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The following debate took place over the course of a couple months in 2016.

Abbreviations:
- DP = Don Preston
- RESPONSE: = Steve
- FP = Full Preterism or Full Preterists
- GWTJ = Great White Throne Judgment
- OC and NC = Old and New Covenant
- OT and NT = Old Testament and New Testament

Don Preston (DP) represents the Full Preterist(ism) position he also refers to as Covenant Eschatology. FP claims all prophecy is fulfilled by the destruction of Jerusalem, ca. 70AD. Don’s comments are in bold.

Steve (RESPONSE:) represents my perspective Proper Preterism. The name (Proper Preterism) may appear as an overly confident stance, but my position will change (without anger, hesitance or indifference, but with appreciation) when clearly shown by scripture to be wrong, that Proper Preterism may
always be right with scripture. I occasionally use bold text also. I use different highlighting, bold, italicize and underline for no other purpose (viz. not color matching facts, etc.) than for extra emphasis. I sometimes use the pronoun “we” representing a few others who see Proper Preterism and have contributed to the overall view.

Proper Preterism is not Partial Preterism, we realize audience relevance and “the first century occurrence of the Parousia of Christ” ca. 70 and that there is no other final coming of Christ as the Partial Preterist’s doctrine requires.

If you cannot finish reading these first several pages BEFORE the debate, please do not engage because there will be too many unanswered questions.

We strongly differ with most Preterists that the Parousia was over in the first century, because the Parousia is the arrival of a dignitary, in this case Christ’s presence on the throne of David in heaven that started in the 1st century and is bringing about previously “hidden detailed” prophecies within “the Day of the Lord” that were not recognized in the OT. The Revelation had to reveal some [not all were hidden, but all needed to be revealed] hidden details (such as the destruction of death, not even in the OT, and Hos 13:14 is not the destruction, it parallels 1Co 15:55 the victory over death) that even the gospels do not discuss. [Yes within the Day of the Lord [aka The Last Day, the last day of the old is also the beginning of the Day of the Lord], because it is not a 24-hour day, nor is it His wrath alone, it BEGINS with His wrath then goes onto resurrection and reign – e.g. “My Day Will Come,” denoting a long period such as an era.]
We affirm “heaven and earth passed away” (signifying the Mosaic marriage covenant) with the destruction of Jerusalem, ca. 70 when the last days ended. As we also see Matthew 24 and the book of Daniel fulfilled by that same time, except for the great mountain (depicting the 5th kingdom of Christ that smashes the statue of Dan 2), which is still growing today.

Full Preterism rightly acknowledges the covenantal scope of the immediate Christian age in the 1st century with words like “every” (such as the regional locality of Rev 1:7 “every eye shall see”) and words like “all” (such as 1Pe 4:7 “the end of ALL things is at hand”), also that the gospel went out to the entire creation Col 1:23, etc. However, in its zeal to promote Preterism to a scoffing dispensational Christianity, it has missed that there are three-four Christian ages with the first age ending ca. 70—two of which deal with defeating Christ’s enemies, then the unjustified in the GWTJ and beyond, which all do not experience the second death, but are judged according to their works and degrees of punishment with Christ as their high priest. What we will be examining is God has plans for a broader outreach (not universalism as in everyone saved) in these different coming aions. FP may not like this because they will say it sounds like futurism, but that does not change these facts.

Now, the word “UNTIL / TIL” in dictionaries means limited duration, up to that point in time. FP may be some of the best thinkers in Christianity, yet they do not know what to do with this little word “until” in the following two important verses.

Heb 1:13 But to which of the angels did He ever say, "Sit at My right hand UNTIL (ἕως) I place Your enemies as a footstool of Your feet?" (MT-Psa 110:1)
1Co 15:25 For he must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. (cf. Psa 110:2)

You are about to see how “until” works in those verses. We are not just going to fling accusations of error; we don’t like to do that, but are going to provide answers that have been missed.

Our claim is that this will be the most important eschatological document a Preterist will read because if Preterism is important, then Proper Preterism is more important. Having studied, critiqued and debated the Full Preterist position for years, I think I know it quite well. Despite some differing views in the FP camps that all agree with all prophecy fulfilled ca. 70 and the erroneous 40 year millennium—so your objections will most likely be addressed.

Proper Preterism (our position) asserts there are a few major prophecies left, such as:

(1) We are currently in the “little while” of (Rev 20:3c) when adversary (satan, not a fallen angel, it is symbolic) is released from his prison. There is a biblically exegetical explanation for this that you need to hear. This also explains our current world.

(2) The present invasion of the camp of the saints (Rev 20:8ff), then the destruction of the Gog and Magog (primarily [but not all] Arab armies) nations, which does not match the Roman/Jewish war of 67-74AD, which no FP has a good explanation for. This cannot refer to Rev
19:17-19 (which is a destruction of the harlot) as I demonstrate that Rev. ch. 19 – 20 are a continuous narrative and the thousand years is a very long period – among other reasons as well,

(3) “the destruction” (as opposed to “the binding” ca. 70) of the devil (Rev 20:10).

(4) the destruction of death as the LAST enemy (1Co 15:24; Rev 20:14), NOT the same as victory over death,

(5) the GWTJ of the UNJUSTIFIED when they are resurrected Rev 20:12 And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing (resurrected) before the throne; and books were opened:

“(the rest of the dead” live not until ALL IN CHRIST are raised during the FIRST Resurrection [inclusive of the martyrs and the firstfruits—NOT exclusive, and still ongoing], there is no other prophetic period for followers of Christ to be raised than the First Resurrection). The GWTJ is instrumental in the destruction of death - STILL to be fulfilled and,

(6) Christ filling the all in all, that God becomes “all in all.” This mostly (in Rev 20) because the symbolic thousand years began—not ended—ca. 70.

We think the above prophetic details, that are all within “the Day of the Lord,” will be (with compelling biblical evidence) fulfilled in our near future because Proper Preterism could not be fully realized until the 20th century
We have pleaded, argued and have taken ridicule for years asking FP to please consider these things and now we have in a progressive and systematic manner laid out a reasonable confutation (irrefutable as a whole even if you do not agree with every point) showing at least four (maybe five) fatal errors in the FP model with a formidable, notable scholar of Full Preterism. You know only one fatal blow is needed to disprove a model (see next paragraph). While we appreciate being corrected—even though it’s never fun being wrong—it can be exciting to be set free and learn more as a result. So, while we want correction second, we want a verdict from you first. Did we present a fatal blow to the FP paradigm and If not, why are our claims false?

We understand that an argument against Proper Preterism could be said to do the same thing (i.e. debunk Proper Preterism), but only if the argument is a fatal blow that strongly identifies Proper Preterism, like the fulfillment we needed to see in the 20th century. In other words, not
every winning point in a debate can debunk the whole system. **We are looking for fatal blows** (and we have at least 4 in this document) **that debunk** Full Preterism (FP) and that would be anything that proves there is prophecy to be fulfilled beyond 70AD.

Please fully, calmly and patiently read this entire document because we don’t want to reject truth and be in any bondage (deception) we can avoid and the truth is worth your full attention, AND IT’S EXCITING TO SAY IT GETS MORE INTERESTING (with rebuttals never formerly addressed that I know of) AS YOU READ ON!

The following is written as a rebuttal to Don Preston’s erroneous 40-year Millennium view as presented in his article entitled “The Millennial Martyrs” in his “Objection Overruled!” Column in the winter, 2014 Vol. 9, issue 4, of “Fulfilled! Magazine.”

Because **THE OBJECTION IS NOT OVERRULED!** Don has not presented a biblical witness when his position (FP) was challenged. Instead, when his model had taken some fatal blows that showed it did not add up, he has jumped right in the middle and either inserted his own (not scripture’s) testimony or ignored the rebuttal altogether. Don Preston refuted his own view of the Millennium almost 20 years ago when he wrote the booklet called "Can God Tell Time?" If God can tell time, would He have used chilia (the Greek word for a thousand) to mean 40 years, even if it’s
symbolic? Even if others have made the same mistake, we don’t think so and we have backed it up.

*IMPORTANT* I am sorry that this debate is not entirely in the order that it was written, because it had to be debated in increments (as you can see different fonts, etc.), as time allowed for both parties. Although, the integrity of the writing was preserved and Don Preston’s Full Peterist view – with his direct quotes – is in no way misrepresented because of the debate not being in perfect order. The debate begins with me.
THE DEBATE

Don, Eph 3:21 says he will reign over the house of Jacob to “the age of the ages” (wrongly translated “forever,” that represents the age before 70 + the thousand years + the little while [age] + two more ages). The point Paul is making is all Christ’s enemies are subject to him by this future time and salvation for all Christians will be complete, then Christ hands that saving and subduing dominion aspect back to the Father that God may be all in all.

Proper translation:

Eph 3:21 to Him is the glory in the assembly in Christ Jesus, to all the generations of THE AGE OF THE AGES. Amen.

The YLT I quoted of Eph 3:21 seems to have it right, because the Greek genea (generations, not endless) and aion (age, not endless) of the aion (ages, also not forever)....

I know you’ve written on the meaning of the Hebrew word olam, therefore must know its Greek counterpart and its derivatives, and that it does not mean forever.

Even if aion(ios) always meant "eternity," which is not the case in classic or Hellenistic Greek or in usage—aionios could still mean only "belonging to eternity" and not "lasting through it," context and subject matter tells us the meaning of olam and aionios.

DP “Steve, There is much to address here that is erroneous.”

Luke 1:33 emphatically declares: "of his kingdom there shall be no end" (ouk estai telos")—to divert
attention away from this by saying it only means "to the age" is misguided--it is "no end." There is no end to Christ's reign—period.

You have ignored the power of the Greek aionion ton aionion, claiming something that is not supported in the lexicons. The term in Ephesians 2:20-21 is indeed a compounded, "heaped up" expression according to some of the best Greek linguists. Likewise, in Revelation 11:15f God and the Christ would rule forever and forever. That is the basic same heaped up, compounded form to emphasize what is being expressed. And as Revelation 22:3 shows, it is the Father and the Son on the throne, ruling together.

Ephesians 3:21—Most Greek scholars say that this is the strongest expression in the Greek for "endlessness." Your attempt on Ephesians 3 is more obfuscation than anything. While it is true that taken in isolation, the single use of the word aion does not denote eternality, (and I did not indicate that it does) [sic] But, in Ephesians [sic] 3, it is in compounded formulaic use and according to the Greek scholars indicates endlessness. It is improper to ignore the compounded formulaic structure of the texts that I cited and depend on the independent singular definition.”

RESPONSE: Don, let’s set aside that point to move on because “to all the generations....” means to all future generations within [“of
“the” age of the ages (see YLT and CLV)—it still does not necessarily say forever, but thank you for your emphasis on the formulaic expression.

However, and what is important is, Full Preterism uses Eph 3:21 and these other verses Dan 7:14; Luk 1:33; Rev 22:3 to infer there is no end to the mission of the church, which is specious.

The FP usage of Eph 3:21 that claims the church continues business as usual, (as it does today) forever and that Christ continues collecting and resurrecting believers forever, is not true according to scripture as I will demonstrate ....

First off, this verse refers to God. The verse says: To Him is the glory in the assembly (ἐκκλησία) [wrongly translated from the German word kirke (kuriakos meaning “belonging to the Lord”) as church], founded in the name (implied) of Jesus Christ, to all the generations.... Eph 3:21 does not contradict the concept of Jesus handing over the kingdom after he subdues all his enemies, as 1Co 15:24 states, as you imply. Eph 3:21 is a reference that states the future glory (as a result of Christ defeating his enemies during “all the generations of the age of the ages”) is God the Father’s: “be glory in the assembly and in Christ Jesus to all generations,” i.e. all the future glory belongs to God.

Referring to a Greek syntax the last word of v. 19 is theou (of God). Referring to his plêrôma (to become full of God).
And it continues ....unto him let it be the glory in the church founded upon Jesus Christ.

The second dative case εν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ is an explanatory parenthetical definition to church, it's in the verse. It's how the sentence is structured. You'll see it in between two commas. The "it is founded" part is dropped from the text in the English. The verb "be" in unto him be the glory is also dropped but implied by the Dative case. It's a parenthetical modification.

The “Him” in this verse refers to the Father. Eph 3:21 says .... To Him is the glory in the assembly (ἑκκλησία), (founded in the name implied) of Jesus Christ, to all the generations.... Again, the verse is clear and there is no contradiction between this verse and 1Co 15:24 which states that Jesus “delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every other rule and every other authority and every other power.”

Thus, Eph 3:21 is NOT even referring to Christ’s reign or how long he does his work in the church. How do we know? In verse 3:19 he talks about the πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ [believers being filled with the fulness of the God—not about God being all in all as FP makes it.] .... The topic still remains the same—he hasn't switched. It implies the church is founded on Jesus Christ. It modifies the church; it doesn't make Jesus the new topic. So Eph 3:21 that Full Preterists have declared to imply that everything continues as it is with Christ and the church is wrong, the subject of the verse is referring to the Father.

Thus, Eph 3:21 is referring to the glory belonging to the Father
and the endlessness to HIS GLORY. Unto HIM be the glory for all generations unto the century of centuries. Christ’s reign is not mentioned; therefore, it does not refer to it. Put in modern Greek translated, that part would read, “Unto the Father be the glory for all generations unto the century of centuries.”

Is the endlessness referring to the church? One can imply it, but in the text the endlessness goes with the glory. The sentence is clear on that. The only thing said about the assembly in that verse is that it is founded on Jesus Christ and the “glory” extended to the Father comes out of the assembly.

+++ 

Don, my next point of contention is related, your model implies nothing changes after Christ’s thousand-year reign and the subduing of his enemies. You quote Rev 22:3 that says "....where shall be the throne of the father and of the lamb." Now clearly they're not sitting in one throne, which is really just depicting positional hierarchy. We are now His Body and his temple and he rules it. But for the sake of imagery and to distinguish the different roles of rule, there are two thrones. But there is no mention on who is the king and who is the prince by this point. But we already know from other verses that Jesus hands over the kingdom. So the kingdom is the Father’s (by 1Co 15:24), at that point (Zec 14:9 states YHWH becomes king over the entire earth, in this chapter “keeping the feast” means being a follower of Christ in OT vernacular). Of course the Lamb is also there, and I'm sure like all princes or lesser magistrates the Lamb has a say, but there is hierarchy and the big daddy is the Father.

Next, you state Luk 1:33 “and he shall reign over the house of Jacob to the ages; and OF his reign there shall be no end.”
So what about “OF [capitalized for a reason later explained] his kingdom there shall be no end.”? — cp. 1Co 15:24-28 seems at first to point to a limit of time when the kingdom of the Christ shall find an end, but a closer study of Paul’s meaning shows that he is speaking of that kingdom as involving contest with the hostile forces of evil. The exercise of sovereignty may, in this sense, cease when all conflict is over, but his reign ceases by being perfected after subduing all his enemies, NOT by passing away after the fashion of earthly kingdoms. The delegated or mediatorial headship of the Christ is merged in the absolute unity of the monarchy of God and that explanation also makes sense of this verse:

Dan 7:14 And to him was given the dominion, and the honour, and the kingdom; and all nations, tribes, and languages, shall serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed.

The kingdom has the high magistrates and subjects ....

Do we say after Mat 28:18 “All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth.” the Father was stripped of his power? No! The kingdom is called the kingdom of God, because God is the one that was going to set it up (Dan 2:44), but Christ shall return it the way the Father wants it and retain it also. It’s not a contradiction when understood properly.

Are there different Greek words for “REIGN” -vs.- “KINGDOM”?

Yes, we see in the below three verses they are derivatives of each other, and kingdom is used differently than reign. For example, the reign has not yet completed its purpose of leading the world into the kingdom. Even with we Christians the reign of God, like our personal struggle, is a continuing reality in our life,
leading us progressively toward the transcendent realm we speak of as the kingdom. The following three verses demonstrate this:

1Co 15:24 Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the **KINGDOM** (G932 βασιλεία basileia) to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. **Βασιλεία** (kingdom) is a feminine noun,

1Co 15:25 For he must **REIGN** (G936 βασιλεύειν basileuo), TIL he hath put all his enemies under his feet. **βασιλεύειν means to να βασιλεύει (vasilefein is infinitive, means the reign, to rule).

