfilled**
 - b) If He **did not**, then He **failed**
 - c) If He failed, He cannot be the **Messiah** or the **Son of God**
 - 1] Jesus came to **do His Father's will** (Jn. 6:38). Could Jesus have **failed** to accomplish this during His earthly sojourn and still be the Son of God?

- 2) Syllogism #1:

- a) *Major Premise:* Jesus came to **fulfill the law** (Mt. 5:17)
- b) *Minor Premise:* Jesus **accomplished the work** God sent Him to do (Jn. 17:4)
- c) *Conclusion:* Therefore, Jesus **fulfilled the law**, and the law **could be destroyed** (Mt. 5:17-18)

3) Syllogism #2:

- a) *Major Premise:* Jesus didn't come to destroy the law or the prophets **till** all is fulfilled (Mt. 5:17-18)
 - 1] Jesus uses a **"not-but" construction** (cf. Jn. 6:26-27; 1 Pet. 3:3-4)
 - 2] **D. A. Carson:** "Moreover, comparison with [Mt.] 10:34 shows that the antithesis may not be absolute. Few would want to argue that there is *no* sense in which Jesus came to bring peace (cf. on 5:9). Why then argue that there is no sense in which Jesus abolishes the law?" ("Matthew," *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 141-142)
 - 3] **"Till"** [*heos*]
 - a] *BDAG:* "1. **to denote the end of a period of time, till, until.**Mt 2:13 – 5:18...." (422)
 - b] *Thayer:* "a particle marking a limit, and I. as a CONJUNCTION signifying 1. the temporal terminus ad quem, *till, until*....a. with an indic. pret., where something is spoken of which continued up to a certain time....b. with *αυ* and the aor. subjunc...where it is left doubtful when that will take place till which it is said a thing will continue....Mt ii. 13; add, v. 18...." (#2193, 268)
 - 4] The word **"till"** implies a **termination point** (cf. Mt. 1:25; 2:15; 24:34; 26:29; 27:45; Acts 13:20; 23:12, 14, 21; *et al.*)
 - 5] Whenever **"all"** (whatever that means in this context) was fulfilled, the law and the prophets **could be destroyed**
- b) *Minor Premise:* All has been **fulfilled** (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-48; Jn. 19:28; Acts 3:18, 24; 13:29)
- c) *Conclusion:* Therefore, the law and the prophets have been **replaced** (Gal. 3:19, 16, 23-25; Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:13-15)

4) Syllogism #3:

- a) *Major Premise:* Jesus didn't come to destroy the law or the prophets **till** all is fulfilled (Mt. 5:17-18)
- b) *Minor Premise:* The law and the prophets have been **replaced** (Gal. 3:19, 16, 23-25; Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:13-15)
- c) *Conclusion:* Therefore, all has been **fulfilled** (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-48; Jn. 19:28; Acts 3:18, 24; 13:29)

5) Syllogism #4:

- a) *Major Premise:* One **jot** [smallest letter] or **tittle** [smallest letter-stroke] will not pass away from the law till all is fulfilled

(Mt. 5:18)

b) *Minor Premise:* **OT food laws** and **circumcision** passed away before AD 70 (Mk. 7:19; 1 Tim. 4:1-5; 1 Cor. 7:18-19; Gal. 5:1-6; 6:15)

1] One cannot argue that this is irrelevant, because Jews continued to **eat kosher food** and **practice circumcision** after the cross, because they are still doing this today

2] These passages must be talking about **the validity** of these religious rituals in God's eyes, not **the practice** of these rituals by the Jews

3] One cannot argue that the **OT law continued for the Jews**, but **Jewish Christians were released from the law**, because if they were **released from the law**, then **the law passed away for them**

a] **No part of the law** would pass away for **any Jew** until all was fulfilled

c) *Conclusion:* Therefore, all was **fulfilled before AD 70** (Lk. 24:44-48; Jn. 19:28; Acts 3:18, 24)

6) Syllogism #5:

a) *Major Premise:* Whoever **breaks** one of the least commandments and **teaches** men so shall be called **least** in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 5:19)

b) *Minor Premise:* Jesus and Paul **taught** that the food laws and circumcision passed away (Mk. 7:19; 1 Tim. 4:1-5; 1 Cor. 7:18-19; Gal. 5:1-6; 6:15) before all was fulfilled in AD 70 (RE view)

c) *Conclusion:* Therefore, Jesus and Paul were **least** in the kingdom of heaven

1] This argument is a *reductio ad absurdum*

7) Jesus did not say that he came to fulfill **every prophecy** in the law and the prophets. He said He came to fulfill **the law and the prophets**

a) Jesus **fulfilled the law** by:

1] Obeying its **laws** perfectly (cf. Rom 8:3-4; 1 Pet. 2:21-22; Heb. 4:15)

2] Fulfilling its **Messianic prophecies** (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-48; Jn. 19:28; Acts 3:18; 13:29)

a] Note: This explanation fits the use of the term **"fulfill"** (*pleroo*) elsewhere in Matthew (cf. Mt. 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 3:15)

3] Embodying its **types** and **shadows** (e.g. 1 Cor. 5:7)

4] Bearing **the curse** of the law (Gal. 3:10-14)

- 5] Paying the **full penalty** of the law as the Substitute for sinners (Isa. 53:5-6, 8, 10-12; 1 Pet. 2:24)
- 6] Being **the end** (i.e. the goal) of the law for righteousness (Rom. 10:4)
- 8) **“All”** (*pas*) is **unlimited** in its context but **limited** by its context
- BAGD*: “...2. subst. –a. without the art. -- α. *pas everyone without exception* Lk 16:16.... γ. *pantes, panai all, everyone* (even when only two are involved = both...).... δ. *panta all things, everything*. In the absolute sense.... –Of a ‘whole’ that is implied fr. the context....” (Bold emphasis added, 631-633)
 - Thayer*: “.... II. Without a substantive; 1. masc. and fem. *every one, any one*.... Plural *pantes*, without any addition, *all men*....**of a certain definite whole**: *all* (the people), Mt xxi. 26; *all* (we who hold more liberal views), 1 Co. viii. 1; *all* (the members of the church), *ibid.* 7; **by hyperbole i.q. the great majority, the multitude**, Jn. iii. 26; *all* (just before mentioned) Mt. xiv. 20.... *oi pantes, all taken together, all collectively*...of all men, Ro. xi. 32; **of a certain definite whole**, Phil. ii. 21....” (Bold emphasis added, #3956, 491-493)
 - Vine*: “radically means ‘all.’ Used without the article it means ‘every,’ every kind or variety. ...or it may signify the highest degree, the maximum of what is referred to.... Used with the article, it means **the whole of one object**. In the plural it signifies **the totality of the persons or things referred to**. Used without a noun it virtually becomes a pronoun, meaning ‘everyone’ or ‘anyone.’ In the plural with a noun it means ‘all.’” (Bold emphasis added, #3956, 38)
- 9) The term **“all”** must always be interpreted in light of **its context**
- Mk. 13:23: Did Jesus explain **Einstein’s theory of relativity**?
 - Acts 2:16: What does **“all flesh”** mean?
 - Chart: “Spirit On All Flesh”
 - 2 Cor. 9:13: What does **“them and all men”** mean?
 - Chart: “‘Them’ & ‘All’”
 - 1 Tim. 5:20: What does “rebuke in the presence of **all**” mean?
 - All men**
 - All who are present**
 - 1 Cor. 6:12: What does **“all things** are lawful for me, but **all things** are not helpful” mean?
 - Everything** is lawful (cf. 1 Cor. 6:9-10)
 - Meat** (or food) (1 Cor. 6:13)
- 10) **“Till all is fulfilled”** [or accomplished (ASV; ESV; HCSB; ISV; NASB; NIV; NRSV; RSV)] (Mt. 5:18) must be interpreted in light of Jesus’ preceding statement: **“I did not come to destroy but to fulfill”** (Mt. 5:17)

11) Does “**all things written**” always refer to **every OT prophecy**?

- a) Lk. 18:31-33: ³¹ Then He took the twelve aside and said to them, “Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and **all things that are written** by the prophets concerning the Son of Man **will be accomplished**. ³² ~~For~~ He will be **delivered** to the Gentiles and will be **mocked** and **insulted** and **spit** upon. ³³ They will **scourge** Him and **kill** Him. And the third day He will **rise** again.”

1] Verse 32 limits the “all things” of verse 31

- b) Lk. 24:44: ⁴⁴ Then He said to them, “These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that **all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms** concerning Me.”
- c) Acts 13:29: ²⁹ Now when they had fulfilled **all that was written concerning Him**, they took Him down from the tree and laid Him in a tomb.

1] Was **every OT prophecy about Jesus** fulfilled in His Passion?

- a] Was Daniel’s Vision of the **Seventy Weeks** fulfilled in Jesus’ Passion? (Dan. 9:26-27)

- b] Was Malachi’s prophecy of the **coming of the Lord** fulfilled in Jesus’ Passion? (Mal. 3:1-3; 4:1-5)

2] If not, then did Jesus and Paul **lie** or were they **mistaken** when they said “**all things written by the prophets**”?

- a] Of course not, “**all things written by the prophets**” is **unlimited** in its context, but **limited** by its context.

- b] The context indicates that “**all things**” refers to Jesus’ **death and resurrection**

3] If “**all things written**” can refer to **Jesus’ Passion** in these passages, why not in Mt. 5:17-19?

- a] If so, then Jesus **did** what He came to do

- b] If not, then Jesus **failed**

12) “**All things which are written**” (Lk. 21:22) must be interpreted in light of its immediate context (Lk. 21:20-21)

- a) “**All things which are written**” refers, not to each and every OT prophecy, but rather to **the prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70 (cf. Mk. 13:23)

- b) “That **all has limited application, as shown by the context**, may have to be stated explicitly, ‘all that is written about it, or, about those days, or, about the coming judgment’.” (*A Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*, UBS Handbook Series, 670)

- c) It is faulty exegesis to assume and assert that “**till all is fulfilled**” (Mt. 5:18) and “**all things which are written may be fulfilled**” (Lk. 21:22) are referring to **the same thing**

13) When were “**all things**” fulfilled?

- a) In **AD 70** in the destruction of Jerusalem? (Lk. 21:22)
 - b) In **AD 30** at the cross? (Lk.18:31-33; Jn. 19:28; Acts 13:29)
 - c) The same kind of language is used for **both events**
 - 1] Why **limit some** of these passages by their immediate contexts and **not all** of them?
 - d) If “**all things which are written**” is not limited by its context:
 - 1] Does Jesus contradict **Himself**? (cf. Lk. 21:22 vs. Lk. 18:31-33; 24:44-46)
 - 2] Does Jesus contradict **John**? (cf. Lk. 21:22 vs. Jn. 19:28)
 - 3] Does Jesus contradict **Paul**? (cf. Lk. 21:22 vs. Acts 13:29)
 - e) Of course, there is **no contradiction** if “**all things which are written**” is interpreted in light of each specific context
 - 1] The **crucifixion** in AD 30 (Lk. 18:31-33; 24:44-46; Jn. 19:28; Acts 13:29)
 - 2] The **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Lk. 21:22)
- 14) Not **every OT prophecy** was fulfilled by AD 70
- a) **The striking of the great image** (Dan. 2)
 - 1] The 4th kingdom [Rome] was not “**crushed.**” It had not become like “**chaff**” so that “**no trace...was found**” before AD 70 (Dan. 2:35)
 - 2] It was not **broken in pieces** and **consumed** before AD 70 (Dan. 2:44)
 - a] “The **Western Roman Empire** collapsed in **476** as Romulus Augustus was forced to abdicate by Odoacer. The **Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire** endured until **1453** with the death of Constantine XI and the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks led by Mehmed II.” (Bold emphasis added, “Roman Empire,” *Wikipedia*)
 - 3] RE Objection: Daniel was talking about how the Messianic kingdom would **crush all these kingdoms spiritually**
 - a] First, were the four kingdoms represented by the giant image **physical kingdoms** or **spiritual kingdoms**?
 - b] Second, Daniel’s interpretation of the vision and the historical fulfillment does not **exactly correspond** to the vision
 - 1} In the vision, the great image is **intact** when it is struck by the stone; but historically, the 4 kingdoms **succeeded one another**, and that is exactly what Daniel indicates in his explanation of the vision: **you** [Babylon] (Dan. 2:37), then “**after you... another kingdom**” [Medo-Persia] (Dan. 2:39), “**then another**” [Greece] (Dan. 2:39), and finally “**the fourth kingdom**” [Rome] (Dan. 2:40)

- 2} The fourth kingdom **broke in pieces and crushed all the others** (Dan. 2:40)
- 3} Rome **incorporated** features of the preceding kingdoms and in that sense the image was **still intact** (cf. Dan. 7:12); but that doesn't change the fact that Daniel indicates a **succession of kingdoms**
- c] Third, the stone first **struck** the image and **broke** it in pieces (Dan. 2:34), then it **crushed** the image and it became like chaff (Dan. 2:35)
 - 1} Those are **two different things**
 - 2} It makes sense to me to conclude that **the striking** of the image occurred when the Messianic kingdom was **established** [Pentecost] and **the crushing** of the image occurred when the fourth kingdom [Rome], which had destroyed the others, was itself **destroyed**
 - 3} Daniel says "it [the Messianic kingdom] shall **break** in pieces and **consume** [Lit. *put an end to*, NKJV note] all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" (Dan. 2:44)
 - 4} How did the Messianic kingdom **put an end** to all these kingdoms? It **put an end to the fourth kingdom**, which had **imbibed** the characteristics of the three preceding kingdoms (cf. Dan. 7:12; Rev. 13:1-2)
 - 5} If the fulfillment of this prophecy involved **the destruction** (physically) of the first three kingdoms, why not the fourth?
- d] Fourth, why would anyone conclude that all these kingdoms were **crushed in the establishment of the Messianic kingdom** when Daniel says in his explanation of the dream, "And **in the days of these kings** [i.e. the 4th kingdom] the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed...." (Dan. 2:44)?
 - 1} How could the 4th kingdom be **crushed** at this point if it **still had kings**?
- e] Fifth, this passage does not say or necessarily imply that the Messianic kingdom **destroyed all of these kingdoms spiritually**
 - 1} It merely indicates that these kingdoms **would be destroyed** and that the Messianic kingdom **would be established** during the 4th kingdom
 - 2} The fact that the Messianic kingdom is a **spiritual kingdom** (which we learn from other passages, e.g. Jn. 18:36) does not imply that the 4 kingdoms of this vision were **spiritual kingdoms** or that

they were **destroyed spiritually**, as opposed to physically

3} After all, Daniel says of God, “And He changes the times and the seasons; He removes kings and raises up kings....” (Dan. 2:21)

f] Sixth, the image was crushed by the stone that became a **great mountain** that **filled the whole earth** (Dan. 2:35)

1} The **stone** is the **Messianic kingdom**, but did it become the **great mountain** that **filled the whole earth** by AD 70?

2} If not, then “**all things which are written**” (Lk. 21:22) [all OT prophecy according to RE’s] was **not fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem**

g] Seventh, if I am **reading too much into this text** and Dan. 2 was **completely fulfilled** in every way before AD 70, that does not mean that RE’s explanation of Mt. 5:17-18 & Lk. 21:22 is correct

b. Response to Syllogism #2 on Mt. 5:17-19:

1) The Minor Premise is an **assertion** without **explanation** or **argumentation**

a) RE’s must prove, not just assert, that the expression “**heaven and earth**” refers to the **Jewish economy**

b) The expression “**heaven and earth**” is found 32x in the NKJV. Where in Scripture does it unequivocally refer to **the Jewish economy**?

1] Chart: “Heaven And Earth”

2] RE Reply: See Isa. 1:2; 51:15-16

a] In Isa. 1:2, Isaiah is **not referring to Judah as heavens and earth**, he is figuratively **calling upon the heavens and the earth to be a witness** to his complaint against Judah (cf. Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28; 32:1ff; Jer. 2:12; 6:19; 22:29; Mic. 6:2)

1} “Here nature serves the purposes of prophecy. **The heavens and earth witness God’s complaint against his people**, and the ox and the donkey dumbly rebuke Israel’s ingratitude” (“Isaiah,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, 6:29)

2} Other commentators concur (e.g. *Tyndale OT Commentary*, *New American Commentary*, *Pulpit Commentary*, *Bible Knowledge Commentary*, et. al.)

b] I think Isa. 51:15-16 may refer to a **new (spiritual) environment** for God’s people (cf. Isa. 65:17-19) rather than representing Judaism; but if not, this does

not mean that Jesus was using “**heaven and earth**” in Mt. 5:18 to represent **Judaism**

- 2) In Scripture the “heavens and the earth” are **proverbial for stability and immutability** (cf. Psa. 78:69; 104:5; 119:90; 148:4-6)
- 3) **Jeremiah** uses similar language (Jer. 31:35-36; 33:19-21) in the same way as Jesus (Mt. 5:18)
 - a) *R. T. France*: “But the expression is probably less a specific note of time than **an idiom for something inconceivable.**” (“Matthew,” TNTC, 1:120)
- 4) Does the **word order** make a difference?
 - a) Chart: “What About Word Order?”
- 5) Lk. 16:17 explains what Jesus means in Mt. 5:18
 - a) Although the **wording is slightly different**, the **meaning is essentially the same** in both passages
 - 1] Cf. “**My blood of the new covenant**” (Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24) = “**the new covenant in My blood**” (Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25)
- c. Response to Paul’s allegory (Gal. 4:21-31):
 - 1) Before Paul mentions his allegory
 - a) He establishes the fact that:
 - 1] Christians are **not under the law of Moses** (Gal. 3:23-25)
 - 2] Christians are **Abraham’s seed** and **heirs** of the promise (Gal. 3:26-29)
 - 3] Christians are no longer **slaves**, but **sons** (Gal. 4:1-7)
 - b) He questions the Galatians’ desire to **go back into bondage** (Gal. 4:8-9)
 - c) He urges them to **become as he is** (Gal. 4:12)
 - 2) The point of Paul’s allegory is to urge the Galatians who were **going back** to the law (Gal. 4:21) to **cast out the law** from their hearts and lives which God had **already cast out** (Gal. 4:30-5:4)
 - 3) Paul’s allegory does not **make the point** that RE’s make
 - a) Paul does not even mention that:
 - 1] “Abraham had two sons which **existed side by side** for a time in the same household”
 - 2] “Ishmael was the first born and, as such, had the **right of primogeniture**”
 - b) And he certainly does not **make any point(s)** based on these **unmentioned items** in his explanation and application of his allegory

- 1] **Bill Reeves:** “Paul, through the Holy Spirit, no more made allegorical the detail of Ishmael and Isaac living in Abraham’s household for a short time, than he did the detail of Isaac’s being weaned! King goes beyond what Paul makes allegorical and misuses the purpose of the allegory, which he did present.” (“The Preterist View Heresy (VIII),” *Truth Magazine*, February 22, 1973, XVII: 16, n.p.)

c) We must **not press figurative language further** than the speaker/writer intended

- 1] **William Barclay:** “C. H. Dodd quotes Augustine’s interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan. *A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho*; Adam is meant; *Jerusalem* is the heavenly city of peace from the blessedness of which Adam fell; *Jericho* means the moon, and signifies our mortality, because it is born, waxes, wanes and dies. *Thieves* are the devil and his angels. *Who stripped him*, namely, of his immortality; *and beat him*, by persuading him to sin; *and left him half dead*, because in so far as man can understand and know God, he lives, but in so far as he is wasted and oppressed by sin, he is dead; he is therefore called *half dead*. The *Priest* and *Levite* who saw him and passed by signify the priesthood and ministry of the Old Testament, which could profit nothing for salvation. *Samaritan* (in Hebrew) could mean Guardian, and therefore the Lord Himself is signified by this name. *The binding of the wounds* is the restraint of sin. *Oil* is the comfort of a good hope; *wine*, the exhortation to work with fervent spirit. The *beast* is the flesh in which Jesus deigned to come to us. The being *set upon the beast* is belief in the incarnation of Christ. The *inn* is the Church where travellers are refreshed on their return from pilgrimage to their heavenly country. The *morrow* is after the Resurrection of the Lord. The *two pence* are either the two precepts of love, or the promise of this life and of that which is to come, or, possibly, the two sacraments. The *innkeeper* is the apostle Paul. The promise he makes to pay any extra expenses incurred, is either his counsel of celibacy or the fact that he worked with his own hands lest he be a burden to any of the brethren.” (*And Jesus Said: A Handbook on the Parables of Jesus*, 15-16)

4) Paul’s allegory is intended to make **the exact opposite point** that RE’s claim

- a) **Stan Cox:** “It in [sic] interesting that King’s interpretation of the allegory stands in direct opposition to Paul’s expressed intent. Paul desired to establish the folly of seeking justification from an abrogated law, ‘*Cast out the bondwoman and her son*’ (vs. 30), and King maintains Paul’s epistle to the Galatians was written at a time when that law remained. In fact, he claims that to be the significant point of the allegory. Just as the time of Ishmael and Isaac overlapped, so did the Jewish world (with its law) overlap with the Kingdom of Christ.” (“A Refutation of the A.D. 70 Doctrine #2, n.p.)

5) Ishmael did not have the **right of primogeniture**

- a) Abraham had **two sons** (Gal. 4:22)
 - b) But Abraham also had **more sons** (Gen. 25:1-6)
 - c) However, Abraham had only **one son of promise** (Gen. 22:2, 12; Heb. 11:17)
 - d) God's covenant was established through **Isaac** (Gen. 17:15-21; 21:12)
 - 1] Although God **blessed Ishmael**, His **covenant** was established with Isaac
 - 2] This announcement was made **before Isaac was born**
 - e) Isaac was given **all things** (Gen. 25:5-6)
- 6) The Galatians were **already sons of the freewoman**
- a) Gal. 4:31: "So then, brethren, **we are** *{present tense}* not children of the bondwoman but of the free
 - b) Gal. 5:1: "**Stand fast** *{present tense}* therefore in the liberty by which Christ **has made** us free *{aorist tense}*, and do not be entangled again with a yoke of bondage
 - c) Gal. 5:13: ¹³ For you, brethren, **have been called** *{aorist tense}* to liberty; only do not use liberty as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another.
 - d) Gal. 2:4: ⁴ And this occurred because of false brethren secretly brought in (who came in by stealth to spy out our liberty which **we have** *{present tense}* in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage),
 - e) Rom. 8:15: ¹⁵ For you did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear, but you **received** *{aorist tense}* the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, "Abba, Father."
- d. **Present tense verbs** (2 Cor. 3:11; Heb. 7:12, 18; 8:13; 10:9; 12:28) do not necessarily indicate that the old law/old covenant was in the **process of disappearing but not abrogated** before the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
- 1) First, other NT passages clearly indicate that the law of Moses or the old covenant was **abrogated at the cross** (cf. Gal. 3:23-25; Eph. 2:14-17; Col. 2:13-17; Heb. 7:11-19 & 8:1,6; 9:15-17)
 - a) This fact cannot be **ignored** or **overlooked** when explaining the use of the present tense
 - b) One of the fundamental principles of Bible study is that the **obscure** or **difficult** must be interpreted in light of the **obvious** and **easy**
 - 2) Second, the Greek present tense does not always denote **linear** (or continuous) **action**
 - a) *Dana & Mantey*: "The fundamental significance of the present tense is the idea of progress. It is the *linear* tense. **This is not, however, its exclusive significance. It is a mistake to suppose 'that the durative meaning monopolises the present stem'** (M. 119). Since there is no aorist tense for

present time, the present tense, as used in the indicative, must do service for both linear and punctiliar action. But it is to borne in mind that **the idea of present time is secondary in the force of the tense. In the indicative the linear significance of the present may sometimes be found more or less remote, being modified by other influences.** The other elements entering into the resultant import of the present tense are **the meaning of the verb itself** and **the general significance of the context.** That is, in dealing with the present tense we must consider not only **the fundamental force of the tense,** but also **the meaning of the verb root,** and **the significance of the context.** As affected by these three factors **the present tense exhibits several variations in use.**" (Bold emphasis added, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 181)

b) The **present tense** is used in **various ways**

1] See Appendix B: "Present Indicative"

c) The **present tense** can be used of **past actions**

1] 1 Cor. 11:18: "I **hear** {*present tense*} that there are divisions among you"

2] Jn. 15:27: "...because **you have been** {*present tense*} with Me from the beginning"

3] Lk. 13:7: "...for three years **I have come** {*present tense*} seeking fruit on this fig tree and found none..."

4] Gal. 3:25: "But after faith has come, we **are** {*present tense*} no longer under a tutor"

5] Mt. 17:11-12: "...Indeed, Elijah **is coming** {*present tense*} first and will restore all things. ¹² But I say to you that Elijah **has come** {*aorist tense*} already..."

6] 1 Tim. 6:4: "his is proud....from which **come** {*present tense*} envy, strife, reviling...."

