



The Sword & The Plow

Newsletter of the Bimillennial Preterist Association

Vol. XIII, No. 7 – July 2010

Preston-Simmons Debate

Where was Sin Defeated? The Cross or AD 70?

First Affirmative

By Kurt Simmons

It is my turn to be in the affirmative. Here is the proposition I will affirm:

Resolved: The Bible teaches that the coming of Christ for salvation in Romans 11:25-27 occurred at the Cross at the climax and termination of the Mosaic Covenant Age.

Here are the definitions I will employ: “Coming” refers to the *first advent* of Christ, from his nativity to his ascension. “Cross” includes *the death, burial, and resurrection* of our Lord. “Salvation” signifies the work of atonement accomplished in Jesus’ substitutionary death. “Climax and termination of the Mosaic Covenant Age” refers to the legal end and annulment of the covenant enjoined by Moses in the wilderness.

(Cont’d page 2)

First Negative

By Don Preston

Truth of Preterism, Falsity of Covenant Eschatology

Kurt’s first affirmative reminds me of a dispensational debate I witnessed. The Zionist read passage after passage that foretold the kingdom, the wolf laying down with the lamb, turning swords into plowshares, etc.. No exegesis. As he sat down he said, “That is my position!” So it is with Kurt. He lists some 88 verses that speak of justification, grace, salvation, etc, and says “This proves my position!” No exegesis, no exposition, and of course, no proof for his proposition!

KURT AND THE COMMENTATORS

Kurt has made a great deal of his false claim that
(Cont’d page 14)

(Kurt's First Affirmative Cont'd from page 1)

Don and I are both agreed that "salvation" in the passage refers to salvation *from sin*. In my negatives, I have already proved that the debt of sin was paid and expunged, and that grace was full and free from and after the cross. But if *salvation* from sin occurred at the cross, it then follows that the *coming* contemplated by the passage also refers to the cross. Thus, proof of one is proof of the other. Moreover, proof that the bondage of sin was broken and men were fully justified in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ also proves that the Old Testament was annulled. As long as the Old Covenant was in force, men were under bondage to sin. But beginning with the gospel, forgiveness of sins in the death of Christ was announced. It thus follows that the Old Testament was not in force or effect from and after Jesus' cross. Reduced to a syllogism, the argument might be expressed thus:

The way into the Holiest was not open while the first tabernacle (the Old Testament) had legal standing (Heb. 9:8).

But the Holiest was a figure for the New Testament (Heb. 9:9).

The New Testament became of force at Jesus' death (Heb. 9:17). Therefore,

The way into the Holiest was opened and the Old Testament (first tabernacle) lost legal standing in Jesus' death.

Moreover, we have shown that it is *impossible* for there to be two concurrent, conflicting covenants in force at the same time. Therefore, proof that the New Testament was of force, *ipso facto* proves that the Old Testament was annulled. To the many verses we have already produced demonstrating this fact, we would add that Dan. 9:27 states that the "sacrifice and oblation" would cease in the midst of the final prophetic week, and that this is traditionally held to signify the legal cessation of the temple ritual by the death of Christ at the conclusion of his three and half year ministry:

"On the ordinary Christian interpretation, this applies to the crucifixion of our Lord, which took place, according to the received

*calculation, during the fourth year after his baptism by John, and the consequent opening of his ministry."*¹

Thus, proof that the power of sin was broken and men were justified after the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, also proves every other element of my proposition, all of which we have already abundantly demonstrated in the course of our negatives. Therefore, we need not say or produce one proof more. Our proposition stands confirmed:

The coming of Christ for salvation from sin was accomplished in the cross at the termination of the Mosaic covenant.

However, since we promised that we could produce pages of verses showing that grace and full and free, and that the Old Testament was therefore legally annulled and taken out of the way at the cross, we will produce some of those now and then lay down our pen. The following are by no means exhaustive; many more could be produced. Don ignored all the verses we produced before. Perhaps he would grace us with his attention to them now. If not, we will consider Don to have surrendered his position and this debate concluded in favor of Christ's cross.

Romans

1:5 – "*By whom we have received grace.*" Note the verb tense "have received."

1:7 – "*Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.*" The gospel of Christ's cross places man in a state of grace and peace with God. AD 70 is nowhere in sight.

1:1, 15 – "*I am ready to preach the gospel (glad tidings)*" The tidings are gladsome because they carry the present assurance of grace. Proof that the gospel was valid *ipso facto* proves the Old Testament was invalid.

¹ J. E. H. Thomson, *Daniel – The Pulpit Commentary* (Hendrickson, Peabody, MA), p. 275.

1:16 – *The gospel “is the power of God unto salvation.”* The gospel is the offer of reconciliation. Since the gospel was in force, the power of salvation and reconciliation were also in force. Not once verse can be produced showing the saints had to wait until AD 70 to be justified.

1:17 – *In the gospel “is the righteousness of God revealed.”* The gospel is the revelation of God’s justification of man in the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

3:21 – *“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.”* The Greek for “righteousness” is *dikaosune* or “justification.” The gospel is God’s justification of sinners. Paul says the justification was “now” manifested. This “now” manifestation of justification was also the manifestation of the way into the Holy of Holies (Heb. 9:8), for the one assumes the other.

3:24 – *“Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.”* The verb tense shows that the saints were in a present state of justification and redemption.

3:26 – *“To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”* Paul here specifically states that God’s justification of man was available “at this time” (e.g., it was not postponed to AD 70).

4:24 – *“But for us also, to whom it [righteousness/justification] shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.”* Paul here states that justification is imputed to all who believe. Again, no postponement until AD 70.

4:25 – *“Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification [Gk. *dikaosin*].”* Christ’s resurrection is proof that Jesus was acquitted from the imputation of sin he bore upon the cross. But if Jesus died under imputation of sin, and was raised justified, then the blood of his sacrifice was received within the Holy of Holies before his ascension, which can only mean that God received it at Jesus’ death. The veil of separation was therefore

“rent in twain” when Jesus died, showing the way into God’s presence was now open.

5:1 – *“Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”*

5:2 – *“By whom we also have access by faith into this grace wherein we now stand.”* Here Paul affirms that the saints “now stand” in a state of grace through the cross of Christ.

5:9 – *“Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.”* Notice the verb tense, “being now justified.” What part of “now justified” would Don deny?

5:10 – *“For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, we shall be saved by his life.”* Note the verb tense, “were reconciled.” By what, the removal of the law as asserted by Don? No! By the death of Christ.

5:11 – *“And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement”* HAVE NOW RECEIVED THE ATONEMENT. Don, which part of “now received” would you deny?

5:14 – Adam was a “figure of him that was to come.” Here, Paul shows that it was in Christ’s *first* coming that humanity began anew (for those that believe), not his second coming.

5:15 – *“But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.”* Paul states “grace hath abounded,” perfect tense, showing completed action in the past.

5:17 – *“They which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life.”* Paul joins “abundance of grace” with the “gift of justification” and makes both the present possession of the church.

5:20 – *“But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.”* The Greek here actually reads “grace super-abounded” over sin and the law. This verse

completely overthrows “Covenant Eschatology,” by showing that grace triumphed over the law and did not need to be separately removed.

6:7 – *“He that has died is freed from sin.”* The Christian “dies” with Christ in baptism; he is made a participant in Jesus’ death, and is thus “freed from sin.”

6:14 – *“Ye are not under law, but under grace.”* What part of “not under law” would Don deny?

6:15 – *“We are not under the law, but under grace.”* NOT UNDER THE LAW, BUT UNDER GRACE.

6:18 – *“Being then made free from sin.”* Don, what part of “free from sin” would you deny?

