

# Realized Eschatology and Exposition of Acts 2:29–36

Dub McClish

Brethren, I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set *one upon his throne*; he foreseeing *this* spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that *neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption*. This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens: but he saith himself, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet*. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.

## Introduction

The Bible contains numerous outstanding sermons or at least briefs thereof. The minds of Bible students immediately go to the Lord's "Sermon on the Mount," Peter's Pentecost sermon, Stephen's oration to the Sanhedrin and the mob (costing him his life), Paul's sermons (in the Pisidian Antioch synagogue, to the Athenians in the shadow of the Parthenon, before Herod Agrippa and Governor Festus in Caesarea, et al.), and many other sermons by God's preachers in both Testaments.

The Pentecost proclamation may be the most significant sermon ever preached. Its Holy Spirit-empowered and inspired message announced the culmination of God's eternal purpose to save mankind through Christ and His church (Eph. 3:8–10). It presented the crucified Jesus as the sacrificed, resurrected, ascended, and enthroned Christ—the ultimate sacrificial Lamb of God Who could fully take away sin (John 1:29). Peter declared to the Pentecost celebrants that the Father had exalted this Lamb to be the Lord on His throne at the Father's right hand.

But Jesus' throne and royalty were not merely titular. Implicitly, His kingdom—that everlasting kingdom which Nathan had promised David that God would give to His heir—came with His throne (2 Sam. 7:12–13). Jesus had prophesied the establishment of His church, which He identified as His kingdom (Mat. 16:18–19). This kingdom/church had its beginning on Pentecost as Peter used the kingdom's keys of Gospel obedience to open its gates. The Lord added those who obeyed Peter's words to His church (Acts 2:41, 47), which is simply an alternate way of saying that God translated them into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13–14).

Some may be curious about why an exposition of a portion of the Pentecost sermon belongs to a study, the purpose of which is to refute and expose the theological creed known as “Realized Eschatology.” (Make no mistake; this dogma is not merely two or three strange doctrinal positions. It is as much a system of theology as Calvinism or dispensational premillennialism – and is just as deadly to the soul.) This study relates to the sermon in Acts 2 because of the exceedingly warped idea of the church and the kingdom that is an integral part of this theological system. While its advocates grant that the church/kingdom began on Pentecost, they aver that it came only partially, lacking fullness, power, and glory. The AD 70 folk insist that Pentecost marked only the beginning of the kingdom’s “construction,” not completed until 40 years later with the destruction of Jerusalem. Only then did the church/kingdom attain power, glory, and perfection.

To Max King and associates, the church was merely a “bridge” between the death and resurrection of Jesus and the passing of the Law of Moses. Thus Moses’ Law only **began** to be phased out and Christ’s Law **began** to be phased in at the cross. By their dictum the two bodies of law overlapped in co-existence for four decades (which would seem to be a monumental case of “spiritual adultery,” according to Rom. 7:1–4). Just as the church was not completely established, neither was the Law of Christ completely established until Jerusalem fell in AD 70. The Lord’s kingdom, in a very insipid and half-baked stage, limped along for 40 years until the be-all, end-all of days arrived. For 60 years I have believed and preached that Pentecost was that historical landmark day. The realized eschatologists now come along and tell me I have had it wrong all these years. The day of days, the zenith event of all time, was the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans! No, it is the preterists who have it all wrong in their outlandish scheme that “spiritualizes” practically every prophetic statement in God’s Word. We shall see in the course of our exposition of a portion of Peter’s words that the aforementioned scheme regarding the church and kingdom of Christ is a fatal flight of foolish fancy.

### **The Immediate Context of Acts 2:29–36**

#### ***Acts 2:1–13***

The chapter begins with the apostles waiting in Jerusalem as the Lord instructed for the promised “power from on high,” which He also identified as baptism in the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4–5, 8; cf. John 14:26; 15:26; 16:13). On Pentecost, the Holy Spirit filled these men, causing them to speak in the known languages (though unknown by them) of the multi-lingual multitude. This phenomenon was accompanied by what appeared to be split tongues of fire

resting on each of the apostles and a tornadic-sounding wind. The crowds, both amazed and perplexed, began asking how and why these events transpired.

