

Examining Realized Eschatology
Part 5: Overlapping Covenants: 1 & 2
Hebrews 8:7-13

I. INTRODUCTION: 1

1. **2** We continue to examine the false teaching: realized eschatology (aka, 70 A.D. doctrine).
2. We noted the five major errors of RE:
 - A. Christ's second coming is past.
 - B. Final judgment is past.
 - C. End of the world is past.
 - D. Spiritual adultery.
 - E. Denies the resurrection of the dead.
3. In this series of lessons we will examine the primary tenets of *Realized Eschatology* (Gal. 1:8-9).
4. **3** In this lesson we will consider *The End of the World*.

II. DISCUSSION:

I. 4 Overlapping covenants:

- A. In the introduction we noted one of the five major errors of RE was its teaching that during the ~40-year period from the death of Christ (~A.D. 30) until the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) the Old and New Covenants were both in effect simultaneously.
- B. In RE lingo this ~S40-year period is called the "eschaton."
 - (1) According to RE, at the death of Christ the Old Covenant was only "ready to vanish away" (Heb. 8:13).
 - (2) Thus, during the eschaton the Old and New Covenants "overlapped" (Gal. 4:21-31) as the Old Covenant was being *transformed* into the New.
 - (3) In other words, Jesus' death on the cross began a process whereby the Old Covenant began "dying" in order to be "resurrected" as the New Covenant in 70 A.D. Consider these quotations from RE's chief patron, Max King:

******"The words 'ready to vanish away' are very significant in this passage (i.e., Heb. 8:13, cvt), showing that the Old Covenant world continued several years after the cross. Its final end came with the fall of Jerusalem, and this event marked the passing of heaven and earth." (SOP-I, p. 298)

******"Christianity was in existence before A.D. 70, but it was not yet fully developed and ready to replace the old." (McGuiggan-King Debate, p. 26)
- C. As one reads the arguments promulgated by RE advocates concerning this aspect of their teaching there are many avenues of discussion, much redefinition of word meanings, and a general striving "about words to no profit" (2 Tim. 2:14).
 - (1) It easily makes one intellectually dizzy.
 - (2) One quickly realizes the exercise is akin to eating half-jelled Jell-O with a toothpick.
 - (3) However, after wandering through this confusing maze one very simple, yet profound, fact is clear: RE teaches the Old and New Covenants overlapped and co-existed during the eschaton (~30-70 A.D.).
 - (4) Indeed, "there is a dead cat on the line somewhere"!

2. Four major errors of the eschaton:

A. **5 Error #1:** Wrong timeline:

- (1) RE's timeline for the eschaton is wrong and condones spiritual adultery: RE's focal point for the removal of the Old Covenant is 70 A.D. while the Bible's focal point is the cross. In Ephesians 2:14-16 Paul wrote:

****14** For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation, **15** having abolished in His flesh the enmity, that is, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man from the two, thus making peace, **16** and that He might reconcile them both to God in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity.

- (2) **6** Paul identifies the source of the "enmity" as "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (v. 15): the Law of Moses.
- (3) To "abolish" means "to render idle, unemployed, inactive, inoperative; to cause to cease, put an end to, do away with, annul, abolish" (Thayer).
- (4) Thus, Paul describes the abolishment of the Law of Moses, or Old Covenant, taking place at least 6-8 years before 70 A.D. (Ephesians written ~62-64 A.D.)
- (5) The parallel passage of Colossians 2:13-14 clearly identifies the cross as the end of the Old Covenant not 70 A.D. Once again, listen to the apostle:

****13** And you, being dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He has made alive together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses, **14** having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.

- (6) Like Sabbatarians, RE advocates seek to evade the clear teaching of this passage claiming "the handwriting of requirements" wasn't the Mosaic Law, but the bond or agreement by the Jews to keep the ordinances (*The Cross and the Parousia of Christ*, p. 154).
- (a) Such a tactic doesn't work because Paul clearly identifies the "enmity" that was "abolished in His flesh" in Ephesians 3:15 as "the law of commandments contained in ordinances."
- (b) Even if Paul was referring to "the bond or agreement of the Jews to keep the ordinances" in Colossians 2:15 (which he was not), Ephesians 3:15 leaves no "wiggle room" to sidestep the clear teaching that the Law of Moses ended at the cross.
- (c) On the contrary, Paul is referring to the Law of Moses in both passages and RE advocates are desperate try to evade the clear force of truth in Colossians 2:13-14.
- (7) **7** Let us consider more passages that have an important bearing on the timing issue of the end of the Old Covenant and the beginning of the New. Hebrews 9:16-17 reads:

****16** For where there is a testament, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. **17** For a testament is in force after men are dead, since it has no power at all while the testator lives.

- (a) ****** When will your father's will go into effect?
- (b) Did it go into effect upon his death or 40 years later? You know the answer.
- (c) When did Jesus' will go into effect? Did it go into effect upon His death or 40 years later? You know the answer unless you are confused by RE theorists.