6:22 – *“Being made free from sin.”*

6:23 – *“For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”* In Rom. 5:15, 17, Paul says the saints had received the “gift” of justification and life in Christ. Here he says that eternal life was also the present gift of God by acquittal from the debt of sin under the law.

7:1-4 – *“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ.”* Don ignored these verses before. They teach that the law of the first husband (Old Testament) terminated with the death of Christ, so that we might enter a new covenant (the gospel). These verses teach the same lesson as those in Heb. 9 regarding the way into the Holiest by the sacrifice of Christ. The one covenant ends where the other begins.

7:6 – *“But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held.”* Note the verb tense: NOW DELIVERED FROM THE LAW.

7:25 – *“I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord”* [for deliverance from bondage to sin and death.]

8:1 – *“There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”* NOW NO CONDEMNATION. What part of “now” would Don deny?

8:2 – *“For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.”* HATH MADE ME FREE FROM THE LAW. Perfect tense, completed action in the past.

8:3, 4 – *“God condemned sin in the flesh [of Christ] that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.”* By Jesus’ death, the law of sin and death was satisfied that God might acquit us.

8:30 – *“Whom he called, them he also justified.”*

10:4 – *“Christ is the end of the law for righteousness for every that believeth.”* END OF THE LAW.

Hebrews

1:3 – *“When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”* Note the verb tense “had purged our sins.” Perfect tense, showing completed action in the past. Christ “sat down” also shows the work of redemption was complete.

2:11 – *“For both he that sanctified and they who are sanctified are all of one.”* ARE SANCTIFIED.

2:14, 15 – *“Through death he might deliver them.”* It was in Jesus’ death that man was saved, not his second coming.

2:17 – *“Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren...to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.”* Reconciliation was made in Jesus’ death, not removal of the law.

4:16 – *“Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.”* This verse compliments Heb. 9:8; 10:19 which invite believers into the presence of God within the veil, showing they have been justified from sin.

6:19 – *“Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil.”* Entering the veil is predicated upon prior remission of sins.

7:12 – “For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” Here the fact of Christ’s priesthood is offered as proof that the law had been changed, for it is impossible to have two conflicting priesthoods both legally valid at the same time.

7:18 – “For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.” Here the commandment (Old Testament) is expressly stated to have been annulled.

7:19 – “For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by which we draw nigh unto God.” MADE PERFECT, BY WHICH WE DRAW NIGH TO GOD. What part of “made perfect” would Don deny?

8:6 – “But now he hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much more he is the mediator of a more excellent covenant.” A MORE EXCELLENT COVENANT. The New Testament supplanted the Old; the two could not be valid simultaneously. Christ’s priesthood replaced the Levitical priesthood, and his Testament replaced the Old.

8:12 – “I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” This is the promise of the New Testament. The testament became of force at Jesus’ death (Heb. 9:17), therefore forgiveness of sins became of force at his death as well.

9:8 – “The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest, while as yet the first tabernacle was yet standing.”

No man could enter the Holy of Holies until the atonement was complete.

But the Holy of Holies was a figure for the New Testament and gospel.

The New Testament was of force from and after the cross. Therefore,

The atonement was complete and man could enter (legally and covenantally) the Holy of Holies from and after the cross.

9:12 – “Having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Perfect tense, showing completed action in the past.

9:15 – “He is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.” This verse plainly shows that the New Testament was then in force and provided redemption that could not obtain as long as the Old Testament was valid.

9:17 – “For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all.” The New Testament supplants the Old; both cannot be valid at the same time.

9:26 – “But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” Christ’s first appearance dealt fully and completely with the problem of sin by Christ’s sacrifice. Thus, the coming in Rom. 11:25-27 being to save from sin, was clearly Christ’s first coming.

10:9 – “When he said, Lo, I come to do they will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.” Here we see that the first covenant was taken away at Christ’s first coming, not second. The first had to be taken away that the second (New Testament) could be established. Why? Because it is impossible both be valid at the same time.

10:10 – “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” The “will” here is the New Testament, by which are sanctified through the offering of Christ. The passage is in the present tense, showing present sanctification.

10:12 – “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right had of God.” That Christ “sat down” shows his work of atonement was complete.

10:14 – “For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Note the verb tense, HATH PERFECTED FOREVER.

10:17 – *“Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.”*

10:18- *“Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.”* The writer’s point here is to show that Jesus’ sacrifice totally supplanted the temple ceremony, so that there was no other offering for sin.

10:19 – *“Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.”* The whole point of this verse is to show that because they had been perfected by Christ’s sacrifice, the saints can now enter the presence of God legally and covenantally through Christ.

10:22 – *“Let us draw near in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.”* “Sprinkling” the conscience here signifies the removal of guilt, by which we are emboldened to enter the presence of God.

10:29- *“The blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified...the Spirit of grace.”* The verb tense here shows that the saints were already sanctified by Jesus’ blood and the Spirit of grace.

12:7, 8 – *“God dealeth with you as with sons.”* Sonship is predicated upon reconciliation and atonement. Under the Old Testament men were deemed servants (Gal. 4:7; Rom. 8:15); but under the New Testament we received the adoption of sonship. This shows that the atonement has been made and that the Old Testament of servitude was annulled.

12:15 – *“Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God.”* Grace is the very essence of the New Testament and is predicated upon Jesus’ atoning sacrifice. Grace was already arrived when the gospel began to be preached on Pentecost after Christ’s ascension.

12:18 – *“For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, etc.”* Here the writer explicitly states that believers had left the Old Testament economy typified by Sinai and were come to the New Testament economy typified by Zion.

12:22 – *“But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.”*

This verse is offered to prove that the time of our estrangement and banishment from God was over and the saints were now admitted (legally and covenantally) into the presence of God in the heavenly Zion.

12:23 – *“To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect.”* SPIRITS OF JUST MEN MADE PERFECT. Notice that God “the Judge of all” is joined by the writer to the justification of spirits in Hades. Thus, God had acquitted them based upon reception of Christ’s blood. The saints on earth were numbered in the assembly of those justified.

12:24 – *“And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.”* Abel was the first martyr, but his blood could not extinguish the debt of sin. Jesus was also a martyr, but his blood brought atonement. The passage shows that the sprinkling and thus the atonement were present realities.

13:10 – *“We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.”* The “altar” is Christ’s sacrifice. We “eat” from that altar probably the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, which Paul teaches is a participation (“communion”) in the body and blood (sacrifice) of Christ. Christians had an altar that unbelievers had no right to approach. The validity of the one altar implies the invalidity of the other.

13:20, 21 – *“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in ever good work.”* The resurrection of Christ assumes his justification from the imputation of sin he bore upon the cross. We participate in Jesus’ death through baptism (Rom. 6:3-6). Therefore, we are justified in Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection. The blood of the everlasting covenant makes perfect all who are in covenant relationship with God.

I Peter

1:2 – “*Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.*” Peter here assures the Gentile believers in Cappadocia and the area of the Black Sea of their sanctification by the sprinkling of Jesus’ blood, and the grace attending their adoption of sonship by God.

1:3 – “*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.*” The verb tense here is perfect, showing completed action in the past. “Hath begotten us again.” The new birth is predicated upon reconciliation and atonement. The resurrection of Christ is proof that justification was a present fact.

1:18, 19 – Ye were redeemed by “*the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.*” Verb tense shows present possession of redemption. What part of “were redeemed” would Don deny?

1:22 – “*Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth.*” Perfect tense, showing completed action in the past. HAVE PURIFIED by obedience. (So much for “faith alone.” Man must obey if he would be purified from sin.)

2:10 – “*Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.*” HAVE NOW OBTAINED MERCY.

2:24 – “*Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that ye, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.*” Perfect tense, completed action in the past.