#### ***Acts 2:14–21***

Peter and the other apostles stood, and he began the pivotal Pentecost sermon. He denied the scoffing explanation some proffered that drunkenness enabled these men to speak in languages they had never learned. Rather, he credited the astounding events to the fulfillment of Joel's eighth-century BC prophecy (2:28–32) of God's unprecedented outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the "last days." The apostle's *this is that* concerning Pentecost settles the matter regarding the meaning of Joel's words. These introductory remarks established the source of the miraculous manifestations and the implied authority of those thus empowered. The closing words of the quotation from Joel directed the attention of the awe-struck multitudes to the subject of calling on the name of the Lord for salvation.

#### ***Acts 2:22–23***

It is not difficult to picture Peter's gesturing with both arms raised to the crowd as he called their attention to what he would say. He reminded his hearers of the incomparable miraculous manifestations they had witnessed at Jesus' hands. That these signs, wonders, and mighty works testified to God's approval was a fact that should have caused them to believe in Him rather than crucifying Him.

In spite of all the evidence that Jesus was Who He claimed to be – the Son of God (Mat. 26:63–64; John 5:36–37; 8:26–29; et al.) – He was "delivered up" (several times and by several people, including Judas, the Sanhedrin, Pilate, and the Jews in general at various stages of His arrest and trials). Ultimately, however, He delivered Himself up to His enemies (John 10:17–18), otherwise none could have touched Him (Mat. 26:53). Peter declared that Jesus' death at the hands of (and for) evil men was in God's "determinate counsel." He later wrote that Jesus' self-sacrifice as the redeeming "lamb without blemish and spot" was "foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world" (1 Pet. 1:18–20). While it was in God's plan for Jesus to shed His blood for man's redemption, the individuals responsible for His death were under no compulsion to so act; they freely chose to do so and stood condemned.

The Jewish leaders who delivered Jesus to Pilate and then incited a mob to madness, demanding His crucifixion, were apparently in Peter's audience. As Nathan had boldly charged, "Thou art the man," to David's face concerning his sin with Bathsheba, so the apostle had no qualms about accusing the Jews of the murder of the Lord. As surely as David murdered

Uriah by proxy a millennium earlier, so Peter charged the Jews with murdering the Son of God, though they manipulated Gentiles to pass the sentence and drive the spikes, as Jesus had prophesied (Mark 10:33).

#### ***Acts 2:24-28***

Immediately after reminding the crowd of the death of Jesus (and their culpability in it), Peter announced the fact that God raised Jesus from the dead (of which they may **not** have been aware). The Jews could kill Jesus, but with their best effort they could not keep Him dead “because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.”

Peter next began citing the evidence of Jesus’ resurrection. He first turned to Scripture, which he knew his listeners revered. He quoted David’s words from Psalms 16:8-11, declaring that David wrote in reference not to himself, but to Christ and His resurrection. The Lord’s soul was not left in Hades (the unseen realm of departed spirits; *hell* is a very unfortunate and misleading rendering of the Greek, *hades*, throughout the KJV NT, but particularly so in this passage), and His physical body did not undergo the normal decay of a corpse. Body and soul, separated at death (Jam. 2:26), were reunited on the third day following His entombment. This announcement of the resurrection and David’s prophecy concerning it brings us to the assigned text for this chapter: verses 29-36.

### **Exposition of Acts 2:29-36**

#### ***Verse 29***

Peter admitted that he spoke “freely” (i.e., plainly, boldly) in what he was about to say about David’s tomb as practical proof of the claim that he spoke of Jesus’ resurrection. David died and was buried in Jerusalem, as they all knew. He wrote of someone whose body would not be left in a tomb long enough for it to decay. They also knew that David’s unopened tomb (did Peter perhaps point toward it?) was still where it was when he died a millennium earlier and that his decayed remains were still in it. Thus David could not have been referring to himself when he wrote of one’s death, burial, and his body’s being resurrected without its putrefying. Peter momentarily left his hearers to infer that David spoke his prophecy about Jesus’ resurrection, which he would soon state as a matter of fact.

#### ***Verse 30***

Peter called David a prophet, connoting the authority pertaining to that office. He pointed out that David recalled that God had “sworn with an oath” to him that He would set

one of his offspring upon his throne. This statement takes us to Nathan's announcement to the king that God would set one upon his throne over an everlasting kingdom:

When thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, that shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever (2 Sam. 7:12-13).

