

Preterism: Not Even On The Radar

*It may be a doctrine in some sense birthed out of Judaism,
but the 'parent' doesn't even seem aware that it has this 'child'.*

Christians most commonly come to the study of the Almighty and His Scriptures from a very narrow and closed perspective. Sadly, they very rarely recognize how narrow and restricted this perspective is.

Some discover, as their knowledge of the Almighty and His ways matures a little, that the Bible (whether we mean the Tanakh (the Old Testament) or the so-called New Testament, or both), needs to be read and studied from a Hebraic perspective to have any real hope of properly appreciating the truths revealed therein.

But it is actually much worse than this.

Christians, through the very nature and central doctrines of the 'Christian' vision of the Creator and His creation, unfortunately are seriously hamstrung by this very restricted worldview, even as they begin to appreciate some of the realities that a Hebraic perspective reveals to them (such as the importance of the Hebraic principle of agency when considering the very nature of the God of Israel).

Such a restricted and blinkered view of the Creator and His creation leads many Christian's, and principally Christian students of the Bible to amazingly far-fetched and fanciful doctrines such as Preterism.

First a basic definition of the two main variants of the doctrine of Preterism.

Full Preterism:

Full preterism believes all prophecies of the Bible, both the Tanakh and the New Testament were fulfilled in AD 70. *"This means there will never be a future second coming, for it already occurred in A.D. 70. Further, there will be no bodily resurrection of believers, which is said to have occurred in A.D. 70 in conjunction with the second coming.... In fact, full preterists say we are not merely in the millennium, but we are now living in what we would call the eternal state or the new heavens and new earth of Revelation 21-22"* (Thomas Ice - *The End Times Controversy*, page 23).

Simply put, Full Preterism argues that Messiah Yeshua returned in 70 CE; and we are now living in the Kingdom of God (also described as the Coming Age or Olam HaBah) and even (for some Full Preterists), that we are in the era of the New Heavens and New Earth.

Partial Preterism:

Partial Preterism argues that most of the end-times prophecies, were fulfilled around 70 CE with the destruction of Jerusalem. Partial Preterism also argues that Yeshua returned in 70 CE (though for the most part in some 'spiritual' sense), and so still agree with a future return as well. *"While partial preterists acknowledge that in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70 there was a parousia, or coming of Christ, they maintain that it was not **the** parousia"* – R C Sproul.

They argue that this was what they call the end of the 'Jewish Age' and that we are now living in the 'Church Age' and the Kingdom of God, the Olam HaBah. Partial Preterists argue that the final Judgement and 'resurrection of the dead' are still future. Consistent with this they therefore reject

that all the promises to the Jewish People that they will be restored to their Land of Israel are now promises to the Church and that therefore the Church is now the 'Israel of God

Resurrection equals the recovery of the "hope of Israel," which had perished. It is life again into the land. Yet the apostles speak of the spiritual sphere.

- Marcus Booker - <http://planetpreterist.com/content/preterism-meets-judaism>

Before I demonstrate how far-fetched; how contrived and fanciful these worldviews are, I think it very wise to pause for a moment and instead reflect on how Jewish scholars within the traditional fold of Rabbinic Judaism (who can trace their historical and theological lineage back over 3,800 years to Father Abraham) approach the Bible and its central messages and doctrines.

To do this I will quote a little from Rabbi Yisroel Blumenthal.

Rabbi Blumenthal has some harsh words to say about Christianity. He however freely acknowledges that there are many great, sincere and loving people within Christendom. Blumenthal though, by approaching Christianity from the theological foundations that Christianity came forth from, is able to demonstrate very emphatically some fundamental errors in Christianity's central doctrines.

He also gives a very simple and yet powerful 4 part approach to analyzing the central claims of Christian and Jewish doctrines. For example, he writes:

- "According to the Jewish Bible (the Tanakh), the deification of any inhabitant of God's earth is idolatry, the greatest rebellion against God.
- The Jewish Bible NEVER associates forgiveness from sin with faith in an individual.
- The Messianic hope presented by the Jewish prophets includes all of mankind and is no way limited to the members of one denomination of Christianity or another.
- And the Messiah of the Jewish Bible will direct everyone's devotion to the One Creator of heaven and earth; not to himself."¹

In an article 'Contra-Brown'², Rabbi Blumenthal explains his 4 step approach:

"Scripture is a lengthy and complex document. The message of scripture cannot be found in the reading of specific isolated passages. Rather, the true message of scripture emerges from an understanding of the totality of scripture. When any given doctrine is presented as a scriptural teaching, there are four basic criteria that should be applied to determine if the doctrine is truly scriptural.