Rom 5:14 Nevertheless death **REIGNS** (G936 εβασιλεύσεν, different form of the word that denotes past tense that continues, but the CLV has it right reigs) from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come. **εβασιλεύσεν** is "past tense" that continues in the ABP interlinear, which should be aorist active indicative, simple 3rd person

In Romans 5:14 The Greek is in the “Aorist, Active, Indicative” and that is most definitely NOT “past tense”. Romans 5:14 should read as we indicated above the CLV “...death reigns from Adam to Moses...” not “...death reigned...”

Jesus also, at least in one instance, does use kingdom in the sense of its spiritual attributes (love, righteousness, etc.) as well, BECAUSE OF THE PHARISEE’S CONCEPT OF WHAT THE KINGDOM SHOULD BE. We are the temple, but we are not the kingdom and the kingdom is also “outside of us” in the sense of something we must enter (Mat 5:20, 7:21, **8:11**).

Rev 20:4d “And they lived and **reigned** (εβασιλεύσαν) with Christ a thousand years.”

We can see from the above examples reign and kingdom are used differently and if you try to put the word “kingdom” in places of
“reigns” in Rom 5:14 it does not work. That is because they have different meanings. Christ's reign is different than Christ's kingdom (i.e. a realm) in that one is a verb denoting what Christ is doing during that period (i.e. a king reigns/rules in a kingdom) and one is a noun describing his kingdom, which is accomplished and sustained or executed from his active reign. **This also provides another solution to Jesus having a kingdom after he gives it over to the Father, because Christ's “reign” ends “he must reign UNTIL,” (1Co 15:24) but his kingdom (a result of the reign/rule) continues to the glory of the Father (Eph 3:21).**

We said we would talk about the words translated UNTIL ...

ἐώς can denote function as a preposition:

In a temporal sense until: (Mat 2:15) He was there until the death of Herod.

In a spatial sense: (Mat 26:58) up to the courtyard of the high priest.

To indicate degree or measure: up to seven times.

There is an overlap in meaning between ἕως and ἂχρι, ἂχρις and μέχρι, μεχρίς. As prepositions they mean until, up to (Act 2:29) up to this day: τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. (Act 10:30) until this hour ... but they can be used also as conjunctions (sometimes in the form μέχρι της ελεύσεως αυτού 1Co 11:26 “until (μέχρι) He should be coming/the advent.” (Mar 13:30) Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until (μέχρι, μεχρίς) all these things be accomplished. See also how μέχρι, μεχρίς is similarly used in Mat 11:23.

Hold this thought or refer back to this when we discuss the
word “UNTIL” further.

The kingdom is a place wherein dwells righteousness where the spirit of God/spirit of Christ/holy spirit that is immortal life, joy exists. Right now the saints inherit the kingdom forever in total when the saint dies (Rev 2:10; 2Co 5:6-8; 2Ti 4:18 et al) because here on earth we have weak, corruptible bodies, we see sickness, suffering, injustice and death all around us. Whether you believe that or not the verses I just quoted (and there are more, et al) proves this.

The Reign of Christ includes taking his kingdom and going out with his armies and waging war against enemy principalities who are not in his kingdom and subduing them all first by dashing them to pieces, til all enemies submit (be converted) or are destroyed.

Psa 21:8 Thine hand shall find out all thine enemies: thy right hand (Jesus the Christ) shall find out those that hate thee.

In reign there is dominion and execution, to wear the crown and to bear the scepter. In the former sense he shall reign forever: honor of his government he laid at the Father’s feet after subduing all his enemies and dominion. The crown he shall never resign; his Father’s throne does not disturb his. But the functions of his current administration the Father assigned him to (“he must reign until”) to reward and punish in judgment, to rescue the oppressed and put down the reign and authority of evil, in this sense shall cease to reign (i.e. after the thousand years + the little season of Rev 20:3), and shall deliver up the kingdom to his Father (1Co 15:24).

Now is God’s reign over us, but only through Christ as mediator; God’s immediate reign we see not so clearly yet. But when the end Paul talks about (the end of what you need to ask) shall come and Christ shall halt his office of mediatorship. The glory of God and the Lamb shall appear
more eminently. The kingdom of Messiah is everlasting in its essence and governmental existence - that part has no end. In America we might say next term we will see the Donald Trump administration, but we would still say it was the American governmental institution we are under.

**DP** “Let me ask you: Do you believe that the Father rules endlessly? Yes or No?”

**RESPONSE:** Maybe in a different capacity, but I do know He recedes out of the picture during the time that Jesus is not subject to Him when he is subduing his enemies. We think the following is during his thousand-year reign, plus the little season of Rev 20:3. ...

1Co 15:27-28 For, He (*Jesus*) put all things in subjection under his (*Jesus’*) feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he (*the Father*) is excepted who did subject all things unto him (*Jesus*).  

28 And when all things have been subjected unto him (*Jesus*), then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him (*the Father*) that did subject all things unto him (*Jesus*), that God may be all in all.

What things did the Father put in subjection under the feet of Jesus? Nothing. The action of subjecting a country or person to one's control is not “giving someone control” it is taking control away from them by your strength or power so that they are powerless. **Delegation of authority is giving someone else control.**

According to my understanding, the Father “Made Jesus’ enemies His Footstool,” but the Father did not “put” anything “in subjection under the feet of Jesus.” That was to be the work of Jesus as He “reigns in the midst of His enemies.” (Psa 110:2) In 1Co 15:24 Jesus “shall have put down all other rule and all other authority and all other power and by
doing that He puts all things in subjection under His feet.

But when Jesus said “all things are put under him,” referencing Jesus’ statement in Mat 28:18, it is manifest that the Father is excepted, who did put all things under the authority of Jesus.” (1Co 15:27)

That is what happens before he goes forth and rules in the midst of his enemies. He is, to this day, the rider on the white horse dashing the nations with a rod of iron because under the new covenant it is Christ Himself who “judges and makes war” against the wicked (Psa 2:9; Rev 2: 27, 12:5, 19:11-16). The phrase “put all things under your feet” stems from a Hebrew idiom which literally in English means “He will stomp them into submission to His authority.” 1Co 15:24-27 is a commentary on Psalm 110:2ff; et al.

There is a difference between putting all things under you (placed in a position of authority/given the crown) and putting under/an end to all things (an activity that destroys one’s enemies).

The activity that the king engages in to put down all reign and subdue all things comes AFTER the status has been granted and it is usually accomplished “after a much later time” and in the case of Christ it takes place after the symbolic thousand years + a little season, take note of the following:

Heb 2:8 THOU HAST PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIS FEET. (Placed in position of authority/King crowned)
For in that HE PUT ALL IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIM, (author acknowledges that Jesus had already at that present time been placed in that position of authority/given the crown) he left nothing that is not put under him. BUT NOW WE SEE NOT YET all things PUT UNDER HIM (“put under,” the actual activity/destruction not just the authority, having a crown that ends or puts an end to all enemies’ rule and authority/everything under/subdued in reality
not just in authority.) V.14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death HE MIGHT DESTROY (Both the devil and death in the future. and the scripture next tells us when this happens) him that had the power of death, that is the devil;

Rev 20: 8 And shall go out to DECEIVE THE NATIONS which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to GATHER THEM TOGETHER to battle:... ⁹And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and FIRE CAME DOWN FROM GOD OUT OF HEAVEN, AND DEVoured THEM. ¹⁰And THE DEVIL THAT DECEIVED THEM WAS CAST INTO THE LAKE OF FIRE and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever... ¹⁴And DEATH AND HADES WERE CAST INTO THE LAKE OF FIRE. This is the second death.

1Co 15:24-26 Then cometh the end, WHEN he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; WHEN he shall have PUT DOWN ALL RULE AND ALL AUTHORITY AND POWER. ²⁵For he must reign U-N-T-I-L (and no longer) he hath put ALL ENEMIES UNDER HIS FEET. ²⁶The LAST ENEMY that shall be DESTROYED IS DEATH.

AD70 is the beginning of the reign of Christ NOT THE END… and he rules TIL HE HAS put down all rule reign and authority, that is until the Magog armies be destroyed.

Now, [remember we capitalized OF in Luk 1:33?] because all that is "OF the kingdom" that Jesus accomplishes continues, but Jesus as King of the kingdom ends and the Father becomes King of all the earth (Zec 14:9). Just as it says “OF the increase OF his
government and **OF** peace there shall be no end,” (Isa 9:7a)

Denoting the attributes of his kingdom he does for the Father.

But Jesus only reigns "for the eons of the eons," (which God accomplishes through Christ **during the Christian ages** He allotted for salvation, aka His ultimate goal or His creation 1Pe 4:11c; Heb 1:2), **NOT** "forever AND ever."

To the ages is not forever (T-I-L or until), and yes there will be no end to the essence **OF** his kingdom, but I just showed you what ends, so that is not the same as saying everything in this world today is going to continue as it has been for the last 2000 years. There will come a time when there is no need for a called out assembly, and there will come a time when the gospel is no longer needed because it will no longer be news. How could the chaotic world in which we live continue the way it has when Christ no longer has any enemies and there is no more war or death? (1Co 15:25-26; Rev 20:14)

**DP** “Steve, You are assuming that the language of no more war, is descriptive of the global situation, when in fact the better case is to see this language as a contrast between covenant worlds. The Old Covenant kingdom was a kingdom in which war was practiced to expand or to defend the kingdom. The New Covenant Kingdom is totally opposite! No more war!”

**RESPONSE:** This sounds kinda like you are putting us in the Rev 21:4 state “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither
sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.” Which is the condition of the saints in heaven NOT the new covenant kingdom here on earth.

In messianic prophecy, we see that Christ rules with "judgment and justice" over the earth. (Rev 5:10) Therefore, to rule with a rod of iron would mean that His rule will be just, and punishment will be harsh to the nations that will end war.

A significant step taken against destroying death, the “last enemy,” will be the elimination of wars, which will be a result of Jesus’ acting as the perfect arbitrator between nations. In fact, all instruments of war are said to be converted into useful tools and yes, the process begins with the last days.

What is the purpose of this reign of Jesus over the earth during the thousand years? Paul indicated that the will of the Father will be “...put into effect when the times will have reached their fulfillment [in the thousand years +]—to bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ” (Eph 1:10).

**Psa 2:6 -9** Yet I have set my king Upon my holy hill of Zion. 7I will tell of the decree: Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my son; This day have I begotten thee. 8Ask of me, and I will give the nations for thine inheritance, And the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. 9Thou shalt smash them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.
Smash, dash, they indeed shall surrender. If death is the “LAST ENEMY to be destroyed,” then the conclusion of this process is the “end” of which Paul spoke when he said, “*Then the end will come, when he [Christ] gives over the kingdom to God the Father after he has destroyed all dominion, authority and power*” (1Co 15:24).

In the real world in which I live war is very real and about to get even more real—perhaps WW3 because adversary is released for a little season (see coming evil figs). Full Preterism has misunderstood this, the hostile forces will be subjugated. Otherwise, why would Christ reign and subdue in the midst of his enemies?

Full Preterist insist that Jesus is no longer subduing His enemies and is only trying to bring healing to the nations. However, contrary to the notion that all prophecy is fulfilled, Jesus will have enemies until Gog and the devil are destroyed or the final GWTJ when those enemies are either subjugated or are slain (see Luk 19:27; 1Co 15:28 et al). Jesus is healing individuals of the nations – one person at a time as the gospel is presented and received (not entire nations being converted yet), but in our current world trying to bring healing (for instance) to a jihadist, a middle easterner, a zealous Zionist or atheist may not get you very far and we are not yet in the healing leaves scenario we read about in Rev 22; and contrary to the notion that all prophecy is fulfilled, when the time arrives that every knee bows and every tongue confesses Jesus
is Lord, these things will no longer be an issue.

Kneeling in this way and confessing allegiance to Jesus is NOT only a covenantal expression such as “EVERY” (eye shall see) as the word “ALL” are sometimes utilized in covenantal narratives. This is a universal application because even though God will not force his enemies to worship him, it has always been His plan (since Abraham and before) to spread His Shekinah glory “to the ends of the earth,” (see Gen 28:14) to continue expanding the city even by the conquering of His enemies.

Rev 20 says the city is also here on earth, in part but not permanently. Paul tells us where the city resides:

Heb 13:13-14 Now then, we may be coming out to Him outside the camp, carrying His reproach." 14 For here we are not having a permanent city, but we are seeking for the one which is impending."

Which bring us to the FP concept of RESURRECTION.

The Church enters the seventh Feast (Tabernacles) which aligns itself with the seventh day of Genesis 1. (no morning or evening, open ended) and this is why the first resurrection began with that day, but there is a last great day representing the GWTJ that brings about the goal/end (Grk. Telos) of God’s plan for that age that brings in the dawn of another age.
The GWTJ BEGAN 70 AND ENDS IN THE FUTURE WHEN THE COURT CONVENES AS DEPICTED IN REV 20:12 ...

The process of separating the sheep (who instantaneously get their new powerful bodies upon physical death—these do not see the grave) from the goats (who sleep in their graves w/no new body, hence their prison sentence) BEGAN ca. 70, but the court (the GWTJ) does not convene until the first resurrection is over and the First Resurrection is still going on if you and I are saved, which means the court does not convene until OUR FUTURE. So, the GWTJ started ca. 70 and ends in our future after the court convenes and when it convenes there will be no more separating of the sheep from the goats—the separating was the long process that began ca. 70.

2Pe 2:9 the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment (their prison sentence, THE GRAVE) unto the (GWTJ) day of judgment; (we are of course advocating the dead unrighteous)

The FP claim is that we do not need to shed our individual body to receive the fullness, “I already have it” they claim. The first century church had an earnest (deposit) of the Spirit. In making this claim, FP somehow thinks we are saying that for 2000 yrs. the Church has not been fully redeemed.

We are not saying that, they are confusing full redemption (the price is paid and Christ returned ca. 70 Heb 9:8 and 28) with full experience of immortal, incorruptible life. Here is one way I put it ....

The day is coming when we will be in the MHP (most holy place) existentially with our new bodies (not just vicariously or indirectly as we are now) and someday it is to engulf all heaven and earth (universally, when we are in God’s space with no dividers because only the HH [holy of holies] will exist Rev 21:22ff). [A Book 3 topic – see the}
Right now we can only make it into the MHP through Christ when we are covered by his blood, which is not all the time (i.e. when we choose to go the way of the flesh and need to get back on the right path, walking in the spirit under the canopy of blood, so to speak). There are still prerequisites many don’t seem to realize and this is not insinuating we are not covered every time we make a mistake—making mistakes is different than changing our lifestyles for the worse, choosing to walk in a way that violates our conscience.

The Torah clearly depicts the Hebrews wandering in the desert for 40 yrs. as betrothed, not married to God still waiting to reach the promised land. In a similar depiction of the infant church (40 yrs. = ca. 33 – 74), Paul said that he espoused them unto Christ. This is not coincidental but points to the fact that until they entered the land flowing with milk and honey, or until the consummation of the age they had not fully embraced the promises of God until the event of Rev 20:4 (inclusive to martyrs and firstfruits, NOT exclusive!) depicting ca. 70.

SO, we have Eph 1:14 telling us that holy Spirit of promise, is THE EARNEST of our inheritance to the redemption of the purchased possession, and ....

2Co 1:22 Who hath also sealed us, and given THE EARNEST of the Spirit in our hearts... 5Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us THE EARNEST of the Spirit.
The term used here is the same one used in a real-estate transaction (i.e. earnest money or pledge money down payment) - only a small partial payment/reward of what is to come. THAT IS WHAT CAME AT PENTECOST. If it is a partial, then it can’t be...... You know the rest of the sentence!

So, why do the scriptures use resurrection type language for covenant believers. (The scriptures are numerous as concerning this).

Repentance is the death, Baptism is the burial thus receiving the Holy Spirit is the Resurrection. Is that correct? NO! FP say “we shall meet him in the air” (the spiritual realm) and have promoted this error far too long.

YES, heaven is a spiritual realm, but it is not here and we do not get there until we physically die! YES, we are buried with Him in Baptism as the scripture declares. YES, the scriptures say that we were raised in newness of life as a result of the resurrection of Christ...

