

CLASS NOTES - ESCHATOLOGY

Taught By Robert Stapleton



**COPIES OF THIS MATERIAL MAY
ONLY BE MADE WITH
PERMISSION BY AUTHOR**

ESCHATOLOGY CLASS INSTRUCTIONS

Robert Stapleton

CLASS DESCRIPTION:

1. This class seeks to conduct a brief overview of Premillennialism and Realized Eschatology.
 - A. Emphasis will be placed on showing the weaknesses of both doctrines.

ESCHATOLOGY COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Two tests will be given.
 - A. Tests will be over Premillennialism and Realized Eschatology.
 - B. Each test will account for 30% of your total grade.
 - C. Any additional credit will be at the instructor's discretion.
2. Each student is to write a term paper on either the subject of Premillennialism or Realized Eschatology.
 - A. Your term paper should be between five and ten double-spaced typed pages, Times New Roman 12 Font.
 - B. Watch for misspelled words and check your grammar.
 - C. Term paper should be turned in to instructor no later than the beginning of class day during the finals week – late papers count one grade per day off.
 - D. Term paper will account for 20% of your total course grade.
3. Each student is to prepare one twenty minute sermon (3-5 pages) on each of the main subjects under consideration.
 - A. Sermons may be preached at some point during the quarter and will count for 20% of your total grade – if not presented, outlines will count as grade.
4. The accumulated articles in booklet entitled “Additional Notes – Kingism” are to be read prior to the time class begins on Realized Eschatology, with a reading log kept.
 - A. Reading log should be turned in to instructor no later than the beginning of class day during the finals week.
5. Recommended Reading:
 - A. Prophecy Foretold Prophecy Fulfilled, E. R. Harper.
 - B. Truth, The Millennium, And The Battle of Armageddon, Leslie G. Thomas.
 - C. Prophecy and Premillennialism, J.D. Bales.
 - D. The Bible Doctrine of Final Things, Robert Taylor, Jr.
 - E. Contemporary Options in Eschatology, Millard Erickson.
 - F. The Kingdoms of God and the Planet Earth, Jim McGuiggan.
 - G. What The Bible Says About The End Time, Russell Boatman.
 - H. The A.D. 70 Theory, A Review of the Max King Doctrine, Wayne Jackson.
 - I. Hansen-Webster Debate on Eschatology, Jack Hansen, Bruce Webster.
 - J. Studies In Biblical Eschatology, Volume I, W. Terry Varner.
 - K. A.D. 70 Revisited, Jim McGuiggan.
 - L. A Study of the AD 70 Doctrine, Mike Willis
 - M. An Introduction To Eschatology, Leon Crouch
 - N. Classical Pre-Millennialism – A Debate, Jim Waldron

PREMILLENNIALISM CLASS NOTES

Robert Stapleton

INTRODUCTION:

1. With the constant changes in the middle-east there is always someone who wants to discuss issues pertaining to the coming of Christ, and how they relate to biblical teaching.
 - A. Since the time of Christ it appears that countless numbers of people have been caught up in end-time dialogue.
 - B. Discussions, on matters of eschatology, constantly run full-steam ahead.
 1. Eschatology - the study of end-time matters.
 2. As part of the class on eschatology we are to consider the subject of premillennialism.
 - A. To accomplish this we will consider the following points:
 1. Premillennialism - What Is It?
 2. The Church - The Kingdom of God?
 3. Who Is The Anti-Christ?
 4. A Rupture of the Rapture Theory.
 5. The "Great Tribulation" Explained.
 6. What Is The Battle of Armageddon?
 7. The Consequences of Premillennialism.

BODY:

1. PREMILLENNIALISM - WHAT IS IT?

- A. Premillennialism is derived from two Latin words:
 1. "Pre" - meaning before.
 2. "Millennium" - meaning 1,000 years.
 3. I like what has been said to be the definition given by Foy E. Wallace.
 - A "Pre means before, millennial means 1,000, ism means there isn't anything to it anyhow."
- B. Basically speaking, premillennialism is the doctrine that Jesus is to return to earth before He begins a, so-called, 1,000 year reign on earth.
 1. The theory began in the late 2nd century A.D. and gradually disappeared after the 3rd century A.D.
 - A. It was later revived and during the past century or so has developed a great following.
 2. The most popular form of premillennialism, today, is referred to as "dispensationalism."
 - A. This is so because those who adhere to this theory view the existence of the material universe through a series of seven dispensations.
 1. Innocence - God in Eden.
 2. Conscience - to the flood.
 3. Human Government - from Babel.
 4. Promise - from the Abrahamic promise.

5. Law - from Moses.
 6. Grace - from Christ.
 7. Kingdom - the millennium.
- B. The notion has to do with God having created the world in six days, and on the seventh day he rested.
1. So, all history is divided into seven dispensations, the final one of which will be the millennium.
- C. This particular theory was crystallized by John N. Darby (1800-1882).
- D. Note, Biblical credence was given to this theory by the Scofield Reference Bible and its footnotes.
- E. The theory was sensationalized by Hal Lindsey's, Late Great Planet Earth.
- C. The theory is based upon a misunderstanding of several Old and New Testament Scriptures.
1. First, a misunderstanding of the Abrahamic promises concerning the "promised land."
 - A. God promised that Abraham, and then later his descendants, would inherit the land known as Palestine - Gen. 13:14, 15; 15:18.
 - B. The Premillennialists contends that the land promise was never fulfilled and makes a connection with the coming millennium and the return of the Jews to Palestine.
 1. The problem is, though, the promise was extended from Abraham to his "seed" or his descendants, as is seen by Gen. 15:18.
 - C. Actually, when one looks correctly at the fulfillment of the prophecy, they see its fulfillment - Jos. 21:43-45; 23:14; Neh. 9:22-24; 1 Kings 4:21; 8:56; Ex. 15:26.
 - D. Should it be argued that Israel later lost that promised land and, therefore, the promise was nullified; several things should be carefully noted.
 1. First, the promise was never an unconditional promise.
 - A. In other words, just as heaven is promised, it is not an unconditional promise.
 - B. Faithfulness is bound upon the one who seeks heaven and, likewise it is so of Israel – Jos. 23:16.
 2. Secondly, even though Israel did loose a portion of the land, it was later regained by David - 2 Sam. 8:3.
 2. Secondly, such prophetic passages as Psa. 118:22 and Isaiah 53 are grossly misunderstood.
 - A. S.D. Gordon, a dispensationalist, wrote: "It can be said at once that His dying was not God's own plan. It was conceived somewhere else and yielded to by God." (Quiet Talks About Jesus, p. 114).
 - B. It doesn't take a biblical scholar to see that this theory is far from the truth on the matter - Acts 2:23; Eph. 3:9-11; Col. 1:26.
 3. Further, such O. T. passages as Dan. 2:36-40 are misunderstood and misapplied.
 - A. It is contended, by the dispensationalist, that the "kingdom was postponed

- until the time of his return."
1. Therefore, the church became "a kind of interim measure."
 - B. Clearly, Daniel declared that the kingdom would come in the days of the Roman Empire - Dan. 2:44.
 1. An empire, which vanished from the earth in 476 A.D.
 - C. Christ plainly announced that the kingdom would come within the lifetime of His contemporaries - Mark 9:1.
 1. By the way, this was announced after Jesus had already told of his impending death - Mark 8:31.
 - D. The "new birth" process granted entrance into the kingdom - John 3:3-5.
 1. If there is no kingdom then there would be no new birth today.
 - E. Paul taught, during the first century, that those who obeyed the gospel were translated into the kingdom - Col. 1:13.
 - F. John, near the end of the first century, spoke of being in the kingdom - Rev. 1:6, 9
 - G. As we have already noted, the Bible clearly teaches that the church was a part of God's "eternal purpose," which was wrought through Christ - Eph. 3:10, 11.
 1. Since the "church" is simply the body of the saved - Eph. 5:23 - it thus follows if the church was simply an after-thought on God's part, then so was salvation.
 4. Also, there is much misunderstanding relative to the meaning of Dan. 9:27.
 - A. The claim is that following the "rapture," a seven-year period of tribulation is supposed to begin.
 1. It is argued that this seven-year period of tribulation is foretold in Dan. 9:27.
 2. It is further claimed that due to a covenant made with "the antichrist," during the first half of this period, the Jewish temple will be rebuilt and the Law of Moses reinstated.
 - A. However, the "antichrist" will break his covenant and a reign of terror will prevail during the final stage of the tribulation period.
 - B. Yet, when one properly studies Dan. 9:27 they will see that it is actually speaking of Christ and his work - not some "antichrist."
 1. Further, the notion that the O. T. system will be revived strikes at the very center of the mission of Jesus and his "better" covenant - Heb. 8:6.
 2. Paul clearly affirmed that the law system of Moses was permanently abolished - Col. 2:14.
 5. As to the N. T., numerous passages are grossly misunderstood and misapplied.
 - A. Such passages as Mt. 24, Rev. 16, 19, and 20 are at the very center of this entire system.
 - B. We will be saying more about these texts later.
 - D. There is also a grave misunderstanding concerning exactly who Israel is today.
 1. Remember, the dispensationalists believe that due to their theory of unfulfilled

- Abrahamic promises (which, as we have seen is error), the Jews are still God's chosen people, and will eventually return to the land of Palestine under God's guidance.
 - A Certain dispensationalists view the acts involved with the Nov. 28, 1947 United Nation's Resolution #181, which was passed in May of 1948, that declared Israel a state, a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy.
- 2. Further they believe that at some future date all Jews will be converted.
 - A. Their idea is that when Jesus comes, the Jews will see His scars and come to a realization that He indeed was the Messiah.
 - B. One of the problems with all of this, though, is that at Jesus' coming He will not be coming to bring salvation to those who have failed to obey.
 - 1. He will be coming to bring condemnation - 2 Thess. 1:6-9.
- 3. Let's notice some things that pertain to this matter from two view points: Who is Israel spiritually, and who is Israel racially?
 - A. In order to understand exactly who spiritual Israel is, we must come to an understanding of God's dealings with the physical Jew as the church age began.
 - 1. When one looks at Mt. 24:1-35, there is little doubt as to who the "abomination of desolation" (v. 15), would fall upon.
 - B. Moving to the book of Romans, the fact of God having turned from physical Israel to spiritual Israel is clear - Rom. 2:28, 29; 9:6, 25-33; 10:1-3; 11:5, 13-24.
 - C. Then, in Gal. 3:7-9 and verses 28, 29, we see, beyond a shadow of doubt that God's concern for Israel is relative to spiritual Israel instead of physical Israel.
 - 1. The whole point of these writings is to show that those who are saved are the seed of Abraham spiritually, and are the recipients of God's blessings today - Eph. 1:3.
 - D. What I am about to say about Israel may surprise some but it is clearly verifiable.
 - 1. "The Jews As a Race: The findings of physical anthropology show that, contrary to popular view, there is no Jewish race." The Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 12, p. 1054, 1973 edition.
 - 2. What is meant by this statement is that over the years there has been so much intermingling of the blood between Jews and other races, that an actual, verifiable bloodline cannot be established.
- 4. In connection with this we often hear people saying something like, "Well, doesn't the Bible say that all Israel is going to be saved?"
 - A. Of course, it does - Rom. 11:26.
 - 1. The problem comes in understanding exactly what is meant by "all Israel," and how will this come about?
 - B. Paul deals with the subject of Israel, and their rejection of the gospel, in Romans chapters 9, 10, and 11.
 - 1. Romans 9:6 helps us to see, exactly, who Israel is.

- A. Rom. 2:28, 29 also serve to confirm this point.
 - C. The problem also comes up as to exactly who it is that is in mind in Romans 11:1, 2a, implying that God has not cast away the Jews as a nation as far as a nationalistic salvation is concerned.
 - 1. What must be done is to carefully read the whole text.
 - A. Romans 11:2 states that "God hath not cast away his people," - no way to deny this.
 - B. But, you must go on.
 - 1. "Which he foreknew."
 - 2. This would be the "remnant" of physical Israel, who became a part of spiritual Israel by their obedience to the gospel- Romans 11:5.
 - 2. Those who were not a part of this "remnant" were cast away - Romans 11:15.
 - 3. Romans 11:23 is extremely important on this point as it shows their having been cast away by implication.
 - A. It would not be possible to "graft" them in again if they were never cut off.
 - D. Now, lets take a quick look at Romans 11:26.
 - 1. It says, "And so all Israel shall be saved."
 - A. We know who Israel is by now - the obedient remnant.
 - 2. The word "so" plays an important part here.
 - A. "So" is an adverb meaning "in this manner."
 - B. Therefore, the statement would be "in this manner all Israel shall be saved."
 - 1. The question, then, logically follows, "What manner?"
 - C. Which, of course, is answered by their having been grafted in, once again, by their acceptance of Christ as the Messiah and obedience to the gospel - John 8:24; Heb. 5:9.
 - E. As to the word "all" we really do not have a problem unless we are seeking for salvation for nationalistic Israel.
 - 1. All Israel that accepts Jesus and remission of sins will be saved.
 - F. Hopefully this gives you an overview of the theory of premillennialism.
 - 1. We will discuss several other tenets as we proceed with this series.
- 2. THE CHURCH - THE KINGDOM OF GOD?**
- A. It should be understood that not all premillennialists explain their concept of Christ coming to reign 1,000 years exactly the same way.
 - 1. However, there is a general agreement among them.
 - B. Basically, that agreement is that the prophets foretold the coming of Christ and his kingdom.
 - 1. However, when He came He did not establish the kind of kingdom that either the Jews of the 1st century, or the present premillennialists wanted him to establish.
 - C. Relative to the time of the kingdom and its coming there are two basic theories.

1. The Postponement Theory:
 - A. This has as its basis a rejection of Christ and His kingdom by the Jews..
 1. Scofield Reference Bible, p. 1148.
 2. Ibid., p. 1,226.
 3. There's A New World Coming, p. 30.
 4. Ibid., pp. 166, 167.
 - B. Yet these people contradict their selves in such statements as "However, the Old Testament prophets also painted another portrait of their coming King-that of a suffering Messiah who would die because of the sins of the people." Lindsey, Hal, There's A New World Coming, p. 36.
 1. In this we see an admission that Jesus came to die as the Messiah, yet in dying, He could not establish the kingdom that He also came to do.
 2. Why was it that He had the "power" to die as Messiah, but lacked the necessary "power" to set up the kingdom?
 - C. While we're on this point, we should stop and ask the question, "How do we know that man won't reject Christ the next time around, should such a theory be Biblically sound?"
 1. If Christ is able to subdue His enemies this time, why was He unable to do so previously?
 - D. Further, shouldn't we be able to find at least one passage that clearly indicates that Jesus "postponed" His kingdom?
 1. Shouldn't we be able to find at least one passage that clearly indicate that the church was more or less a substitute for a kingdom unable to be established?
2. No-postponement Theory:
 - A. Certain premillennialists now interpret prophecy in such a way as to make it appear that there was no postponement of the kingdom.
 1. The idea is that the time has not yet come for its beginning.
 - B. As strange as it may seem, given what we've already noted on the Scofield Reference Bible's position on the postponement theory, Scofield also held to the no-postponement theory - page 902.
 1. I guess its like having your cake and eating it too.
 - C. Another said, "In that dream the Lord revealed not only the succession of coming world powers but also the establishment of God's kingdom following the fourth and last earthly empire." DeHaan, Richard W., The Time of Christ's Return (Radio Bible Class, 1981), p. 12.
 - D. If this theory is true, then God always intended for the kingdom to be established sometime after (key word), the conclusion of the Roman Empire in 476 A.D.
 1. The so-called ten-kingdom confederacy actually would have no part at all of the Roman Empire.
 2. Likewise, the kingdom really would have nothing to do with the Roman Empire as spoken of in Daniel chapter two.

- A. We should, therefore, wonder why it was even spoken of in Daniel?
 - 3. DeHaan stated that Daniel's prophecy shows the establishment of the kingdom "following" the Roman Empire.
 - A. Yet Daniel's prophecy actually states that it would be "IN" the days of those kings - Dan. 2:44.
 - 4. There is absolutely nothing said in Daniel 2 concerning the feet representing 10 nations or any 10 nation confederacy.
- D. Let us now proceed to note what the Bible has to say relative to this matter from a prophetic perspective.
 - 1. In other words, if Jesus came to earth to establish the kingdom, and ended up being powerless to do so, and eventually dies, how does this theory relate to O. T. prophesy?
 - A. Granted, not all fail to see this point.
 - B. Some admit that Jesus came to die as the Messiah and establish the kingdom.
 - 1. However, He was only able to muster up enough "power" to do one of the two.
 - 2. What of the following prophecies?

A. Rejection by the Jews	Isa. 53:3	John 1:11
B. Triumphant entry	Zech. 9:9	John 12:13, 14
C. Betrayal by a friend	Psa. 41:9	Mark 14:10
D. Sold for 30 pieces of silver	Zech. 11:12	Mt. 26:15
E. False witnesses	Psa. 27:12	Mt. 26:60, 61
F. Silent when accused	Isa. 53:7	Mt. 26:62, 63
G. Smitten and spat upon	Isa. 50:6	Mk. 14:6
H. Suffered vicariously	Isa. 53:4, 5	Acts 8:30-35
I. Crucified with sinners	Isa. 53:12	Mt. 27:44
J. Hands and feet pierced	Psa. 22:16	John 20:27
K. Mocked and insulted	Psa. 22:6-8	Mt. 27:39, 40
L. Given gall and vinegar	Psa. 69:21	John 19:29
M. Side pierced	Zech. 12:10	John 19:34
N. Soldiers cast lots for coat	Psa. 22:18	Mark 15:24
O. No bones broken	Psa. 34:20	John 19:33
P. Buried with the rich	Isa. 53:9	Mt. 27:57-60
Q. Resurrection	Psa. 16:10	Mt. 28:9
R. Ascension	Psa. 68:18	Luke 24:50, 51
 - 3. Surely we can see that the above prophecies, and their fulfillment, do not fit the premillennial viewpoint.
 - A. Actually, we can see from the words of Jesus that He came to fulfill the prophets - Mt. 5:17.
 - 4. Now, that we've cleared that up, let us move onto see that the Bible clearly teaches that Christ is now King on David's Throne reigning over the kingdom
- E. Christ Is Now King On David's Throne.