- (8) **8** If RE advocates are correct that the Old Covenant remained in force until 70 A.D. then truly mankind was subject to two covenants simultaneously. But Romans 7:1-6 tells us this is impossible unless one is a spiritual adulterer. Romans 7:1-6 reads:

9 *I Or do you not know, brethren (for I speak to those who know the law), that the law has dominion over a man as long as he lives? 2 For the woman who has a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives. But if the husband dies, she is released from the law of her husband. 3 So then if, while her husband lives, she marries another man, she will be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she has married another man. 4 Therefore, my brethren, you also have become dead to the law through the body of Christ, that you may be married to another — to Him who was raised from the dead, that we should bear fruit to God. 5 For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions which were aroused by the law were at work in our members to bear fruit to death. 6 But now we have been delivered from the law, having died to what we were held by, so that we should serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the oldness of the letter.*

- (a) **10** A woman is “bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives.” (v. 2)
- (b) She is only free to marry another man “if her husband dies.” (v. 2)
- (c) What does the death of her husband mean?
 - (i) It means she is free to marry another. Why is she given this freedom?
 - (ii) Because when her husband dies “she is released from the law.” (“released”: she is discharged, the prohibition is rendered ineffective, Vine)
 - (iii) But if she “marries another man” while her husband still lives, “she will be called an adulteress.” (v. 3) Why?
 - (iv) Because she is still “bound by the law.” (v. 2; held by an obligation)
- (d) **11** Christians “are married to another—to Him who was raised from the dead” (v. 4; i.e., Christ).
 - (i) How is that possible? I thought one had to be “released from the law” to be “married to another”?
 - (ii) It is only possible if “we have been delivered from the law, having died to what were held by...” (v. 6)
 - (iii) We can only be married to Christ (i.e., the New Covenant) if we “have become dead to the law through the body of Christ” (v.4).
 - (iv) It is only possible if the Law of Moses, Old Covenant, is no longer operative!
- (e) In Paul’s illustration the Old and New Covenants are clearly parallel with the two husbands of Romans 7:1-6.
 - (i) In the physical realm a woman cannot be married to another husband unless the first husband dies.
 - (ii) If the woman marries the second husband while her first husband remains alive she is guilty of adultery.
 - (iii) The same is true in the spiritual realm.
 - ☛ To be married to Christ and seek to simultaneously try to adhere to the Old Covenant was to commit spiritual adultery.

- ☛ The Roman Christians (both Gentiles and Jews) were only free to marry Christ because “we have been delivered from the law” (v. 6).
- ☛ Interestingly, “delivered” here is the same Greek word as “abolished” in Ephesians 2:15.
- ☛ **The Roman Christian’s marriage to Christ could only become legitimate once the Old Covenant was “abolished,” made “null and void” (Robertson’s *Word Pictures in the New Testament*).

(9) **12** RE advocates also twist Hebrews 8:13 in an attempt to prove the Old Covenant did not end at the cross, but the cross only marked the beginning of a ~40-year period in which it began to “vanish away” not ultimately meeting its end until 70 A.D.

(a) For example, on page 223 of Max King’s book *The Cross and the Parousia of Christ* he states:

**”When the writer of Hebrews wrote (i.e., Heb. 8:13, cvt) the consummation of the old aeon had not taken place. The Old Covenant was ‘ready to vanish away...The phrase ‘is ready to vanish away’ was from the writer’s point of view, an anticipation of the imminent, age-consummating coming of Christ” (i.e., Christ’s coming in 70 A.D.).

(b) ** To the careless Bible student this explanation may possess a whiff of plausibility, but it cannot withstand the examination of sound biblical exegesis.

(c) **13** The context of Hebrews 8:13 is a contrast between the Old and New Covenants as the Hebrew writer quotes from Jeremiah 31:31-34 which was written about 600 years earlier.

(d) In Hebrews 8:13 the Hebrew writer is clarifying a point he made previously (Heb. 8:8) when he says:

v. 8: “He says: ‘Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah...’”

v. 13: “In that He says, ‘A new covenant,’ He has made the first obsolete. Now what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away.”

(e) ** The question of importance to our discussion is not if the Old Covenant “is becoming obsolete and growing old” or “is ready to vanish away.”

(f) The important question is: When did this happen?

(a) **14** RE advocates assert this “vanishing away” occurred during the eschaton from 30-70 A.D.

(b) However, the text says the obsolescence and vanishing away of the Old Covenant began at the time when God said, “Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah” (see Heb. 8:8 and 8:13).

(10) When did God make this pronouncement?

(a) ** The pronouncement was not made by the Hebrew writer in the first century A.D.; rather it was made by God through the prophet Jeremiah six centuries earlier!

(b) So, at the very moment 600 years before Christ when God said, “Behold, the days

are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant,” marked the time when “He has made the first obsolete” and “ready to vanish away.”