More particularly, Peter's words take us to David's statement in Psalms 132:11, which he almost quoted: "Jehovah hath sworn unto David in truth; He will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne."

Although it should go without having to say it, God specifically stated the matter nonetheless. The throne and kingdom of David's heir were to be concurrent: His reception of the throne would mark the beginning of his reign over His kingdom.

### *Verse 31*

Being an inspired prophet, when David foresaw one who would someday die but whose soul would return from Hades and whose body would not be corrupted in the tomb, he spoke of Jesus. Moreover, David also foresaw in the one whom God would raise from the dead the fulfillment of God's promise/oath. The resurrected "Jesus Christ, son of David" (Mat. 1:1) met the requirements of the prophecy perfectly.

Paul made the identical argument to the Pisidian Antioch synagogue attendees:

Because he saith also in another psalm, Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but he whom God raised up saw no corruption (Acts 13:35-37).

In effect, both Peter and Paul said concerning David's prophecy, "This is that," as Peter had earlier done concerning Joel's prophecy.

### *Verse 32*

Peter now repeats, perhaps for emphasis' sake, what he had declared in verse 24—God raised **this** Jesus. He perhaps added *this Jesus* lest the hearers confuse Him with any other Jew by that name. More likely, he thus said to once more emphasize the One whom these Jews had slain and Whom Peter has declared to be resurrected.

The apostle now turns from David, the dead witness of the resurrection (through his prophecy), to living witnesses—the apostles. Although Jesus appeared to various ones in His resurrected body (to above five hundred at once [1 Cor. 15:6]), He appeared to the apostles on more than one occasion. Luke told Theophilus that to His chosen apostles Jesus "showed

himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God" (Acts 1:2-3). Although Paul was not among the original twelve, he nonetheless was a witness of the resurrected Christ as He halted Saul on his deadly mission to Damascus (Acts 9:1-5; 22:6-8; 26:12-15). Paul could thus declare that he was a qualified witness that God raised up Christ (1 Cor. 15:15). The Lord did not haphazardly appear to men after His resurrection. At Cornelius' house, Peter emphasized the fact that God carefully chose those to whom the resurrected Christ would appear:

Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead (Acts 10:40-41).

God thus "hand-picked" the witnesses, but not, as some critics have charged, because their closeness to and familiarity with the Lord would make them render biased testimony. If this were so, the Divine strategy miserably failed. The record shows that, in spite of Jesus' numerous clear prophecies of His resurrection (Mat. 12:40; 16:4; 20:19; 26:32; John 2:19), even some of the apostles did not at first believe in Jesus' resurrection (Mat. 28:17; Mark 16:11-14; Luke 24:11, 41; John 20:24-25). God perhaps chose those who knew Jesus best to most often see Him and to converse and eat with Him after His resurrection so that none could credibly charge that some imposter who looked like Jesus deceived them. There was no possibility of "mistaken identity" by these to whom He appeared.

### *Verse 33*

Some of Peter's listeners may have been wondering, "If this Jesus was resurrected, why is He not here Himself, or where is He now?" Whether or not Peter was intending to satisfy such curiosity, he now abruptly takes the minds of his audience from the Lord's resurrection to His ascension, exaltation, coronation, and glorification in Heaven by the Father's right hand.

I remind readers that the preterist advocates, while admitting that Jesus' kingdom (His church) began with the events of Pentecost, deny that it came in the fullness of its glory and power. They allege, without Scriptural basis, that it was thus weak, lacking in glory, and incomplete until 40 years later (AD 70) when the Romans destroyed Jerusalem. Since Jesus' kingdom began when He was enthroned (see v. 30 above), if the kingdom/church He received was inglorious, weak, and incomplete, it must follow that Jesus' reign did not begin with glory and power, which it would not attain for another forty years.

Contrary to this irreverent depiction of the Lord's return to the Father, Peter did not say that God merely **placed** His Son by His right hand, but that He **exalted** Him. This is another

way of describing the glory Jesus received upon His ascension. Note Jesus' prayer concerning His return to the Father: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5). Did He have only a little glory with the Father before His incarnation? Apparently the realized eschatologists believe so. Paul declared that the Lord had to empty Himself of His glory, which was equal to that of the Father, in order to take on the "fashion as a man" (Phi. 2:7-8). It is the restoration of this original fullness of glory for which Jesus prayed. Various Scriptural statements indicate that this is exactly what He received, with not the slightest hint that it was merely partial or less than perfect.