1. Jesus came to establish His kingdom - Luke 1:31-33.
2. He came at the right time - "The Kingdom of God is at hand."
 - A. John - Mt. 3:2.
 - B. Jesus - Mk. 1:15; 9:1; Dan. 2:44; 9:24-27.
 - C. The twelve - Mt. 10:7.
 - D. The seventy - Lk. 10:9.
 1. In all of this we need to remember that the second coming was not "at hand."
 - E. Jesus affirmed that He was King - Lk. 23:3.
 - F. He has been given all authority - Mt. 28:18.
 - G. He was resurrected to reign on David's throne - Acts 2:29-34.
 - H. He was to reign and sit on David's throne while David slept - 2 Sam. 7:12-14.
 - I. He went to receive a kingdom - Lk. 19:11-28.
 - J. He was given a kingdom at His ascension - Dan. 7:13, 14.
 1. Compare to Mt. 20:21; Mk. 10:37; (Kingdom and glory are interchangeable); 1 Tim. 3:16; Lk. 24:26.
 - K. He has built up David's house on His throne - 2 Sam. 7:12-24; Amos 9:11, 12; Heb. 1:4-6; Acts 15:13-17.
 - L. He reigns as Priest upon His throne, which Christ could not do on earth - Zech. 6:12, 13; Jere. 33:17, 18; Rom. 15:12; Heb. 8:1-4; Gen. 14:18-20.
 - M. He now reigns till the last enemy is destroyed - 1 Cor. 15:20-28.
 - N. He will reign till He comes again - Heb. 1:8, 13; 10:12, 13; 1 Cor. 15:20.
 - O. He sits on David's throne, for David's throne is God's throne - 1 Kings 1:46-48; 2:12; 1 Chron. 29:23; Rev. 3:21.
 - P. He reigns in Heaven on His throne, not His footstool - Isa. 66:1; Psalms 11:4; Acts 7:49; Zech. 6:12, 13.
3. Further, we see that the Bible describes Jesus as King.
 - A. He has the keys of David's kingdom - Isa. 22:22; Rev. 3:7; Mt. 16:19.
 - B. He has naturalization process into His kingdom - John 3:5; Acts 8:12.
 - C. He has ambassadors - 2 Cor. 5:20; Acts 20:25; 19:8; 28:23, 31.
 - D. He has a territory - Mt. 28:18.
 - E. He has subjects - Col. 1:13; 1 Thess. 2:12; Heb. 12:28; Rev. 1:9.
 - F. He has a throne in heaven - Zech. 6:12, 13; Heb. 10:12, 13.
 - G. He has a law system - Isa. 2:2-4; Lk. 24:46-49.
4. If Jesus is not now King over the kingdom then all of the above passages are in error.
- F. God knew that people would set themselves against Him and His Son in order to thwart His plans.
 1. He is, therefore, pictured as "laughing" at their feeble attempts at such - Psalms 2:1-6.
 2. Clearly God rules as "victor" over mortal man in this matter.
 3. In Psalm 2:6, it is predicted that God would set His king upon the holy hill of Zion.

- A. The Hebrew writer states that Christians are NOW (i.e. then), "come unto mount Zion to the church" - Heb. 12:22, 23.
- B. Then in verse 28 he further corroborates this point - Heb. 12:28.
- C. Luke, in Acts 4:25-30, records Psalm 2:1, 2 and applies it to Christ and the church, as Herod, Pilate, the Gentiles, and the Israelites band together in their opposition to Jesus.
 - 1. These three texts strike a deathblow to the premillennial theory.
- 4. The basic problem that underlies all of this confusion, pertaining to the kingdom is that all premillennialists teach that the kingdom will be a literal earthly kingdom.
 - A. When one looks at Rev. 20:1-4, they must wonder how some can take the portion speaking of the 1,000 year reign as literal while all the time denying the literalness of the key, the chain, and the bottomless pit mentioned in verses 1-3.
 - 1. It is extremely interesting to note what people like Lindsey have to say pertaining to a literal interpretation of scripture.
 - B. See - The Late Great Planet Earth, p. 176 and There's A New World Coming, pp. 269, 270.
 - 1. Now let us note how well they follow their advice:
 - A. The 10 days of Revelation 2:10 are not literal - T.N. W.C. p., 50.
 - B. The "24 elders" of Revelation 4:4 are not literal, they are representatives of the church - T.N.W.C. pp., 84, 85.
 - C. The smoke, fire, and brimstone of Revelation 9:17, 18 are not literal, they refer to a thermonuclear war.
 - 1. "Smoke represents the immense clouds of radioactive fallout and debris." – T.N.W.C., 141.
 - 2. "Brimstone is simply melted earth and building materials." ibid.
 - D. The 144,000 "virgins" of Revelation 14:4 are not literally virgins, they are spiritual virgins – T.N.W.C. p., 199.
 - 1. These are literal "Jewish Billy Grahams turned loose on this earth." - L.G.P.E. p., 111.
 - E. The clouds of Revelation 1:7 are not literal, as it refers to a "throng of believers in Christ...all dressed in spotless white robes." - T.N.W.C., pp. 28, 29.
 - F. The two wings of a great eagle of Revelation 12:14 are not literal, they represent an "airlift made available by aircraft from the U.S. Sixth Fleet." T.N.W.C., p. 179 (See Hermeneutics, pp. 79, 80, 82, by Dungan).
 - 2. I think this sufficient to prove the point that their claims of viewing the book of Revelation from a literal viewpoint is false.
 - 5. We can bring to a conclusion this point as we have already noted proof of the fact that Jesus came to establish the same kingdom that He established.

3. WHO IS THE ANTI-CHRIST?

- A. Much has been said over the years pertaining to exactly who the antichrist is.
 - 1. Of course, the majority of that which has been said is false.
- B. Over the years numerous individuals have been singled out to be the antichrist.
 - 1. Such people as Hitler, the Pope, Henry Kissinger, Ronald Reagan, and now Saddam Hussein, have been referred to as the antichrist.
 - 2. Others, such as Hal Lindsey, see "Two Anti-Christ's" - T.N.W.C., pp. 180-ff.
 - 3. Then in "The 1980's: Countdown to Armageddon," he says, "We know the anti-Christ's number, but not his name. He will be easily recognized, however. A member of the European Common Market will suffer a head wound, which would normally be fatal. Miraculously he will be restored to health. That will be an unmistakable signal" - p. 112.
 - 4. He also refers to the antichrist as the "Future Fuehrer," (L.G. P.E., p. 103), and stated that he "will come to power just before the return of Christ."
 - 5. He went on to say, "We believe that according to all the signs, we are in the general time of his coming."
 - A. It is important to keep in mind that this book was published in 1970.
 - B. Likewise it is important to note what he says ten years later in The 1980's: Countdown to Armageddon. (Copyright March 1981)
 - 1. "The decade of the 1980's could very well be the last decade of history as we know it.", p. 8.
 - C. He also stated, "I believe that this very man lives right now somewhere in Europe.", T.N.W.C., p. 183, Copyright 1973.
- C. With all of this in mind, can we know exactly who the antichrist is, without referring to fanciful names and theories?
 - 1. Or are we relegated to some back-yard theory that is almost funny?
- D. It is interesting to note exactly what the Bible does say about the antichrist.
 - 1. I'll guarantee you that authors, such as Lindsey, have said much more about this matter than what is found in God's word.
 - 2. The Greek word "antikristos" is found only five times in all of the N.T. - 1 John 2:18 (twice), 22; 4:3; 2 John 7.
 - A. It is extremely significant that in Lindsey's L.G.P.E., in the chapter that deals with "The Future Fuehrer," that he never once mentions any of these passages on any of the 16 pages.
 - B. Likewise, in his T.N.W.C., which also involves 16 pages, there is only one reference to any of these passages.
 - 1. And that is simply a passing statement indicating one of what he calls the "names" given to this person by the Bible - pp.183, 184.
 - C. I think we have to realize that the reason for such blatant omission is clear.
 - 1. That being that biblical information simply does not fit such a theory.
 - 3. When examining the N. T., concerning this matter, one quickly sees that there is no one specific person denominated as "the antichrist."
 - A. Instead John clearly says that "many antichrists" have arisen - 1 John 2: 18; 2 John 7.

4. Also, the N. T. does not affirm that the antichrist is some sinister, prophetic world figure that is to arise during the 1980's or 90's.
 - A. Actually, we can see that even when John was writing, probably around 90 AD., there were many "antichrists" - 1 John 2:18; 4:3.
- E. When a careful analysis of the N. T. usage of the term antichrist is conducted, it will reveal that the word is a general word employed to speak of a spirit of unbelief and rebellion.
 1. Basically, in summation here, any person who deliberately rejects the authority of Jesus is the spirit of the antichrist, regardless of which century they happen to live.
- 4. A RUPTURE OF THE RAPTURE THEORY.**
 - A. This theory relates to a two-stage coming of Christ, for his church - with his church, attributed to Margaret McDonald, of Glasgow, Scotland, from a trance in 1830.
 - B. We've all seen bumper stickers that said something like, "At the Rapture This Car Will Be Left Unmanned."
 1. Perhaps we really didn't know what in the world they were trying to say, but we did know that they were trying to say something..
 - C. See page 135 of T.L.G.P.E. under the title of "The Ultimate Trip."
 1. Basically, this is the sensationalized dialogue of the premillennialist as he attempts to explain what is often referred to as the "Rapture."
 - D. John C. Walvoord said, "The scriptures predict that the church will be raptured or 'caught up' to heaven at the coming of the Lord for them" The Rapture Question, p. 8.
 1. If this were all that was involved then we would have no problem with the theory.
 2. You see it is clear that the church will indeed meet Jesus in the air at His coming - 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.
 3. However, there is more, and that is where the problems come in.
 - E. "The question of the rapture comes from another question viz. Will the church have to endure the tribulation?" *ibid.*, p. 4.
 1. When one considers the theology of people like Lindsey and Walvoord they soon see things coming from their teachings that have no Biblical basis.
 - F. In order to better understand this theory we have to lay a little ground work.
 1. Proponents of dispensational premillennialism have, as a part of their theology, a period of "Great Tribulation" that lasts for seven years.
 2. During this period of time the "raptured" church will remain at some location with the Lord in the air.
 - A. It is following this period of "Great Tribulation" that the Lord is supposed to return to the earth with the "raptured" church for his millennial reign.
 3. Further, this "rapture" will only be witnessed by the believer and, therefore, will be "secret" or "mysterious" in nature.
 4. To complicate the matter, there are three views as to the time of the "rapture," relative to the "Great Tribulation."

- A. There are those known as Pre-tribulationists, who view the "rapture" as an event prior to the so-called "Great Tribulation."
- B. The second group is known as Mid-tribulationists, who view the coming of Christ for His church sometime in the middle of the seven-year period of tribulation.
- C. The third group is known as Post-tribulationists, due to their view of the "rapture's" arrival after the tribulation.
- D. We can, also, add another group to the overall groups by noting those who believe in a "rapture" that can be viewed as a "Partial-rapture."
 - 1. Their view is that only some believers will be "raptured."
- 5. The term "rapture" is not found in the scriptures.
 - A. It is from the word "rapere," found in the expression "caught up" in the Latin translation of 1 Thess. 4:17.
 - B. Our argument, though, is not with the word but the use of the word and the system it advances.
- G. In order to show the unscripturalness of this system it necessitates our examining certain N.T. texts.
 - 1. The "rapture" theory is based largely upon an assumption.
 - A. That assumption being that the church is prophetically bound to go through the "Great Tribulation."
 - 2. The proponents of this theory believe that Mt. 24:15-31 serves as a proof text for the "Great Tribulation" theory.
 - A. The problem with this is that it is clear that the prophecy found in these verses relate to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and not to some yet unfulfilled "Great Tribulation."
 - B. Let us note some things in Matthew 24 that will show this to be true:
 - 1. First, in verse 3, the disciples ask either two or three questions.
 - A. Jesus had just spoken relative to the destruction of Jerusalem - 24:2.
 - B. The disciples logically ask concerning as to the time of this event - v. 3.
 - 2. Jesus now begins to answer the first question.
 - A. Verse 16 - if the "rapture," then only the believers would know.
 - 1. No reason for the unbeliever to "flee into the mountains" even if he knew what was happening.
 - B. Verse 17 - notice those on the housetop were told not to come and remove articles from the house - this suggests an instantaneous event.
 - 1. If the "rapture" then, again, these unbelievers wouldn't even know that something was going on.
 - 2. Further, there would be no need for the unbeliever to do this even if he knew of it.
 - C. Verse 18 - the same applies here.
 - D. Verse 19 - why would a woe be upon those who knew nothing of

what was going on?

- E. Verse 20 - what "flight" is in mind here?
- F. Verse 20 - why be concerned about the Sabbath?
- G. Verse 22 - if the "Great Tribulation," then who are the "elect" that, for their sake, the tribulation is shortened?
- H. Verse 24 - while we're at it, note the arising of False Christs (i.e., antichrists).
- I. Verse 31 - who are the "elect" here - remember, according to them, the church has been "raptured."
 - 1. On this some have attempted to argue that the 144,000 are "Jewish Billy Grahams" who were teaching others.
 - 2. The problem with this, though, is that these same people see the Holy Spirit as a "restrainer of sin" who is no longer operating in order to get these 144,000 Jews converted.
 - A. How would it be possible for them to turn to Christ if the world would be left without so much as a saved person and the Holy Spirit couldn't function as the so-called "restrainer of sin?"
 - 3. Clearly we can see that the events spoken of here are events that were to be imminent - Mt. 24:34.
- 3. Those who advance this theory see in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18 their greatest proof text.
 - A. All other passages, including Matthew 24, are presented only in view of their understanding (should I say misunderstanding), of this text.
 - B. However, there are valid reasons as to why this text cannot be made to fit their theory.
 - 1. First, this "coming" is neither silent nor mysterious.
 - A. Verse 16 seems to be quite vociferous.
 - B. This passage has as somewhat of a parallel the words of 2 Thessalonians 1:6-9, where we see everything but silence and mystery.
 - 2. Secondly, after the church has risen to "meet the Lord in the air" Paul states that it shall "ever be with the Lord."
 - A. If the church is to forever be with the Lord "in the air" it is not possible for the return to earth so necessary for this theory.
 - 4. Another argument that is advanced to support the rapture theory is the one based upon the Greek words "parousia" and "epiphaneia."
 - A. "Parousia," so they say, speaks of Christ's coming for His saints.
 - B. "Epiphaneia," speaks of His coming with His saints.
 - C. Careful study of the N.T. usage of these two words will clearly indicate that there is no such distinction.
 - 1. For example in 2 Thessalonians 2:8 Paul uses both words to speak of the same event.
 - A. Brightness - epiphaneia.

- B. Coming - parousia.
- D. Even Walvoord admits the truth on these terms and that they do not buoy up their position.
 - 1. "The use of parousia in these passages proves it is not a technical word. The same word is used of the coming of the Lord at the translation (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 2:19; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thess. 2:1; James 5:7, 8; 1 John 2:28). Some pretribulationists have erred in claiming the word parousia as a technical word referring to the rapture. That this is not correct is shown by its usage in passages referring to the coming of Christ after the tribulation (Mt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Thess. 2:13; 2 Thess. 2:8; 2 Pet. 1:16)." Walvoord, John E., The Rapture Question, p. 156.
- 5. Let us now bring this portion to a conclusion by considering certain points which disprove or "rupture" the "rapture" theory.
 - A. First, the Bible knows of only one resurrection - Acts 24:15; John 5:28, 29; 6:37, 40, 44, 54.
 - 1. Yet, this theory calls for four resurrections.
 - A. The first at the time of the "rapture."
 - B. The second at the beginning of the millennium, seven years after the first.
 - C. The third is the one they refer to as the "final" resurrection of the wicked.
 - D. But they've forgotten about their righteous dead who died during their so-called millennium.
 - 1. Therefore, four resurrections.
 - B. Secondly, the separation of the righteous and the unrighteous is to occur at the end of the world - Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43, 47-50; 1 Thess. 5:1-4; Acts 17:30, 31; 2 Cor. 5:10.
 - 1. The "rapture" theory, though, denies this by their division at the "rapture" and subsequent resurrections.
 - C. Thirdly, following Christ's ascension, the N.T. speaks of only one literal coming of Christ - Heb. 9:28.
 - 1. At this time all the dead will be raised simultaneously - John 5:28, 29; Acts 24:15.
 - 2. At this time all human beings, good and bad, will be judged simultaneously- 2 Cor. 5:10; 2 Thess. 1:7-12; Acts 17:30, 31; Eccl. 12:14.
 - 3. At this time this globe will be destroyed - 2 Pet. 3:7-13.
 - 6. Indeed, Christ is coming again and we must be prepared.
 - A. But this gives us no reason to develop such a fanciful theory to connect to it.