3:18 – “*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.*” This bringing to God implies our entrance within the veil, washed and made pure by the blood

of Christ. His resurrection is evoked in token of our justification from sin.

3:21 – “*The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us...by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*” Here, baptism is analogized to the waters of Noah by which the believing were saved. Peter makes Jesus’ resurrection the power that gives the sacrament and ordinance of baptism effect; viz., the blood of Christ received within the veil at Jesus’ death made the atonement and justified him from the imputation of sin, so that his resurrection stands in power and evidence of the atonement in which believer’s share.

II Peter

1:2 – “*Grace and peace by multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord.*” Grace is the state of present reconciliation.

1:9 – “*And hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.*” Past tense – was purged from his old sins. When? AD 70? No, AD 33 at the cross.

I John

2:2 – “*He is the propitiation of our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.*” The word “propitiation” here is actually “mercy-seat” and shows that Jesus’ sacrifice enters within the veil, coving the debt of sin by the law.

2:12 - “*Your sins are forgiven you for his name’s sake.*” AD 70? No, AD 33.

Galatians

Gal. 2:4 – “*Because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that hey might bring us into bondage.*” The Judaizers, like Don, claimed that the law was still binding, but Paul told the church not to submit to obey its demands.

Gal. 2:9 – “*For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.*” By Christ’s atoning sacrifice, we are redeemed from the law and become dead to its demands.

2:21 – “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.” Here Paul shows that grace was the present possession of the church and that submitting to the law (which Don says was still obligatory) would frustrate God’s grace.

3:13 – “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” Note the verb tense, “hath redeemed.”

3:25 – “But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.” The law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Paul says the church was no longer under the law once the gospel arrived.

5:1 – “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.” If the law was valid as Don alleges, then Paul was under serious misapprehension of the facts.

5:18 – “But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” NOT UNDER THE LAW. If Christians were already delivered from the law, then the salvation from sin contemplated by Rom. 11:25-27 was clearly tied to the cross.

Colossians

2:9, 10 – “For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.” “Complete” here has the sense of soteriological perfection. In Christ the saints were complete, lacking nothing to make them acceptable for salvation. And when were they complete? At AD 70? Of course not. They were complete from and after the cross.

2:13- “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.” HAVING FORGIVEN ALL TRESPASSES. When, AD 70? No! The Cross!

2:14 – “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and

took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.” The “handwriting of ordinances” here is not the Ten Commandments as is commonly supposed, but a memorandum, like a mortgage, reciting our debt before the law. When a man paid off his debt, it was nailed to the post of his door, providing public evidence that he was freed of his former obligation. So here, Paul says Christ carried the debt of our sin to the cross, nailing it there, showing publicly its cancellation in his death. If Don were permitted to have his way, we would have to rewrite this verse so that the debt was nailed to a Roman catapult in the siege of AD 70!

2:15 – “And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it [his cross].” The principalities and powers Christ triumphed over were the very power and dominion of sin and death themselves. The sting of death was sin and the strength of sin was the law (I Cor. 15:56). Christ triumphed over the law, spoiling the strong man of sin in his substitutionary death and atoning sacrifice. He did not take the law away (the moral law still exists and condemns our sins as much as ever). Rather, he triumphed over it by bringing in his all sufficient grace.

Don’s Empty Boxes

The reader will recall that we challenged Don to produce verses showing that the saints were under the debt of sin until AD 70 and gave him a box to put the verses in (Box No.1). Don could not produce even one verse. We then added a box challenging Don to produce even one verse that showed the law was binding until AD 70 (Box. No. 2). Again, Don could not produce even one verse. We then asked him to produce even one commentator that agreed that Isa. 27:7-11 referred to the AD 70 destruction of Jerusalem. Again, nothing. Finally, we challenged him to produce even one verse showing that the saints received justification from sin in AD 70. Still nothing. We on the other hand have now produced about nine pages of verses. Probably nine more could be added.

Don's Box No. 1 Verses?	Don's Box No. 2 Verses?	Don's Box No. 3 Commentators?
--	--	--

Don's Box No. 4 Verses?
--

In school sports, when one team cannot even get on the score board and the other has 7 touch-downs, the referee calls the game as a matter of good sportsmanship. That is what needs to happen here. Since Don has no verses, not even one, we feel there is no point in pursuing this discussion further. Don

must directly refute *each verse* we have produced, or we will “call the game” and consider this debate over.

Conclusion

Scripture abundantly testifies to the fact that atonement was complete and justification full and free from and after Jesus’ cross. But if salvation from sin arrived at the cross, then the coming of Rom. 11:25-27 was Christ’s first coming. And if men could enter a state of grace from and after the cross, then the New Testament became of in force, and the Old Testament annulled in Jesus’ death. Covenant Eschatology is a system of error that denies Jesus’ cross.

(Preston’s First Negative, Cont’d from page 1)

no commentator has ever applied Isaiah 27 to AD 70. I have not addressed this because I am concerned with scripture, not commentators. But, do any commentators apply Isaiah 27 to AD 70? **Matthew Henry** says Jesus referred to it when speaking of the unfruitful vine being burned up, and it was fulfilled, “in a particular manner in the unbelieving Jews.” **John Gill** and **Albert Barnes** applied Isaiah 27 to the second coming. **Adam Clarke** says that Matthew 24:31 anticipated the fulfilment of Isaiah 27:13. So, **commentators do apply Isaiah 27 to AD 70 and the second coming!** So much for Kurt’s appeal to the commentators!

ISAIAH 27

It just keeps getting more confusing as we read my friend’s attempt to explain why Paul cited Isaiah 27. He now claims that when he said that Paul cited Isaiah 27 along with Isaiah 59 that he was relating what most commentators say (*Sword and Plow*, Sept, 2009). This is not true! **He said not one word** to indicate that he was relating what the commentators- as opposed to Kurt-- say about Romans 11 and Isaiah 27. He was patently admitting that Paul cited Isaiah 27. But now, when that admission backfires on him, he claims that Paul was not referring to Isaiah 27!

(But remember, **virtually** all commentators disagree with him, *and he even admits it!*)

And now, my friend tries a totally new approach– **his fourth position on Isaiah 26-27!** He says Isaiah 27:10f is not related to the coming of the Lord of 26:20f, which he now, belatedly, admits again applies to AD 70. And this after saying that Isaiah 26 has “nothing” to do with AD 70! So, he said that Isaiah 26:20f *could* apply to AD 70. Then he *denied it*. Now, he admits it!

He says Isaiah 27:9f has nothing to do with 26:10f because Isaiah supposedly changes his subject, over, and over, and over again, all within a few verses. **Not so!** Notice that the destruction of Leviathan (27:1) would be “in that day” *the Day of the Lord when the Lord would avenge the blood of the martyrs (26:20-21)*. Kurt says 26:20f can be AD 70, but that 27:1 must be the destruction of Assyria. *No, 27:1 is the Day of 26:20f that he admits is AD 70!* But notice, that “in that day” is likewise the time of Israel’s salvation at her judgment and the sounding of the Great Trumpet (27:10-13). The references to “in that day” falsify Kurt’s desperate claim that Isaiah constantly changes the subject. Thankfully, Isaiah was not as disorganized as Kurt suggests.

Finally– Isaiah 59!

Do you see what my friend has done? I tried for **three presentations** to get Kurt to address Isaiah 59. He said my only “relevant” argument was on Isaiah 27 (which he now denies has any relevance)! *Now* he says that Isaiah 59 is the only relevant text. Yet he ignored Isaiah 59 until his last negative, and makes some **new arguments**.

