

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1211 – March 11, 2012

Preterism: Time-Texts

We're looking at views of eschatology and I want to start off by reminding you of why we're going to look at these five views; preterism, post-tribulationism, mid-tribulationism, pre-wrath and pre-tribulationism. Why not just tell me the right view? Basically because the Church has been working this out for the last 200 years and it's not an easy thing to work out. It's not about a verse here and a verse there, it's about the entire Old and New Testaments. And more than 60% of your NT will be affected by your eschatology. That's because every truth is linked to every other truth, you can't just separate out a few verses here and formulate belief A and then separate out some other verses over here and formulate belief B and make a list of what you believe. If you do that you'll have belief A contradicting belief F contradicting belief R and that's not the mind of God. God doesn't think in a fragmented fashion, He's a rational thinker. He's coherent and that's why so much of the NT is affected by your eschatology. Once you've stated F, G quickly follows. Eschatology first and foremost is related to ecclesiology. Let's just think of that one for a minute. Let's say you don't see the Church as distinct from Israel. For you it's all just the same thing, there are the elect and the non-elect, the saved and the non-saved, one people of God. Now when you come over to eschatology you can't see distinctions between Israel and the Church, everything is the same as far as you're concerned; the rapture, the second coming, the judgment and resurrection, it's all just one and the same event, they all occur together at the end. So one important lesson to learn in this eschatology business is that the Holy Spirit teaches the Church pedagogically, lesson by lesson and if you don't accept lesson 1 then lesson 2 isn't going to make any sense to you and by the time you get to lesson 54 you don't have a clue. That's one reason people get screwball ideas when it comes to eschatology.

Another reason is the volume of material we're trying to harmonize. It's one thing if you were Adam and Eve; your whole eschatology is one verse, Gen 3:15. But God's revelation has progressed far beyond that and now we have thousands of verses to get together, there's a tremendous complexity to seeing the whole picture.

So it's how all the material goes together in a harmony that we are struggling with. Our strategy has been to start with what was revealed in the OT and develop certain key terms as they relate to Israel and her destiny as a nation, then go to the NT and look at the vocabulary there as it relates to the Church and its destiny and try to figure out how it all fits together. We found there is distinct terminology for Israel and for the Church. When you read through the OT you find that Israel will go through a period of horrible, horrible Tribulation, they are given a calendar of 70 sevens, 69 of those sevens they've already gone through so there is only 1 seven remaining, during this seven the world will face a period of birth pangs that causes tremendous fear unlike anything the world has ever faced and then the kingdom of God will be born into the world. As for the NT you find OT terms like birth pangs but there's a new terminology introduced that you do not find anywhere in the OT; the rapture, the judgment seat of Christ and the marriage supper of the lamb. These relate to the Church. So how do these Church events fit with the prior scheduled events for Israel? That's the task of eschatology.

We're looking at the five basic ways of putting this together. The first one is called preterism which means what? We contrasted it with futurism. We said if futurism is the future then preterism is what? Past. So their view is that all or most of Bible prophecy has already been fulfilled in the past. The date they key in on is AD70 - the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. God is through with the Jewish people. AD70 was God's wrath against the Jews for their rejection of their Messiah. That's very important to realize because it shows you a preterist can't possibly be premillennial. Premillennialism still sees a future kingdom for the Jews. So if God is through with the Jews then preterism only works with amillennialism or postmillennialism. And that's what you'll find; all preterists are either a-mill or post-mill.

Let's review those terms briefly. Amillennialism means no thousand years by which they mean that there is no future earthly kingdom lasting 1,000 literal years. Right now is the kingdom, the Church is the kingdom and the 1,000