5. THE GREAT TRIBULATION EXPLAINED.

- A. By now we have already covered some of the necessary material on this point.
 - 1. However, there is still some material that needs to be examined.

- B. Following the events known as the "rapture," which we have already "ruptured," the premillennialist sees a seven year period of tribulation upon the earth.
 - 1. When this period is past the Lord will come again to the earth and establish His kingdom over which He will reign a 1,000 years.
- C. One author stated, "The fact that a time of great tribulation is coming upon the earth is firmly established in the scriptures." Smith, Chuck, *The Tribulation and the Church* p. 1.
 - 1. To support this he cites Dan. 12:1 and Mt. 24:21, 22.
- D. In order to refute this theory, in its entirety, we would need to spend more time than we have.
 - 1. Not that it is so difficult to refute, only that so many scriptures are misapplied to support it.
 - 2. One author states, "The alert and knowledgeable Bible student will recognize that the above is a skillfully but artificially arranged mosaic of tidbits of mostly unrelated Scriptures found here and there over the Bible." Wright, Cecil N., *The Premillennial Doctrine of The Tribulation Is False*, *The Spiritual Sword*, Vol. 9, Number.1, p. 32.
 - A. Incidentally, both numbers 1 and 2 issues of Vol. 9 deal with this matter.
 - 3. Another said, "Nowhere in the Bible is the word 'tribulation' used in connection with a seven year period at the end of the age, either while the Church is still on the earth, as Historic Premillennialism holds, or after the church has been removed from the earth, as Dispensationalism holds. Instead, it is used to describe: (1) the sufferings of Christians during this present age, (2) the sufferings inflicted upon worldly rejecters of Christ, (3) the sufferings especially prophesied for the Jewish nation at various times in its past history." Boettner, Loraine, *The Millennium*, p. 177.
 - 4. Foy E. Wallace, referring to Daniel 12:1 stated, "If the millennialists can find a passage in the Bible or the Almanac that refers to 'wrath' or 'trouble' or 'battle' they jump to the tribulation, the millennium and Armageddon." *God's Prophetic Word*, p. 519.
- E. Examination of Daniel 12:1.
 - 1. The "time of trouble," mentioned herein, historically has absolutely no reference at all to any pending "Great Tribulation," as far as we are concerned.
 - 2. Actually, it has prophetic reference to the evil Seleucidan domination some 167 years before Christ.
 - A. It was at that time that Antiochus defiled the temple in Jerusalem. (see Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, Book 1, p. 429ff).
 - 1. Joseph ben Matthias, circa 37 -100 a.d.
 - B. Things were such that "In fact the Jews of that day called this evil ruler's ungodly tactics 'the abomination of desolation.'" Ramsey, Johnny, *The Rapture and the Tribulation*, p. 189.
- F. Examination of Daniel 9:23- 27.
 - 1. When one studies this text from a premillennial perspective they quickly run into problems relative to consistency.

- A. For example, in order for the premillennialist to use "the seventy weeks of Daniel" they must apply what is called the "day a year" theory.
 - 1. In other words the seventy weeks, according to them represent a 490-year period.
- B. It should be understood that the "day a year" concept is Biblical.
 - 1. But in those cases where it is used prophetically, there is no question at all about the propriety of such - Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:4-6.
- C. But it should be likewise understood that this principle is not the rule.
 - 1. For example the 400 years of Genesis 15:13 did not work on this principle.
 - 2. Neither did the 70 years in Jeremiah 25:11, nor the 65 years in Isaiah 7:8.
- D. Actually, we have only the two clear-cut cases of such usage in the Bible.
 - 1. And we know this to be so because we are told it is so.
 - 2. The problem of consistency viewed.
 - A. There are two views that must be considered.
 - 1. Chronological
 - 2. Non-Chronological.
 - B. How do they determine that the 70 weeks must be understood as 490 years?
 - 1. Why not a literal 70 weeks?
 - 2. Or, why not follow the regularly accepted prophetic view of it speaking of years instead of days?
 - C. Secondly, how do they know that the tribulation is literally only seven years?
 - 1. Why not 2,555 years by application of the "day a year" principle? (7 X 365)
 - D. Thirdly, how do they know that the 1,000 years of Revelation 20:4 is not actually 365,000 years based on the "day a year" principle?
 - 3. There is nothing at all in this context that indicates that Daniel was prophetically speaking of events yet to happen at this present hour.
 - 4. Further, based upon the accepted prophetic principle that the weeks are not days but years, we end up with 69 weeks bringing the Jewish system up to the time of the crucifixion of Christ - thus the non-millennial chronological view.
 - A. This leaves one week left to complete the seventy.
 - B. Which is from the point of the crucifixion to the conversion of Cornelius, when the covenant was confirmed "with many" as required by Dan. 9:27.
 - C. ▼ **DECREE 483 years Baptism of Christ ["CUT OFF" ▼ 458 B.C. (69 Weeks) "IN THE MIDST OF THE WEEK"**
 - 5. Brief explanation of the chart above.
 - A. The command to rebuild the city begins with 458 when Artaxerxes gives approval for Ezra to go to Jerusalem - Ezra 7:1-10.

- B. Dan. 9:25 states that from that command unto the Messiah is 69 weeks.
 - 1. Based upon the principle of a day equals a year this would be 483 years.
- C. Add 483 years to 458 B.C. and you get 25-26 A.D.
 - 1. This would coincide with the time of the baptism of Jesus and his having received the anointing of the Spirit.
- D. Verse 27 states that in the middle of the 70th week the Messiah would cause the sacrifices and oblation to cease.
 - 1. This would be accomplished by his death and the nailing of the law to the cross - Col. 2:14.
- F. Further, we note that the Lord's earthly ministry lasted approximately 3 1/2 years, which resulted in his death.
- 6. This way of understanding this text best fits the prophecy.
 - A. To be quite honest, there is no actual proof that the day equals a year principle is operative here either.
 - B. But, on the other hand, it is clear from a historical perspective that there is no literal chronological system that will fit this prophecy - thus the non-chronological view.
 - 1. Therefore, we are compelled to apply a non-literal interpretation to it
 - 2. Also the "seventy weeks" are decreed on Daniel's people and the holy city.
 - A. However we see this prophecy it must be seen as embracing the desolation and end of the Judaic system.
- 7. Also, one can see that there are six things dealt with that are to occur during these "seventy weeks."
 - A. To finish transgression - v. 24.
 - B. To make an end of sins - v. 24.
 - C. To make reconciliation for iniquities - v. 24.
 - D. To bring in everlasting righteousness - v. 24.
 - E. To seal up prophecy - v. 24.
 - F. To anoint the most holy - v. 24.
 - 1. All of these can be associated with the destruction of Jerusalem.
- 8. Perhaps this context is best summed up in the words of Boettner, "The correct interpretation of Daniel's prophecy is, we believe, that the events of the 70th week were fulfilled during the public ministry of Christ in Palestine, including the completion and abolition of the Old Covenant. After a further period of Grace, some 37 years later, the final breakup of the Jewish economy came with the destruction of the temple and the city of Jerusalem and the final dispersion of the Jewish people." The Millennium, p. 183.
- G. Examination of Matthew 24.

1. Quite often this context is seen as a valuable text to support this theory so long as it is seen in conjunction with other such passages.
 2. We have, already, covered this text in detail as we studied the "Rapture" theory.
 - A. In having done so, I believe, we refuted both theories based upon this text.
 1. Therefore, there is no reason to go over it again.
- H. Examination of Revelation 20.
1. You will recall that we have previously discussed this to some degree.
 - A. Remember that those who push for a literal interpretation of the 1,000 year reign fail to be consistent on the overall text.
 2. Further, it should be asked as to exactly who it is that is to "live (ed) and reign (ed) with Christ a thousand years"?
 - A. Those who "sat upon" the "thrones" would be the saints of whom Christ had promised that they would share in ruling over the nations - Rev. 2:26-29; 3:21.
 - B. There is also "souls" involved in all of this.
 1. Here, again, we have to see the inconsistency of those who claim to literally interpret the chapter.
 2. If you follow the literal interpretation, then just this point will rule out any literal millennial reign on the earth.
 3. It is said that these "souls" "lived" which, due to it being aorist tense (i.e. point action), we have the implication of their having "came to life."
 - A. This would have to imply people as souls (i.e. spirits), do not die.
 - B. Therefore, we have to imply a non - literal application.
 3. The basic problem or difficulty with these Revelation passages is the arbitrary application of literal and non-literal interpretation.
 - A. Note what Boettner said of this, "For according to that interpretation, chapters 4-19, a total of 16 chapters, are used to describe the comparatively short seven year Tribulation while only six verses in chapter 20 are used to describe the glorious 1000 year reign of Christ upon the earth, with all the great and mighty events that undoubtedly would happen during that time. Such a method of interpretation is absurd on the face of it." Boettner, Loraine, The Millennium, p. 202.
- I. Clearly, there is not one scripture that teaches a "Great Tribulation" period yet somewhere off into the future.
1. Note what Johnny Ramsey stated here, "No one, reading the Bible by itself, would ever find these matters in the sacred pages. One needs help - and lots of it - from sectarian sources - to even find a hint of such teaching in any of the 66 books of the Bible." The Rapture and the Tribulation, p. 185.
- J. In conclusion, on this point, let us suffice to say that the fact is the "Great Tribulation" has not the slightest relationship to Truth.
- 6. WHAT IS THE BATTLE OF ARMAGEDDON?**
- A. Although much has been, and now is being said of the "Battle of Armageddon," it

may surprise you how little the Bible has to say on the subject.

1. One would think that since it is described as "World War III," by such people as Hal Lindsey, that the Bible would be replete with scriptures that relate to it.
2. Further, since it is viewed as "the battle in Israel which brings the great tribulation to a climax, as the Antichrist triumphs over the Jews to seize Israel's homeland for himself" (The Bible and Future Events, Leon J. Wood, p. 28), it would seem as if such an important eschatological event, as this, would demand a major portion of scripture.
 - A. Or, at least, more than what it does.
 - B. When one studies the Biblical references on this matter they soon realize how little there is to be found on the matter.
 1. Actually, there is only one passage in the Bible that mentions it - Rev. 16:16.
 2. Based on this Russell Boatman has said of Armageddon, "The term is a grossly overworked apocalyptic symbol in current eschatology." What The Bible Says About The End Time, p. 93.
 - C. The basic idea of the time of the so-called "Battle of Armageddon" is at the conclusion of the alleged "church age."
 1. Then will be the "Rapture," which will usher in the 70th week spoken of by Daniel in Daniel chapter nine.
 2. This 70th week will be a literal 7-year period known as the "Great Tribulation."
 3. At the conclusion of this tribulation there will be the "Battle of Armageddon."
 - A. Boatman refers to this as "Eastus vrs. Westus." *ibid.*
 4. At the end of the battle they say Jesus will come to set up His millennial kingdom over which He will rule for the 1,000 years.
 5. Following this Satan is to be loosed for a "short period," which will result in the final assault.
 6. Then judgment and eternity will follow.
 - D. Since we have already removed the "Rapture," the "Great Tribulation," the "Antichrist," and the "Millennial Reign" from the overall premillennial picture, we surely realize that this portion of the theory will, too, fall by the wayside.
 1. Actually, what you will see is that as one aspect of the theory falls so goes the whole theory.
 - E. In conclusion on this point lets give some thought to exactly what the "Battle of Armageddon" is.
 1. This, I believe, will help you see what it isn't.
 2. "The battle of Armageddon is best understood as an apocalyptic symbol of warfare per se, much as in modern times anyone who suffers a crushing defeat is said to have met his waterloo." Boatman, *loc. cit.*, p. 93.

3. The Bible speaks of the area of Megiddo – Jud. 5:19; 2 Kings 9:27; 23:28, 29; Zech. 12:11.
 - A. "Megiddo was a city of the Manassites, situated in the great plain of the tribe of Issachar..." Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, p. 74.
 - B. "In the history of Israel it had been the scene of never-to-be-forgotten battles." I.S.B.E. Vol., 2, p. 1340.
4. Since we are dealing with an apocalyptic book, which should be understood from the viewpoint of signs and symbols, we should understand that this "battle" represents all who rebel against God and their eventual downfall or defeat.

7. THE CONSEQUENCES OF PREMILLENNIALISM.

- A. We've noted most of these points already as we've covered the material
 1. However, as we conclude this series I want us to see exactly what the consequences are and how damaging this theory is.
 - A. Denies that Christ is reigning now - Rev. 1:5, 6.
 - B. Annuls this dispensation as the last days - Heb. 1: 1.
 - C. Makes God false to His promises - Mk. 1:14, 15.
 - D. Alternates Judaism and Christianity - Heb. 8:5-7; 9:9, 10.
 - E. Minimizes the gospel and belittles the church - Mk. 16:15, 16; Eph. 3:9-11.
 - F. Revokes the great commission - Mt. 28:18-20.
 - G. Nullifies salvation to the Gentiles now - Acts 10:1-48; 15:15-18.
 - H. Demotes Christ from His throne in Heaven to His footstool, the earth - Heb. 1:3-13.
 - I. Makes the first coming of Christ a failure - Gal. 4:4, 5; John 17:1-14.
 1. The above points were taken from God's Prophetic Word by Foy E. Wallace, p. 349.

CONCLUSION:

1. Surely we have been made to see that the theory of Premillennialism is without Biblical support.
 - A. As those who seek to "speak where the Bible speaks" we need to be careful that we do not fall into the trap of this doctrine by using terms foreign to God's word.

A REVIEW OF THE A.D. 70 DOCTRINE

Robert Stapleton

INTRODUCTION:

1. A teaching is not wrong just because it is different than what we have previously heard.
 - A. A teaching is wrong when it is different than the Word of God.
2. In this study of the A.D. 70 Doctrine we will deal with the major points that are advocated.
 - A. There are too many problems with the doctrine to try to cover them all.

BODY:

1. METHOD OF INTERPRETATION USED IN BOOK

- A. Title: Spirit of Prophecy
 1. Taken from Revelation 19:10.
 2. Important to note that the testimony of Jesus is the true Spirit of Prophecy.
 - A. Therefore, no true Spirit of Prophecy separate and apart from Jesus.
- B. Spiritual method of interpretation.
 1. *"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."* S.O.P., pp. 1, 2.
 2. Weakness in this method of interpretation as per S.O.P.
 - A. Rather than saying what the passage apparently says King suggests that we look at it differently.
 1. Similar to Baptists on Acts 2:38; Mark 16:16; etc.
 - B. A misunderstanding of Apocalyptic writing.
 1. For example, trying to make the book of Daniel coincide with the book of Revelation.
- C. Supposing that similar expressions in the Bible always refer to the same thing.
 1. S.O.P., Max says the 4th beast of Daniel 7 is the beast of the sea in Revelation 13.
 - A. However, they are not the same.
 - B. Note four beasts in Daniel 7 and only two in Revelation 13.
 - C. Also Daniel says the fourth beast will be a fourth kingdom while Revelation 13 speaks of a power.

2. TEACHING SET OUT AS ORDERLY AS POSSIBLE

- A. Law of Moses and the Christian system existed side by side, equally enforced from A.D. 33 to A.D. 70.
 1. Both with God's approval.
 2. During this overlapping period the Jews persecuted and hampered the spiritual kingdom (yet with God's approval).
 3. This period of overlapping is, to them, the period known as the "last days" mentioned in the N.T.

4. The predictions concerning the "last days" were to be fulfilled within the lifetime of the Apostles, or there about.
 - A. By the way, King's Book The Cross and the Parousia, teaches differently on this – *“27. King's understanding of the 'One Body' or 'One World' and its people is determined mainly by his understanding of 'resurrection' as a process. But it is also shaped by his insistence that national Israel is the heir to the Abrahamic promises. Let me explain. National Israel must be resurrected and that is accomplished by resurrecting the Old covenant which is a 'body of death' and transforming it into a 'spiritual body'. 30. The New covenant 'body' didn't replace the Old covenant 'body'. The New covenant is the Old covenant transformed or resurrected. Since resurrection is a process, the resurrection of the Old covenant took time...He repeatedly tells us that the Old covenant IS the New covenant. 31. It is important for King that he does not have two covenants coexisting. It is important that there should not be two ages or worlds or 'bodies' existing side by side. Why is that? 32. Because, if there are two independent (though related) covenants, worlds, ages or bodies one would replace the other and that wouldn't be 'resurrection'. In a 'resurrection' of a person, world or age, it is that person, world or age that is resurrected or there is no resurrection. We can't have the Old covenant dying and the New covenant being resurrected. It's the one that dies that is resurrected. If the Old dies it must be the Old that is resurrected. If the New one doesn't die the New one can't be resurrected. So we hear him say (174): "The two covenants (the Old and the New) are ONE covenant with a twofold administration..." (The caps are his.) 33. All this might do if you can believe that the Old and the New covenants are the same covenant. They are dedicated with different blood, at different times, one is 'the first' and 'old', the other is 'second' and 'new' but they are the same covenant? Is that what your reading of Hebrews 7-10 conveys to you? 34. King has the disconcerting habit of quoting only so much of an 'authority' as suits his purposes. 36. Still, King insists that 'neos' is the word for 'new' in the sense of not existing before. But Hebrews 12:24 says that the 'new' covenant is 'new' (neos). So what was gained by the selective quoting of scholars? On King's terms, the New covenant is not the Old covenant! On King's terms it is a covenant which had not existed before. 37. Max has recurring difficulties with the covenants. He insists that the Mosaic and New covenants are the **Abrahamic** covenant.” Jim McGuiggan, A.D. 70 Revisited, pp. 25-27.*
 - B. The second coming of Christ was in the lifetime of the Apostles.
 - C. Judaism was destroyed and out of its dead carcass came forth Christianity.
 1. Christianity came with the perfection of the kingdom, thus the kingdom and

the church are not the same.