- Luke 24:26: "Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?"
- John 7:39: But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified."
- John 13:31-32: "When therefore he was gone out, Jesus saith, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him; and God shall glorify him in himself, and straightway shall he glorify him."
- Heb. 2:9: "But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man."

Since Jesus' glory and exaltation were complete when He received His kingdom, no Scriptural basis exists for the conclusion that the kingdom itself was less than complete from its inception.

When the Father set His Son at His right hand, He "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit." The Spirit had been "poured forth," and they had seen and heard the results of it in the sounds of the rushing mighty wind and the tongues in which the Spirit enabled the apostles to speak. As Peter had earlier attributed those phenomena to the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy (vv. 16-21), so he here again assigns them to the Holy Spirit, as sent by the Father and as promised by Jesus to His apostles (John 14:26; et al.).

#### *Verses 34-35*

Having told the crowd that God had exalted Jesus by His right hand, He now proceeds to amplify this announcement. Peter had earlier argued in part the case of Jesus' resurrection based on the fact that David could not have referred to himself in Psalms 16:8-11; his body had suffered corruption and its remains were still there in Jerusalem. Now he uses the same approach on David's prophecy in Psalms 110:1. Before he quotes the passage, Peter first denies

that David could have referred to himself, for David had not done what his words described — he “had ascended not into the heavens.”

In David’s prophecy, Jehovah told David’s Lord to sit on His (Jehovah’s) right hand. While no ascension is mentioned in the Psalm, it is implied (one who is on earth can hardly sit at God’s right hand without ascending). Peter’s inspired exegesis of the prophecy is that David’s “Lord” is the Lord Jesus Who ascended to the Father, Who then seated His Son at His right hand. As before, this application of the prophecy has the same effect as Peter’s earlier applications of prophecy: “This is that.” The significance of this prophecy may be gauged at least in part by its being the most frequently noted Old Testament text by New Testament writers, quoted either fully or in part twenty-three times in ten different books.

To be at the “right hand” of one in authority is itself a place of great authority. Paul elaborates upon the extent of the authority the Father gave to Christ when He thus seated Him: “For, He put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him” (1 Cor. 15:27). In other words, the Father “turned everything over” to His Son except Himself. The Lord expressed this very thought in His preface to the Great Commission: “All authority [power, KJV] hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth” (Mat. 28:18). While He had not ascended when He spoke these words, His ascension was imminent, and the reception and exercise of this authority was so certain, He could state that He had already received it.

The apostles of the AD 70 theology apparently do not believe that Jesus received all authority when He ascended on high and was seated at the Father’s right hand. They must believe He at first had only limited authority, which then grew to perfection over the next four decades. If they profess to believe that the Father gave Him all authority at the time He occupied David’s throne, the authority was largely useless until AD 70. By their reckoning, His kingdom, which began concurrently with His reign, only limped along in impotence for forty years. The fact of the matter is that both His authority and His kingdom were invested with full power from their inception.

Paul enlarged upon the authority of Christ. The Father demonstrated His great power...  
... in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all (Eph. 1:20-23).



Note the following from this passage:

- God manifested His power in raising Jesus from the dead.
- God invested His Son with authority/power by seating Him at His right hand.
- The Lord's dominion was/is absolute, not merely superior, but far superior to all other rule, authority, power, dominion, and name.
- This rule encompasses all creatures, whether heavenly or earthly (cf. Mat. 28:18), and all ages.
- His church/kingdom, which is His spiritual body, is particularly under His absolute headship.
- The church/kingdom/body is His "fullness."
- The church/kingdom/body "filleteth all in all."

Paul wrote the Ephesian letter some eight or ten years before Jerusalem was destroyed. He must not have believed in realized eschatology, for he said that the church/kingdom was the "fullness" of Jesus that "filleteth all in all." By this we understand that the church is the full expression of all that Jesus came to provide for mankind. Paul made the same point when he wrote that God has "blessed us with every spiritual blessing...in Christ" (Eph. 1:3). We don't see in such passages any insufficiency, weakness, or lack of glory or power in the kingdom, as promoted by the AD 70 peddlers.