7] Heb. 8:8: "Because **finding fault** {*present tense*} with them, **He says** {*present tense*}: "*Behold, the days **are coming** {*present tense*}, **says** {*present tense*} the Lord,* when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah

8] Heb. 8: 10: "...**I will put** {*present tense*} My laws in their mind and write them on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people." (*The McGuiggan-King Debate*, 33-34)

3) Third, consider **the context** of 2 Cor. 3:

a) In this context, Paul contrasts the **new** (which is already in existence) with the **old**

1] To the Corinthians, Paul says "You **are** {*present, active, indicative*} our epistle..." (2 Cor. 3:2)

a] These epistles are in contrast to **the tablets of stone** (i.e. the ten commandments) (2 Cor. 3:3)

- 2] The apostles were **made sufficient** {aorist, active, indicative} as ministers of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:6)
- 3] The Jews were reading the “**Old Testament**” (2 Cor. 3:14)
- 4) Fourth, Paul uses **several different verb tenses** in 2 Cor. 3
- a) 2 Cor. 3:2: ² You **are** {present, active, indicative} our epistle **written** {perfect, passive, participle} in our hearts, **known** {present, passive, participle} and **read** {present, passive, participle} by all men;
 - b) 2 Cor. 3:3: ³ clearly you **are** {present, active, indicative} an epistle of Christ, **ministered** {aorist, passive, participle} by us, **written** {perfect, passive, participle} not with ink but by the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of flesh, that is, of the heart.
 - c) 2 Cor. 3:6: ⁶ who also **made** us **sufficient** {aorist, active, indicative} as ministers of the new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.
 - d) 2 Cor. 3:7: ⁷ But if the ministry of death, written and **engraved** {perfect, passive, participle} on stones, **was** {aorist, passive, indicative} glorious, so that the children of Israel could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of the glory of his countenance, **which glory was passing away** {present, passive, participle}
 - 1] Paul uses the present tense to talk about the **fading radiance of Moses’ face** when he came down from Mt. Sinai (cf. Ex. 34:29-35)
 - 2] Was the radiance of Moses’ face **fading** when Paul wrote these words?
 - e) 2 Cor. 3:8: ⁸ how will the ministry of the Spirit not **be** {future, middle, indicative} more glorious?
 - 1] The ministry of the Spirit was **future from the time of Moses**
 - f) 2 Cor. 3:9: ⁹ For if the ministry of condemnation *had* glory, the ministry of righteousness **exceeds** {present, active, indicative} much more in glory.
 - g) 2 Cor. 3:10: ¹⁰ For even what **was made glorious** {perfect, passive, participle} **had no glory** {perfect, passive, indicative} in this respect, because of the glory that **excels** {present, active, participle}.
 - h) 2 Cor. 3:11: ¹¹ For if what **is passing away** {present, passive, participle} was glorious, what **remains** {present, active, participle} is much more glorious.
 - 1] Paul could be referring to the process of the “**passing away**” of the old law which **began in Moses’ day** and was **symbolized by the fading glory of his face** cf. 2 Cor. 3:13

- i) 2 Cor. 3:12: ¹² Therefore, since we **have** {present, active, indicative} such hope, we use great boldness of speech—
 - j) 2 Cor. 3:13: ¹³ unlike Moses, who **put** {imperfect, active, participle} a veil over his face so that the children of Israel **could** not **look steadily** {aorist, active, infinitive} at the end of what **was passing away** {present, passive, participle}.
 - k) 2 Cor. 3:14: ¹⁴ But their minds were **blinded** {aorist, passive, indicative}. For until this day the same veil **remains** {present, active, indicative} **unlifted** {present, passive, participle} in the reading of the Old Testament, because the veil is **taken away** {present, passive, indicative} in Christ.
 - l) 2 Cor. 3:15: ¹⁵ But even to this day, when Moses is read {present, passive, indicative}, a veil **lies**{present, middle or passive, indicative} on their heart.
 - m) 2 Cor. 3:16: ¹⁶ Nevertheless when one turns {aorist, active, subjunctive} to the Lord, the veil **is taken away** {present, passive, indicative}.
- 1] The comments of scholars on this passage seem to indicate that the verb tenses have **several different nuances**
 - a] See Appendix C: “Comments On The Verb Tenses In 2 Cor. 3”
- 5) The Hebrew writer’s use of the **present tense** does not inevitably mean that the old covenant **was still in effect**
- a) He may have used the present tense to describe the viewpoint from **Jeremiah’s perspective**
 - 1] See Appendix D: “Comments On Heb. 8:13”
 - 2] RE Objection: This explanation cannot be correct, because **600 years**, from Jeremiah’s day, cannot mean “**ready to vanish away**”
 - 3] Reply: Some judgments of God are described as “**imminent**” when evidently **they are not**
 - a] Moses prophesied an “**imminent**” **judgment on Israel** ca. 1405 BC (Dt. 32:34-35) that was not fulfilled until 586 BC
 - b] Isaiah prophesied an “**imminent**” **judgment on Babylon** ca. 746-686 BC (Isa. 13:6) that was not fulfilled until 539 BC
 - c] Obadiah prophesied an “**imminent**” **judgment on Edom** (Obad. 15) that was not completely fulfilled for centuries
 - 1} Some date Obadiah **early** (mid 800’s BC). Others date the book **late** (ca. 400 BC)

- 2} Either way, this prophecy was **not fulfilled for centuries**
 - 3} *Homer Hailey*: “Historically, Edom’s destruction began with the Chaldean invasion under Nebuchadnezzar but was not completed by that nation. Between the sixth and the end of the fourth centuries, Edom was invaded by Arabs known as the Nabataeans, a highly gifted people who drove the Edomites out of their land into a region south of Judea. The Maccabees brought them under subjection in the second century when Judas Maccabeus slew some twenty thousand of them. John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.) subjugated the remnant of the nation, forcing them to accept circumcision and nominally to accept the Jewish religion. Under the Romans some time during the first century after Christ the remaining Edomites were absorbed by the Arabs and their identity was lost completely.” (*Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, 37-38)
- d] Note: The same Greek word (**engys**) is used in these passages in the LXX that is used in Heb. 8:13
- b) He may have used the present tense to acknowledge the **continuing practice** of the old covenant by unbelieving Jews
- 1] *Donald Guthrie*: “The word translated *obsolete* (*pepalaiōken*) is in the **perfect tense** which suggests that **the first covenant has already become obsolete, the result of which is still evident in the present**. The same verb is used in the second sentence as a present participle, *becoming obsolete*, because the writer wants to point out that although theoretically the old has already become obsolete, **in practice it is a gradual process**. The combination of this thought with that of *growing old* brings out the inevitability of the process. As all people grow old and die, so illustrating their transient character, the old covenant is equally seen to be transient.” (Bold emphasis added, “Hebrews,” TNTC, 15:180)
 - 2] *Craig S. Keener*: “The writer undoubtedly says ‘**about to disappear**’ because **the temple service had not been directly discontinued** by Jesus’ exaltation, but it was at that time on the verge of disappearing.” (Bold emphasis added, “Hebrews,” IVPBBCNT, Elec. Ed., n.p.)
 - 3] Certainly unbelieving Jews continued to **practice** the religion of the old covenant (Heb. 8:3-4; 9:6-9) until the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 made this impossible
 - 4] But their practice of old covenant Judaism does not indicate that God viewed this covenant as **still authoritative** (cf. Heb. 9:15-17; 10:8-10)

- c) He may have used the present tense to speak generally of **the nature of obsolete things**
- 1] ESV: **In speaking of** a new covenant, he makes the first one obsolete. And what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away.
 - 2] HCSB: **By saying**, a new ^Lcovenant^L, He has declared that the first is old. And what is old and aging is about to disappear.
 - 3] NET: **When he speaks of** a new covenant, he makes the first obsolete. Now what is growing obsolete and aging is about to disappear.
 - 4] NASB: **When He said**, “A new covenant,” He has made the first obsolete. But **whatever** is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear.
 - 5] NIV: **By calling** this covenant “new,” he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.
 - 6] NKJV: **In that He says**, “A new covenant,” He has made the first obsolete. Now what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away.
 - 7] YLT: **in the saying ‘new,’** He hath made the first old, and what doth become obsolete and is old is nigh disappearing.
 - 8] *Bill Reeves*: “The Hebrew writer does not say that the Old Covenant was becoming obsolete and growing old, but that **whatever** (neuter) is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear! That’s his point; such is true of anything like that. It is a statement of general application. That’s why the neuter is used: ‘that which,’ or ‘whatever.’” (“The Preterist View Heresy (III), *A Study Of The A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 77)
- d) These three explanations are **reasonable** and **plausible**, and they **harmonize** with other NT passages that teach that the old covenant was abrogated at the cross
- e) The explanation offered by RE’s **does not harmonize** with these passages
- e. Jewish Christians did continue to **observe certain Jewish customs**, but **why?**
- 1) Not to be **justified** (Acts 13:38-39; Gal. 2:15-16)
 - 2) But out of **respect for their Jewish heritage** (Acts 21:20-26)

- 3) To **become all things** to all men (1 Cor. 9:19-23)
- 4) Paul said that **Peter lived in the manner of the Gentiles**, and not as the Jews when he was among Gentiles (Gal. 2:14). Could Peter have done that if he were **still under the law**? (cf. Acts 10:28; 11:1)
- f. Many NT passages clearly indicate that the law of Moses was **abrogated** and **replaced** before AD 70
 - 1) Christians had been **made dead** to the law (Rom. 7:4) and **discharged** from the law (Rom. 7:6-7)
 - a) *Joe Price*: “If the old and new covenants **overlapped** from A.D. 30-70, then **Paul’s illustration would mean nothing!** Furthermore, a Jewish Christian would be **married to two husbands** (covenants) simultaneously, hence, spiritual adultery!” (Bold emphasis added, “The Second Coming of Christ: Did It Already Occur? (II), *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 49)
 - b) Were Jewish Christians guilty of **spiritual adultery**?
 - 2) The old covenant had **passed away** (2 Cor. 3:1-18)
 - a) The Jews were reading the **Old Testament** (v. 14)
 - b) What made it “**old**”?
 - 3) Christians were **no longer under the tutor** that brought the Jews to Christ (Gal. 3:23-25)
 - a) The promises were made to **Abraham** and his **Seed** (Gal. 3:16a)
 - 1] The Seed was **Christ** (Gal. 3:16b)
 - b) The **law of Moses**, given 430 years later, **could not annul God’s covenant** to make the promise of no effect (Gal. 3:17)
 - 1] If the inheritance is **of law**, then it is no longer **of promise** (Gal. 3:18a)
 - 2] But God gave it to Abraham **by promise** (Gal. 3:18b)
 - c) The law was **added** because of transgressions **till the Seed should come** (Gal. 3:19)
 - d) The law was **not against the promises** of God (Gal. 3:21)
 - e) Before faith [the gospel] came, we [the Jews] were **kept under guard** by the law (Gal. 3:23)
 - f) The law was **our tutor** to **bring us to Christ** (Gal. 3:24)
 - g) After faith **has come** {aorist, active, participle} , we **are** {present, active, indicative} **no longer under a tutor** (Gal. 3:25)
 - h) You [Galatian Christians] **are** {present, active, indicative} **all sons of God** through faith (Gal. 3:26)
 - i) In Christ, there is neither **Jew** nor **Greek** (Gal. 3:28)
 - j) You [Galatian Christians] **are** {present, active, indicative} all one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:28)

- 1] Jewish and Gentile Christians could be **one in Christ**, because the **wall of separation**, the law of Moses, had been **removed** through the **cross** (Eph. 2:14-17)
- k) Christians **are** {*present, active, indicative*} heirs according to the promise (Gal. 3:29)
- 4) Christ came to **free the Jews from the bondage of the law** (Gal. 4:1-7)
 - a) Christ came to **redeem** those under the law that they might receive the **adoption as sons** (Gal. 4:5)
 - 1] Christ redeemed the Galatians through **the cross** (Gal. 3:13-14; cf. Eph. 1:3; Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:12; 1 Pet. 1:18-20)
 - b) The Galatians had **already received** this adoption when Paul wrote (Gal. 4:6-7)
- 5) The old covenant had been **cast out** (Gal. 4:21-31)
- 6) The law of commandments contained in ordinances had been **abolished** (Eph. 2:11-18)
 - a) Gentiles were, at one time, **aliens** from the commonwealth of Israel (Eph. 2:11-12)
 - b) But **now** in Christ Jesus, they **have been brought** {*aorist, passive, indicative*} near by the blood of Christ (Eph. 2:13)
 - c) Christ **has made** {*aorist, active, participle*} both Jews and Gentiles one (Eph. 2:14)
 - d) Christ did this by breaking down the **middle wall of division**, the **law of Moses** in **His flesh** (Eph. 2:14-15)
 - 1] **“Broken down”** {*aorist, active, participle*}
 - 2] **“Abolished”** {*aorist, active, participle*}
 - e) Jews and Gentiles were **reconciled** (*aorist, active, subjunctive*) through **the cross** (Eph. 2:16)
- 7) The handwriting of requirements was **nailed to the cross** (Col. 2:13-17)
 - a) Paul is talking about the **law of Moses** or the **old covenant**
 - 1] This handwriting contained **“ordinances”** or **“requirements”** (Col. 2:14)
 - a] The law of Moses certainly contained **“ordinances”** or **“requirements”** (cf. Lev. 18:4)
 - 2] This handwriting was **“against us”** (Col. 2:14)
 - a] The law of Moses was certainly **“against us”**
 - 1} It required **perfect obedience** (Lev. 18:5; Dt. 27:26; Neh. 9:29; Ezek. 20:11, 13, 21; Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:10-12)
 - 2} It was **weak through the flesh** (Rom. 8:1-3)

- 3} It could not provide **true forgiveness** (Heb. 9:11-15; 10:1-4)
- 3] The **parallel passage** (Eph. 2:14-18) points to the law of Moses
- 4] Paul's subsequent admonitions concern **Jewish rituals** (Col. 2:16)
- 5] These Jewish rituals were the **shadow** of things to come, but the **substance** is of Christ (Col. 2:17)
 - a] The Colossians were **already complete** in Christ (Col. 2:10)
- b) Paul says that the law of Moses was:
 - 1] **"Wiped out"** {*aorist, active, participle*}
 - 2] **"Taken** {*perfect, active, indicative*} out of the way"
 - 3] **"Nailed** {*aorist, active, participle*} to the cross"
- 8) The change in the priesthood demanded a **change in the law** (Heb. 7:11-14)
 - a) Jesus was **serving as High Priest** when the writer wrote Hebrews (Heb. 4:14-16; 8:1-2; 10:19-21), before AD 70
 - b) To serve as our High Priest, **the law had to be changed**, because Jesus was from the tribe of **Judah**, not **Levi**
 - c) Therefore, **the law of Moses was changed before AD 70**
 - d) If the law of Moses continued until AD 70, were there **two priesthoods in force at the same time**?
- 9) The law of a carnal commandment had been **disannulled** (Heb. 7:15-19)
- 10) The law was **a shadow** of good things to come (Heb. 8:4-5)
 - a) RE Objection: Jewish priests were **offering "gifts according to the law"** when the book of Hebrews was written
 - b) Yes, but this does not prove that the old covenant was **still in force** in the eyes of God
- 11) The old covenant had been **replaced** by a new covenant (Heb. 8:6-13)
- 12) The **death of the testator** established the new covenant (Heb. 9:15-17)
 - a) Jesus **died** on the **cross** (Phil. 2:8)
 - b) The death of the testator **makes valid** his last will and testament
 - c) Jesus' new testament (or covenant) **became valid** at His death
 - d) Can **two wills** be valid at the same time?
- 13) The first was **taken away** to establish the second (Heb. 10:1-10)
 - a) The writer says the first is **taken away to establish** the second

- b) This indicates that the first **did not co-exist** with the second
- c) So what was the writer talking about?
 - 1] The “first” could be the **old covenant** and the “second,” the **new covenant**
 - 2] The “first” could be the **animal sacrifices** and the “second,” **Christ’s sacrifice**
- d) The **second possibility** seems to me to fit the immediate context better
- e) But I don’t think it really makes much difference. Can you really separate the **animal sacrifices** from the **old covenant** that commanded them?
- f) Point: The “first” **did not co-exist** with the “second”
- g) RE Objection: The writer uses the **present tense** when he says “He **takes** away the first...”
 - 1] **Clinton Hamilton:** “This interpretation cannot stand the light of truth. In Hebrews 10:10 it is said, ‘By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.’ Let us observe the grammar involved. ‘Are’ is from the word *esmen* which is the indicative present active of the verb and expresses the state or condition in which they stand. ‘Sanctified’ is from *hegiasthēnai* which is a perfect participle. **Their having been sanctified prior to the present, which is the force of the perfect participle, enabled them to be standing in their current condition.** The OT had been abolished and the OT system went out with it. **The abolition of the OT system enabled them to have been sanctified by the will or testament that took its place. The OT was not in the process of being removed but had already been removed and when the Hebrews passage was penned, the brethren were in the condition stated.** The language of this passage contradicts the argument made on the present tense.” (Bold emphasis added, “The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 36)
 - 2] The Hebrews were already “**sanctified**” {*perfect tense*}
 - 3] This was made possible “through the **offering** of the body of Jesus Christ”
 - 4] When was this offering made? At the **cross**
 - 5] But the **first** was taken away to establish the **second**
 - 6] **Kenneth Wuest:** “The writer shows **the incompetence of animal sacrifices to satisfy the will of God, and the setting aside of the same in order that room might be made for that Sacrifice which will permanently satisfy His holy requirements.** When Messiah offers Himself as the sacrifice, **God takes away the First Testament and brings in the second or the New**

Testament. And this is the argument of the Book of Hebrews.” (Bold emphasis added, WWSGNT, 174-175)

- 7] *Paul Ellingworth*: “The present tense is related to the exposition of scripture (compare λέγων in v. 5); the author is not concerned with a chronological relation between the death of Jesus and the end of sacrifice in the Jerusalem temple.” (“Hebrews,” NIGTC, 505)

14) The old covenant had been **removed** (Heb. 12:18-29)

- a) The writer told his readers: “But you **have come** {*perfect tense*} to....” (Heb. 12:22)

- 1] Mount **Zion**
- 2] **City** of the living God
- 3] Heavenly **Jerusalem**
- 4] Innumerable company of **angels**
- 5] General assembly and **church of the firstborn** [ones]
- 6] **God**, the Judge of all
- 7] Spirits of just men **made perfect** {*perfect tense*}
- 8] **Jesus**, the Mediator of the new covenant
- 9] **Blood of sprinkling** that speaks better things than that of Abel

- b) The **perfect tense** emphasizes **action in the past with continuing results**

- c) RE Objection: The writer uses the present tense when he says “Therefore, since we are **receiving** {*present tense*} a kingdom which cannot be shaken....” (Heb. 12:28)

- 1] **Marvin R. Vincent**: “**Receiving a kingdom** (βασιλείαν παραλαμβάνοντες) The participle gives **no note of time**, but simply indicates the fact that Christians as such receive.” (Bold emphasis added, WSNT, 4:558)
- 2] The term “**kingdom**” (*basileia*) means different things in different contexts
- 3] First-century Christians were in the process of receiving the “**heavenly kingdom**” (2 Tim. 4:18; 2 Pet. 1:11)

- g. If the law of Moses or the old covenant was **still in effect only for Jews** during the “eschaton” (AD 30-70):

- 1) Could faithful Jews **be saved** by **keeping the law** between AD 30-70?
- 2) Why were Jews **evangelized**? (Acts 13:46)
- 3) If a Jew **rejected the gospel** but **kept the law** could he **be saved** between AD 30-70?

C. All Prophecy Was Fulfilled By AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. In the Olivet Discourse, Jesus declares that **all OT prophecy** would be **fulfilled** in the destruction of Jerusalem
 - 1) Lk. 21:22: ²² For these are the days of vengeance, that **all things which are written may be fulfilled**.
 - 2) Lk. 21:28: ²⁸ Now when these things begin to happen, look up and lift up your heads, because **your redemption draws near**.
 - 3) Lk. 21:31: ³¹ So you also, when you see these things happening, know that **the kingdom of God is near**.
 - 4) Lk. 21:32: ³² Assuredly, I say to you, **this generation will by no means pass away till all things take place**.
 - 5) Lk. 21:36: ³⁶ Watch therefore, and pray always that you may be counted worthy to escape all these things that will come to pass, and to **stand before the Son of Man**.
 - b. Therefore, **all OT prophecy was fulfilled in AD 70** when the Romans destroyed Jerusalem
2. Evaluation & Refutation:
- a. See the material below on Mt. 5:17-20 (III. A. 2.)
 - b. RE requires that all NT books must have been **written before AD 70**
 - 1) Many NT books were **written before AD 70**
 - a) **Paul** was executed ca. AD 67-68; therefore the **Pauline epistles** (Rom. – Phile.) were written before AD 70
 - b) **Peter** was executed ca. AD 68; therefore the **Petrine epistles** (1 & 2 Pet.) were written before AD 70
 - c) **Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, James, and Hebrews** are generally dated by most commentators before AD 70
 - 2) Some NT books are generally **dated after AD 70**
 - a) **Jude** (AD 62-80)
 - b) **John** (AD 80-98)
 - c) **1, 2, & 3 John** (AD 90-96)
 - d) **Revelation** (AD 90-96)
 - 1] See Clinton Hamilton, "The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory, Ed. Mike Willis, *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, pp. 26-30
 - 2] See "Dating The New Testament," <http://www.errantskeptics.org/DatingNT.htm>
 - c. If there is a NT book **written after AD 70** that mentions a **future event**, then RE **cannot be correct**
 - d. There are NT books commonly dated after AD 70 that mention a **future coming** of the Lord
 - 1) Chart: "Comings After AD 70"
 - 2) Chart: "'Last Time' After AD 70"

- e. To sustain the view that **all prophecy was fulfilled by AD 70**, RE's must conclusively prove that all of the NT books were **written before AD 70**
 - 1) The **burden of proof** lies on the shoulders of RE's
- f. **Almon Williams**, who personally holds the opinion that all of the NT was written before AD 70, does not believe that this can be **conclusively proven**
 - 1) **Almon Williams**: "Let us get to our point about the AD 70 doctrine's pre-AD 70 dates for all NT books. **Can this thesis be proven beyond a reasonable doubt?** I, although I am a joint-believer in this view and would not ordinarily, in any other context, like to admit it so freely, do now most unhesitatingly say, '**No!**' and frankly confess my view here to be nothing but an opinion. In other words, **so long as any proponent of some NT books' post-AD 70 origin can present arguments [sic] which are as persuasive or even nearly so as those of the pre-AD 70 advocate, the latter has not gotten close to proving his view beyond a reasonable shadow of doubt** ... In conclusion, to argue for the pre-AD 70 date of all NT books as a personally satisfying opinion is one thing, but to argue for such as an absolute necessity to uphold one's basic belief about the new covenant and the only true meaning of divine truth is, to say the least, quite another thing. In short, it is an opinion -- pure and simple!" (215)

D. Daniel's Prophecies Were Fulfilled In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:
 - a. Daniel's Vision of the "**Seventy Weeks**" was fulfilled in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Dan. 24-27)
 - b. The "**Seventy Weeks**" would accomplish **several things**
 - 1) Chart: "70 Weeks Are Determined"
 - c. Therefore, these things were **accomplished** in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - d. Daniel's Vision of the **Kings of the North & South** was also fulfilled in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 1) Similar language is used in the vision of the "**Seventy Weeks**" and in the vision of the "**Kings of the North & South**"
 - a) Chart: "Daniel 9 & Daniel 11-12"
 - 2) Similar language is used in the vision of the "**Kings of the North & South**" and in Jesus' **Olivet Discourse**
 - a) Chart: "Daniel & Olivet Discourse"
 - 3) Similar language is used in the vision of the "**Kings of the North & South**" and in the book of Revelation
 - a) Chart: "Daniel & Revelation"
2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. The text does not say that everything would be accomplished in or at the point of the **Jerusalem's destruction** in AD 70 but rather **within the "seventy weeks (lit. sevens)"**
- b. **Similar language** in different contexts does not prove an **identical reference**
 - 1) While some of the language of **Daniel 11-12** is similar to the language of the **Olivet Discourse** concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the language of **Dan. 11-12** is arguably more similar to the language of **Daniel 8** concerning the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 BC
 - a) Chart: "Similar Language: Dan. 8 & Dan. 11-12"
 - b) Chart: "Similar Language In Daniel"
 - c) RE's really have **three choices** with respect to the **similar language** in Daniel 8, 9, & 11-12:
 - 1] Daniel 8, 9, & 11-12 are all talking about the **destruction of Jerusalem** (AD 70) or the **desecration of the temple** (168 BC)
 - a] But **who believes** that Daniel 8 is fulfilled in AD 70?
 - 1} Chart: "Vision Of Ram 7 He-Goat"
 - 2} I checked 33 commentaries, Study Bibles, and Bible Handbooks in my Logos Bible Computer Program. **None** of them suggested that **Daniel 8** was fulfilled in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 3} *J. Dwight Pentecost*: "There is no question among expositors that **Antiochus is in view in this prophecy.**" (*Bible Knowledge Commentary*, 1:1359)
 - b] And **who believes** that Daniel 9 is fulfilled in 168 BC?
 - c] So this option **will not work**
 - 2] Daniel 8 is talking about the **desecration of the temple** by Antiochus Epiphanes (168/167 BC), and Daniel 9 & 11-12 are talking about the **destruction of Jerusalem** (AD 70)
 - a] But if that's the case, then the **similar (or identical) language** in Daniel 8 and 11-12 refers to **two different events**
 - b] Therefore, we can't assume that **similar (or identical) language** always indicates an **identical reference**
 - c] But RE's repeatedly make **this assumption** in their argumentation (i.e. "last days," "this age," "the age to come," "the end," "the time of the end," etc. always mean the same thing in every context)
 - d] So this option **gets RE's in trouble**

- 3] Daniel 8, 11-12 are talking about the **desecration of the temple** by Antiochus Epiphanes (168/167 BC) and Daniel 9 is talking about the **destruction of Jerusalem** (AD 70)
 - a] But if that's the case, then **Daniel 11-12 are not fulfilled in AD 70**
 - 1} Chart: "Out The Window"
 - b] RE Objection: The language in Dan. 11-12 doesn't fit Antiochus Epiphanes
 - 1} Chart: "Persecution By Antiochus IV"
- 2) Furthermore, some of the language in Daniel 11-12 is **not found in the Olivet Discourse**
 - a) Chart: "Dissimilarities Between Dan. 12 & Olivet Discourse"
- 3) Apocalyptic literature uses "**boilerplate**" language and imagery
 - a) Chart: "The Day Of Jehovah"
 - b) Chart: "The Great Supper Of God"
 - c) Chart: "Cosmic Cataclysm"
 - d) Chart: "Coming On The Clouds"
- 4) Thus, similar (or identical) language is used for **many different judgments**
- 5) Furthermore, apocalyptic literature is often **hyperbolic**
 - a) Chart: "Greatest King"
 - b) Chart: "Nor Ever Shall Be"
- c. There are good reasons to believe that Daniel 11-12 does not look beyond the time of **Antiochus Epiphanes**
 - 1) Chart: "Arguments For Antiochus"
 - 2) If that is correct then the things mentioned in Daniel 11-12 cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70

E. The Second Coming Occurred In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:
 - a. Jesus would **come in judgment on Jerusalem** (Mal. 4:1, 5; Mt. 23:37-39; 24:3, 27, 30; 26:64; Mk. 13:26; Lk. 21:27)
 - 1) The disciples ask Jesus concerning **the time** and **the sign** of the coming destruction of the temple
 - a) Chart: "The Disciples' Questions"
 - b) By comparing the three accounts, it is obvious that the disciples linked the **destruction of Jerusalem** with the **coming of the Lord** and the **end of the age/world**
 - 2) The questions of the disciples are **significant**
 - a) The address that follows is given to **answer these questions**