years is not literal, it's just a long period of time. Who got this idea started? It wasn't in the early church, the early church still had a significant portion of Jewish believers and they weren't about to throw out their OT kingdom promises. They interpreted those literally and expected a future restoration of the Jewish people, that's premillennialism. It wasn't until the Church became Gentile dominated that a new way of interpreting the Scriptures came into the Church and Augustine was the key guy that rejected the literal 1,000 year earthly kingdom and said, no, Christ is ruling now in the kingdom through the hearts of His saints on earth. His book *The City of God* is considered a Christian classic. His point is we shouldn't expect any more of a kingdom than we have here and now. He argued that a future earthly kingdom is materialistic, it's unspiritual, and so the kingdom must be allegorical. And Augustine, he was a church doctor so everyone said, yeah, that sounds right, God is through with the Jew, the kingdom is now in the Church and amillennialism dominated church history for a thousand years in Roman Catholicism and when the Protestant Reformation occurred the Protestants didn't have time to work out eschatology so they just took amillennialism over and it's still with us today. There are lots of amillennial Christians around and they all view God as through with the Jew; so many of them have become preterists, lumping it all back in AD70.

Then there's postmillennialism and postmillennialism is a lot like amillennialism except its more optimistic. They see the gospel triumphing and Christianizing the world. They see progress and this is why postmillennialists are historically suckers for the social gospel. And progressive organizations know this so they like to hijack postmillennial institutions to get their funds for their social programs. The postmillennial idea is that the gospel is so powerful that it is going to be successful in Christianizing the world and starting Christ's kingdom and then Jesus will come back and say, thank you, you fulfilled the Great Commission and He'll take over the kingdom that we brought in by preaching the gospel. And postmillennialists are also preterists, probably more postmills are preterists than amills. But they both think God is through with the Jew so most prophecy was fulfilled in AD70.

I know you're still thinking WHAT? So let me explain a couple of reasons for this. One reason both amillennialists and postmillennialists are flocking to preterism is because of the work of futurists. I'm sure you've heard of the *Left*

Behind series by Tim LaHaye. That series was immensely popular, not only among Christians but non-Christians as well. It got a lot of press and a lot of people read those books and that put a lot of pressure on a- and post-mill people to deal with prophecy. The futurist premillennial people were dealing with these texts and it was getting a lot of media attention. So they said, hey, we have to get on the ball here. Here's a quote by Robert Reymond in his systematic theology that shows you how threatening we are. This is just a sample. "Dispensationalism has thrown down the gauntlet; and it is high time that covenant theologians take up the challenge and respond to them Biblically." That largely is a response to futurists getting their case out in the public arena of ideas and affecting public policy. Very clearly this Jew friendly eschatology has affected our foreign policy toward Israel. So now they are threatened because their eschatology is not Jew friendly but to explain why it's not they have to give an alternative interpretation of the text. And the most logical alternative is preterism, eschatology is the story of the end of the Jew that occurred in AD70.

Now the modern proponents didn't come up with preterism, it was already in the air, they just seized it as a system to manage these passages in a different way. Where did it come from? Why was it already in the air? Someone had a question last time, a very good question I want to work with here in answering this question. People have goals, they have agendas, they're after something, the question was what were the earlier evangelical preterists trying to achieve by interpreting the Bible this way? Why did they want to lump everything, or almost everything into AD70? Well, there was a goal they were after. I mentioned last time preterism was held in the 1800's by German higher critics of the Bible. These men were liberals, not political liberals but theological liberals, which means they didn't believe the Bible was a divine product for even a moment. They just studied the Bible to rip it up. And one of the liberal attempts to rip the Bible up was to seize what they called timing words, they call them time-texts and we'll get into some of them today. But they pointed to time texts and said, see, the Bible says Jesus is coming back soon and this generation will not pass away until all these things are fulfilled. And yet Jesus did not come back soon and so the Bible is wrong. That was the liberal argument against the inerrancy of the Bible. The reaction to this among evangelicals, one reaction was to say, you know Mr Liberal, I hear what you're saying, I see your concern and now that I read these time-texts and I agree, they do require a 1st century fulfillment. But let

me assure you Mr Liberal that the Bible does not err because these things did happen in the 1st century, just in a metaphorical sense. AD70 and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple - that is the event that metaphorically fulfills the time-texts. So the goal was to salvage the Bible. They really thought they were doing Christianity a favor here by saying it's all past, it has been fulfilled just like Jesus said. Jesus didn't get anything wrong. There are no errors in the Bible. That was their response to this Liberal approach, to agree fundamentally with the premise but to metaphorically interpret the Bible to get fulfillment.