- (11) **15** The law was just a temporary measure serving as a “tutor” until “*faith has come*” (Gal. 3:25).
- (a) Once “*faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor*” (Gal. 3:25), because the “*law of commandments contained in ordinances*” was “*abolished in His flesh*” (Eph. 2:15).
 - (b) Once again, the RE theory is weighed in the balance and found wanting.
- (12) **16** Furthermore, the Christians to which the inspired writer addressed the Hebrew epistle had “*been sanctified*.”
- (a) These Jewish Christians were already “*partakers of the heavenly calling*”; they were already “*partakers of Christ*” (3:1, 14).
 - (b) These Jewish Christians already had a “*great High Priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God*” (Heb. 4:14); they already had a “*High Priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek*” (Heb. 6:20).
 - (c) Their High Priest (4:14) and Mediator (9:15) was not a prospect to be realized in 70 A.D., but a reality at the time the epistle was written (pre-70 A.D.).
- (13) **17** So, by which “*will*” then had these folks been “*sanctified*”?
- (a) Was it the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses which was dedicated with the sprinkling of animal blood (9:18-22; Ex. 24:3-8).
 - (b) Or, was it the New Covenant which was “*purchased by the blood of Christ*”? (Matt. 26:28; Acts 20:28)
 - (c) The Hebrew writer informs us the old will, the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses was only “*a shadow of the good things to come*” (10:1).
 - (d) The Old Covenant could not make “*those who approach perfect*” (10:1) because its sacrifices, “*the blood of bulls and goats*,” could not “*take away sins*” (10:1, 3).
 - (e) Thus, if the Hebrew Christians had been “*sanctified*” by that “*will*” (i.e., the Old Covenant) their sanctification would rest on a faulty (8:7) and “*obsolete*” (8:13) covenant, on “*the blood of bulls and goats*” which “*can never...make those who approach perfect*” (Heb. 10:1-4).
 - (e) **18** On the contrary, Jesus came to establish a New Covenant, which was a “*better covenant...established on better promises*” (8:6).
 - (f) How did He establish this New Covenant? He did so through His complete obedience: “*Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God.*” (10:9)
 - (g) And in doing so Jesus took “*away the first (Old Covenant, cvt) that He may establish the second*” (New Covenant, cvt) (10:9).
 - (h) By which “*will*” then had these folks been “*sanctified*”?
“*By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all.*” (10:10)
 - (i) Which “*will*” was that?
 - (i) It was certainly not the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses because that “*will*” was ratified with “*the blood of calves and goats*” (8:19).

- (ii) No, the “will” by which these folks were “*sanctified*” was the one established on the shed blood of our Savior (9:15; 12:24; cf. Matt. 26:28).
 - (j) For RE to assert that somehow the Old Covenant overlapped the New is blatantly false and an affront to God’s great scheme of redemption based on the precious blood of Jesus Christ!
- (14) **19** Let’s summarize this point, the Law of Moses, the Old Covenant, has been:
- ☛ “*taken out of the way,*” because it was “*nailed it to the cross*” (Col. 2:14),
 - ☛ “*abolished in His flesh*” (Eph. 2:15),
 - ☛ Served its purpose as “*our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith*” (Gal. 3:24) and Christ made it inoperative, “*obsolete*” (Heb. 8:13; Matt. 5:17-18).
 - ☛ So that we “*may be married to another*” (Rom. 7:4), “*so that we should serve in the newness of the Spirit*” (Rom. 7:6).
- (a) If the Old and New Covenants overlapped during the ~40-year period from the cross to 70 A.D. Paul was wrong and his inspired illustration in Romans 7:1-6 is erroneous and nonsensical.
 - (b) If RE is correct Jewish Christians were married to two husbands (covenants) at the same time and were committing spiritual adultery.
 - (c) Who do you believe: the inspired apostle Paul or RE advocates?

B. 20 Error #2: Negates the priesthood of Christ:

- (1) Everyone agrees the Levitical priesthood was an essential feature of the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses (Ex. 28:41).
 - (2) If RE theorists are correct that the Old and New Covenants overlapped and the Old Covenant was not fully and finally abolished until 70 A.D., then it **undeniably** follows that the Levitical priesthood was a legitimate institution during the ~40-year period from 30 to 70 A.D.
 - (3) There is only one problem with that: The Bible clearly teaches that was **impossible**. Note Hebrews 7:11-13:

**** II** *Therefore, if perfection were through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise according to the order of Melchizedek, and not be called according to the order of Aaron?*
12 *For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the law. 13*
For He of whom these things are spoken belongs to another tribe, from which no man has officiated at the altar.
- (a) ****** This passage unequivocally states that for Jesus to become a priest there had to be “*a change of the law.*”
 - (b) Jesus was of the tribe of Judah (7:14; Matt. 1:2, 3:2:6; Lk. 3:23-38; Rev. 5:5) “*from which no man has officiated at the altar.*”
 - (c) The Law of Moses, the Old Covenant, **only** allowed those of the lineage of Aaron, the tribe of Levi, to serve as priests (Ex. 28:41).
 - (d) But after the cross and before 70 A.D. God’s word says, “*We have such a High Priest, who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens*” (Heb. 8:1).