- b) Therefore, our understanding of **the disciples' questions** is important to our understanding of **Jesus' answer**
- 3) At this time the apostles did not understand Jesus' teaching concerning His **death, burial, resurrection, and ascension**
 - a) At that time, He was still with them, and they did not **expect Him to leave**
 - b) They **did not understand**:
 - 1] **1 year** before His death (Mt. 16:21-23)
 - 2] **6 months** before His death (Lk. 9:43-45)
 - 3] **3 months** before His death (Lk. 18:31-34)
 - 4] **1 week** before His death (Lk. 19:11)
 - 5] **1 night** before His death (Jn. 14:1-6; 16:16-22)
 - 6] **3 days** after His death (Lk. 24:9-11; Jn. 20:8-10)
 - 7] **43 days** after His death (Acts 1:6)
- 4) Therefore, it is highly unlikely, if not impossible, that they would have been asking about **the "Second Coming"**
 - a) *Sam Dawson*: "They didn't expect Jesus to go away the night before he died. They would not have asked about a final return, which they, at that time, didn't believe in." (*Essays on Eschatology*, 45)
- 5) Furthermore, the language that the disciples used does not, in and of itself, prove that they were thinking of **the Second Coming or the end of the world**
 - a) The phrase **"Your coming"** [*parousia*, lit., "presence"] could very easily refer to an **invisible, impersonal "coming" in judgment** cf. Isa. 19:1; Mt. 10:23; 26:64
 - b) The phrase the **"end of the world"** [*aion*, lit., "age"] could very easily refer to the **end of the "age"** cf. 1 Cor. 10:11; Heb. 9:26
 - 1] In Jewish thought, there were **two ages**:
 - a] **"This age"** [the Pre-Messianic age]
 - b] **"The age to come"** [the Messianic age]
 - c) In the Parable of the **Wheat** and the **Tares**, Jesus spoke of a **harvest** at the **end of the age** Mt. 13:30, 39-43
 - 1] When Jesus asked the apostles: **"Have you understood all these things?"**, they replied **"Yes, Lord"** (Mt. 13:51)
 - 2] So they were not confused about the **"end of the age"**
 - d) So when the disciples asked Jesus "Tell us, when will these things be? And what *will be* the sign of Your coming, and of **the end of the age?**" (Mt. 24:3), they knew that the **"end of the age"** was the **coming of Christ in judgment on the Jewish nation** and the destruction of the temple

- e) Therefore, they were asking about **the end of the Pre-Messianic age** -- the age when “these things” would be accomplished
 - 1] The destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 was described as **“the end”** (Mt. 24:3, 6, 13-14; Mk. 13:7, 13; Lk. 21:9)
- 6) If the apostles **didn’t ask** about the “Second Coming,” why would Jesus have **talked about it**?
- 7) While many postulate **a transition** in the Olivet Discourse from the destruction of Jerusalem to the Second Coming (at Mt. 24:36) there are good reasons to doubt any such transition
 - a) **A comparison of Lk. 17:22-37 with Mt. 24:1-51** indicates that there is no transition from a discussion of Jerusalem’s destruction to the Second Coming in Jesus’ Olivet discourse
 - 1] Chart: “Is There A Transition?”
 - 2] If Jesus’ language implied a change of subject in Mt. 24, then the same language would have Jesus **jumping back and forth** between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Coming in Lk. 17
 - a] Chart: “All These Transitions???”
 - b) If the word **“end”** is referring to the **end of time** or the **Second Coming** and there is **a transition** or change of subjects somewhere in the chapter, we would expect Jesus to use the word **“end”** in the **latter part** of the chapter, but this is not the case. The word **occurs before the supposed transition** (Mt. 24:6, 13, 14)
 - c) Jesus uses the word **“coming”** throughout this discourse without regard to any supposed transition (Mt. 24:3, 27, 30 & Mt. 24:37, 39, 42, 44) which suggests that there is **no transition**
- b. The NT repeatedly refers to an **imminent coming of the Lord**
 - 1) Chart: “An Imminent Coming”
 - a) Note: In the NT the expression **“this generation”** always refers to **Jesus’ contemporary generation** (Mt. 11:16; 12:41-42; 23:36; 24:34; Mk. 8:12; 13:30; Lk. 7:31; 11:30-32, 50-51; 17:25; 21:32)
 - b) *Sam Dawson*: “Paul taught the imminent return of Christ [1 Th. 4:15-16], and included himself among those who would still be alive when the resurrection of the dead in Christ happened.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 15)
 - 1] Reply: Paul was executed before Jerusalem was destroyed in AD 70, so if Paul “included himself” he was wrong
- c. The **only imminent coming** of Jesus was **His coming in judgment on Jerusalem**
 - 1) Plural pronouns **“you,” “our,” “us”** (1 Cor. 1:7; 1 Th. 5:4) indicate a fulfillment within the lifetime of those addressed

- a) Reply: Those passages do not promise that Jesus **would return** in their lifetime; they teach that they should **be ready if He returns**
- b) Reply: Furthermore, plural pronouns can be used in a **generic sense**, rather than a specific sense (cf. Gen. 49:1, 10)
- d. Therefore, **Jesus' "Second Coming"** was **His coming in judgment on Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 1) **F. W. Farrar**: "It was to this event [the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, ksk], the most awful in history that we must apply **those prophecies of Christ's coming** in which every one of the Apostles and Evangelists describe it as **near at hand**. To those prophecies our Lord Himself fixed these three most definite limitations -- the one, that **before that generation passed away all these things would be fulfilled**; another that **some standing there should not taste death till they saw the Son of Man coming in His kingdom**; the third, that **the Apostles should not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come**. It is strange that these distinct limitations should not be regarded as the decisive proof that **the Fall of Jerusalem was, in the fullest sense, the Second Advent of the Son of Man**, which was primarily contemplated by the earliest voices of prophecy." (Bold emphasis added, *The Early Days of Christianity*, 489-490)

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. There are **several things** that can be said about RE's contention that the apostles' could not have asked Jesus about **some other "coming"** than His coming in judgment on Jerusalem
 - 1) RE's assume several things concerning **"the end of the age"** (Mt. 13:39-40, 49; 24:3) and **"the end"** (Mt. 10:22;
 - a) They assume that the terms **"the age"** and **"this age"** always **mean the same thing**
 - 1] Chart: "Same Term – Different Meanings"
 - 2] Chart: "Laying On Of Hands"
 - b) They assume that the terms **"the age"** and **"this age"** refers to **the Jewish Age**
 - c) They assume that **Jesus was talking about the Jewish Age**
 - d) They assume that when the disciples said they understood, they **really did understand**
 - 1] **Job's friends** thought they understood the reason for Job's suffering -- "Piety pays, perversity punishes" (cf. Job 4:6-8; 8:20); but they didn't (cf. Job 9:21; 23:11-12; 27:1-6; 31:6)
 - 2] **The apostles** were very slow to understand:
 - a] Jesus' **teaching** (Mt. 15:10-20; 16:5-12)
 - b] Jesus' **miracles** (Mk. 6:30ff, 51-52)
 - c] Jesus' **death** (Mt. 16:21-23; Mk. 9:30-32; Lk. 18:31-34; Jn. 14:1-5; 16:16-20; Lk. 24:44-47)

- 1} Even though Jesus told them of His death plainly
- 3] If we accept the apostles' words, we still **don't know what they understood**
 - a] A "harvest" at the end of **the Jewish Age**
 - b] A "harvest" at the end of **the world**
 - 1} *Aion* can mean **world** (cf. Heb. 1:2; 11:3)
- e) They assume that the apostles were using the **same terminology the same way in two different contexts** (more than a year apart) (A. T. Robertson, *A Harmony of the Gospels*, Elec. Ed., n.p.)
 - 1] One can use the **same term in different ways** in the **same context**, much less different contexts (cf. Mt. 8:22)
 - 2] Illust.: "I took my money out of my piggy **bank** and deposited it at Sun Trust **Bank** downtown. While on the way I saw a man fishing on the river **bank**."
- f) They assume that **"the end"** always refers to **the same event**
 - 1] Bible writers speak of **many different "ends"**
 - a] Chart: "The End"
 - 2] **"The end"** could refer to many different things:
 - a] The end of **persecution** (Mt. 10:17-23)
 - b] The **destruction of Jerusalem** (Mt. 24:6, 13-14; Mk. 13:7, 13; Lk. 21:9; , Mt. 10:17-23; 1 Pet. 4:7)
 - 1} **"All things"** must be understood in light of its context (cf. Lk. 18:31-33; 1 Cor. 6:12; 10:23)
 - c] The end of **Jesus' trial** (Mt. 26:58)
 - d] The end of **Jesus' life** (Jn. 13:1)
 - e] The **end of life** (1 Cor. 1:8; 2 Cor. 1:13; Heb. 3:6, 14; 6:11-12; Rev. 2:26)
 - f] The **Final Coming** (*i.e.* Second Coming) (1 Cor. 15:24)
- 2) Jesus can teach **beyond man's understanding**
 - a) Chart: "Jesus Can Teach Beyond Man's Understanding"
 - b) So the apostles' lack of understanding **would not preclude** Jesus' teaching on both the **destruction of Jerusalem** and the **Second Coming**
- 3) The **same language** in Luke 17 and Matthew 24 is not necessarily used in the **same way** in both passages
 - a) Luke 17 is not a **parallel passage** with Matthew 24
 - b) The **same language** can mean **different things in different contexts**
 - 1] Chart: "Metaphors & Meaning"

- 4) There are **significant contrasts** between the first part of the Olivet Discourse and the last
 - a) Chart: “Significant Contrasts”
- 5) The material that is **unique to Matthew’s account** of the Olivet Discourse seems to relate to the disciples’ question: “And what will be **the sign of Your coming**, and of **the end of the age?**” (Mt. 24:3)
 - a) Chart: “The Disciples’ Questions”
- b. Jesus’ coming in judgment on Jerusalem is **not the only coming of the Lord**. The NT refers to **many “comings of the Lord”**
 - 1) Chart: “Comings’ Of The Lord”
 - 2) If there are **many different comings of the Lord**, then there could be **a future coming of the Lord** after AD 70
 - 3) RE Question: Since so many NT passages that talk about the **“coming of the Lord”** do in fact refer to **His coming in judgment on Jerusalem**, why not all of them?
 - a) Answer: For the same reason that the baptism that Jesus experienced in His Passion (Mt. 20:22-23; Mk. 10:38-39), the **“baptism of suffering,”** is not **water baptism**. **THE CONTEXT WILL NOT ALLOW IT!**
- c. Jesus’ coming in judgment on Jerusalem is **not the only imminent coming of the Lord**. The NT refers to **imminent comings** of the Lord that could not be the **destruction of Jerusalem**
 - 1) Chart: “Imminent Comings (Not AD 70)”
 - 2) Jesus came representatively through **the Holy Spirit** (Jn. 14:16-18, 28)
 - a) Jesus promised to send the Holy Spirit to the apostles. There is no good reason to believe that Jesus’ words **“I will come to you”** refers to anything else but this
 - b) Before His ascension, Jesus promised the apostles Holy Spirit baptism **“not many days from now”** (Acts 1:4-5)
 - c) The apostles received Holy Spirit baptism on **Pentecost** ten days later (Acts 2:1-4)
 - d) Therefore, this was an **imminent coming** of the Lord that was **not the destruction of Jerusalem**
 - 3) Jesus’ coming to **punish or bless the 7 churches of Asia**
 - a) He promised to come **quickly** (Rev. 2:5, 16; 3:11; 22:7, 12, 20)
 - b) But His coming to **punish** or **bless** was dependent on their **repentance** or **faithfulness** (Rev. 2:5, 16; 3:3, 11, 19-20)
 - c) Jesus’ coming in judgment on Jerusalem was **not dependent on repentance**
 - 1] When Jesus prophesied Jerusalem’s destruction it was **too late for repentance** (Mt. 23:31-39; 24:29-31)

- d) Therefore, this was an **imminent coming** of the Lord that was **not the destruction of Jerusalem**
- 4) Thus, the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 was **not the only imminent coming** of the Lord
- 5) Chart: “Comings Of The Lord: Conditional & Unconditional”
- 6) If there are **imminent comings** of the Lord that cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, RE’s must prove, and not just assume, that **any particular imminent coming refers to the destruction of Jerusalem**
- d. The NT also speaks of a **delayed coming** of the Lord that was **not imminent**
 - 1) The coming of the Son of Man will be **like the coming of the flood** (Mt. 24:36-39)
 - a) The “the Divine longsuffering **waited** in the days of Noah, while *the* ark was being prepared” (1 Pet. 3:20) for **120 years** (Gen. 6:3)
 - 2) In the Parable of the Faithful and Evil Servant, the master **delayed his return** (Mt. 24:48-51)
 - 3) In the Parable of the Ten Virgins, the bridegroom **delayed his coming** (Mt. 25:5)
 - 4) In the Parable of the Talents, the lord returned “**after a long time**” to settle accounts (Mt. 25:19)
 - 5) The coming of the Lord would not occur until there was **a falling away** and **the man of sin** would be revealed (2 Th. 2:1-5)
 - 6) Scoffers were asking “**Where is the promise of His coming?**” (2 Pet. 3:4)
- e. There is a **coming of the Lord** in Scripture that **does not “fit”** the destruction of Jerusalem
 - 1) There is a coming of the Lord to **judge all nations** Mt. 25:31-33
 - a) Were **all nations** judged in AD 70?
 - 2) There is a coming of the Lord **like the ascension** Acts 1:9-11
 - a) Jesus ascended **bodily** and **visibly** in a **literal** ascension
 - b) What would the apostles have **understood** the angels to mean?
 - c) Jesus did not come **bodily** and **visibly** and **literally** (in the sense that the apostles would have understood the angels’ language) in the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
 - d) “**In like manner**” modifies “**will so come,**” not “**This same Jesus**”
 - 1] *Kenneth Gentry*: “The Greek *hon tropon* literally means ‘**what manner.**’ The Greek phrase ‘never indicates mere certainty or vague resemblance; but **wherever it occurs in the New Testament, denotes identity of mode or manner**’ (A. Alexander, Acts, ad loc.). Consequently, we have express biblical warrant to expect a **visible, bodily,**

glorious return of Christ paralleling in kind the **ascension.**” (“A Brief Analysis of Full Preterism or Hyper Preterism,” <http://fide-o.com/2009/05/full-preterism/>)

- 2] *Barclay M. Newman*: “*In the same way* refers to **the manner of the Lord’s return**, that is, on the clouds of heaven, as is depicted in other passages of the New Testament. This may be rendered in some languages as ‘just like he went.’” (*A Handbook on The Acts of the Apostles*, 21)
- 3] “Not another and in a different way, but this same Jesus in the same way, would descend for believers as they had seen Him ascend from them.” (KJVBC, 2129)
 - a] Chart: “The Return Of Jesus”
- e) “When the **plain sense** makes **good sense** any other sense is **nonsense**”
- 3) There is a coming of the Lord that is **personal, audible, and visible** 1 Th. 4:13-18
 - a) Nothing like this occurred in AD 70
 - b) RE Objection: The “**dead**” are the **OT saints** and the **living** are the **NT saints**
 - 1] Chart: “Are “The Dead” OT Saints?”
 - 2] The “**dead**” are:
 - a] “Those who have **fallen asleep**” (1 Th. 4:13)
 - b] “Those who **sleep in Jesus**” (1 Th. 4:13)
 - c] “Those who are **asleep**” (1 Th. 4:15)
 - d] “The dead **in Christ**” (1 Th. 4:16)
 - 3] How does a person **get into Christ**? He is **baptized** into Christ (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27)
 - 4] Were **OT saints baptized** into Christ?
 - c) RE Objection: The **same kind of language** is used in passages referring to the destruction of Jerusalem
 - 1] Chart: “Mt. 24 & 1 Th. 4 & 5”
 - 2] To ask “Is it **possible** that Mt. 24 and 1 Th. 4 & 5 refer to the same event?” is the wrong question. We should ask “Is it **probable** or **certain**?”
 - a] **Possibility** doesn’t prove **probability**, and it certainly doesn’t prove **certainty**
 - 1} Illust.: Is it **possible** that Mark Furman planted the bloody glove and the LAPD manipulated the blood evidence in the O. J. Simpson case? Is it **probable**? Is it **certain**?
 - 3] **Similar or even identical language** can refer to **different things in different contexts**
 - a] *D. R. Dungan*: “Rule 8. It must be remembered that

figures are not always used with the same meaning.--A lion may not always symbolize the same thought, nor need a sheep, water, or fire always be employed for the purpose of expressing the same calamity or blessing.

“There is a very grave error among an untaught class of exegetes in compelling every word that has, at any time, been used figuratively, to always represent the same thought as in that passage. Many seem disposed to regard themselves as at liberty to make anything out of the Bible which their theology may demand or their whims require. And if, at any time, they find a passage that will not harmonize with that view, then the next thing is to find one or more words in the text used elsewhere in a figurative sense, and then demand that such use be the Biblical dictionary on the meaning of that word, and hence that it must be the meaning in that place. “ (*Hermeneutics: A Text-Book*, 1888, 216-217)

b] Chart: “Metaphors & Meaning”

c] RE’s argue like JW’s. They apply **one meaning** across the board

1} Chart: “JW’s On ‘Soul’ & ‘Spirit’”

4] If God’s judgments in time are **typical** of God’s final judgment, then we should not be surprised that **similar language** is used to describe all of God’s judgments

5] While there are **certain similarities** between Mt. 24 and 1 Th. 4 & 5, there are also some **significant differences**

a] Chart: “Are They Really Parallel?”

4) “**If it doesn’t fit, you can’t acquit!**”

f. **Meaning** must always be determined by **context**, and the **immediate context** must **take precedence** in determining meaning over other contexts

g. If the “**Second Coming**” (Heb. 9:28) occurred in **AD 70**:

1) What is so remarkable about **Jesus’ statement about John?** (Jn. 21:20-23)

2) Why can’t we **judge** the hidden things of the heart? (1 Cor. 4:1-5)

3) Why do we still observe the **Lord’s Supper?** (1 Cor. 11:23-26)

a) Paul says that in the Lord’s Supper we “proclaim the Lord’s death **till He comes**”

b) If Jesus **came in AD 70**, and He is **not coming again**:

1] Does the Lord’s Supper **no longer proclaim** Christ’s death?

2] Is the Lord’s Supper **no longer applicable** today?

4) Why is Realized Eschatology “unrealized” in **early post-apostolic writings?**

- a) See Almon Williams (“AD 70: The End?” *The Doctrine of Last Things*, 1986, 216-219)
- b) See Terry Varner (*Studies in Biblical Eschatology*, 1:78-97)

F. The Resurrection (Of The Dead) Occurred In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

a. The **resurrection** would occur at **Christ’s coming**

- 1) The **resurrection of the dead** occurs at **Jesus’ Coming** (1 Cor. 15:20-23; 1 Th. 4:15-16)
- 2) The Lord would come in the **destruction of Jerusalem** (Mt. 24:30)
- 3) The Lord’s Coming was **imminent** (Jas. 5:7-8)
- 4) The **only imminent coming** of Jesus was **His coming in judgment on Jerusalem**
- 5) Therefore, the **resurrection of the dead** occurred when **Jesus came in judgment on Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - a) *Max King*: “The author sincerely believes that the *general resurrection* belongs to the same time and event as given to the **coming of Christ, the judgment, end of the world**, and receiving of the **eternal kingdom**. It completes, not hinders, God’s plan of redemption.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 212)

b. The **death** under consideration is **spiritual death**

- 1) *Max King*: “**Judaism was the metaphorical grave of the spiritual dead out of which this resurrection took place.** The fall of Judaism was the defeat of the ‘ministration of death’ and the opening of the graves. Those who had previously heard and obeyed Christ were found worthy of eternal life in the new heaven and earth. The disobedient were raised to eternal hell or separation from God (2 Thessalonians 1:7-9)” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, 220)
- 2) The death that Adam brought into the world (1 Cor. 15:21-22) was **spiritual death**, not physical death
 - a) *Major Premise*: God told Adam that “in **the day** that you eat of it [the forbidden fruit] you shall surely die” (Gen. 2:17)
 - b) *Minor Premise*: Adam did not **die physically** the day he ate of the forbidden fruit (Gen. 5:1-5)
 - c) *Conclusion*: Therefore, he **died spiritually** that day, *i.e.* he was separated from God (Rom. 5:12ff)
 - d) Adam later **died physically** only because he was **denied access to the tree of life** (Gen. 3:22-24)
 - 1] Adam was **mortal before he sinned**; that’s why he needed **continual access** to the tree of life
 - 2] *Sam Dawson*: “...Adam didn’t die physically because he sinned, and neither do we. Is physical death an enemy to a Christian? It wasn’t even to Adam, who was subject to death

physically before he sinned! **Physical death is certainly not a consequence of Adam's sin, nor a curse for it.** Adam died in his relationship to God the day he sinned, and that death passes to all who sin." (*Essays on Eschatology*, 172)

- c. The **resurrection** under consideration is a **spiritual resurrection**
 - 1) If the **"death" is spiritual**, then the **"resurrection" must be spiritual** as well
 - 2) *Max King*: "While the physical resurrection of Christ stands as a cornerstone of our faith, the question of how we share in that resurrection was on the minds of New Testament writers. In Romans 6, Paul associates our baptism with our death in Christ, and speaks of **our resurrection** in the same context. The death Paul speaks of here is **not a literal or biological death – the resurrection that would follow need not be understood in this light either....**" (Bold emphasis added and unconfirmed quotation, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 309)
 - 3) *Max King*: "In John 5 Jesus addresses **two stages of one resurrection**, which follow his determinative death and resurrection.... His focus is on **the resurrection of Israel**, 'the dead' from the standpoint of 'the life' that Christ came to give. As they were **raised out of the graves of national death** by 'the word of the Lord' in their historical captivity (Ezek. 37), the hour had come for Israel to be **raised out of their graves of sin captivity** by 'the voice of the Son of God.'" (Bold emphasis added and unconfirmed quotation, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 331)
 - 4) The **resurrection** is a **spiritual resurrection** from **spiritual death**
 - a) *Major Premise*: Adam brought **death** into the world, and Christ brings the **resurrection of the dead** (1 Cor. 15:21)
 - b) *Minor Premise*: The death that Adam brought into the world was **spiritual death**, not physical death
 - 1] Adam didn't **die physically** because he sinned
 - 2] Adam didn't **die physically 900 years later** (Gen. 5:5) because he sinned
 - 3] Adam wasn't the **first person to die physically** -- Abel was (Gen. 4:8)
 - 4] Christ was not the **first to be made alive physically**, because others were **raised before Him**
 - a] Widow's son (1 Ki. 17:17-22)
 - b] Shunnamite's son (2 Ki. 4:32-35)
 - c] Unnamed man (2 Ki. 13:20-21)

- d] Jairus' daughter (Mt. 9:23-25)
 - e] Widow's only son (Lk. 7:11-15)
 - f] Lazarus of Bethany (Jn. 11:43-44)
 - g] Many saints (Mt. 27:52-53)
- 5] Christ's death doesn't redeem us from the **physical death of Adam**, for we **still die** (Dawson, *Essays on Eschatology*, 160)
- 6] Furthermore, physical death is **not an enemy** (1 Cor. 15:26) to a child of God (cf. Ps. 116:15; Phil. 1:21)
- c) *Conclusion*: Therefore, Christ's remedy is a **resurrection from spiritual death**, not physical
- d. The **body** that is raised is a **spiritual body**
- 1) The term "**body**" (singular) (1 Cor. 15:35) indicates that it is a **corporate body** that is raised, **not human bodies** (plural)
 - 2) Max King taught that **the body** that was raised in AD 70 was **the church** (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18, 24) from **the grave of Judaism**
 - a) *Max King*: "Why did he [Paul] use the plural, '**our**' and the singular '**body**,' [in Phil. 3:21, ksk] if he were talking about a general resurrection of individual dead bodies?" (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 194)
 - b) *Max King*: "The redemption of **our body (not bodies)** in Rom. 8:23 is equated with **our vile body (not bodies)** in Phil. 3:21, and corresponds to the redemption of the purchased possession or **church** in Eph. 1:14." (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 194)
 - c) *Max King*: "There is nothing in **Paul's corporate language of the 'body' of Christ** that forces us to assume that **the resurrection to come** (in their day) would involve the **literal process of individual corpses coming out of their graves**. Instead, the expected eschatological resurrection was **the translation of the children of God from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant** (2 Cor. 3:18). The death from which we are corporately raised is from sin-death, or alienation from God." (Bold emphasis added and unconfirmed quotation, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 309, quoted by Allen Dvorak, "The Coming Resurrection of the Dead: The Death Knell of Realized Eschatology (Part 1)," 4)
 - d) *Max King*: "Thus, **out of the decay of Judaism arose the spiritual body of Christianity** that became fully developed or resurrected by the end-time. Hence, this is the primary meaning of Paul's statement 'It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.'" (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, 200)
 - e) So the **redemption of the "body"** (Rom. 8:23) is the **redemption of the church** (Eph. 1:5-14; 4:4-5, 15-16, 30)

- f) This redemption occurred in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Lk. 21:20-22, 27-28, 31-32)
- 3) Sam Dawson teaches that **the body** that was raised in AD 70 was **the body of OT saints**
- a) *Sam Dawson*: “Paul never used ‘**bodies**’ in this chapter. He spoke of the resurrection of **one body, the Old Covenant faithful who were being transformed into the body of Christ**. The question had to do with how Jewish and Gentile saints were going to be in that one body, along with Old Covenant saints who didn’t even see or obey Christ.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 181-182)
- b) Syllogism: The **body** raised in AD 70 was **OT Israel**
- 1] *Major Premise*: Paul **taught nothing** but what Moses and the prophets said would come concerning the resurrection (Acts 26:22-23)
- a] A resurrection of **the just** and **the unjust** (Acts 24:14-15)
- b] A resurrection of **the dead** (Acts 26:6-8)
- c] A resurrection of **Christ** from the dead (Acts 26:21-23)
- 2] *Minor Premise*: Moses and the prophets foretold the **resurrection of Israel** (Isa. 25:6-9; Hos. 6:1-2; 13:14; Ezek. 37:1-14), not the **resurrection of human bodies**
- a] *Sam Dawson*: “The Old Testament foretold the resurrection quite a number of times, not the popular view of fleshly bodies coming out of holes in the ground, but a lot about **the resurrection of Israel**: how Israel would die, be planted like a seed, be resurrected and transformed, etc.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 109)
- b] *Sam Dawson*: “[T]he resurrection Paul spoke of in I Corinthians 15 was **not a resurrection of physical bodies** out of holes in the ground, but **the resurrection of Old Covenant Israel** from the death of its fellowship with God.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 113)
- c] *Sam Dawson*: “...Paul’s preaching on the resurrection was based squarely on nothing but the teaching of Moses and the prophets. Moses and the prophets **knew nothing about a resurrection of physical bodies** out of holes in the ground, yet Paul said he preached just like them, and that the Corinthians received that same teaching.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 132)
- d] Note: Paul quoted **Isaiah 25:8** and **Hosea 13:14** in his discussion of the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:54-55)
- 1} *Sam Dawson*: “[N]o one on earth interprets those Old Testament prophecies as of a resurrection of physical bodies out of holes in the ground.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 133)

3] *Conclusion:* Therefore, the resurrection that Paul taught was the **resurrection of Israel**, not the **resurrection of human bodies**

a] Dawson argues that “**some**” at Corinth (1 Cor. 15:12) were denying, not their own resurrection, or Christ’s resurrection, or the resurrection of Gentile Christians, or the resurrection of Jewish Christians, but **the resurrection of OT saints** (Dawson, *Essays on Eschatology*, 143)

4) The resurrection in AD 70 **released OT saints from Hades**

a) *Sam Dawson:* “That is, at the resurrection, the Old Covenant faithful would be taken from the ‘unseen’ Hadean state into the presence of Christ in the twinkling of an eye. They would, as a body, in this eye-opening experience, be restored to the relationship Adam had with God before his fellowship was broken. They would be in the presence of Christ himself.