What we want to do is see if these things were fulfilled in the 1st century. And if not, why not? How should we understand the time time-texts?

The major prophecies they're pointing to are Matt 24, the Olivet Discourse and the Book of Revelation. I want to read some quotes, just so you understand when I start going through this you don't think I'm making all this up. I've got a series of quotes here; you listen, that's all you have to do, just listen. I'm not saying these are right, in fact I'm going to show they're not, but I want you to hear this with your own ears. These aren't my words; these are the words of the preterist themselves.

Here's what David Chilton said about Matt 24. "The Olivet Discourse is not about the second coming of Christ. It is a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70AD."ⁱ Now in saying that he's recognized something true, there are prophecies that relate to Jerusalem in Matt 24. It wouldn't be much of a deception if there weren't a few particles of truth mixed in with their error. However, Matt 24 does not end with Israel being destroyed, it ends with Israel being saved.

Here's another quote, this one by Ken Gentry, talking about Matt 24:34, this generation will not pass away. He says, "This statement of Christ is indisputably clear—and absolutely demanding of a first-century fulfillment of the events in the preceding verses, including the Great Tribulation." His point is that the entire Tribulation is already fulfilled. So we'll have to look at that verse a bit later on but understand this verse is the key to their system. Everything revolves around this verse.

Well if that's the case then who was the Antichrist? They had to have an Antichrist. Revelation talks about the beast. Who was the beast in the 1st century? They've got an answer. "The beast of Revelation was a symbol of both Nero in particular and the Roman Empire in general." So Nero is their explanation for the beast. Nero's name in the Hebrew, they go over to the Latin and transliterate back into the Hebrew and say Neron Caesar, they have a particular spelling they like because if they get the special spelling it adds up to 666. The problem is that Caesar is not his name, Caesar is a title. It would be like saying President Truman adds up to 666 rather than adding up Harry Truman.

What about the kingdom? When is the kingdom? They state, "the Kingdom of Jesus Christ which He established at His First Advent, the period between the First and Second Advents of Christ, the millennium is going on now with Christians reigning as kings on earth." Right now we are reigning as kings. You say it's not a thousand years. I thought the millennium was a thousand years? They say, "that is a large rounded off number, the number ten contains the idea of a fullness of quantity...a thousand multiples and intensifies this ten times ten times ten in order to express vastness. It represents a vast undefined period of time, it might require a million years."

What about the new creation, the new heavens and earth of Rev 21 and 22? This has "already begun. The Bible describes our salvation in Christ both now and in eternity as a new heaven and a new earth." So Rev 21-22 just describes our salvation. The New Jerusalem, what's that? That's "the city of God which is the Church." See what's happening here? Watch how all these things are redefined, they use the same words but they mean something utterly different by the words than you.

Armageddon, what was Armageddon, that's in the book of Revelation. "It was for St. John a symbol of defeat and desolation, a waterloo signifying the defeat of those who set themselves against God, who obey false prophets instead of the true. There never will be a literal battle of Armageddon for there is no such place." I think you get the idea.

Now let's get into the time-texts. Charles Clough asks, "What exegetical justification do preterists offer? They cite New Testament texts that seem to anticipate the soon coming of Christ. With these texts in hand, they appeal to

believers to defend the inerrancy of Scripture by adopting preterism.” Do you catch the argument that they’re making here? Sproul makes this argument. What he’s saying is if you interpret the text of the NT literally then you have to conclude that Jesus is coming soon and if He didn’t come soon then the Bible has an error. So AD70 is when He came, and that defends us against the liberals who are attacking the text.

Turn to Rev 1, we’ll start with this text, “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave Him to show to His bond-servants, the things which *must soon take place*,” there it is they say, the second coming of Jesus Christ must take place soon. Now look at verse 3, this is just a sampling, “Blessed is he who reads and those who hear the words of the prophecy, and heed the things which are written in it; for *the time is near*.” There it is again, the Book of Revelation had to be fulfilled near in time to when it was written. Rev 3:10, “Because you have kept the word of My perseverance, I also will keep you from the hour of testing, that hour which is *about* to come upon the whole world,” about to come they say requires 1st century fulfillment. One preterist says, “A preterist approach to Revelation seems to be demanded by...the temporal expectation of the author.” John he says expected Jesus to come back soon and therefore preterism is correct.