It is absurd to attempt to separate the glory, power, and completeness of Jesus' kingdom from the glory, power, and completeness of His rule. The fertile minds of men, not content with the doctrine of Christ, produce such wild conjectures. If His kingdom/church was not complete in its glory and power from its establishment, it must follow that His rule was likewise less than complete. Contrariwise, since His authority was absolute from the time Jesus' sat down at the Father's right hand, His kingdom/church possessed its fullness of glory and power from that same moment – not forty years later.

The Christ would (and does) thus reign in full power (which, in the general sense, includes all mankind, whether in submission or rebellion [Mat. 28:18]). He shall reign until all enemies have been subdued (made His footstool), the last of which is death (1 Cor. 15:25–26). The Lord has conquered death "in principle" by bringing "to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). The universal and final conquest of death will occur when the Lord returns and calls good and evil alike from their tombs (John 5:28–29). Upon this final victory, the Lord will apparently return the royal reign to His Father (1 Cor. 15:27). Per David's

further prophetic statement, the Lord shall until that time rule in the midst of His enemies (Psa. 110:2).

### *Verse 36*

Peter has explained the miraculous incidents, accused the Jews of crucifying the Christ and proclaimed His resurrection, ascension, and coronation. He has cited the prophets and the testimony of credible witnesses as proof of his proclamations, plus reasoning with them about these facts. From all that Peter declared from the moment he stood up with the eleven, he now draws a conclusion: "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." The apostles were not agnostics. The proposition Peter set before "all the house of Israel" was one that they could not only know, but "know assuredly." He thus set before them with absolute certainty the ultimate authority of Jesus (He was Lord, ruler) and the fact that Jesus was their prophesied Messiah (the Christ, the One anointed by God). He reminded them once more that this Lord and Christ was the very one they had crucified fifty days earlier.

By implication, when Peter announced that Christ was on His throne as Lord-Ruler, he proclaimed the beginning of the kingdom. However, the New Testament likewise teaches this fact explicitly. John, Jesus, and the apostles all preached that the kingdom was "at hand" (i.e., nearby) (Mat. 3:2; 4:17; 10:7). More specifically, Jesus declared: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1). The AD 70 advocates argue that this was not fulfilled until AD 70, for until that time the kingdom, though in existence was weak and powerless. It did not "come with power" they aver until the destruction of Jerusalem. They are "dead wrong," however.

Immediately before disappearing in the clouds to return to His Father, Jesus instructed His apostles to wait in Jerusalem after His departure until they received "power from on high" (Luke 24:49). He also identified this reception of power with "the promise of the Father" and baptism in the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:4-5). In the same instructions, the Lord told them they would receive the promised power when "the Holy Spirit is come upon you," after which they were to begin providing their testimony to all the earth, beginning at Jerusalem (v. 8).

From the foregoing we note that the kingdom was to come "with power" and that the power would be theirs with the coming of the Holy Spirit, sent by God and described as a "baptism" (i.e., they would be overwhelmed by the Spirit's power). Thus the Spirit's coming upon the apostles in this unprecedented measure of power would mark the beginning of the

kingdom. The power came upon the apostles (Acts 2:1–4), which marked the time for the kingdom to begin—in AD 30, not AD 70! Far from beginning in weakness and insufficiency, it began in great power. The section of Scripture we have analyzed in this chapter exposes the grievous error of realized eschatology theology. As with the remainder of its doctrinal program, it is utterly wrong in its teaching concerning the kingdom’s gradual gaining of power, glory, and completeness over a forty-year span.

The verses following Acts 2:36 demonstrate what the previous verses of that chapter imply. The church/kingdom Jesus promised to build (Mat. 16:18–19) and proclaimed was “at hand” (4:17) came right “on schedule” and in power and glory—on the first Pentecost following the Lord’s resurrection. Some of those in the apostles’ audience were so deeply convicted by their preaching—led by Peter—that they interrupted his sermon, asking, “What shall we do?” (Acts 2:37). Peter did not tell them (as most modern preachers tell sinners seeking salvation) that, since they obviously now believed in Jesus as the Christ, they need do nothing more to secure their salvation, or at most that they need only say the mythical “sinner’s prayer.” Peter, however, inspired by the Holy Spirit, responded, “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,” after which he continued to testify and exhort the crowd “with many other words” (vv. 38–40). Here, on the church’s “birthday and the day of the kingdom’s establishment, we see declared and enacted the plan of salvation for alien sinners that will endure until the Lord ends time and material by His glorious return. Regardless of the popular doctrines of men that teach otherwise, the New Testament provides no other plans by which men can gain access to the cleansing power of Jesus’ blood. I urge readers who have not submitted to King Jesus in obedience to Peter’s proclamation on Pentecost to do so with all haste.