- (e) In fact, at least five times in the book of Hebrews the writer identifies Jesus as High Priest and that His priesthood was in effect at that point in time (i.e., post cross, pre-70 A.D.; cf. Heb. 3:1; 4:14-16; 6:20; 7:24-28; 8:1).
- (4) **21** This presents an insurmountable problem for RE advocates: If RE's overlap theory is true, the Levitical priesthood of the Old Covenant and the priesthood of Christ in the New Covenant also overlapped; two orders of priesthood co-existed!
 - (a) However, Hebrews 7:11-14 makes it crystal clear it is impossible for the two priesthoods to overlap and coexist.
 - (b) In order for Christ to serve as priest "*of necessity there also was a change in the law*" (Heb. 7:12).
 - (c) After the cross and prior to 70 A.D. the Bible says, "*We have such a High Priest, who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens*" (Heb. 8:1).
 - (d) But, this could only be true if there had been "*a change of the law.*"
 - (e) Well, there was "*a change in the law,*" because the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses was "*abolished*" (Eph. 2:15) when it was "*nailed to the cross*" (Col. 2:13-14).
 - (f) This ended the Levitical priesthood (Heb. 7:12) and allowed one who "*belongs to another tribe*" (Heb. 7:13) to become "*the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Christ Jesus*" (Heb. 3:1).
 - (g) Once again, RE doctrine is at odds with biblical truth.

C. 22 Error #3: Epistle to the Galatians:

- (1) RE mocks the primary message of Paul's epistle to the Galatians.
 - (a) The epistle to the Galatians makes absolutely no sense whatsoever if RE's Old/New Covenant overlap theory is correct.
 - (b) Paul warned the Galatian Christians they had turned away from the pure and original gospel of Christ "*to a different gospel*" (1:6).
 - (c) What exactly had they done to bring this serious charge, condemnation and warning?
 - (d) They desired "*to be under the law*" (4:21); tried to "*be justified by the law*" (5:4).
 - (e) For them to attempt to follow the Law of Moses was to remain under the "*curse*" of the Law of Moses (3:10).
- (2) Paul plainly states, "*no one is justified by the law*" (3:11) and "*the law is not of faith*" (3:12). So, when did this "*faith*" come of which Paul spoke?
- (3) **23** In Galatians 3:23-25 Paul writes:

23 But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterward be revealed. 24 Therefore the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. 25 But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor.
- (4) ****** Prior to the coming of the "*faith,*" "*we were kept under guard by the law,*" the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses. Why?
 - (a) In anticipation of "*the faith which would afterward be revealed*" (3:23).
 - (b) The "*law*" and "*faith*" are two quite different things (3:12); one ("*law*") is the Old

Covenant, the Law of Moses; the other (*“faith”*) is the New Covenant.

- (e) Justification was not from the Law of Moses (3:11, 24), rather we are *“justified by faith”* (3:24).
- (f) And, once *“faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor,”* we are no longer under the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses.
- (g) Does that sound like an overlap of covenants to you?
- (5) **24** If RE theory is correct about the overlapping of covenants Paul’s message to the Galatians was wrong.
 - (a) The Law of Moses would have been a legitimate system by which the Galatians could serve God.
 - (b) But Paul, in unequivocal terms, condemns their allegiance to the Law of Moses by telling them they had become *“severed from Christ...ye are fallen from grace”* (Gal. 5:4; ASV).
 - (c) Their allegiance to the Law of Moses caused them to be *“hindered...from obeying the truth”* (Gal. 5:7).
- (6) Now I may not be the sharpest crayon in the box, but this epistle makes it clear to me the RE overlap theory would be condemned by the inspired apostle.
 - (a) Thus, RE theory is a *“different gospel”* (Gal. 1:6) than that taught by the inspired apostles and preaching it makes one *“accursed”* (Gal. 1:8).
 - (b) That may seem like harsh words by some, but my only answer is the answer given by Paul: *“Have I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?”* (Gal. 4:16)

D. 25 Error #4: RE Mocks Great Commission:

- (1) The *eschaton*, overlapping of the Old and New Covenants, taught by RE makes a mockery of the Great Commission preaching by the apostles.
 - (a) The book of Acts records the apostles and other preachers going forth preaching the message of the Great Commission (Matt. 28:19-20; Mk. 16:15-16).
 - (b) Many of the sermons recorded in Acts were presented to primarily Jewish audiences.
 - (c) The consistent message preached is that the Jews *“by lawless hands”* had *“crucified and put to death”* the Son of God (Acts 2:23; 3:13-15; 4:10-11; 5:30; 7:52).
 - (d) Furthermore, this man Jesus whom the Jews had put to death *“God has made...both Lord and Christ”* (Acts 2:36), thus, salvation could **NOT** be found anywhere else, *“for there is no name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved”* (Acts 4:12).
- (2) **26** Now, all will agree that the events in the book of Acts transpired during the so-called *eschaton* from ~30-70 A.D.
 - (a) If RE advocates are correct and the Old and New Covenants overlapped during this time period, were co-existent, were both in force; then the preaching recorded in Acts is strange indeed!
 - (b) Peter pleaded with the Jews on the day of Pentecost to *“Repent...and be baptized”* that very day (Acts 2:38).