NO, the language of baptism should not be confused with resurrection!

The scriptures also say that Baptism is for the remission of sins. (Acts 2:38) Ananias told Paul at his conversion to be Baptized to wash his sins away. (Acts 22:16)

Baptism (dying to one’s self and coming up as a new creation) is part of the process and has similar language (baptism being symbolic or a type of resurrection), but it is not resurrection.
Col 3:1-2 If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. 2 Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth KJV

Paul told the Church of his day that they were risen with Christ.

This is BECAUSE IT IS THE PRECURSOR TO WHAT WAS THE PROMISED REWARD AFTER THE END OF THIS LIFE (Rev 2:10b “BE THOU FAITHFUL UNTO DEATH” (they already died to themselves i.e., their carnal, fleshly minds Rom 8:6ff with Christ, thus this death in Rev 2:10 must mean physical death, which is a sacrifice to God denoting it is small in comparison to immortal life, in the mind of the follower), AND I WILL GIVE YOU A CROWN OF LIFE). 11 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; He that overcomes shall not be hurt of the second death. AND AS SUCH COL 3:1ff AND SIMILAR PASSAGES ARE NOT THE RESURRECTION OR NEW LIFE THAT WAS YET PROMISED TO COME.

Think of it this way, you need your physical body to have consciousness on earth and communicate with us earthlings; without it you could not. Likewise, you must shed it to be there (i.e. in the heavenly kingdom with and to communicate with saints who have since passed from this life 2Ti 4:18; 1Co 5:3; 2Co 5:6-8). Paul uses the simple analogy of the seed: the outer body of the seed must die and shed in order for it to get a new body -- just as our physical outer body must die in order for our “inner man” (Eph 3:16) to receive a new powerful, immortal body as God chooses (1Co 15:38, 43ff).

ERGO 1Co 15:36 But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? 36 THOU FOOL, that which thou sowest is not quickened, EXCEPT IT DIE. PAUL EVEN SAYS – “YOU FOOL!”

James identifies with the feast of Pentecost by saying that “they” are a type of First Fruits. The first generation of believers were partakers of the first harvest of believers. The rest of us are the rest of the harvest as pictured in the
feast of Tabernacles or Ingathering (seventh feast) as it enters into the sabbatical rest that Jesus promised. Revelation identifies the 144,000 as first fruits unto God and the Lamb; thus, tying that bunch to the first century.

Also note that additional identification is provided as John calls them virgins. This further identifies them with Mat. 25 in the parable of the 10 virgins. *(that generation)*

I already showed how this process of separating the sheeps from the goats BEGAN ca. 70, but the court (the GWTJ) does not convene—*even though the separating process does*—until the first resurrection is over and the first resurrection for the just (and the separating of sheeps and goats) is still going on if you and I are saved and your biological existence has to cease in order for your true "inner man" (Eph 3:16) to fully bloom in resurrection incorruptible life with a new powerful (vs. the weak body you have now) body.

Thus, the GWTJ cannot include the righteous dead; they are waiting for their *final* reward/punishment after their prison sentence (the grave) awaiting their day in court. Did not the last harvest commence with the blowing of the *trumpet*? Yes. Let’s read it:

John 4:35-36 *Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.*  
*36 And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.*

The court/judgment has two different parts of the SAME COURT SESSION..... PART ONE FOR THE SAINTS ONLY Part 2 of the SAME COURT SESSION is for the rest of the dead. Rev 20 is ONLY describing that second part or resurrection unto damnation, which is why
the books are open for them (it is akin to our human or regular courts where in the mornings are tickets/misdemeanors, BUT the afternoon session is for felonies, murder, rape etc.) You might say the GWTJ sees its grand finale for the rest of the dead by the future time of Rev 20:12.

Just as the word white only refers to God’s judgment, just as God sits on a throne and the word white only refers to the color of His image and His throne. There is NO association of judgment with the color white except perhaps to say that white reflects the purity of the one who is sitting on the throne and exemplifies His judgment, but there is no other special relationship to the color white in that it is some prophetic time indicator. It is simply I looked and saw a white truck, a white dress, a white horse, etc. God sat down on his throne and began to finally judge the nations once and for all beginning with the war of AD70 and that judgment on that throne continues to this day and will continue until the last enemy death is destroyed. Rev 20 is simply a summary of events that take place for that long period, which lasts a symbolic thousand yrs. + a little season.

Col 3:1-2 is a continuation of the thoughts in Col 2:12. It is obvious that it is about baptism and the fact that our spirit is dead so God gives us a NEW spirit in our physical bodies to live with and if we nurture that spirit of God within us then we will be resurrected with new bodies upon our physical demise as I already showed you.

BAPTISM, A RITUAL NOT RESURRECTION, (being born again/anew is not resurrection) pay close attention to the BOLD:

Col 2:12 Being entombed together with Him in baptism, in Whom you were raised together also through faith in the operation of God, Col 2:23 which are (having, indeed, an expression of wisdom in a willful ritual and humility and asceticism) not of any value toward the surfeiting of the flesh.”
CF. Eph 2:6 and *raises* us together (symbolically displayed in baptism v.5) and seats us together among the celestials, in Christ Jesus, \(^7\) that, in the *oncoming eons*,..... \(^10\)For His achievement are we, *being created in* Christ Jesus (BEING CREATED, an ongoing process) for good works, which *God makes ready beforehand*, that we should be walking in them.”

**CONCLUSION FOR BAPTISM AND RESURRECTION**

Please realize baptism language — though similar — is not resurrection, being born again/anew from above *is not resurrection*, you must **physically die first** even though you possess that life in you, you must put on an incorruptible, powerful body. As Paul says, it is even foolish to question it because it is evident, but we have a great propensity to deceive ourselves — again, thou fool! he says.

++++

I have heard one FP say that God wants us to have enemies to shape our character, thus he says those enemies will always be.

This statement is essentially correct *as long as there are descendants of the first Adam representing the natural (vs. the spiritual) being born who have not submitted to Christ there will be enemies of Jesus and His followers*. However, there comes an “end” to resurrection as Paul tells us in 1Co 15:24.

You’re probably thinking about now:

‘THE END TO RESURRECTION?’ IS THAT A TYPO? DOES THE PASSAGE INFERENCE THAT? I THINK IT SAYS THEN COMES THE END.
If you did, you need a better translation of 1Co 15:24-28:

“24) Then the end of the order (see v. 23 for context) of resurrection, when he puts down all rule and all authority and power and delivers the kingdom to God, even the Father; 25) For he reigns until he has put all enemies under his feet. 26) The last enemy being destroyed is death. 27) For he puts all things under his feet. But when he says all things are put under him [See Mat 28:18], it is clearly evident that he who put all things under his authority is excepted. 28) And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.”

So, contrary to the claim “God wants us to have enemies to shape our character, thus those enemies will always be.” God’s word states those enemies will not always be: 1Co 15:25 “For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.” Thus, those enemies only last until Jesus has put all of His enemies under His feet. After ALL in Christ are risen with an end to resurrection of the just first, then [after the just] the unjust (the rest of the dead) and an end to death there will be no need for enemies. In fact, enemies are slain/subjugated as these verses assure us (Luk 19:27; 1Co 15:28).

Of course, most FP say “outside of the city are the dogs...” (Rev 22:15) implying the dogs will always be there because this statement is at the end of the book. It seems to me Rev 22:15 is a warning, saying to those outside of the city that they should want to be part of that
city and definitely not want to be outside the city.

FP have a real problem here, because if the GWTJ had already taken place there would be no dogs outside of the city since dogs are enemies which Christ said he will conquer (1Co 15:25-27).

This shows this verse is not intended for chronological sequence except for the fact it is saying the city had begun – the Revelation does at times recapitulate. Since the Revelation itself tells us death was still present (Rev 20:5a “The rest of the dead—these are the unjustified, raised after those in Christ; besides showing the chronological order right in the passage, that’s why they’re called “the rest of the dead!”—do not live until the thousand years should be finished”). We know that when there is no more death (1Co 15:26; Rev 20:14) there will be no more dogs, because all dogs will eventually die in the second death.

So “outside are the dogs…” is more of a warning than a statement of prophetic timing. Dogs, etc. will eventually be destroyed in the lake of fire and the lake of fire seems to disappear from the narrative after (Rev 20:14-15 – Rev 21:8 is a reiteration of what was coming) when death is abolished because there is no further need of the “lake of fire” after it signifies destroying death (Rev 21:4 “And He will be brushing away every tear from their eyes. And death will be no more, nor mourning, nor clamor, nor misery; they will be no more, for the former things passed away.”)
This is not to say Rev 22:15, “outside of the city are the dogs” cannot be appropriately placed on a historical timetable from a prophetic perspective. The proper timetable begins when “the city built without hands” began to be built in the first century and the dogs remain outside the city until the GWTJ, but that is not the point as much as the warning.

FP are not placing the dogs outside the city (Rev 22:15) appropriately in history any more than they are placing verses like Rev 22:20 “He who testifies these things saith, Yea: I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus.” in proper historical context WHEN they say this verse means all prophecy is fulfilled by 70.

Which leads us to the FP “bookend’s argument” – probably one of their weakest arguments especially since the Revelation reiterates and recapitulates – the argument goes like this: In the beginning and the end of the Revelation there are imminent time-statements, thus they conclude those time statements must mean everything in Revelation is fulfilled by the time those two statements are fulfilled or better yet arrive ca. 70 (because to come does not = to be over – it means to begin the process). The two alleged bookend time statements being ....

Beginning of the book::
"Rev 3:11 Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." And Rev 1:1’s things which must shortly come to pass.

End of the book:: which they say bookends the Rev 22:20’s “I come quickly”

This bookend’s argument has no scriptural support. Yes, the time-statements were imminent, and yes the majority of the book of Revelation is wedged in-between those verses. However, Revelation had not yet been written when Jesus made the statements about all things written being fulfilled (Luk 21:22, 24:44) so it would seem foolish to include anything that was later written in Revelation within the concept of the “all things written” statement’s of Jesus. Furthermore, in context it is all things written pertaining to the destruction of the whore.

The above rebuttal refutes the assertions saying Christ does not prophesy anything beyond the fulfillment of those bookend verses and that everything is fulfilled by the destruction of Jerusalem.

What are the supposed bookend time statements saying?

The “I come quickly” is an admonishment to endure as
overcomers for the soon coming thousand-year reign, which was part of their deliverance and reward “if we endure, we shall also reign [a thousand years] with him:” (2Ti 2:12a). Incidentally, shall means future tense from when the writer was speaking. A thousand years is a figurative expression denoting a long period, which is a prophecy that began (not ended, as FP assert,) ca. 70 that the righteous were eager for. The “I come quickly” was also a warning to the Christians who had fallen prey to the Babylonian doctrine (of the Judaizers) about the soon coming judgment of the whore (come out of her my people) and “the day of the Lord.” None of this means all prophecy is fulfilled, because those time statements are allegedly bookends at the beginning and end of the book.

The New Jerusalem is a heavenly city that only those who have accepted Jesus’ gospel of the kingdom can get into by personal resurrection/regeneration. The reference to the “dogs, etc. outside of that city is, of course, a reference to people on earth who have not accepted the gospel of the kingdom and Jesus its King. FP think that the New Jerusalem is on earth, which it is not. However, it does have an earthly impact through the “water” that flows from the throne of God and the throne of the Lamb. (This impact brought some peace during the thousand years, which we will talk about.) See also Rev 22:17” And the Spirit and the bride say come. And let them that hear say come. And let him who is thirsty come. And whosoever will
come, let him take of the water of life freely.” This “water” can and does reach at least some of the “dogs, etc.” referenced above (cf. 1Co 6:9-11). But the dogs, sorcerers, etc. will eventually perish in the lake of fire, which is the second death. CONCLUSION: Thus, the presence of the dogs, etc. is not an ever continuing scenario in God’s prophetic plan as FP claims.

If you say the new covenant kingdom is inside you. In the real world in which I live, inside of me there is a great war going on – I want to be like Jesus and do no wrong; however, in this body of flesh it’s a miserable struggle. I have probably tied with, maybe exceeded Paul as being the worst of all sinners; so, once again, where is this kingdom located where there is no war?

Christ said his kingdom was not of this world therefore his servants did not fight, which still applies to this day because Christ and the resurrected saints in that kingdom are NOT of this world, they are part of a spiritual city that is in heaven waging a spiritual war that has direct and real physical results and effects on this world.

It is still true because we who are still in the flesh are to walk after the spirit. Our warfare is spiritual, not physical and the kingdom is spiritual and a spiritual city with a spiritual God. Nothing physical except to say our bodies are a temple of God (the new earth) and as such the temple does not wage war, it is literally "sacred earth" that
is to be holy and must not be polluted or preordained by violence or bloodshed.

Jesus said, “But now my kingdom is from another place.” That place is described in 2Sa 7:10ff and is a PLACE where Jesus said, “I tell you, many will come from east and west and recline at a table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven,” (can’t be only inside us!) and Jesus’ famous words “I go and prepare a PLACE for you…”

“Therefore, though we are always confident and know that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord-- for we walk by faith, not by sight—but we would be pleased to be out of the body and at home with the Lord.” (2Co 5:6-8)

We are “at home in the body” while we are on earth in our fleshly bodies! Thus, Paul says, “we are away from the Lord.”

In Paul’s letter to Timothy, his son in the faith, Paul wrote:

“And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom [we give] glory for ever and ever. Amen.” (2Ti 4:18)

According to this letter, Paul certainly understood that the kingdom of Jesus was going to be a “heavenly kingdom” – not an earthly kingdom that comes without observation. Instead it came without observation, because it’s not here, and that is why they needed a sign. (Mat 24:2-3)

Even though I am not under old covenant law, I am a new covenant overcomer, when God is “all in all” there will be
nothing to overcome. It is the struggle of the new covenant to be an “overcomer” of the fleshly nature described in Gal 5:19-21. See Rev 3:5, 16 same principles today. Though I’m not under the law, I do have the pulls of the flesh to overcome.

Physical war causes deception, pain, sorrow, suffering and death that are real. Right now there is probably an innocent child being raped and abused who will be scarred for life. Last year about 25 dogs suffocated to death in what was supposed to be a vacation (dog sitting) retreat where their parents took them while they (their parents) were on vacation. The owner (in Florida) went home and the electric went out on a hot 90+ degree day, so the air conditioner went out. Talk about pain, sorrow and suffering – all because of human neglect and ignorance. In the final new heavens and earth this negligence and carelessness will be a thing of the past because Jesus will have subdued all his enemies and the knowledge of God will fill the earth as waters fill the seas. For this world to continue the way it is would be an affront to God and Christ who says his enemies will be subdued. Do not his enemies he says he will defeat apply to the new covenant world? If you say no, then I contend those first century enemies you agree on, are back in the land and this is extremely interesting when we get to the evil figs, who now represent “a dry [fig] tree.”

If you read the rest of Psa 110 particularly verses 2, 3, 5 & 6 you can see the reference to WHEN this PROCESS begins (AD70) right out through. It begins waging war with all the other nations (not just Jerusalem) as well, which started with the second half of the war, thus all fulfilled (begun, not over) and we are now living in the DAY OF WRATH & THE DAY OF THE LORD, where this process continues until all nations and death itself are destroyed.

Note v. 2, the rod/right arm is SENT OUT OF ZION to go
wage war on the enemies, NOT COMES INTO ZION. Defeating his enemies is outside the city. Christ, the right arm/rod of His strength, first returns to Jerusalem/Zion to destroy those enemies. The destruction of his enemies BEGINS (NOT ENDS!) at Jerusalem and has been moving out to ALL the other nations. That is why kings are almost extinct, chaos reigns more and more in the world as you move through and down history. While it is true that there are those who wish and are trying to take us to a one world unified government, their efforts are in fact bringing us to global collapse, and this chaotic situation eventually (the Gog/Magog incursion of Rev 20) brings us to the FINAL new heaven and earth when God is all in all.

DP “The thousand years does not denote a long period of time. It denotes the time designated by YHVH for the finalization of His scheme. I have demonstrated this in my book Who Is This Babylon in which I show that the millennium was consummated in the first century.”