Verse 41 records the response: About 3,000 of the vast multitude in Jerusalem “gladly received” (KJV) the Lord’s instruction through Peter and were baptized in order to be forgiven of their sins, thus saved. To this number the Lord continued (and continues) to add others daily as they were/are saved (v. 47). To what did He add these on that day? While the King James Version says He added them “to the church,” the literal rendering of Luke’s record is simply “the Lord added to them,” correctly reflected in the American Standard Version. However, subsequent passages clearly demonstrate that the church is that to which the Lord added on that day (and has continued to add) confessing believers who repent and are baptized in order to be saved (Acts 4:4, 23, 32; 5:11, 14; 6:1, 7; 8:1, 3; 9:26, 31; 11:22; et al.). Paul described

the same process in reminding members of the Colossian church the way they had become such: God "...delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love" (Col. 1:13).

The remission of sins/salvation the 3,000 received upon Pentecost was not an incomplete, "beginning" degree of pardon that would gradually increase until it attained fullness in AD 70. No, their forgiveness of and salvation from their previous sins was complete as they arose from baptism to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:3-4); they were then fully "born of water and the Spirit," thereby entering the kingdom of God (John 3:5). Likewise, the church to which the Lord added those Pentecostians and the kingdom into which the Father translated them was complete in its power and glory to serve the Lord's will until the time when He will return and deliver it to the Father for all eternity (1 Cor. 15:24). The Lord did not establish – nor did He add obedient souls to – an entity for forty years that was weak, second-class, and imperfect. The very suggestion that the Lord would be a part of establishing any such thing is reprehensible.

### Conclusion

By God's power, the prophet Daniel saw and wrote of many marvelous and amazing visions and interpreted dreams with truly historical meanings. One of his very interesting visions is the following:

I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed (Dan. 7:13-14).

Some commentators see in this vision figurative speech concerning various persons and events related to Daniel's time. The AD 70 errorists hold this to be a description of the "coming of the Lord" in the destruction of Jerusalem. In the first place, to so believe, they must reverse the direction the "son of man" was traveling; He was **going to** "the ancient of days," not **coming from** Him. In the second place, the Lord did not bodily "come" when He brought judgment upon Jerusalem. In the third place, He received His kingdom upon His ascension ten days before the Pentecost of Acts 2, as we have proved.

Daniel's vision appears simply to be a beautiful prophetic picture of the ascension and coronation of the Lord Jesus Christ. Note that when the Lord came before the Father, He was given exceeding power and **a kingdom** in keeping with such power. Moreover, this kingdom

matches perfectly in power, glory, and duration with the kingdom foreseen in Nebuchadnezzar's first dream, interpreted by Daniel:

And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these (Dan. 2:44).

This everlasting, powerful, and glorious kingdom was thus given to the Lord upon His ascension, **forty days** after His crucifixion. The Max King disciples say that this powerful, glorious, and complete kingdom was given to Him when the Roman general, Titus, overran the walls of Jerusalem and laid it waste, **forty years** after the Lord died. No, when He ascended He was crowned "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15)—and He was given a kingdom/church that fully comported to that great power and glory.

Paul described some false teachers and their doctrines in the Galatian churches, which description well fits the adherents of realized eschatology and their errors:

I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, if any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema (Gal. 1:6–9).

As with the scribes and Pharisees of old whom Jesus so severely chastised, so with the adherents of realized eschatology: They compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, they make him twofold more a son of hell than themselves (Mat. 23:15). It never ceases to amaze me what some folk will believe—as long as it is not in the Bible.

### Endnote

All Scripture quotations are from the American Standard Version unless otherwise indicated.

[**Note:** I wrote this MS for and presented a digest of it orally at the Bellview Lectures, hosted by the Bellview Church of Christ, Pensacola, FL, June 12-16, 2015. It was published in the book of the lectures, *Refuting Realized Eschatology*, ed. Michael Hatcher (Pensacola, FL: Bellview Church of Christ).]

**Attribution:** From *thescripturecache.com*; Dub McClish, owner and administrator.