- 1) *We must ask ourselves if the doctrine in question is **fully supported** by scripture. Does scripture support all of the main points of the doctrine? Or are there significant gaps which the proponents of the doctrine must fill in? Does scripture provide **comprehensive support** for the doctrine in question?*
- 2) *Another quality we must look for in our examination of the given doctrine is **clarity**. Is the scriptural support claimed for the doctrine **clear and unambiguous**? Or are there other possible interpretations of the passages marshaled on behalf of the doctrine in question.*
- 3) *A third criteria by which we should judge a specific doctrine is the **directness** of the scriptural support. Are the passages quoted to sustain the theory addressing the issue in a **direct and***

¹ see <http://jewsforjudaism.org.au/resources/blumenthal-series/christianity-unmasked/>

² <http://jewsforjudaism.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Contra-Brown.pdf>

straightforward manner? Or is the scripture discussing another issue altogether.

- 4) *Finally we must ask if the scriptural support for the doctrine is **consistent**. After evaluating the doctrine for comprehensiveness, for clarity and for the direct nature of the support – we must then ask if scripture ever provides a conflicting teaching that is as comprehensive, clear and direct as are the passages cited in support of the doctrine in question.*

When we apply these criteria ... the scriptural support for (many of) the doctrines of Christianity is fragmentary, vague, indirect and inconsistent.”

Rabbi Blumenthal is arguing here that the doctrines of Christianity are

- 1) fragmentary, that is they do not have full and comprehensive support;
- 2) vague, that is they are not clear and unambiguous;
- 3) indirect; that is the passages used to support these doctrines are not direct and straightforward; and
- 4) inconsistent; that is these doctrines are based on and present conflicting and inconsistent evidence and implications.

Blumenthal goes on to give two clear examples.

Firstly, he uses his 4 step approach to evaluate the doctrine of the Trinity and the issue of idolatry that this doctrine introduces:

“In order to establish His relationship with the Jewish people God introduced Himself to the nation as a whole with the words “I am the Lord your God” (Exodus 20:2). This revelation gave the people to understand that there is no power aside from God (Deuteronomy 4:35). This revelation was God’s way of teaching us whom to worship, and through the process of elimination – who we cannot worship.

If the being in question was not present at Sinai, then it does not deserve our devotion (Exodus 20:19, Deuteronomy 4:15). Scripture consistently warns against worshipping - “gods that neither you nor your fathers have known” (Deuteronomy 11:28, 13:3,7,14, 28:65, 29:25, 32:17, Jeremiah 7:9, 19:4) – or “that which I have not commanded” (Deuteronomy 17:3). The clear message of scripture precludes worship of a being that was not revealed to us at Sinai. It is on this basis that the Jewish people cannot accept a teaching which deifies a human being.

***These passages provide full support for the Jewish doctrine.** The entirety of the Jewish doctrine as it relates to this issue is contained in Deuteronomy chapter 4. The Sinai revelation defined for the nation who it is that they are and who it is that they are not to worship – and that is all there is to it – we worship the God who revealed Himself to our ancestors - as our ancestors preserved that revelation.*

***These passages are clear.** It occurred to no-one to dispute the obvious fact that this passage speaks of the issue of idolatry.*

These passages are direct. In these passages God directly commands His people who it is that they are to worship and who it is that they are not to worship.

***And these passages are consistent.** There are no other passages in scripture which are as direct, as clear and as comprehensive as these, that would give us a conflicting view. The Jew can be satisfied that the doctrines of Judaism are indeed scriptural.”*

These comments are part of an article by Rabbi Blumenthal addressing the apologetics of the Trinitarian, Dr Michael L Brown³. Blumenthal then goes on to say:

³ <http://askdrbrown.org/about-dr-brown/ministry-profile>

The verses that Dr. Brown mustered in support of (the Trinity) do not meet any of these criteria.