RESPONSE: I agree THE THOUSAND YEARS is for the finalization of His scheme, but that does not mean it does not denote a long period—that most assuredly is a fatal blow for your paradigm. The Old and NT show John’s thousand years to be a period when God’s people Israel are in their own land (which was not the case in the 1st century, so this alone refutes that idea, catch the power of this — The division between the two houses was of God for a specific reason and FP has missed this.) Dwelling safely and securely, (from the flowing of water from the Lamb’s throne we just talked about,) without walls during
Ezekiel’s “many days” ....

Rab Yamin. Many days. Ezek. 38: 8

His Days. Psa. 72: 7

Leolam. Forever. Ezek. 37: 25, 26, 28

Chila Ete. Thousand Years. Rev. 20: 1-7

All descriptive of the same period of time, bounded on each side by the same events, the period between the Parousia and the destruction of Gog, or between the binding (ca. AD 70) and loosing of the adversary. All the prophets believed in a period of time, “after” Messiah’s Coming to judge the Nations, in which Israel; re-gathered, redeemed, restored, renewed, resurrected, and renationalized as a resurrected people, should enjoy the Messianic glory in the kingdom of heaven – which would also impact the people continuing to live-on earth during this period – a period of time called “Many Days,” or as John has it, a “thousand years,” and prior to the Last Judgment.

Revelation 6:12-17 establishes that the “fleeing of heaven and earth from before His face” occurred during the time of the “wrath of the Lamb” when “the heaven departed as a scroll” and the earth was radically changed. It was at that time that the new heaven and the new earth was established by the resurrection of those who belonged to Jesus the Christ – not at the time of the GWTJ as is commonly misapprehended, though I say ESTABLISHED new heaven and earth (NOT FINAL new heaven and earth) as there will be changes to it. Thus, Revelation chapters 21-22, which describe things about the new heaven and the new earth, are actually describing things that occurred in and
continued from (not ended) AD 70.

It does seem strange that any student of God's word should doubt, for one moment, the truth that blazes everywhere so clearly in the Old as well as the New Testaments, viz., that the Parousia of Christ *precedes* the Millennium.

**DP** “Steve, I am hectically trying to get ready for a speaking engagement this weekend, so I don't have much time. But, let me make a point or two.

1. If the forty year millennium is so absurd, why was that believe somewhat commonplace among some ancient rabbis? You Greek professor notwithstanding.”

**RESPONSE:** Don, believing (putting scriptural merit into) deceived rabbis who don’t think Christ is our Messiah was an apparent mistake *here*. Below is a conversation with my Greek teacher and believe me that he has no problem telling me when I am wrong (I am “Me::”) ….

Whether it's (the thousand years of Rev 20) literal or figurative, it's certainly trying to express a very long time. Certainly longer than a person's life cycle from birth to death. 40 years he [Don] is suggesting is less than that.

Like I've said, there are other expressions closer to 40 years. If the author wanted to be more specific, he could have chosen those. 40 years are way too little a time for chilia to be used. Geneá (generation) would be more suitable.
Me:: “Well, as a student of scripture I try to bring down heresies like the so-called 40 year chilia ete. What did you say was more likely to be used if John meant a short 40-year period for the ete chilia?”

Geneá or even hekato etê (a hundred years) Hekatontaetêr ís Geneá being roughly 30-40 years in span.

Εκατονταετίς is the actual grouping of a hundred years together like in centennial.

And the other two 100 years. Or even aiôn (century). All closer to 40 than 1000 years (chilia etê).

Me:: “Ok thanks. Is it because chilia ete is meant to mean a long period if anything?”

Chilia etê means literally a thousand years. Metaphorically sure, it can mean many years without being specific. It certainly doesn't mean 40 years.

This is what the 2001 translation of the Bible had to say about the Greek words for the thousand years (it would be like the expression “he has thousands”). Though the Modern Greek would disagree since chilioi is in the male gender, etymology is not always reliable. Here’s their take:

Thousand Years or Thousands of Years?
There appears to be some question as to the meaning of the Greek text at 2 Peter 3:8, as well as several verses of Revelation 20. For while most modern Greek text sources seem to agree on the words of these verses, the wording in Tischendorf's text [an older version] should also be considered. For there it uses the Greek words chilioi etos (pronounced kee-lee-o-ee etos). Chilioi etos is the plural form of chilia eta, which means, thousand years. And although the words appear in their singular forms in most modern texts, such sources as Vine's seem to acknowledge that the plural form is how it may have once appeared in those verses.

What difference does all of this make? Well, recognize that the singular form (thousand years) is the preference of almost all Bible translators, so it may be correct. However, if the plural form (thousands of years) is correct, then certain common Bible teachings may be in error. For example: Is a thousand years as one day to God, or are thousands of years as one day to Him? And will Jesus reign for a thousand years or for thousands of years? We will leave others to debate such things; we're just bringing it to your attention.

Rev 20:1-2 Well after that, I saw a messenger come down from the sky with a long chain in his hand [that held] the key to the abyss; \(^2\) and he grabbed the Dragon – the original snake, the Slanderer and Opposer – and chained him up for a thousand years (or thousands of years).
DP “Steve, your comment: << Don, believing (putting scriptural merit into) deceived rabbis who don’t think Christ is our Messiah was an apparent mistake here. ....>>

Is extremely poor logic. It says because the rabbis were wrong on some points, they must be wrong on others. Logical failure of major proportions!”

RESPONSE: I was going to add that that does not mean they are wrong about everything, but they are definitely wrong about the millennium. That’s why I said “….was an apparent mistake here” I did not mean everywhere. Either way, whether they’re not wrong about everything, it does not make them right either.

DON PRESTON “In Revelation, the destruction of Satan occurs at the end of the millennium. But, Paul said the destruction of Satan was imminent when he wrote Romans (16:20). Therefore, the end of the millennium was near when Paul wrote Romans.”

Rom 16:20 And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.
MY RESPONSE: Don, that assessment is a fatal blow for your model Full Preterism, here’s why …

There’s been much unnecessary controversy over this verse in the Preterist community. **What about audience relevance?** Who was Paul speaking to? Hold onto that thought!!

First, Rev 20:10 is to cast satan into the lake of fire (destroy) after the millennium. **Crush or bruise is NOT the same thing as casting satan into the lake of fire — two entirely different events!**

Now, IF I can prove that Rom 16:20 is referring to the binding (not the destruction) of satan, then FP has no scripture that can be used prior to the destruction of Jerusalem (AD70) to demonstrate that satan was destroyed, thus it must occur after 70, which destroys all things fulfilled by 70! In other words, this would render the erroneous claim of the strong man (which John would’ve mentioned in his list to describe satan in Rev 12:9, 20:2) in Mat 5 or any other claim of the binding before Romans 16:20 was written. Here is my case (in red)::

Assigning complete destruction to Rom 16:20 has no support, it is to bruise or crush satan (Grk. συντριψει), which can mean to squelch. Squelch coincides with the binding since this adversary would be released again in the distant future. To squelch means to stop
(something/deception) from continuing by suppression, not complete annihilation.

This correct understanding of Romans 16:20 would put Paul in full agreement with God, Jesus, and John that the adversary (the satan) would soon be crushed or squelched by God’s judgment under the feet of the Romans at the beginning of the thousands years and coincides (is a commentary) to Gen 3:15 where Satan’s head would be bruised, a Greek word used to denote “hurt” or “injure.” The adversary would be bound, cast into the abyss, shut up, and sealed in that “he should deceive the nations no more until the thousands years are fulfilled…”

This squelching (suppression) also used for (συντριψει) that is translated crush/bruise (implying a crushing defeat) occurs at the beginning of the thousand years to give some peace, safety and absence of this entity deceiving during the long period called the thousand years.

The same expression is used to describe Christ’s bruises/stripes he took for us ….

Isa 53:9b - 10a “…. For He does no wrong, and no deceit is in His mouth, yet Yahweh desires to crush Him, …. ”

We know God did not destroy Jesus.

This is another case of victory vs. destruction – in this case it’s of the devil, instead of death — victory and destruction are not the same in either death or the devil
in these verses!

1Jn 3:8 he that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sins from the beginning. To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

Destroying “the works” of the devil is **victory over the devil** by Christ.

Rev 20:10 a “And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone,”

**Is destruction of the devil by God.**

It’s another case of victory over vs. destruction.

Did Satan have a Kingdom?

Mat 12:26 and if Satan casteth out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand?

Mat 21:43 Therefore say I unto you, **The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you** (Judah, the Jews), and shall be given to a nation (Christendom) bringing forth the fruits thereof.

We see from the above verses (and it’s also in the OT) **this satan adversary had a kingdom in the 1st century.** We shall see that this satan (adversary apostate Judah—yes you read that right!) is this entity, personified in the above
verse that Jesus pronounced God’s judgment on, who were rejecting Christ and killing his followers.

While the 1st century Christians had the promise of being in the kingdom already (Col 1:13) the kingdom still had to be taken (Mat 21:43) from satan (Judah, not Israel) and then or afterwards (not before) officially be given (the kingdom’s inauguration) to Christ including his faithful followers to achieve this BRUISING ca. 74 with the destruction of Jerusalem, as Rom 16:20 predicted.

From an examination of Gen 3:15 (the bruising Paul pronounced was prophetically about to be fulfilled “soon”) we can make the following conclusions.

1. The seed of the woman refers to redeemed humanity beginning with Abel that has its ultimate fulfillment in Christ.

2. The bruised heel of the seed of the woman refers to the crucifixion of Christ. This bruising did not destroy Christ.

3. The bruised head of the serpent speaks to the binding of Satan and it is God — not the church or Christ, but because of Christ — this bruising did not destroy satan!

It is GOD (the Father) who destroys Satan the devil in the Lake of Fire in Rev 20:10 (Rom 16:20 is NOT it)!!

GREEK WORD for BRUISE
Job 9:17 who breaks me with a tempest, and adds to my wounds [συντριμμάτα same root as Paul uses for BRUISE(s)] without cause; God did not destroy Job out of existence!

Gen 3:15 in a Greek interlinear reads: “καὶ ἐχθράν θέλω στήσει ἀναμέσον σου και της γυναίκος, και αναμέσον του σπέρματός σου και του σπέρματος αυτῆς· αυτό θέλει σου συντρίψει (BRUISE) την κεφαλήν, και συ θέλεις κεντήσει την πτέρναν αυτοῦ.”

Literally reads:

“...and enemies I will set [in] your midst and the woman, and the midst of thy seed and her offspring; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel. (cf. Psa 110:2 rule in the MIDST OF YOUR ENEMIES!)

IT’S BRUISE that was prophesied—not complete destruction!

Paul [in Rom 16:20] is prophesying that the prophecy that God spoke in Genesis 3:15 was shortly (soon) to come to pass, obviously in a metaphorical, but still a very real way.

This means that the Roman Christians were being used by God in his kingly work of bruising/crushing/trampling Satan under the Roman’s feet (audience relevance!) at the stoning and burning of the whore, the satan. We KNOW who the Romans trampled! This is when satan was bound, not destroyed.
USAGE of συντριψει (below argument) can also imply TRAMPLE as in under the Roman’s feet as the verse states, trample is a little different than the modern Greek which is more along the lines of bruise, squelch or crush—as in crushing defeat—not complete annihilation either …

Based on my sources and the way that tribos is used in the NT (base of the word suntribo) is used as crush/bruise/hurt as in trampling the satan (Jewish adversary) under the Roman’s feet (i.e. “your feet”). Why do you think that the translators of the AV, RV, LITV & YLT chose the word “bruise”, IF it really means “destroy,” which is the way Preston is using “crush”?

“συντριψει” is the Greek word used, not “συντρίβω”. If you doubt me, just check out the Greek text. Paul did use the 3rd person future tense of the verb and, in my opinion, he was saying that the adversary of the Christians was going to be trampled and defeated under the feet of the Romans soon; not totally destroyed, since they would re-emerge as a DRY tree much later or after the thousand years (see “evil figs” in this document).

Here is my source: Greek/English dictionary
to tread down
AV-path 3; 3 (and most other translations)
1) a worn way, a path
2a) to put Satan under foot and (as a conqueror) trample on him
NAS Greek Lexicon
tρίβος tribos tree’-bos τρίβος tribos; from τριβω tribo a beaten track, a path:—

Strong’s
tρίβος tribos tree’-bos; from τριβω tribo a rut or worn track: — path.

“τριβοὺς” is used three times in the NT:

Mat 3:3 For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths (τριβους) straight.
Mar 1:3 The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths (τριβους) straight.
Luk 3:4 As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths (τριβους) straight.

And each time it is translated “paths”. Does it mean “friction” too as the modern Greek infers? Why did the translators translate it as “path” every time it appears alone in the Greek text?

Paths are made by the “trampling” of feet, not by the “friction” of rubbing things together as modern Greek infers, but we are focusing on usage here.
Here is the way that Romans 16:20 appears in the Message:

“and before you know it the God of peace will come down on Satan with both feet, stomping him into the dirt. Enjoy the best of Jesus!” (Rom 16:20 Message)

If “τρίβους” has to mean “friction” as the modern Greek implies, then where do you suppose that Peterson got the idea that it meant “stomping,” unless that too can be considered a form of friction or pulverizing.

CRUSH or BRUISE

As Genesis 3:15 had predicted, there would be ongoing “enmity” between the serpent (God’s adversary satan) and the woman (God’s people) and the “Seed” (Jesus and his followers) who would come from the woman. Furthermore, this passage indicated that Satan would have limited success in being able to “bruise” Christ’s heel by his resurrection and return as King of kings and Lord of lords, qualifying to replace him as the ruler of this world. (Mat 21:43)

The woman represents Israel, and her child is Christ, the Messiah (Isa 7:14; 9:6; 66:7.8; Mic 5:2; Rom 9:4,5; Rev 12:5)

The woman is the called out assembly (church), only because the church did bring forth Christ and Israel (lost and scattered since the 8th century b.c.) became (not replaced) the church.

The sun reflects redeemed Israel's unique glory, brilliance and dignity because of her exulted status and shows her as God's chosen nation.
The moon under her feet alludes to God's promise of dominion, and the crown of twelve stars pictures royalty and relates to the 12 tribes. See Gen 37:9 - 11 Joseph’s dream about the sun, moon and 11 stars which were bowing down to Joseph. (who was the 12th).

In this look toward the third heaven by John, we are taken back into the ancient battle that has gone on through the Christian age between Jesus and satan. If Jesus is again in warfare with this satan, then His people are in battle as well.

Next, we see satan active pre-70 throughout scripture deceiving during the erroneous 40-year millennium. I will show you the deception does not prevent the gospel from getting out and being accepted, as it did with John the Baptist. Please realize if this truly is the thousand years, this deceiving cannot be:

Eph 2:2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience:

1Ti 4:1 But the Spirit expressly says that in latter times (the last days were from the birth of Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem) some will depart from the faith, cleaving to deceiving spirits and teachings of demons.
2Th 2:10 And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

IV gospel 13:2 And during supper, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him.

Rev 2:10 Fear not the things which thou art “about to” (Grk. mello) suffer: behold, the devil is about to cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days. Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.

Rev 12:10 And I hear a loud voice in heaven saying, "Just now (ca. 70) came the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of His Christ, for the accuser of our brethren was cast out, who was accusing them before our God day and night." (CLV)

Rev 18:23c “….for with thy sorcery were all the nations deceived.” Note, this is right before the destruction of the harlot Jerusalem.

Rev 2:20 But I have much against you, seeing that you pardon that woman of yours, Jezebel, who says that she is a prophetess, and is teaching and deceiving My servants so as to commit prostitution and to be eating idol sacrifices."
1Pe 5:8, “Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walks about, seeking whom he may devour, “1Co 15:30-31, “Why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour? I protest by that glorifying in you, brethren, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily. “

This period certainly is not the thousand years! Does this language sound like it is coming from those that have had their enemies subdued or satan destroyed since the cross, as Full Preterism claims? No, the deception runs right up to AD70, and nowhere is the binding of satan a prerequisite to getting the gospel out – it was going out before satan was bound, as with John the Baptist. In a little while you will learn what the deception is.

Jesus’ and our enemies are one in the same:

Php 3:18 For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ:
Luk 1:71-74 That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear,

Thus, we can see this satan was not yet even bound, much
less destroyed as Don asserts. So, it would be more accurate to say that Paul was simply saying that the adversary (the satan) was going to be trampled (crushed) under the feet of the Romans shortly.