“Then after the resurrection of spiritual Israel at the destruction of Jerusalem, Christians who die physically, don’t go to a Hadean warehouse to wait for a massive simultaneous judgment, but straight to their heavenly reward, Rev. 14.13, another spiritual event. This means you and I, and our loved ones, go straight to be with Christ when we die if we’ve lived a faithful life --no warehousing for thousands of years.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 161)

1] *Sam Dawson:* “As Hosea foretold, the body of Old Covenant Israel was sown (buried) in apostasy by God, died in Babylonian captivity, and then it was being raised by him in a different form, New Covenant Israel.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 187)

e. The **present, passive verbs** in 1 Corinthians 15 indicate that the resurrection that Paul talked about was **not a future resurrection** but one **occurring at that time**

- 1) 15:2: “by which also you are saved” = by which also you are **being** saved
- 2) 15:12: “Now if Christ is preached” = Now if Christ is **being** preached
- 3) 15:15: “we are found false witnesses of God” = we are **being** found false witnesses of God
- 4) 15:16: “For if *the* dead do not rise” = For if *the* dead ones are not **being** raised
- 5) 15:26: “The last enemy *that* will be destroyed is death” = The last enemy *that is* **being** destroyed is death
- 6) 15:32: “If *the* dead do not rise” = If *the* dead ones are not **being** raised

- 7) 15:35: “How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come?” = How are the dead ones **being** raised up? And with what body are they **coming**?”
- 8) 15:42: “*The body* is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption” = *The body* is **being** sown in corruption, it is **being** raised in incorruption
- 9) 15:43: “It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power” = It is **being** sown in dishonor, it is **being** raised in glory. It is **being** sown in weakness, it is **being** raised in power
- 10) 15:44: “It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body” = It is **being** sown a natural body, it is **being** raised a spiritual body
- 11) *Ray Summers*: “The significance of the passive voice is the same in Greek as it is in English – the subject is being acted upon by an outside agent, is receiving the action....Thus **the present passive pictures continuous action received by the subject in present time.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Essentials of New Testament Greek*, 35, quoted in Dawson, *Essays on Eschatology*, 139)
- 12) Therefore, the resurrection that Paul talks about in 1 Cor. 15 was **already in progress** when Paul wrote, and this **rules out a future resurrection of human bodies**

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. The **resurrection** will occur at the future **Second Coming** of Christ
 - 1) See the material above on the **Coming of the Lord** (III. D. 2.)
- b. The **death** under consideration is **physical death**, not spiritual death
 - 1) Christ’s death was **physical death** (1 Cor. 15:3)
 - 2) The death that Adam brought into the world, in this context, was **physical death** (1 Cor. 15:21-22)
 - a) While Adam certainly **died spiritually** the day he ate of the forbidden fruit (Gen. 2:16-17; 3:6-8), **physical death** was also a consequence of **The Fall** (Gen. 3:19; cf. Eccl. 12:7; Job 34:15)
 - 1] Chart: “Consequences Of The Fall”
- c. The **resurrection** under consideration is a **resurrection of human bodies**, not a spiritual resurrection
 - 1) “Resurrection” is the raising of **the body** when **the soul** reinhabits it
 - a) Chart: “OT Resurrections”
 - b) Chart: “NT Resurrections”
 - c) While there are **symbolic or figurative resurrections** [e.g. dry bones (Ezek. 37:4-10), baptism (Rom. 6:4), etc.), a “**body**” **is always raised** albeit symbolically or figuratively
 - 2) Christ’s resurrection was a **resurrection of His body** from physical death (1 Cor. 15:3-4; cf. Jn. 2:18-22; Acts 2:25-32)
 - a) *Allen Dvorak*: “**What was raised was that which was put into the tomb** – the physical body of Jesus. It was the body of

Jesus which was missing from the tomb (John 20:2-9) and which was touched by the apostles (John 20:19-20, 24-27).” (Bold emphasis added, “The Coming Resurrection of the Dead: The Death Knell of Realized Eschatology” (Part 1), 2)

- 3) Paul argues that if there is **no resurrection of the dead**, then **Christ could not have been raised** (1 Cor. 15:12-13, 15-16)
 - a) Paul is refuting the false notion that some of the Corinthians had that there would be **no resurrection of the dead** (1 Cor. 15:12)
 - 1] **“From”** (*ek*) = “out of”
 - 2] **“Dead”** (plural) = “dead ones”
 - 3] Note: Paul does not charge “some” at Corinth with saying “there is no resurrection of **some** of the dead” (i.e. OT saints), but rather “there is no resurrection of **the dead**” (period)!!!
 - b) He does that by arguing that if there is **no resurrection of the dead**, then **Christ was not raised** 1 Cor. 15:13
- 4) But Paul’s argument **makes no sense** if the resurrection of the dead under consideration is **not of the same nature** as Christ’s resurrection
 - a) How would a **spiritual resurrection of Christianity** from the decaying corpse of Judaism demand the **resurrection of Jesus’ body** from physical death?
 - 1] The word **“those”** suggests **individuals**, not some kind of **religious system** (1 Cor. 15:18, 20, 23, 48)
 - 2] Max King’s idea that Paul is talking about the **resurrection of Christianity** from the decaying corpse of Judaism is **absolutely absurd** in this context
 - b) How would a **spiritual resurrection of OT saints** from Hades (without their bodies) demand the **resurrection of Jesus’ body** from physical death?
 - 1] Sam Dawson’s idea that Paul is talking about the **resurrection of OT saints** from Hades (without their bodies) is also **absurd** in this context
- 5) The risen Christ is **the firstfruits** of those who have fallen asleep 1 Cor. 15:20-23
 - a) **“From”** (*ek*) = “out of”
 - b) **“Dead”** (plural) = “dead ones”
 - c) Why is Christ called the **“firstfruits”**?
 - 1] The firstfruits were to be **given to God** (Ex. 23:19; 34:26)
 - 2] The firstfruits were the **choicest part** of the crop (Num. 18:12)
 - 3] The firstfruits **guaranteed** the rest of the crop

- 4] Therefore, the firstfruits were of the **same nature** as the rest of the crop (Dt. 18:4; 2 Chr. 31:5; Neh. 10:35-37)
 - a] If Christ's resurrection was **the firstfruits** and it was the resurrection of His **human body**, then **the fruit to follow** must be a resurrection of **human bodies** as well (cf. Phil. 3:20-21; 1 Jn. 3:2)
 - b] *Joe Price*: "The resurrection of the dead endorsed by 1 Corinthians 15 is a future, bodily resurrection of mankind, based upon the fact of Christ's bodily resurrection. If, however, the body to be raised in 1 Corinthians 15 is 'Christianity out of Judaism,' **why must we believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ?** If the later fruit is not the bodily resurrection of mankind, there is no reason to believe that the 'firstfruits' was the bodily resurrection of Jesus." ("The Second Coming of Christ: Did It Already Occur? III, *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*" 56)
- d. The **body** that is raised is **the human body** in a changed form
 - 1) The words "**asleep**" (1 Cor. 15:6, 18, 20) and "**sleep**" (1 Cor. 15:51) suggest **physical death** (Psa. 13:3; Jn. 11:11-13; 1 Cor. 15:20; Eph. 5:14; 1 Th. 4:14)
 - a) *Major Premise*: The part of man that **sleeps** goes to the **dust** (Dan. 12:2)
 - b) *Minor Premise*: But it is the **body/flesh** that goes to the dust (Eccl. 12:7)
 - c) *Conclusion*: Therefore, it is **the body that sleeps in death**
 - 1] When Jesus went to **awaken Lazarus** from His "**sleep**" (Jn. 11:11-14), He **raised His body** from the dead (Jn. 11:34, 41, 43-44)
 - 2) Whatever it is that **dies** is what is **resurrected**
 - a) The "seed" sown must **die** (1 Cor. 15:36)
 - b) The "**seed**" that is sown is not the "**body**" [plant] that grows (1 Cor. 15:37)
 - c) But there is a correspondence between the "**seed**" that is sown and the "**body**" (plant) that grows (1 Cor. 15:38)
 - 1] The **corn stalk** corresponds to the **corn kernel**
 - d) The body that will be **raised** is a body that **died**? (1 Cor. 15:35-38, 42-44)
 - e) So what is it that **dies** and is later **raised**?
 - 1] The human **soul**
 - 2] The human **body**
 - 3] The **church**
 - 4] **Christianity**

- a] Was the **church** or **Christianity** dead during the “eschaton” (AD 30-70)?
- 5] **Judaism?**
- a] Was **Judaism** “dead” during the “eschaton” (AD 30-70)?
- b] How could it have been **dead** if there was an “**overlapping of the covenants**”?
- f) *Wayne Jackson*: “In the burial/resurrection analogy, **whatever is buried is raised; whatever dies, comes to life**. If it is Judaism that dies, then it is Judaism that comes back to life. If it is Christianity that is ‘raised,’ then it was Christianity that was buried. The King theory has Judaism being buried, and the kingdom of Christ being raised.” (Bold emphasis added, *The A.D. 70 Theory: A Review of the Max King Doctrine*, 72)
- 3) Paul’s use of “**our**” {*plural pronoun*} and “**body**” {*singular noun*} does not prove that the “**body**” under consideration is **the church** or **the body of OT saints**
- a) The use of the **distributive singular** is not uncommon
- 1] “**Your**” {*plural pronoun*} “**body**” {*singular noun*} (1 Cor. 6:19)
- 2] “**Your**” {*plural pronoun*} and “**spirit**” {*singular noun*} (Phil. 4:23)
- 3] “**Your**” {*plural pronoun*} and “**spirit**” {*singular noun*} and “**soul**” {*singular noun*} and “**body**” {*singular noun*} (1 Th. 5:23)
- a] Is Paul talking about the individual **Christian** or the **church**?
- 4] “**Our hearts**” {*plural noun*} and “**our body**” {*singular noun*} (Heb. 10:22)
- a] Is the Hebrew writer talking about the **individual bodies** of Christians or is he talking about **the corporate body** of the church?
- 5] “**Our**” {*plural pronoun*} and “**heart**” {*singular noun*} (1 Jn. 3:20-21)
- b) Paul clearly uses **singular nouns** to refer to **the human body** (not the church or the body of OT saints) in connection with **plural pronouns, verbs, and nouns**
- 1] Chart: “2 Cor. 4:7-11”
- 2] Chart: “2 Cor. 4:16-18”
- 3] Chart: “2 Cor. 5:1-4”
- 4] Chart: “2 Cor. 5:6-8”
- c) *Almon Williams*: “Finally, a misuse of English grammar is the smug insistence that **when a word is singular in form, it must be singular in usage**. For instance, Max King does this

repeatedly in resurrection passages where the term body is often in the singular number although it obviously has a plural force... Nigel Turner, a Greek scholar, puts the clincher on this usage in the Bible when he explains the reason for its prevalence, 'Contrary to normal Greek and Latin practice, **the N.T. sometimes follows the Aram. and Hebrew preference for a distributive singular**' (Moulton 23) and gives numerous examples in his grammar on page 23." ("AD 70: The End?" *The Doctrine of Last Things*, 1986 Florida College Lectures, 228-229)

- 4) Paul **preached nothing** other than what Moses and the prophets taught concerning **the resurrection of Jesus**, not the **resurrection of the dead** Acts 26:22-23
 - a) Paul did not say that he preached nothing except what Moses and the prophets taught concerning **the general resurrection of the dead**
- 5) While OT writers certainly foretold the **resurrection of Israel** (Isa. 25:6-9; Hos. 6:1-2; 13:14; Ezek. 37:1-14), there is also abundant evidence for the **resurrection of human bodies**
 - a) **OT** (Isa. 26:16-19; Dan. 12:1-3; Job 14:14 & 19:26; Psalms 16:8-11; 17:15; 49:15; 73:23-28)
 - b) **Apocrypha** (2 Macc. 7:10-13)
 - c) **Pseudepigrapha** (cf. 1 En. 51:1; 62:14-16; 4 Ezra 7:32-33a; 2 Bar. 50:2, 4; T. Jud. 25:4-6; T. Benj. 10:6-10) (*Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 743)
 - d) **NT** (Rom. 8:10-11; 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 4:14; 5:1-5)
 - e) **Josephus** (*The Wars of the Jews*, 3:374)
- 6) Paul's quotations of **Isaiah 25:8** and **Hosea 13:14** do not prove that he was talking about a **spiritual resurrection** in 1 Corinthians 15
 - a) NT writers sometimes **apply OT quotations differently** than they were applied in their original contexts
 - 1] Chart: "NT Use Of OT"
 - b) The **immediate context** of 1 Corinthians 15 clearly indicates that Paul was talking about a **resurrection of human bodies** from physical death, not a **spiritual resurrection of Israel**
 - c) The **immediate context** must always take precedence over **remote contexts**
- e. The **present, passive verbs** in 1 Corinthians 15 do not demand an **ongoing resurrection** at that time
 - 1) *Allen Dvorak*: "[T]he comments cited by Machen and Summers (Dawson, 135), only describe **the general significance of the present tense** in the Greek language and the difference between the active and passive voices of that tense, rather than the use of the present tense in various contexts." (Bold emphasis added, "The Coming Resurrection of the Dead: The Death Knell of Realized Eschatology" (Part 1), 11)
 - 2) *Dana & Mantey*: "The fundamental significance of the present tense is the idea of progress. It is the *linear* tense. **This is not, however,**

its exclusive significance. It is a mistake to suppose ‘that the durative meaning monopolises the present stem’ (M. 119). Since there is no aorist tense for present time, the present tense, as used in the indicative, must do service for both linear and punctiliar action. But it is to borne in mind that **the idea of present time is secondary in the force of the tense. In the indicative the linear significance of the present may sometimes be found more or less remote, being modified by other influences.** The other elements entering into the resultant import of the present tense are **the meaning of the verb itself and the general significance of the context.** That is, in dealing with the present tense we must consider not only **the fundamental force of the tense,** but also **the meaning of the verb root,** and **the significance of the context.** As affected by these three factors **the present tense exhibits several variations in use.”** (Bold emphasis added, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 181)

- 3) There are **several nuances** to the Greek present tense
 - a) Chart: “Uses Of Present Tense”
- 4) There is a special usage known as the **“futuristic present”**
 - a) *Dana & Mantey*: “*The Futuristic Present.* This use of the present tense denotes an event which has **not yet occurred**, but which is regarded as **so certain** that in thought it may be contemplated as **already coming to pass.**” (Bold emphasis added, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 185)
 - b) *Ernest De Witt Burton*: “**The Present for the Future.** In a similar way **the Present Indicative may be used to describe vividly a future event.**

“Rem. The term ‘Present for Future’ is sometimes objected to, but without good reason. The arguments of Buttmann, pp. 203 f., and Winer, *WT.* pp. 265 ff.; *WM.* pp. 331 ff., are valid only against the theory of an arbitrary interchange of tenses. It is indeed not to be supposed that Greek writers confused the Present and the Future tenses, or used them indiscriminately. **But that the form which customarily denoted an act in progress at the time of speaking was sometimes, for the sake of vividness, used with reference to a fact still in the future, is recognized by all grammarians.** See, *e.g.*, *J.* 397; *K.* 382, 5; *G.MT.* 32. The whole force of the idiom is derived from the unusualness of the tense employed.” (Bold emphasis added, *Syntax of the Moods And Tenses In New Testament Greek*, 9-10)

 - 1] “I go” (Jn. 14:2)
 - 2] “Will be delivered up” (Mt. 26:2)
 - 3] “I will keep” (Mt. 26:18)
 - 4] “I will rise” (Mt. 27:63)
 - 5] “Is being betrayed” (Mk. 9:31)
 - 6] “Is laid...is cut down...thrown” (Lk. 3:9)

- 5) The use of the “**futuristic present**” in **prophetic passages** is not at all surprising since when God promises to do something, it will **certainly be done** (cf. Rom. 4:16-17)
- f. There is a **resurrection** in Scripture that **does not “fit”** the destruction of Jerusalem
 - 1) The **righteous** will be raised (Jn. 6:39-40, 44, 54; 11:24) and the **wicked** will be judged on the “**last day**” (Jn. 12:48)
 - a) This is a resurrection of **individuals** (“him” & “he”)
 - b) If the “**last day**” occurred in AD 70, it **wasn’t the last day**
 - c) RE **requires a figurative interpretation** of the expression “the last day,” but the texts **do not require it**
 - 1] *D. R. Dungan: Rule 1. All words are to be understood in their literal sense, unless the evident meaning of the context forbids.--Figures are the exception, literal language the rule; hence we are not to regard anything as figurative until we feel compelled to do so by the evident import of the passage. And even here great caution should be observed. We are very apt to regard contexts as teaching some theory which we have in our minds. And having so determined, anything to the contrary will be regarded as a mistaken interpretation; hence, if the literal meaning of the words shall be found to oppose our speculations, we are ready to give to the words in question some figurative import that will better agree with our preconceived opinions. Let us be sure that the meaning of the author has demanded that the language be regarded in a figurative sense, and that it is not our theory which has made the necessity.” (Hermeneutics: A Text-Book, 1888, 184)*
 - 2) There is a resurrection that **ends marriage and death** (Mt. 22:23-33; Mk. 12:18-27; Lk. 20:27-40)
 - a) If it was a “**spiritual resurrection**” that the Sadducees didn’t believe in (Mk. 12:18), why did they ask Jesus about **levirate marriage**? What would that have to do with a “spiritual resurrection”?
 - 1] The Sadducees’ hypothetical scenario was designed to show the absurdity of a resurrection of **human bodies** from **physical death**: “In the resurrection, when **they rise again....**” (Mk. 12:23)
 - 2] Jesus’ response contemplates the **same kind of resurrection**: “For when **they rise from the dead....**” (Mk. 12:25)
 - b) If it was a “**bodily resurrection from physical death**” that the Sadducees didn’t believe in (Mk. 12:18), and there is only a “spiritual resurrection” (as RE’s claim), why didn’t Jesus **correct their misunderstanding**?
 - c) Jesus’ First Argument: In the resurrection there will be **no marriage or death**
 - 1] This resurrection results in **no marriage** and **no death**

- 2] A resurrection ending marriage and death **did not occur in AD 70**
- 3] **Marriage** and **death** continue to occur today
- 4] Therefore, this resurrection must **occur in the future**
- 5] RE Objection: Jesus is discussing **the nature** of the resurrection and arguing that the world to come would not be entered by **physical means and methods**
 - a] *Sam Dawson*: “The issue is that in Jesus’ age, the Mosaic Age, **sons of God were produced by physical birth**, hence the extreme importance of marriage under the Law of Moses; thus, the Levirate vow required a man to go into his brother’s widowed wife to produce offspring for his brother, etc. Eunuchs, for example, couldn’t have children, so that they missed out completely in producing sons in Jesus’ age, the Mosaic age. However, **in the succeeding Christian age, producing sons of God doesn’t depend on such marrying and giving in marriage** (the only kind of marrying and giving in marriage Jesus spoke of in Luke).” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 449)
 - b] *Max King*: “The statement that those in the world to come would neither marry nor be given in marriage is not, as it would appear on the surface, a denial of marriage or physical life in the Christian age. Rather, it has the meaning of Paul’s statement that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14:17). **Jesus was not teaching that the citizens of the world to come ‘do not marry’** anymore than Paul taught that citizens of the kingdom do not eat or drink. The point being debated is the nature of the world that was to come. The ‘children of this world’ (the Jewish world) were constituted as such by physical birth, being the fleshly seed of Abraham. Thus, **the citizens of ‘this world’ were propagated by marriage or fleshly procreation. But such would not be true in the world to come** (the Christian age). Jesus said **those who would be worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, would not do so by physical means or methods**. It was not the kind of world that could be entered by flesh and blood (1 Cor. 15:50) ... **‘Neither can they die any more’** because they are ‘the children of the resurrection,’ refers to **the spiritual state of redeemed man, and not his physical state.**” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 237-238)
 - 1} *Bill Reeves*: “Rom. 14:17 has nothing in the world to do with the subject of Lk. 20:27-40. Jesus is talking about the world to follow the one we are living in now, and Paul is talking about our conduct as citizens of the kingdom now. What we eat and

drink, or do not eat and drink, is not the basis of our conduct in the church, Paul says, in a context dealing with matters of indifference.” (“The Preterist View Heresy (III), *A Study Of The A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 93)

- 6] Jesus is not talking about **how to get into the world** (age) to come; He is talking about **what people would not be doing** once they got into that world: **marrying and dying**
- a] In the Sadducees hypothetical scenario:
- 1} Seven brothers **married** and **died** (literally)
 - 2} The wife **married** and **died** (literally)
 - 3} Their question: “Therefore, in the resurrection, **when they rise**, whose wife will she be? For all seven had her as wife.” (Mk. 12:23) must refer to a bodily resurrection
- b] Jesus responds by declaring that what happens in **this age** (marriage and death) will not occur in **the age to come** (Lk. 20:34-36)
- c] *Marc Gibson*: “Jesus’ answer used the same words and meanings that the Sadducees had used in their question. They raised the issues of marriage, death, and the resurrection – all in the literal sense. Jesus answered them by speaking of marriage, death, and the resurrection *in the same literal sense*. **There is no textual, grammatical, or linguistic reason to take Jesus’ words as any less literal than the Sadducees’ words.**” (Bold emphasis added, *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 18)
- d] Dawson’s explanation ignores the reason the Sadducees presented this hypothetical scenario to Jesus – namely to prove that there could be **no resurrection of the dead**
- 1} The **resurrection of the dead** is the fundamental issue that Jesus addresses, not **how people are made children of God** (Lk. 20:27, 33, 35, 36)
- d) Jesus’ Second Argument: God is the God of the living
- 1] Major Premise: I **am** the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Mk. 12:26; Lk. 20:37; cf. Ex. 3:6, 15)
 - 2] Minor Premise: God is **not the God of the dead**, but the living (Mk. 12:27; Lk. 20:38)
 - 3] Conclusion: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were **still living** after death, and they **will be raised**
 - 4] *Wayne Jackson*: “This argument was designed to prove the resurrection, and the Lord’s point is this — **even though the patriarchs are dead physically, in reality they are alive, and they live in anticipation of a reunion with their bodies.** Their survival anticipates a

resurrection.” (Bold emphasis added, *The A.D. 70 Theory: A Review of the Max King Doctrine*, 65)

- 3) There is a resurrection of **all in the tombs** Jn. 5:28-29
 - a) RE Objection: Jesus is talking about a **spiritual resurrection** (cf. Jn. 5:24-25)
 - 1] Reply: There are **significant contrasts** between Jn. 5:24-25 and Jn. 5:28-29 that suggest otherwise
- 4) There is a resurrection that **Paul preached in Athens** Acts 17:18, 32
 - a) Chart: “Paul’s Preaching In Athens”
 - b) If Jesus’ resurrection was a **bodily resurrection** (Acts 17:30-31), why wouldn’t the resurrection of the dead [ones] be **like His**?
 - c) What relevance would a **resurrection of Christianity** from the decaying corpse of Judaism or a **resurrection of OT saints** from Hades have had to pagan philosophers in Athens hundreds of miles away from Jerusalem?