- D. The new heavens and the new earth describe Christianity.
 - 1. Therefore, the old world represents Judaism.
- E. The kingdom came in glory and power in A.D. 70.
- F. There is to be no future bodily resurrection, as the general resurrection is past.
- G. Adoption (manifestation of sons), marriage, redemption all occurred in A.D. 70.
- H. The universal judgment is past.
- I. Too much emphasis placed upon the destruction of Jerusalem.

3. DISCUSSION OF MAJOR POINTS LISTED ABOVE

- A. Law of Moses and the Christian system existed side by side.
 - 1. *"While Ishmael and Isaac coexisted, neither received the inheritance, and in order for Isaac to receive full inheritance, it was necessary to cast out Ishmael... Fleshly and spiritual Israel coexisted from Pentecost (the time of Isaac's birth) until the destruction of Jerusalem (the time of Ishmael's casting out),..."* S.O.P. chapter 3 "Abraham Had Two Sons", p. 30 paragraph 2; *"This complete change was consigned to the fall of Jerusalem, or the casting out of Ishmael. Ishmael and Isaac could not continue to coexist. The son of the bondwoman could not inherit with the son of the free-woman...The center and heart of prophecy is not Pentecost. (the birth of Isaac) so much so as the fall of Jerusalem (the casting out of Ishmael). This fact will become evident in the studies to follow."* p. 33, paragraph 1.
 - 2. Derives this idea from the allegory of Galatians 4:21-31.
 - A. Allegory: An extended metaphor, figure of speech.
 - 3. Lesson of Galatians chapter 4 is seen in verse 31.
 - A. Pay careful attention to tense - "...we are..." - present tense (written 57, 58).
 - B. This allegory simply teaches that the law was (had already been), abolished at the cross and that N.T. Christians are not (then), under the old law.
 - 4. With God's approval?
 - A. See Hebrews 7:12.
 - 1. Was Jesus High Priest before A.D. 70?
 - 2. If so then there was a new law in existence prior to A.D. 70.
 - A. Hebrews 4:15 - "Have not" - Priesthood of Christ not futuristic.
 - B. Hebrews 7:24 - "Hath" - Priesthood of Christ not futuristic.
 - C. Hebrews 8:1 - "Have" - present tense.
 - D. Hebrews 9:11 - "Being come an..." - Priesthood not futuristic.
 - B. The entire book of Hebrews was written to show the superiority of the new system over the old.
 - 1. If both overlapped with God's approval, then was not the book of Hebrews a little early?
 - 2. Why were the Hebrews encouraged to give up Judaism if it was still approved of by God?
 - 3. Would it not have been just as good to remain under the Jewish system

- until A.D. 70 if theory is correct?
- C. Could Christians before A.D. 70 worship as priests - 1 Peter 2:5, 9?
 - 1. Could a Hebrew Christian, after Pentecost (Acts 2), still bring an animal across his shoulder and offer a sacrifice that he might typify the shedding of the blood of Christ?
 - A. Imagine typifying the death of Christ with the Passover lamb yearly while on the Lord's Day one eats the Lord's Supper remembering his death.
 - D. See Hebrews 9:15, 16.
 - 1. The N.T. (covenant system) came into affect at the death of Christ, not A.D. 70!
 - A. *"...we must put the fulfilling of the Law of Moses AFTER Calvary, which is what the New Testament does do in fact...No, the kingdom of Christ and God (Ephesians 5:5) was not established on the day of Pentecost."* Studies In Bible Prophecy, October 1980, pp. 1, 3, emphasis theirs.
 - 2. *"Again, we emphasize the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem was a crucial point in God's scheme of redemption, for it was the end of one world, and the completion and beginning of another world that had been born on Pentecost day."* S.O.P. pp. 36, 37.
 - A. Note, *"...beginning of another world that had been born on Pentecost day."*
 - 1. Isn't it interesting that something could be born, but not have its beginning until 40 years later?
 - E. During this overlapping period the Jews persecuted and hampered the spiritual kingdom (yet with God's approval).
 - 1. To contend that Judaism co-existed as an approved system of God from Pentecost to A.D. 70, in view of its unrelenting warfare upon the church, would have one of God's approved systems (Judaism), seeking to exterminate the other approved system (Christianity).
 - 2. Also, if the Law of Moses were binding on the Jews until A.D. 70, the Jews would not have been amenable to the Law of Christ during this period.
 - F. This period of overlapping is the period known of as the "last days" mentioned in the N.T.
 - 1. S.O.P. p. 76 – Chart – See appendix # 1.
 - 2. *"While Pentecost, in a sense, was the beginning of the Christian dispensation, yet the New Testament writers often spoke of it as a world or age to come, because the Jewish age had not yet ended at the time of their writing."* S. O. P. p. 79, paragraph 1.
 - 3. *"The right application of last days is to the closing period of the Jewish age, during which Christianity (Isaac) was born, and at the end of which Christianity was brought to perfection, and Ishmael was cast out."* S.O.P. p. 80, paragraph 3.

4. *"But the truth is, 'last days' **never** refer to the Christian age, but as we have shown, to the closing period of the Jewish age, which was from Pentecost to the fall of Jerusalem (or the end of the world). This was the period of time when God poured out his spirit upon all flesh, and this pouring out was in miraculous measure, or in the form of special gifts (1 Cor. 12:4). These gifts were given during the 'last days' only, or until that which was perfect came (1 Cor. 13:10). They served the purpose of bringing the church and the faith to maturity or perfection in Christ. The 'last days' were the infantile period or childhood days of the church, during which a change was being made from one age to another age (1 Cor. 13:11-13). S.O.P. p. 85, paragraph 2, emphasis his.*
5. The major problem with this point is the taking of a general term, such as "the last days," and making it refer to the same thing in every place.
6. See Joel 2:28-32.
 - A. Acts 2:14-22 (Joel fulfilled).
 - B. *"'These last days, the Christian dispensation;' whereas, the term 'times past' (Heb. 1:1) refer to, 'the Jewish dispensation.' Outline of Hebrews, C.D. Beagle, 1968 Stark County Training School", as quoted by W. Terry Varner, Studies in Biblical Eschatology, pp. 45, 46.*
 1. *"Christ himself appeared in the 'last days' (Hebrews 1:2, KJV). The ASV has 'the end of these days.' That time could be the end of the Jewish dispensation but could not be the end of the Christian dispensation.", Studies in Bible Prophecy, Sept. 1979, p. 1.*
7. Must allow text to define "the last days."
 - A. See Genesis 49:1 (fulfilled when Israel possessed and settled in their earthly inheritance).
 - B. See Numbers 24:14 where Balaam speaks of what would happen to the nation of Balak.
 - C. See Jude 18.
 1. Note v. 4 in relation to "certain men."
 2. In order to be consistent with the A.D. 70 doctrine, the "end time" would have to have already been there.
 - D. Even if we were to agree with King, which we don't, on his "last days" argument, where does it say that the work of revealing was to be restricted to the duration of his "last days"?
 1. *"It was all revealed, taught, and confirmed in the 'last days' period (Heb. 1:1), which ended with the consummation of that age (Mt. 24:3). The God-inspiring, revealing and confirming work of the Spirit was during the 'last days' ONLY...", McGuiggan - King Debate, Prop. 111, King's Second Affirmative, p. 154. No. 2.*

8. In association with the "last days" Ed Stevens sets forth his concept in his booklet, What Happened IN 70 AD?
 - A. *"Several in our brotherhood and among the denominations have written books, presenting the idea that the miraculous gifts ceased at 70 AD. Franklin Camp, Jack Lunsford, Guy N. Woods, and George E. Gardner are just a few. This is a staggering idea, especially regarding the implications it holds for the dating of N.T. books. If miraculous gifts ceased at 70 AD, then writing by inspiration, which was one of those gifts, must have ceased at 70 AD also! This means that all N.T. books had to have been finished before the cessation at 70AD!"* Page 13, paragraph 3, emphasis his.
 - B. *"At 70 AD, Jesus returned and ended the LAST DAYS of the Jewish nation. It was God's great and glorious DAY OF THE LORD for the vindication of His people, and an awesome day of judgment and destruction for those who had rejected and crucified Jesus. The two passages, 1 Cor. 1:5-8 and Acts 2:16-20, both had their fulfillment at 70 AD! The last days of the Jewish nation ended at 70 AD. A new age had begun. The miraculous gifts associated with the last days ceased also. Now we don't have to think in some nebulous terms about when the gifts ceased, such as 'when the last apostle died.' We can assign a definite date to it."* Page 15, paragraph 4, emphasis his.
 - C. *"Steven's logic is gravely at fault. Inspiration was a direct gift from God – no where given through the laying on of hands. Powers of the apostles last as long as the apostles did – John's case, until nearly 100 A.D."* personal correspondence with Guy N. Woods, December 16, 1982.
9. Even if the phrase "last days" does mean the last days of the Jewish age it won't fit the A.D. 70 doctrine because the Jewish age ended at the cross and not the destruction of Jerusalem - Colossians 2:14; Galatians 3:24, 25.
 - A. If the law was nailed to the cross it was "killed," done away with and without the law there was no Jewish system approved by God.
10. Note also that the phrase "the last days" is used in respect to a coming age - Isaiah 2:2; Jeremiah 23:20; Micah 4:1; Acts 2:17.
 - A. *"The expression, 'The last days,' was used by the Rabbis for that period of time which extends from the coming of the Messiah to the end of the world (Thus it signifies, this age or period we live in now.) The age of the Messiah is so termed in 1 John 3:18: 'Little children, it is the last time,' Paul also uses the same term, 2 Tim. 3:1; Heb. 1:2. (J. S. Howson, The Acts of the Apostles). Joseph Klausner, Professor Emeritus of Hebrew Literature and Jewish History in the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, gives a*

Messianic interpretation to Joel's prophecy. After quoting Joel 2:30-31 this eminent Hebrew scholar commented: 'Hereby was laid the foundation of the alarming descriptions of the great changes for the worse that will take place in nature in the time of 'the birth pangs of the Messiah'...

Klausner quotes Joel 2:28-32 as 'the description of the spiritual blessedness' in the days of the Messiah. 'We have here not the redemption of the Jews alone, as many Christian scholars would see it, but a universal redemption, a redemption of "all flesh." Obviously, redemption will come only to the good and upright among all the nations, the "remnant" to be saved from "the day of the Lord" and from the judgment upon the peoples...', Hub Of The Bible, J.D. Bales, pp. 47, 48.

- G. The major problem on this point is the failure to realize that the kingdom and the church are synonymous at times.
 - 1. The A.D. 70 doctrine has the church being born at Pentecost, but the kingdom coming with power at A.D. 70.
 - A. *"There are two basic views on the time of the arrival of the eternal kingdom. Some place its arrival at the ascension of Christ into heaven (quoting Daniel 7:13, 14 as proof), or more specifically on Pentecost day when the Holy Spirit came, while others assign it to the second coming of Christ (which they believe is yet future). Both views have insoluble problems because each is clouded with error"* S.O.P., p. 135, paragraph 3.
 - 1. Multiple errors in this chapter, most of which will be discussed on other points.
 - 2. *"ARE THE CHURCH AND THE KINGDOM THE SAME? If you believe this, try something: Put the word 'church' in the following passages and read them; Matthew 16:19; Luke 21:31; John 3:5; Acts 14:22; Colossians 1:13; Hebrews 12:28; Revelation 11:15. How do they sound? Now, try putting "kingdom" in the following verses: Matthew 16:18; Acts 2:47; Romans 16:16; I Corinthians 1:1; Galatians 1:2; Colossians 1:18; Revelation 1:4. What do you think? If they do not sound right, maybe that reveals that they are not identical and that the scriptures do not use them in such a fashion. Had you noticed that Paul, e.g., never wrote to the 'kingdom at Thessalonica' or the 'kingdoms of Galatia' (I Thessalonians 1:1; Galatians 1:2)., Studies in Bible Prophecy, October 1980, p. 4. "There are some identifying marks which show the church of the New Testament and the kingdom of God promised in the prophets to have close similarities. But we believe that to show them identical in every way is to not recognize certain*

passages which seem to reveal distinctiveness between the two." Studies In Bible Prophecy, Jan-March, 1982, p. 2.

A. Matthew 16:18, 19.

B. Ephesians 1:22, 23.

1. Are the church and the body the same?

2. Do they sound right when exchanged in other passages?

3. How come Paul never wrote to the body at Corinth?

3. We must keep in mind that the phrase "kingdom" or "kingdom of God" sometimes refers to heaven - Matthew 8:11; 2 Peter 1:11.

A. This point is gravely over looked in the S.O.P.

H. Some errors of this chapter.

1. *"First, in Acts 14:22 Paul exhorts new converts to 'continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.'"* Page 136, paragraph 5.

A. Failure to understand the above point, text speaking of heaven.

B. See N.I.V.

C. Note 2 Thessalonians 1:5.

2. *"Therefore, reason the 'future kingdom advocates,' if the eternal kingdom of Christ or of Daniel 2:44 came on Pentecost, then God has two eternal kingdoms, because the kingdom of Acts 14:22 and 2 Pet. 1:11 was still future long after Pentecost. Their reasoning is correct and presents a problem of two eternal kingdoms, which is inconceivable."* Page 137, paragraph 1.

A. Again, speaking of heaven and not the church.

B. Following the Christian graces will put one into this everlasting kingdom, i.e. heaven.

1. What do the Christian graces have to do with entering the kingdom or the church?

C. This is a failure to allow the passage to remain in its context.

3. *"A second passage is 2 Tim. 4:1, which equates the coming of the kingdom with the second coming of Christ."* Page 137, paragraph 2.

A. King says that the *"quick and the dead"* are Gentiles and Jews.

1. This is done so as to avoid the problem of there being dead waiting judgment.

B. Where does it say that the kingdom is yet to come except in the mind of Max King?

1. If this was speaking of the kingdom (i.e. the church), then no one was in the kingdom until A.D. 70 - Colossians 1:13.

C. See N.I.V., N.A.S.V., R.S.V.

1. Note that we have a parenthetical statement.

A. Thus a statement that could have been left out.

4. *"Third, the coming of the kingdom in power in Mark 9:1 is parallel*

with Matt. 16:27, 28. Many are willing to apply verse 28 to Pentecost while ignoring the rest of the text. Verse 27 states, 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.'" Page 139, paragraph 2.

A. No universal judgment in A.D. 70.

B. Thousands of people living then did not know, nor did they care, of what happened in Jerusalem.

C. Actually we have a descriptive statement of Jesus.

1. Text says nothing of a coming kingdom.

5. *"Heb. 12:28 is often cited as proof the eternal kingdom came on Pentecost, but again we find application being made to the fall of Judaism. The writer did not say, 'we have **already** received a kingdom which cannot be moved,' but rather 'wherefore we **receiving** a kingdom which cannot be moved.' There is a difference in 'receiving' and 'having received.'"* Pages 140, 141, paragraph 3, emphasis his.

A. "Receiving" is a present tense participle denoting that at that time they were receiving a kingdom.

1. See N.A.S.V., R.S.V.; The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, p. 75.

2. Vines Expository Dictionary says this means *"To receive from another,"* p. 936.

B. The Second Coming of Christ was in the lifetime of the apostles.

1. *"This was the time that the 'prince and his people' came and destroyed the city and the sanctuary (temple), bringing the whole house of Israel to complete desolation. This was the end of the world, the destruction of the temple, and the coming of Christ."* S.O.P. p. 68, paragraph 3 and 4; *"It is his second coming, and it is his coming in the fall of Jerusalem, for these are not two separate comings but **one**."* p. 70, paragraph 2, emphasis his; *"Inspiration declares the coming of Christ is a past reality."* p. 121, paragraph 1; *"If, and when we ever understand the purpose and effect of Christ's second coming, we will likewise thank God that it is now history!"* p. 129, paragraph 1.

2. *"As we shall soon see, the second coming of Christ was to shortly follow his first coming. Both comings would transpire within the same generation of time."* S.O.P. p. 101, paragraph 2.

3. *"While the term 'second coming' does not appear in the scriptures, the fact of Christ's coming again is repeatedly affirmed. In Heb. 9:28 we have the expression 'appear the second time' Jesus promised his disciples, 'I will come again, and receive you unto myself.' (John 14:1-3)"* S.O.P. p. 105, paragraph 1.

A. Why did the Apostles remain on earth?

4. *The second coming of Christ is the theme of Zechariah 14, and is equated with Matt. 24 and the fall of Jerusalem. It is called the 'day of the Lord' (verse 1), and Jerusalem is the scene of activity (verse 2). The Lord's presence in that event is symbolically pictured in verse 4, 'as standing in that day upon the*

mount of Olives,... ” S.O.P. p. 107, paragraph 3.

A. Did Jesus stand on the mount?

1. Did mountains split?

5. *“As already shown from Matt. 24, Christ ascribed his coming, the end of the world, and the destruction of the temple to ‘that generation.’ ...The temple’s destruction, the coming of Christ, and the end of the world (Matt. 24:3) are inseparably related.”* S.O.P. p. 109.