- (c) Ananias implored the “Hebrew of Hebrews” (Phil. 3:5) Saul of Tarsus, “*why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord*” (Acts 22:16).
- (d) Many other similar examples could be cited.
- (3) My question is simply this: Why the big hurry?
 - (a) **27** Why the insistence “*there is no name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved*”?
 - (b) These men were inspired by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 2) and the Spirit was guiding them into “*all truth*” (Jn. 16:13).
 - (c) If RE is true, surely they knew there was no big rush?!
 - (d) The Jews had ~40 years to mull this Jesus business over before deciding.
 - (e) They were still legitimately, according to RE theory, able to abide in the Law of Moses being guided by the Levitical priests and finding acceptance with God.
 - (f) Who cares if you follow the Levitical priests or Jesus as High Priest; just so you follow one or the other.
- (4) **28** Why did the Jews get so upset with the New Testament preachers and persecute them so fiercely and vehemently?
 - (a) Was it because these preachers were pushing this Jesus business when in fact there was ~40 years in which to make this transition?
 - (b) Or, was it because the Jews understood the apostles’ were preaching that the Old Covenant, the Law of Moses had been “*taken out of the way,*” “*nailed...to the cross*” (Col. 2:14) and “*abolished in His flesh*” (Eph. 2:15).
 - (c) Thus, they were to “*be married to another*” (Rom. 7:4) “*so that [they] should serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the oldness of the letter*”? (Rom. 7:6)
 - (d) Did their resistance and persecution arise from the former or the latter?
 - (e) The answer is clear & obvious it was the latter unless blinded by RE false doctrine.

E. 29 Conclusion: Much more can be said in connection with this aspect of RE doctrine.

- (1) So, I beg you to bear with me for examining another aspect of the RE covenant overlap issue by looking at Paul’s allegory in Galatians 4:21-31.
- (2) ****** According to Max King “That allegory of Paul, Galatians 4, is rich in giving us of the key of the Bible” (*A Study of AD 70 Doctrine*, pp. 65-66).
 - (a) ****** Thus, any examination of RE doctrine would be incomplete without examining Paul’s allegory.
 - (b) But, make no mistake, the arguments outlined will conclusively show the RE overlapping covenant theory does not agree with scripture.
 - (c) RE claims the Bible describes a slow, ~40 year *transition* period where both two covenants coexist.
 - (d) However, our examination of scripture has shown the change in covenants is described, not by transitional language, but by replacement language.

3. **30 Paul's Allegory:**

- A. The RE heresy relies heavily on Paul's allegory in Galatians 4:21-31.
- B. In fact, according to Max King, RE's interpretation of this allegory is so crucial he calls it "the key of the Bible" and writes:
- ****"...this simple allegory (Gal. 4:21-31) establishes the 'Spirit of Prophecy,' confirming prophecy's fulfillment in the spiritual seed of Abraham through Christ (Gal. 3:16, 26-29), and beyond the fall of Jerusalem these prophecies cannot be extended." (SOP-I, p. 239)
- C. ****** Boiling it down, RE doctrine relies on their unique misinterpretation of Paul's allegory in a vain attempt to 'prove' two things upon which their doctrine absolutely depends:
- ① ******The Old and New Covenants overlapped, co-existed, and were in force simultaneously during the *eschaton* from A.D. ~30-70.
 - ② ******Ishmael was Abraham's rightful heir "until" he was "cast out," therefore, the Jews were the rightful heirs of God's promises. Thus, RE claims Paul's allegory proves Christians were given "the place and inheritance of the Jews." (i.e., the Jews were meant to be God's rightful heirs, but due to their national rejection of Jesus, God 'disinherited' the Jews and gave His inheritance to Christians.)
- D. Regarding these points consider the words of RE champion Max King:
- ****"Christianity was in existence before A. D. 70, but it was not yet fully developed and ready to replace the old." (*McGuiggan-King Debate*, p. 26)
- **** "...that the Jewish age came to a close on Pentecost day is another erroneous concept. This is assumed on the basis that Pentecost was the beginning of the Christian Age. The error is in failing to see the overlapping period of these two ages or dispensations. Ishmael and Isaac co-existed in Abraham's house for a time before Ishmael was cast out. The Jewish Age did not end until their city, temple, and state fell under Roman invasion in A.D. 66-73." (SOP-I, p. 79)
- **** "...Ishmael was the first born and, as such, had the right of primogeniture, a right he maintained at the birth of Isaac, and even thereafter until he was cast out or disinherited." (SOP-I, p. 30)

E. **31 Galatians 4:21-31:**

21 Tell me, you who desire to be under the law, do you not hear the law? **22** For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, the other by a freewoman. **23** But he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and he of the freewoman through promise, **24** which things are symbolic. For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gives birth to bondage, which is Hagar — **25** for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children — **26** but the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all. **27** For it is written:

32 "Rejoice, O barren,
You who do not bear!
Break forth and shout,
You who are not in labor!
For the desolate has many more children

Than she who has a husband.”