G. The Final Judgment Occurred In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:
 - a. **Final judgment** would occur at **Christ’s appearing** (2 Tim. 4:1)
 - 1) Christ’s coming was **imminent** in the first century (Jas. 5:7-8; 1 Pet. 4:7, 17)
 - 2) The **only imminent coming** of Christ was His **coming in judgment on Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 3) Therefore, **final judgment came in AD 70**
 - b. The Greek word **mello** suggests an **imminent judgment** in the first century Acts 17:30-31; 24:24-25
 - 1) *Max King*: “Paul said **God was about (mellei) to judge the world**. This word ‘mello,’ where found in the present, active, indicative tense signifies, not only **intention of purpose** but also **nearness of action**, meaning at the point of, or ready to do what has been stated. Had Paul meant to teach judgment of 2000 or more years’ future, he certainly would not have used *mello* in any tense, especially in the present tense. Therefore the judgment of the habitable world (*Oikoumene*) was about to take place in Paul’s day, and in view of other related scriptures we have every reason to believe Paul’s choice of words conveyed the meaning intended by the Holy Spirit.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 158)
2. Evaluation & Refutation:
 - a. There is a judgment that **does not “fit”** the judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70
 - 1) A judgment **after death** Heb. 9:27
 - 2) A **day** of judgment (2 Pet. 2:9; 3:7; 1 Jn. 4:17)
 - 3) A **day** of judgment for **ancient peoples**

- a) Were **ancient cities and people** judged in AD 70?
 - 1] **Sodom and Gomorrah** (Mt. 10:15; Mk. 6:11)
 - 2] **Sodom** (Mt. 11:24; Lk. 10:12)
 - 3] **Tyre and Sidon** (Mt. 11:21-22; Lk. 10:13-14)
 - 4] **Queen of the South** (Mt. 12:42; Lk. 11:31)
 - 5] **Nineveh** (Mt. 12:41; Lk. 11:32)
- b) What did the **destruction of Jerusalem** have to do with **ancient people** who had been **dead for centuries**?
- 4) A judgment on the **last day** Jn. 12:48
- 5) A judgment for **all nations** Mt. 25:31-32
 - a) RE Reply: The land of Israel comprised **many nations**
 - 1] *James Stuart Russell*: “In our Lord’s time it was usual to speak of the inhabitants of Palestine as consisting of several nations. Josephus speaks of ‘the nation of the Samaritans,’ ‘the nation of the Batanaeans,’ ‘the nation of the Galileans,’ -- using the very word (*ἔθνος*) which we find in the passage before us. Judea, was a distinct nation, often with a king of its own; so also was Samaria; and so with Idumea, Galilee, Paraea, Batanea, Trachonitis, Ituraea, Abilene, -- all of which had at different times princes with the title of *Ethnarch*, a name which signifies the ruler of a *nation*. It is doing no violence, then, to the language to understand *panta ta ethne* referring, to ‘all the nations’ of Palestine, or ‘all the tribes of the land.’” (*The Parousia*, 105)
 - 2] *Sam Dawson*: “[T]he Jewish historian Josephus referred to the nation of the Samaritans, the nation of the Galileans, and the nations of Idumea, Perea, Trachonitis, Iturea, and Abilene. Judea was spoken of as a distinct nation, with a king of its own.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 74)
 - 3] Jesus spoke of “**nations**” in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem (Mt. 24:7, 9, 14; Mk. 13:8, 10; Lk. 21:10, 25)
 - a] Reply: Different “nations” in or around Palestine is not “**all nations**.” What does “**all nations**” mean in Lk. 21:24?
 - 4] Joel prophesied a judgment of **all nations** (Joel 3:2, 11-12) after the Spirit was poured out “before the coming of the great and awesome day of the Lord” (Joel 2:28-32) (*Dawson, Essays on Eschatology*, 78-81)
 - a] Reply: Joel is prophesying a judgment that would come:
 - 1} After **the return** of the captives from Babylonian Captivity, not in AD 70 (Joel 3:1)
 - 2} On account of God’s people **Israel** (Joel 3:2)

- 3} On **the nations** that had scattered Israel (Joel 3:2)
- 4} On **Tyre, Sidon and Philistia** (Joel 3:4)
- 5} On those who had **sold God's people** to the Greeks (Joel 3:6)
- 6) A day of judgment for **all men** Acts 17:30-31; Jude 15
 - a) Chart: "Acts 17:30-31 In Context"
- 7) A judgment for **the living** and **the dead** 2 Tim. 4:1; cf. Acts 10:42
- 8) A judgment when **every knee will bow** and **every tongue will confess** Rom. 14:10-12
- 9) A judgment when each one will **receive the things done in the body**, whether good or bad 2 Cor. 5:10
- 10) A day of judgment for **the ungodly** 2 Pet. 2:9; 3:7
- 11) A day of judgment when the righteous can have **boldness** 1 Jn. 4:17
- 12) A day when Paul and all who love Christ's appearing will receive **the crown of righteousness** (2 Tim. 4:8)
- 13) A judgment for the **words and deeds of youth** Eccl. 11:9-10
- 14) A judgment for **every work** and **every secret thing** Eccl. 12:13-14
- 15) A judgment for **every idle word** men may speak Mt. 12:36
- 16) A judgment that caused **Felix to tremble** (Acts 24:25)
 - a) *Wayne Jackson*: "Why would a Roman be 'terrified' with reference to the impending destruction of Judaism -- when he would be on the **winning** side, not the losing one?" ("The Menace of Radical Preterism," ChristianCourier.com)
- 17) A judgment resulting in either **everlasting fire/punishment** or **eternal life** (Mt. 25:41, 46)
 - a) RE Reply: Jude uses identical language to describe God's judgment against **Sodom and Gomorrah** (Jude 7)
- b. The Greek word *mello* does not require an **imminent judgment** in the first century
 - 1) *Mello* can indicate **imminence** or **inevitability** (BDAG, 627-628; Thayer, 396-397; Vine, 2:4)
 - 2) The RE "proof texts" cited in Greek lexicons are said to indicate **inevitability**, not imminence
 - a) See Appendix E: "Definitions of *Mello*"
 - 3) The RE "proof texts" in standard English versions are generally translated to indicate **inevitability**, not imminence
 - a) See Appendix F: "Translations Of *Mello* In RE 'Proof Texts'"
 - 4) *Mello* **cannot mean imminence** in some passages
 - a) John the Baptist was the "**Elijah who is to come**" Mt. 11:14

- 1] Malachi prophesied that “Elijah” would come **400+ years** before John the Baptist was born (Mal. 4:5-6)
- b) The prophets and Moses foretold that Christ’s suffering, resurrection, and preaching to Jews and Gentiles “**would** come” Acts 26:22-23
 - 1] Moses prophesied of Jesus (cf. Dt. 18:18; cf. Acts 3:22-26) **1400+ years** before Jesus’ birth
- c) Adam was a type of “Him who **was to come**” Rom. 5:14
 - 1] **Thousands of years** intervened between the time of Adam and Jesus
- d) The Jews were kept under guard by the law for the faith that “**would** afterward be revealed” Gal. 3:23
 - 1] The OT was written between **1400-400 BC**. That’s at least **400 years** before the faith was revealed
- e) The Jewish feasts, new moons, and Sabbaths were “a shadow of things to **come**” Col. 2:16-17
 - 1] These Jewish rituals were observed **1400 years** before Christ
- f) Paul was a pattern to those who are **going** to believe (1 Tim. 1:16)
- g) The law was a shadow of the good things to **come** (Heb. 10:1)
- h) Abraham went out to the “place which he **would** receive as an inheritance” (Heb. 11:8)
 - 1] Abraham never received this inheritance **personally** (Acts 7:5; Heb. 11:9-10, 13)
 - 2] He did inherit the Promised Land through his descendants (Gen. 28:4; Ezek. 33:23-24) **400 years** after the promise (Gen. 15:13-16; Acts 7:6-7)
- i) Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau “concerning things **to** (*mello*) come” (Heb. 11:20)
 - 1] This included the coming of “**Shiloh**” (Gen. 49:10)
- 5) The contexts of RE “proof texts” **do not demand immediacy**
- 6) The connotation of **imminence** is **absurd** in some RE “proof texts” (*e.g.* Acts 17:30-31; 24:24-25)
 - a) How would an **imminent judgment** on the **Jews** in **Jerusalem** in **AD 70** be a **motivation** for **Gentiles** in **Athens** to **repent** of their sins?
 - 1] The Gentiles in Athens would have been **on the side** of the Romans who destroyed Jerusalem
 - b) *Wayne Jackson*: “Why would a Roman be ‘**terrified**’ with reference to the impending destruction of Judaism -- when he would be on the **winning side**, not the losing one?” (Bold emphasis added, “The Menace of Radical Preterism,” ChristianCourier.com)

- c) “If the **plain sense** makes **good sense** any other sense is **nonsense**”

H. Completeness In Christ Did Not Occur Until AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. *Max King*: “The fall of Judaism (and its far reaching consequences) is, therefore, **a major subject of the Bible**. The greater portion of **prophecy found its fulfillment** in that event, including also the types and shadows of the law. It was **the coming of Christ in glory** that closely followed his suffering (1 Peter 1:11), when **all things written in the prophets were fulfilled** (Luke 21:22; Acts 3:21). It corresponded to the **perfection of the saints** (1 Corinthians 13:10) when they reached **adulthood** in Christ, receiving their **adoption, redemption, and inheritance**. The **eternal kingdom was possessed** (Hebrews 12:28) and **the new heaven and earth inherited** (Matthew 5:5; Revelation 21:1, 7). Out of the natural body (which received its death blow, Heb. 8:13) arose the spiritual body, wherein the saints were manifested in glory, fully clothed with their **house from heaven** (2 Cor. 5:1-5). The earnest of the spirit (miraculous gifts) did not fail in power or purpose, bringing the gift of **spiritual or heavenly inheritance** to all the seed Of Abraham (Acts 2:38, 39; Gal. 3:28, 29; 1 Pet. 1:4).” (*The Spirit of Prophecy*, 239)
- b. *Max King*: “When would ungodliness be turned away from Jacob, or their sins be taken away? When Christ, the deliverer, came OUT OF SION [Rom. 11:26-27, ksk]. When did Christ come out of Zion? Not at his first coming, but his *second coming*.” (*The Spirit of Prophecy*, 63)
- c. **Redemption** was “**near**” in the destruction of Jerusalem (Lk. 21:28)
 - 1) Chart: “Events At ‘Coming’”
 - 2) Chart: “Events At ‘Appearing’”
 - 3) Chart: “Events At ‘Revelation’”

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. The **same term** can mean **different things in different contexts**
 - 1) Illust.: The term “**sanctify**” normally means to **set apart** from sin to God. But is that what “**sanctified**” means in 1 Cor. 7:14? Is an unbelieving mate **set apart from sin to God** by a believing mate?
- b. The term “**redemption**” refers to different things in different context
 - 1) Redemption from **Egyptian bondage** (Ex. 6:6; Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 2 Sam. 7:23; Psalms 77:15)
 - 2) Redemption of **land** (Lev. 25:23-24; Jer. 32:7-8)
 - 3) Redemption from **slavery** (Lev. 25:47-55)
 - 4) Redemption of **the firstborn** by the Levites (Num. 3:40-51)
 - 5) Redemption of **a wife** in levirate marriage (Ruth 4:1-10)
 - 6) Redemption from **sin** (Psalms 130:7; Rom. 3:24-26; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:15)
 - 7) Redemption in the **destruction of Jerusalem** (Lk. 21:28)

- 8) Redemption of **our body** (Rom. 8:23)
- 9) Redemption of the **purchased possession** (Eph. 1:14)
- c. In the NT, the term “**redemption**” usually refers to **redemption from sin**, but it doesn’t always mean that
- d. The **redemption** that was **near** in the destruction of Jerusalem could not have been **redemption from sin**
 - 1) Christ obtained **eternal redemption** “**through His own blood**” [NASB] before He ascended into heaven Heb. 9:11-12; cf. Tit. 2:14
 - 2) **Redemption** and **forgiveness** was promised long before AD 70 Acts 2:38-39; 22:16; Rom. 6:17-18
 - 3) First-century Christians were **redeemed** from the curse of the law long before AD 70 Gal. 3:13-14
 - 4) First-century Christians were **redeemed** from sin by the blood of Christ Eph. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:18; Rev. 5:9
 - 5) Heb. 10:14: ¹⁴ For by **one offering** He has **perfected forever** those who are being sanctified.
 - a) “**Perfected**” {*perfect tense*} = past action with continuing results
- e. **Redemption** was **near** in the destruction of Jerusalem in the sense that:
 - 1) **Biblical Judaism** could no longer be practiced
 - 2) **Jewish persecution** of Christians ceased
- f. First-century Christians enjoyed **completeness in Christ** long before AD 70
 - 1) Chart: “Completeness In Christ Before AD 70”
 - 2) Why did the writer of Hebrews urge his readers to **press on to maturity** (Heb. 6:1-3), if such were **not available** to them until AD 70?
 - 3) RE Reply: Completeness in Christ is described as **present** and **future**

I. The Kingdom Came “With Power” In AD 70

- 1. Explanation & Argumentation:
 - a. During the Personal Ministry of Jesus the kingdom was “**at hand**” (Mt. 3:2; 4:17; 10:7) or “**near**” (Lk. 10:9, 11)
 - b. The kingdom certainly **began** on Pentecost (Acts 2:36)
 - c. But the kingdom did not come with **power and glory** until Jesus’ judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70 (Mk. 9:1; Mt. 24:30)
 - 1) Chart: “Son Coming In Kingdom”
 - d. The kingdom was **near** in the **destruction of Jerusalem** (Lk. 21:31)
 - e. There was an “**already, but not yet**” aspect to the kingdom

- 1) Although first-century Christians were **in the kingdom** (Col. 1:13), they were also **waiting for the coming of the kingdom** (1 Cor. 15:24-28)
- 2) Jewish Christians were **receiving** {*present, active, participle*} a kingdom Heb. 12:28
- 3) Paul said: “If we endure, we **shall also reign** {*future, active, indicative*} with Him” (2 Tim. 2:12)
- f. The **judgment** of the living and the dead would take place at Jesus’ **appearing** and **kingdom** 2 Tim. 4:1-2
- g. The **rule of Christ** would extend: (2 Views)
 - 1) Throughout the **eschaton** (AD 30-70) [Max King]
 - a) *Max King*: “The second stage of the resurrection takes place in conjunction with the **Messianic reign** of Christ, which we have placed in the period of time **between His ascension and His parousia** in the A.D. 70 consummation of the age. This means that Christ’s reign was **an age-ending reign**, a transition to ‘the age to come.’” (*The Cross and Parousia of Christ*, 415)
 - 2) **Forever** (Isa. 9:6-7; Dan. 2:44; 7:13-14, 27; Lk. 1:31-33) [Sam Dawson]
2. Evaluation & Refutation:
 - a. Isaiah and Micah prophesied the establishment of **Jehovah’s mountain** (Isa. 2:1-4; Mic. 4:1-3)
 - 1) Chart: “Prophecies Of Jehovah’s Mountain”
 - a) The **mountain of Jehovah’s house** would be established in **the latter days** (Isa. 2:2; Mic. 4:1)
 - 1] Note: In OT prophecy a “**mountain**” sometimes symbolizes a **kingdom** (cf. Dan. 2:35, 44-45; Isa. 13:4; 41:11-16; Jer. 51:24-26)
 - b) After the mountain of Jehovah’s house is established, **all nations will flow to it** (Isa. 2:2-3a; Mic. 4:1-2a)
 - c) After the mountain of Jehovah’s house is established, **the word of Jehovah would go forth from Jerusalem** (Isa. 2:3b; Mic. 4:2b)
 - 2) These prophecies were **fulfilled long before** the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70
 - a) Peter proclaimed Jesus both “**Lord and Christ**” (Messiah = Anointed One) on Pentecost Acts 2:36
 - 1] Chart: “Peter’s Sermon”
 - 2] Chart: “Jesus Is Ruling On David’s Throne”
 - 3] Chart: “Christ Has All Authority”
 - 4] Chart: “The Kingdom Has Come”
 - b) The **Gentiles** came to Christ long before AD 70 (Acts 10)

- c) The **word of the Lord** went forth from Jerusalem after Pentecost (Acts 1:8), long before AD 70
- 3) It was the **establishment** of Jehovah's mountain (*i.e.* the Messianic kingdom) that made all these things possible
- b. Daniel prophesied that the **kingdom** would be given to the Son of Man when He **ascended to the Ancient of Days** (Dan. 7:13-14), not when He came to **destroy Jerusalem**
 - 1) Jesus **ascended** to the Father ten days before Pentecost (Acts 1:3, 9-11 & 2:1)
 - 2) Christ was given **glory and power** when He ascended into heaven (Eph. 1:18-23)
 - 3) Peter declared on Pentecost that:
 - a) Jesus had **ascended** to the right hand of God (Acts 2:32-35)
 - b) God had made Him both **Lord** [Master] and **Christ** [Messiah = Anointed One] (Acts 2:36)
- c. Zechariah prophesied that the Branch would: build His **temple**, sit and rule on His **throne**, and be a **priest** on His throne (Zech. 6:12-13)
 - 1) Paul described the **church** as the **temple of God** long before AD 70 (1 Cor. 3:16-17; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:19-22)
 - 2) **Glory** and **power** existed in the church before AD 70 (Eph. 3:20-21)
 - 3) Jesus **sat** down on His throne and began to **rule** long before AD 70 (Acts 2:30-36; Eph. 1:20-23; Heb. 12:2; Rev. 3:21)
 - 4) Jesus was made **High Priest** long before AD 70 (Heb. 3:1; 4:14-15; 6:19-20; 8:1-2)
 - 5) **Peace** existed in the church long before AD 70 (Acts 10:36; Rom. 5:1; Eph. 2:13-18; Col. 1:19-22)
- d. The Son of Man coming in **His kingdom** (Mt. 16:27-28; cf. Mk. 8:38-9:1; Lk. 9:26-27) could refer to:
 - 1) His coming in **judgment on Jerusalem**
 - a) **Similar language** is used to describe Christ's coming in His kingdom and His coming in judgment on Jerusalem
 - 1] Chart: "Son Coming In Kingdom"
 - b) Jesus' reference to "**some** standing here" (not "many," "most," or "all") who would see the kingdom coming would seem to better fit AD 70 (40 years away) than **Pentecost** (1 year away)
 - 2) His coming on **Pentecost**
 - a) Chart: "Christ Came On Pentecost"
 - b) Chart: "Coming Of Kingdom"
 - 3) While it's possible that Mt. 16:27-28 and its parallels refer to **Pentecost**, I think it's more probable that they refer to **the destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70; but that doesn't prove that:
 - a) The kingdom was **not fully established** on Pentecost

- b) The “**Second Coming**” occurred in AD 70
- e. There is **only one kingdom**
 - 1) Chart: “One Kingdom”
 - 2) There is no difference between:
 - a) The kingdom of **heaven** and the kingdom of **God** (Mt. 19:23-24)
 - b) The kingdom of **Christ** and the kingdom of **God** (Eph. 5:5)
 - c) The **kingdom of God** and the **power of Christ** (Rev. 12:10)
- f. No part of the kingdom was **missing** after Pentecost and before AD 70
 - 1) Chart: “Nothing Missing In Kingdom”
- g. The term “**kingdom**” (*basileia*) means **different things** in different contexts
 - 1) Chart: “‘Kingdom’ Can Mean”
- h. The kingdom of God was “**near**” in the destruction of Jerusalem, not because it was only **partially established** on Pentecost, but because God’s dominion, sovereignty, power, or rule was **manifested** in judgment on Jerusalem
 - 1) Chart: “Kingdom Near In DOJ”
 - 2) Chart: “Manifestation Of Power”
 - a) If Jesus could say: “²⁸ But if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, surely the kingdom of God **has come** {*aorist tense*} upon you. (Mt. 12:28)
 - 1] **Before** the kingdom was established on **Pentecost** (cf. Mt. 16:18-19; Acts 1:6; Dan. 7:13-14)
 - 2] Because He **manifested kingdom power** in casting out demons (Mt. 12:22-23)
 - b) Why can’t Jesus mean that the kingdom of God was **near** in the destruction of Jerusalem?
 - 1] **After** the kingdom was established on **Pentecost**
 - 2] Because He **manifested kingdom power** in judgment on Jerusalem (cf. Mt. 22:7)
 - 3) Chart: “Coming Of The Kingdom”
- i. Paul says that the **kingdom existed in power** long before AD 70 (1 Cor. 4:20)
- j. The fact that the Hebrew Christians were **receiving** {*present tense*} a kingdom (Heb. 12:28) does not prove that the kingdom was **not fully established** on Pentecost
 - 1) They could have been **receiving a kingdom** in the sense of:
 - a) Receiving a **manifestation** of the kingdom
 - b) **Submitting to the rule of Christ** in their hearts (cf. Mt. 6:10; Lk. 11:2; Mk. 10:15)

- 1] Heb. 12:25: ²⁵ See that you **do not refuse Him who speaks** {*present, active, participle*}. For if they did not escape who refused Him who spoke on earth, much more shall we not escape if we turn away from Him who speaks from heaven,
- 2] Heb. 12:28: ²⁸ Therefore, since **we are receiving** {*present, active, participle*} **a kingdom** which cannot be shaken, let us have grace, by which we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear.
- c) Receiving the **heavenly or everlasting kingdom** (Mt. 25:34; 2 Pet. 1:10-11)
 - 1] Could first-century Christians have been **receiving the heavenly kingdom** in the same way that they were **entering** {*present tense*} God's Sabbath-rest? (Heb. 4:3, 9)
 - 2) **Marvin R. Vincent:** "Receiving a kingdom (*βασιλείαν παραλαμβάνοντες*) The participle gives **no note of time**, but simply indicates the fact that Christians as such receive." (WSNT, 4:558)
- k. Max King's view that Jesus ruled only during the *eschaton* has **serious consequences**
 - 1) If Jesus ruled only during the *eschaton*, then:
 - a) He is not **ruling now**
 - b) He is not our **High Priest now**
 - 1] Chart: "Priest On His Throne"
 - 2) These consequences should highlight **the absurdity** of this view
- l. Sam Dawson's view that **Jesus' Messianic Reign** will continue **forever** flies in the face of **abundant evidence to the contrary**
 - 1) The expression "**no end**" (Isa. 9:6-7) must be understood in context. It does not always **literally mean "no end"** (cf. Eccl. 4:8; 12:12; Isa. 2:7; Nah. 2:9)
 - 2) The word "**forever**" (H: *owlam*; G: *aion*) does not always mean **forever and ever and ever**. It can mean "**age-lasting**"
 - a) Chart: "'Forever' Or 'Everlasting'"
 - b) Chart: "'Forever Things' Can Cease"
 - c) How do we know that some "forever things" **have ceased**? Other passages **tell us so**
 - 3) While some passages speak of Christ's reign as "**forever**" or "**everlasting**," others indicate that it will **end**
 - a) Chart: "Christ's Reign"
 - b) Chart: "Christ's Reign Will End"
 - c) Chart: "Christ's Rule Ends"
 - d) Chart: "The Messiah's Rule"

- 4) Christ will **rule till He puts all enemies under His feet** at the Second Coming
 - a) **“Till”** [*achri*]
 - 1] *BDAG*: “... 1. marker of continuous extent of time up to a point, *until*.... 2. marker of extension up to a certain point, *as far as*....” ⁽¹⁶¹⁾
 - 2] *Thayer*: “...It has the force now of a prep. now of a conj., *even to; until, to the time that*....” ⁽⁹¹⁾
 - b) The word **“till”** implies a **termination point** (cf. Mt. 24:38; Lk. 1:20; 21:24; Acts 3:21; 13:11; 22:22; 1 Cor. 11:26; Gal. 3:19; Rev. 7:3; *et al.*)
 - c) Chart: “The Rule Of Christ”

J. The Eternal Kingdom Came In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. Paul was confident that the Lord would preserve him for His **heavenly kingdom** (2 Tim. 4:18)
 - 1) But Jesus’ kingdom would come at **His appearing** (2 Tim. 4:1)
 - 2) Jesus coming was **imminent** (Jas. 5:7-8; 1 Pet. 4:7, 17)
 - 3) The only imminent coming was in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 4) Therefore, the **heavenly kingdom** came when **Jesus judged Jerusalem** in AD 70
- b. First-century Christians who made their call and election sure would be given an abundant entrance into the **everlasting kingdom** (2 Pet. 1:11)
 - 1) But Jesus’ kingdom would come at **His appearing** (2 Tim. 4:1)
 - 2) Jesus coming was **imminent** (1 Pet. 4:7, 17)
 - 3) 2 Peter was written to the **same Christians** as 1 Peter (2 Pet. 3:1)
 - 4) The only imminent coming was in the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 5) Therefore, the **everlasting kingdom** came when **Jesus judged Jerusalem** in AD 70

2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. See the material above on the **Coming of the Lord** (III. D. 2.)
- b. See the material above on the **Kingdom Came “With Power”** (III. E. 2. g.)

K. The End Of The World Occurred In AD 70

1. Explanation & Argumentation:

- a. 2 Peter is written to the **same people** as 1 Peter (2 Pet. 3:1)
- b. Peter was writing to urge his readers to be mindful of the words spoken by the **holy prophets** and the **apostles**; so they must have **prophesied** of the things he is about to mention (2 Pet. 3:1-2)

- 1) E.g. the new heavens and the new earth (2 Pet. 3:13; cf. Isa. 65:17; 66:22)
- c. The “**last days**” is the **eschaton** – the last days of the Jewish economy (2 Pet. 3:3)
- d. The **scoffers** were doubting the promise of **Christ’s imminent coming** in judgment on Jerusalem (2 Pet. 3:3-4)
 - 1) In his first epistle, Peter spoke of an **imminent judgment** of the Lord (1 Pet. 4:7, 17; cf. 1 Pet. 1:5, 13; 2:12)
 - 2) Since 1 & 2 Peter were written to **the same people** (2 Pet. 3:1), the recipients of 2 Peter would naturally think that **the judgments** mentioned in both letters were **the same**
 - 3) The **only imminent coming** of Jesus was **His coming in judgment on Jerusalem**
- e. The “**world**” that perished in the flood was not the *terra firma* but the **religious order of Judaism** (2 Pet. 2:5; 3:6)
 - 1) *Sam Dawson*: “Notice that the world that then perished, the old heavens and earth was **not the globe and sky**. They were still there as Peter wrote, but he spoke of **the old world order**. Likewise, the planet and stars Peter lived on and under were the same planet and stars Noah lived on and under. Accordingly, **the earth and heavens that passed away were not the planet and stars, but the corrupt pre-flood order or world**. The planet and stars Peter lived on and under are the same planet and stars we live on and under. Consequently, the earth and heavens that are about to pass away in II Peter 3 are not the planet and stars, but **the religious order** Peter was living under, i.e., the Mosaic Covenant.” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 90)
 - 2) The OT prophets used this kind of language to speak of **the passing of one social order** and the establishment of a new one (cf. Isa. 51:15-16; 65:17-18; 66:22-23)
- f. The “**heavens and the earth**” in this context refer to the **religious order of Judaism** (2 Pet. 3:7)
 - 1) The OT prophets used this kind of language to describe God’s judgment on:
 - a) **Assyria** (Isa. 33:14)
 - b) **Israel** (Jer. 4:4; Amos 5:6)
 - c) **Nations** (Hag. 2:6-7, 21-22)
 - 2) This kind of language was used to describe God’s judgment on **Jerusalem** in AD 70 (Mt. 3:10-11)
- g. The “**day of the Lord**” is the day of judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70 (2 Pet. 3:10)
 - 1) In the OT, the “**day of the Lord**” is commonly used of **national judgments**
 - a) Chart: “Day Of Jehovah”

- 2) Jesus speaks of His coming as **a thief** in the Olivet Discourse (Mt. 24:43)
 - h. The **“cosmic cataclysm”** that Peter describes is the **apocalyptic language** of judgment (2 Pet. 3:10-12)
 - 1) Similar language was used by the OT prophets to describe **God’s judgments on wicked nations**
 - a) Chart: “Cosmic Cataclysm”
 - 2) Everywhere else the word **“elements”** (*stoicheion*) is used in the NT, it always refers to the **rudimentary principles of religion** (Gal. 4:3, 9; Col. 2:8, 20; Heb. 5:12), and so it should be understood here (2 Pet. 3:10, 12)
 - a) *Max King*: “The word element in the scriptures means **‘the rudimentary principles of religion...the elementary principles of the O.T., as a revelation from God,** Heb. 5:12, R.V.’ This same word is found in Gal. 4:3, 9 where it is used in reference to **the rudimentary principles of the Jewish system**. Since law or government is involved in the meaning of heaven, it follows that the rudiments or elements of Judaism properly belong to the region of heaven. These were the elements that would melt with fervent heat, fire being a symbol of destruction.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 187)
 - i. Peter’s readers would be able to **look for and hasten** the coming of the day of God (2 Pet. 3:12)
 - 1) This **“day of God”** must be the **destruction of Jerusalem** rather than the “Second Coming” because:
 - a) Peter’s first-century readers **couldn’t look for a final advent of Christ**, because there are **no signs** given of a final advent at the end of time
 - b) The final advent **wasn’t near** in Peter’s day! (1 Pet. 4:7, 17)
 - c) There will be **no future final advent** if RE is true
 - 2) However, Peter’s first-century readers **could look for the destruction of Jerusalem**, because Jesus had given **warning signs** (Mt. 24:4-15, 32-35; Lk. 21:28)
 - j. Isaiah used the expression **“new heavens and a new earth”** to speak of the **new Messianic age** (Isa. 65:17-25; 66:22-24), and that is what Peter is talking about (2 Pet. 3:13)
 - 1) *Sam Dawson*: “This new heavens and new earth were not a new planet and skies, any more than the new heavens and earth after Noah were a new planet and skies. Peter spoke of the new order of things after the destruction of Jerusalem, the victorious church having weathered Jewish persecution, victorious Christians withstanding potential eradication by Jews.” (*Essays on Eschatology*, 98)
 - k. Similar language was used by Jesus in the Olivet Discourse concerning the **destruction of Jerusalem** in AD 70
 - 1) Chart: “2 Pet. 3 & Olivet Discourse”
2. Evaluation & Refutation:

- a. Consider **the context** of 2 Peter
 - 1) It is generally dated from the **mid to late 60's**
 - 2) There is **nothing particularly Jewish** about the letter [???]
 - a) Peter's reference to **Paul's epistles** (2 Pet. 3:15-16) written only a few years earlier to predominantly Gentile churches, would argue against a Palestinian destination
 - 3) Peter expects to **die soon**, and he is writing so that his readers will **"always" remember his teaching** after his death (2 Pet. 1:12-15)
 - a) It seems more likely that Peter didn't want his readers to **forget** things that would be fulfilled in the **distant future** as opposed to the **near future** 2 Pet. 3:8
- b. Not everyone believes that **1 Peter** is the letter followed by **"this second epistle"** (2 Pet. 3:1)
 - 1) Of course, many believe that the "first letter" is **1 Peter**
 - 2) But some believe that the "first letter" is **2 Peter 1-2**
 - 3) Others believe that the "first letter" is a **"lost letter"**
 - a) Cf. **Paul's "lost letter"** to the Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor. 5:9)
 - 4) If this "first letter" is **not 1 Peter**, then its references to an **imminent "salvation"** (1 Pet. 1:5), **"end of all things"** (1 Pet. 4:7), and **"judgment on the house of God"** (1 Pet. 4:17) would not necessarily pertain to the **"day of the Lord"** discussed in 2 Peter 3
 - 5) If this "first letter" is **1 Peter**, the **saints' expectations** of an imminent coming would not necessarily be the same as the **scoffers' expectations**
- c. The **"words"** which were spoken before by the holy prophets" may be **prophecy** (foretelling) or they may be **preaching** (forth-telling), like the "commandment" of the apostles (2 Pet. 3:2)
 - 1) If these "words" were prophecy, is it about:
 - a) The **scoffers**? (2 Pet. 3:3)
 - b) The **coming** of the Lord? (2 Pet. 3:4)
 - c) The **day** of the Lord? (2 Pet. 3:10)
 - d) The **destruction** of the heavens and the earth? (2 Pet. 3:10-12)
 - e) The **new heavens** and the **new earth**? (2 Pet. 3:13)
 - f) **All** of the above?
 - g) **Some** of the above?
- d. The **"last days"** can **mean different things** in different contexts (2 Pet. 3:3)
 - 1) See the material above on the "last days" (III. B. 2. b.)
 - 2) Sometimes the "last days" merely refers to the **indefinite future** (cf. Gen. 49:1; Num. 24:14)

- e. The scoffers **need not have doubted** the promise of Christ's coming in judgment on Jerusalem: (2 Pet. 3:3-4)
 - 1) If they were **not among the recipients** of 1 Peter (Peter said "scoffers **will come** in the last days")
 - 2) If 1 & 2 Peter were written to **different recipients**
 - 3) If there is compelling evidence in the NT of **another future coming** that **does not "fit"** Jesus' coming in judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70
 - a) Would scoffers have doubted the promise of Jesus' coming to destroy Jerusalem in **less than 40 years**?
 - b) Would they have made an argument based on **uniformitarianism** when the **Jewish-Roman war began in AD 66**? (2 Pet. 3:3-4)
- f. Peter answers the scoffers' argument based on **uniformitarianism** (2 Pet. 3:4) by citing the **Noahic Flood** as an example of **catastrophism** 2 Pet. 3:5-6
 - 1) The **"heavens"** and the **"earth"** (2 Pet. 3:5) refer to **the universe** originally created by the word of God (Psa. 24:1-2; 33:6, 9; 136:5-6; Heb. 11:3)
 - 2) The **"world"** refers to: (2 Pet. 3:6)
 - a) The **earth** or the **globe**
 - 1] If so, it is parallel to the **"earth"** in verse 5
 - a] Sometimes **"world"** (*kosmos*) is used interchangeably with **"earth"** (*ge*) (cf. Acts 17:24; Rom. 10:18; Rev. 3:10; 13:8; 17:8)
 - 2] It was the globe that was **"flooded with water"** (2 Pet. 3:6; cf. Gen. 7:10, 17-20)
 - 3] In light of the **catastrophic cataclysm** of the Noahic flood, it would be legitimate for Peter to say that the "world" (globe) **perished** (cf. Gen. 7:11, 17-20; 8:21-22; 9:11)
 - a] *Vine*: "*apollumi* (ἀπόλλυμι, 622), a strengthened form of *ollumi*, signifies 'to destroy utterly'; in middle voice, 'to perish.' **The idea is not extinction but ruin, loss, not of being, but of wellbeing.** This is clear from its use, as, e.g., of the marring of wine skins, Luke 5:37; of lost sheep, i.e., lost to the shepherd, metaphorical of spiritual destitution, Luke 15:4, 6, etc.; the lost son, 15:24; of the perishing of food, John 6:27; of gold, 1 Pet. 1:7. So of persons, Matt. 2:13, 'destroy'; 8:25, 'perish'; 22:7; 27:20; of the loss of well-being in the case of the unsaved hereafter, Matt. 10:28; Luke 13:3, 5; John 3:16 (v. 15 in some mss.); 10:28; 17:12; Rom. 2:12; 1 Cor. 15:18; 2 Cor. 2:15, 'are perishing'; 4:3; 2 Thess. 2:10; Jas. 4:12; 2 Pet. 3:9." (Bold emphasis added, 2:164)

- b) The **world of mankind** (cf. 2 Pet. 2:5; Gen. 6:13, 17; 7:21-23; Mt. 24:37-39; Lk. 17:26-27)
 - 1] If so, it is not parallel to the “**earth**” in verse 5
 - 2] In this sense, it was not a **world system** or **social order** that perished but **mankind**
- c) **Both**
- 3) Peter is arguing here that things have **not always continued** as they were from creation as the scoffers claimed
- g. Peter declares that **the heavens** and **the earth** now preserved by God’s word are **reserved for fire** 2 Pet. 3:7
 - 1) There are no compelling reasons to believe that the “**heavens and the earth**” in verse 7 are not the same as those in verse 5
 - a) If the heavens and the earth are symbolic of **Judaism**, did Judaism **stand out of water and in the water?** (2 Pet. 3:5)
 - 2) If the “**water**” of the flood was literal (2 Pet. 3:6), why wouldn’t the “**fire**” of this future judgment be literal (2 Pet. 3:7)?
 - 3) In Scripture the “**heaven(s) and the earth**” usually refer to the physical heavens and the earth?
 - a) Chart: “Heaven And Earth”
 - 4) If Peter is referring to AD 70, then **the type** (Noahic Flood) is greater than **the antitype** (Destruction of Jerusalem); but this would violate one of the primary principles of typology
 - 5) The **judgment in Noah’s day** by water (2 Pet. 3:6) is contrasted with the **future judgment** by fire (2 Pet. 3:7)
 - 6) Just as the **judgment in Noah’s day** was a universal judgment (2 Pet. 3:6), the **future judgment** will be a universal judgment (2 Pet. 3:7, 10-12)
 - a) But the judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70 was **not a universal judgment**
- h. Why would Peter make the point that **time is immaterial with God** if he is referring to a judgment that would be **fulfilled in just a few years?** (2 Pet. 3:8)
- i. The **salvation** in this context is **spiritual**, not physical (2 Pet. 3:9, 15-17; cf. 1:2-4, 8-11)
- j. The “**day of the Lord**” can refer to **many different judgments**, and it could certainly refer to a **future final judgment** at the end of time (2 Pet. 3:10)
 - 1) Chart: “Day Of Jehovah”
 - 2) The “**day of the Lord**” would come as **a thief** in the night, but the destruction of Jerusalem did not come as a **thief**
 - a) Jesus gave **specific signs** so Christians could know when to flee (Mt. 24:15-21; Lk. 21:20-24)

- b) Historians tell us that **no Christians perished** in the destruction of Jerusalem
- k. In this context, there are no compelling reasons to believe that Peter is talking about anything other than the **literal destruction** of the **heavens**, the **elements**, and the **earth** (2 Pet. 3:10-12)
 - 1) Just because **similar (or identical) language** is used figuratively in other passages to describe **God's judgments on wicked nations**, that does not prove that Peter is using this language in the same way here
 - a) If there is compelling evidence of a **future final judgment** that does not "fit" the judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70:
 - 1] It is very reasonable to believe that all God's judgments in time **foreshadow** this final judgment
 - 2] It is not surprising that Peter would use the same kind of **"boilerplate" terminology** used to describe God's judgments in time to describe this final judgment
 - 3] It is not unreasonable for Peter to use this "boilerplate terminology **literally**, instead of figuratively, if the context so indicates
 - 2) Just because the word **"elements"** is used in other passages to refer to the **rudimentary principles of Judaism** (Gal. 4:3, 9; Col. 2:8, 20; Heb. 5:12), that does not prove that Peter so uses this term here
 - a) See Appendix G: "Definitions of 'Elements' (*stoicheion*)"
 - b) To define "elements" as the "elementary principles of the OT" **does not fit the context** of 2 Peter 3
 - c) Illust.: The Greek word *pneuma* is usually translated **"Spirit"** or **"spirit,"** but in John 3:8 it is correctly translated **"wind"**
 - d) Illust.: **Leaven** is always a **symbol of evil** (Mt. 16:6, 11-12; Mk. 8:15; Lk. 12:1; 1 Cor. 5:6-8; Gal. 5:9), except in the Parable of the Leaven (Mt. 13:33; Lk. 13:20-21)
 - 3) If Peter wanted to describe an **actual destruction** of the heavens and the earth, how would he do that, if not in **these terms** (or similar ones)?
- l. How would first-century Christians **hasten the destruction of Jerusalem** in a way that they **could not hasten the "Second Coming"**? (2 Pet. 3:12)
 - 1) **"Hasten"** (*speudo*)
 - a) *BDAG*: "1. **to be in a hurry, hurry, hasten**, intr. a. w. inf. foll. *make haste, hasten....* b. *go in haste, hasten....* 2. **to cause someth. to happen or come into being by exercising special effort, hasten**, trans.... 2 Pt 3:12.... 3. **to be very interested in discharging an obligation, be zealous, exert oneself, be industrious**, in the Gr-Rom. world a mark of civic excellence...." (937-938)

- b) *Thayer*: “**1.** intrans... *to hasten*: as often in the Grk. writ., foll. by an inf.... **2.** *to desire earnestly*: τί, 2 Pet. 3:12....” (584)
- c) *Vine*: “denotes (a) intransitively, ‘to hasten,’ Luke 2:16, ‘with haste,’ lit., ‘(they came) hastening’; Luke 19:5, 6; Acts 20:16; 22:18; (b) transitively, ‘to desire earnestly,’ 2 Pet. 3:12, RV, ‘earnestly desiring’ (marg., ‘hastening’), KJV, ‘hasting’ (the day of God)....” (2:292)
- 2) Some English versions translate pseudo as “**hasten**” [or something similar] (KJV; ESV; LEB; NET; NASB; NIV; NKJV; NRSV; RSV; YLT)
- 3) Other English versions translate *speudo* as “**earnestly desiring**” [or something similar] (ASV; HCSB)
- m. Just because Isaiah used the expression “**new heavens and a new earth**” to speak of the **new Messianic age** (Isa. 65:17-25; 66:22-24), that does not prove that Peter is talking about exactly the same thing (2 Pet. 3:13)
- n. There are other passages that talk about the **destruction of the heavens and the earth** (cf. Psalms 102:25-27; Hebrews 1:10-12)

IV. **WHY? THE FUNDAMENTAL FLAWS OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY**

A. “**Spiritual**” Interpretation

1. *Max King*: “It is the belief of the author that the **spiritual method of interpretation** is firmly established in the Bible, and that it **is the basic and primary method of interpretation** involved in end-time prophecy.” (*The Spirit Of Prophecy*, 1-2)
2. *Max King*: “Abraham had two sons, and the difference between **Ishmael** and **Isaac** is the difference between the **old** and the **new** economy. The **spiritual principle of interpretation** receives its support in **Isaac**, just as the **literal or fleshly principle** adheres within **Ishmael**, and cannot be applied to Isaac.” (*The Spirit of Prophecy*, 26)
 - a. So all things pertaining to **spiritual Israel**, the church, must be understood by the **spiritual method** of interpretation
 - b. And all things pertaining to **fleshly Israel**, Judaism or national Israel, must be understood by the **literal method** of interpretation (Varner, 18)
3. But there are **no special rules** of interpretation for the Bible. *Max King’s* hermeneutical principle is a **figment of his imagination**
 - a. *Alexander Campbell*: “The language of the Bible is, then, *human* language. It is, therefore, to be examined by **all the same rules which are applicable to the language of any other book**, and to be understood according to the true and proper meaning of the words, in their current acceptation, at the times and places in which they were originally written or translated.... But the fact, that God has clothed his communications in human language, and that he has spoken by men, to men, is *prima facie* [i.e., adequate to establish a fact, WTV] evidence that he is to be understood, as one conversing with another. ... As then, there is no divine dictionary, grammar, or special rules of interpretation for the Bible, then that book, to be understood, must be submitted to the common dictionary, grammar, and rules of the language in which it was

written; and as a living language is constantly fluctuating, the true and proper meaning of the words and sentences of the Bible, must be learned from the acceptation of those words and phrases, in the times and countries in which it was written.... To adopt any other course, or to apply any other rules, would necessarily divest the sacred writings of every attribute that belongs to the idea of revelation. It must never be forgotten in persuing the Bible, that in the structure of sentences, in the figures of speech, in the arrangement and use of words, it differs not at all from other writings, and must, therefore, be understood and interpreted as they are (Bold emphasis added, *Christianity Restored*, pp. 22-23, quoted in Varner, 14-15)

4. Furthermore, RE's do not consistently apply this principle
 - a. They do not **interpret literally** all prophecy dealing with **fleshly Israel**
 - 1) **"Elijah"** (Mal. 4:5) = John the Baptist (Mt. 11:13-14; 17:10-13)
 - 2) **Prepare the way of the Lord** (Isa. 40:3-5) = John's preaching (Mk. 1:1-5; Lk. 3:3-6), not prepare a desert highway, raise the valleys, level the mountains, and make the crooked straight
 - 3) **End with a flood** (Dan. 9:26) = Destruction Of Jerusalem in AD 70, not a literal flood
 - b. They do not **interpret spiritually** all prophecy dealing with **spiritual Israel**
 - 1) "Time of trouble" (Dan. 12:1) = literal persecution

B. Ignore Context

1. Chart: "Ascension & Second Coming"
2. Chart: "Acts 17:30-31 Context"
3. Chart: "Judgment That Made Felix Afraid"

C. Tunnel Vision (Inflexible Definitions)

1. Chart: "Tunnel Vision"

D. Peculiar Definitions

1. Chart: "Peculiar Definitions"
2. **Max King**: "*Mellonton* always means 'to be about to be,' just as *at hand* always means 'at hand' or 'near.' When men must **change or pervert the meaning of words** to uphold their theory, the process of learning has been swallowed up in **prejudicial pride**." (Bold emphasis added, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, 365)
3. Rom. 2:21: ²¹ You, therefore, who **teach another**, do you not **teach yourself**?

E. Doctrinal Prejudice

1. Chart: "Doctrinal Glasses"
2. RE's must **whittle** on the puzzle pieces and then take a hammer and **pound** them into place to make them fit their doctrine

F. Assumptions & Inferences

1. RE is largely based on **assumptions** and **inferences** – inferences that are not even a 42nd cousin to a **"necessary inference"** (i.e. inescapable conclusion)

2. It is certainly possible for people to **infer** things that are **not implied** (cf. Jn. 21:22-23)
3. *Kurt Simmons*: “We all understand the plain testimony of verses, but when men start building doctrine based upon deductions, look out! ‘If this, then that. And if that, then this, and this, and this!’” (“Second Negative,” *The Preston-Simmons Debate*, p. 46)

G. **Preoccupation With Novel** (Acts 17:21; 2 Cor. 11:4)

H. **Esotericism** (Job 12:1-3)

I. **Pride & Arrogance**

1. “There’s a curious irony to the fact that in science or religion, if you’re two steps ahead, you’re hailed as a leader. If you’re five steps ahead, you’re considered a visionary. But if you’re **ten steps ahead**, you’re a **heretic** or a **madman**.”
(http://www.presence.tv/cms/transmillennial_view.php)
2. “I know that the brethren aren’t ready for this yet.”

V. **WHERE? THE CONSEQUENCES OF REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY**

A. **Universalism**

1. *Kurt Simmons*: “[Max] King was at the front of Preterism in the 70’s, 80’s and 90’s until his system of eschatology led him into **Universalism**.” (Bold emphasis added, “First Negative,” *The Preston-Simmons Debate*, p. 17)

B. **Transdenominationalism**

1. “Last year Tim King became president of Living Presence Ministries and opened their ministry to others with a view to **transdenominationalism**. It cannot be denied that this **one-time church of Christ ministry**, through its teaching, established the foundation of the present-day preterist movement.” (Bold emphasis added, *Quest*, Jan. 2000, quoted by Wayne Jackson, “King & Company Go Transdenominational, ChristianCourier.com)

C. **Rejection of Hell**

1. *Sam Dawson*: “I now believe that **hell is the invention of Roman Catholicism**; and surprisingly, most, if not all, of our popular concepts of hell can be found in the writings of Roman Catholic writers like the Italian poet Dante Alighiere (1265-1321), author of *Dante’s Inferno*. The English poet John Milton (1608-1674), author of *Paradise Lost*, set forth the same concepts in a fashion highly acceptable to the Roman Catholic faith. **Yet none of our concepts of hell can be found in the teaching of Jesus Christ!**” (Bold emphasis added, *Essays on Eschatology*, 209)
2. Note: Not all RE’s **reject** the biblical doctrine of eternal punishment in hell

D. **Heaven On Earth Now**

1. “Some, throughout cultural history, have seen the **greater reality**, finding **eternal life in the here and now**.” (<http://www.presence.tv/cms/faqview.php>)
2. *Tim King*: “We live in the new heavens and new earth that has come.” (The Transmillennial® View, Jan 15, 200)
3. “We are Zion-born -- heaven is our birthright, **the country we now inhabit**.” (http://www.presence.tv/cms/transmillennial_view.php)

4. "Heaven is the **inner spiritual reality**, And earth is the **outer visible reality**." (<http://www.presence.tv/cms/faqview.php>)
5. "Our name announces the fact that the Presence of God has been restored and we live in a **face-to-face relationship with God**." (<http://www.presence.tv/cms/faqview.php>)

E. Questions About NT Rituals

1. *Ed Stevens*: "If we are living in the paradise of God again, does this mean that rituals, ceremonies, sacrifices (such as **baptism, Lord's Supper**, etc.), physical temples (**'church' buildings**), priesthood (**clergy**) and other such physical trappings are no longer 'imposed' on us (see Heb. 9:10)? Adam and Eve didn't have those things in the Garden, nor did they need them until after the Fall and the Curse. **Do we need those things now that the conditions of the Garden have been restored?** But, do we go to the extreme of throwing them out with the proverbial 'bath water', or could they still have some value if observed as teaching, confessional and edificational tools (even though **no longer obligatory and binding**)?" (Bold emphasis added, "Preterist Principles & Their Implications," 1)

F. Who Knows???

1. *Oscar Miles*: "I glanced at the article by Ed Stevens after you brought it to my intention. I certainly agree with the attitude expressed. I used to think members of churches of Christ would actually live up to the Berean attitude of being willing to have every belief questioned and examined. But the great majority of the ones I have met will never consent to a serious consideration of teachings like covenant eschatology. **Ed Stevens does not know all of the implications and neither do I.** But for our study, we need to talk about whether Bible eschatology is about the end of physical universe or the end of a covenantal world. **Considering the implications and specific applications if [sic] way too premature.**" (Email to Kevin Kay, 07/04/11)

Conclusion:

- I. I am convinced that RE is **false**, as false as it can possibly be, and it is an **insidious false doctrine** because:
 - A. It drastically affects **biblical interpretation**
 - B. It has **serious consequences**
 - C. It has **troubled and divided churches**
 - D. It appears to be **gaining acceptance**
- II. What about those preachers who have **accepted RE**, but they **don't teach it**?
 - A. They still **believe error**, and that's serious (1 Tim. 1:3-7; 4:1-2)
 - B. Their **hermeneutical approach** to RE will likely affect other doctrines
 - C. They must avoid several **key passages** (e.g. Mt. 24-25; 1 Cor. 15; etc.) and several **key doctrines** (e.g. The Second Coming; The Resurrection of the Dead; Final Judgment; etc.) which means they are not preaching "**the whole counsel of God**" (Acts 20:26)
 - D. They must teach on these key passages and doctrines but **keep their true convictions to themselves** which means they are **dishonest** (cf. Mk. 7:21-23)

- E. They must **teach their convictions** on RE, but then it's **not private** anymore, and they will **cause trouble** among their brethren (1 Tim. 6:3-5; 2 Tim. 2:16-18) and **"deceive the hearts of the simple"** (Rom. 16:17-18)
- III. In RE, **"the devil is in the details"** (e.g. *mello*, present tense verbs, inflexible definitions, etc.), and this doctrine can only be refuted by **careful attention to those details**

Kevin Kay
1816 Weaver Branch Rd.
Piney Flats, TN 37601
kevinskay@centurylink.net

Sources Consulted

- Benton, Terry and Don Preston. *The Benton-Preston Debate*. <http://www.eschatology.org/all-articles-articles-211/115-written-debates> .
- Cates, Curtis. *The A.D. 70 Theology: A Religion That Overthrows The Faith And Undermines The Hope Of Men*.
- Charles, R. H. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2004.
- Cox, Stan. "A Refutation of the A.D. 70 Doctrine (Part 1-3).
- Dawson, Samuel G. *Essays on Eschatology: An Introductory Overview of the Study of Last Things*.
- Dunagan, Mark. "A.D. 70 Theory."
- Gentry, Kenneth. "A Brief Analysis of Full Preterism or Hyper Preterism." May 26, 1009.
- Gibson, John R. (Audio Sermons On Realized Eschatology). www.pepperroadchurch.org/sermons/24-false-doctrines .
- _____. (Unpublished Sermon Outlines On Realized Eschatology).
- Gibson, Marc W. "The 70 A.D. Doctrine Examined."
- Jackson, Wayne. "Defending the Faith with a Broken Sword – Part 3." ChristianCourier.com.
- _____. "Did The Law Of Moses Continue Until A.D. 70?" ChristianCourier.com.
- _____. *The A.D. 70 Theory: A Review of the Max King Doctrine*.
- _____. "The Menace Of Radical Preterism." ChristianCourier.com.
- Jamerson, Frank. "Response To 70 A.D. Doctrine." <http://www.midwaychurchofchrist.org/articles.htm> .
- _____. "Reply To A Letter Defending The 70 A.D. Doctrine." <http://www.midwaychurchofchrist.org/articles.htm> .
- _____. "Response to a Letter about My Sermon on The New Heavens and Earth." <http://www.midwaychurchofchrist.org/articles.htm> .
- _____. "A Study of the 70 A.D. Doctrine." <http://www.midwaychurchofchrist.org/articles.htm> .
- King, Daniel. "Premillennialism And Realized Eschatology." *Guardian of Truth*. Feb. 20, 1986: 30:4: 114-115.
- King, Max. *The Cross and The Parousia Of Christ*. 1987.
- _____. *The Spirit Of Prophecy*. 1983.
- Mayberry, Mark. "Realized Eschatology: The A.D. 70 Doctrine." July 12, 2009.
- _____. "The Coming Of The Lord." May 12, 2009.

- _____. "Haunting Questions Regarding Realized Eschatology and the A.D. 70 Doctrine." July 12, 2009
- McGuiggan, Jim. *A.D. 70 Revisited*. 1991.
- McGuiggan, Jim and Max King, *The McGuiggan-King Debate*.
- Miles, Oscar. "The Day of the Lord in 2 Peter 3: End of the Universe or Destruction of Jerusalem?" 2008 SITS Conference.
- Pafford, Arland. "Plain Talk About AD 70 Doctrine." <http://aplaintalk.com/ad70doctrine.html>.
- Preston, Don and Kurt Simmons. *The Preston-Simmons Debate*. 2010. <http://www.preteristcentral.com/Preston-Simmons%20Debate.html>.
- Price, Joe. "The AD 70 Doctrine: Realized Eschatology Is Realized Apostasy? (Part 1-_____." "The Second Coming of Christ: Did It Already Occur? (1-3), *Guardian of Truth*, Oct. 5, 19, Nov. 2, 1989
- Robinson, Garland. "The A.D. 70 System of Kingism." #1-6. <http://www.seektheoldpaths.com/stop096.htm#AD701>.
- Russell, James Stuart. *The Parousia: A Critical Inquiry Into The New Testament Doctrine Of Our Lord's Second Coming*. 1878. http://www.preteristarchive.com/Books/1878_russell_parousia.html.
- Turner, Allan, *et al.* *Realized Eschatology Seminar* (Unpublished Manuscripts).
- Varner, W. Terry. *Studies in Biblical Eschatology*. Vol. 1. 1981. Therefore Stand Publications.
- Walters, Dan. "Realized Eschatology." *Guardian of Truth*, Nov. 7, 1985. 29:21:659, 664.
- Williams, Almon. "AD: The End? *The Doctrine of Last Things*. Florida College Annual Lectures. 1986.
- Willis, Mike. *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*. (A collection of articles from *Guardian of Truth Magazine*

Appendix A: “The Last Days”

“This phrase [“the last (or latter) days,” ksk] in itself has **no intrinsic eschatological significance** but refers only to **a period of time in the indeterminate future** (Gen. 49:1; Nu. 24:14; Dt. 4:4:30; 31:29). It is used to designate the final period of time when God’s kingdom of peace and blessedness will be realized (Isa. 2:2-4) and Israel will be redeemed under a Davidic king (Hos. 3:5). In Ezk. 38:16 it is used of the time of the eschatological war after Israel has been restored.” (Bold emphasis added, G. E. Ladd, “Eschatology,” ISBE, Rev. Ed., 2:132)

“Last Day(s), Latter Days. In the Old Testament several constructions appear with Heb. *ʾaḥārīt* “latter, last” and related words, **but only sometimes with a focus that could be called eschatological** (e.g., Ezek. 38:8, 16; Hos. 3:5; Mic. 4:1; cf. Isa. 2:2). **More often the “latter days” are simply “days to come” (e.g., Deut. 31:29; cf. 4:30; Num. 24:14) and the “latter (time)” is “the future” (e.g., Prov. 19:20; Jer. 31:17; so RSV).** Some of these noneschatological passages (particularly in Deuteronomy) can, however, be seen as part of the background of the development of prophetic eschatology. **“The end (*qēṣ*) of days” is another expression used eschatologically in the Old Testament (Dan. 12:13; simply “the end” in Ezekiel and Daniel), but more often noneschatologically (e.g., 1 Kgs. 17:7; RSV “after a while”; Neh. 13:6; RSV “after some time”; Jer. 13:6; RSV “after many days”).**

“In the New Testament Gk. *éσχatos* “last” occurs in various ways with reference to the end and the time immediately before the end. The coming of Christ and the conditions brought on by his coming, including the experiences of the Church, are so indicated (e.g., Acts 2:17; Heb. 1:2; 2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:3; Jude 18; cf. 1 Pet. 1:20, “end of the times”; 1 John 2:18, “last hour”), as are events and conditions of the future (1 Cor. 15:26; 1 Pet. 1:5; Rev. 15:1; 21:9). Unique to the gospel of John is “the last day,” which refers to the time of the coming general resurrection (John 6:39–40, 44, 54; 11:24) and judgment (12:48). Analogous terms are “the day of judgment” (1 John 4:17), “the day of the Lord” (1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Thess. 2:2), “the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” and similar expressions (1 Cor. 1:8; 5:5; 2 Cor. 1:14; Phil. 1:6, 10; 2:16), and “that Day” (2 Tim. 1:18).” (Bold emphasis added, *The Eerdman’s Bible Dictionary*, 643)

Last Day(s), Latter Days

“A phrase (Heb. *hayyôm hāʾaḥrôn*, *ʾaḥārīt ṭ hayyāmū m*) that **connotes a future time that will precede, coincide with, or follow a decisive divine reckoning.** Associated terms are “day of the Lord,” “day of judgment,” or simply “the/that day.” The earliest uses of the term in Hebrew refer to military victories and defeats. Used in this sense, the term refers to the judgment of God’s enemies in battle (Num. 24:14; “days to come”). The latter days can be a time of tribulation and exile for Israel (Deut. 4:30; 31:29) or, similarly, a time when Israel will understand the wrath of the Lord (Jer. 23:20; 30:24; cf. Ezek. 38:16). The latter days may also be a time of the restoration of nations that were previously punished (Jer. 48:47; 49:39); of Israel, who will return to seek the Lord (Hos. 3:5); of Jerusalem (Isa. 2:2 = Mic. 4:1); and of justice, when the Redeemer shall stand on the earth (Job 19:25–27).

