

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

C1420 – June 4, 2014 – Matthew 3:7-17
The Baptizing Of The King

We're still working with Matthew 3 and the key to Matthew 3 is understanding the relationship of the Mosaic covenant to the Abrahamic covenant. Galatians 3 explores this relationship. At the root of the nation Israel is the unconditional Abrahamic Covenant. The terms of this covenant outlined that God will ultimately bless the nation Israel in the land, by the seed such that they are a global blessing. Within this covenant God gave the nation Israel the conditional Mosaic covenant. The terms of this covenant outline the obedience necessary for them to enjoy the blessings of the land, seed and global blessing. In other words, the unconditional covenant will be enjoyed but it has conditions for it being enjoyed. As an example, what was required even before the Mosaic covenant for someone to enter into the enjoyment of the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant? Gen 17, they had to be circumcised. If you were not circumcised you were "cut off" from accessing the blessing. So it's the relationship of the Mosaic covenant to the Abrahamic covenant that gives the context for John's message in Matt 3.

In other words, John is not preaching the gospel as we would think of it. This is all before the cross. If you are clinging to the faulty idea that John is preaching the gospel then I hope to break you of that idea. Probably the vast majority of those who came out to John and repented were already believers in the OT sense; they already had a faith like Abraham's and were justified apart from the Law. However, what's the issue after you're justified? How do you get sanctified? What was the rule of life for the nation in order to be sanctified? The Mosaic covenant. So these believers are coming out and repenting because they were following the system of the Pharisees and the Sadducees in order to be sanctified. But that system was corrupt. That system with all its rules and regulations was a distortion of the Mosaic Law. So if it's a distortion of the Law who made the law? Whose law is it? It's

man's law not God's law. What had happened to God's Law? They had rejected it. But once you reject God's Law the human heart immediately adopts a new law. So John's message was that they needed to repent, they needed to have a change of mind about the humanistic law of the Pharisees and Sadducees that they invented and return to covenant obedience under the Mosaic Law. John is calling them back to the Law. What is Jesus doing in the Sermon on the Mount? What is one of the things He is doing? Calling them back to the Law, the same thing John is doing. You have heard it said...but I say to you....What had they heard? The humanistic law of the Pharisees and Sadducees. What was He saying? The true intent of the Mosaic Law. It was a compare and contrast in order to get them to do what? Repent. The same thing John was doing, trying to get the nation in spiritual shape so they could welcome the King and enthrone Him.

John was the first prophet in over 400 years. What did we see in verses 1 and 4? That John came ministering in the likeness of Elijah. What was his message to Israel? Verse 2, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The command to "repent" was a call to have "a change of thinking." Change of thinking about what? About the official religious system of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Both groups claimed that if the nation followed their rules and regulations they would be eligible for covenant blessing! John disagreed. They needed to repent! The rules and regulations of the Pharisees and Sadducees had nullified the true intent of the Mosaic covenant. They were not eligible for enjoying blessing but for cursing. The only way for the nation to become eligible for blessing would be to repent and return to the true intent of the Mosaic covenant. How could they demonstrate they had repented? Verse 8, bring forth fruit in keeping with the Mosaic covenant. If the nation did repent as a whole and bring forth this fruit then they would be eligible for the blessing and prepared to meet their King and give Him a Messianic greeting. The King would then baptize the nation with the Spirit and fire, an essential ingredient to entrance into the kingdom. We'll look more at His baptism tonight. What expression does Matthew use to refer to the kingdom? "the kingdom of heaven." What does this expression refer to? The kingdom of God. There's no difference. The expression kingdom of heaven is parallel to kingdom of God in the synoptics. It's none other than the earthly kingdom as defined by the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants. Finally, this kingdom was "at hand" meaning that it was on the verge of coming into history. It was not here, it had not arrived but it had drawn near in that the

King had arrived and He was the One who would establish the kingdom. John went before Him as a voice crying in the wilderness in order to prepare the nation for His arrival.

Were people responding to John's ministry? In droves. Evidently many were unsatisfied by the message of the Pharisees and Sadducees and so they were coming to John for baptism. What were they saying by being baptized by John? We identify with you John and your message of the at hand kingdom. We reject the system of the Pharisees and Sadducees. And as John baptized them in the Jordan River what were they doing? Confessing their sins. They hadn't been living according to the Mosaic covenant and so they were not eligible to enjoy the blessings of the Abrahamic.