28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise. **29** But, as he who was born according to the flesh then persecuted him who was born according to the Spirit, even so it is now. **30** Nevertheless what does the Scripture say? “Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.” **31** So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free.

F. 33 Error #1: Covenants did not overlap:

(1) RE is wrong, the Old and New Covenants did not overlap, they were not in force simultaneously:

- (a) The previous section definitively proved this aspect of RE doctrine is diametrically opposed to plain Bible teaching (cf. Rom. 7:1-4).
- (b) In fact, the very allegory in Galatians 4:21-31 RE uses to ‘prove’ their covenant overlapping theory, proves the exact opposite!

(2) To understand Paul’s allegory, one must take two important truths into account.

- (a) **** First:** The very purpose of the letter to the Galatians was to admonish the Galatian Christians not to go back to the Law of Moses for justification “*for if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain.*” (Gal. 2:21)
 - (i) ****** In the letter Paul clearly states, “*the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. 25 But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor.*” (Gal 3:24-25, emphasis mine)
 - (ii) **34** Why would Paul say such a thing?
 - ☛ Because, the Law of Moses had been abrogated, it had been “*blotted out*” (Col. 2:14), it had been “*taken out of the way*” (Col. 2:14), it had been “*nailed to the cross*” (Col. 2:14-15; epistle written ~62 A.D.)
 - ☛ It was no longer God’s law for His people, Christ “*made the first (Old Covenant) obsolete*” and made it “*vanish away*” (Heb. 8:7-13).
 - ☛ Christ “*fulfilled*” “*the Law [and] the Prophets*” (Matt. 5:18) by doing God’s will and in doing so “*He taketh away the first (Old Covenant), that he may establish the second (New Covenant).*” (Heb. 10:9)
 - ☛ ****** Thus, it is “*by that will*” (i.e., New Covenant) that “*we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*” (Heb. 10:10) and “*we have been discharged from the law*” (Rom. 7:6 ASV).
 - (iii) **35** Thus, Paul describes Christians seeking justification in the law: “*Ye are severed from Christ,*” “*ye are fallen from grace*” (Gal. 5:4; ASV).
 - (iv) Therefore, Christians “*are not under the law*” (Gal. 5:18), but, are “*justified by faith*” (Gal. 3:24) and thus “*led by the Spirit.*”
 - (v) The Old and New Covenants could no more “co-exist” than a woman can be married to two husbands at the same time without being “*called an adulteress*” (Rom. 7:1-6, esp. v. 3).
 - (vi) It is no wonder Paul tells the Galatians they had turned to a “*different*” and “*accursed*” gospel (1:6), that they were “*foolish*” and “*bewitched*” (charmed or misled).

- (vii) Their turn back to the Law of Moses meant they were not obeying “*the truth*” (Gal. 3:1). The same is true of RE doctrine, it is “*foolish*,” and “*bewitches*” its followers because it is not “*the truth*”!
- (b) **36 Second:** The very point of Paul’s allegory unequivocally disproves any overlapping of the Old and New Covenants.
 - (i) Leading up to the allegory we’ve already seen that Paul made it crystal clear we are no longer “*under*” the Old Covenant (“*tutor*”) once “*faith has come*” (Gal. 3:25).
 - (ii) As we move into chapter four Paul says that to turn back to the Law of Moses was to “*turn again to the weak and beggarly elements*” and is indicative of a desire “*to be in bondage...again*” (Gal. 4:9).
 - (iii) Then Paul introduces the allegory with: “*Tell me, you who desire to be under the law, do you not hear the law?*” (Gal. 4:21)
 - (iv) These and the other words of this letter are not words from an apostle teaching some cockeyed theory of overlapping covenants.
 - (v) These are words of chastisement, admonishment and rebuke to drive home the point to the Galatian Christians they are no longer under the Law of Moses.
 - (vi) The “*faith has come*,” hence, they “*are no longer under a tutor*” (Gal. 3:25), they are no longer under the Law!
- (3) **37** Paul uses this allegory, with which every Jewish Christian in Galatia would be familiar, as a fitting illustration to prove this vital point. ****Allegory:** a figure which uses characters, events, places, etc. to symbolize things with a deeper moral or spiritual meaning or application.
 - (a) Hagar represents the Old Covenant, Sarah represents the New Covenant, Ishmael represents the Jews under the Old Covenant, and Isaac represents Christians under the New Covenant (Gal. 4:21-31).
 - (b) ****** The point of the allegory is that the Galatian Christians should not “*desire to be under the law*” because that very law taught the Old Covenant (Hagar) and son (Ishmael, the Jews; fleshly descendants of Abraham) had been “*cast out*” and “*the son (Ishmael) of the bondwoman (Hagar) shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.*” (Isaac, children of the promise, i.e., Jew & Gentile Christians; Gal. 4:30; Abraham’s spiritual descendants, **Gal. 3:29:** “*And if you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.*”)
 - (c) ****** These folks were in danger of losing their souls (Gal. 5:4) over what RE teaches as sound doctrine!