A. Did Jesus gather his elect to fulfill their idea of Matthew 24?

6. A major point overlooked in the S.O.P. is that the fact that the comings of Jesus were (are), not always a literal coming.

A. Luke 17:22, 26 - note days (plural).

B. Revelation 2:5, no trace of the Ephesian church today, when did he come?

C. Acts 2, coming in his kingdom, Max King to the contrary not withstanding.

D. A.D. 70, Matthew 24.

E. Second Coming

1. That day - 2 Timothy 1:12; 1 Corinthians 5:5, Destruction of Jerusalem?

2. 1 Thessalonians 4:14-5:8

3. 2 Thessalonians 2:1-6; 2 Peter 3:3, 4.

7. "At hand" does not necessarily refer to the second coming - James 5:8; 1 Peter 4:7

8. The truth about the second coming.

A. Only two personal comings ever referred to in the scriptures:

1. His birth - Isaiah 9:6; Philippians 2:5-11; Hebrews 10:5; Matthew 1:23.

2. His second coming.

A. Hebrews 9:27, 28.

1. "Appear" - who saw him appear in A.D. 70?

2. The second time.

3. Hebrews 9:26 - "appeared," "world" (age), "sacrifice" contrast with v. 28 - "appear" seen at both comings.

3. His second personal coming was not in A.D. 70.

A. Jesus knew, and gave signs relative to the A.D. 70 coming - Matthew 24:33, 34; Luke 21:20

B. He did not know the time, nor did he give any signs relative to the second coming - Matthew 24:36; Mark 13:32

4. If this event happened in A.D. 70 then there is now no hope of a second coming - Hebrews 9:27, 28; Titus 2:12, 13.

A. 2 Timothy 4:8 - "...crown of righteousness...shall give...unto all them that love his appearing."

1. Where is Max King's crown?

5. Jesus is coming again - 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18; John 5:28, 29; 1 Corinthians 15:19-28.

- C. Judaism destroyed (A.D. 70), and out of the dead carcass of Judaism came forth Christianity.
1. According to the A.D. 70 advocates Christianity came prior to the perfection of the kingdom, thus the kingdom and the church are not the same.
 2. *"...resurrection had reference many times to the change from the Jewish system to the Christian system, where the material body of Judaism is put off on death and the spiritual body of Christianity is resurrected in life. This is Paul's primary application in 2 Cor. 5 and 1 Cor. 15."* S.O.P. p. 191, paragraph 2; *"Where were these New Testament Christians during the decay period of Judaism? They were in that **natural** body, germinated (or begotten by the seed, 1 Pet. 1:23) and growing, anticipating their coming forth into a fully developed spiritual body."* p. 207, paragraph 4, emphasis his; *"...Phil. 3:21 deals with resurrection of the body or the church from the Jewish body into its heavenly inheritance at the fall of Judaism. It is the time of redemption, adoption, inheritance, marriage, manifestation as sons, etc. (An understanding of the overlapping of Judaism and Christianity is essential to a proper discernment of many New Testament problems and passages of scripture)." p. 195, paragraph 2; "Thus, out of the decay of Judaism arose the spiritual body of Christianity that became fully developed or resurrected by the end-time."* p. 200, paragraph 1; *"The time, therefore, of their entrance into the eternal kingdom was at the coming of Christ in the end of that age or world to cast out the children of the kingdom and give it to another nation – the saints (Matt. 21:43; Matt. 25:34; Daniel 7:21, 22)...Thus, the obedient citizens of the natural body are brought forth to eternal life in the spiritual body that was raised up as a result of the death and decay of the natural body."* p. 202, paragraph 1.
 3. *"No.5. BUT ONE THING IS BEYOND DISPUTE. The decay of fleshly Judaism and the rising of a new Israel while simultaneous was BY NO MEANS INSTANTANEOUS. The time from Pentecost to 70 A.D. was a TRANSITION period. What does **transition** mean? What does it imply? Jim **knows** and he has said "Nor can we fail to notice the existence of a transition period in the New Testament era" (Daniel, page 41). Transition is defined as "a passing from one condition, form, stage, activity, place, etc. to another" (Webster). Jim, from what **CONDITION, FORM, STAGE, ACTIVITY, and PLACE** did Jewish Christians pass? **OUT OF WHAT** did they come? Who made the rule that they could not be made free from the Law, redeemed, and forgiven in Christ **BEFORE** their transition was completed. **JIM McGUIGGAN MADE THAT RULE** not God Almighty. No prisoner ever came out of the penitentiary **before** he was **pardoned**. Pardon is the **first step**. His pardon, release and separation may be taken in "one gulp," but it involves a series of actions." McGuiggan - King Debate, - p. 217 no. 5.*
 4. *"Realized Eschatology teaches that the church was resurrected out of the dead body of Judaism in 70 A.D."* "A Study of the Resurrection," The World Evangelist, March 1978, paragraph 1.

5. The truth about the destruction of Judaism and the coming forth of Christianity from the dead carcass of Judaism.
 - A. If Judaism died and Christianity came forth from its dead carcass then you would have a reincarnation instead of a resurrection.
 1. When Jesus was buried, Jesus resurrected, not someone else.
 2. When Lazarus was buried, Lazarus resurrected, not someone else.
 3. When Dorcas died (Acts 9), Dorcas was resurrected, not someone else.
 - B. In order for Christianity to resurrect, Christianity would have had to have lived and died.
 - C. Concerning the word "body" in Philippians 3:21.
 1. *"With this thought before us, let us look once more at Phil. 3:21. 'Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.' The first thing obvious here is the statement 'our vile body' or our body of 'humiliation,' which is the true meaning of the word vile. Notice, Paul did not say our **bodies** (plural), but **our body** (singular). Why did he use the plural 'our' and the singular 'body,' if he were talking about a general resurrection of individual dead bodies? The fact is that in this text the body is **one** or singular, and it was composed of as many members as were included in the plural word 'our,' or all Christians who were waiting for their body of humiliation to be manifested (sic) in glory, honor, and praise to God."* S.O.P. p. 194, paragraph 2, emphasis his.
 - A. We are told that since the word "body" is used instead of the plural word "bodies," it must have reference to a "body," Judaism.
 2. Such is not true.
 - A. Romans 8:16 - "...with our spirit..." (singular), "...that we are children..." (plural).
 - B. 2 Corinthians 4:17 - "For our light affliction" (singular), while in the previous verses Paul names several afflictions.
 - C. Romans 6:11-14 - "yourselves" (plural), "body" (singular).
 1. Note also v. 14 as this shows that it can't be Judaism or the law would still be in force.
 - D. Acts 2:37 - "they" (plural), "their" (plural), "heart" (singular).
 1. Note "yourselves" (plural), in v. 40 also.
 - E. Hebrews 6:12 - "them" (plural), "faith" (singular).
 - F. *"Coming In Their (plural, RWS) Lifetime"* (singular, RWS). S.O.P. p. 112, section heading.
6. One other major point that is overlooked is that Judaism had been destroyed at the cross, and from the cross came forth Christianity, not from the destruction of Judaism.
 - A. Colossians 2:14; Hebrews 7:19.
 - B. Matthew 24:28.
 1. Matthew 23:38 - Even before the cross Judaism had changed hands.

2. It was no longer a possession of God, but had been given over to the Jews.
- C. Between then and A.D. 70, Judaism was nothing more than a dead carcass awaiting burial.
 1. This came about in the destruction of Jerusalem.
 2. At a burial, the remains are put out of sight; this is what happened at the destruction of Jerusalem.
- D. Matthew 27:51.
 1. The splitting of the temple signified the parting of the ways.
 2. Judaism has come to a close as far as God was concerned.
 - A. And at the destruction of Jerusalem God removed all the remains.
 3. It was at the splitting of the temple that we see the means of access to God being destroyed.
 - A. God was about to enter a new temple, one not built with hands.
 - B. Therefore, He would no longer need the old one.
 1. 1 Corinthians 3:16 (church); 1 Corinthians 6:16; Hebrew 3:6; 1 Timothy 3:15.
- D. The New Heavens and the New Earth describe Christianity as opposed to Judaism.
 1. *"Ishmael was typical of the Jewish world...Isaac was typical of the Christian world...That this spiritual seed, along with their constitutional system is referred to as a world, or the new heaven and earth, will be seen in the progress of this study."* S.O.P. p. 33 - "God's Two Worlds," paragraph 1, 2.
 2. *"But from the context it is evident that the world of inheritance was the one typified by Isaac in contrast to the world typified by Ishmael."* S.O.P. p. 34, paragraph 1.
 3. *"Now not to be overlooked is the fact that these things were not of a distant FUTURE because of the present tense of the verbs 'are come.' Mt. Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, the church of the firstborn, Jesus, the new covenant, his blood, combine to constitute the new world promised to Abraham and his seed. It was not a world in contrast to the MATERIAL heavens and earth, but rather in contrast to the Jewish world...Placing the world promised to Abraham and his seed, at the end of the present material world puts it in contrast with the wrong world, and postpones the time of its arrival far beyond what scripture will allow. The world promised to Abraham's spiritual seed stands in contrast to that world promised his fleshly seed, and this is the new heaven and earth that replaces the old heaven and earth...Again, we emphasize the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem was a crucial point in God's scheme of redemption, for it was the end of one world, and the completion and beginning of another world that had been born on Pentecost day."* S.O.P. pp. 36, 37 paragraph 2, 3, emphasis his.
 4. *Having established the fact that the new heavens and earth stand in contrast to the Jewish world (and not the material creation)...*S.O.P. p. 37, "The New Heaven and Earth," paragraph 1.

5. The truth of the matter.
 - A. Matthew 5:17, 18; Luke 16:16; Matthew 11:13.
 1. Jesus taught that the law would not pass until all was fulfilled by him - John 19:30.
 - A. *“Therefore, Christ’s coming in the fall of Judaism was the fulfillment of **all things written** and spoken by the prophets of God. That event finished or completed the plan and mystery of God – all came to pass in the day that was appointed of the Lord. The Jewish system stood until every portion of the law was completely fulfilled. Jesus said, ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled’ (Matt. 5:17, 18). The heaven and earth, whose passing corresponded to the fulfillment of the law, is the same heaven and earth of Matt. 24:35, and corresponds to the world that was going to end in that generation – at the coming of Christ (Matt. 24:3, 14, 34, 35). It all happened in the fall of Jerusalem.”* S.O.P. pp. 229, 230, emphasis his.
 - B. Matthew 24:35; 2 Peter 3:10.
 - C. Genesis 1:1 - Judaism? Christianity? Universe?!
 - D. Exodus 20:11 - Judaism? Christianity? Universe?!
 - E. Ephesians 3:14,15.
 1. If the phrase "heaven and earth" refer to Judaism one should be able to show from the scriptures when the expression changed from speaking of the universe to Judaism.
 - F. If the phrase "heaven and earth" means Judaism, and if this means A.D. 70, then Matthew 5:18 is false because the law ended before A.D. 70.
 1. The argument advanced by the A.D. 70 advocates would be that the law passed away when the "heaven and earth" passed away.
 2. Yet when confronted with the significance of 1 Corinthians 11:26, they say that "till" doesn't mean "until that time" based upon the word "till", in 1 Corinthians 11:26, being a conjunction which would allow further eating of the Lord's Supper.
 - A. *“One of the objections found in considering the second coming of Christ as a past phenomenon is located in Paul’s words to the Corinthian church about 1900 years ago.”* Tract, Ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come" by Charles Geiser, p. 2, paragraph 1.
 3. Yet the word "till," in Matthew 5:18, is also a conjunction.
 - A. See Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, p. 268.
 4. Since the law passed at Calvary, then if "heaven and earth" are Judaism, then they too passed at Calvary.
 - A. And if "the new heaven and earth" signify the church, then this all came about at the cross and not in A.D. 70.

1. *“Thus, the new world, or heaven and earth promised to Abraham typified by the Jewish world, set forth in Old Testament prophecy, anticipated by the New Testament saints, and envisioned by John in Revelation, found its fulfillment in the close or end of the Jewish age, which extended until the time of the invasion of the Romans into Palestine and the destruction of the Jewish temple and their holy city.”* S.O.P. p. 38, paragraph 2.
 2. The major problem is in realizing that the law was fulfilled at Calvary, and not A.D. 70.
 3. What a tragedy it is to have brethren who do not realize the simple fact that the law was long gone by A.D. 70 - Romans 7:14; Galatians 2:16; Ephesians 2:13-16; Colossians 2:14-16; Hebrews 2:1-4; Hebrews 7:12.
- G. One of the A.D. 70 advocates went so far as to write an article entitled “The Corinthians Were Under The Law.”
1. See 2 Corinthians 3:11,15.
 2. *“Where were these New Testament Christians during the **decay** period of Judaism? They were in that **natural body**, germinated (or begotten by the seed, 1 Pet. 1:23) and growing, anticipating their coming forth into a fully developed spiritual body.”* S.O.P. p. 207, paragraph 4, emphasis his.
- E. The Kingdom came in Glory and Power in A.D. 70.
1. *“There are two basic views on the **time** of the arrival of the eternal kingdom. Some place its arrival at the ascension of Christ into heaven (quoting Daniel 7:13, 14 as proof), or more specifically on Pentecost day when the Holy Spirit came, while others assign it to the second coming of Christ (which they believe is yet future). Both views have insoluble problems because each is clouded with error.”* S.O.P. p. 135, paragraph 1, emphasis his.
 2. *“The establishment of the eternal kingdom is equated with the time of Christ’s coming in his kingdom with power, which is commonly assigned to Pentecost day. But this is an assumption lacking in scripture proof. The first proof offered is Mark 9:1 and Acts 8:1 (sic), which is a coalition of two scriptures separated in time.”* *“The power received by the apostles would eventually lead to, or result in the kingdom’s coming in power, but the one precedes the other in time and event.”* *“...the apostle’s question and the Lord’s answer concerning the kingdom, places its coming in power, beyond Pentecost.”* *“Thus, the second coming of Christ and the restoration of the kingdom were synchronous events, and neither was fulfilled on Pentecost...Christ did not come in his kingdom with power on Pentecost.”* S.O.P. p. 138, paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4.
 3. *“Pentecost was the beginning of his kingdom, but the fall of Jerusalem was the climactic state of its development and manifestation in power, glory, and judgment.”* S.O.P. p. 139, paragraph 2.

4. *"There was no glory for Christ or his saints while Judaism stood against the kingdom, and occupied the place belonging to the new heaven and earth. But, because Judaism was about to be destroyed, the glory of Christ and the saints was **about** to be manifested. (Rom. 8:18; Col. 3:4; 2 Cor. 4:17, 18) S.O.P. p. 150, paragraph 1, emphasis his.*
5. *"...there is nothing contained in Daniel 2:44 that makes Pentecost the necessary date of its fulfillment." S.O.P. p. 140, paragraph 3.*
 - A. *"More needs to be said concerning 1 Cor. 15, which will be considered in the resurrection chapter. The purpose here is to show that 'the end' referred to the second coming of Christ in the consummation of the Jewish age, and marked the beginning of his eternal kingdom (delivered or raised up) and his reign forever and ever." S.O.P. p. 146, paragraph 1.*
 - B. *"That was the time of removing the kingdom from Israel and giving it to another nation, namely spiritual Israel (Matt. 21:40-44)." S.O.P. p. 129, paragraph 4.*
 - C. *"(Luke 21:31, 32). This passage does not deny the existence of the kingdom from Pentecost, but rather establishes the time when the kingdom came in power and victory (Rev. 11:15). The saints 'inherited' the kingdom at the coming of Christ in power and glory (Matt. 25:31-34), and the gospel of Luke places these events at the fall of Jerusalem. According to Daniel, the saints possessed the kingdom **after** their battle with the beast, and at the coming of Christ, the Ancient of days (Dan. 7:21, 22). S.O.P. p. 235, paragraph 2, emphasis his.*
 1. By the way, what good was a kingdom that was not "possessed" until 40 years later?
6. The truth of the matter.
 - A. If the kingdom did not come in Glory and Power until A.D. 70 this leaves the pre-seventy Christians a part of something that had no Glory and no Power.
 1. *"Second, nothing starting on Pentecost was considered perfected, redeemed, delivered, inherited, or possessed by the saints until the Jewish system was destroyed." S.O.P. p. 153, paragraph 3.*
 2. One can't help but wonder why one would want to be a part of a kingdom that had no Glory and or Power?
 - B. Jesus had all power and authority (Matthew 28:18-20), during this period, but according to this theory he established something on Pentecost that lacked both Glory and Power.
 - C. According to the A.D. 70 doctrine Pentecost had no power.
 1. The gospel preached on the day of Pentecost was void of glory.
 2. The 3,000 baptized experienced no victory.
 - D. Who "opened the doors" of the kingdom in A. D. 70?
 1. Matthew 16:18, 19.
 2. Peter was dead before A.D. 70.
 - A. As a matter of fact most all of the apostles were dead by then.