It is simply not accurate to say that “Paul said the destruction of Satan was imminent when he wrote Romans (16:20)” because that is not what he said and it is not what he meant. Therefore, contrary to your incorrect assertion, Romans 16:20 has nothing to do with the “end of the millennium.” You may spin this verse all you want in order to ‘shoehorn’ it into your erroneous paradigm, but it will not change these facts.

Rom 16:20 has to be referring to the binding because the destruction of satan is not until Rev 20:10, which occurs a thousand years AFTER the beast and false prophet were already in the lake of fire where this satan would be cast. Notice the beast and false prophet are cast in BEFORE the thousand years! (Rev 19:20)

The sequence of events leading up to the destruction of the devil (in our near future) can be understood by the continuous narrative of Rev 19 and 20, explained by the lake of fire. …

Rev 19:20 And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of
the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone.

Rev 20:10 And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet [were], and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

So it is only AFTER the thousand years of Rev 20:4 expires that Satan is cast into the lake of fire, and that the beast and false prophet ARE ALREADY THERE. This makes it impossible for the thousand years of Rev 20:4 to come BEFORE the destruction of the beast and the false prophet, and makes it impossible for it to come AFTER the destruction of Satan in the lake of fire! Please catch the power of this.

So in that sense, the events of Rev 19 precede the events of Rev 20, making it a continuous narrative.

The millennial period could not have started until AFTER the 2nd advent because of the arrangement of Rev 19 and 20. If 70AD is the destruction of the harlot of Rev 16, 18 and 19, then Satan could not have been destroyed before that, such as ca. 67-69AD. That takes the continuity of events and completely 180’s them. Satan is chained after the destruction of the beast and false prophet. There is no way around it. See if you can get
around this otherwise the case is closed.

In fact, the land beast and false prophet representing the two politico-religious systems are not completely defeated until ca. 74AD according to history! So ....

Rev 12:10 (w/emphasis) And I hear a loud voice in heaven saying, "\textbf{JUST NOW (ca. 70-74)} came the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of His Christ, \textbf{for the accuser of our brethren was cast out} (Satan bound ca. 70-74), who was accusing them before our God day and night." (CLV)

According to the above verse and the timing of the kingdom coming ("Just now …came") we can conclude:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{THE ACCUSER OF OUR BRETHREN} = SATAN (who needed to be bound when the thousand years began) = \textbf{THE APOSTATE JEWS WHO INCLUDED THE LAND BEAST AND THE FALSE PROPHET!} ...
\end{quote}

All of this is verified by the fact that in \textbf{Rev 18:23 THE HARLOT, JERUSALEM, is identified as the one that “by thy sorceries were all NATIONS DECEIVED.”} In Rev 12:10c “the accuser (national Judaism, in the NT Jews are identified as accusers \textbf{more than 30 times}) of our brothers (Christians) is cast down…” Note that in 20:3 satan (the adversary of Christianity, “synagogue of satan” Rev 2:9, 3:9) is bound specifically that “he should \textbf{deceive the nations no more}.” And then in verse 8 he
(the Zionist Jew, the great harlot, the deceiver of the nations) is released to “go out and deceive the nations” AGAIN!

Did you catch the power of this? FP lies mortally wounded. So, satan is only cast into the lake of fire AFTER the thousand years had transpired. Where the beast and false prophet ALREADY WERE a [figurative] thousand years earlier!

Next, in addition to the above, there are several words Paul could have used - but did not - for “destroy” in the Greek and that is because crush does not mean obliterate—that is what gehenna and the lake of fire (not the Roman armies) are for! All four of the following Greek words tell us they mean destroy. Notice none of these words are in our verse:

ἐξολοθρεύω (exolothreuō) is exterminate (G1842)
αφανισμός (noun) αφανίζω (verb) = extinction, annihilation
εκμηδένιση is annihilation
εκμηδενίζω is annihilate

Why do they all denote destruction? Because there are many ways to annihilate something.

You can extirpate something
You can render something invisible
You can bring something back to zero

I think they're all equally potent. It's like burn up VS. burn down. It depends how strong your emotion is.

Do they also describe completely destroy out of existence? The degree of destruction out of existence is not the question here. It's just the mental image of how that is achieved.

Eksolothreúô means to extirpate, to cause to be lost from reference. Aphanismos is to destroy something to the point nothing can be seen. Ekmêdenisis is to make something into a zero, a nothing. Their result is the same. Obliteration.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that syntripsei Greek συντριψει has connotations of bruise/trample/crush (as in crushing defeat)/injure/squelch. While it has those connotations, we still think that “Bruise” is the best rendering, as Rom 16:20 is a fulfillment of Gen 3:15. The serpent bruised Christ’s heel with his crucifixion, and the serpent was bruised (and bound) by the trampling under the Roman’s feet ca. 70.

Thus, we have learned that syntripsei Greek συντριψει does NOT denote destruction or complete annihilation as
the Lake of Fire connotes will happen to this adversary (the devil/slanderer) in the near future if we are correct in our identification of it, as a counterfeit Zionism. “Audience relevance” also affirms our identification of this adversary (i.e. God will soon bruise satan “under your feet” the Roman’s feet—that can only be one entity).

Syntripsei (συντριψει) used in our verse in question Rom 16:20 is a verb to grind, to bruise/crush, to pulverize. We think it is used as in saying a “crushing defeat” but not total annihilation because this entity would re-emerge onto the world scene many, many years later, or after the thousand years, as we see it today.

Whether the rubble is there after being crushed or cleared away, the fortress (kingdom) has fallen. In the case of an enemy, he would have been totally defeated. But, syntripsei (depending on context) is also a vivid way of saying to completely defeat, but not physically obliterate. Satan is not completely destroyed until Rev 20:10 when thrown into the lake of fire, which we have shown is an impossibility by the event of Rom 16:20.

+++

QUESTION: WHAT ENDS AND WHAT DOES JESUS GIVE UP IN 1CO 15:24? (discussed above also)…
1Co 15:24 Then *cometh* the **end**, when he shall **deliver up** (surrender) the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. (ASV)

DP “Steve, the fact a person can find occasions where a given word is used in a certain way does not determine its use in every case. Paul set the tone for the use of paradidomi in 1 Corinthians 15:2—and it is not surrender. In light of the fact that every single other text that deals with what happens between Christ and the kingdom at his parousia has him entering fully into his reign, it is specious to impose the idea of surrender onto the text of 1 Cor. 15.

Your delineation between the essence of the kingdom and a so-called change of management is misguided, as the previous comment demonstrates. At his parousia, Christ would marry the church—that is not delivering the kingdom (i.e. surrendering) his brided.

Paul said the end (goal) of the previous ages had arrived (was arriving) in the first century. Now, since the goal of all the previous ages was arriving 2000 years ago, it is specious to posit another end of another age. That is not Biblical.

You are operating under the assumption, that [sic] I have demonstrated is wrong, that Jesus somehow surrenders the kingdom. I have falsified that in the following ways:
1. The way Paul used that very word in v. 2.”

RESPONSE: Don, I think you meant v. 3? Anyway, you violate your own method here when you told me, “Steve, the fact a person can find occasions where a given word is used in a certain way does not determine its use in every case.” regarding paradidom* which you say means “share.”

As we know the chapters are not holy inspired thus Paul is not setting the tone with the meaning of the word. It’s better to take the whole counsel of God into consideration with context leading the way. But it does mean surrender most of the time; just as its root, the verb didomi means to give. Paradidomi is used throughout for God surrendering or delivering up Israel’s enemies to them (Gen 14:20; Exo 23:31 et al). It is used in the NT when John is cast into prison (Mat 4:12).

Paradidomi, such as 1Co 15:3 you quote, means to bequeath, to pass down, to place in someone's care and responsibility and by extension to surrender. So, no, it doesn't mean to share.

Δίδωμι didomi (its verb derivative) is simply "to give". To hand something to someone. Didomi is the original verb. Paradidomi is a derivative.

Just keep in mind the image of someone taking something and putting it in someone else's hands. Παραδίδωμι (paradidomi) εαυτόν means to surrender oneself into custody. They're both
verbs. The prefix para- simply colors the verb didomi and gives it the sense of "passing down", "bequeathing" or "place in someone's care", "to deliver", "to surrender."

1Co 15:3 “For I delivered (παραδίδωμι - shared?) to you in the first place what I also received, that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures,…”

Paul here uses it in the sense of bequeathing. Of passing down tradition, dogma, teaching. Maybe English could use share, but in Greek the word “to share” literally means to split something into parts and give people their share. Paul here certainly is not sharing. He's bequeathing. He's passing down wisdom, passing on information. The verb to share is "nemomai" Μοιραζω. Not "paradidomi".

He's basically saying "I'm passing down to you what was passed down/given to me..."

Metadidomi means to spread or to transmit, whereas Strong’s says it is to share, but Strong’s is not always correct; usage is and you are relying on an approximate translation of the word in English and not the strict, actual meaning of the word in Greek.

Νέμομαι means that something has been shared to me. Like a plot of land. I now have the rights to it and I exploit it financially. It's a medio-passive verb. It's active form Νέμω (infinitive form νέμειν) means to take something, for instance, the same plot of land and then share it out to your sons and daughters.
Concordances are not very useful in the study of Greek. A lot of the verbs cannot translate into English with one word very well, only as a paraphrase. The verb Μοιράζω <----- from the noun μερίδιον (part/share)<------ which in turn comes from the noun μέρος (part/side) is used even more strictly in the sense "to share something out between people".

Etymology is not always reliable, but you can test these with Google Translate and against scripture:

Παύλος αγρόν νέμει (Paul shares his plot of land to his kids)

Παύλος αγρόν νέμεται (Paul has bought or was given/shared out a plot of land, which he now exploits)

Παύλος σοφίαν μεταδίδει (Paul transmits wisdom)

Παύλος σοφίαν παραδίδει (Paul bequeaths wisdom)

Hence, bequeath derived from paradidomi is not sharing as you asserted for 1Co 15:3. But in v. 24 it is surrender (as I asserted) when Jesus gives up the kingdom to the Father after he has nullified all sovereignty, authority and power in our near future.

The Greek wording means that he's handing it over to the Father. He delivers it and passes it on to the Father's care and responsibility. That's what the verb paradidomi means. So I guess Jesus would no longer be "nemetai” (to be allotted something that's now in your care.) the kingdom because he fulfilled his commission.
There does not seem to be any implication of participation in the running of things. Jesus hands the whole thing over. God is seen as the ultimate King and administrator after Jesus puts down all rule and authority that opposes, as Zec 14:9 says!

Now, if there is a temporal aspect to Christ’s reign (i.e. the thousand years) then what do we say about verses like Dan 4:3, 7:14 where Christ’s kingdom is translated "everlasting and forever," where the Greek is aionios αἰώνιος and the Hebrew olam are used? Does that make your claim right and we should ignore the temporal reign? ….

Dan 7:14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an EVERLASTING dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

But again, the EVERLASTING here is αἰώνιος.

Also, dominion in that verse does not insist the same administration as the Father will have, but since Christ and the Father are one we would expect the effects of what Christ had done (age-during/age-abiding/“the thousand years plus the little season,”) to continue, but under the Father at that point in time, in the future.

Now, aionios is used in modern Greek to mean eternal but to be precise means a period of 100 years+. But since its root is αἰών aion, it would NOT mean forever, because αἰών means an age or century+. Aionios is something or someone who lasts 100
years or over. So, to many it's unclear whether they mean everlasting or simply longer than 100 years. But generally speaking the word aionios is used to describe something that lives on more than humans do.

The YLT translates it age-during/age-abiding, and it CAN be translated as such. A century can be an age, ask a Greek speaking person. So, it does not necessarily have to mean forever or everlasting, since the word is used in both contexts.

Thus it CAN be translated as such ….

Dan 7:14 And to him is given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, and all peoples, nations, and languages do serve him, his dominion is a dominion AGE-DURING, that passeth not away, and his kingdom that which is not destroyed. (YLT)

What about the “passes not away?” Remember, the Father and Christ are one so what Christ does “for” the kingdom during the figurative thousand years + the little season, lasts (does not pass away,) but the administration will change at that point in the future.

Don, this is contrary to your theory about paradidomi meaning share, rather nemomai is to share (Ekho or katekho is to possess).

Metadidomi often translated share in scripture is not synonymous with paradidomi, it just means to transmit. Paradidomi in 1Co 15:24 implies to literally hand over. You no longer have it. Surrender is a right rendering too. Paradidomi
eauton, for instance, means to surrender oneself, to turn oneself over to the authorities.

Don, you said: “...and you [sic] paradigm essentially says he will never rule, because at his coming he surrenders the kingdom!” Maybe from a full preterist perspective, but not from a biblical one ....

My paradigm has always been he receives the kingdom at his coming (or sit at my right hand [ca. 33] “until” – [ca. 70]. Remember, pre-70 he is on his Father’s throne Rev 3:21. Post 70 he takes his own throne). You need to put the “until” where it belongs – from the time at which Jesus sat down at the right hand of the Father (ca. 33 AD) through the time until the Day of the Lord and the Parousia began, ca. 70AD. A time of approximately 35 – 40 years.

DP “2. He sat down on the throne of David, at the right hand of the Father, and from there, fulfilled the Psalms: "rule though in the midst of your enemies." Sitting at the right hand, is a position of authority and sovereignty, although, it is not the full glory of the of rule and reign.“

RESPONSE: Don you are wrong that Jesus “sat down on the throne of David” when He sat down at the right hand of the Father and I hope this can put to rest this dyslexic approach to these musical chairs.

Hebrews 10:13 is the quintessential commentary on Psalm
110:1 within the NT:

“But this man (Jesus), after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; and from there He is waiting for His enemies to be made his footstool.” (Heb 10:12-13, emphasis and commentary added)

Hebrews was written ca. 64 AD, several years after 1Corinthians was written. According to the author of Hebrews, Jesus was still sitting at the right hand of the Father in ca. 64 AD, because He was still waiting for His enemies to be made His footstool.

So this is same as my above comment, your paradigm assumes he is reigning immediately upon his ascension because you ignore the “until” of Psa 110; it says he sits at the Father’s right hand (cf. the Father’s throne Rev 3:21), “until” he takes his own throne and begins to reign. Christ’s reign has to be inaugurated AFTER the destruction of the harlot “as I laid out systematically before using the lake of fire as the reference point showing Revelation chapters 19 - 20 have a continuous narrative.” Luk 21:28-32 and Rev 20:4 shows the time between 33 – 70 Christ’s reign was approaching and began at the time of redemption (ca. 70). Redemption is a process, which takes time. ….

The 1st century Apostles were sealed with the spirit (30-70AD), which was the EARNEST DOWN PAYMENT Eph 1:13-14; 2Co 1:22, but did NOT have salvation at the cross and resurrection of Christ, but were waiting for his parousia (Mat 24:2-3, 30) and the sign of it.
Heb 9:28 and Rom 13:11 are a couple verses that show salvation does not occur at His cross and resurrection as Full Preterism assumes, because there is a process to our redemption — HIS RETURN “A SECOND TIME” HAS TO ALSO HAVE OCCURRED. It’s the process of redemption and that process ended with the destruction of the old system ca. 70AD, then redemption/salvation began in the promised kingdom.

Heb 9:28 so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear “A SECOND TIME,” apart from sin, to them that wait for him, “UNTO SALVATION.”

Romans 13:11 And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for NOW is our salvation “NEARER” [Don, near is not here] than when we believed. (Carefully consider this verse with Heb 9:28 above to see they did not have it yet, until His return.)

I repeat, Rom 13:11 (above verse) salvation is close ….

Salvation is here ….

Rev 12:10 And I hear a loud voice in heaven saying, "Just now came the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of His Christ, [WHEN?] for the accuser of our brethren was cast out, who was accusing them before our God day and night." (CLV)

In the Parousia, Jesus leaves His Father’s throne and ascends to his throne, i.e. the promised throne of His Father David when He
invites His faithful “overcomers” to ascend to heaven (by resurrection) and “sit with Me in My throne even as I also overcame and sat with My Father in His throne.” Once He is sitting on HIS OWN throne God “sends the rod of (Jesus’) strength out or Zion” and so Jesus reigns “in the midst of His enemies.” Paul, commenting on this passage, states that, “He must reign until…He has put down all rule and all authority and power…when all things shall be subdued unto Him…” in our future.

