AD70 Dispensationalism: According to that view, AD70 was the end of 'this age' and the start of the 'age to come'. Those who lived before AD70 could only 'see in part' and such, lacking the resurrection and redemptive blessings which supposedly came only when Herod's Temple in Jerusalem fell. Accordingly, AD70 was not only the end of Old Testament Judaism, but it was also the end of the revelation of Christianity as seen in the New Testament.

HYPER PRETERISM

"Full preterist" material is being archived for balanced representation of all preterist views, but is classified under the theological term hyper (as in beyond the acceptable range of tolerable doctrines) at this website. The classification of all full preterism as Hyper Preterism (HyP) is built upon well over a decade of intense research at PreteristArchive.com, and the convictions of the website curator (a former full preterist pastor). The HyP theology of final resurrection and consummation in the fall of Jerusalem, with its dispensational line in AD70 (end of old age, start of new age), has never been known among authors through nearly 20 centuries of Christianity leading up to 1845, when the earliest known full preterist book was written. Even though there may be many secondary points of agreement between Historical/Modern Preterism and Hyper Preterism, their premises are undeniably and fundamentally different.

WARNING: THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL HAS BEEN CLASSIFIED AS "HYPER PRETERIST"

THE CROSS

and

THE PAROUSIA OF CHRIST

The Two Dimensions of One Age-Changing Eschaton

By Max R. King
(1987)

PREFACE

The cross and the parousia of Christ are in biblical eschatology what alpha and omega are in the Greek alphabet – the beginning and the end. Our primary aim in this volume, as indicated by the title, is to show that Christ’s cross and parousia (i.e., His presence or arrival commonly call the second coming) are the two foci of one complete, indivisible eschaton (end time) that pertain to the fulfillment of all redemptive history and prophecy within the closing period ("the last days") of the Old Testament aeon (age).

The cross has been recognized generally as an eschatological event that forms the turning point between the two covenantal aeons – the Old and New Testaments or the Jewish and Christian ages. However, what has not received adequate attention (which in our opinion is the very root of eschatological disparity and dissension throughout the history of Christianity and of recent years in particular) is the total range of the cross-determined eschaton that unquestionably takes in the age-consummating parousia of Christ. The longstanding, traditional concept has been that the Old Covenant aeon, in all of
its variegated projections of "things to come," was fully consummated within the cross/Pentecost time frame. This has been a key factor in an unbiblical dichotomizing of the one cross/parousia eschaton to the effect that the Christian age arbitrarily is inserted between these two complementary, age-changing events.

When the cross and Christ's parousia are thus separated and assigned to different end-time periods, they become counteractive rather than coactive in their salvific design. The age that Christ died to establish (the Christian age) becomes the age that He must return to bring to an end. Not only does this undermine the saving efficacy of the cross, but it makes temporal what is declared to be everlasting – the New Covenant age (Heb. 13:20).

More problematic is the urgency, the imminency or nearness factor in New Testament expectation concerning Christ's age-consuming parousia. Believers of apostolic time were exhorted to watch and to wait for Christ's coming (1 Thess. 1:10; 5:6) in view of the nearness of the end (2 Pet. 4:7) and the approaching day of the Lord (Heb. 10:25,37). We believe that it is neither logical nor biblical for the preparatory Old Covenant aeon (which lasted fifteen centuries) to give birth, through the cross event, to the promised New Covenant aeon ("the age to come"), only for it to become necessary for believers immediately to begin watching and waiting for that which Christ died to establish to come to an end at any moment! This kind of eschatological existence/expectation does not dovetail with the better (Heb. 8:6) and more lasting work of God through Christ – a new covenantal creation that fulfills His eternal purpose (Eph. 3:9,21).

It might be argued by 20th century man that the New Covenant aeon already has exceeded the time frame of the preparatory Old Covenant aeon by five centuries, therefore the end may come at any moment. Even if five hundred years could mean the difference between what is temporal and what is eternal (which would be a foolish assumption), the fact remains that believers in apostolic times were the ones instructed to watch and wait for Christ's age-changing parousia. If that parousia were tied to the end of the Christian age as commonly assumed, it is apparent that these saints were instructed to watch and wait for the end of that which has not yet reached maturity. They were waiting for Christ to return and conclude the age that He died to establish even before the full end of the former, preparatory age (the Jewish age) had been reached in the A.D. 70 consummation.