KS– “The coming in Rom. 11 is taken, *not from Isa. 27*, but Isa. 59! That's right! “The Redeemer shall come to Zion” is from Isa. 59:20, 21. Isa. 27 is not quoted in Rom. 11 in connection with a “coming” at all.” Kurt cites Jamieson, Fausett and Brown (JFB) for support, (Note: JFB do not **deny** a connection with Isaiah 27. **They simply do not mention it**). But notice the following about JFB: **1.)** They apply Isaiah 27 (JFB, p. 541) and Romans 11:26 to **the second coming**– contra Kurt. **2.)** They say Isaiah 27 / Romans 11 speaks of a yet future conversion of *ethnic Israel*, and they say that those (like Kurt) who reject this view do “great violence” to the text! **3.)** They apply Isaiah 59 and Jeremiah 31 to the second coming– **contra Kurt**. So, Kurt selectively argues **from what they do not say**, and **rejects what they do say, yet claims they agree with him!** But, let's look closer at Kurt's admission that Paul quotes Isaiah 59. He was silent about the arguments I have made, so, let me refresh the reader's memory.

In Isaiah 59 YHVH accused Israel of shedding innocent blood and violence (v. 1-8). The Lord saw Israel in her sinful condition and, “His own arm brought salvation for Him; and His own righteousness, it sustained Him for He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation on His head; He put on the garments of vengeance for His clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak. According to their deeds, accordingly He will repay, Fury to His adversaries, Recompense to His enemies.” **Isaiah 59 predicted the salvation of Israel at the coming of the Lord in judgment of Israel for her guilt in shedding innocent blood.**

Please catch the power of Kurt's admission that Paul is citing Isaiah 59. Kurt says of Romans 11: **a.)** The coming of the Lord is referent to the cross, not AD 70. **b.)** Israel is not OC Israel, but the church. **c.)** The salvation is referent to the conversion of Jews and Gentiles throughout the Christian age. However...

The coming of the Lord for salvation, in Romans 11:26-27, is the coming of the Lord predicted in Isaiah 59– Kurt Simmons now agreeing!

But, the coming of the Lord of Isaiah 59 is the coming of the Lord in judgment of Israel for shedding innocent blood. (It is not a prediction of the cross, or the salvation of the church throughout time).

Therefore, the coming of the Lord for salvation in Romans 11:26-27, is the coming of the Lord in judgment of Israel for shedding innocent blood. (Which was in AD 70-Matthew 23).

Nothing in Isaiah 59 even remotely resembles Kurt's view of Romans 11! **Nothing!** Yet, Isaiah is, *Kurt now agreeing*, the source of Paul's prediction in Romans 11:26. Kurt must explain why Paul cited a prophecy that had nothing whatsoever to do with the subject he was discussing, in order to validate what he was discussing. Kurt has refused to answer *because he cannot answer this*. Yet, his admission that the coming of Romans 11 is the coming of Isaiah 59 is **100% fatal** to his new theology. His admission proves that all of the verses in Kurt's first affirmative must speak of a *process begun*, but a process to be *perfected* at the Second Coming. My affirmative proposition is established by Kurt's fatal admission.

ENTRANCE INTO THE MHP

I asked: What is **the one thing** that prevented man from entering the MHP– He refused to answer.

I asked: If the destruction of Jerusalem was irrelevant to man's spiritual justification, and the saints were perfected prior to that event, **why did the saints have to wait until AD 70 to enter the MHP?** He refused to answer **because he has no answer**.

Kurt threw up a cloud of dust about the time of reformation. His admission that the time of reformation was not completed until AD 70, when the saints could enter the MHP is **fatal** to his rejection of Covenant Eschatology.

Note Kurt's ever shifting position on the time of reformation: He said it began at the cross, (but man could not objectively enter the MHP). He then said that the time of reformation was *completed* in AD 70 with the completion of the Spirit's work. But **now**, he says the time of reformation *ended* (it was not perfected) in AD 70!

Hebrews 9:6-10– If the time of reformation fully arrived at the cross as Kurt originally contended, man should have begun to **actually** enter the MHP, from that point. But, no, Kurt tells us **man could not truly enter the MHP until AD 70!** Kurt admitted, and I agree, “When the gifts of the Spirit ceased, **the time**

of reformation was complete and not before.” (My emp., DKP). But, realizing the fatal nature of this admission, Kurt now says: “The time of reformation *ended* in AD 70.” (My emp., DKP) Do you see the problem? On the one hand he correctly says the time of reformation was completed in AD 70. But that is self-destructive, so he now says the time of reformation *terminated* in AD 70. This is a blatantly self contradictory.

Hebrews 9 says there could be no entrance into the MHP *until the arrival—not termination- of the time of reformation*. The time of reformation began at the Cross— and was guaranteed by the Spirit- - but was not perfected until AD 70. And, **there was no true entrance into the MHP until AD 70 (KS)**. If the time of reformation *ended* in AD 70, Kurt, **then man could never enter the MHP, and the time for man to enter the MHP ended without so much as one person ever entering the MHP!** Man could not, per Kurt, enter before AD 70. But, per his *newest* position, the time of reformation (when man could *supposedly* enter) **terminated**, in AD 70! Kurt has hopelessly entangled himself.

I have focused on the time of reformation because it is in some respects, what this debate is about. So, let me reiterate my argument, which Kurt has totally ignored, and which he must ignore:

Kurt admits that there was *no entrance* into the MHP at the *initiation of the reformation*, i.e. at the cross. *Entrance came only when the time of reformation—the work of grace— was completed, at the parousia.* Now watch as we apply this *to the atonement*:

Kurt offered another syllogism. Unfortunately for him, his efforts fail. Here is his self-contradictory argument:

**No man could enter the Holy of Holies until the atonement was complete.
But the Holy of Holies was a figure for the New Testament and gospel.
The New Testament was of force from and after the cross. Therefore,
The atonement was complete and man could enter (legally and covenantally) the Holy of Holies from and after the cross.**

Those who have been paying attention to this debate will see instantly that Kurt has, once again, **changed his position** and destroyed his own argument.

Kurt— “**No man could enter the Holy of Holies until the atonement was complete.**” (Amen, brother! This is a *fatal admission*).

Kurt— “I never said the saints entered heaven (The MHP, Revelation 15:8, DKP) before AD 70!”

Therefore, the atonement was not completed until AD 70!

ATTENTION! Did you notice Kurt’s shift from the MHP being heaven to being the New Covenant? He has changed theological positions again!

Watch this.

**No man could enter the MHP while Torah remained binding (Hebrews 9:9f)
The MHP represented the New Covenant (Kurt’s New Position).**

**But, no man could enter the MHP until AD 70 (Revelation 15:8-KS supposedly agrees).
Therefore, Torah remained binding and no man could enter the New Covenant until AD 70.**

Kurt has re-embraced Covenant Eschatology! Kurt’s desperate attempt to radically redefine the MHP from his earlier position backfires on him.

Kurt says: “The atonement was complete and man could enter (legally and covenantally) the Holy of Holies from and after the cross. This is sophistry. If man was “covenantally” able to enter the MHP (But, what proof did Kurt offer?) then man should have been able to objectively enter the MHP! It was covenant that prevented objective entrance (*Hebrews 9:6f*). Therefore, if the New Covenant was completed prior to AD 70, then man should have been able—objectively— to enter the MHP! This is irrefutable. Yet, Kurt admits: “I never said the saints entered heaven before AD 70!” Furthermore, Kurt (ostensibly) understands that the New Covenant, *while established by Jesus’ death* (Galatians 3:15) was not fully revealed and confirmed through the Spirit’s ministry until AD 70! This is called covenantal transition.

So, Kurt adamantly tells us that he has “never” said that man could enter the MHP before AD 70. Now of course, *he has changed horses again*, saying that the MHP was the New Covenant and that man was fully in the New Covenant before AD 70! Yet, he still (?) says man could not objectively enter the MHP until AD 70! Confused? You should be.