The parousia consists of his reign (Luk 1:32-33) and the accession to His promised throne – and is not the wrath of God as Full Preterism espouses — “the Day of the Lord” begins with the wrath of God on the 1st century Apostate Jews and shines through the Parousia of Christ, still going on today. According to Matt 19:28, 25:31; Rev 20:4, 3:21, including OT passages in the Bible prove the “Parousia” of Jesus Christ, began ca. 70 AD.

As Full Preterism does know, historically, the events prophetically described by Jesus in Luke 21:8-27 occurred in the years of ca. 36-70 AD. Jesus clearly instructed His listeners that “when you see these things happening, know that the kingdom of God is NEAR!” and “when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draws nigh” [Luk 21:28]

1) We know he does not rule without a kingdom, and 2) near does not mean here. 3) draws nigh does not mean here.

Thus, Full Preterism needs to correct their doctrine in this area and acknowledge that salvation begins with Christ’s inaugurated kingdom ca. 70 (Rev 20:4; Heb 9:28; Rom 13:11; Luk 21:28).
“29 Men, brethren; permit me to freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. 30 Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; 31 He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that He was not left in hades, neither did His flesh decay. 32 This Jesus, God has raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. 33 Therefore, being exalted to the right hand of God, and receiving from the Father the promised Holy Spirit, He has shed forth this which ye now see and hear. 34 For David did not ascend into the heavens: but he said, YHWH said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, 35 Until I make thy foes thy footstool. 36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God has made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” (Act 2:29-36, Emphases added)

The certain key to this passage is the phrase, “until I make your foes your footstool” and the key word, which you seem to ignore is “until.” Every dictionary which I have checked defines until as “Up to the time of the event referenced.” The event referenced in this passage is “...I make your foes your footstool.” Therefore, properly understood, the passage simply states that Jesus is to sit down at the right hand of the Father and wait for the event referenced to occur. It does not say that Jesus was to have His foes made His footstool at the very moment that He was seated at the right hand of the Father as
you seem to think.

The author of Hebrews also stated:

“‘23 Let us hold fast the profession of faith without wavering…
24 And let us consider one another to incite unto love and to
good works: 25 Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves
together, as the manner of some; but exhorting: and so much the
more, as ye see the day approaching. 26 For if we sin willfully
after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there
remains no more sacrifice for sins, 27 But a certain fearful
looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall
devour the adversaries.” (Heb 10:23-27, emphasis added)

Thus, these Hebrews were instructed that “the day of the Lord”
when the Father would make Jesus’ enemies His footstool was
rapidly approaching. A day that would begin with “judgment
and fiery indignation” as Jesus stepped up and accessed His
seat (began His reign) in the throne of His glory (Matt 19:28,
25:31) and delivered “judgment (IV gospel 5:22, 30; et al.) and
fiery indignation” to His first century enemies,” referencing Psa
110:1. Then Jesus goes forth and rules in the midst of his
enemies, referencing Psa 110:2

“The judgment and fiery indignation” in this passage surely
begins ”the day of the Lord” spoken of as “these be the days of
vengeance” by Jesus as recorded in Luke 21:22.

If the verses above are true (and they are), then it is not
possible that “Jesus receive(d) the "throne of David" in Act 2:33 “Being, then, to the right hand of God exalted,…”  Contrary to that assumption, this passage does not say a word about Jesus receiving “the throne of His glory” (the phrase which Jesus chose to use for His coronation as King of kings and His being seated on the throne of David). However, it does plainly state that Jesus received the gift of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Contrary to the assumption of some “receiving the Holy Spirit” does not equate to being placed on “the throne of His father David.”

Jesus’ references to His being seated in/on the “throne of His glory” clearly associate that event with the resurrection of His apostles (Mat 19:28) and His Parousia (Mat 25:31; cf. Rev 3:21) which occurred ca. 40 years after Peter’s statement as recorded in Acts 2. Thus, it should be apparent that Jesus did not think that He would receive the throne of David upon His ascension to the right hand of the Father. Was Jesus wrong?

The Father gives Jesus the authority to deal with His enemies by placing Jesus on His own throne (after being on the Father’s throne “until” ca. 70) Rev 3:21, Rev 11:15ff, 20:4, then the Father recedes out of the picture, so to speak, and allows Jesus to deal with His enemies as He sees fit. When Jesus has accomplished all that is before Him, He delivers the full kingdom to the Father, in the manner that the Father wants it to be, that God may be all in all (a grand time we are waiting for).

He does not surrender his reign (as mediator and
conqueror, i.e. rule in the midst of your enemies) until after he has subdued all his enemies, after the long period called the thousand years (notice long period vs. short period called “little while” of Rev 20:3), after satan has been released “a little while” which has occurred in our day that I wish you would consider (fully demonstrated in my book below link). ALL taking place 2,000 years after (beginning ca. 70 with the thousand years and ending with the “little season” satan is released) his Parousia began.

Now, I understand the FP position on this, that the “little while” of Rev 20:3 is that 3.5 years of the war leading up to 70, and I show that is an impossibility above where I showed the error in Don’s false statement “Paul said the destruction of Satan was imminent when he wrote Romans (16:20).”

THE DECEPTION OF THE “LITTLE SEASON” OF REV 20:3

We hope you have ears to hear this. Here is more proof the 3.5 years of the war is not the little season of Rev 20:3 as FP requires. First, satan being bound is not a prerequisite for believing the gospel. Where does Scripture state that the “deception of the adversary” had anything to do with the conversion of the nations? look at John the Baptist and all he baptized before the ministry of Christ. That is not what the deception is. The deception is the Jews claiming a right to the land and convincing people they are God’s chosen.

Just like they were doing here – THIS is the deception of the “little season” of Rev 20:3:
"...Yahweh said unto me; Son of man (Ezekiel), your brethren, even your brethren (of the house of Israel), your fellow exiles, all of the whole house of Israel, are those of whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem (hard hearted apostate Jews) have said, ‘They (the whole house of Israel) have gone far from the LORD; to us (the apostate Jews) this land (the land promised to Israel) is given for our (apostate Jews) possession. (Ezk 11:15)" (comments and emphasis added)

Then after the city of Jerusalem fell to the Babylonian's, God told Ezekiel:

"Son of man (Ezekiel), they (the evil figs of Jer 24 who eventually became the "synagogue of the adversary" Rev 2:9, 3:9) who inhabit those ruins in the land of Israel are saying, ‘Abraham was only one, and he inherited the land. But we are many; the land has been given to us as a possession." (Ezk 33:24)

Thus, we now see that the very unique sin of the apostate Jews (evil figs) was the claim that they were the rightful heirs and sole possessors of the land given to all twelve tribes through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. As a result of the "binding in judgment" in AD 70, these evil figs were no longer (rightfully) able to make that false claim and thus deceive the nations. But the ban was lifted ("must be" Rev 20:3c) and the thousand years ended ca. 1948. The nations are certainly deceived about something and Dispensationalism is tightly linked to this counterfeit Judeo-Christian Zionism (an oxymoron)! Only now, the evil figs are a "dry [fig] tree," like Jesus alluded to here: “For if they [the apostate Jews killing him [the evil figs]] do these things in the green tree (while they still had the kingdom pre-70, before God took it from them Mat 21:43), what shall be done in the dry [tree, post-70 after the thousand years when satan is released for a short while Rev 20:3c]?” (Luk 23:31 w/emphasis) Well, we see today what they are doing as a dry tree. Deceiving and making war!
Why does Rev 20:3 state “must be”? The "must be" in Rev 20:3c "And after these things, he MUST BE set loose a little time." is because of the horrors the world must endure during this short period and it is because the destruction of that nation (described in verse below) could be the only historical event that could convince ardent Christian Zionists that they are not the chosen and that destruction is becoming more and more plausible for our day.

Rev 20:10a "And the Devil (the slanderer counterfeit Zionism) leading them astray was thrown into the Lake of Fire and Brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet were." (were, a symbolic thousand years earlier)

DP  “2. The indisputable fact that in every text that speaks of Christ and the kingdom at his coming, it speaks of his taking the kingdom, or entering fully into the reign of the kingdom, or marrying his bride. Luke 19 and Jesus' parable there is a prime example of the falsification of your claims.”

RESPONSE: I never implied Christ does not enter fully into his reign at the Parousia. Luke 19 does not tell us exactly when he receives the kingdom, only that he has it when he returns. However, it does say that his enemies are slain AFTER he returns (Luk 19:27). This, we are told, is a process that takes time and all his enemies today are not slain.

DP  “Christ was subject to the Father-- before the parousia, and at the parousia, as the text states, he would be subject as well.”
RESPONSE: No, it does not say “at the Parousia” he would be subject, it is *after* he subdues all his enemies during the long period called the thousand years + the little season of Rev 20:3 and in 1Co 15:28 that Christ becomes subject *again* to the Father as I demonstrated above. The subduing of the enemies BEGINS at the Parousia ca. 70.

DP “The "delivering" (i.e. the sharing) was necessary in that the Father had given the Son the task of putting down all enemies rule though in the midst of your enemies"—"sit at my right hand until I make your enemies thy footstool"—when that was done, Jesus sat down with the Father on the one throne—Revelation 22:3— which you have ignored.”

RESPONSE: Rev 22:3 occurs when Christ has defeated all his enemies, all rule, authority and power has been made useless, and every one of his has been raised, still in our future. I understand that Revelation 22 is a continuation of chapter 21 which begins with “And I saw a new heaven and a new earth…” This new heaven was *first* created in AD70 thousands of years before Christ will have subdued all of His enemies, but that creation is ongoing because it is creating new people (the city) in Christ and I am looking at Rev 22:3 as when that kingdom has reached its fullness.

Two thrones does not mean there are equal or even similar authorities and rule, nor does it mean there is no change after Christ delivers up the kingdom to the Father
(as mediator and conqueror, i.e. rule in the midst of your enemies). Otherwise what would be the point in Christ giving back the reign? There would be none. What reign does he give back? A change in administration does not entail his (Christ’s) government has ceased.

DP “Steve, you are trying to avoid the obvious fact that scripture posits Christ on the throne with the Father after the "end" as I have shown, you try to deny that and to say that paradidomi cannot mean share: Rev 22:3 And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall serve him. Your distinction between the throne of Jesus and the throne of God is likewise specious and without merit. Read Revelation 22:3—one throne.”

RESPONSE: It does not imply “sharing” as I demonstrated by the Greek above and below I will demonstrate with scripture. Christ is given his own throne and it is given, not shared with the Father during this period (Luk 1:32b; Rev 3:21; Dan 7:13-14) to do his own job, as are his disciples to rule in their own capacities, and when he’s completed it, he gives it to the Father.

If Jesus was not to have an individual throne of His own instead of sharing with his Father as you persist, why does the Bible so often make just such a statement that Jesus has His own throne? Are we to believe the Father sits on the throne of David? I don’t thinks so.
**Mat 19:28** “...in the regeneration (Tit 3:5) when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”

**Luk 1:32, 33** “...the Lord shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: And He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” (this is not the conquering aspect of his reign - rule in the midst of your enemies - he surrenders to the Father after a determinate period, nor is it the gathering his elect aspect which also has an end 1Co 15:24)

**Act 2:30** “…of the fruit of his loins (David's), according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne.”

“To him that overcometh I (Jesus) will grant to sit with me (Jesus) in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.” (Rev 3:21)

**1Co 4:8** “…I would to God ye did reign now, that we also might reign now with you.” (But they did not!)

**2Ti 2:12** “If we suffer, we shall (future tense) also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us:”

**Col 1** “That in all things He might have the preeminence.” The word "preeminence" means "occupying the foremost or first place".

In a prophetical meaning there will be a day when He will be Lord over all, and when, "That at the name of Jesus every knee
should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father". (Phi 2:10-11)

This prophecy will take place "in the whole world" in the future. Col 1:18 And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

In this verse the word "that" is "hina" in the Greek, meaning, "in order that", which refers to something that has been said earlier, and gives the reason why He should have the pre-eminence. In order that in all things he might have the preeminence.

Something fundamental I’ve also seen missed in Full Preterism. The phrase is often used “AT the Parousia"..

(1) First:
I can stand "AT THE DOOR" on the OUTSIDE NOT YET THERE of your house literally "AT the threshold" but not yet there......

............OR.......

I can stand "AT THE DOOR" on the THRESHOLD itself "AT the threshold"

............OR.....

I can stand "AT THE DOOR" on the INSIDE of your house
literally "AT the threshold" but no longer outside the house.

All three are equally true even though one takes place BEFORE, the other DURING and the last AFTER - my "ARRIVAL"

(2) since the "Parousia" is his presence NOT just the act of coming/returning, then AT that presence would and MUST NOT EXCLUDE the possibility of ANY TIME after the arrival or coming itself.

Full Preterists want to use the parousia to demand it all takes place at the coming or return itself, while at the same time acknowledging and using the word to represent an ongoing presence of Christ?!?

That is called using the word/concept inconsistently with itself and within its own construct. No, the Parousia of Christ is still going on today and lasts as long as the first resurrection.

This is important because "AT the presence" or "IN his Parousia" of Christ does NOT demand that everything is over with the return, but rather can and as I have shown MUST take place AFTER the arrival and YET STILL MUST BE CONSIDERED ..."AT or IN his PAROUSIA."

Please think hard about this: How can those things be over with the age that was coming to an end in AD70???
The problem you have is scripture describes the resurrection and judgment taking place in the age to come. Thus, if it takes place with or in the age to come, then there is no way it could be over with that age that was coming to an end in AD70.

Not to mention the fact you are completely missing the other arguments and the promises after the war of AD 70 et al ad fin (Eph 2:7; Mat 12:32; Mar 10:30, 18:30; Heb 2:5, 6:5). What was happening to Christianity then was only the beginning.

NOW FOR THE GREEK LANGUAGE

Graecus, whom I am engaging with, is a certified linguist and philologist, plus a native Greek speaking person! Of course none of those things (along with your guy’s 5 degrees) makes anyone automatically right, but the way to arrive at the truth your method prohibits because you are not addressing his objections. I asked him if he was willing to do the same as you did and consult another Greek professor to verify his claims. This is what he told me:

No, because he's not replying to any of the questions regarding grammar. He says his professors have assessed the grammar and said it's incorrect. Give grammatical evidence or I want their names, universities and phone numbers. I am writing to their heads of department.
Google dynamic infinitives yourself. It's all over the Internet.

What did I explain erroneously? He is avoiding the issue entirely and points to the theology. Not the grammar. He simply says "my guy says it's not correct but he doesn't want to get involved". Any professor of Greek would get involved. He already is involved. This is basic high school grammar 101.

I sat and wrote the page explanation of everything. And he's going to dismiss it with "my five-degree friend says it's wrong?" Sure and my dog ate my homework. What kind of abysmally moronic claptrap behind the safety of the Internet is this? I want his friend's details. I am willing to visit his friend at his office anywhere in the country.

I want a full grammatical and syntactical explanation and breakdown of all my points. His Greek professor(s) owe me an explanation. I'm a certified linguist. They're effectively telling me I don't know my job. I am also a native speaker of the damn language. He's telling me I don't understand my own language.

If his friend is real, he will have absolutely no issue with me contacting him personally. I don't. He can contact me anytime he wants and we can exchange evidence of our specialties. Degrees, references. I can talk to him in Greek
all he wants too.

I've done everything I could as a professional and a scientist. And he's dismissing me with generalities. That's just plain rude and unprofessional. He's not even adequately addressed my objections. I'm sorry, but just saying something is wrong, without an explanation, is not enough.

His (Don's) "scholar" doesn't want to get involved further! What? He's already involved. All he has to do is provide grammatical evidence and references to specific rules of syntax that justify his (Don's) position. Not theology. Not interpretations. No generalities. I analyzed the etymology of the verb, I gave detailed explanations of grammar. I followed through with specific information about verbs, tenses and infinitives. I gave similar examples!