*In order to support the Christian doctrine which attributes deity to and encourages worship of Jesus, Brown quotes Psalm 110:1, Daniel 7:13, Psalm 45:18, Isaiah 52:13, Isaiah 9:6-7, Exodus 24:9-10, and Genesis 18. Even if we were to grant that Brown's interpretation of these verses is correct (and we shall shortly demonstrate that this is not the case), still, all of **these verses together only provide fractional support** for the doctrines of (the Trinity).*

According to Brown, these verses teach that a person can be God. These verses do not tell us if this is limited to one person or if many persons can be God. These verses do not tell us if this representation of God is co-equal to God or if he is subservient to God. These verses could be used to support the Hindu and Buddhist doctrines of the incarnation of the divine as easily as they could be used in support of the Trinitarian doctrine. And most importantly, these verses do not teach us to worship this representation of God as a deity.

*The scriptural support that Brown presented for the Christian doctrine is **fragmentary and incomplete**.*

*These passages that Brown presented in support of (the Trinity) are **not clear**. Each of these verses can be understood without reference to the Christian doctrine of incarnation.*

*The scriptural support presented ... **is vague and ambiguous**. None of these passages directly address the issue at hand. Not one of these passages is placed in a context which would give us to understand that this is God's teaching on the correct method of worship or to help us understand His nature. **The scriptural support is circuitous and oblique**.*

In light of the limited nature of the Christian proof-texts, and in light of the vague and indirect quality of the support that these passages provide for the Christian doctrine, we recognize that the Christian usage of these passages is inconsistent. The scriptures declare openly and unequivocally that God has no form (Isaiah 40:17, 25) and that no representation of Him is to be worshiped (Deuteronomy 4:15). There is no way that one can say that the Christian doctrine is a consistent scriptural theme."

Blumenthal also addresses that Christian doctrine of the atonement through faith in one man:

"On the issue of atonement, the message of scripture rings loud and clear. Ezekiel 33:10 gives expression to the feeling of hopelessness that overtakes the sinner - "our sins and transgressions are upon us, and we melt away in them, how then shall we live?" The next verse gives us God's response - "Tell them - as I live says the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn away from his sins and live".

The passage goes on to assure the penitent sinner "none of the sins that he committed will be remembered against him" (Ezekiel 33:16). Here the scriptures directly address the feelings of guilt and hopelessness that overwhelm the sinner. God's answer is repentance - a turning away from sin and a new commitment to follow God's Law. The primary and direct purpose of this passage is to address the issue of getting out of the trap of sin and achieving God's forgiveness.

The teaching of scripture on this issue is - repentance. There are quite a number of passages in scripture which directly address the question of the sinner's hope and the answer is always repentance. (Deuteronomy 4:29,30, 30:1-3, - addressing the nation as a collective unit, Isaiah 1:16,17, 55:7, Ezekiel 18:21,22,23, Micah 6:6-8 and the entirety of the book of Jonah all give us clear and direct guidance on the issue of atonement. See also Jeremiah 36:3, Zechariah 1:3, and Job 22:23.)

These passages are comprehensive, they are clear, they are direct and they are consistently affirmed

throughout scripture.

It is on the basis of God's explicit word that the Jewish people reject the Christian theology which denies the efficacy of repentance.

Christians build the scriptural case for the Christian doctrine of atonement upon the passages that describe the various Temple offerings, the Day of Atonement service described in Leviticus 16, Leviticus 17:11, Numbers 35:28, and upon Isaiah 53.

These verses are presented in support of the Christian doctrine which posits that there is no forgiveness for sin without faith in Jesus.

*The support is **not comprehensive**. ... all of these verses together do not tell us that there is no atonement without a blood offering.*

*These passages do not teach that faith in an individual plays any role in the atonement process, and they certainly do not teach that without faith in an individual there can be no atonement. The scriptural support (these passages provide) ... is **fragmentary and incomplete**.*

There is no way that this Christian doctrine (of atonement through faith in Jesus) can be considered the consistent message of scripture."⁴

Now, with this approach and background understanding, I would like to again address the Christian doctrine of Preterism.

If this doctrine is as central and significant as Preterists would have us believe, we should expect to observe that it has comprehensive support from Scripture. That is, that it is a clear theme of Scripture from Genesis onward and not just a revelation from the New Testament.

If it were a clear and significant doctrine in the Hebrew Bible, the Tanakh, or even an implied concept, we could easily point to passages that directly and unambiguously speak to this doctrine. If this were the case, we would also expect it to be a doctrine addressed by mainstream Jewish and Judaic thought.

