

Applying the Touchstone and Lodestar of *Scripture* To The Morassy Foundation and Principles of *Preterism*

Chapter 9

Matthew 26:64

Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Matthew 26:64

"Jesus says to him [Caiaphas], Thou hast said. Moreover, I say to you, From henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." (Matt. 26:64)

Alluding here to both Psalm 110:1 and Daniel 7:13, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the King of the Jews, "declares that in the future, He will be manifested in the glory of Israel's Messiah coming to earth to reign."—Stanley D. Toussaint (*Behold the King: A Study of Matthew*, p. 307. Multnomah Press, 1981).

"Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I put thine enemies as footstool of thy feet. Jehovah shall send the sceptre of thy might out of Zion: rule in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in holy splendour." (Psalm 110:1-3a)

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like a son of man, and he came up 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 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)

Now Preterists hold that the Lord's address here was intended to be strictly *personal* to Caiaphas the high priest (and perhaps to all those present at the "trial" before the high priest and the Sanhedrin?), promising that he himself would see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven in power and great glory to establish His kingdom. *Therefore* (they say), the coming of the Son of Man to establish His kingdom *must have been* fulfilled in the lifetime of Caiaphas—specifically in, or immediately after, the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, in 70AD.

Recall, once again, that "partial" Preterists hold to a *non-literal, non-personal, non-physical, providential Second Coming of Christ* in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD; whereas "full" Preterists claim to hold to a literal (!), personal, physical Second Coming of Christ in, or immediately after, the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD. **But, in either brand of Preterism, *the kingdom inaugurated at His 70AD Second Coming is mysticalized/spiritualized.* [Of course, the "partial" Preterist notion is also contradicted entirely, e.g., by Matt. 24:29-31. The Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD cannot *be* the providential Second Coming; nor can it be the *result* of the providential Second Coming. For the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory is declared by Scripture to take place *after—immediately after—*"the tribulation of those days,"**

which, in the spiritual alchemy of Preterism, *is the very destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD*. To thus teach that the destruction of Jerusalem takes place after the destruction of Jerusalem is utter nonsense!]

And it has already been demonstrated at some length that the Preterist *approach or methodology* is a *selective, isolated, pseudo-literal* one (2 Pet. 1:20), which *reads into* their select texts *that which cannot be found there or anywhere else* in God's Word, and which *mysticalizes* the kingdom, and *overthrows* the *genuinely* plain, normal, literal sense of *all other prophetic scriptures*—including, e.g., the myriad of OT prophecies, and the very Olivet Discourse itself and the book of Revelation as a whole—bearing on the future of Israel, the promised kingdom, the coming of Christ, etc. etc. As such, the Preterist take on Matt. 26:64, e.g., is completely illegitimate and cannot possibly be true.

Another point to note is this: Preterists *mysticalize* Daniel's 70th week/the Tribulation Period/Matt. 24 of the Olivet Discourse as *referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD*, based on their *selective, isolated, pseudo-literal eisegesis* of Matt. 26:64 (24:34, 16:28, and 10:23), which they imagine requires the Lord to have returned *specifically* in 70AD (which has been shown to be absolutely false and unsupported). Further, this is a blatant case of **circular reasoning**. For Preterists *mysticalize* Matt. 24 of the Olivet Discourse *based on* their view of Matt. 26:64 (along with 16:28, 24:34, and 10:23); but they *justify* their 70AD view of Matt. 26:64 (16:28, 24:34, and 10:23) *based on* their *mysticalizing* of Matt. 24 of the Olivet Discourse!

"Jesus says to him [Caiaphas], Thou [singular] hast said. Moreover, I say to you [plural, Jews as a whole], From henceforth ye [plural, Jews as a whole] shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." (Matt. 26:64)

There are, of course, only two options in understanding this text: a false one (of which there could be many) and the true one.

(A) False Option: The Preterist view has been shown, and will further be shown, to represent a false option, which entails an *eisegetical* interpretation in *isolation* from all other scripture revelation on the subject (including the Olivet Discourse itself), and particularly as to the nature of the kingdom (i.e., *each and every single* OT covenant, prophecy, promise to His earthly people Israel concerning a literal earthly kingdom is *mysticalized* or *alchemized* into a mere "spiritual" kingdom). The Preterist view, therefore, in no way follows a genuinely literal interpretation. It is an *eisegetical, isolated*, and thus a gravely erroneous and *pseudo-literal* interpretation.