Verses 5 and 6 are where you see John baptizing. What do you observe about his baptism? It had been going on for some time, certainly long enough for John to be nicknamed the Baptizer and certainly long enough for the word to spread out to Jerusalem and all Judea and the whole district around Jordan. There were probably thousands of Jews, unsatisfied by the system, going out to be identified with John's hopeful message of the kingdom's nearness. But notice in verse 7 who else is coming out to be baptized. **Many of the Pharisees and Sadducees.** This is the first mention of these two groups in the NT so let's review the basics of these groups that will clash with one another and with Jesus throughout the gospels. Who were the Pharisees? What does Pharisee mean? It means the "separators." They were the separated ones. What separated them? Cleanliness. They were obsessed with cleanliness. If a woman was drowning they wouldn't even rescue her for fear of touching her and becoming unclean. They were fanatical about external bodily cleanness. How did they interpret the Bible so that they became so obsessed with external ritual? Allegorically. They were very loose with the text; a text could have multiple layers of interpretation. That's how they came up with all the extra-biblical ritual and tradition. What kind of person was usually a Pharisee? Lawyers and businessmen in the main. They had a large influence. The Pharisees were the dominant party, they taught in the synagogues. Most of the people followed the Pharisees. Abba Eban says, "The mass of the nation was inclined to Pharisaism, whose cardinal principle was the strict application of the law to every sphere of life in the interest of national preservation."ⁱ Who were their opponents? The Sadducees. What does their name mean? It probably means "destroyers." They were the

destroyers of the law in the estimation of the Pharisees. Why? Because they only held to the first five books of the OT as the authoritative word of God. In the main they were only interested in the temple. They were in control of the temple. The high priest throughout the NT is always a Sadducee. How did they interpret the Bible? Literally, hyper-literally. They were concerned exclusively with offering the sacrifices according to Leviticus. They had a very narrow set of beliefs which is why they rejected the resurrection, rejected angels, etc...What kind of person was usually a Sadducee? An aristocrat, they were usually wealthy and elite. They were very political. The two groups were at odds with one another but here we see members of each coming out together.

What do they want from John? They want to be baptized by John. He says they are **coming for baptism**. But how are we to take that? Are we to take that as a genuine desire? Probably not. Why not? Because in verse 8, they're not coming with **repentance**. Is John going to baptize someone without **repentance**? No. So John does not see these people repenting of the system they are involved in. If a Pharisee had truly repented he would be cutting himself off from Pharisaism and saying that it was no good. But what they are really doing is coming out and saying, "We want to identify with you John but we want to continue as Pharisees because as Pharisees we already have sufficient fruit, we don't have any need for repentance." The Sadducee, if he truly repented, would be repudiating his system that he thought was sufficient fruit. But, again, they're coming out to identify with John but wanting to continue as Sadducees. If they'd really been repentant they would have rejected their systems and brought forth fruit in keeping with **repentance**. What would that fruit have looked like? Obedience to the Mosaic covenant! John is looking for obedience to the Mosaic covenant because it's obedience to that covenant which is necessary for the nation to be eligible for blessing in preparation for the King! He didn't see any **repentance**, he saw Pharisees coming out to be baptized but wanting to remain Pharisees; he saw Sadducees coming out to be baptized but wanting to remain Sadducees. So, John repudiated them.

Why do you think they really want to be baptized by John? What's their motive? Probably to blend in with and take over John's ministry. What has John done to them? Taken their constituents. Hundreds and thousands of people had left Pharisaism and Sadduceeism. What's one strategy to win

back your constituents? Try to identify with the party that your constituents have moved to. I mentioned last time that the Republicans followed this strategy when the Tea Party sprung up and traditional Republican constituents started moving over to the Tea Party. So in response the Republican candidates started trying to cozy up to the Tea Party. What are they saying when they do that? We're not really all that different, we hold to the same basic ideas, this is an intra-mural issue. So it's probable that the Pharisees and Sadducees were trying to cozy up to John in order to play down the differences. Ultimately I'd say they can't wait to get rid of John so they can win back their constituents.