“Jewish apocalyptic and Christian writers typically associate the latter days (or “last times”; Gk. *éσχatos t n hēmer n*) with cosmic events: the coming tribulation, last judgment, and salvation (4 Ezra 10:59; 6:34; cf. 1 QM 1, 11; 2 Apoc. Bar. 24:1; 51:1). In Daniel the events of the latter days are mysteries to be revealed from heaven (Dan. 2:28; 10:14). In the NT the phrase is associated with **the resurrection** (by Jesus) **at the last judgment** (John 6:39–40; 11:24), **the Christian era** that began with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:17; cf. Joel 2:28–32 [MT 3:1–5]), **the tribulation and disbelief** before the last judgment (2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:3; Jas. 5:3), **the time when salvation will be revealed** (1 Pet. 1:5), and **the present time** characterized by God’s revelation through Christ (Heb. 1:2).” (Bold emphasis added, Alexandra R. Brown, *Eerdman’s Dictionary of the Bible*, 2000, 791)

Appendix B: Present Indicative

1. *Progressive (Descriptive, Durative, Specific)*. The present tense is the main tense for **present action**, and since it overlaps with the speaker's comment on it, it will **normally refer to a continuing present action or state**. It may be translated as a Simple Present ("I loose") or as a Present Progressive ("I am loosing") depending on what fits the context and the word used.

εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (Rom. 5:1)

we have peace with God (NOTE: it is over-reading the tense to render this "we have having" or "we are in the process of having..."; "we have" represents in English what is expressed by the Greek)

Ραααί, ποῦ μένεις; (John 1:38)

Rabbi, where *are you staying*?

2. *Customary*. The present may denote things that are **true for long periods of time**, and are **true presently**. Many theological truths are expressed in this way.

ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν (1 John 4:8)

God *is* love

οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ (John 14:6)

no-one *comes* to the Father but through me

3. *Iterative* (pronounced ih-TER-uh-tiv; *Customary*). **Repeated or habitual action** may be expressed with the present tense. Here, the prepositional phrase is what shows this to be habitual action.

καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω (1 Cor. 15:31)

I *die* daily

4. *Historical (Narrative)*. In narratives, **the present may be used interchangeably with the past tenses**; it is found most frequently in Mark, and often with verbs of speaking. By switching to the present, the author may be **making the action more vivid to the reader**. It should be translated as a **past tense**.

Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει... (John 1:29)

On the next day *he saw* Jesus coming to him, and *said*...

5. *Gnomic* (pronounced NO-mik). The present may be used to express that **a truth or proverb is timeless**, and not merely true in the present or for an extended period of time (cf. "a stitch in time saves nine"). Translate with an English present tense.

πάν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ (Matt. 7:17)

every good tree *produces* good fruit

6. *Aoristic*. While speaking, **a person may use the present tense, but clearly with no thought of progressive action**. It is commonly found with pronouncements.

Αἰνέα, ἰάταί σε Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (Acts 9:34)

Aeneas, Jesus Christ *heals* you

7. *Conative* (pronounced KAHN-uh-tiv; *Tendential*). Infrequent. **An action that is being attempted, but not actually carried out**, may appear in the present tense. "Try to" or "attempt" are sometimes appropriate.

διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον ἐμὲ λιθάζετε; (John 10:32)

for which work of these *are you trying to stone* me?

8. *Futuristic*. **An expected event may be in the present tense**, especially with a verb of motion. It is **rendered as a Future** (first example, note that it is linked with a future tense) or as a Simple or

Progressive Present (second example).

πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν (John 14:3)

I *will come* and will receive you to myself

φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν (1 Cor. 15:32)

let us eat and drink, for tomorrow *we die* (Chapman, *Greek New Testament Insert*)

Appendix C: Comments On The Verb Tenses In 2 Cor. 3

2 Cor. 3:6:

Murray J. Harris: “Like ἀποκτείνει, the verb ζωοποιεῖ is a gnomic present, depicting what is always and everywhere the case. When Paul observes here that the Spirit ‘imparts life’ or when he describes the Spirit as ‘life-giving’ (τῆς ζωῆς, Rom. 8:2; cf. Gal. 5:25), he is affirming that one characteristic — perhaps the principal characteristic — of the Spirit is that he perpetually grants the physical and spiritual life of which he is the source.” (2 Corinthians, NIGTC, 269)

2 Cor. 3:7:

M. J. Harris: “Τὸ καταργούμενον (*to katargoumenon*; cf. v. 7) may mean ‘what was destined to pass away’ or ‘what was in process of fading away.’” (Bold emphasis added, “2 Corinthians,” EBC, 10:337, n. 11)

Murray J. Harris: “The aorist ἀτενίσαι is constative, viewing as a single conceptual unit the repeated inability of the Israelites to keep their gaze focused on the shining brilliance (δόξα) of Moses’ face whenever he emerged from “the tent of meeting” (Exod. 33:7-11; 34:34-35).” (2 Corinthians, NIGTC, 283)

Murray J. Harris: “Since καταργουμένην is articular in 3:7, qualifying τὴν δόξαν, it is adjectival (not adverbial) and therefore its tense (present) is only indirectly, not directly, related to the principal verb ἐγενήθη, which is aorist.” (2 Corinthians, NIBTC, 284)

Murray J. Harris: “(5) τὴν καταργουμένην may be classified as an attributive participle expressing repeated action in the past.” (2 Corinthians, NIGTC, 285)

David Garland: “The present tense would imply that ‘the glory was in process of abolition’ from the time of its beginning.” (“2 Corinthians,” NAC, 29:174)

Simon Kistemaker: “τὴν καταργουμένην—the present participle in the passive voice (not the middle) denotes concession: ‘although it is being set aside.’ The nearest feminine antecedent is ‘glory.’” (“2 Corinthians,” BNTC, 115)

Clinton Hamilton: “‘Was to be done away’ in verse 7 is translated from *katargeoumenen*, derived from the verb *katargeo*, which in this context has reference to ‘the radiance on Moses’ face’ (AG 418). It appears in this passage as a present passive participle with the significance of ceasing or passing away. From the day that the law of Moses was given, its glory was passing away even as the radiance of the face of Moses was ceasing or passing away. The idea of the law’s glory being in the process of ceasing during the so-called 40 year transition period (A.D. 30 to A.D. 70) is foreign to this passage. It is only by twisting and perverting it that one can even approximate any such meaning.” (“The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 38)

2 Cor. 3:8:

Murray J. Harris: “It is possible that ἔσται is a purely temporal future, referring to the glory of the future age or the glory to be displayed at the parousia, although Bengel refers the glory to the present age as seen from the standpoint of the OT (3.365). But if the glory were wholly future in relation to the time of writing, some qualification of δόξη might have been expected such as ἐν δόξῃ τῇ μελλούσῃ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (cf. Rom. 8:18; 1 Pet. 5:1). Since the δόξα described in 3:9 and 3:18 (cf. 4:17) was a present reality when Paul wrote, it is preferable to treat ἔσται as a logical future (Bultmann 81), although some commentators envisage this future as both logical and chronological.” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 286)

Roger Omanson: “RSV slavishly maintains the future tense of the Greek verb *will ... be*. When the Law of Moses was given, the new covenant was an event in the future. But the future tense in English suggests that the new covenant is not a present reality for Paul. For that reason TEV uses the present tense: “how much greater is the glory.” (*UBS Handbook: 2 Corinthians*, 62)

2 Cor. 3:10:

Murray J. Harris: “After ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ in v. 7, the perfect οὐ δεδόξασται describes a glory that no longer exists, having been superseded. Such disparagement of the era of the old covenant, although relative (v. 7; cf. Rom. 7:12), indicates how thoroughly new Paul considered the new covenant (καινὴ διαθήκη, 3:6), the new creation (καινὴ κτίσις, 5:17), and the new order ([τὰ] καινὰ, 5:17).” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 288-289)

Murray J. Harris: “The final phrase in the verse affords the reason for the bold, absolute statement οὐ δεδόξασται: ‘on account of [the comparison with] the surpassing glory [of the new order that totally outshines the old].’ That is, the old covenant has been ‘eclipsed’ by the new, the Law by the gospel. But, as in astronomy, the light that has been eclipsed has not been extinguished but has been surpassed in splendor.” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 289)

2 Cor. 3:11:

Murray J. Harris: “It is not illegitimate to treat both these participles as timeless (‘the transient ... the permanent,’ Wand), but while τὸ μένον clearly means ‘what lasts’ indefinitely or forever, ‘what is destined to remain,’ τὸ καταργούμενον would seem to demand some indication of the time of the annulment or abolition or fading. Thrall renders the participle ‘what is being abolished,’ arguing that for Paul ‘in some sense’ the Mosaic ministry and covenant remained in existence (3:14-15) while the preaching of the gospel and the conversion of Jews meant the old covenant was in the process of abolition. But perhaps this line of reasoning proves too much — as long as Judaism continued, the process of abolition would continue, without the old covenant ever being finally abolished. Would Paul not have regarded the Mosaic covenant as terminated in effect when the new covenant was inaugurated by Christ’s death? The alternative is to relate τὸ καταργούμενον to the time indicated by the constative aorist ἐγενήθη in 3:7: ‘what was destined to fade away.’ Such a rendering preserves the verbal link with τὴν καταργουμένην in 3:7 (‘which in fact faded away’), although there in 3:7 the allusion to the Mosaic order is secondary, whereas here in 3:11 the Mosaic economy is the focus, with Moses’ face alluded to by the phrase διὰ δόξης.” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 290-291)

Murray J. Harris: “Paul’s stark contrast between τὸ καταργούμενον and τὸ μένον, between ‘what faded’ and ‘what lasts’ (Moffatt), epitomizes his view of religious history in the light of the cross of Christ. The old covenant and its ministry belonged to a vanishing order, an economy that began to fade immediately after its inception, as was typified by the divine glory reflected on Moses’ face — a glory that began to fade as soon as he left the divine presence. On the other hand, the new covenant and its ministry began in splendor and will always be invested with glory (τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ [ἔσται/ἔστίν]), for it constitutes God’s final word to humankind. In the period between the two advents of Jesus, there is only one divine ordinance, the gospel, an eternal gospel (Rev. 14:6) of an eternal covenant (Heb. 13:20). It remains until the parousia, when its implications for all creation, animate and inanimate, will be fully realized (Rom. 8:18-23). The era of the gospel is permanent, never to be superseded, for it marks the end of the ages (1 Cor. 10:11), the culmination of God’s redemptive purposes for the world (Gal. 4:4-5).” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 291)

Roger Omanson: “*What faded away* may be translated ‘what was being annulled’ (AB). The whole verse may have to be rendered more explicitly, as in CEV: ‘The Law was given with a glory that faded away. But the glory of the new agreement is much greater, because it will never fade away.’” (UBS Handbook: 2 Corinthians, 64)

A.T. Robertson: “**Passeth away** (καταργούμενον [katargoumenon]). **In process of disappearing before the gospel of Christ.** **Remaineth** (μένον [menon]). The new ministry is permanent. This claim may be recommended to those who clamour for a new religion. Christianity is still alive and is not dying.” (WPNT, n.p.)

Marvin R. Vincent: “That which is done away (τὸ καταργούμενον). Lit., *which is being done away; in course of abolition* through the preaching of the Gospel. Both the A. V., and Rev. *passeth* fail to bring out the idea of *process*.” (WSNT, 3:305)

Warren Wiersbe: “The tense of the verb here is very important: ‘that which is passing away.’ Paul wrote at a period in history when the ages were overlapping. The New Covenant of grace had come in, but the temple services were still being carried on and the nation of Israel was still living under Law. In A.D. 70, the city of Jerusalem and the temple would be destroyed by the Romans, and that would mark the end of the Jewish religious system.” (BEC, 1:638)

Clinton Hamilton: “*Katargoumenon*, is done away, is a present passive participle in the nominative case in verse 11, whereas in verse 7 it appears in the accusative case. The significance of the participle is ‘ceasing’ or ‘passing away.’ If the law from the point of giving was glorious and which glory was ceasing or passing away from that time, then certainly the new covenant which remains is glorious. This is the sense of verse 11 and to eisegete into this passage a 40 year transition period does violence to the sense of the language in context.” (“The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 38)

2 Cor. 3:13:

Murray J. Harris: “ἐτίθει is an iterative imperfect: ‘it was Moses’ custom to put a veil on his face.’ This allusion requires a careful examination of the sequence of events in Exod. 34:33-35 (LXX). 34:33 indicates that on the occasion of his (second) descent from Sinai, after he had finished speaking to the people, he put (ἐπέθηκεν) a veil over his face, the aorist depicting a single action. But in 34:34 three iterative imperfects appear: ‘Whenever Moses entered (εἰσεπορεύετο) the Lord’s presence to speak with him, he used to take off (περιηρθεῖτο) his veil until he went out. After he had gone out, he would tell (ἐλάλει) all the people of Israel whatever the Lord had commanded him.’ Finally, in 34:35, where Moses’ customary action is still being described, we read that ‘the people of Israel saw (εἶδον) that the face of Moses was radiant and so Moses placed (περιέθηκεν) a veil over his face until he went in to converse with the Lord.’ These two constative aorists depict repeated action unitarily. All this validates Paul’s use of ἐτίθει.” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 297)

Roger Omanson: “*The end of the fading splendor* does not mean that the splendor stopped fading and yet remained to some degree. The *end* of the fading splendor means that the splendor ceased to exist altogether. The participle translated as *the fading splendor* in RSV is neuter as in 3:11 (referring to the old covenant), and not feminine as in 3:7 (referring to the splendor).” (UBS Handbook: 2 Corinthians, 65)

2 Cor. 3:14:

Murray J. Harris: “The aorist ἐπωρόθη may be constative (of their continuous past state), or, as van Unnik suggests, *ingressive* (“became hardened”). If Paul is already thinking of his Jewish contemporaries (in the αὐτῶν) as well as Jews of earlier times, the aorist may be *gnomic* (“are hardened”).” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 301)

Murray J. Harris: “Whereas the adjective ἀρχαῖος (‘old’) has the predominant sense of ‘ancient’ or ‘venerable,’ παλαιός more often means ‘old’ in the sense of ‘antiquated’ or ‘dated.’ In the light of Paul’s argument in 2:14–4:6 for the grandeur and superiority of the apostolic ministry, it is fair to observe that he has carefully chosen the adjectives he uses to qualify διαθήκη. The ‘old’ covenant does not simply belong to former times (ἀρχαῖος); it is dated (παλαιός). The ‘new’ covenant does not simply belong to recent times (νέος); it is superior (καινός).” (“2 Corinthians,” NIGTC, 302-303)

Murray J. Harris: “How καταργεῖται is translated depends in part on its implied subject. If the subject is taken to be the glory of the Mosaic covenant (cf. vv. 7, 13), then the verb will mean ‘is in the process of fading.’ If the subject is the old covenant, the sense will be ‘is

abrogated' (NEB), 'is abolished' (Spicq 2.248), 'is being annulled,' or 'is set aside' (Lietzmann, Schlatter). Alternatively, if we take κάλυμμα as the subject, the verb may mean 'is set aside' (NRSV), 'is ... abolished' (Thrall), or 'is ... removed' (Goodspeed, Berkeley). The principal reason for preferring κάλυμμα as the subject is that, after τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ... μένει, and then the neuter μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον which naturally refers back to κάλυμμα, the reader would be hard pressed to envisage a change of subject with καταργεῖται. It is certainly possible to see present tense καταργεῖται as denoting a process that was ongoing at the time of writing, but it is better, especially if κάλυμμα is the implied subject, to take it as a gnomic present, expressing a general truth, or as an iterative present, of the removal of the veil from a succession of hearts (cf. v. 15) when persons turn to the Lord (v. 16). If the old covenant were, in fact, the subject of καταργεῖται, we would have expected Paul to write κατήργηται ('has been annulled,' 'is void') or κατηργήθη ('was abrogated')." ("2 Corinthians," NIGTC, 304)

F. W. Farrar: "The present tense, 'is *in course* of annulment,' might naturally be used until the utter abrogation of even the possible fulfilment of the Mosaic Law at the fall of Jerusalem." ("2 Corinthians," PC, 61)

Roger Omanson: "*Remains unlified, because only through Christ is it taken away:* the Greek text of this verse may be punctuated in a different way which slightly changes the meaning. If a comma is placed after the word *remains*, the proposition would stop with "that same veil remains." The *RSV unlified* is more literally "not revealed." The conjunction translated *because* in *RSV* will be translated 'that.' The rest of the verse is then translated as 'nor is it revealed to them that this covenant has been abolished by Christ.' This alternate translation is given in the footnotes of both *NJB* and *NVSR*, and in the text of *Mft*.

"*Is it taken away:* the subject of the verb *taken away* is not explicit in Greek. *TEV* understands the subject to be 'the veil,' which is the closest possible noun that could be referred to in the structure of the Greek. This interpretation has the advantage of keeping the same subject as for the verb *remains*. On the other hand the subject of the verb *taken away* in 3:11, 13 is the old covenant, and some interpreters consider *the old covenant* to be the implicit subject." (*UBS Handbook: 2 Corinthians*, 67)

Marvin R. Vincent: "**Untaken away** (μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον). Rev., admirably — giving the force of ἀνά up — *unlified*. But both A. V. and Rev construe *unlified* with *veil: the same veil remaineth untaken away (unlified)*. This is objectionable, because καταργεῖται *is done away* is used throughout the chapter of the glory of the Mosaic ministry, while another word is employed in ver. 16 of the taking away of the veil. Further, the reading of the best texts is ὅτι *that* or *because*, and not ὅ τι *which*. *Because* is not true to the fact, since the veil remains unlified, not because it is done away in Christ, but because of the hardness of their hearts. It is better, therefore, to take μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον *unlified*, as a nominative absolute, and to render, *it not being revealed that it (the veil) is being done away in Christ*. This falls in naturally with the drift of the whole passage. The veil remains on their hearts, since it is not revealed to them that the Mosaic economy is done away in Christ." (WSNT, 3:307-308)

Clinton Hamilton: "Is done away' is translated from *katargeitai*, which is the perfect passive indicative form of *katargeo*. There were Jews in Paul's day who were still reading the law with the veil of a hardened heart. This kept them from understanding that the law had already been abolished in Christ, which is the sense of the perfect passive, this passive action having occurred back of the present. The action of the ceasing of the law had already occurred. He most certainly is not speaking of the law's being in the process of ceasing in a 40 year transition period. To interpret this passage to mean this is to wrest the language and the context in which it appears." ("The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory," *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 39)

Appendix D: Comments On Heb. 8:13

Marc Gibson: “[T]his statement (‘is ready to vanish away’) is not made from the Hebrew writer’s point of view, but from the viewpoint of Jeremiah’s prophecy that had announced the ‘new covenant.’ God made the first covenant obsolete when *he said* “A new covenant’ and this is when it began growing old and vanishing away. When Christ came the first time, the old, vanishing covenant was taken away (2 Cor. 3:16; Gal. 3:24-25).” (“The A.D. 70 Doctrine Examined,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 20)

Bill Reeves: “The Hebrew writer indicates that God considered the Old Covenant as obsolete in *Jeremiah’s* time! When did God say that He would make a *new* covenant? Back in Jeremiah’s time! What did God do to the first covenant when He said that? He made it old. What about anything old and obsolete? It is near to disappearing. This is what Heb. 8:13 is talking about!” (“The Preterist View Heresy (III), *A Study Of The A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 78)

Marvin R. Vincent: “**Is ready to vanish away**...Lit. *is nigh unto vanishing*....The whole statement indicates that the writer regarded the Sinaitic covenant, even in Jeremiah’s time, as obsolete, and that Jeremiah himself so regarded it. When God announced a new covenant he proclaimed the insufficiency of the old, and the promise of a new covenant carried with it the promise of the abrogation of the old.” (WSNT, 4:473-474)

Kenneth Wuest: “In saying the word ‘new’ (v. 8) God through the prophet Jeremiah had even at that time made the First Testament old. The distinctive Greek word for ‘old’ here is not *archaios* (ἀρχαῖος), namely, that which is old in point of time, but, *palaaios* (παλαιος), that which is old in point of use, worn-out, antiquated, useless, outmoded. Even in Jeremiah’s time, the insufficiency of the First Testament was recognized, and the need of a new one proclaimed.

“The words ‘**made old**’ are the translation of *palaioo* (παλαιοο) which verb has the same root as the noun *palaaios* (παλαιος) mentioned above. It is in the **perfect tense**, which tense speaks of **an action completed in past time having present results**. Thus, we could translate, **‘In saying new, He has permanently antiquated the first (covenant).’** The word ‘decayeth’ is the translation of the same verb, and we have ‘that which is being antiquated.’ The words ‘waxeth old’ are the translation of *gerasko* (γερασκο) which means ‘to grow old’ and carries with it the suggestion of the waning strength and the decay which are incident to old age. It has the meanings also of being obsolescent, failing from age.” (Bold emphasis added, WWSGNT, 149)

Clinton Hamilton: “One needs to take a look at this passage in context. It should be noted that verse 13 is introduced by the expression ‘in that he saith, a new covenant he hath made the first old.’ The verb translated ‘**hath made the first old,**’ *pepalaioken*, is the perfect active indicative of *palaioo* which ‘denotes in the Active Voice, to make or declare old, Heb. 8:13 (1st part)’ (Vine III:135). ‘Saith’ is from *lego* that means to say and appears here as an aorist perfect infinitive. **At the point that God said that He would make a new covenant (Heb. 8:8; Jer. 31:31), he at that point made the first covenant old** is the sense of this aorist tense. **The perfect active indicative, *pepalaioken*, indicates this was done back of the present which in context is the point in the past when God did the saying** under discussion. *Palaioo* is defined ‘make old, declare or treat as obsolete . . . treat the first covenant as obsolete Hb 8:13a’ (AG 610). Thayer says of it in this context, ‘to declare a thing old and so about to be abrogated’ (474).” (“The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 37)

Clinton Hamilton: “The very fact that God said he would make a *new* covenant made (active voice) the first covenant *old*. If it is old, then it decays and waxes aged and is near to **vanishing or being abolished**. ‘Waxeth old’ is the translation of *gerasko* which is the present active participial form of the verb *gerasko* means ‘to grow old’ (Vine III:136). . . . **The idea is that it is in the process on a linear path of becoming old and obsolete from the point at which God made the prediction in Jeremiah 31:31.** It is moving toward being abolished or taken out of effect. . . . **It is moving toward obsolescence from the day**

that God made the prediction of the new covenant.” (“The End Of All Things And The A.D. 70 Theory,” *A Study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine*, 37)

Leon Morris: “The author picks out the word ‘new’ (cf. v. 8) and sees it as making his essential point. It implies that something else is ‘old’ and that the old is to be replaced. **When God speaks of a ‘new’ covenant, then, it means that the old one is obsolete. And that in turn means that it is close to disappearing.** It is not something people should go back to with nostalgia. The words used of it emphasize that it is ineffective, unable to meet people’s needs, outworn.” (“Hebrews,” EBC, 12:79)

Simon Kistemaker: “Already in the days of Jeremiah, approximately six hundred years before the birth of Christ, God spoke of a new covenant. **By implication, the existing covenant was then already ‘obsolete and aging.’**” (BNTC, 228)

Simon Kistemaker: “ἐν τῷ λέγειν—the articular present infinitive with the preposition ἐν is in the dative case. The dative expresses time; that is, ‘while he is saying.’

“πεπαλαίωκεν—from the verb παλαιόω (I make old), **the perfect active suggests action with lasting result.** The active, not the passive, is used to indicate that God has declared the covenant old.” (BNTC, 230)

J. Barmby: **“He hath made the first old’ (πεπαλαίωκε) refers to the time of Jeremiah’s prophecy, not of the writing of the Epistle. The very mention of a new covenant had even then antiquated the other.** It thenceforth survived only under the category of *old* as opposed to *new*; and further marked with the growing decrepitude which is the precursor of dissolution. This further idea is expressed by the present participle παλαιούμενον (elsewhere applied to garments that are wearing out; cf. Ps. 102:27; ch. 1:11; Isa. 50:9; 51:6; Luke 12:33), and also by γηράσκον, a figure taken from the advance of old age in men. When the Epistle was written, it would not have been spoken of as ‘waxing old,’ but as defunct. The temple, indeed, was still standing, with the old ritual going on; but it had become but as the stately shrine of a lifeless thing.” (“Hebrews,” PC, 212)

JFB: **“made ... old— ‘hath (at the time of speaking the prophecy) antiquated the first covenant.’** From the time of God’s mention of a new covenant (since God’s words are all realities) the first covenant might be regarded as ever dwindling away, until its complete abolition on the actual introduction of the Gospel. Both covenants cannot exist side by side....

“that which decayeth—Greek, ‘that which is being antiquated,’ namely, at the time when Jeremiah spake. For in Paul’s time, according to his view, the new had absolutely set aside the old covenant. The *Greek* for (*Kaine*) *New* (Testament) implies that it is *of a different kind* and *supersedes the old*: not merely *recent* (*Greek, ‘nea’*).” (Elec. Ed., n.p.)