In light of Scripture, it does not make good sense for the post-Pentecost of pre-end-of-the-age saints to be waiting for two simultaneous age-consuming comings of Christ – one with reference to the consummation of the Jewish age (Mt. 24:3) and one with reference to an alleged end of the Christian age. Is it conceivable that the latter coming was a possibility before the occurrence of the A.D. 70 coming; that the end of the better and more lasting New Covenant aeon might have come even before the preparatory Old Covenant aeon was consummated? It is not, then how can one account for the fact that post-Pentecost saints were instructed to watch and wait for Christ's final coming after His ascension rather than after the fall of Jerusalem? Why watch and wait for two comings when one of them could not possibly have occurred until after the other one? Furthermore, if, as it is claimed, the two comings of Christ are separated by an entire age (especially by an age that represents the fulfillment of God's eternal purpose in Christ), how could the final coming at the end of the Christian age possibly follow in close sequence Christ's coming in the consummation of the Jewish age? Again we point out that it is easy for 20th century man to place an entire age between two alleged age-ending comings of Christ since two thousand years now stand between us and the end of the Jewish age, but this was not the case in apostolic time. In that time frame, even before the age to stand between two comings of Christ. How, then, could the saints of that day be watching and waiting for a soon coming of Christ to consummate what had not been in existence long enough to qualify as a short age, much less an everlasting age that had been anticipated by historical Israel for fifteen hundred years?

When the Old Testament background for the New Testament's eschatological message is taken into consideration, it is apparent that the gospel's futurism
During the transition period peculiar to Paul's day, he had in view the consummated covential change or conformity to the image of Christ in writing, "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith" (Gal. 5:5).
For him, Christ's arrival or presence was bound up in the arrival of the New Covenant aeon. This unquestionably was the focal point of the gospel's futurism, beyond which one can not carry New Testament eschatology without undermining both the completion and the permanency of the New Covenant aeon. There is no place for eschatology in which that brings man into the full, face to face presence of Christ.

We believe that within the Six Parts of this volume, more than adequate proof is given for a biblical, singular, indivisible, cross/parousia-of-Christ eschaton relative to a cross-determined change from the old to the new covenantal aeon. In Part One, attention is given to the Problem of Time that exists for the interpreter who, for whatever reason, fails to remain within the gospel's clearly delimited futurism for the one and only cross/parousia-of-Christ eschaton. The predominance of end-time nearness in the New Testament is inescapable. This is demonstrated by the incessant efforts of scholarship to account for the eschatological consciousness of the early church, when, in the minds of most interpreters, the end still has not been reached.

Over the years a number of scholars have concluded that the end-time expectations of the early church proved to be a delusion, and that it was not long before the church began to make adjustments to the failure of Christ's parousia and the end of the world to take place. Some believed that such adjustments can be detected in the later writings of Paul, particularly in the pastoral letters, where concern for the growth, organization and worship of the church is seen as a shift in interest from Christ's parousia to continued historical existence. However, when the closing period of the Old Testament aeon is seen as the framework for the eschatological outlook of the early church, the emphasis placed on the upbuilding of the church was essentially tied to its coming to maturity or perfection at the parousia of Christ. Christ's disciples understood that they were the last generation of the old aeon, but on the other hand they were conscious of the fact that even though they were not in the world (Jno. 17), that in Christ they were the people of the coming new aeon. From this perspective, the early church never faced any eschatological disappointment, for the age-ending parousia of Christ did not fail to take place within the time frame of that generation.

Over the years other scholars have questioned the authenticity of many sayings of Christ concerning the nearness of the end, believing that such sayings were attributed to Him by the early church. This approach to the problem of time has been revived recently by many prominent mainline scholars, as for example, the Jesus Seminar launched in 1985 composed of more than 100 scholars, of whom nearly half meet twice a year (the most recent meeting in South Bend, Indiana, Oct. 86) to assess and vote on what should be considered the authentic sayings of Jesus. There is currently a widespread movement toward surrendering as unauthentic the eschatological sayings of Jesus that, in the end-time mentality of the interpreter, would mean that Jesus was mistaken in believing that the end was near.