What did John think about that? He sees no **repentance**, no **confession** of sin but a desire for baptism? What was John's response? "**You brood of vipers.**" I don't know if you like being called a snake but in the business world if someone calls you a snake it's usually not a compliment. And mind you, this is in the open. John is shouting this in the hearing of those present. And what's the imagery behind the statement? Gen 3, the serpent. Who was the serpent? Satan. So here's a whole brood of Satans. And what is the main characteristic of Satan? He's a deceiver. What have the Pharisees and Sadducees done? They've done what Satan has done, they've deceived the people into thinking that if they follow their humanistic rituals and do the sacrifices just right then God's going to be so happy with them and they'll be eligible for the covenant blessings. It was a deception.

Now I'd also say they were deceived under the principle that the deceiver is always the greatest deceived. They probably thought they were pleasing God but what they've done is they've lured the people into their deception. In other words, this is the leadership that has done this. The leadership is a major concern of Matthew. Some Bible students think the key is how the leadership respond to Jesus because how the leadership respond ultimately directs how the people respond. This is probably right on the mark because remember in Matt 2 when the magi came looking for the king of the Jews? Who did Herod call in? The leadership! Chief priests and scribes. And did they trot down to Bethlehem to welcome the King? No. They had no interest. Take note of that because it's the leadership that ultimately led the people astray. What should they have done when they heard of John baptizing? They should have been the first ones out of the gate, leading the nation out to John, repenting of their evil religious system, being baptized by John and

confessing their sins! They should have led the way but instead they're a brood of Satans and they've deceived the people and now they're trying to take over John's ministry by this hypocritical baptism!

What else does John say to them? **Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?** Think back to the OT and tell me what the **wrath to come** is. What wrath did the OT prophets say would come just before the kingdom came? The day of the LORD! Remember that expression from Obadiah, from Joel, from Amos, from Zephaniah, from Isaiah, etc...73 uses in the OT, it was the most common expression for the time when the LORD would come and fight against all His opponents. People call it the tribulation today but technically it's the day of the LORD and it is characterized by **wrath**. And John is mockingly asking them, **"Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"** As if to say what? Why does John say that? Because did they think they were going to have to face the day of the LORD's wrath? No. They considered themselves righteous! They were exempt from the wrath, had automatic kingdom entrance. They were deceived. Had these become undeceived? By no means. They want to be baptized but remain Pharisees, remain Sadducees.

What was their response to John? They didn't have time to respond because in verse 9 John was all over them. When he says, **and do not suppose**, he's refuting what they are thinking before it even comes out of their mouth. He knew their doctrines. **do not suppose that you can say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham for our father'; for I say to you that from these stones God is able to raise up children to Abraham.** In other words what was their belief? If you were a physical descendant of Abraham then you were automatically going to enter the kingdom. Edersheim says, "Abraham was represented as sitting at the gate of Gehenna, to deliver any Israelite who otherwise might have been consigned to its terrors. In fact, by their descent from Abraham, all the children of Israel were nobles, infinitely higher than any proselytes." So Abraham was something of a watchman at the gate to Gehenna and he would allow no Jew entrance. They were automatically in the kingdom. What is John's view? Entrance into the kingdom is not based on physical descent from Abraham but spiritual descent, those who had a faith like Abraham. Did the Pharisees and Sadducees have faith? I don't think so. Did those John had been baptizing have faith? I think so. So there were people who understood that they needed

to have a faith like Abraham in order to enter the kingdom but the Pharisees and Sadducees thought they merely needed to be a physical descendant of Abraham. John's point is that entrance is not based on physical descent but on spiritual descent, having faith. In fact, what does John imply by the expression **from these stones God is able to raise up children to Abraham?** Who are the **stones?** Gentiles. Even if a Gentile has faith they get to enter the kingdom. Matthew, at key moments, points out that Gentiles are receptive, Gentiles are going to come to faith and enter the kingdom. The irony is that the Pharisees and Sadducees, the leadership, are not going to enter the kingdom! So they were physical descendants of Abraham, they were children of Abraham in that sense, but they were not spiritual descendants, they needed to have faith because it's only by faith that kingdom entrance is granted. That's how Gentiles like you and me, who are not physical descendants of Abraham but are spiritual descendants, get kingdom entrance. We are children of Abraham. That doesn't make us Jews. We'd need to be physical descendants of Jacob to be Jews but we are spiritual children of Abraham because we've had faith, but because the Pharisees and Sadducees don't have faith they are mere physical descendants of Abraham, children in that sense but they took it too far and considered themselves as automatically entering the kingdom! John says uh, uh, uh, **wrath** for you! No kingdom entrance, which must have been a startling realization.