Appendix E: Definitions Of Mello

BDAG: 1. **to take place at a future point of time and so to be subsequent to another event, be about to**, used w. an inf. foll. a. only rarely w. the fut. inf., w. which it is regularly used in ancient Gk. (Hom. et al.), since in colloquial usage the fut. inf. and ptc. were gradually disappearing and being replaced by combinations with μέλλω (B-D-F §338, 3; 350; s. Rob. 882; 889). **W. the fut. inf. μ. denotes certainty that an event will occur in the future** μ. ἔσεσθαι (SIG 914, 10 μέλλει ἔσεσθαι; 247 I, 74 ἔμελλε ... [δῶσε]ιν; Jos., Ant. 13, 322; Mel., P. 57, 415) **will certainly take place or be** **Ac 11:28; 24:15; 27:10**; 1 Cl 43:6; cp. Dg 8:2. b. w. the aor. inf. (rarely in ancient Gk. [but as early as Hom., and e.g. X., Cyr. 1, 4, 16]; Herodas 3, 78 and 91; UPZ 70, 12 [152/1 b.c.]; PGiss 12, 5; POxy 1067, 17; 1488, 20; Ex 4:12; Job 3:8; 2 Macc 14:41; JosAs 29:3; ParJer 9:13; GrBar 4:15 [Christ.]; ApcMos13; s. Phryn. p. 336; 745ff Lob.; WRutherford, New Phryn. 1881, 420ff) **be on the point of, be about to**, μ. ἀποκαλυφθῆναι **be about to be revealed Ro 8:18**. τὸ δωδεκάφυλον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μέλλον ἀπολέσθαι *the twelve tribes of Israel that were about to be destroyed* 1 Cl 55:6. ἤμελλεν προαγαγεῖν **Ac 12:6**. ἀποθανεῖν **Rv 3:2**. ἐμέσαι vs. **16**. τεκεῖν **12:4**. c. w. the pres. inf. So mostly (ca. 80 times in the NT.; oft. in lit., ins, pap, LXX; TestAbr B 4 p. 108, 14 [Stone p. 64]; ApcEsdr 6:23f p. 32, 2f Tdf.; EpArist; Demetr.: 722 Fgm. 7 Jac.; Just., A I, 51, 8; D. 32, 4 al.; Tat. 14, 1; Mel., P. 38, 263; Ath. 32, 1). α. *be about to, be on the point of* ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν *he was at the point of death* (Aristot. Fgm. 277 [in Apollon. Paradox. 27] and Diod S 6, 4, 3 μέλλων τελευτᾶν; cp. Jos., Ant. 4, 83; 12, 357) **Lk 7:2**. Also ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν (Artem. 4, 24 p. 217, 5 γραῦς μέλλουσα ἀποθνήσκειν; Aesop, Fab. 131 P.=202 H.; 233 P.=216 H.; 2 Macc 7:18; 4 Macc 10:9) **J 4:47**. ἤμελλεν ἐαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν *he was about to kill himself* **Ac 16:27**. Of God's eschat. reign μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι 1 Cl 42:3. Of heavenly glory ἢ μέλλουσα ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι **1 Pt 5:1**. Cp. **Lk 19:4; J 6:6; Ac 3:3; 5:35; 18:14; 21:27; 22:26; 23:27**.—**Occasionally almost = begin** ἤμελλον γράφειν **Rv 10:4**. ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα *when all these things are (or begin) to be accomplished* **Mk 13:4**; cp. **Lk 21:7; Rv 10:7**. β. **in a weakened sense it serves simply as a periphrasis for the fut.** (PMich III, 202, 8ff; 13ff [105 a.d.].—Mayser II/1, 226) ὅσα λαλῶ ἢ καὶ μ. λαλεῖν (=ἢ καὶ λαλήσω) *what I tell or shall tell* Hm 4, 4, 3. So esp. oft. in Hermas: μ. λέγειν v 1, 1, 6; 3, 8, 11; m 11:7, 17; Hs 5, 2, 1. μ. ἐντέλλεσθαι v 5:5; m 5, 2, 8. μ. κατοικεῖν Hs 1:1; 4:2. μ. χωρεῖν (=χωρήσω) IMg 5:1. μ. βασιλεύειν GJs 23:2.—Substitute for the disappearing fut. forms (inf. and ptc. B-D-F §356); for the fut. inf.: προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν πίμπρασθαι **Ac 28:6**; for the fut. ptc.: ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι **Mt 11:14**. ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν *the one who was going to do this* **Lk 22:23**; cp. **24:21; Ac 13:34**. οἱ μέλλοντες πιστεύειν *those who were to believe (in him) in the future* **1 Ti 1:16**; 1 Cl 42:4; Hm 4, 3, 3. μέλλοντες ἀσεβεῖν *those who were to be ungodly in the future* **2 Pt 2:6** v.l. (s. 3, end). Of Christ ὁ μέλλων κρίνειν **2 Ti 4:1**; 7:2. οἱ μέλλοντες ἀρνεῖσθαι = οἱ ἀρνησόμενοι Hv 2, 2, 8. πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους *raging fire that will devour the opponents* **Hb 10:27**. γ. **denoting an intended action: intend, propose, have in mind** μέλλει Ἡρῴδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον *Herod intends to search for the child* **Mt 2:13**. οὐ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι *where he himself intended to come* **Lk 10:1**. μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι *they intended to come* **J 6:15**. Cp. vs. 71; 7:35; 12:4; 14:22; **Ac 17:31**; 20:3, 7, 13ab; 23:15; 26:2; 27:30; **Hb 8:5**; **2 Pt 1:12**. τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν; *what do you intend to do?* Hs 1:5. οὐ μ. ποιεῖν *I have no intention of doing* MPol 8:2. μ. προσηλοῦν *they wanted to nail him fast* 13:3. μ. λαμβάνειν *we wanted to take him out* 17:2. 2. **to be inevitable, be destined, inevitable** a. w. pres. inf. **to denote an action that necessarily follows a divine decree is destined, must, will certainly** ... μ. πάσχειν *he is destined to suffer* **Mt 17:12**; B 7:10; 12:2; cp. 6:7. μ. σταυροῦσθαι *must be crucified* 12:1. μ. παραδίδοσθαι **Mt 17:22; Lk 9:44**; 16:5. ἔμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν **J 11:51; 12:33; 18:32**. ἐν σαρκὶ μ. φανεροῦσθαι B 6:7, 9, 14. Cp. **Mt 16:27; 20:22; Ro 4:24; 8:13; Rv 12:5**. οὐκέτι μέλλουσιν ... θεωρεῖν *they should no more see* ... **Ac 20:38**. τὰ μ. γίνεσθαι *what must come to pass* **26:22**; cp. **Rv 1:19**. διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν *those who are to inherit salvation* **Hb 1:14**. μέλλομεν θλιβεσθαι *that we were to be afflicted* **1 Th 3:4**.—

Mk 10:32; Lk 9:31; J 7:39; Hb 11:8. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἔμελλε θηριομαχεῖν *on the day on which Paul was to fight the wild animals* AcPl Ha 3, 9. ὡς μελλούσης τῆς πόλεως αἵρεσθαι *in expectation of the city's destruction* 5, 16. ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυροῦσθαι *I (Jesus) am about to be crucified once more* 7, 39. b. w. aor. inf. ἀποκαλυφθῆναι *that is destined (acc. to God's will) to be revealed* **Gal 3:23**. 3. The ptc. is used abs. in the mng. **(in the) future, to come** (Pind., O. 10, 7 ὁ μέλλων χρόνος 'the due date') ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων *the age to come* (s. αἰὼν 2b), which brings the reign of God (opp. ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος or ὁ νῦν αἰὼν) **Mt 12:32; Eph 1:21**; 2 Cl 6:3; Pol 5:2; cp. **Hb 6:5**. Also ὁ μ. καιρός (opp. ὁ νῦν κ.) 4:1. ἡ μ. ζωὴ (opp. ἡ νῦν ζ.) **1 Ti 4:8**. ὁ μ. βίος (opp. ὁ νῦν β.) 2 Cl 20:2. ἡ μ. βασιλεία 5:5; ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μ. **the world to come Hb 2:5**. ἡ μέλλουσα πόλις (as wordplay, opp. [οὐ ...] μένουσα π.) **13:14**. ἡ μ. ἐπαγγελία *the promise for the future* 2 Cl 10:3f. τὰ μ. ἀγαθὰ **Hb 9:11** v.l.; Hv 1, 1, 8. ἡ μ. ἀνάστασις 1 Cl 24:1; τὸ κρῖμα τὸ μ. **the judgment to come Ac 24:25**; cp. 1 Cl 28:1; 2 Cl 18:2; MPol 11:2. ἡ μ. ὁργή **Mt 3:7**; IEph 11:1. ἡ μ. θλίψις Hv 4, 2, 5. τὰ μ. σκάνδαλα 4:9.—ἡ μέλλουσα σου ἀδελφή *your future sister*=the one who in the future will be your sister, no longer your wife Hv 2, 2, 3. Several times the noun can be supplied fr. the context: τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, i.e. Ἀδάμ **Ro 5:14**.—Subst. τὸ μέλλον *the future* (Aeneas Tact. 422; 431 al.; Antiphanes Com. [IV b.c.] 227 K.; Menand., Monostich. 412 [608 Jaekel] Mei.; Anacreont. 36; Plut., Caes. 14, 4; Herodian 1, 14, 2; SIG 609, 5; ViEzk 13 [p. 75, 12 Sch.]; Philo, Mel.) 1 Cl 31:3. εἰς τὸ μ. *for the future* (Jos., Ant. 9, 162) **1 Ti 6:19**; specif. *(in the) next year* (PLond III, 1231, 4 p. 108 [144 a.d.] τὴν εἰς τὸ μέλλον γεωργίαν; s. Field, Notes 65) **Lk 13:9**. τὰ μ. *the things to come* (X., Symp. 4, 47; Aeneas Tact. 1050; Artem. 1, 36; Wsd 19:1; TestJob 47:9; JosAs 23:8; Philo; Just., D. 7, 1; Ath. 27, 2) **Col 2:17**; PtK 3 p. 15, 21. (Opp. τὰ ἐνεστώτα *the present* as PGM 5, 295) **Ro 8:38; 1 Cor 3:22**; B 1:7; 5:3; 17:2. Ox 1081 39f (SJCh 91, 2) (s. ἀρχή 2). Uncertain **2 Pt 2:6** (if ἀσεβέσιν is to be retained, the ref. is to impending judgment for the impious). 4. **delay** τί μέλλεις *why are you delaying?* (cp. Aeschyl., Prom. 36; Eur., Hec. 1094; Thu. 8, 78; Lucian, Dial. Mort. 10, 13; Jos., Bell. 3, 494 τί μέλλομεν; 4 Macc 6:23; 9:1) **Ac 22:16**. οὐ μελλήσας *without delay* AcPl Ha 8, 4. The connection in AcPt Ox 849, 1 is uncertain.—B. 974. DELG. M-M. TW." (627-628)

Thayer: "μέλλω; fut. μελλήσω (Mt. 24:6; and L T Tr WH in 2 Pet. 1:12); impf. ἔμελλον [so all edd. in Lk. 9:31 (exc. T WH); Jn. 6:6, 71 (R G); 7:39 (exc. T); 11:51 (exc. L Tr); Acts 21:27; Rev. 3:2 (where R pres.); 10:4 (exc. L Tr)] and ἡμελλον [so all edd. in Lk. 7:2; 10:1 (exc. R G); 19:4; Jn. 4:47; 12:33; 18:32; Acts 12:6 (exc. R G L); 16:27 (exc. R G); 27:33 (exc. R G T); Heb. 11:8 (exc. L); cf. reff. s. v. βούλομαι, init. and Rutherford's note on Babrius 7, 15], **to be about to do anything**; so

"1. the ptc., ὁ μέλλων, absol.: τὰ μέλλοντα and τὰ ἐνεστώτα are contrasted, Ro. 8:38; 1 Co. 3:22; εἰς τὸ μέλλον, **for the future, hereafter**, Lk. 13:9 [but see εἰς, A. II. 2 (where Grimm supplies ἔτος)]; 1 Tim. 6:19; τὰ μέλλοντα, **things future, things to come**, i.e., acc. to the context, the more perfect state of things which will exist in the αἰὼν μέλλων, Col. 2:17; with nouns, ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, **Mt. 12:32; Eph. 1:21**; ἡ μέλλ. ζωὴ, 1 Tim. 4:8; ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλ. **Heb. 2:5**; ἡ μ. ὁργή, **Mt. 3:7**; τὸ κρῖμα τὸ μέλλον, **Acts 24:25**; πόλις, Heb. 13:14; τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθὰ, Heb. 9:11 [but L Tr mrg. WH txt. γενομένων]; 10:1; τοῦ μέλλοντος sc. Ἀδάμ, i.e. the Messiah, Ro. 5:14.

"2. joined to an infin. [cf. W. 333 sq. (313); B. § 140, 2], a. **to be on the point of doing or suffering something**: w. inf. present, ἡμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, Acts 16:27; τελευτάν, Lk. 7:2; ἀποθνήσκειν, Jn. 4:47; add, **Lk. 21:7**; Acts 3:3; 18:14; 20:3; 22:26; 23:27; w. inf. passive, Acts 21:27; 27:33, etc. b. **to intend, have in mind, think to**: w. inf. present, Mt. 2:13; Lk. 10:1; 19:4; Jn. 6:6, 15; 7:35; 12:4; 14:22; Acts 5:35; **17:31**; 20:7, 13; 22:26; 26:2; 27:30; Heb. 8:5; [2 Pet. 1:12 L T Tr WH]; Rev. 10:4; w. inf. aorist (a constr. censured by Phryn. p. 336, but authenticated more recently by many exx. fr. the best writ. fr. Hom. down; cf. W. 333 (313) sq.; Lob. ad Phryn. p. 745 sqq.; [but see Rutherford, New Phryn. p. 420 sqq.]): Acts 12:6 L T WH; Rev. 2:10 (βαλεῖν R G); 3:16; 12:4; w. fut. inf. ἔσεσθαι, Acts 23:30 R G. c. as in Grk. writ. fr. Hom. down, **of those things which will come to pass (or which one will do or suffer) by fixed necessity or divine**

appointment (Germ. *sollen* [*are to be, destined to be, etc.*]); w. pres. inf. active: Mt. 16:27; 17:12; 20:22; Lk. 9:31; Jn. 6:71; 7:39; 11:51; 12:33; 18:32; Acts 20:38; 26:22, 23; Heb. 1:14; 11:8; Rev. 2:10; 3:10; 8:13, etc.; Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι, Mt. 11:14; ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι, Lk. 14:21; κρίνειν, 2 Tim. 4:1 [WH mrg. κρίναι]; w. pres. inf. passive: Mt. 17:22; Mk. 13:4; Lk. 9:44; 19:11; 21:36; Acts 26:22; Ro. 4:24; 1 Th. 3:4; Jas. 2:12; Rev. 1:19 [Tdf. γενέσθαι]: 6:11; τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης, 1 Pet. 5:1; w. aor. inf.: τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, Ro. 8:18; τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, Gal. 3:23; **used also of those things which we infer from certain preceding events will of necessity follow**: w. inf. pres., Acts 28:6; Ro. 8:13; w. inf. fut. Acts 7:10. **d.** in general, **of what is sure to happen**: w. inf. pres., Mt. 24:6; Jn. 6:71; 1 Tim. 1:16; Rev. 12:5; 17:8; w. inf. fut. ἔσεσθαι, Acts 11:28; 24:15. **e.** **to be always on the point of doing without ever doing, i.e. to delay**: τί μέλλεις; Acts 22:16 (Aeschyl. Prom. 36; τί μέλλετε; Eur. Hec. 1094; Lcian. dial. mort. 10, 13, and often in prof. auth.; 4 Macc. 6:23; 9:1).” (#3195, 396-397)

Yellow Highlight = Inevitability (Certainty)

Blue Highlight = Imminence

Note: RE “proof texts” are not listed as examples of imminence in these lexical definitions

Appendix F: Translations Of *Mello* In RE “Proof Texts”

	Mt. 3:7	Mt. 12:32	Mt.16:27	Mk. 13:4	Lk. 3:7
ASV	to come	to come	shall	are about to come	to come
ESV	to come	to come	is going to	are about to	to come
HCSB	the coming (wrath)	to come	is going to	are about to	the coming
ISV	the coming (wrath)	to come	is going to	will be	the coming
KJV	to come	to come	shall	shall	to come
LEB	the coming (wrath)	the coming (one)	is going to	are about to	the coming
NET	the coming (wrath)	to come	will	are about to	the coming
NAB	the coming (wrath)	to come	will	are about to	the coming
NASB	to come	to come	is going to	are going to	to come
NCV	God’s coming punishment	the future	will	are going to	coming
NIV	the coming (wrath)	to come	is going to	are all about to	coming
NKJV	to come	to come	will	will be	to come
NRSV	to come	to come	is to	are about to	to come
RSV	to come	to come	is to	are all to be	to come
YLT	the coming wrath	that which is coming	is about to	may be about to	the coming
GBS Int.	being about to be	one being about to be	is about	are about	being about to be
NA27 Int.	being about to be	one being about to be	is about	are about	being about to be
Newberry Int.	coming	coming [one]	for is about	be about	coming
Lex. Int.	(in the future), to come coming	(in the future), to come coming	to be about to, is going to is going	to be about to, is going to are about	(in the future), to come coming

	Lk. 21:7	Lk.21:36	Acts 17:31	Acts 24:15	Acts 24:25
ASV	are about	shall come	will	shall	to come
ESV	are about	are going to	is going to	will	coming (judgment)
HCSB	are about	are going to	is going to	is going to	to come
ISV	are about	are going to	is going to	is to be	coming (judgment)
KJV	shall come	shall come	shall	shall	to come
LEB	are about	are going to	is going to	is going to	that is to come
NET	are about	must	will	is going to	coming (judgment)
NAB	are about	are imminent	will	will	coming (judgment)
NASB	are about	are about to	is going to	shall certainly be	to come
NCV	are about	will	will	will surely be	the time when God will
NIV	are about	is about to	will	will be	to come
NKJV	are about	will come	will	(untranslated)	to come
NRSV	is about	will take place	will	will	coming (judgment)
RSV	is about	will take place	will	will	future (judgment)
YLT	may be about	are about to	about to	about to	about to be

	Lk. 21:7	Lk.21:36	Acts 17:31	Acts 24:15	Acts 24:25
GBS Int.	it is about	being about to	he is about	to be about	being about
NA27 Int.	it is about	being about to	he is about	to be about	being about
Newberry Int.	are about	are about	he is about	is about	about
Lex. Int.	to be about to, is going to are about	to be about to, is going to are about	to be about to, is going to he is going	to be about to, is going to [that] there is going	(in the) future, to come that is to come

	Rom. 8:18	Eph. 1:21	2 Tim. 4:1	Heb. 2:5	Heb. 10:27
ASV	shall be	come	shall	to come	which shall
ESV	is to be	come	is to	to come	that will
HCSB	is going to be	come	is going to	to come	about to
ISV	will be	come	is going to	coming (world)	that will
KJV	shall be	come	shall	to come	which shall
LEB	is about to	coming one	is going to	to come	that is about to
NET	will be	come	is going to	to come	that will
NAB	for	come	is going to	to come	that is going to
NASB	is to be	come	will	to come	which will
NCV	will be	next	is to	was coming	that will
NIV	will be	come	will	to come	that will
NKJV	shall be	come	will	to come	which will
NRSV	about to be	come	is to	coming (world)	that will
RSV	is to be	come	is to	to come	which will
YLT	about to be	coming one	about to	coming (world)	about to
GBS Int.	being about	one being about to be	being about	about to be	being about
NA27 Int.	being about	one being about to be	being about	about to be	being about
Newberry Int.	about	coming [one]	is about	is to come	about
Lex. Int.	to be about to that is about to	(in the) future, to come coming one	To be about to, is going to, is destined to who is going	(in the) future, to come to come	to be about to is going to that is about

Appendix G: Definitions Of “Elements” (stoicheion)

BDAG: “1. **basic components of someth., elements** a. of substances underlying the natural world, the basic **elements** fr. which everything in the world is made and of which it is composed...to disappear in the world conflagration at the end of time **2 Pt 3:10, 12**....The four elements of the world (earth, air, fire, water).... b. of basic components of celestial constellations, **heavenly bodies**.... c. of things that constitute the foundation of learning, **fundamental principles**... or even *letters of the alphabet, ABC’s... the very elements of the truths of God Hb 5:12*. This mng. is also prob. for the passages in Gal (**4:3, 9** NEB ‘elementary ideas belonging to this world’...) and Col; s. next. 2. **transcendent powers that are in control over events in this world, elements, elemental spirits**. The mng. of στ. in τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου **Gal 4:3; Col 2:8, 20** (for the expr. στοιχ. τ. κόσμου cp. SibOr 2, 206; 3, 80f; 8, 337) and τὰ ἀσθενή καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα **Gal 4:9** is much disputed....Some (e.g. Burton, Goodsp.) prefer to take it in sense 1c above, as referring to the elementary forms of religion, Jewish and polytheistic, which have been superseded by the new revelation in Christ.... —Others (e.g. WBauer, Mft., NRSV) hold that the ref. is to the *elemental spirits* which the syncretistic religious tendencies of later antiquity associated w. the physical elements....” (946)

Thayer: “**στοιχείον**, -ου, τό, (fr. στοιχος a row, rank, series; hence prop. that which belongs to any στοιχος, that of which a στοιχος is composed; hence), **any first thing, from which the others belonging to some series or composite whole take their rise; an element, first principle**. The word denotes spec.

“1. **the letters of the alphabet** as the elements of speech, not however the written characters (which are called γράμματα), but the spoken sounds: στοιχείον φωνῆς φωνῇ ἀσύνθετος, Plat. defin. p. 414 e.; τὸ ῥῶ τὸ στοιχείον, id. Crat. p. 426 d.; στοιχείον ἐστὶ φωνῇ ἀδιαίρετος, οὐ πάσα δέ, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἧς πέφυκε συνετὴ γίνεσθαι φωνή, Aristot. poet. 20, p. 1456, 22.

“2. **the elements from which all things have come, the material causes of the universe** (ἐστὶ δὲ στοιχείον, ἐξ οὗ πρώτου γίνεται τὰ γινόμενα καὶ εἰς ὃ ἔσχατον ἀναλύεται ... τὸ πῦρ, τὸ ὕδωρ, ὁ ἀήρ, ἡ γῆ, Diog. Laërt. Zeno 69, 137); so very often fr. Plat. down, as in Tim. p. 48 b.; in the Scriptures: Sap. 7:17; 19:17; **2 Pet. 3:10, 12**.

“3. **the heavenly bodies**, either as parts of the heavens, or (as others think) because in them the elements of man’s life and destiny were supposed to reside; so in the earlier eccles. writ.: Ep. ad Diogn. 7, 2; Justin. M. dial. c. Tryph. 23; τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα, id. apol. 2, 5; στοιχεῖα θεοῦ, created by God, Theoph. Ant. ad Autol. 1, 4; cf. Hilgenfeld, Galaterbrief, pp. 66–77. Hence some interpreters infelicitously understand Paul’s phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. 4:3, 9; Col. 2:8, 20, of the heavenly bodies, because times and seasons, and so sacred seasons, were regulated by the course of the sun and moon; yet in unfolding the meaning of the passage on the basis of this sense they differ widely.

“4. **the elements, rudiments, primary and fundamental principles** (cf. our ‘alphabet’ or ‘a b c’) **of any art, science, or discipline**; e.g. of mathematics, as in the title of Euclid’s well-known work; στοιχεῖα πρῶτα καὶ μέγιστα χρηστῆς πολιτείας, Isocr. p. 18 a.; τῆς ἀρετῆς, Plut. de puer. educ. 16, 2; many exx. are given in Passow s. v. 4, ii. p. 1550^b; [cf. L. and S. s. v. II. 3 and 4]. In the N. T. we have τὰ στ. τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ (see ἀρχή, 1 b. p. 76 bot.), Heb. 5:12, such as are taught to νήπιοι, ib. 13; τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, the rudiments with which mankind like νήπιοι were indoctrinated before the time of Christ, i. e. the elements of religious training, or the ceremonial precepts common alike to the worship of Jews and of Gentiles, Gal. 4:3, 9, (and since these requirements on account of the difficulty of observing them are to be regarded as a yoke—cf. Acts 15:10; Gal. 5:1—those who rely upon them are said to be δεδουλωμένοι ὑπὸ τὰ στ.); spec. the ceremonial requirements esp. of Jewish tradition, minutely set forth by theosophists and false teachers, and fortified by specious arguments, Col. 2:8, 20....” (588-589)

Vine: “*stoicheion* (στοιχεῖον, 4747), used in the plural, primarily signifies any first things from which others in a series, or a composite whole take their rise; the word denotes “an element, first principle” (from *stoichos*, ‘a row, rank, series’; cf. the verb *stoicheo*, ‘to walk or march in rank’; see walk); it was used of the letters of the alphabet, as elements of speech. In the NT it is used of (a) the substance of the material world, 2 Pet. 3:10, 12; (b) the delusive speculations of gentile cults and of Jewish theories, treated as elementary principles, ‘the rudiments of the world,’ Col. 2:8, spoken of as ‘philosophy and vain deceit’; these were presented as superior to faith in Christ; at Colosse the worship of angels, mentioned in v. 18, is explicable by the supposition, held by both Jews and Gentiles in that district, that the constellations were either themselves animated heavenly beings, or were governed by them; (c) the rudimentary principles of religion, Jewish or Gentile, also described as ‘the rudiments of the world,’ Col. 2:20, and as ‘weak and beggarly rudiments,’ Gal. 4:3, 9, RV, constituting a yoke of bondage; (d) the ‘elementary’ principles (the A.B.C.) of the OT, as a revelation from God, Heb. 5:12, RV, ‘rudiments,’ lit., ‘the rudiments of the beginning of the oracles of God,’ such as are taught to spiritual babes.” (2:196)

Kittel: “4. In 2 Pt. 3:10, 12 the only possible meaning is obviously “elements” (→ 673, 32 ff.) or “stars” (→ 681, 10 ff.). The former is suggested (→ III, 644, 16 ff.; V, 515, n. 136) by the use of terms found in the widespread doctrine of the elements, e.g., λύεσθαι (Plat. Tim., 56e; 57b) and τήκεσθαι (→ 673, 10 f.) It is supported by the adoption of the Stoic idea of a cosmic conflagration in which the other elements will dissolve into the primal element of fire. The use of “dissolution of the elements” for the destruction of the world, which is adequate in itself, is elucidated in 3:10 by a description of the overthrow of the main parts of the visible world consisting of the highest and lowest elements; for this reason the earth does not need to be mentioned again in 3:12. It is improbable that the οὐρανοί as the vault of heaven are being differentiated from the stars (στοιχεῖα) which belong to it. (#4747, TDNT, 7:686)