- E. Colossians 1:11-14.
 - 1. Does this text give the impression that there was, at that time, a powerless, glory less, victory less kingdom?
- F. *“Thus, the second coming of Christ and the restoration of the kingdom were synchronous event, and neither was fulfilled on Pentecost...Christ did not come in his kingdom with power on Pentecost.”* S.O.P. p. 138. paragraph 4.
 - 1. Herein is another grave error.
 - A. The N.T. kingdom is not a restoration of the kingdom of Israel.
 - B. To restore something is to bring it back to its original state or condition.
 - 1. This, of course, was NEVER done!!
 - 2. For it was NEVER intended to be done!!
 - C. God implemented a new covenant, not a refurbished old one – Hebrews 9:15.
- G. *But it is argued that he came **to** rather than **from** the Ancient of days, but this is not the true rendering of the passage. The version of the Septuagint renders the last two clauses thus: ‘As the Ancient of days he came, and those standing around were present to him.’”* S.O.P. pp. 142, paragraph 3.
 - 1. The impression left by the A.D. 70 advocates, as allegedly drawn from the Septuagint rendering of Daniel 7:13, is that Jesus is the Ancient of Days, and would (did), receive his kingdom at the second coming.
 - 2. If you will check any and all reputable English Versions you will see that the rendering of this passage is incorrect as per the A.D. 70 theory.
 - A. The correct English Versions have the Son of Man going to the Ancient of Days to receive his kingdom.
 - B. This indicates the receiving of the kingdom at his ascension and not at a second coming in A.D. 70 - Luke 19:12.
- H. The kingdom came with Glory and Power at Pentecost as this was after the ascension of Christ to the Ancient of Days to receive that kingdom.
- F. No future bodily resurrection, as the resurrection is past.
 - 1. *“Their resurrection will be the receiving of their new bodies, and whatever else is involved in their adoption for habitation in the eternal state. Truly death has been **destroyed** ‘in Christ’ (1 Cor. 15:22).”* *“The only difference today (but a vital one) is the fact that Hades has been emptied of its subjects and destroyed (Rev. 20:14), which took place at the coming of Christ in the fall of Judaism, and now, at death, one goes directly to his reward due to the fact that the primary resurrection of 1 Cor. 15 is **past**.”* S.O.P. p. 204, paragraphs 1, 2, emphasis his.
 - 2. Note the following inconsistency: S.O.P. p. 204 where the resurrection is said to be in the past but still in the future.
 - A. *“Their resurrection will be...”* - How can it be both past and yet future?
 - 3. If the resurrection is past where does hope fit into the overall scheme?
 - A. Remember Biblical hope is desire plus expectation.

- B. Hope does not refer to past or present possessions - Romans 8:24.
4. If, as the S.O.P. says, "*Hades has been emptied of its subjects and destroyed (Revelation 20:14), which took place at the coming of Christ in the fall of Judaism...*" then would it not also follow that the devil has been in eternal hell (Gehenna), since A.D. 70?
 - A. If not, why not based on Revelation 20:10?
 - B. Have all who have lived since A.D. 70 not had a devilish adversary, as a roaring lion, walking about seeking whom he might destroy -1 Peter 5:8?
 - C. If he is (and he is), still doing what Peter said how could he be literally roasting in the fires of an eternal Hell (Gehenna)?
 5. The A.D. 70 advocates do not deny the bodily resurrection of Christ, but they do deny a future (or even a bodily) resurrection of mankind.
 - A. "*A physical resurrection, however, is denied (and with scriptural support), but the receiving of a spiritual body at death is affirmed. The fact that the primary application of the resurrection is applied to the death of Judaism, and to the rise of Christianity, does not deny the bodily resurrection of Christ, or the state of eternal life that is in him, but rather confirms it.*" S.O.P. p. 204, paragraph 1.
 - B. Acts 26:23 (Was he first and last?).
 - C. 1 Corinthians 15:20, 23 (First-fruits indicate what?).
 - D. The word "resurrection" comes from two Latin words "re," meaning again, and "surgere," meaning to rise.
 6. "*The concept of a fleshly body's coming out of a literal grave is quite contrary to the profound teaching of Paul...The Bible teaches a resurrection of the **dead** but not the resurrection of the **flesh**.*" S.O.P. p. 216, paragraph 3, emphasis his.
 - A. If the body of Jesus had not been resurrected could there have been a resurrection?
 1. Based upon the true meaning of the word, of course not!
 - B. If the body of Christians, both past and future, is not resurrected in what since is there a resurrection?
 7. "***First**, it must be assumed that a physical body will come out of the grave, for such is not taught here or anywhere else in the Bible. It is only stated that they which are in the graves shall come forth. **Nothing** is said about the state or nature of that which comes forth. **Secondly**, it is assumed that the dead will be raised in a physical body and then be changed to enter the eternal kingdom. Paul taught that the **living** would be 'changed' and that the **dead** would be 'raised' incorruptible. They were not to be raised and then changed or made incorruptible, for Paul said you do not reap that body which is sown (1 Cor. 15:37). **Thirdly**, it is assumed that 'the change' of the living involves the physical body. Many interpret 1 Cor. 15 as dealing with the end of all time and all fleshly existence on the earth, but this remains to be proven.*" S.O.P. pp. 218, 219, emphasis his.
 - A. Would you, in reading 1 Corinthians 15, understand it to imply or relate to

- the end of the Jewish era and the beginning of the Christian one?
- B. *This 'end' in 1 Cor. 15:24 corresponds to the 'end' in Matt. 24:14; 1 Pet. 4:7, and refers to the end of the Jewish age. To 'deliver up the kingdom to God' does not mean to 'give it up,' and cease to reign or be king, but rather to raise it up or restore it to its rightful place.*” S.O.P. pp. 143, 144.
 - C. 1 Corinthians 15:24 - "deliver up," "restore."
 - 1. *"To give over into (one's) power or use"* 1 Cor. 15:24, Thayer's, p. 481.
 - 2. *"To deliver over,"* Vines Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words, p. 291.
 - 3. *"To deliver over, as to prison, judgment, or punishment,"* The Interlinear Greek English N.T., p. 75.
 - 4. *"To surrender, i.e. yield up, instruct, transmit;...deliver (up), give (over, up),"* Strong's Greek Dictionary of the N.T., p. 54.
8. John 5:28, 29.
- A. *"Dwelling in graves or in the dust of the earth meant the same thing, denoting the fallen, forlorn state of Israel in Babylon. The grave emblematic of death and is metonymically used for the state of the spiritual dead, as in John 5:25-29."* S.O.P. p. 216, paragraph 5.
 - 1. Metonymy: Word used in the place of another that it suggests, for example, "a man sets a good table, instead of good food."
 - 2. John 5:28, 29, according to the A.D. 70 advocates, means Judaism.
 - A. Not physical body - S.O.P. p. 218, see quote above.
 - B. Not literal graves – *"This text deals with spiritual, not physical death, which is fairly evident from the context. The 'quickenings' power of God and Christ (John 5:19-23) has to do with spiritual regeneration."* S.O.P. p. 219, paragraph 3.
 - C. Judaism is the metaphorical grave – *"At the end of Judaism came the judgment announced of God...Judaism was the metaphorical grave of the spiritual dead out of which this resurrection took place."* S.O.P. p. 220, paragraphs 3, 4.
 - B. The truth of the matter.
 - 1. What is in the graves of John 5:28, 29? - Bodies!
 - A. Remember the argument on Philippians 3:21 and the use of the word "body"?
 - 1. Look at the words here, "All" (plural), "graves" (plural), "they" (plural).
 - 2. It appears to me that there are a plurality of graves and more than one in these graves.
 - 3. Yet if we were dealing with Judaism why would we need more than one grave?
 - A. Even with the A.D. 70 advocates' reasoning, we would need only one grave for the one body of Judaism.
 - 2. Are the graves literal graves?
 - A. *"A sepulchre, tomb,"* see Mt. 23:29; 27:52; 28:8; Mk. 5:2; Lk.

- 11:44; John 11:17,31; Acts 13:29," Thayer's, p. 416
- B. *"Tombs, the idea of burial."* - Word Studies In The N.T., Vol. 2, p. 138.
 - C. *"It usually denotes a tomb, and is translated either tomb or sepulcher or grave."* - Vines, p. 512.
 - D. *"Grave, sepulchre, tomb."* - Strong's Greek Dictionary, p. 48, no. 3419.
 - E. "Judaism" - S.O.P.
 - 1. Where is the lexicographical proof?
 - 2. Assertions won't work!
 - G. Adoption (manifestation of sons), marriage, and redemption occurred at A.D. 70.
 - 1. *"...Phil. 3:21 deals with resurrection of the body or the church from the Jewish body into its heavenly inheritance at the fall of Judaism. It is the time of redemption, adoption, inheritance, marriage, manifestation as sons, etc. (An understanding of the overlapping of Judaism and Christianity is essential to a proper discernment of many New Testament problems and passages of scripture)." S.O.P. p. 195, "The coming of Christ was the destruction of Jerusalem and Judaism, and the receiving in marriage of the bride...The wedding was ready when the city was burned (Matt. 22:7, 8)." p. 128, "The fall of Jerusalem was the culmination of God's redemptive program, which signaled the fulness of times when all things were brought to perfection in Christ (Eph. 1:10). It marked the beginning of the new age anticipated by the saints and prophets of old;..." p. 227.*
 - 2. Thus the church from A.D. 33 to A.D. 70 had no redemption, adoption, or inheritance.
 - 3. Neither were they "married" to Christ, and they further lacked the blessings of sonship.
 - A. This is true due to the fact that the above came either at A.D. 33 or A.D.70.
 - 1. They could not come twice.
 - 4. S.O.P. p. 30 - *"...encouraged to faithfulness the offspring of the freewoman..."*
 - A. The "offspring" of the freewoman would be Christians.
 - B. However, on page 195 (quoted above) we see that neither marriage nor manifestation of sons was until A.D. 70.
 - 1. How is it possible to produce "offspring" before the "manifestation of sons?"
 - 2. What is the nature of children born to a physical union before marriage?
 - A. Illegitimate!
 - 3. What, then, is the nature of children born to a spiritual union before marriage?
 - A. Once again, illegitimate!
 - 4. Therefore, the S.O.P. has every Christian born into the family of God between Pentecost and A.D. 70 as illegitimate children of God.

- A. If not, why not?!
- C. It would appear to me that Jesus was "married" to the church when Ephesians 5 was written at about A.D. 62 or 63 or there would be no true analogy.
 - 1. The stress of Ephesians 5 is upon the importance of the purity of the church.
 - A. Ephesians 5:21-33.
 - 1. "...is the head...", not to become the head.
 - 2. Keep in mind no one has the right to wear the husbands name until the marriage.
 - B. This then clearly shows that the church was the "wife" of Christ prior A.D. 70.
 - 1. How would the church be subject unto Christ, in light of this analogy, if it was not yet married to Him?
 - 2. Also, "one flesh" does not happen until marriage.
 - C. The context shows subjection of the wife (i.e. the church), unto the husband (i.e. Christ).
 - D. *"For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:17, 18). The heaven and earth, whose passing corresponded to the fulfillment of the law, is the same heaven and earth of Matt. 24:35, and corresponds to the world that was going to end in that generation – at the coming of Christ (Matt. 24:3, 14, 34, 35). It all happened in the fall of Jerusalem."* S.O.P. p. 230, paragraph 1.
 - 1. *"As here, of betrothing or taking a wife,"* Word Studies In The New Testament, Vol. 3, p. 345.
 - 2. *"...is used in the middle voice of marrying or giving in marriage; in 2 Cor. 11:2 it is rendered 'espoused,' metaphorically of the relationship established between Christ and the local church, through the Apostle's instrumentality.* Vines, p. 381.
 - 3. *"**Espoused** does not mean necessarily **married**; but when joined with the word **husband**, it means **married**."* Questions Answered by Lipscomb and Sewell, p. 431, emphasis theirs.
 - D. It would appear to me that there was sonship when Galatians 3:26, 27 was written.
- 5. *"Now let us study individually the six promised blessings to Daniel's people, and the holy city. These were to come in fulness, not on Pentecost, but the fall of Jerusalem, because the perfection of Old Testament saints depended upon the victory and acceptance of the 'first-fruits' of the gospel."* S.O.P. p. 57, paragraph 2.
 - A. These "six promise blessings" are – "TO FINISH TRANSGRESSION," "TO MAKE AN END OF SINS," TO MAKE RECONCILIATION FOR

INIQUITY,” “TO BRING IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS,” “TO SEAL UP THE VISION AND PROPHECY,” and “TO ANOINT THE MOST HOLY.” S.O.P. pp. 60-64.

1. "To make an end of sins."
 - A. Didn't happen until 70 A.D., can you believe it?
2. "To make reconciliation for iniquity."
 - A. I thought all this happened at the cross?!
 1. Matthew 26:28.
 2. Galatians 4:4-7 - note tenses.
 3. Ephesians 1:3-11.
 - A. Ephesians 1:3 - "all spiritual blessings" before A.D. 70.
 - B. Ephesians 1:7 - "in whom we have redemption," before A.D. 70.
 - C. Ephesians 1:11 - "have obtained an inheritance," before A.D. 70.
 - B. *"Of the 'things' realized by the New Testament saints in A.D. 70, one is 'salvation.' Geiser wrote, 'Salvation was directly related to the second coming of Christ (Heb. 9:28)'...I responded to this comment by pointing out the meaning of the word 'directly'" that is, '1. in a direct way or line; straight; 2. without a person or thing coming between; immediately [directly responsible]; 3. exactly; completely [directly opposite]; 4. instantly; right away' (Webster) and questioned Geiser if he was implying 'that salvation was not inaugurated prior to the second coming' ...in A.D. 70? Geiser then asked and stated, 'Did remission of sins "come" with the "preaching of the gospel at Pentecost?" I had thought eis meant 'towards, in direction of' (Acts 2:38)."* Studies In Biblical Eschatology, Vol. 1, p. 63, emphasis theirs.
 1. Therefore, pre A.D. 70 Christians had no remission of sins according to this doctrine.
 2. *"The affirmative [WTV] goes into much 'depth' on eis, with the conclusion that 'Peter says that their "baptism" RESULTS in "remission," not in the future some 40 years away at the fall of Jerusalem' in his 3A18. But his whole piece of definitions did not resolve the TIME (WHEN?) of the fulfillment of eis. If what Peter preached and their obedience 'RESULTS' in 'remission,' WHEN DID 'remission' take place? Brother Varner says 'not in the future some 40 years away,' BUT THAT IS HIS INTERPRETATION OF EIS IN ACTS 2:38. If affirming it does not refer to the second coming of Christ, then denying will be equal in authority. Romans 11:26, 27; Daniel 9:24; Hebrews 10:16, 17 can help interpret Acts 2:38."* Studies In Biblical Eschatology, Vol. 1, p. 64, emphasis theirs.

A. CAN YOU BELIEVE A GROUP OF "GOSPEL

PREACHERS" WHO CANNOT UNDERSTAND ACTS
2:38?????

H. Judgment a past historical event.

1. *"The second coming of Christ is associated with numerous events that have a direct bearing on the consummation of God's redemptive purpose, such as the judgment, the resurrection, the end of the world, and the establishment of the eternal kingdom. In the previous chapter it was shown that the establishment of the eternal kingdom was a direct result of Christ's second coming, and since the judgment falls into the same time-table of events, its purpose and place in God's program of eschatology must be seen."* S.O.P. p. 155, paragraph 1; *"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 a judgment 2000 or more years future, he certainly would not have used mello in any tense, and especially in the present tense...In 2 Tim. 4:1, Paul informs Timothy of a coming judgment which was near. 'I earnestly testify therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is about to judge the living and dead according to his appearing and his kingdom.' In this passage Paul relates the judgment to the coming of Christ in his kingdom, and in the place of 'world' as in Acts 17:31, he uses the terms 'the quick' and 'the dead.'"* p. 158, paragraphs 1, 2.

A. Compare this to K.J.V.; N.I.V.; N.A.S.V.; R.S.V.; N.E.B.; Philips Translation; New American Catholic Bible.

2. On "Mello" see The Interlinear Greek-English N.T. on Mt. 16:27 - "...about..."

A. *"**'So likewise when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand'** (Lk. 21:31). The aspect of the kingdom that Jesus was dealing with in this text, which would be manifested at His second coming, was not **'at hand'** **WHEN Jesus made that statement to His disciples** (as Jim claims) McGuiggan-King Debate, p. 67, emphasis theirs.*

3. *"James said the coming of the Lord is **at hand** (Jas. 5:8). If, as some affirm, this can cover a 2,000 year period of time, we run into an exegetical problem in 2 Thess. 2:2 where Paul said the coming of the Lord was **not at hand**. James said it was, Paul said it was not. Which one is correct?...When Paul wrote the second Thessalonians letter, the time of Christ's coming was not at hand. When James wrote his Epistle, the time was at hand. The Epistle of James is dated from eight to ten years later than the second Thessalonian letter, which furnishes us with some idea of the nearness of time by the expression 'at hand.' Eight or more years was enough to make the difference between Christ's coming being at hand and not at hand."* S.O.P. pp. 114, 115, paragraph 2; *"Thus Matt. 16:27, 28 and 2 Tim. 4:1 are synchronous in time and event. Neither passage can apply to Pentecost day, but both must apply to **that generation**, finding fulfillment in the judgment and destruction of Judaism, and the redemption and salvation of spiritual Israel."* S.O.P. p. 158,

paragraph 3.

A. Now the question is, which is it?

B. Was His coming "at hand" or not?

4. The truth of the matter.

A. Acts 17:30, 31

1. How would the fall of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70, motivate the Greeks of Acts 17 to repentance?

A. Actually, the motivation for repentance is found in v. 31.

2. If the word "world" has reference to Judaism why would the judgment brought upon the Jews at Jerusalem bring about repentance to the Greeks at Athens?