Instead though, there is not a single direct mention of this doctrine on any leading Jewish theological sites. It is not addressed at all on the very comprehensive site **aish.com** or at **chabad.org** for example⁵. In fact, having searched through a significant number of the top Jewish sites, I can find no direct reference to this doctrine at all. Surely, if it were even hinted at in the Tanakh, some Jewish scholars would have written a book or two, or at least an article on it. The silence is deafening.

These sites address many Christian doctrines, and not only those which are common to both Christianity and Judaism. Perhaps, the failure to address Preterism is because they can not see even a shred of support for this doctrine anywhere in either their Scriptures or other ancient Jewish writings and historical evidence?

This is perhaps even more damning an indictment of the non-scriptural nature of this doctrine, when we consider that Preterism argues for the validity of a number of originally Jewish, rather than Christian doctrines.

⁴ For more on the errors of the 'blood atonement' doctrine and the associated 'original sin' doctrine see "Righteousness Before Messiah" – at <http://circumcisedheart.info/Righteousness%20before%20Messiah.pdf> and 'Original Sin and the Fall of Adam' by Frank Selch – at <http://circumcisedheart.info/christian/Original%20Sin%20and%20the%20Fall%20of%20Adam.pdf>

⁵ Other leading Jewish sites that have I have found no mention of Preterism on are www.Simpletoremember.com, <http://www.outreachjudaism.org/> & <http://www.beingjewish.com/>

Rabbinic Judaism (and the 'proto-Judaism' of the first century of the Common Era) has always acknowledged that the world will eventually experience a day of great judgment (the ultimate Yom Kippur or Day of Atonement⁶), after which there will be a Coming Age; a 'World to Come'; a true Kingdom of God⁷ when the righteous will be resurrected to life eternal and true peace, the Shalom (peace) of the Almighty will be established over the entire world. They have always understood the Tanakh to teach that this Kingdom of God will be ruled by a very special man, a descendent of King David.

Preterism, in arguing that all the 'end-times' prophecies that relate to these events were actually fulfilled in the terrible tragedy of the fall of Jerusalem⁸ in 70 CE, argues that the resurrection of the righteous occurred at this time and that the Kingdom of God has been established from this time and that this very special man, (Jesus) has ruled the earth from this time.

Surely, if these events had occurred, events that Judaism has looked and prayed for, for so long, not only the Jewish scholars, but all Jews and in fact all men and women over the entire face of the planet would know about it.

The reality; the absolute, unquestionable and undeniable reality is that the righteous have not been resurrected. Not in 70 CE, not in any following year up to this point in time in 2013!

For example, Abraham, Moses and King David do not walk amongst us. There is no true peace in this world; a world that murders 50+ million of it's most innocent every year. There is no theocratic government led by a Jewish 'Anointed One' (Messiah).

When the Messianic rule arrives, when the world is ruled from Jerusalem and true shalom is undeniably present there will be no doubt in anyone's mind. It is abundantly clear that, at this point in history and in no age or time since 70 CE has there been a theocratic rule over the entire world.

So when we consider Preterism in light of the 4 step approach that Rabbi Blumenthal advocates, we find that it is fragmentary, far from clear and unambiguous; indirect to the extreme in it's lack of scriptural evidence; not at all straightforward; and most inconsistent in it's implications.

In reality, Preterism is not even on the radar of most well-informed and perceptive people with an evidence-based and reasonably accurate world-view⁹.

So you might well ask, how can otherwise intelligent, sincere and studious people come to believe and advocate such an erroneous doctrine?

I would argue that it is just another classic example of how limited and restricted the standard Christian worldview is. As I intimated in the introduction to this article, a failure to approach the

⁶ For more on this most significant day listen to this Podcast - http://aubreyandpaul.podomatic.com/entry/2012-09-22T19_55_36-07_00

⁷ For more on the Coming Age read 'Resurrected to Life' - <http://circumcisedheart.info/Christian%20site/Heaven%20Booklet%20April%202007.pdf> or listen to the Podcast - <http://circumcisedheart.info/OneGod/Conference08/paul1%20the%20KoG.WMA> and <http://circumcisedheart.info/OneGod/Conference08/KoG%20National%20Conference%202008%20paper%201.pdf>

⁸ I believe that it is an insult to the memory of this great massacre of the Jewish people to suggest that this tragedy was actually the greatest event in the history on mankind (which is the implication if Preterism were true). The Jewish people acknowledge that the fall of Jerusalem was in part a punishment from the Almighty because of the great failure to live by Torah (see Lev 19:18). The Talmud states: "*Why was the Second Temple destroyed? Because of 'sinat chinam', senseless hatred of one Jew for another.*" To suggest that the Almighty would use such an event to also bestow the greatest blessing He offers mankind is ambiguous, and contradictory and suggests He is capricious to the extreme!