(B) The True Option: The Lord's prophetic declaration was addressed, not merely to Caiaphas *personally*, but to *the Jews as a whole* ("you" is plural)—*as representative* of those Jews living during, and to the end of, the (necessarily) *yet future* Tribulation Period/70th week of Daniel (not simply the elect/godly Jewish remnant, but all the tribes of the land), who will be alive to see the sign of (consisting of) the Son of Man in heaven, literally, physically, personally coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory (Matt. 24:30; **and cf. Rev. 1:7**). "They would see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory, and then all the [Jewish] tribes of land (of the land of Israel . . .) shall wail because of Him, returning in glory. The faithful remnant sharing in a general way the fate of the nation, but delivered from their unbelief, will mourn, we know in another manner (Zech. 12:10-14), looking upon the One whom they had pierced."—J.N. Darby. This is in perfect accord with all other scripture revelation on the subject, including the nature of the kingdom. It is in perfect harmony with all other scripture (2 Pet. 1:20), including the immediate context, and thus the correct and genuine literal interpretation.

It has already been conclusively shown that the period of time covered by Matt. 24 (Mark 13 and Luke 21:8-11, 25-36) of the Olivet Discourse is necessarily, the post-70AD, and thus yet future, Tribulation Period/70th week of Daniel (the reader is directed to the discussions under Matt. 24:34 and Matt. 16:28 for careful consideration in this regard; particularly on the key bearing of Matt. 24:15 and Luke 21:12). Therefore, the coming of the Son of Man in Matt. 26:64 and Matt. 24:29-31 must be fulfilled sometime subsequent to 70AD . . . and after the accomplishment of the 70th week of Daniel.

As such, even the selective, isolated, pseudo-literal Preterist view of Matt. 26:64 must be fulfilled sometime subsequent to 70AD . . . and after the accomplishment of the 70th week of Daniel, whenever that might be.

This leads to the next point . . .

"Jesus says to him [Caiaphas], Thou [singular] hast said. Moreover, I say to you [plural, Jews as a whole], From henceforth ye [plural, Jews as a whole] shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." (Matt. 26:64)

Assuming for the sake of argument that the absurd Preterist view of Matt. 26:64 is correct—insofar as, the Lord's address here was intended to be strictly *personal* to Caiaphas the high priest (and perhaps to all those present at the “trial” before the high priest and the Sanhedrin?), promising that he himself would see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven in power and great glory to establish His kingdom—***it still in no way entails Preterism; i.e., the coming of the Son of Man and establishment of His kingdom in the destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD.*** For Matt. 26:64 says *not one word* as to when the Son of Man would come; though it has been conclusively shown (see discussions under Matt. 24:34 and Matt. 16:28) that it would ***have to be sometime subsequent to 70AD . . . and after the accomplishment of the 70th week of Daniel, whenever that might be.*** Preterism/“70ADism” is thus absolutely ruled out.

Further, there is absolutely *no statement or promise* of the Lord in Matt. 26:64, or anywhere else for that matter, which indicates that Caiaphas would be “kept from dying” until 70AD, or that he would be “kept from dying” only until 70AD. Nor is there one word in Matt. 26:64 which indicates that Caiaphas would see the coming of the Son of Man to establish His kingdom *while he was still alive*, or while he was still alive *on this earth*—i.e., that he would be “kept from dying,” or that he would be *kept on this earth, until* he saw the coming of the Son of Man to establish His kingdom. (All such preterizing notions have been *assumed and read into* the text *without any scriptural basis whatsoever.*)

Rather (still assuming for the sake of argument the basic correctness of the Preterist view), the Lord's declaration in Matt. 26:64 simply requires that Caiaphas see “the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.” But He gives not the slightest suggestion as to *when* that would be (certainly not 70AD).

As such, this yet leaves *two possibilities . . . actually the only two tenable positions* (though there can be a slight variation of a detail or two within the scenarios of these only two tenable positions) . . . that Preterists may adopt, and one of which they *must* adopt, *under* their absurd, isolated, pseudo-literal view of Matt. 26:64 (i.e., insofar as, the Lord's address here was intended to be strictly *personal* to Caiaphas the high priest [and perhaps to all those present at the “trial” before the high priest and the Sanhedrin?], promising that he himself would see *the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory to establish His kingdom*):

(1) That is, the Lord's affirmation entails that He would, and has, miraculously kept Caiaphas alive for the past 2,000 years and will continue to do so until he sees the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. Where is he being kept alive? The text does not say; but if he became a believer later in life, then presumably he is alive in Paradise/the third heaven; otherwise he is alive in Sheol/Hades. Thus, the Lord (in making good on His affirmation that Caiaphas would “see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven”) has been miraculously keeping him alive as such for the past 2,000 years (whether in Heaven or Hades)—*until he is returned to this earth after (or perhaps just prior to) the completion of the Tribulation Period/Daniel's 70th week, in order to “see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven” to establish His literal kingdom on this earth.*

(2) Caiaphas did die in the first century, perhaps even prior to 70AD. Nonetheless, the Lord's affirmation entails that Caiaphas will be given to see (whether as an unbeliever or as having become a believer later in life) the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory after the completion of the yet future Tribulation Period/Daniel's 70th week. If Caiaphas became a believer later in life, *then he will return with the Lord (or perhaps just prior to His return)* and will thus, in his resurrected body, “see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven” to establish His literal kingdom on this earth. If Caiaphas never repented, believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, *then from Sheol/Hades he will miraculously* be given to “see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven” to establish His literal kingdom on this earth.