B. *"Paul told the Athenians to repent and turn to Christ because he was going to judge the world. But when? How soon would that judgment day come? Many feel there is nothing in the text itself to indicate time, whether near or afar, but to this we can hardly agree. Most Greek interlinears will furnish this reading" 'Because he set a day in which he is about to judge the habitable world in righteousness by a man whom he appointed.' 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 actions, meaning at the point of, or ready to do what has been stated. Had Paul meant to teach a judgment 2000 or more years future, he certainly would not have used mello in any tense, especially in the present tense."* S.O.P., pp. 157, 158, emphasis his.

1. Note, once again, p. 367 of the Interlinear...

2. *"To intend, have in mind, think to, ... Acts 17:31."* - Thayer's, p. 396.

A. Preceding the above definition, Thayer defines the word "mello" as "to be on the point of doing or suffering something."

1. It is significant that Thayer does not list Acts 17:31 as an illustration of this usage.

2. *"Mello signifies (a) of intention, to be about to do something, e.g. Acts 3:3; 18:14; 20:3; Heb. 8:5; (b) of certainty, compulsion or necessity, to be certain to act, e.g. John 6:71. See Almost, Begin, Come, Intend, Mean, Mind, Point of (at), Ready, Shall, Should, Tarry."* - Vines, p. 17.

3. *"The term mello means 'to be about to, be on the point of..., it serves to express in general a settled futurity...to intend.'" - Analytical Greek Lexicon, p. 262.*

C. *"There is no evidence that "mello," even with the present infinitive, necessarily implies immediate action. It only implies something certain to happen sometime in the future."* - Bill Lambert, B.A. Degree in N.T. Greek, as quoted by Robert Taylor, Jr., Sept. 1973 First Century Christian.

D. Therefore, to conclude this point, there is nothing in the text that demands that "mello" be translated "about to."

5. Acts 24:25.

- A. Does judgment refer to the destruction of Jerusalem?
 - 1. If so why would Felix, a Roman citizen, tremble when he heard of judgment upon the Jews at Jerusalem?
 - 2. Especially since he would be one of the administrators of that judgment.
- B. It would appear to me that he would rejoice!
- 6. *"...and here this judgment seems to involve **all nations** or all the **tribes of Israel**. It was a judgment to determine true spiritual Israel from rebellious fleshly Israel...The kingdom of God was never taken from **Gentiles** for they never had it (Eph. 2:12). Nor were the **Gentiles** ever cast out of the kingdom, for they were never in it."* S.O.P. p. 170, paragraph 1, emphasis his.
 - A. Were (are), the Gentiles the Spiritual Israel?
 - 1. Romans 11:11-26; Galatians 6:16.
 - B. If so, then what happened to them?
 - 1. According to the S.O.P. Spiritual Israel was involved in the judgment of Matthew 25:31-46.
 - 2. However, the S.O.P. teaches that the Gentiles were not involved in this judgment.
 - 3. Therefore, the judgment of Matthew 25 must be futuristic, seeing it involves spiritual Israel.
- 7. *"This judgment, commonly referred to as the great white throne judgment, is the last or final judgment in the plan of redemption. Again, emphasis is given to the fact that it is not the end of judgment in time, but the final judgment in God's plan or system of redemption."* S.O.P. p. 176, paragraph 3.
 - A. How can this be?
- I. The significance of the fall of Jerusalem.
 - 1. Herein is found one of the major problems of the A.D. 70 doctrine.
 - A. *"The fall of Babylon was crucial to the restoration of true Israel...God made the end of Judaism the focal point of prophecy and all revelation, therefore the application intended by inspiration must be made....but Judaism was the only force of opposition that could completely block or prevent the establishment of Christianity. A relationship existed there that never existed in any other form of opposition. She (Judaism) was a relative of Abraham that could (if not removed) block the legal rights and inheritance of the spiritual seed; thus we **are** dealing with a **very crucial** judgment."* S.O.P. p. 165, *"No one should have difficulty in realizing that the end of Judaism, as represented in the fall of Jerusalem, was a **major** subject in Old Testament prophecy."* p. 189, *"The fall of Judaism was the culmination of God's redemptive program, which signaled the fulness of times when all things were brought to perfection in Christ (Eph. 1:10). It marked the beginning of the new age anticipated by the saints and prophets of old..."* p. 227.
 - 1. Was this event the major thrust of all prophecy?
 - A. NO!

2. Was this event the dominant theme of the apostolic writings?
A. NO!
3. If one were to never read such materials as the S.O.P. they would never come to the conclusion drawn by this material.
2. What then was the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem?
A. Judaism was a theocracy.
 1. *"Theocracy: Government of a state by the immediate direction of God; thearchy; hence, government by priests or ministers as representatives of God," Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, p. 881.*
 2. Jesus nailed the law to the cross (Ephesians 2:14-16; Colossians 2:14-17; 2 Corinthians 3; Hebrews 10:9), therefore leaving the state without the direction of God.
 - A. The temple still stood, however empty (God had moved into another temple), the high priest still retained his position (as far as the Jews were concerned), of temporal power.
 - B. The religious aspect of Judaism ended at the cross with the ending of the law, but the civil and ecclesiastical (high priest, priest serving in the temple), aspect continued (without God's approval), until the temple was destroyed.
 - C. Judaism from Pentecost to A.D. 70 was nothing more than a dead carcass (Matthew 23:38), waiting to be buried.
 - D. In Matthew 23:38 Jesus referred to the temple as "your house."
 1. He said it is "left unto you desolate."
 - E. In that immediate context Jesus left the temple (Matthew 24:1), and there is no record of him ever entering it again.
 1. It was no longer his and his Father's house.
 3. Therefore, the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem is seen in the burial of the dead carcass of Judaism.
 - A. Never to be restored or resurrected in any form.

MORE PROBLEMS

1. *"'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.' (1 John 3:2). Paul admitted, 'For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.' (1 Cor. 13:12). Both Paul and John were speaking of the manner or condition of things in the coming age, which were not as yet fully manifested. The dark night of Judaism had not yet been dispelled by the bright sunlight of Christianity."* S.O.P. p. 125, paragraph 2.
A. What is there different between ourselves and the pre 70 Christians?
2. *"Paul told them they would have rest or relief from persecution 'when Christ came, '...' "* S.O.P. p. 127, paragraph 2.
A. Read Fox's Book of Martyrs.
B. How about the persecution under Domitian, etc. that was post A.D. 70?

3. *"This end was also a time of beginning (Rev. 21:5). The gospel at that time became the everlasting gospel (Rev. 14:6)." S.O.P. p. 128, paragraph 3.*
 - A. Wasn't the gospel everlasting before A.D. 70?
4. *"Many New Testament scriptures containing the phrase 'before the world began, or from the foundation of the world' have reference to the Jewish world formed at Sinai. (See Titus 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pet. 1:20; Rom. 16:25)...David's prophecy in Psa. 102:25-28 would appear on the surface to apply to the material creation, but New Testament application shows it to be in reference to the Jewish world. (Compare with Heb. 1:8-12; 12:26-28). Joel's prophecy concerning the sun and moon was applied by Christ to the fall of Jerusalem (Joel 2:31; Matt. 24:29)." S.O.P. p. 131, paragraphs 1, 2.*
 - A. The eternality of God is the theme of Psalm 102:25-28.
 - B. Here God's eternality is contrasted with the impermanence of the universe.
 1. The universe will grow old and pass away, but God endures eternally.
5. *"Our faith cannot be complete, or inheritance cannot be fully comprehended, and our relationship with God cannot be really meaningful until we have seen both the first and the second comings of our Lord." S.O.P. p. 132, paragraph 2.*
 - A. I thought faith came by the word of God - Romans 10:17?!
 - B. Didn't Paul say that they walked by faith - 2 Corinthians 5:7?
 1. Therefore, according to the S.O.P., they walked by an imperfect faith.
 2. And, if so, in which direction did they walk?
6. *"...I say unto you, that unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him... (Luke 19:12-27). In this parable, Christ is represented as a certain nobleman who went to receive a kingdom, and to **return**. Now just **when** did he **return**? Those who apply his return to Pentecost have an exegetical problem with the rest of the parable, because his servants were to **occupy**, or administer his affairs, till his return. If Pentecost is the time of his return, then Christ came back before his servants ever got started with their 'occupational' work." S.O.P. p. 140, paragraphs 1, 2, emphasis his.*
 - A. Note that the S.O.P. doesn't deal with the nobleman who went to receive a kingdom.
 1. Why can't this apply to a future end?
 - B. The S.O.P. is overlooking that this isn't dealing with Pentecost, but the end of time.
7. *"Thus, through the power of sin, strengthened by the presence of law, Judaism became a 'body of death.' This is the force and meaning of Paul's statement in Romans 7:24 as he summarizes his state under the law, 'O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'" S.O.P. p. 145, paragraphs 2, 3*
 - A. Was Paul, at the writing of the book of Romans, under the law?
 1. Of course not!
 - B. He was simply speaking of the law of sin.
 - C. It seems that the law that Paul was writing about was a "bad" law.
 1. Yet even Max King admits that the Law of Moses wasn't sin or bad, but that man was not able to keep it.

8. *"...but Judaism was the only force of opposition that could completely block or prevent the establishment of Christianity. A relationship existed there that never existed in any other form of opposition. She (Judaism) was a relative of Abraham that could (if not removed) block the legal rights and inheritance of the spiritual seed; thus we **are** dealing with a **very crucial** judgment."* S.O.P. p. 165, paragraph 1, emphasis his.
 - A. I thought that God set up Christianity?
 1. If so, did Judaism have power over God?
9. *"The field is the world;...Jesus explained the field as the **world**. Since the gospels were directed primarily to the Jews, it is only reasonable to assume that the world or field corresponds to the Jewish system or world."* S.O.P. pp. 166, 167, emphasis his.
 - A. Assumed, but no proof!
 - B. Were verses 40-43 fulfilled at A.D. 70? (Context – Matthew 13:24-30).
10. *"It would seem more natural to speak of the 'elements' of the earth rather than the heavens, if the material world were the subject. However, the interpretation of the Jewish world gives a natural explanation for element being placed in the heavens, as seen from the meaning of the word. 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."* S.O.P. pp. 186, 187.
 - A. *"The substance of the material world, 2 Peter 3:10,12."* - Vines, p. 362.
 - B. *"The elementary principles (the A.B.C.), of the O.T., as a revelation from God, Heb.5:12, R.V..., " Vines, p. 363.*
 - C. Shades of dishonesty!
 1. Note that the S.O.P. does not point out what definition given to 2 Peter 3, but applies the definition of Hebrews 5 for 2 Peter 3.
11. *"Fleshly Israel (the first-born of Abraham) had the right of primogeniture, and therefore contested the right of Christians to the kingdom of God, until she was removed or cast out in the end of that age. Then came the change for which the saints had watched and prayed. Having overcome, they could hear the welcome words of 'Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' (Matt. 25:34)."* S.O.P. p. 195, paragraph 1.
 - A. What about v. 46?
12. *"The Pentecost advocates cite 2 Cor. 3:11 as proof the 'ministration of death' age was done away in A.D. 33, 'For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.' But the true rendering of this verse is as follows: 'For if that which is being annulled (was) through glory, much rather that which remains (is) in glory.' Thus, the ministration of death **being** annulled."* S.O.P. p. 207, paragraph 2..
 - A. N.I.V., was; R.S.V. what faded; Philips, it is eclipsed; N.A.C.B., if what was

- destined; G.N.F.M.M., for if there was glory in that which lasted for a while; N.A.S.V., for if that which fades away.
- B. As the glory of Moses' countenance was done away, so was the glory of the law done away.
1. The moral laws embodied in the law were still "laws" to be obeyed, not because of their being a part of the law, but because they were brought over in to the new covenant.
13. *"Thus, out of the decay of Judaism arose the spiritual body of Christianity that became fully developed or resurrected by the end-time...By this he means Judaism (or the natural body)... S.O.P. p. 200; "Where were these New Testament Christians during the **decay** period of Judaism? They were in that **natural body**, germinated (or begotten by the seed, 1 Pet. 1:23) and growing, anticipating their coming forth into a fully developed spiritual body." S.O.P. p. 207, - paragraph 4, emphasis his. "A vital point almost totally ignored by the 'A.D. 33 Advocates' is the relationship of the natural body to the spiritual body. The natural body was first and the spiritual body, **depended**, upon the death and decay of the natural body, just as a living plant depends upon the death and decay of the seed body...Hence, we speak of the spiritual Israel of God today; The same seed and identity, but a new body...First, these two bodies are contrasted in the terms 'earthly' and 'heavenly.' 'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' The 'earthly house' is the 'natural body' of 1 Cor. 15:44, and corresponds to the 'ministration of death' in 2 Cor. 3:7." p. 208, paragraphs 1, 3.*
- A. Therefore, according to the S.O.P. the Corinthians were in Judaism prior to their putting on the "spiritual body" (i.e. Christianity).
1. See 1 Corinthians 12:12, 13; 15:44.
 2. I thought, according to the S.O.P. p. 170 (see above), that the Gentiles were never a part of the kingdom (natural body), yet here it says they were.
- A. Which is it?
- B. You can't have it both ways, if either way!
14. *"First, these two bodies are contrasted in the terms 'earthly' and 'heavenly.' 'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' The 'earthly house' is the 'natural body' of 1 Cor. 15:44, and corresponds to the 'ministration of death' in 2 Cor. 3:7." S.O.P. p. 208, paragraph 4.*
- A. Affirmed, but, as usual, no proof!
- B. Isn't it strange that Paul spends all this time writing to a Gentile church about things concerning Judaism (natural body), of which the Corinthians were never a part (S.O.P., p. 170, see above), or were they (S.O.P. p. 207, see above)?
- C. Of course they were never a part of Judaism and it is a shame that we have brethren who can't understand (accept) it.
15. *"'For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven'...The time and place of Paul's groaning were during the decay of the natural body, before they were delivered from that body of death (Rom. 7:24), and*

- clothed upon with their house from heaven.*” S.O.P. p. 209, paragraphs 1, 2.
- A. Was Judaism from heaven (natural body)?
 - B. We all know that the physical body is not from heaven.
 - 1. However, the body that we will receive will be (1 Corinthians 15:42-50), Max King to the contrary notwithstanding.
16. *“Those who refused to put off the old clothing of Judaism perished with the decaying body.”* S.O.P. p. 209, paragraph 2.
- A. I didn't know that every Jew who still held (holds), to the Law of Moses died at the destruction of Jerusalem.
 - 1. What of the "Jews" in Jerusalem today?
 - 2. Did they all perish and just don't know it?
 - 3. Perhaps they just don't know enough to lie down?
 - 4. Maybe they need the S.O.P. to tell them that they perished almost 2,000 years ago and really shouldn't be around today?
 - B. *“The groaning of the saints in 2 Cor. 5:4 is equated with their groaning in Rom. 8:22, 23, where Paul taught that ‘the **whole creation** (or member of the natural body from Moses) groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.’* S.O.P. p. 209, paragraph 3.
 - 1. Again, an affirmation without any proof.
 - 2. Were not the Gentiles a part of the "whole creation?"
 - A. Give a man the liberty to define his own terms and he can "work miracles."
17. *“‘Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (For we walk by faith, not by sight:) We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.’ (2 Cor. 5:6-8)...hence the reason for Paul saying we are **now** (at that time) absent from the Lord. They were willing, however, to be absent from the natural body and present with Christ in his spiritual body...One must realize that ‘absent’ and ‘present’ are relative terms, not meaning Christ was not with his disciples in the transition period, for he promised them he would be (Matt. 28:20). The word ‘present’ denotes the nearness of Christ’s presence due to the clearness of vision and understanding in the age to come.”* S.O.P. p. 210, paragraphs 1, 2, emphasis his.
- A. Which is it, is Paul absent from the Lord or not according to the S.O.P.?
 - 1. How can one be "absent" yet "not absent" yet "near"?
 - 2. Was Paul a part of Judaism at the writing of 2 Corinthians at about A.D. 58?
 - A. See Hebrews 3:6; Galatians 1:13-16; 2:12, 13; 3:27, 28.
 - 3. To be under the law was to be under condemnation.
 - A. Yet the Christians after Pentecost were not under condemnation (Romans 8:1), nor the law (Romans 6:14).
 - B. *“‘Thirdly, it is assumed that ‘the change’ of the living involves the physical body. Many interpret 1 Cor. 15 as dealing with the end of all time and all fleshly existence on the earth, but this remains to be proven.”* S.O.P. p. 219, paragraph 2; *“‘The earthly house of this tabernacle’ refers to the house or system of Judaism which was still standing when Paul wrote Second Corinthians.”* p. 366, paragraph

2; “‘we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body’ (verse 23). Where were they and what was the cause of their groaning? If we return to 2 Cor. 5:1-10, the answer is clearly supplied. They were still in the earthly house, undelivered or unredeemed from it, waiting for the change to come. If the reader will observe the illustration on page 363 again, he will see the firstfruits still in the Jewish world, but not of that world. Their deliverance came when the old heaven and earth passed away, or the veil was removed from the holiest of all. Then they were resurrected, redeemed, adopted, married, glorified, and clothed upon with their house from heaven – not made with hands.” p. 367, paragraph 1.