We shall examine these and other mainline time solutions proposed by different scholars in their efforts to account for an assumed non-fulfillment, failure, delay or postponement of the end time taught and expected by Christ and the early church. It will be seen that the problem lies in what has been assumed, rather than in what the Scriptures actually teach.

In Part Two, an overview is given of Dispensational Premillennialism, which accounts for an alleged delay in Christ's parousia, particularly the coming of the kingdom of God, by the employment of a postponement hermeneutic. Under this arbitrarily chosen method of interpretation, the crucifixion of Christ represents Israel's rejection of a bona fide offer of the Davidic kingdom (in a literal, earthy form correspondent to the Old Covenant economy), resulting in the setting up of a temporal church age -- the so-called mystery age. In the conclusion of this age, Christ returns to establish an earthly kingdom that allegedly fulfills God's promises to Israel -- at least for a literal thousand years.

One of the merits of premillenarians is their equation of the gospel's futurism with the fulfillment of "the hope of Israel," a future that clearly is extended beyond the cross/Pentecost time frame. Their error from our viewpoint, however, is the...
overshadow that which is central and abiding relative to God's redemptive work and if all the prophecies and promises of God have been fulfilled, then we are left in a hopeless, limbo state of existence. This betrays a woeful lack of understanding and acceptance of the fullness and completeness of the never-ending life we have in Christ in terms of the everlasting New Covenant. As creatures, finite beings, we always shall have needs that must be met continually by the providential care and power of God, including continued life beyond one's biological mode of being. This is not denied. That which we do oppose, and which we believe is a distortion of biblical eschatology, and therefore of the true meaning of life, is the lifting of the gospel's end-time futurism out of its covenantal framework and giving it a carnal meaning and application (e.g., the destruction of earth and humanity) that serves only to overshadow that which is central and abiding relative to God's redemptive work.

Part Three deals with the meaning of The Millennium. A study of this highly controversial subject serves to highlight some of the major differences between two extreme interpretative systems (premillenarianism versus amillenarianism) in contrast to what we believe to be the biblical framework of time and history for this particular end-time episode in Revelation 20.

In Part Four, attention is called to some of the distinctive eschatological concepts inherent in amillennialism, particularly the dichotomizing principle of interpretation in contrast to the postponement hermeneutic of premillennialism. A fundamental error committed by non-millenarians is that of dividing the one cross-determined eschaton into two distinct, separate end times – one at the end of the old aeon, and one at an alleged conclusion of the Christian age. Consequently, any scripture pointing to a post-Pentecost futurism is labeled for a second eschaton at an alleged end of the Christian age. It will be seen that what must be assumed here, namely, the complete fulfillment of the hope of Israel in the cross/Pentecost time frame, will not stand up under Paul's treatment of Israel's promised future in post-Pentecost. This future of Israel can not be collapsed in a restricted cross/Pentecost time frame, neither can it be deferred, in the theology of non-millenarians, until the end of the Christian age. Where, then, is it fulfilled?

Part Five is divided into two sections dealing with The Resurrection of the Dead. In Section One, the imminency of the resurrection in post-Pentecost time is shown to be anchored in the decisive resurrection of Christ, the firstfruits (I Cor. 15:23), or the firstborn from the dead (Col. 1:18). Just as the term "firstfruits" denotes two interrelated stages in the completion of a harvest, we find a parallel situation with respect to resurrection in the cross/parousia-of-Christ eschaton. The first resurrection, involving the perfection of the end-time saints (through their dying and rising with Christ), formed what we call the bridge community for the passage of Old Testament saints from sin-death to their consummated New Covenant inheritance in Christ at His parousia. The design of the perfection of the firstfruits (the pre-end-of-the-age believers) was not the exclusion, but the age-consuming inclusion of the faithful dead of the former dispensation.