These two positions (with whatever slight variation is espoused) are the *only two tenable* ones that Preterists may adopt, and one of which they *must* adopt, *under* their absurd, isolated, pseudo-literal view of Matt. 26:64. But either one is a self-defeating position! For Preterism/70ADism is thus absolutely ruled out by the very Preterist view of Matt. 26:64!

Therefore, either, one of these two positions represents the true fulfillment of Matt. 26:64—in which case Preterism/70ADism disproves itself . . . collapses of its own weight . . . perishes in the ash heap; or the true position is that which recognizes that the Lord here spoke prophetically, not merely to Caiaphas *personally*, but to *the Jews as a whole* (“you” is plural), *as representative* of those Jews living during, and to the end of, the (necessarily) *yet future Tribulation Period/70th week of Daniel*, who would thus see the Son of Man coming literally, physically, personally on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory (Matt. 24:30; and cf. Rev. 1:7)—in which case, again, Preterism/70ADism is sent packing to return to *never never land*. Either way, *Futurism* is the end result!

Given the Preterist mysticalizing methodology in approaching the scriptures, it is *impossible* for that system to conclusively *disprove*, *either logically or biblically*, the self-defeating positions outlined above. It would be interesting and instructive to behold the *manner* of their attempt!

“And then [immediately after the tribulation of those days, v. 29] shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the land lament, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.” (Matt. 24:30)

“Jesus says to him [Caiaphas], Thou [singular] hast said. Moreover, I say to you [plural, Jews as a whole], From henceforth ye [plural, Jews as a whole] shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.” (Matt. 26:64)

“Behold, He comes with the clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they which have pierced Him, and all the tribes of the land shall wail because of Him. Yea, amen.” (Rev. 1:7)

One final observation . . .

Why do Preterists *not* use Rev. 1:7 as a *fifth* “proof” text in support of their 70ADism? That is, why do they not use Rev. 1:7 in same way that they use Matt. 26:64 to claim that the coming of the Son of Man to establish His kingdom *must have been* fulfilled in 70AD? To be sure, they do preterize Rev. 1:7 via their mysticalizing method of interpretation; but they do not appeal to Rev. 1:7, as they do to Matt. 26:64, in order to claim proof of a *necessity* for a 70AD fulfillment of the coming of the Son of Man. Why not?

When it comes to Matt. 26:64, Preterists hold that the Lord’s address was intended to be strictly *personal* to Caiaphas the high priest, promising that he himself would see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven in power and great glory to establish His kingdom; *therefore* (they say), the coming of the Son of Man to establish His kingdom *must have been* fulfilled in the lifetime of Caiaphas—specifically in, or immediately after, the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, in 70AD.

When it comes to Rev. 1:7, why is it that Preterist do not similarly argue that the passage was intended to be strictly *personal* to “*they which pierced Him . . . all the tribes of the land*,” promising that *they would all see* the Lord Jesus Christ *coming with the clouds* to establish His kingdom; and *therefore*, His coming *must have been* fulfilled in the lifetime of “*they which pierced Him*”—specifically in, or immediately after, the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, in 70AD?

For the very simple reason that, “they which pierced Him . . . all the tribes of the land” refers to *the Jews*; and if Preterist applied the same *absurd, eisegetical, isolated, pseudo-literal* methodology to Rev. 1:7 as they do Matt. 26:64, then they would end up with a promise entailing that *all of the Jewish contemporaries of Christ*, “they which pierced Him . . . all the [Israelite] tribes of the land,” would “*see Him coming with the clouds*”—which means that *every single Jew* alive at the time of the crucifixion of their King *would have to be alive in 70AD*, so as to “*see Him coming with the clouds*.” But the facts of Scripture and profane history obviously demonstrate that not all of the Jews alive at the time of the crucifixion of their King lived to 70AD. Far from it.

Thus even Preterists recognize that their *absurd, eisegetical, isolated, pseudo-literal* methodology will not work with Rev. 1:7 . . . and that “they which pierced Him” cannot be interpreted in a strictly *personal* sense, but in a *representative* sense (of the Jews as a whole, as a people, *just as in Matt. 26:64*). But such recognition does not stop them from blatant *inconsistency*—in attempting to foist their absurd methods on Matt. 26:64!

James M Ventilato
December 28, 2004
Updated: July 4, 2013