Those are a few from Revelation, let me show you their favorite one from Matt 24. This is the verse you’ll hear them repeat *ad nauseum*, everything revolves around this text so let’s look at it. Notice how the discourse begins in Matt 24:1 so you get the context, “And Jesus came out from the temple and was going away when His disciples came up to point out the temple buildings to Him. 2And He answered and said to them, ‘Do you not see all these things? Truly I say to you, not one stone here shall be left upon another, which will not be torn down.’ 3And as He was sitting on the Mount of Olives, the disciples came to Him privately, saying, ‘Tell us, when will these things happen, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?’” So He pointed out the Temple, He predicted its destruction. They get to the Mt of Olives and the disciples have some questions.

Let’s look at some of Jesus’ answer. By the way, in Matthew’s account he only records the answer to the last question, “the sign of the coming and of the end of the age” which is technically just one question. The first question about the destruction of the Temple isn’t discussed in Matthew or Mark’s

account, it's discussed in Luke's account. So his answer to the second question about His coming and the end of the age. Verse 5, "For many will come in My name, saying, 'I am the Christ,' and will mislead many. ⁶"You will be hearing of wars and rumors of wars. See that you are not frightened, for *those things* must take place, but *that* is not yet the end. ⁷"For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and in various places there will be famines and earthquakes." So wars, famines, earthquakes, preterists say, when you read the Book of Acts do you read about wars, famines and earthquakes? Well, I read about famines and earthquakes. Remember Agabus' prophecy of a famine? Remember Paul getting out of prison due to an earthquake? Yeah, so then all this was fulfilled they say. Verse 9, "Then they will deliver you to tribulation, and will kill you, and you will be hated by all nations because of My name."¹⁴"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all the nations, and then the end will come." They say the gospel went out to all nations, they say that was fulfilled before AD70. We don't have time to cover that one except to say that the passages they used to support this in Rom and Col refer to the gospel going out to the three people groups, Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles, but what Matthew is talking about is going out to literally every continent. Verse 15, "Therefore when you see the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (let the reader understand)," they say that happened, this is all done. Verse 20, skip on down, "But pray that your flight will not be in the winter, or on a Sabbath. ²¹"For then there will be a great tribulation, such as has not occurred since the beginning of the world until now, nor ever will." Verse 27, "For just as the lightning comes from the east and flashes even to the west, so will the coming of the Son of Man be. ²⁸"Wherever the corpse is, there the vultures will gather." That's Jesus coming in the Roman armies to destroy the Jews. Verse 29, "But immediately after the tribulation of those days THE SUN WILL BE DARKENED, AND THE MOON WILL NOT GIVE ITS LIGHT, AND THE STARS WILL FALL from the sky, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken. ³⁰"And then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the SON OF MAN COMING ON THE CLOUDS OF THE SKY with power and great glory." That is all the destruction of the Jews, we're told, AD70. Now skip down to verse 34, this is where we've been trying to get to, this is their proof text that all this was fulfilled in AD70. "Truly I say to you, this generation will not pass away until all these things take place." You can see, if you read this cursorily you can say well, maybe

there's something to preterism. It says "this generation will not pass away until all these things" be fulfilled. Jesus is speaking to the disciples so maybe it had to be fulfilled in their lifetime. So that's one of their key proof texts. We'll deal with that verse.

So if you put all this together, here we have in Matt 24 a snapshot of the end times, in Rev you have an amplification of the snapshot. We've got Jesus saying "this generation will not pass away till all these things are fulfilled," we've got John in the Revelation saying it will happen soon, it's near, it's about to come. So if you put it all together it sounds like there's something to this.

But now what I'm going to do is start dismantling the preterist position. We're going to show seven things that demonstrate that preterism is not an adequate explanation of how the end times unfold. The first one is simple; the biggest problem with the preterist approach is that the Second Coming of Jesus Christ did not occur in AD70. Who saw Jesus come back in AD70? Did the greatest event of world history occur without anybody seeing it? Wouldn't we expect to have hundreds and hundreds of reports of this? And we're being told we don't even have one? Someone must have seen Jesus Christ come back.