The truth is that man could not enter the MHP **while Torah remained valid. Torah would remain valid**

until man could enter the MHP at the time of reformation. Thus, Torah ended when the time of reformation was completed, and man could enter the MHP, in AD 70. Kurt has surrendered his objection to the initiation of grace, salvation and covenant transition. He has unwittingly affirmed Covenant Eschatology. So, *once again*:

There could be no access to the MHP as long as Torah remained binding (Hebrews 9).

But, man could not enter the MHP until AD 70 (Kurt Simmons).

Therefore, Torah remained binding until AD 70.

This is the *correct* use of logic and the argument is indisputable.

The Triumph of Grace Over Law, and the so-called “Mysterious” Negative Power of Torah

My friend expends a great deal of steam on grace triumphing over law. He simply reiterates his claims, with no exegesis, and then, amazingly, makes the following statements: “Don states ‘removal of Torah was essential for man’s justification after all!’” (emphasis in original). Don states, “Torah had to end in order for forgiveness, entrance into the MHP and life to become realities!” Dear reader, *we deny this totally and emphatically*. The law was taken away, not so grace could enter in, but because it was a *mere schoolmaster* to bring us to Christ; it was a system of types and shadows *pointing* to Jesus.” Then, in some of his more amazing comments, my friend adds this: “There is *nothing* in the temple ritual or *anywhere* in the law that can forestall God’s grace in Jesus Christ. NOTHING. Law doesn’t prevent grace, it invites it! *The inability of Torah to forgive in no way implies it also possessed a negative power to prevent or forestall forgiveness of sin!* What is Don’s proof of this “mysterious “negative power”? He has none!” Readers, here is the crux of the matter, and the problem with Kurt’s new theology. It is in flagrant denial of the Biblical text and manifest demonstration of my friend’s abuse of logic. Follow...

A.) Kurt sets up a false dichotomy. He says that Torah had no negative power, for it was “a mere schoolmaster.” So, per Kurt, Torah could not exercise negative power by being the schoolmaster; it was *either* a schoolmaster or a negative power. It could not be both! This is an abuse of logic.

B.) Kurt says removal of Torah was not necessary for grace to enter. But wait, Torah was to bring man to “the faith” and Christ, and would endure until then. So, **Torah was a schoolmaster until the arrival of grace!** Yet, Kurt says no, **it was just a schoolmaster**

and not a negative power, although **according to Paul, as a schoolmaster**, it was given to make sin abound, it brought death, it could not deliver from death, and could not provide forgiveness and grace.

C.) Kurt emphatically denies that Torah had negative power. Hebrews says as long as Torah remained, there was no forgiveness. Kurt says this is not a negative power, “forestalling forgiveness and grace.” I will stand with scripture on this.

D.) Kurt says Torah had no power to prevent entrance into the MHP. Hebrews 9 says as long as Torah stood, there could be no entrance into the MHP. I will stand with scripture on this.

Has my friend forgotten what Hebrews 9:6-10 says, or is he simply willing to deny what it says?

Why could man not enter the MHP? What does the inspired text say, Kurt? As long as Torah stood binding, there was no entrance into the MHP! **Torah had the negative power to prevent entrance to the presence of God! Torah had no power to forgive**, thus, no power to bring man into the presence of God. ***That sure sounds like a negative power to me!*** What is so “mysterious” about that? It is what the text says. So...

As long as Torah remained binding, there was no forgiveness of sin, no entrance into the MHP (Hebrews 9:6-10).

No entrance into the MHP until AD 70– KS (ostensibly) teaches this truth.

Therefore, Torah remained binding and there was no objective forgiveness until AD 70!

Kurt’s new theology however, denies this and sees no relationship between Torah, lack of forgiveness and entrance into the MHP. He claims now that removal of Torah was not even necessary for grace to triumph over law! **Did you catch that?** If removal of Torah was not necessary for grace to triumph over law, **then removal of Torah was not necessary to bring forgiveness, and entrance into the MHP, Kurt!** Let me remind you again of Kurt’s total silence in the face of these questions.

Kurt claimed that removal of Torah had *nothing* to do with Paul’s soteriology, and *now* claims it had no negative power “to prevent or forestall forgiveness.” **(Kurt, where are your commentators in support of this new theology?)** I offered the following and urged the readers to watch for Kurt’s answer. *We are all still waiting for his response.*

Torah was the ministration of death (2 Corinthians 3:6f). Kurt, did the deliverance from the ministration of death, to the ministration of life have *nothing* to do with soteriology? If Torah was a ministration of death, was death, empowered by Torah, not a *negative power*?

Paul said Torah could not deliver from the law of sin and death (Romans 8:1-3). He said Christ does deliver from that law! **Did the deliverance from the law of sin and death have nothing to do with forgiveness?** Was being under the power of the law of sin and death not a negative power, Kurt? Come now, my friend, *please* answer the question.

Paul said Torah killed, “The commandment came, sin revived, I died” “sin, working death in me by that which is good...became exceedingly sinful” (Romans 7:13). Kurt, are these positive, or negative aspects of Torah?

Torah could not give life or righteousness (Galatians 3:20-21). Did deliverance from that law, to the covenant that gives life and righteousness have *nothing* to do with salvation?

Paul said those under Torah were under “the curse” (Galatians 2-3). Did deliverance from that curse had nothing to do with redemption? **Was the curse of Torah a negative power, Kurt?**

There was no forgiveness under Torah. There would be forgiveness *when Torah ended at the time of reformation.* **Is forgiveness related to soteriology?** Is unforgiven sin positive or negative, Kurt?

There was no entrance into the MHP under Torah; there would be entrance into the MHP at the end of Torah, the time of reformation. **Is entrance into the MHP related to salvation, Kurt?**

Hebrews 9 is Covenant Eschatology, anyway you want to look at it. Torah had to end in order for forgiveness, entrance into the MHP and life to become realities! End of Torah = Covenant Eschatology; End of Torah = Salvation! Kurt can ridicule this, but it will not change the indisputable facts as specifically stated by inspiration. Hebrews 9:6f stands as an insurmountable bulwark against Kurt’s insistence that Torah was removed at the Cross. Furthermore, his admission that man could not, after all, enter the MHP until AD 70 is an open admission of my position.

DANIEL 12– THE POWER OF THE HOLY PEOPLE

My friend’s desperation manifested itself for all to see in his “response” to my question. He *says* that Israel’s “power” (Daniel 12:7) was the identical power as the pagan nations. This is *astounding!* YHVH always said that His special covenant relationship with Israel was totally distinctive. *When He gave them Torah* He said, “If you will indeed keep my covenant then you will be a special treasure to me above all the people; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Exodus 19:5-6). In Deuteronomy 26:18-19, at the second giving of the Law, God said, “Today the Lord has proclaimed you to be His special people, just as He promised you, so that you should keep His commands. In Psalms 147:19-20 God said, “He gave His statutes to Jacob. He has not done so with any nation”! In spite of all of this– and much more could be added– Kurt tells us that Israel’s power was not her covenant with YHVH. In fact, *Israel was just like the pagans in regard to her power.* This argument is manifest demonstration of the desperation and falsity of Kurt’s position. To deny that Israel’s power, *her only power*, was her covenant with God is patently false. And since Daniel posits the destruction of the power of Israel at AD 70, this is irrefutable proof that Torah remained valid until AD 70. **This is Covenant Eschatology.**

TRANSFIGURATION

Kurt claims that the Transfiguration was a vision of **Jesus’ first appearing**, not the second coming. He says the Transfiguration was not about covenant contrast and transition.