G. 38 Error #2: Ishmael was never Abraham’s rightful heir:

- (I) **RE is wrong, Ishmael was never Abraham’s rightful heir and Christians were never given “the place and inheritance of the Jews.”**
 - (a) **First:** RE advocates claim their overlap theory is correct because of their claim Ishmael “had the right of primogeniture.”
 - (i) According to Dictionary.com *primogeniture*, in this sense, means: “the system of inheritance or succession by the firstborn, specifically the eldest son.”

- (ii) Thus, RE theory says, until Ishmael was “cast out” of Abraham’s house he was Abraham’s rightful heir with his tenure as heir “overlapping” that of Isaac.
- (iii) Hence, according to RE, that meant the two covenants overlapped.
- (iv) **39** This claim has one main problem: it is wrong. (“There’s a dead cat on the line!”)
 - ☛ Ishmael was never the “heir” of God’s promise.
 - ☛ Ishmael was never part of God’s plan.
 - ☛ Ishmael was the result of a human scheme (Gen. 16), not a divine plan.
- (v) God’s promise was **always** through the “son of promise” which was Isaac and **never** through Ishmael: **Genesis 17:19-21**:

****19** Then God said: “No, Sarah your wife shall bear you a son, and you shall call his name Isaac; I will establish My covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his descendants after him. **20** And as for Ishmael, I have heard you. Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly. He shall beget twelve princes, and I will make him a great nation. **21** But My covenant I will establish with Isaac” (emphasis mine).
- (vi) **40** Ishmael could never be disinherited by Abraham as it concerns the “promise” since he was **NEVER** an heir of the “promise” to begin with.
- (vii) Furthermore, Sarah “cast out” Ishmael and Hagar, not God! (Gen. 21:10)
- (viii) God approved of the casting out (Gen. 21:12), because Ishmael was **NEVER** part of His plan, “For if those who are of the law are heirs, faith is made void and the promise made of no effect” (Rom. 4:14).
- (b) **41 Second**: RE theory teaches Ishmael was Abraham’s rightful heir, but was “cast out,” hence, the Jews (Ishmael) were the rightful heirs but Christians (Isaac) were given “the place and inheritance of the Jews.” Consider Max King’s words:

******“Christianity is a fulfillment of the prophecies, types and shadows of the law and not merely a ‘fill-in’ between Judaism and another age to come. Abraham had two sons, and there was no gap between them. They (i.e., Old and New Covenants, cvt) overlapped a little, but Isaac ‘came on’ when Ishmael ‘went out.’ The son born of the *spirit* was given the place and inheritance of the son born of the *flesh*. Hence, this simple allegory (Gal. 4:21-31) establishes the ‘Spirit of Prophecy,’ confirming prophecy’s fulfillment in the spiritual seed of Abraham through Christ (Gal. 3:16, 26-29), and beyond the fall of Jerusalem these prophecies cannot be extended.” (SOP-I, p. 239)
- (i) ****** Thus, RE asserts Paul’s allegory establishes the Jews under the Old Covenant (Ishmael) were the rightful heirs of God’s inheritance (i.e., “the promise”).
- (ii) However, due to their national rejection of the Messiah, they were “cast out” by God as evidenced by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.
- (iii) The supposed result of this great calamity was, like Ishmael, the Jews were stripped of their inheritance which was then given to Christians.
- (iv) Once again I do not wish to appear flippant, but there is only one thing wrong with this theory: It is wrong. (**Gal. 2:21**: “...if righteousness comes through the

law, then Christ died in vain.”; **Gal. 3:21**: “Is the law then against the promises of God? Certainly not! For if there had been a law given which could have given life, truly righteousness would have been by the law.”)

(c) **42** The Bible teaches no such thing; please consider the following biblical truths that prove Christians were not given “the place and inheritance of the Jews”:

- ☛ This aspect of RE teaching is based on their faulty assumption Ishmael was Abraham’s rightful heir “until” he was “cast out.”
 - We have already proven from the scriptures Ishmael was never the “heir” of God’s “promise,” because he was **NEVER** part of God’s plan (Gen. 16; 17:19-21).
 - This being true, RE’s attempt to draw a parallel between Isaac’s supposed receipt of Ishmael’s inheritance when he was “cast out” with the Jews being cast out and their “place and inheritance” being given to Christians is pure fiction.
- ☛ The “inheritance” was **NEVER** through the Old Covenant, “but God gave it to Abraham by promise” (Gal. 1:18).
 - If the “inheritance” had been through the Old Covenant “it is no longer of promise” (Gal. 1:18).
- ☛ **43** Romans 4:13-14 makes it crystal clear Christians were not “given the place and inheritance of the Jews”

****Rom. 4:13-14:** “For the promise that he would be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. 14 For if those who are of the law are heirs, faith is made void and the promise made of no effect,”