In Section Two, we deal with the bodily or somatic aspect of the resurrection, showing that I Cor. 15 can not be isolated from Rom. 6-8 in Paul's understanding of bodily death and resurrection. There is a futuristic dimension of the resurrection defended by Paul in I Cor. 15. A verse by verse exegesis of all 58 verses of I Cor. 15 is made (consisting of seven chapters or sub-divisions), showing that I Cor. 15 is not peripheral but central to Paul's treatment of the resurrection, of which Christ is the firstfruits or the firstborn one. It will be seen that an assumed spiritual resurrection in Romans 6-8 versus an assumed physical resurrection in I Cor. 15 is foreign to the thinking of Paul.

Finally, in Part Six, some concluding observations are made on the everlasting nature of the New Covenant creation, and from this perspective we champion the abiding relevancy of realized eschatology. The commonly voiced objection that if every facet of eschatology in New Testament Scripture has been realized, and if all the prophecies and promises of God have been fulfilled, then we are left in a hopeless, limbo state of existence. This betrays a woeful lack of understanding and acceptance of the fullness and completeness of the never-ending life we have in Christ in terms of the everlasting New Covenant. As creatures, finite beings, we always shall have needs that must be met continually by the providential care and power of God, including continued life beyond one's biological mode of being. This is not denied. That which we do oppose, and which we believe is a distortion of biblical eschatology, and therefore of the true meaning of life, is the lifting of the gospel's end-time futurism out of its covenantal framework and giving it a carnal meaning and application (e.g., the destruction of earth and humanity) that serves only to overshadow that which is central and abiding relative to God's redemptive work.
The feeling that the eschatological existence or consciousness of the early church must be duplicated in every generation of believers; that every generation from the cross onward must also, in order to have hope, be waiting for the coming of that which is perfect, is an unconscious denial of God's completed work in Christ. Praise be to God that the period of time from the cross to the full end of the Jewish age—the time for the eschatological workings of the imparted Spirit—can not and need not be duplicated in our day. We are not and can not be the latter day (i.e., the pre-end-of-the-age) saints. Neither can we be, as were they, the firstfruits that were brought to maturity or perfection within the period of covenantal transition. Unlike them, we do not stand between the ages, participating in the once-and-for-all transition. Rather, in view of a first century realized eschatology, we are privileged to be partakers of the fullness of the promised life of God through Christ. The only firstfruits taken from among men of the last generation of the old aeon have been redeemed (Rev. 14:4). Babylon has fallen (v.8). The battle of Armageddon is past history. May we, therefore, cease to continually look for an end time that does not fall within the range of biblical eschatology and instead, with joy and optimism, arise to the challenge of now "having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people" (v.6), for "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever" (Isa. 9:7).

Max R. King
Warren, Ohio
July 1987

What do YOU think?

Submit Your Comments For Posting Here
Comment Box Disabled For Security

Date: 10 Jun 2006
Time: 22:15:05

Comments:
Where and when do you worship? Do you partake in the Lord's supper? Do you contribute as prospered on the first day of each week? What is meant by the phrase; "Mercy is the most important thing?"
If there is to be no marrying after the judgement, how do you account for marriage today?
Humbly submitted;
Earl Wilburn
ebetwil@earthlink.net

Date: 27 Oct 2009
Time: 14:00:26

Your Comments:
Is this site still viable?

A couple comments. I understand the bible to teach that physical death was the enemy of mankind from the beginning and that eternal death was made manifest through the revelations of both old and new testaments. What this means to me is physical death did not bring on eternal damnation, only the judgment at the parousia would do that, nevertheless, jesus died physically to destroy death and open up spiritual life to all who call on his name. Therefore as paul says, the earthy man was first and then the spiritual. We bear the image of the earthy so that we can bear the image of the heavenly man. this means that physical death was the issue up until Jesus brought life and immortality to light through the gospel and by his conquering of death via his rasied body, he is able to bring many sons and daughter to God ... in the Spirit.

Finally, concerning what people say about the 'rapture' in the first century. Why not? Did'nt Peter and the others start the rumor that the disciple whom Jesus loved would not taste of death since he would abide 'until I come'? Why start a rumor unless there was good reason to believe that those alive in the first century, at the second coming would indeed be changed?
Thanks

Dan

Date: 15 Feb 2011
Time: 07:57:57

Your Comments:

Where is the order form for Max Kings book on the parousia?