Response: First, Kurt’s argument is virtually unprecedented in the entire history of Christian commentary which agrees that the Transfiguration was a vision of Christ’s second coming. **2.)** Peter was not writing against those who denied Jesus’ incarnation, but his second coming (2 Peter 3:3). **3.)** Peter wanted to establish three equal tabernacles. God would not allow it. **This is a covenant contrast.** **4.)** The Voice said of Jesus “This is my beloved Son, hear him.” In the Greek, the “hear him” is literally “*Him*, hear!”, and is in the emphatic, meaning that *in contrast to Moses and Elijah*, Jesus is to be heard. **5.)** Moses and Elijah vanish away, at the voice that says of Jesus “Him hear!” Yet, Kurt eschews the text, rejects the virtually unanimous testimony of the commentaries, and says he “feels” that it is not about covenant contrast, or Jesus’ second coming. No, the Transfiguration is about *the covenantal transition*

from Moses to Christ, and it was a vision of the second coming. The Transfiguration is therefore, all about **Covenant Eschatology**.

Passing of Torah– Subjective and Objective

Kurt makes one of the most illogical “arguments” a person will ever read. He claims that when Paul said, “you have become dead to the Law through the body of Christ” that this actually means that **the Law itself had died!** This is like saying that when a person gets a divorce that the entire institution of marriage is destroyed! Watch the following illustration.

For decades the Berlin Wall stood as a barrier to freedom. East Berliners longed to escape the oppressive communist law. Now, Kurt, when someone managed to escape from East Berlin into the West (prior to the fall of the “Wall”) did that mean that East Berlin communism was dead? Patently not. The *individual* who escaped *had died to communism!* Just like Paul said those coming into Christ through baptism had ***died to the Law through the body of Christ!*** (Incidentally, Kurt claims I ignored Romans 7:4. Not true. I appealed to Romans 7!) Paul did not say Torah had died. Just so, in 2 Corinthians 3:10f, Paul said that *when a person turned to Christ*, the veil of Torah was removed for them. He did not say Torah had passed. Huge difference! This is what Paul affirms in Ephesians 2, Colossians 2, etc... When a person, through faith, entered into the power of the cross, *they died to the Law!* Kurt admits this in his first affirmative! But when a person died to the Law, the Law did not die. The NT speaks of the objective passing of the Law itself, however.

ATTENTION!! Kurt admits that Colossians 2:14f does not say that Torah was nailed to the Cross: “What was nailed to the cross? Not the Mosiac (sic) law, but the sentence of the law (the law of sin and death) condemning the transgression of men” (Sept. 09, S-P- And first affirmative). **Folks, this is fatal!** If Colossians 2 does not (and it *doesn't*) say that Torah was nailed to the Cross, then no passage does, and **Kurt has admitted that it doesn't!** Note his contradiction: Torah was *not* nailed to the cross. *His proposition:* Torah ended at the cross! There is no way to reconcile Kurt's self-contradiction. He has totally surrendered his proposition. Do not fail to catch this!

In Hebrews 8:13, Paul says that **the Covenant** –not some already dead outward form of the Law– was “nigh unto passing.” In chapter 12:25f– the heaven and earth of the Old Covenant had not yet passed, but was **about to be removed**. Furthermore, Jesus did

say that not one jot or one tittle of the law could pass until it was all fulfilled, and *even the ceremonial aspects of Torah had not yet been fulfilled*, since Paul said those ceremonial sacrifices remained, when he wrote Colossians and Hebrews, “shadows of good things about to come” (Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 10:1-4). Torah, **objectively speaking**, had not been done away. ***This is why there was still no access to the MHP until AD 70. As long as Torah remained valid, there was no access to the MHP***, and Kurt admits there was no entrance into the MHP until AD 70. **This is Covenant Eschatology validated and proven.**

In Kurt's first affirmative he desperately argues, falsely, that God could not have two systems in force at the same time. **Kurt, did God have two systems in place when He gave Torah to Israel, but not to the pagans?** Were there two “systems” in place when John preached the baptism of repentance and faith in the coming of Messiah, while the Temple cultus was still in effect? John's baptism was not Torah “baptism!” And consider Galatians 4.22f. Paul, anticipated the yet future casting out of the bondwoman– which he says was **the Old Covenant** and her seed– **for persecuting the Christians**. The allegory has the two sons *dwelling in the same house*, but Ishmael was cast out for persecuting Isaac. And Paul said “as it was then, even so it is now.” Paul said the Old Covenant and seed would be cast out **for persecuting Christians**. But, there were no Christians before the Cross! It is therefore irrefutably true that **the two sons dwelt together while the seed of the flesh persecuted the Seed of promise and was then cast out**. Torah and Israel were not cast out at the cross. This is **Covenant Eschatology**. Kurt's essential argument that two systems could not temporarily co-exist is false.

Was Jesus' Resurrection the Proof of the Completion of the Atonement?

Kurt says: “Will Don deny Jesus died under imputation of sin? Will he deny he was raised justified, free from imputation of sin (Rom. 6:7, 10)? But if Christ was justified from the imputation of sin at his resurrection, it is clear that his blood was received by God within the veil *before* his ascension, and that can only mean it was received by God *at his death*.”

Response: Kurt is so desperate to prove his position that he continues to **invent historically unprecedented arguments**. Kurt, give us some commentary support for your idea that Jesus had to be justified from the sin of others!

1.) Kurt argues as he does because of his *historically unprecedented argument* that Jesus had to enter the MHP twice (He said Christ “legally” pierced the veil, (that is *once*), and then entered the MHP at his ascension. That is *twice*). In this view, Christ’s ascension and entrance into the MHP was *legally*

2.) Kurt has consistently ignored Hebrews 9:12– Christ entered the MHP **ONCE! Not twice**. Not once *legally* (whatever that means), and then once *actually*. **ONCE!** Kurt says twice, Paul says ONCE! Kurt is wrong.

3.) Kurt said it was appropriate for him to draw the analogy with Jesus and the OT priest who had to enter the MHP twice. But:

A.) The OT high priest had to enter *twice* because ***the first time*** (the cross per Kurt’s analogy) the priest had to offer sacrifice ***for his own sins– not for the sins of the people!*** Kurt argues that Jesus died the sinner’s death and legally, *but not actually*, pierced the veil, when he bore the sins of the people! **But in scripture**, the priest bore the sins of the people at the *second entrance into the MHP* The **second time, Kurt, *not the first!*** You have no analogy.

B.) The OT priest had to **actually** enter twice. He did not enter in some vague, “legal” sense, and then **actually**, as in Kurt’s new paradigm.

C.) Jesus’ sinlessness voided any need for him to enter the MHP twice. He entered **ONCE**, and that for the sins of the people (Hebrews 9:12). ***Do not lose sight of this verse amid Kurt’s smoke screens!***

D.) Jesus had to appear the second time “***for*** (This is the reason why Jesus had to come again!) the law, *having (present tense*, Kurt) a shadow of good things about to come” (Hebrews 10:1f). Kurt has repeatedly ignored this argument, even though he admits to the Greek present and future tenses in his book. So, Jesus *had to come again*, to fulfill the typological (ceremonial) aspects of atonement / Torah, which were, when Paul wrote, *still valid and binding shadows*. Kurt himself has said that there could be no entrance into the MHP until the atonement was perfected, and there could be no entrance into the MHP until AD 70! Do not fail to catch this amidst all of Kurt’s smoke. It is fatal to every single one of his claims.