In verse 10, John drops some more bad news about the **wrath to come**. **The axe is already laid at the root of the trees; therefore every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.** He's using symbolism here and the trees are an orchard of Israelites and the one wielding the axe is the King and He's walking around His orchard looking for those Israelites who have good fruit. What happens if an Israelite is fruitless? The King **cuts him down** and **casts him into the fire**. Judgment in the wrath! What would be the **good fruit** that the King is looking for? Verse 8, the **fruit of repentance**. Which is what? Obedience to the Mosaic covenant. Connect what's happening here. The King is coming and the King is the judge; when He arrives He is going to walk around the orchard of Israel and examine each Israelite; if there's no obedience to the Mosaic covenant then that Israelite is going to be cut down, no kingdom entrance. Why not? Because they were not believers. The ultimate blessing of the Abrahamic covenant only comes on believers! The believers were coming and repenting and bring forth the fruit of obedience.

The judgment of the King continues in vv 11-12 but the additional element of salvation is brought into the picture. Judgment-salvation always go together. **As for me**, John says, **I baptize you with water for repentance**. The idea is John was baptizing on the basis of **repentance** or because of **repentance**. He wouldn't **baptize** you if you didn't have **repentance**. That was what was lacking in the Pharisees and Sadducees in verse 8. What did John baptize with? With **water**. What did the baptism with water do? It was a sign that they were breaking their ties with the official religious system and identifying with John and his system. That's all it is, an external sign! But what baptism is the Messiah coming to administer? John says, **He who is coming after me is mightier than I, and I am not fit to remove His sandals; He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire**. The emphasis here is on the greatness of the one coming after John and His superior baptism. John's baptizing ministry was merely external, **with water**; Jesus' baptizing ministry would be internal, **with the Spirit and fire**.

Note the first expression **He who is coming after me is mightier than I, and I am not fit to remove His sandals**; or untie. The untying of sandals was the task of a menial servant; the servant would untie and remove his master's sandals. What's John saying? The one coming after me is so great I'm not even fit to be His servant. He's amplifying the greatness of the Messiah. Then note the second expression, **He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire**. Now this is where I say judgment and salvation are pictured but this is a difficult expression and one that people have debated. The debate is whether this is one baptism or two? Grammatically, it could be one baptism with two aspects or it could be two separate baptisms. The grammar is not definitive. The first view is that of Stanley Toussaint and he says that the Messiah has one baptism with two aspects; "the Spirit even fire;" that is, the Messiah will baptize the believing remnant with the Spirit who purifies them. In this view fire is being mentioned because of its purifying abilities. When you want to remove all the impurities in silver and gold you put it through fire. This view has the support of the Malachi 3 use of fire in a purifying sense. Fire is also used this way in 1 Cor 3 when the believer's works are put into the fire in order to purify the good works by separating them from the bad works. So this view would be saying that the fire is not a judgment but rather a purifying work of the Holy Spirit among

the nation which removes all impurities among the believing remnant in order to prepare them for kingdom entrance. This is a possible view grammatically and linguistically.