 - It was impossible for the promise to have been through the law (Hagar/Ishmael), “For if those who are of the law (Ishmael) are heirs, faith is made void and the promise of no effect.” (Rom. 4:14)
- ☛ The “inheritance” was never through “the law” (Hagar/Ishmael) because “it is of faith that it might be according to grace” (Rom. 4:16).
 - **44Why?** This was true “so that the promise might be sure to all the seed, not only to those who are of the law, but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham” (Rom. 4:16; i.e., Jews and Gentiles).
 - If this were not so, the “promise” to bless “all the families of the earth” (Gen. 12:3; Gal. 3:8) would have been a vain and empty promise.
- ☛ **45** Christians did not receive “the place and inheritance of the Jews” because “the righteousness of God” is “apart from the law” (Rom. 3:21).
 - Christians receive “the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ,” because “by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified” (Rom. 3:20-21).
- ☛ **46** Righteousness and justification were **NEVER** meant to be through the Old Covenant, for “a man is not justified by the works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ” (Gal. 2:16).
 - It was God’s eternal plan (Eph. 3:11) that “we might be justified by faith in

Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.” (Gal. 2:16)

- Further, *“if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain.” (Gal. 2:21; cf. Rom. 3:20-21)*
- ☛ **47** Christians did not receive “the place and inheritance of the Jews” because the Old Covenant was only capable of enslaving man in “a yoke of bondage” (Gal. 5:4) because the Law of Moses was **NEVER** a part of the “promise.”
 - God gave the “inheritance” “by promise” not through the law (Gal. 3:15-18).
 - The law contained no “inheritance” only a “curse,” but thankfully *“Christ...redeemed us from the curse of the law...that the blessing of Abraham (i.e., the “promise”) might come upon” us “that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” (Gal. 3:10-13)*
- ☛ **48** Christians did not receive “the place and inheritance of the Jews” because the “promise” which brought the “inheritance” preceded the Old Covenant and was not dependent upon the Old Covenant.
 - The “promise” was made to Abraham through Christ (Gal. 3:16) and then some “four hundred and thirty years later” (Gal. 3:17) the “law...was added” (Gal. 3:19).
 - Thus, *“the law...cannot annul the covenant that was confirmed before by God in Christ, that it should make the promise of no effect” (Gal. 3:17).*
 - ******Certainly “the law” was not “against the promises of God” (Gal. 3:21), but the law could not deliver the “promise” for it could not give “life” or “righteousness” (Gal. 3:21).

H. **49** Paul’s Allegory: Conclusion:

- (1) It is sad how RE advocates have taken Paul’s simple allegory (Gal. 4:21-31) twisted it and turned it completely upside down in a vain effort to support a false theory.
- (2) Think about this very, very carefully:
 - (a) By asserting Christians received “the place and inheritance of the Jews” RE has not merely lost sight of the temporary nature of the Old Covenant (Gal. 3:19, 25); they have completely missed the very purpose of the law! (Gal. 3:19, 24)
 - (b) In doing so, whether realizing it or not, they are saying it would have been possible for God’s ultimate purpose of blessing “all the nations of the earth” (Gen. 22:18) to have been accomplished through the Old Covenant.
 - (c) Such an assertion calls into question God’s eternal purpose to save mankind through the perfect sacrifice of Christ (Eph. 3:11).
 - (d) In fact, such an assertion nullifies the sacrifice of Christ, *“for if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain.” (Gal. 2:21)*
 - (e) That is exactly why Paul told the Galatians seeking justification through the law: *“Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen away from grace.” (Gal. 5:4; ASV)*
 - (f) I’m sure those are bitter pills RE advocates are unwilling to swallow, but nonetheless it is where the logic of their false teaching leads.

III. CONCLUSION: 50

- I. Once again our study has shown a stark contrast between RE doctrine and what is taught in the scriptures.
 - A. Christians are to be guided by God's word (2 Tim. 3:16-17) not the "*doctrines and commandments of men*" (Matt. 15:9).
 - B. RE doctrine is not Bible doctrine, it comes from the mind of men, not the mind of God.
 - C. Hence, to be deceived by the errors of RE is to be turned away to "*a different gospel*" (Gal. 1:6), an "*accursed*" gospel (Gal. 1:8-9).
 - D. RE doctrine is not "*the doctrine of Christ*" (2 Jn. 9) thus those believing and teaching it are "*not abide in the doctrine of Christ*" and thus do "*not have God*" (2 Jn. 9).

2. Harsh? The consequences of wresting the truth are set by God and not by me.

Rom. 16:17-18: "*Now I urge you, brethren, note those who cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine which you learned, and avoid them s. 18 For those who are such do not serve our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by smooth words and flattering speech deceive the hearts of the simple.*"

3. Invitation

References:

1. *A Study of the 70 A.D. Doctrine.* 2006. Edited by Mike Willis; Guardian of Truth Foundation; Bowling Green, KY.
2. Jackson, Wayne. 2005, *The 70 A.D. Theory: A Review of the Max King Doctrine.* Christian Courier Publications; Stockton, CA.
3. King, Max R. 1971 *The Spirit of Prophecy* (1st Edition).
4. King, Max R. 2002 *The Spirit of Prophecy* (2nd Edition).
5. King-Nichols debate, 1973
6. McGuiggan-King Debate. Undated. Warren Letter Shop, Inc.; Warren, OH.
7. Watson-Daly debate. June, 2018. Indianapolis, Indiana.