There's nothing more physically I could have done. I went above and beyond. And now his scholar simply doesn't agree and doesn't want to get involved? Five degrees? When did he receive them? Where did he get the time? I've struggled with two. I've signed my name on everything I've said!!

The rules are simple. Verbs of necessity govern dynamic infinitives. In this sentence we have a dynamic infinitive governed by a verb that means (it is necessary = necessity). Dynamic infinitives are either in the Aorist by
rule or the Present. This one is in the present. Why? Because it refers to an action that has duration. His scholar even said it himself. Greek tenses do not refer to time. They are aspectual. Therefore, he also said that the infinitive is expressing duration. A reign has duration. Therefore, the Aorist cannot be used. By grammatical and syntactic rules we must use a present infinitive. The grammar doesn't imply anything. The rest is personal interpretation not borne out by the language. It's theology. It's theory and opinion. I couldn't be clearer. Neither could the grammar.

He (Don) thinks that Christ is reigning at the time of Paul because the infinitive is in the present. But here's the catch. The infinitive must be in the present for the following reason: if the past infinitive is used it would mean that Jesus will reign in the future once AFTER all this has happened. But the sentence says that Jesus shall reign $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ (UNTIL) his enemies are brought before God. The present infinitive here makes sense aspectually. But it doesn't imply at all anything about Jesus reign's current state. Paul's not, in other words, implying that Jesus is actually reigning now.

His scholar owes me a complete grammatical and syntactical analysis of the sentence like I did.

If he's going to stand here and lie about my actual profession without justification or evidence, we have a
problem. I'm very clear on all my arguments and where my disagreement with what he says are. I'm not discussing theology or interpretation. I have no vested interests in mainstream Christianity or whatever it is he supports. I'm dealing with the text as I would with any text written in my own language. If he's going to stand there and make claims that I don't understand the language I grew up in, then we have an issue. Simple. Evidence and explanation countering my arguments with "correct grammar".

If he wants it stopped here he either relents and admits he's wrong or he gives me his scholar's name and office phone number. I want to contact him personally. It's more than reasonable.

One more thing, I never noticed his Greek professors directly stating paradidomi is a Greek synonym for share? I have not heard any of them be specific about anything. Are they willing to make that statement?

Check any dictionary online. Just google παραδίδωμι ... You will not see it in any dictionary as share. It never meant share. Ever. In all 3,000 years of written Greek.

++++

DP “Steve, You say in regard to Luke 19-- "I never implied Christ does not enter fully into his reign at the
Parousia. Luke 19 does not tell us when he receives the kingdom, only that he has it when he returns. However, it does say that his enemies are slain AFTER he returns though (v.27). This, we are told, is a process that takes time.

This is disingenuous. If he went to a far country (heaven) there to receive a kingdom, then that tells us when he received the kingdom--in the far country. And it would be at his coming that the last enemies would be destroyed.”

RESPONSE: Don, It’s not disingenuous, there is a gap of 40 years in which the text is not specific, but we can come at least to a deduction of when from other scripture. You say it is ca. 33, I say it is closer to 70.

Furthermore, is it “at his coming” (erchomai) as you claim or “in his presence” (parousia in context denoting a time period) the last enemies would be destroyed? There is a difference. “In his presence” begins the process ca. 70 (not ends) and goes on until our near future when the last enemy will be destroyed, after the GWTJ of Rev 20:11.

DP “You then say: "No, it does not say at the Parousia he would be subject, it is after subduing his enemies Christ becomes subject again to the Father, because at that point Christ’s enemies are subdued. As demonstrated above in v.27, the process of
subduing of his enemies only BEGINS at the Parousia.” Actually, the text says not one thing that you say, Steve.”

RESPONSE: Oh, but the Bible does, only I should have included: “Luk 19:15 And it came to pass, when he was come back again, having received the kingdom …. Luk 19:27 But these mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.

That is the same thing I said above that you said “the text says not one thing” I said “….v.27, the process of subduing of his enemies only BEGINS at the Parousia.” Scripture tells us when he comes back (his second advent, better described as his Parousia) he slays those who would not he reign over them.

Don, you say in regard to 1Co 15:24 … “The end comes when the last enemy is destroyed—It does not say that the subduing of the enemies begins at the parousia. And, yes, it is at the end that Christ is subject to the Father—at the parousia—which is at the end.” You also say “This means he was ruling 'in the midst of his enemies as those enemies were being put under him.”

That is incorrect, he does not rule “until” his enemies are made his footstool by the Father. The Father gives
authority to rule at that point and forward, only after his enemies are put under him.

It is also incorrect to say “at the parousia,” because it is too vague a description. Is it at the beginning of the parousia, the middle, the end? The Parousia of Christ is still going on today, as I soundly exegeted, which you have not replied to, so that’s a long period, meaning one cannot just say “at the parousia” when we are trying to pinpoint prophecy.

Also, Paul’s “the end” in v.24 when the last enemy is destroyed is not the old Jewish covenant that was about to come to an end. As Preterists we need to ask “End of what?” because “at the parousia” is vague and incorrect. Is it “the end” of the old Jewish covenant? Because that is what your model is making it, and it simply does not work. Christ's enemies are subdued “much later” than ca. 70 when Jerusalem was destroyed.

DP “The text says "he must reign until all enemies are put under him"-- the "he must reign" is in the present infinitive, meaning that Christ was- when Paul wrote-ruling and reigning. This means he was ruling 'in the midst of his enemies" as those enemies were being put under him. The putting down of the enemies does not begin when he comes, it is consummated at his coming.”
RESPONSE: Christ was reigning when Paul wrote was disproved above, look under Greek Language.

DP “When does Christ rule / reign in the midst of his enemies, Steve. In your paradigm, Christ does not begin to rule until his enemies are put under him, Scripture says he would rule in the midst of his enemies.”

RESPONSE: Don, put under him meaning his footstool, an idiom that means put under his authority, then he goes forth and rules and subdues them.

DP “But, yes, the parousia is the time of wrath-- Luke 21:22.”

RESPONSE: The Parousia is more than a coming of wrath, it is his ongoing presence, which Full Preterists agree, thus are inconsistent with by trying to cram everything into “at his parousia” LIMITING it to the first century and somehow to God's wrath on Jerusalem, which is also incorrect. It does not work, his presence is ongoing “until” he hands his [mediatorial aspect] reign over to the Father and God becomes all in all.

In regard to 1Co15:25 Don, YOU CLAIM “he must reign” is in the present infinitive so Christ is reigning when Paul wrote, but the function of this infinitive here is purely grammatical as a syntactical rule. The impersonal verb Dei
(must) is **always** followed by the present infinitive as it is also in the present. So it does not prove Christ was reigning in the midst of his enemies when Paul wrote, as you assert.

In regard to your statement: “**This means he was ruling in the midst of his enemies as those enemies were being put under him....**” that is incorrect, Christ does not reign until the Father puts his enemies under his feet or his authority (Psa 110:1; Heb 1:13). Again, you are forgetting the “sit at my right hand **until**” (G2193, limited duration, see how it is used in IV gospel 13:38 “The cock shall not crow, TILL (also G2193) thou hast denied me thrice.”) …. 

Paul’s commentary on Psa 110:1 is 1Co 15:23c. His commentary in verses 24b-28 is his commentary on Psalm 110:2 – Jesus reigning, as a result of the Parousia of verse 23c, in the midst of His enemies. The Father gives Jesus **His position of Authority** (makes His enemies His footstool) then Jesus reigns in the midst of His enemies putting His enemies under His feet as a result of His reign until He has put down all other rule and authority. Jesus now reigns, until .... !

To further demonstrate the error in your conclusions, **UNTIL = LIMITED DURATION**. Αχρις literally means "up to the point when."

A better understanding of the aspects of Christ’s reign that I mentioned and you ignored would render this, like many other
similar objections, impossible. The kingdom of Messiah is, as the scriptures everywhere declare, everlasting in its essence and governmental existence - that part has no end.

Isa 9: 7; Heb 1: 8-12. Messiah’s throne is “forever.” Psa 89: 4, 29, 36; Heb 1: 8; 72: 77. Throughout its several forms of dispensations, it is an everlasting kingdom also, but yet to each of these forms there is an “END.” Mat 24: 14; Heb 9: 26; 1Co 15: 24.

It is olamic aionian in both, but in a different sense; in the first, absolutely so; in the second, relatively so; unlimited as to its essence, limited as to its forms. As to its essence, no external event can limit it. As to its form, external events do limit it. Viewed in its essence it is eternal only. Viewed in its essence and form, together, it is both temporal and eternal, yet called eternal in its relative sense, that is, “age-abiding.” Essentially it is one, and endures forever in an absolute sense. Circumstantially, or dispensationally, it is many, its forms evanescent, though each is age-abiding. This rests upon the nature of the case, and the biblical expression is accommodated to the fact. The wise man tells us God has sent “Olam,” “eternity,” in the heart of man, and he knows “that whatever God doeth it should be Leolam, forever.”

Ecc 3:11, 14. No man can find, out the work of God from its beginning, or in its end, no man can conceive an absolute beginning or an absolute end, for no man can conceive an absolute beginning or an absolute end, because “God has set Olam in the heart of man.” Eternity transcends human thought, and yet it is the innermost core of man’s spiritual constitution,
writes vanity on all things perishable, and bespeaks man’s immorality. In spite of the world’s fading fashion which attracts and in the eternal state, differ as greatly from its previous form in the millennial state, as that millennial form differs from the previous age of the old Mosaic, or as that did from the patriarchal tent.

DP  “Steve, In 1 Corinthians 15 when it speaks of Christ putting down his enemies and then of the last enemy to be destroyed, Paul uses two distinct words. The word for "put down" (subdue) is from hupotasso. The word for destroy is katargeo. Again, Paul uses them interchangeably / synonymously.”

RESPONSE: Don, they are not synonyms. Hypotasso = hypo [under, below, beneath + tassô] (to place in order, to put, to arrange something in place = put someone under me, under my control, to subdue)

Katargô : prefix kata (against, completely) + ergon (work) = to abolish, to stop someone or something from working or having effect.

They are different verbs with different meaning. For instance the verb katargô can be used in the context of "abolishing or annulling a law". Hypotasso cannot, and that's because they're not synonyms. Katargô is used more in the sense of annulling or canceling the effect, power or reign of the devil.
Hypotassô is a stronger verb and has more physical connotations of bringing someone under one's authority and dominion. In a way, we could picture it as a scene, to put someone in a hold and keep him down.

Katargô does not have such connotations. They can be used in reference to an enemy, but they paint slightly different pictures. They would have been synonyms if both could be used in all contexts the same way. You cannot say "tous nomous hypotassô" (I subdue the laws). You have to say "tous nomous katargô" (I annul the laws or abolish the laws). So the two verbs are not synonymous.

Likewise you couldn't say "to kratos you echthrou hypotassô" (I subjugate the power of the enemy). You would have to say "to kratos tou echthrou katargô" (I abolish/cancel/annul the power of the enemy). As you can see from these two simple examples they are not synonyms.

According to the Greek language we just established they are not synonymous, thus Paul would not use them interchangeably with the same meaning as you assert. What about usage in scripture - are kartargeo and hupotasso used synonymously then? ....

For arguments sake let’s see if they can be used interchangeably in the English. Then, the issue could not be as much how those words are used in 1Co 15, the bigger issue is that all power and authority was given
Him, then all things are under his authority as opposed to those things being destroyed at the end of the process. (two different purposes)

The phrase or concept to "put down" can refer to different circumstances ....

In 1Cor 15:25 For he must **REIGN TILL** he hath **PUT ALL ENEMIES UNDER HIS FEET**. 26The **LAST ENEMY** that shall be **DESTROYED IS DEATH**.

These are similar IN THIS VERSE, Christ is “taking action” TIL it is accomplished. Namely reigning and dashing (see verse below) TIL he has DESTROYED all enemies and thus THEN they will have been “put under his feet,” because the PUTING UNDER here is a reference to the destruction of ONE’S ENEMIES.

**Rev 19:15**  And out of His mouth goes forth a sharp sword, that with it He might smite THE NATIONS. And He will shepherd them with an iron rod. And He treads the winepress of the wine of the anger and of the wrath of God Almighty. (cf. Rev 6:2)

"TO PUT UNDER" is a generic concept that MUST BE QUALIFIED. In 1Co 15:25 it is qualified by the accomplishment of that ACTION = (ultimately) Destruction ..... Just like the SLAYING (in the Luke 19 parable) BEGAN THEN (1st century), but continues, because to fulfill = to come, NOT
it is over. JUDGMENT and the SLAYING all BEGAN with the house of Judah (an enemy) and is now going out against those nations and everyone else (other enemies). In fact, THE SLAYING them is what he is doing during all that time that he reigns TIL (limited duration) he puts an end to all rule, reign and authority.

Looking at Heb 2:8, it is using the same basic phrase in two different ways:

FIRST: as the authority that the king gets that places all things under the king’s power (you are crowned today) …..

SEECOND: the other is the actual state of fact of subduing the enemies (after he has the authority) in your kingdom by virtue of waging war against them and destroying them, not just by someone placing a crown on your head.

Otherwise it makes NO SENSE. It states in a nutshell all things are subjugated so that he would subjugate all things!?!?

Heb 2:8 ALL THINGS YOU (THE FATHER) SUBJECTED under the feet of him (JESUS). ....This is Christ obtaining all power and authority in heaven and on earth (given crown, given the Authority/power to act) ..... IN ORDER (FOR THE PURPOSE OF) For TO SUBJECT (CHRIST PUT IN A POSITION TO NOW PUT DOWN OR SUBJUGATE) to him ALL THINGS.

This destruction of the enemies follows (or to say it another way, the result of the exercise of that power obtained)..... THEN (after you get the authority and
crown) you go out and wage war and win/destroy all your enemies, then all your enemies are also said to be subjugated at that time as well.

To be made subject is to be put under, LIKEWISE to be subjugated/subdued/arrested is also to be put under. It is simply a matter of perspective using the same basic concept because that is how the terms have always been used.

If you are given a rule in a kingdom over subjects of that kingdom then those subjects are “put under you”, If you wage war and destroy your enemies then they too will have been subjugated/subdued and or PUT UNDER ..literally, "put 6’ under" as they say.

If it is looked at that way, then yes, “TO BE PUT UNDER" can and is true for BOTH EVENTS (the giving of authority and the subduing that comes later) that is why the same phraseology is used.

Just like "to put away' your wife is true when you divorce her she is put away, but if you kick her out of the house and abandon her then you have PUT HER AWAY even though you may not have divorced her yet, but you have not subjugated or subdued her.

Looking at it from yet another perspective shows they are not used synonymously. Paul uses “katargeo” in 1Co 15:24, 26 "Then the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have destroyed “katargeo” all rule and all authority and power. And verse 26
“The last enemy being destroyed “katargeo” is death.

Paul uses the word “**hupotasso**” in verses 27 “For he puts <hupotasso> all things under his feet. But whenever he says all things are put under <from hupotasso> him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put “from hupotasso” all things under him.” (1Co 15:27) and in verse 28 “And when all things shall be subdued <from hupotasso> unto him, then shall <from hupotasso> the Son also himself be subject <from hupotasso> unto him that put <from hupotasso> all things under <from hupotasso> him, that God may be all in all.

Following is the Greek text with the derivatives of hupotasso marked in maroon:

1Co 15:27  παντα γαρ υπεταξεν <hupotasso> υπο τους ποδας αυτου οταν δε ειπη οτι παντα υπετακται <hupotasso> δηλον οτι εκτος του υποταξαντος <hupotasso> αυτω τα παντα

1Co 15:28  οταν δε υποταγη <hupotasso> αυτω τα παντα τοτε και αυτος ο υιος υποταγησεται <hupotasso> τω υποταξαντι <hupotasso> αυτω τα παντα ινα η ο θεος τα παντα εν παισιν

**According to Don’s synonym’s theory, verses 27 & 28 should be translated:** “But whenever He says “all things are destroyed by Him” it is evident that He is excepted who destroyed all things under Him. And when all things are destroyed unto Him, then the Son shall also Himself be destroyed by Him that put all things destroyed Him, that God may be all in all.”

As you can see, if Don is right about Paul using katargeo and
hupotasso “interchangeably/synonymously”, then God must “destroy Jesus” in order to be all in all.