The second view is that of Dwight Pentecost and he says that the Messiah has two separate baptisms to administer; “the Spirit and fire;” that is, the Messiah will baptize the believing remnant with the Spirit and the non-believing remnant will be judged by fire. Fire in this view is looked upon as a metaphor for judgment in order to exclude them from the kingdom to come. Fire is often used as judgment. The grammar also supports this view. It also has the support of the context since in the preceding verse 10 those trees without good fruit would be **cut down and thrown into the fire**; clearly a picture of judgment, and the following verse 12 presents the Messiah as a farmer separating the wheat from the chaff. Probably the best view is this second view, that the Messiah’s baptism with the Spirit and fire are two distinct baptisms. The first would be the baptism with the Spirit. What is the baptism with the Spirit accomplishing? What are all baptisms doing? Making an identification! Identification is the key. Who is the baptizer? The Messiah! What are the recipients being baptized with? The Holy Spirit. What will the Holy Spirit identify them with? The Messiah! This baptism is different than John’s in that his was with water, an external mark, but the Messiah’s baptism is with the Holy Spirit, an internal mark.

Now are there any passages in the OT that you might link back to as far as a baptism with the Holy Spirit? The OT never uses the expression baptized with the Holy Spirit. But what passages might your mind be drawn to? Joel 2 and Ezek 36. What does Joel 2 predict? I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh...” (referring to Jewish flesh) “I will pour out My Spirit in those days.” What days? The days when the nation Israel is facing wrath in the day of the LORD, the days just preceding the kingdom. So I take it that John is thinking in terms of this pouring out of the Spirit when he says the Messiah will baptize with the Holy Spirit. The baptism would identify them with the Messiah internally since they would have His Spirit indwelling them. It would identify them as those who were to enter the kingdom

What other passage? Ezekiel 36. What does Ezek 36 say? “I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit within you; and I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. I will put My Spirit within

you and cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will be careful to observe My ordinances...I will cleanse you from all your iniquities.” Again, this is just before the kingdom comes. Before the kingdom comes God was going to put His Spirit within them so that they would walk in His statutes in the kingdom and never be subject to exile. I take it that John’s reference to the baptism with the Spirit is reaching back to Ezek 36.

What other passage? Jer 31:31-34, the new covenant. No mention of the Spirit is made in Jer 31 but mention is made of putting His law in their heart. What does Jeremiah say? “this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days,” declares the LORD, “I will put My law within them and on their heart I will write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.” Again, though the Spirit is not explicitly mentioned here, the writing of the Law of God on their heart is here and thus it connects to the same ideas, purposes and time period of the passages in Ezek 36 and Joel 2. Before the kingdom has to come the Messiah would pour out His Spirit on the nation. This would fulfill the new covenant. This is precisely what John seems to have in mind with the baptism with the Spirit. When the Messiah came, if a sufficient portion of the nation repented then He would baptize the nation with the Spirit in fulfillment of the new covenant as He took them into the kingdom.

What then does the baptism with the Spirit have to do with the Church? I have a hard time saying that John is here prophesying of the Church. John had no idea of a Church. He is talking to Israel and rooting his ideas firmly in the OT. The first mention of the Church is Matt 16:18. Yet the Church is typically said to uniquely have the baptism with the Spirit as the distinguishing mark from Israel. Merrill Unger made this popular in an article in 1956. 1 Cor 12:13 is usually cited, “For with one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit.” This passage teaches that the Church is composed of Jews and Gentiles who have been baptized with the Spirit into one body. According to Jesus in Acts 1:5 this baptism was yet future. According to Peter in Acts 11:15 it had already begun. Logically the baptism with the Spirit had to begin in Acts 2, the Day of Pentecost. On that day the Messiah baptized Jewish believers with the Spirit. The baptism was attested by the physical phenomena of speaking in tongues. Peter quoted Joel 2 as an explanation for the tongues even though Joel 2 does not mention

tongues. His point was that a pouring out of the Spirit had occurred which explained the tongues (cf Acts 2:33). Joel 2 did predict a pouring forth of the Spirit among other phenomena. However, nothing else Joel predicted occurred. Peter cited Joel in order to make an application of that one aspect of Joel 2. Peter continued in Acts to preach repentance to the nation Israel in preparation for the kingdom (e.g. 3:19-21). However, when a sufficient portion of the Jews did not repent the message went out in Acts 8 to the Samaritans and they were being baptized with the Spirit. In Acts 10 the message goes to the Gentiles and they too are baptized with the Spirit, also attested by tongues. Finally in Acts 19 the message goes to the disciples of John the Baptist and they too are baptized with the Spirit as attested by tongues. These four events where the Messiah baptized various groups with the Spirit describe the historical formation of the Church as Jew and Gentile in one body. The baptism with the Spirit is presently a unique identifier of the Church. This, however, does not nullify the teaching of Matt 3; that the Messiah will baptize the nation Israel with the Spirit in preparation for the kingdom. This baptism never occurred because it was contingent on the nation's repentance. In the meantime, an application of it is presently being made to the Church. This application is not identical to the baptism of the Spirit that the Messiah will administer on the nation when they receive Him, although it is similar. For example, the future baptism with the Spirit for Israel will result in complete obedience whereas the Church's baptism with the Spirit results in only partial obedience. So the Church's baptism with the Spirit is similar to Israel's but it is not identical. Similarly, the Church is receiving benefits from the new covenant but these benefits are not identical to the benefits that Israel will receive in the future.