⁹ I would argue that any world-view that is not birthed from, and largely based on, the Tanakh must be seriously flawed. Both the revelation of nature and the revelation of mankind point directly to the God of Israel as the Creator of this Universe and the true Father of humanity. Any attempt to create a world-view based on an interpretation of the New Testament as the central foundation, rather than the Tanakh, must by its very nature be a 'castle in the air', an unsupported imagining.

New Testament from a Hebraic and historically contextual vantage point leads to many very false conclusions.

But even more, a failure to begin with the foundational truths that the Tanakh emphatically teaches, before then seeking to understand what additional revelation the NT may provide is even more calamitous¹⁰. This is quite clearly the approach that Preterists employ.

To demonstrate how far out the worldview and perspective of Preterists generally is I would like to briefly critique a little of a Preterist's attempt to persuade orthodox Jews of the possible merit of this doctrine. Following is an excerpt from a blog post on a Preterist website by a 'Marcus Booker'. This is apparently a copy of a comment he posted on a Jewish site (my brief comments are in brackets):

"As for what I believe concerning Jesus, I will tell you. Whether you believe the apostles or not, this message is what they proclaim. Jesus systematically shows how he supersedes the law. (Immediately, he has lost his readers – to even suggest that it is possible that a man, a human being could 'supercede' the Law (Torah) is totally beyond the pale).

He is the covenant incarnate, the word made flesh (Booker is promoting the idolatrous doctrine of the Trinity – again, his readers would award him little credibility for this foundational misunderstanding of the nature of the Almighty).

The law, in all of its particulars, is fulfilled in him. (The argument that Yeshua 'fulfilled the law' in the sense prompted here is not an accurate interpretation of the NT passages that address this issue¹¹). *He is the circumcision, the temple, the holy days, etc.*

He is the nation itself and its restoration (this is clearly over-extended metaphor which is used by many anti-Zionist Christians - as most Preterists must surely be – again, such a statement would find little sympathy, even amongst many Christians). *He is its Messiah.*

Jesus appealed to an original righteousness off of which the law was patterned. The law, then, was a copy and shadow of something better (a pattern given to Moses), which he was about to reveal fully. (Here we see some serious misunderstanding of the writings of the Apostle Paul, including the well-known and very often mis-interpreted Colossians 2:16¹²).

For those who disobey, G-d does not heed their prayers, He hates their new moons and sabbaths, and their fragrant incense is a stench. In the days of the prophets, many in Israel pretended to obey G-d through their adherence to these shadows; their deeds were done to be seen by men. In truth, however, these things and rules which state "Do not handle; do not touch" have no value at restraining fleshly indulgence. (The serious failure to understand what it is about the observance of 'new moons and sabbaths' - observances that God Himself

¹⁰ For some more thinking on this issue and an alternative approach see my article 'Living the Dream: Final Thoughts and New Beginnings' @ <http://luke443.blogspot.com.au/2011/02/living-dream-final-thoughts-and-new.html>

¹¹ The late Prof. David Flusser explains in his seminal book 'Jesus' that to 'fulfill the Torah' was to correctly interpret and enact it and to 'destroy the Torah' was to interpret in incorrectly. It was apparently quite common for Pharisees in arguments with each other to shout 'You are destroying the Torah!' or 'I am fulfilling Torah!'

Two examples that I think illustrate this well are Gal 6:2 and Romans 13:10. Try reading these passages and replacing 'fulfill' with 'correctly interpret and enact' and hopefully you will see what I mean:

Gal 6:2 *"Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the Torah of Messiah."* Romans 13:10 *"Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of Torah."* This context is of course perfectly in harmony with God's pronouncement to Moses that he would send a Prophet who would perfectly declare the Torah (that is, who would 'fulfill' it).