CONCLUSION

Let’s not lose sight as to why Full Preterism uses these words synonymously and why this is important. It’s important because Don’s paradigm (Full Preterism) ignores the context and uses every place that refers to "putting under his feet” as the same thing and as such (he argues) must also include the destruction of one’s enemies including death all by AD70, which is unsupportable by scripture.

Don pushes this because he wants the last enemy to be destroyed (which is death) by AD70. But, the FIRST (maybe second) enemy was only conquered by ca. AD70 (Apostate Judah) and then he would go out from there to fight against all other enemies! This process came with AD70 and continues to this day and will until the devil and death itself is cast into the lake of fire and destroyed, which we still have (Rev 14:13; Rev 20:7f). He is ignoring the PROCESS; he only sees an EVENT.

FIRST: they are put under his feet via given all authority and power over all things FOR THE PURPOSE/"SO THAT” he can put all enemies under his feet by
destroying them.

DP “Steve, The "fullness of the Gentiles" was Paul's responsibility to bring in. See Colossians 1:24-27. Paul uses the emphatic mode to emphasize that the completion of the mystery of God was his personal responsibility.

The fulfillment of Isaiah 2 (chapters 2-4) are posited for the last days. The last days were in the first century- and do not refer to the Christian age - which has no end. I demonstrate this in depth in my book, The Last Days Identified. http://eschatology.org/index.php?option=com_virtuemart&view=productdetails&virtuemart_product_id=9&virtuemart_category_id=13.

Don't forget that Peter on the day of Pentecost said that Joel's prediction of the "last days" events were being fulfilled that day-- "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel."

RESPONSE: Don, we have no arguments there.

DP “Steve, Scripture is clear that: 1. Jesus ascended to the Father there to receive the kingdom- Luke 19. If he did not receive the kingdom in the far country, then what he said is wrong.”
RESPONSE: Don, No one is arguing that Jesus ascended to receive the kingdom, I merely meant Luke 19 cannot be cited to claim Jesus received the kingdom upon his ascension ca. 33 (to support the full preterist position) or to support ca. 70 (my position), only that he received it BEFORE HE RETURNED, it does not specifically tell us (date or year) when he received it.

DP “3. Steve, He returned when the last enemy, death, was destroyed-- that is the explicit prediction of 1 Corinthians 15, the end would be at that time. Not after that time. There is not another coming of the Lord after that.”

RESPONSE: Yes, there is not another coming of the Lord and Proper Preterism realizes when the last days ended with the destruction of Jerusalem, that is not the issue - we agree there. However, on 1Co 15 is where we disagree. The Parousia of Jesus occurs in verse 23c and the rest of 15:24-28 deals with the reign against hostile forces that follows or are in the Parousia. Please look at the “order” of resurrection that Paul presents beginning with the time paralleled with John’s Rev 20:24a.

The Two Ends: There are two ends along with two ages, and two resurrections (which can also be looked at as a resurrection with three phases depending on the perspective—here we are grouping justified then the unjustified aka the rest of the dead in Rev 20). The first end is signaled by the coming of the Son of Man, our Lord Jesus from the clouds of heaven in his second advent, which begins his Parousia, which includes resurrection of those that are his. The prophet Daniel laid this out in Ch. 7:9–14 as did the prophet Ezekiel in chapters 37ff. Instead of a
Valley of Dry Bones, the nation Israel is restored again with the [first] resurrection as an analogy with an implantation of the revitalizing breath of life in each of the skeletons as the nation is once again placed back in her own land (2Sa 7:10f et al). This marks the opening of the Age to Come, the thousand year rule and reign of Christ [of Rev 20:4] with his saints.

The second end progresses with the GWTJ (Rev 20:11 cf. 1Co 15:24) in which all the rest of the dead, the unjustified, are resurrected to be judged by our Lord and his saints, which correlates with “the end” Paul intimates in 1Co 15:24. This does not end the age to come, it goes on without cessation, unless of course there is another age after that.

So, for you to say that “the end would be at that time” (the time when Christ returned ca. 70,) is about 2,000 years off because when the last enemy is abolished, it is the SECOND “end” of 1Co 15:24, not the first end of the old Jewish covenant, ca. 70 as you say, when Christ returned and his Parousia BEGAN. The context of the end in 1Co 15:24 is Christ’s reign during the first resurrection, resurrection of the just is what ends there and the resurrection of the wicked begins - not the old Jewish covenant because the resurrection and Judgment BEGAN with the NEW age and could not possibly have ended with the age that was coming to an end.

Resurrection and judgment will ALSO have an END to them as well, but their end takes place in the AGE that was to COME.

DP “2. Your view of Israel dwelling in the land safely
is an imposition on the text. Revelation says not a word about it,…”

RESPONSE: It’s not an imposition because Revelation does not need to go into every detail - that’s why we have one of its parallel text in Ezekiel 38ff, which is undoubtedly written to the house of Israel in its future form (i.e. the church Lord’s assembly) and could not had meant the 1st century house of Judah as I’ve demonstrated and you have not addressed.

DP “…and, Ezekiel 38f from which you derive that concept is undeniably posited for "the last days." The NT writers affirmed that they were living in the days foretold by the OT prophets, i.e. the last days-- Acts 2:15f; 3:21f). Your extrapolation of Revelation beyond those first century last days is therefore wrong.”

RESPONSE: It’s not wrong, and again we agree when the last days ended, but there is prophecy beyond the last days, which you have missed. As a Preterist you know you need to ask “The last days of what?” Eek 38:8 plainly tells us that it was the last days of “the latter years.” Ezk 38:8 After many days thou shalt be visited: in the latter years ….. Rabbin Yamin: Many days Ezek 38:8 same as Chila Ete: Thousand Years of Rev. 20: 1-7.

DP “There is no prophecy beyond the last days of Israel-- Daniel 9:24 delimits the cessation of

RESPONSE: Don, “….and to seal up vision and prophet, and to anoint the holy of holies.” (Dan 9:24) However, Jerusalem was not destroyed until 70AD, so that means (and this is extremely important), contrary to what you are pushing, that any prophecy given within the Revelation would be perfectly legitimate and most definitely would not fall within the “everything” written that Full Preterism has been pushing for years. For that matter any prophecy written into the NT would fall into the same category as the everything written period ends with the writing of the OT 400 years before the NT was written.

Steve No, there is no "New Covenant" prophecy. The NT writers tell us repeatedly that their eschatology was nothing but the hope of Israel found in Torah. If you claim an eschatology divorced from- or different from that, then you are denying what they say. It is that simple.”
RESPONSE: Don, the new covenant prophecy IS the hope of Israel being fulfilled (e.g. the continuance of the first resurrection in his parousia, God becomes all in all, etc.). No conflict there.

While it is true, that there was a certain “last days” to the Mosaic Marriage Covenant; where does the Bible ever teach the notion of a last days for Israel? The simple truth is that it does not; in fact, since Jesus Christ is the true Israel and He and His followers make up the third and only true branch of Israel it should be understood that Israel will end only when Jesus Christ will end – which is never. This demonstrate lack of understanding of the OT history of Israel and proves you’re seriously in error.

DP “Steve, This is self-contradictory. On the one hand, you say that all OT prophecy is fulfilled. Then, you turn around and say that Revelation 20:4f is new prophecy. Then, your turn around again and say that Revelation 20:4f parallels Ezekiel-- which is OT prophecy! Revelation does not simply "parallel" Ezekiel, it IS Ezekiel, just as the New Creation of Revelation 21, is the fulfillment of Ezekiel 37-- God's OT promise made to Old Covenant Israel.”

RESPONSE: I did not say all OT prophecy is fulfilled. I said events to take place within the new covenant are discussed and prophesied about in the
OT. (OT and OC [old covenant] are not the same)

ONLY the law and prophets have been fulfilled. The Book of Revelation was a revealing of how those things in the age to come would "PLAY OUT"...

I think you are confusing fulfilled with "it is over"....what was fulfilled was “the coming” of the AGE and THE PROCESSES THAT WOULD BEGIN (not end) TO TAKE PLACE IN THAT AGE.

To claim the resurrection is over and likewise that death has been cast into the lake of fire already is eisegesis.

DP “Steve, your system is one of eisegesis, not exegesis. Note what Revelation 3 actually says:

"To him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne."

RESPONSE: Don, we already discussed Jesus sat on the Father’s throne until ca. 70, no more musical chairs. You are not addressing many of my claims, which makes this difficult, if not impossible.

DP “You denial that Christ went into a far country there to receive the kingdom is
disingenuous. You claim that he does not actually receive the kingdom until he leaves that far country. Meaning that you are wrong.

You claim that the kingdom did not arrive - was not given to him - until AD 70. Yet, Paul said the Colossians had been "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." You can't be in something that does not exist.”

RESPONSE: Don, when Jesus told them they were of the kingdom, it is spoken of as if it is done because it was …

It depends on what one means by KINGDOM COME. Since the kingdom was prophesied long before Christ’s earthly ministry (Mat 25:34) the kingdom was prophetic and discussed as being present, a divine emanation promised by God. Other passages state the process of setting up the new kingdom (IV gospel 14:3; take from the Jews to give to a new nation in Christ Mat 21:43) was not complete until AD70 (Luk 21:31 So also when you see these things happening (the events between 33-70), you know that the kingdom of God is “NEAR.”).

THUS, Rev 11:15; Luk 21:30; et al verses have to do with the completion of the process or inauguration
of the kingdom.

I am referring to when the PROCESS of "SETTING UP" the kingdom is complete ergo "THY KINGDOM COME"/ "the kingdom draws Nigh" Luk 21:31 et al (note the following) ....

The Seventh Trumpet was an AD70 event

Rev 11:15 And the seventh angel sounded; and there followed great voices in heaven, and they said, The kingdom of the world IS BECOME the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever.

DP “Steve, 3. The Millennium period is the time of the filling up of the measure of the martyrs. It corresponds to Revelation 6:11ff; chapter 12; chapter 17, etc.. Satan - the persecutor - is not destroyed until the end of the Millennium, which means that those eschatological martyrdoms was not completed until that time. Paul said that the crushing of Satan - which occurs at the end of the Millennium - was at hand when he wrote Romans, thus establishing the 40 year Millennium, and falsifying your claims about no martyrdom during the Millennium. The thousand years does not denote a long time. It is a symbolic
reference to the divinely appointed time for the filling up of the measure of the eschatological martyrdom, as proven by the correlation with Revelation 6:9f; Revelation 12:12, etc., and by the fact that Satan - the persecutor-- is destroyed at the end of the millennium. The destruction of Satan takes place because the measure of martyrdom is then full. As I have noted before, Paul said the destruction of Satan was near in Romans 16:20. This demands that the end of the Millennium was near. See Joseph Vincent's excellent book on the Millennium:


RESPONSE: The Scriptures do not give us any examples of anyone being martyred in the millennium! This and the erroneous 40-year millennium are fatal blows to your model. Instead it has been known throughout Christian history as a time of peace (contrary to FP which has the thousand years right during “the great tribulation” Mat 24:21), but not complete peace, which is only after the thousand years plus the “little season” when Christ subdues all his enemies.

Proper Preterism understands the thousand years as the time Ezekiel talked about when God’s people are “dwelling safely in unwalled villages” as America and Europe (the camp of the saints of Rev 20:9) have had and if we are correct that the figurative thousand years has ended – we should be seeing
America and Europe being invaded by these Gog and Magog nations of Rev 20 & Ezk 38, 39 and sure enough, we do!

Lloyd Dale’s “The Timing of the Millennium and Millennial Martyrs” …

“Preston continues, “What were they waiting for during the Millennium? They were waiting for the measure of the martyrs to be filled up.” Now, in our opinion, this is where Preston completely ‘jumped the track’ and headed down the wrong road. It appears to us that Preston’s claim that the martyrs were “to wait -- for a thousand years...” is a complete fabrication on his part. Were does the text in question, Revelation 20:4, state, or for that matter even imply, that they were “to wait” for anything – let alone a thousand years?

The martyrs described in Rev 6:9-11 are seen again in Rev 20:4 where they are included with others “who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God” who by that time had been killed because they “had not worshiped the beast or its image and had not received its mark on their foreheads or their hands.” Thus, the number “to be killed” was now “complete” as explained in 6:9-11. Lloyd continues ....

In your zeal to promote and establish your erroneous forty year millennium, you has [sic] failed to do proper exegesis of Revelation 6:9-11 and Revelation 20:4. Because of this error in exegesis, you erroneously conflates [sic] 6:9-11 and 20:4 into one package instead of seeing them as sequential events, where 20:4 provides us with the “completion” of the promise given to the martyrs in 6:9-11. When the full number of martyrs had been completed; vengeance was taken, their blood was avenged “on those who dwell on the land” and the Resurrection of 20:4d occurred. The full measure of suffering had been
fulfilled and the blood of the martyrs was vindicated by the destruction of those who dwell on the land and the dead belonging to Christ were regenerated and resurrected out of the dead as is stated in Rev 20:4d (see also 1Cor 15:23c and 1Thess 4:13-17).”

You can finish it here: http://thechristianmythbusterseries.com/860-2/

Again, John’s thousand years is Ezekiel's time spoken of a redeemed Israel (the church assembly, better known as “the Mountains of Israel” in Ezekiel) dwelling safely and confidently during the (Rab Yamin) Many days of Ezk 38:8, the (Le olam) Forever of Ezk 37:25, 26, 28, and the (Chila Ete) Thousand Years of Rev. 20: 1-7.

All descriptive of the same period of time, bound on each side by the same events - the period between the beginning of the Parousia of Christ (we are still living in, as Preterists say we are still in his presence) and the destruction of Gog, or between the binding and loosing of Satan. The judgments which precede this period are the same. The “First Resurrection” which occurs at the same time as the resurrection of the faithful dead in the OT, as is clear from Ezk 37:12ff; Dan 12: 1-3; 1Co 15: 23, 54, 55; 1Th 4:16-17; Rev 20:4-5. The time of these judgments and this resurrection is the Yom Yehovah or “the Day of the Lord.” The judgments at the close of this period are the same. What confirms this all the more is the fact that after the final GWTJ we see the same Ezekiel and Revelation temples - however you want to define those temples, they are nonetheless there.
During this figurative thousand years, Christians enjoy some of the Messianic glory on earth as a result of the heavenly reign— a period of time prior to the Last Judgment and the final New Heaven and earth. We are not living in the “final” new heaven and earth as it will be when Christ subdues all his enemies and God is all in all. This is great news now and even for those in the after-life to know that evil, injustice, perversion, torture, pain, disease, sorrow, suffering and death will not always be part of our daily lives.

If we were to give FP an advantage and say that since “the Day of the Lord” came ca. 70 thus calling it “fulfilled,” which in a sense is true, and the hidden detailed prophecies of Revelation— such as the incursion of Gog and Magog, the GWTJ and the destruction of the devil and death are WITHIN the Day of the Lord; then we would have to say “ALL THINGS FULFILLED" should be defined only in the manner that Christ promised, NOT how false teachers imagine what that means and have redefined it in a way that is inconsistent with how God does!

So the misleading here is really coming from Full Preterists’ who teach that fulfilled = it is over rather than it is come and BEGAN the process in the first century. They redefine what "all things written are fulfilled" ACTUALLY MEANS, so I would somewhat arbitrarily, but with good reason define those who insist and persist to include things that are NOT part of "ALL THINGS WRITTEN" as also being fulfilled — such as the destruction of death — as “Hyper-Preterism” (a pejorative term used by
opponents of Full Preterism), because hyper implies something that is "more than should be"…or "extra" or "in addition to" …”above and beyond.”

We have extensively and exegetically demonstrated the folly in the erroneous 40-year millennium paradigm and claims that allegedly support it. The gig is up on the Full Preterism false tradition, which make void the word of God (Mat 15:6). While it is not pleasant to be wrong, it is Christian to admit it. We’ve all been there and it is the truth we are supposed to be united in. A hand of friendship is extended for all in the Preterist communities to collaborate in order to reach thousands more with Proper Preterism, because if Preterism is important – then Proper Preterism is more important.

Steven Hawk

See how Proper Preterism could not be fully realized until the 20th century in ….

THE LAST DAYS EDITION OF THE CHRISTIAN MYTHBUSTERSERIES
(available in 3 formats)