What's the second baptism of the Messiah in Matt 3:11? The second would be the baptism with **fire**. What does the fire represent? As verse 10 indicates, the **fire** is a picture of judgment upon those unbelieving Israelites who brought forth no fruit of **repentance**. Because of this the Messiah will baptize them with fire which means to identify them with His fiery judgments in the day of the LORD. This will remove them from earth prior to the kingdom's arrival since the initial kingdom population will be only believers.

As verse 12 shows, **His winnowing fork is in His hand, and He will thoroughly clear His threshing floor; and will gather His wheat into**

the barn, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. The Messiah is pictured as a farmer who goes out into His field and brings in the harvest to the threshing floor. He tramples down the harvest until there is a large pile of **wheat** mixed with **chaff**. When the evening breeze blows He tosses it up in the air and the wind blows the **chaff** away and the **wheat** falls. It's the process of separating that which was invaluable from that which was valuable. The **wheat** is valuable and it would be gathered **into the barn**. What's **the barn** symbolizing here? The kingdom. The **wheat** would be the believers, the Messiah baptized them with the Holy Spirit so that they were identified with Him, they are valuable because they are identified with Him; the **chaff** would be the unbelievers, the Messiah baptized them with fire, which is judgment, they go to judgment.

In summary, the prophetic forerunner of the King has come, he has preached the message of repentance in light of the at hand kingdom and many people were being baptized by him, identifying with his message. He has also warned the leadership that they will not be in the kingdom but rather will face wrath because when the Messiah comes He will baptize the believing remnant with the Spirit in preparation for kingdom entrance and He will baptize the non-remnant with fires of judgment to remove them from the earth.

In conclusion, what applications can we make? Don't follow a man-made system of religion. It is blinding and leads away from God. Follow the word of God. Listen to the true expositors of the word of God. Most of churchianity is just the blind leading the blind, no different than the people following the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Interest; following a religion; truth; zero.

Questions?

To lay out the whole program, when the King came John announced that the kingdom had drawn near. The kingdom was near in that the King of that kingdom was present on earth. However, the kingdom did not come because its arrival was contingent on the nation Israel's acceptance of the King. After the nation crucified Him the King continued to preach the kingdom for forty days before departing. In the Book of Acts Peter and the disciples continued to offer the kingdom but this kingdom offer gradually disappeared as the realization set in that Christ was now building His church. The church will

form the spiritual nucleus of the future kingdom. We are in training now for reigning in the kingdom. When the church is complete then Elijah the prophet will come to prepare the nation to receive the King. At that time the nation will repent and receive the King. Then the kingdom promised by the OT covenants and sought after by all the prophets will come and God's will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven. This is God's kingdom program as I understand it from the Scripture but it is very rare view heard today. Most of the views re-define the kingdom to be the Christian's role in bringing social justice into the world or re-defining it as the heavenly rule of Christ in heaven or Christ's rule in the believer's heart. Scripturally I am not satisfied by any of these views. Revelation 11:15, which is set in the future 70th week of Daniel, looks at Jesus as receiving His kingdom and beginning His kingdom reign when He physically returns to earth and not before. The response of those who reject this view is that the kingdom is both/and; it is both now in some sense and yet future in the earthly sense. However, I see this as confusing and my major objection is I do not see the kingdom ever re-defined to include now aspects though I do see the church as forming the spiritual nucleus of the one future earthly kingdom.

ⁱ Ed Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 72.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2014