¹² See my article 'Colossians 2:16 and the Sabbath' for more on this - in particular, the misapplication of the 'shadow' reference - <http://circumcisedheart.info/Col%20%20and%20the%20Sabbath.pdf>

instituted - that He does not condone is compounded here by applying the Apostle Paul's reference to pagan practices –'do not handle, do not touch ...' as if this were a reference to Jewish and Biblical practices¹³.)

The Pharisees in the first century also took comfort in their idols, which they served and of which they boasted. As the apostles document, these men (like Cain) harshly persecuted the assembly (their brother Abel), killing many as had their fathers who killed the prophets. Vindication and victory would come with much longsuffering. G-d would bring great tribulation and judgment upon their persecutors who had blasphemed true righteousness. (His poor historical understanding is also evident here when he falsely accuses the Pharisees of the Second Temple Period and first century CE. – while Judaism acknowledges that there was far too much 'senseless hatred of one Jew for another', the Pharisee's were not generally involved in this hatred, persecution and killing. In Yeshua's day, a great many Pharisees were moved to follow Yeshua¹⁴).

Thus would end the law, which became an idol and brought death because its children had made void the covenant. (The Torah is everlasting and the Mosaic covenant is everlasting. Nowhere does the Tanakh, nor the NT argue that the Torah will ever be 'ended' or removed and done away with!)

G-d would cast out Hagar and her son so that the son of the free woman would receive the inheritance (as per Paul's teaching in writing the Galatians). (I address this serious misunderstanding of the Hagar/Sarah allegory in Galatians in a number of articles, as well as in my book, 'Defending the Apostle Paul: Weighing the Evidence'¹⁵)

Anyway, following the apostles' midrash is the key to understanding their message. What they meant by a "new covenant" was not identical to what Jeremiah meant. They spoke not of physical restoration in the land but of a heavenly gathering of the elect into a "better fatherland." (While the writer may actually have displayed some understanding in describing the Apostle's writings as 'midrash', to suggest that the Tanakh and the Jewish people of the that era did not understand that prophetic 'restoration' to be a physical restoration, and return from the Disapora, to the Land of Israel just again demonstrates his serious lack of a proper and adequate understanding. The re-establishment of the State of Israel in this current age is also proof of his serious error¹⁶).

This was the everlasting life of which they spoke, not Psalm 133's "life age-lasting" which was in the [physical] land. It is in this context that the apostles speak of a resurrection of the just and unjust that was about to occur. They speak like Ezekiel in the valley of dry bones. (His blindness and very restricted worldview means that his eyes have been closed to the fulfillment of this prophecy over the last 65+ years! The resurrection and restoration is both spiritual and physical).

¹³ I give more detail on this as well in my Col 2:16 article.

¹⁴ For a little more on this see 'The Times of Yeshua' - <http://www.circumcisedheart.info/The%20Times%20of%20Yeshua.pdf>

¹⁵ The book is available from Amazon – see <http://www.amazon.com/Defending-The-Apostle-Paul-ebook/dp/B009TLLK0U/> or see the article 'Works of the Law' at <http://www.circumcisedheart.info/Works%20of%20the%20Law.pdf>

¹⁶ See 'Israel: Return in Belief or Unbelief' -

<http://www.charismacomputers.com.au/Christian%20site/Israels%20Return%20in%20belief%20or%20unbelief.pdf> and 'Isaiah 49: A commentary' - <http://circumcisedheart.info/Isaiah%2049%20-%20a%20commentary.pdf>

Resurrection equals the recovery of the "hope of Israel," which had perished. It is life again into the land. Yet the apostles speak of the spiritual sphere.

- Marcus Booker - <http://planetpreterist.com/content/preterism-meets-judaism>

As you may now recognize, I believe that Preterism is a fantasy born out of a very flawed 'Christian' worldview. A worldview that has developed from a Hellenistic and anti-Zionist mindset that has failed very seriously to recognize what and where the true foundations lie.

In this article I have tried to give a little of an overview to the faulty presumptions and false foundations that underpin Preterism.

For a little more on the specifics, I have written a couple of other articles. Some years ago I wrote '[Preterism- a Brief Reply](#)', and a few months ago I wrote a blog post on the [Preterist approach to Matthew 24](#).

Paul Herring

April 2013

Updated August 2023