1. “**All through this debate** Jim has tried to make it stick that King had the Christian Jew bound, enslaved, in bondage, under the curse of the law, and therefore spiritually dead until Christ’s second coming in 70 A.D. See his No. 38. I categorically deny the charge.” McGuiggan-King Debate, Prop. IV; King’s first negative, pp. 216, 217, no. 4, emphasis his.
2. In one place the S.O.P. says they were in the world (Jewish system), but not of it, yet time and time again we see the Saints being a part of the world.
 - A. Which is it???
3. If they were absent of redemption, adoption, marriage, and glory how could they have been in Christ since in Christ (even before A.D. 70), came redemption, et.al?
 - A. Redemption - 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Peter 1:18, 19.
 - B. Adoption - Romans 8:15; Galatians 4:5.
 - C. Marriage - Ephesians 5:22-32 - how could the wives be in subjection to the husband "as the church is unto Christ" if the church was not the "wife" of Christ?
 - D. Glory - 1 Corinthians 1:31; Galatians 6:14.
4. How is it possible to be in Christ and not have all of the above since they were in or through Christ?
- C. “**BUT ONE THING IS BEYOND DISPUTE.** The decay of fleshly Judaism and the rising of a new Israel, while **simultaneous**, was **BY NO MEANS INSTANTANEOUS**. The time from Pentecost to 70 A.D. was a **TRANSITION** period. What does **transition** mean? What does it imply? Jim **knows** and he has **said**, ‘ Nor can we fail to notice the existence of a transition period in the New Testament era’ (Daniel, page 41). Transition is defined as ‘ a passing from one condition, form, stage, activity, place, etc. to another’ (Webster). Jim, from what **CONDITION, FORM, STAGE, ACTIVITY, and PLACE** did early Jewish Christians pass? **OUT OF WHAT** did they come? Who made the rule that they could not be made free from the Law, redeemed, and forgiven in Christ **BEFORE** their transition was completed? **JIM MCGUIGGAN MADE THAT RULE**, not God Almighty. No prisoner ever came out of the penitentiary **before** he was **pardoned**. Pardon is the **first step**. His pardon, release and separation may be taken in ‘one gulp,’ but it involves a series of actions.” McGuiggan-King Debate, p. 217, no. 5.
 1. No prisoner ever remained in prison 37 years after being pardoned either.

2. King says that McGuiggan made the rule that they could not be free from the law, redeemed, and forgiven in Christ before the transition.
 - A. S.O.P. p. 367, paragraph 1 – see above.
 - B. *Now let us study individually the six promised blessings to Daniel's people, and the holy city. These were to come in fulness, not on Pentecost, but the fall of Jerusalem, because the perfection of Old Testament saints depended upon the victory and acceptance of the 'first-fruits' of the gospel.*” S.O.P. p. 57, paragraph 2.
 1. Note pages 60-64 and the “six promised blessings.”
 - A. “TO FINISH TRANSGRESSION.”
 - B. “TO MAKE AN END OF SINS.”
 - C. “TO MAKE RECONCILIATION FOR INIQUITY.”
 - D. “TO BRING IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS.”
 - E. “TO SEAL UP THE VISION AND PROPHECY.”
 - F. “TO ANOINT THE MOST HOLY.”
 - C. Who says what? Nuf said!!
18. *“In the New Testament, fleshly Israel takes on the meaning of Babylon, and the dead men in her captivity were the gospel saints or firstfruits (Rev. 14:1-8). They were in pain, groaning or waiting for the time of their deliverance by the Lord's coming out of his place. Until that coming of judgment on Babylon (Israel) the saints are considered as dwelling in the 'dust of the earth,' emblematic of oppression, want, and dejection. Paul said they were **dead** with Christ “For if we be dead with him we shall also live with him,” (2 Tim. 2:11). ‘For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.’ (Col. 3:3, 4)”* S.O.P. p. 215, paragraph 1.
 - A. How about that, at one point King says they were not under the law (McGuiggan-King Debate, pp. 216, 217), yet here he says they were dead while on page 145 he said that Judaism was a body of death, and to be under Judaism necessitated being under the law.
 1. Which, when 1 and 1 are put together, puts the saints in Judaism (i.e. death).
 - A. *“Therefore, Christ's coming in the fall of Judaism was the fulfillment of **all things written** and spoken by the prophets of God. That event finished or completed the plan and mystery of God – all came to pass in the day that was appointed of the Lord. The Jewish system stood until every portion of the law was completely fulfilled. Jesus said, ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.’ (Matt. 5:17, 18). The heaven and earth, whose passing corresponded to the fulfillment of the law, is the same heaven and earth of Matt. 24:35, and corresponds to the world that was going to end in that generation – at the coming of Christ (Matt. 24:3, 14, 34, 35). It all happened in the fall of Judaism.”* S.O.P. pp. 229, 230, paragraph 3, emphasis his.
 - B. If the system stood so did the law for without the law there would be no

system.

1. If the laws of America were removed there would be no America.

B. The point is the A.D. 70 advocates are overlooking the FACT that Paul is talking about being dead to sin in this text.

1. See Romans 6:7-15.

A. By the way, aren't verses 14 and 15 interesting?!

C. The A.D. 70 advocates attempt to have their "cake and eat it too," and it just won't work.

19. *"The sin that results in man's failure to see this event as the consummation of the ages, as a future anticipation of prophetic predictions that rob this present age of much of its glory, power, and meaning."* S.O.P. p. 227, paragraph 2; *"Revelation is the vision and record of Christ's coming, and the need for, and the results of that coming, must be seen today in order that the true nature of spiritual Israel may be preserved and forever propagated. For this reason, a severe judgment is pronounced upon those who would willfully pervert the true meaning, nature, and application of Revelation by adding to, or taking from the things written therein."* p. 381, paragraph 1.

A. "Bet" you didn't know that you sinned by failing to see the destruction of Jerusalem as the consummation of the ages?!

1. *"Transgression of the law of God. 2. An offense, in general; misdemeanor...To do or commit wrongly as in sin."* Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, p. 789.

2. By not seeing the destruction of Jerusalem as the A.D. 70 advocates do we are robbing this age of "much of its glory, power and meaning."

A. Can you believe it?!

20. *"When were Christ and his bride married? None can place this even in 33 A.D. or even as late as 60 A.D. when Paul wrote the Corinthians 'For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ' (2 Cor.11:2)...The time for the marriage is clearly shown in chapters 19 and 21 of the book of Revelation. In chapter 19 it follows the judgment or fall of Babylon – see verses 1-10...Second, the law did not end at the cross, nor was it completely fulfilled then as seen in Matt. 5:17, 18. It was, however taken out of the way **for those who accepted Christ**"* S.O.P. pp. 230, 231, emphasis him.

A. See notes on marriage, letter G, page 20 of these notes.

B. According to the S.O.P. Jesus is married to physical Israel and engaged to Spiritual Israel for the period of time from Pentecost to A.D. 70.

1. Therefore, if Jesus was still married to the "law system" then the "law system" still remained in effect until A.D. 70 as it was still his wife, even though unfaithful.

A. Assertions? Yes!

1. Proof? No!

2. Remember, what we have already noted, S.O.P. p. 207, paragraph 4b.

A. Were the Corinthians saints?

B. Did they not come by the cross?

21. *"Beyond any doubt or controversy, the marriage of Christ and the church is synchronous with the fall of Babylon and the coming of the new heaven and earth."* S.O.P. p. 232, paragraph 1.
- A. In Revelation 21:1, 2 where does it say anything about a marriage?
1. *"The text does not say that the church will become the wife of Christ at that time, but that her preparation for the Lord's coming will be made with the same care that a bride prepares for her husband-to-be."* A Commentary on the Book of Revelation by John T. Hinds; Gospel Advocate series, p. 299. 22.
 2. *"(Matt. 22:1-8). There are few scholars that would apply this parable to any other time or event except the fall of Jerusalem. Verse seven is a prophecy bearing directly upon the fate of Jerusalem and her people, even as predicted in Matt. 23 and 24. But it must be recognized that after their city was destroyed **then** it was said, **the wedding is ready**. This statement pinpoints the time of the wedding, the fall of Babylon, and the coming of the new heaven and earth. It proves beyond any doubt that the Revelation message deals directly and specifically with the fall of Judaism, and confirms the fact that John was writing of things **at hand** and **shortly** to happen."* S.O.P. p. 232, paragraph 2, emphasis his.
- A. One needs to keep in mind that the wedding scene is used throughout the Bible and does not always refer to the same thing.
1. As usual the context must define the meaning of the use of the word marriage.
 - A. See Matthew 25:1-13; John 3:28-30; Matthew 22:1-14; Luke 12:34-40.
 - B. The teaching of the parable found in Matthew 22:1-14 is the making preparation to meet the Lord at the universal call.
 1. The first called were the friends (Jews), and the second called were the Gentiles (Romans 1:16; 11:11 - 36; et al.).
- C. It will also help us to understand this parable if we understand that, rather than a marriage, the text is speaking of a marriage feast or supper which came at the end of the "ceremonies" prior to the bride and groom retiring to the bride-chamber.
1. See Luke 14:15-24.
 2. See N.I.V.; N.A.S.V.; R.S.V.; N.E.B.; N.A.C.B.
 3. "But the phrase refers to the marriage-feast, rather than to the marriage - ceremony." Word Studies In The N.T., Vol. 1, p. 119.
 4. *"...the marriage feast, RV in Mt. 22:2, 3, 4, 9."* Vines, pp. 725,726.
 5. *"A wedding or marriage-festival...esp. a wedding-banquet, a marriage-feast: Mt. 22:8,10; plur. (referring apparently to the several acts of feasting), Mt. 22:2,9; 25:10; Lk. 12:36; 14:8."* Thayer's, p. 109.
 6. *"A. Marriage, spec. a marriage feast, sing. or plur., Heb. 13:4; Rev. 19:7." B. Reading as per Mt. 22:2, "Has become like the kingdom of*

the heavens to a man a king, who made a wedding feast for his son."

A. Thayer's, p. 23.

B. The Interlinear Greek-English N.T.

1. Wonder why brother King didn't refer to Berry, on this point, like he has so much before?!

23. *"It may be argued from such scriptures as Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5; Rom. 6:15 that Christians were adopted before the end of Judaism, and in a sense that may be true... 'even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.'"* S.O.P. p. 234, emphasis his.

A. First, there is more than "in a sense" the saints before A.D. 70 were adopted!

1. Either Galatians 4:5; Ephesians 1:5; Romans 8:15 teaches they were adopted or the Bible lies.
2. As a child I was adopted.

A. At no time prior to, or after the adoption, was I "in a sense" adopted!

B. While I was in the state of "childhood" I was still adopted.

1. And my adoption has not changed one whit since.

B. What is being overlooked is the fact that the word adoption is used in two different ways in the N.T.

1. First, at the point of our conversion we are adopted into the family of God - Romans 8:15.

2. Secondly, at the point of our bodily resurrection we are adopted into the kingdom of heaven (heaven).

A. Note: The adoption involved the *"redemption of our body"* - Romans 8:23.

B. This points to the redemption (resurrection), of the body from the grave – John 5:28,29.

C. *"In Rom. 8:23 the adoption of the believer is set forth as still future, as it there includes the redemption of the body when the living will be changed and those who have fallen asleep will be raised."* Vines, p. 34.

1. The original adoption involves the soul while the later involves the body.

A. Therefore, the complete man receives the adoption.

24. *"The redemption of the body (Rom. 8:23) or the purchased possession (Eph. 1:14) was the resurrection of the **spiritual** body from the **natural** body, (1 Cor. 15:44) which transpired in the destruction of Judaism."* S.O.P. p. 235, paragraph 1, emphasis his.

A. Body - Judaism - A.D. 70 advocates.

B. Body - *"SOMA, is the body as a whole, the instrument of life, whether of man living, e.g., Mt. 6:22, or dead, Mt. 27:52; or in resurrection, 1 Cor. 15:44."* Vines, p. 138.

1. *"A body, i.e. the living body of an animal, Jas. 3:3; or of a man, as 1 Cor. 12:12."* The Interlinear Greek-English N.T., p. 97.

A. Wonder why the S.O.P. did not appeal to Berry on this point?!

2. *"...the living body: of animals, Jas. 3:3; of man...Mt. 5:29; Lk. 11:34; Rom. 4:19; 8:23..."* Thayer's, p. 611.

- A. One should also note the word "body" and its usage in other passages listed on this point by Thayer.
- 3. Give a man the freedom to define words the way he wants and he can "prove" anything.
- 25. *"While Judaism stood, the saints were considered as minors or heirs of God. (Rom. 8:16, 17)." S.O.P. p. 236, paragraph 1.*
 - A. Heirs before adoption?
 - 1. If my adopted parents had died while in the process of adopting me would I have had a legal right to receive their inheritance?
 - A. Of course not!
 - B. The same is true here.
- 26. *"Abraham and his seed would inherit the world...but when? What world would they inherit? Jesus said, 'Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth' (Matt. 5:5)... The new heaven and earth envisioned by John (Rev. 21:1) was the earth of Matt. 5:5 and the world of Rom. 4:13." S.O.P. p. 236, paragraph 2.*
 - A. Assertions, plenty!
 - 1. Proof, none!
 - B. "...land or earth, as (1) the material soil; (2) the producing soil, the ground; (3) land, as opposed to sea; (4) earth, as opposed to heaven, often involving suggestions of human weakness and sin; (5) region or territory." The Interlinear Greek-English N.T., p. 22.
 - 1. Wonder why the S.O.P. didn't appeal to Berry's on this point?!
 - A. Do you get the feeling that the S.O.P. only appeals to Berry's, et al., when their definitions suit the authors of the S.O.P.?
 - C. "...denoted (a) earth as arable land; (b) the earth as a whole...; (c) the inhabited earth...; (d) a country, territory...; (e) the ground...; (f) land..." Vines, pp. 352,353.
- 27. *"Eternal life was another promise involving inheritance, and belonging to the world to come (Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30). It answers to the immortality of the spiritual body raised up in the last day (1 Cor. 15). The saints often spake of eternal life as though they already possessed it, (1 John 5:11; John 10:28) but actually they had only the earnest of it, as was also true of the kingdom, the adoption, and their redemption. The perfect state came with the coming of Christ and the departure of Judaism. That world 'which was to come' is now a present reality, and eternal life belongs to its citizens...as long as they abide faithful or maintain their sonship." S.O.P. pp. 237, emphasis his.*
 - A. "Bet" you didn't know that Christians from Pentecost to A.D. 70 did not possess eternal life, only a promise of it, but those after A.D. 70 possess it?
 - 1. See 1 John 5:11, 12; John 5:24; 6:47; 17:3; Mark 16:16; Luke 19:9; Acts 11:14; etc.
 - B. Where are the scriptures that teach that our promise or pledge of eternal life is any different than what the pre 70 saints had?
- 28. *"Admittedly, many scriptures or prophecies of the Old Testament had double applications, such as 2 Sam. 7:12-16. Can this also be true of New Testament*

*scriptures, and if so, which ones have a secondary application? While it is not the purpose of the writer to dogmatically oppose a secondary application of eschatological passages, there are reasons for believing that most such scriptures are limited to a primary application only... Until a proper and correct primary application is recognized and accepted we have no foundation for a secondary application – should there be one... Reasons for not believing in secondary applications of New Testament predictions are as follows: ... it is inconceivable for a **time** prophecy to have a double meaning. No scholar of the Bible can ignore or reject the time of a prophetic prediction and still honor Biblical inspiration... The **whole** book of Revelation was devoted to the coming of Christ, the judgment, the end of the world, the resurrection, and a new heaven and earth which were **at hand** and were going to happen so **shortly** that John was forbidden to **seal up the book**. There is absolutely no form of fair and rational interpretation that can remove those events from 'that generation' and place them in a future time hundreds and hundreds of years away... Therefore, the fact that New Testament predictions had a definite, God-revealed, Spirit inspired stated time of fulfillment (such as 'at hand,' 'near,' 'soon,' 'night,' 'shortly,' 'that generation,' 'before some of you die'), a secondary application seems unlikely... Fourth, a secondary application seems inadmissible when perfection came by the first or primary one... Secondary applications as they may apply to man himself, are not denied, such as contained in 1 Cor. 15." S.O.P. pp. 242-244, emphasis his.*

- A. Would not 1 Corinthians 15 and 1 Thessalonians 4 involve "a time prophecy" since, according to the S.O.P., it was "primarily" fulfilled in A.D. 70?
 - B. "So you see, he is not dogmatically opposed to secondary applications but if you make one on a **TIME** prophecy (such as 1 Cor. 15; 1 Thess. 4) you are neither fair nor rational; and your view is unconceivable. I'd say that was dogmatic enough." McGuiggan-King Debate, p. 232, emphasis his.
29. "James said the coming of the Lord is **at hand** (Jas. 5:8). If, as some affirm, this can cover a 2,000 year period of time, we run into an exegetical problem in 2 Thess. 2:2 where Paul said the coming of the Lord was **not at hand**. James said it was, and Paul said it was not. Which one is correct? ... When Paul wrote the second Thessalonian letter, the time of Christ's coming was not at hand. When James wrote his Epistle, the time was at hand. The Epistle of James is dated from eight to ten years later than the second Thessalonian letter, which furnished us with some idea of the nearness of time by the expression 'at hand.' Eight or more years was enough to make the difference between Christ's coming being at hand and not at hand." S.O.P. pp. 114, 115, emphasis his.
- A. See "at hand" in Matthew 3:2; 4:17; 10:7; Luke 21:31.
 - B. If eight years would be enough to change something from "not being at hand" to being "at hand," could not three years be even more "at hand"?
 - C. What kingdom was "at hand" at the preaching of Jesus and John?
 - 1. An imperfect one?
 - 2. A glory less one?
 - 3. A powerless one?

30. *"I confess the more I look at this man's doctrine the worse it becomes and the sillier are the extremes to which he will go to defend it."* Jim McGuiggan, McGuiggan-King Debate, p. 255.