Kurt’s List and His Unequal Emphasis on the Greek Tenses

unnecessary, since the work of atonement was finished when he “legally pierced the veil” **while hanging on the cross! Kurt, where are the commentators who agree your unprecedented argument?**

We do not have space to examine every one of the verses listed by Kurt, nor need we to. His argument can be summed up under certain headings of: forgiveness, redemption, salvation, atonement, New Covenant, etc.. If it can be demonstrated that these soteriological elements were not completed at the Cross, but was awaiting perfection in AD 70, then my friend’s entire affirmative is negated.

In spite of the use of the past tense in the verses cited by Kurt, **each of these elements is also couched in future tense verbs**.

Redemption: Already → “**In whom we have redemption**” (Ephesians 1:7). **Future:** “You were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise *until the day of redemption*” (Ephesians 1:12-13; 4:30)→ If redemption was already perfected, why did they need the charismata *to guarantee its completion*? Why did Paul look forward to the day of redemption? Kurt, why do you ignore these future tenses and the work of the Spirit?

Notice: Paul equates redemption with forgiveness: “in whom we have redemption, *even the forgiveness of our sin*.” Yet, again, ***the Holy Spirit was the guarantee of the future day of redemption!*** So, redemption = forgiveness, and redemption would not fully arrive until Christ’s second coming in AD 70. It follows inexorably that forgiveness would objectively arrive in AD 70– precisely as Romans 11:26f says! Kurt, why do you ignore the future tense of the Day of Redemption?

Adoption / Sonship: Already→ “We have received the spirit of adoption” (Romans 8:14). **Future**→ “longing for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body” (Romans 8:23). Kurt, why do you ignore the future tense?

Atonement: Already→ “We have received the atonement” (reconciliation, DKP, Romans 5:10)– **Future**– “We shall be saved by his life” (Romans 5:10). Also, KS– “The soul could not enter the presence of God in heaven without the atoning sacrifice of Christ, so the dead were sequestered in Hades until the general resurrection.” So, **even according to Kurt**, the atonement was not completed until AD 70!

Inheritance: Already→ Ephesians 1:11: “In Him also we have obtained an inheritance.” **Future**→ Ephesians 1:14: “who is the guarantee of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.” Now watch: Kurt appeals to Hebrews 9:15 to prove that the New Covenant was already fully in place and that those from the first covenant now had redemption. If that is true, Kurt, **why could those in the Hadean realm not enter the MHP until AD 70 (Revelation 15:8)?** Oh, wait, you have (*inadvertently*) answered this: “The soul could not enter the presence of God in heaven without the atoning sacrifice of Christ, so the dead were sequestered in Hades until the general resurrection” (S-P, Sept. 09). So, Kurt himself informs us that the inheritance and forgiveness through completed atonement did not arrive until AD 70! If the atonement and forgiveness of sin—sin being the only thing to keep man from the MHP—was fully realized at the cross, then those under the first covenant (i.e. in Hades) had already received “the better resurrection,” and the eternal inheritance! Kurt has distorted Hebrews 9:15, and contradicted his own writings, *again*.

New Covenant: Already→ I have repeatedly noted the *present tense verbs* that speak of the then passing of Torah (2 Corinthians 3:6f; Hebrews 8:13, etc.), and the **future** passing of the Law (Hebrews 12:25f). I have noted the Greek present tenses that prove that Torah, including the sacrificial system, was still, when Paul wrote, typological of good things *about to come* (future tense). **In his book, Kurt acknowledges these present tenses, but now he denies them!**

Furthermore: The Holy Spirit was the guarantee of the New Covenant, and that through the distinctive personal ministry of Paul. Kurt affirms that covenant transition was over and done at the cross. Paul disagreed, and said that the transition from the Old Covenant to the New was ongoing when he wrote 2 Corinthians 3-4: “we are being transformed from Glory to Glory, by the Spirit. wherefore, having this ministry...” Paul uses the *present tenses* several times to speak of the present and impending passing of Torah. **Kurt, why do you reject the present and future tenses?**

Furthermore, if the New Covenant was perfected, why was the ministry of the Spirit necessary, Kurt? Paul said it was the ministry of the Spirit to reveal the New Covenant and to bring about the transition from the Old to the New (2 Corinthians 3). But that work of the Spirit was unnecessary in Kurt’s paradigm.

Kurt falsely claims that in Hebrews 7:12f Paul affirmed the past tense of the passing of the Law. **False. Paul uses the present tense!** Kurt says Christ could not serve in a priestly capacity unless Torah had been removed. Again, false. *Jesus was serving as high priest in the true heavenly tabernacle (Hebrews 8:1f)*, where he *could serve* because he was no longer subject to the law. Yet, Paul is emphatic, “if he were on earth, he could not serve as priest, seeing there are (present tense) priests who serve (present tense) according to the Law” (Hebrews 8:5). Kurt even claims on Hebrews 10:9 that Torah “was taken away.” ***This is inexcusable.*** Paul uses the *present tense*: “He is *taking away* the first that he might establish the second.” We have already noted the present tenses in Hebrews 9:6-10:1f *which Kurt acknowledges in his book*, but now wants to deny. Kurt, *why do you ignore these Greek tenses?*

Clearly, ***there were two systems in effect at the same time!*** Christ was serving as priest in the heavenly tabernacle. The Aaronic priests were serving under Torah. The earthly system was “nigh unto passing” while the heavenly city and tabernacle were “about to come” (Hebrews 13:14).

So, what we have are proleptic (a form of past tense) statements, present tense statements, and future tense references. No proper exegesis of all of this evidence can ignore *two out of three uses of the Greek tenses* and claim to be the whole picture, ***yet this is precisely what Kurt has done. Kurt, what is your linguistic or grammatical authority for rejecting the present and future tenses?*** You have *no authority for this* other than your newly invented theology.

Grace: Already→ “By grace are you saved through grace” (Ephesians 2:8-9). **Future:** “hope to the end for the grace that shall be brought to you at the coming of the Lord” (1 Peter 1:7-8).

Perfect in him: Already→ “And you are perfect in him” (Colossians 2:10). **Future**→ “That we might present every man perfect in Christ” (Colossians 1:27). Notice that the early church had the charismata to “equip the church for the work of the ministry...until we all come to the perfect man” (Ephesians 4:13-16). Kurt, if they were already perfected, ***why did they need the gifts to bring them to the perfect man?***

Salvation: Already→ “By grace are you saved through grace” (Ephesians 2:8-9). **Future:** “to those who eagerly look for him, he will appear the second time, apart from sin, for salvation, ***for***, the law having

a shadow of good things about to come” (Hebrews 9:28-10:1); the salvation “ready to be revealed in the last times” at the parousia (1 Peter 1:5-12).

In each verse cited by Kurt, he ignores the transitional period. He sees covenant transition completed at the cross. This is false. He likewise ignores the work of the Spirit as the guarantee of the completion of what began at the cross. Furthermore, from Pentecost onward, the church was betrothed – *not married*-- to Christ. Kurt admits this. This is a *process begun*, awaiting consummation! Likewise, the foundation for the New Covenant Temple was laid, but, “construction” was on-going from Pentecost onward. The Temple was not complete at the Cross (Ephesians 2:19f; 1 Peter 2:4f). *Note the present tenses*. Kurt, *do you deny these present tenses?*

Let me reiterate: Paul uses past, present and future tenses to speak of each of the elements Kurt emphasizes. *Proper hermeneutic* cannot emphasize one of the tenses to the exclusion of the others. This is to practice presuppositional theology. This is precisely what Kurt has done. Let me now introduce some critical factors.

DO NOT MISS THIS!! Kurt ignores the **indisputable fact** that each element he lists had to do with **the fulfillment of God’s promises to OC Israel**. If salvation was completed at the cross, **then Israel’s salvation (resurrection! Isaiah 25:8-9; Romans 9:28) was completed at the cross: “Salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22), i.e. from the Jews first, then to the nations!** Yet, Kurt admitted (2nd Neg) that Romans 9:28 referred to the salvation of “national Israel” in AD 70! How could Israel have been cut off at the cross, if Israel was not saved until AD 70? How could salvation be completed at the cross if Israel’s salvation was in AD 70? This is a fatal contradiction! Let me build on that concept.

The resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 is the resurrection predicted in Isaiah 25:8. The resurrection of Isaiah 25:8 would be the time of **the salvation of Israel**. Therefore, the resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 would be the time of the salvation of Israel. **Kurt says** 1 Corinthians 15 is about the death of *individuals* throughout the Christian age. **Paul said** the resurrection he anticipated was *the salvation of Israel!* Whom shall we believe?

Furthermore...

The resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 is the resurrection predicted in Hosea 13:14. The resurrection of Hosea 13:14 would be the resurrection, ***of Israel***, from alienation from God through sin (Hosea 13:1-2: “When Israel sinned, he died”).– I.e. it would be resurrection through forgiveness and reconciliation.

Therefore, the resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 would be the resurrection, **of Israel**, from alienation from God through sin (Hosea 13:1-2).– I.e. it would be resurrection through forgiveness and reconciliation.

The resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 would be the resurrection, **of Israel**, from alienation from God through sin (Hosea 13:1-2).– I.e. it would be resurrection through forgiveness and reconciliation. But, the resurrection of 1 Corinthians 15 was still future when Paul wrote.

Therefore, the resurrection, **of Israel**, from alienation from God through sin (Hosea 13:1-2).– I.e. resurrection through forgiveness and reconciliation was still future when Paul wrote.

Of course this means that Israel was not cut off at the cross. God’s promises to her were “irrevocable” (Romans 11:28), **and until His covenant promises to her were fulfilled she would not enter her salvation (Romans 11:26f) at the resurrection.**

The last enemy to be destroyed was death (Kurt agrees). But, sin produced death (Romans 6:23; “the law of sin and death”). The last enemy would be destroyed at the resurrection in AD 70 (Kurt agrees *theoretically*, but not truly. See below). Thus, sin, which produced death, would be destroyed (for those “in Christ,” and the power of his resurrection, 1 Corinthians 15:22) at the resurrection in AD 70.

The resurrection is when sin, the sting of death was to be overcome, (1 Corinthians 15:54-56). The miraculous gifts of the Spirit were the guarantee of that resurrection (2 Corinthians 5:5; Ephesians 1:13). Therefore, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were the guarantee of the final victory over sin!

So, again, since the charismata were the guarantee of the resurrection, and since the resurrection is when sin, the sting of death would be overcome, **it therefore follows that the charismata were the**

guarantee of the final victory over sin. Kurt says the charismata endured until AD 70. Thus, the final victory of sin was in AD 70. Kurt has ignored these arguments.

Kurt's False View of Sin, Death and Resurrection
Let me introduce the problem of Kurt's false view of sin-death-forgiveness.

Kurt says physical death was the "immediate" result of Adam's sin— thus, physical death is the result of sin today, and, "it is from physical death that the promise of resurrection was given" (KS, Oct. 2009, S/P).

Kurt correctly believes in the *substitutionary death of Jesus*. Substitutionary means "in the place of." Consider what this means.

Jesus died a substitutionary death for man. Jesus' physical death was the substitutionary death that he died.

Substitutionary means "in the place of."
Therefore, Jesus died physically so that man would not have to die physically.

Please pay particular attention to this. You cannot argue, as Kurt does, that Jesus' *physical death* was his substitutionary death, and then say that even those in Christ and ostensibly in the power of his death still have to die physically! What does *substitutionary* mean, after all? If Jesus died so that those in him *do not have to die*, then why do those in him have to die physically? Did Jesus' substitutionary physical death do no good? Or, has no believer has ever entered fully into the benefit of his substitutionary death?

It will do no good to say that resurrection delivers man *out of death, after man dies!* Death is the penalty of sin: "The wages of sin is death." Thus, the physical death of even the most faithful Christian is proof positive that the Christian was still under "the strength of sin," and has not experienced deliverance from sin, if physical death is "the immediate result of sin"! The bottom line is that if Jesus' physical death was *substitutionary, as Kurt says, then people of faith should never die physically.* This is logically inescapable, and reveals just part of the problem with Kurt's theology.

Kurt claims that "sin was defeated in Christ's cross." It was actually "the law of sin and death" (*not Torah itself!*) that was nailed to the cross. He says forgiveness of sin was objectively applied from then.

Well, if sin brings physical death, then if sin was defeated and those of faith were (or are) objectively **forgiven of sin**, then why does man have to die physically? *Forgiveness is the removal of that which kills, is it not?* So, if sin brings physical death, but, a person is completely forgiven, **with no sin in their life**, why does that person still experience physical death, Kurt? If, as you say, Christ nailed the law of sin and death to the cross, *then why are Christians still subject to the law of sin and death?*

My friend's view logically demands that the physical death of even the most faithful Christian is a powerful testimony to the lack of forgiveness in their life. Kurt even says that if the Christian sins, "he comes again under the power of sin and death" (S-P, Sept. 09). Thus, *physical death is the indisputable proof that the Christian is under the power of sin!* And, since that physical death is the *final testimony of the power of sin*, this *logically demands* that that person is *lost*, for the final act in their life was *not forgiveness*, but *the imposition of the law of sin and death: i.e. you sin, you die!* The believer's *physical death* proves, *indisputably*, that they were not objectively forgiven, for they died a sinner's death! So, exactly how did Jesus nail the law of sin and death to the cross, Kurt?

Summary and Conclusion

I have demonstrated *prima facie*, that Kurt has mis-applied the Greek past tenses, by ignoring the transitional work of the Holy Spirit as *the guarantee of the finished work of salvation*, and by ignoring the present tenses and the future tenses of the work of salvation. He is guilty of mis-representing the present and future tenses, actually claiming that they are past tense applications.

I have shown indisputably that covenant transition was not complete at the cross. I have even shown **from Kurt's own hand that Torah was not nailed to the cross! Do not miss that!**

I have shown that every tenet listed by Kurt is inextricably bound to the hope of Israel and the fulfillment of God's OT promises to her. Those promises were to arrive at the end of her age in AD 70: "These be the days of vengeance in which all things that are written must be fulfilled" (Luke 21:22).

I have demonstrated that the Cross is to the parousia what the foundation is to the finished structure of a house (cf. Ephesians 2:19f again).

I have shown from Isaiah 59 that the coming of the Lord of Romans 11:26f cannot be referent to the cross. Kurt has not breathed on this argument.

I have shown that Kurt's position on sin, death and resurrection is false and logically demands that Christ's death has accomplished nothing at all, **even for Christians**, since all men, just like Adam, suffer the consequences of the law of sin and death.

Do not miss what Kurt said in his last negative: "We must be careful not to let our hermeneutic *drive* our interpretation of scripture." But, if there was ever a case of a presuppositional hermeneutic driving interpretation, it is Kurt. 1.) He denied that we need to be concerned with the "proper exegesis" of Isaiah 27. 2.) He has eschewed the use of logic. 3.) He has made *historically unprecedented arguments*. 4.) He has repeatedly changed his arguments when caught in self-contradiction. 5.) He has abused the Greek tenses— contradicting what he has written in his books. 6.) He has admitted, fatally, that ***the Mosaic law was not nailed to the Cross!*** 7.) He has ignored the fundamental connection between the fulfillment of Israel's salvation promises- and salvation for Gentiles ***flowing from that--*** and the parousia.

Kurt says the debate, like a ball game, should be called. The trouble is, that for a game to be called a team has to score some points, and Kurt has not even gotten to first base! He has in fact, struck out.