What does the text require? Look at Matt 24:30, here's just one, we could cite many, but in Jesus' response to the disciples question in verse 3, "what is the sign of Your coming and of the end of the age," look at how He answers. Verse 30, "And then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see **THE SON OF MAN COMING ON THE CLOUDS OF THE SKY** with power and great glory." The sign there *is* the Son of Man coming on the clouds of the sky. That's how you'll know that it's the Second Coming. And that's when all the tribes of the earth will mourn; when they see Him? Who saw Him coming on the clouds in AD70? Who mourned when they saw Him coming? Oh, that's not all the tribes of the earth preterists tell us, that's all the tribes of Israel, the twelve tribes, they'll see Him. Oh yeah, well who of the twelve tribes saw Him? Well, they saw Titus and the Roman armies. Now wait a minute, Jesus says He will come on the clouds of the sky. Did He come back on the clouds in AD70? Well, that just means judgment.

Hold your place here and turn over to Acts 1. Remember when we dealt with the ascension of Jesus and the disciples were walking along having a nice conversation and suddenly He's taking off? Look at verse 9, "after He said these things, "He was lifted up while they were looking on, and a cloud received Him out of their sight." There's a cloud. He disappeared into the cloud and while they were staring up into the sky two angels were in the midst of them and look what they said in verse 11, "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into the sky? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in just the same way as you have watched Him go into heaven." So if he went up in a cloud then how will He come back? In a cloud. What did He say in Matt 24:30? I will come back on the clouds. Question: Did Jesus come back in the clouds in AD70? Did Jesus Christ return in AD70 in the same way the angels said He would in Acts 1:11? No.

Now there are several people who recognize this problem and rather than try and use the rubber Bible technique they say, whoa, whoa, we don't think Matt 24:30 is describing the Roman armies, we think that's still future, those are the partial preterists, they split the second coming passages in two so you have a second coming in AD70 but you also have a second coming still future. So partial preterists really have three comings; His first coming, physically, bodily as a baby, His second comings in AD70 which is spiritual through the Roman armies and a third coming which is still future, the physical, bodily one that we believe in. Do you see what you get yourself into when you start going down this path? But the full preterists go so far as to say there is no future second coming, it all happened in AD70, that would be Don Preston and people like that. No future second coming, AD70 is it.

So the first strike against preterism is that it doesn't fit the model for the second coming of Jesus Christ. It requires some rather imaginative exegetical gymnastics to hold to this view. And observe how serious a doctrine is; this is the Second Coming of Jesus Christ we're talking about here. Not exactly a lesser of the doctrines, a major component of Christianity. But once you've set up your system, observe this, once you've started down a path you're forced to stretch the text. And that's one of our criticisms of preterism, it gives in to allegorical interpretation where we start de-historicizing the text and coming up with some rather imaginative interpretations.

Let's go to a second point. The second point is the meaning of the terms soon, near and about to. I took you through a few of them in Revelation, the time is near, I am about to come, those sort of texts *do not require the meaning they say it requires*. The three Greek words are *eggus*, *taxos* and *mellos*. And they insist they must mean what? That Jesus had to come in a near time frame, in the 1st century and here it is 2000 years later and He hasn't come back yet? That doesn't sound very near to me. Can't you read, they say, He said He was going to come back soon? So the issue here is the meanings of the words "soon," "near" and "about to." Do these words require us to see the coming of the Lord Jesus in a near time frame and therefore if He did not come back in that near time frame then Jesus was wrong and the NT has errors in it? Or can these words have other meanings? Let's follow this. What we're really interested in is how these words were used in the 1st century. Were there other definitions of those terms? If you look in the lexicons you'll find that there are other meanings. The word translated "soon" can have the meaning of speed or quickness, something that happens quickly. It can also mean, a short period of time between two events. So it turns out there's not just one meaning of these terms but two. It can mean an event happening within a near time frame or it can mean when an event happens it happens quickly.

Let me show you two passages which illustrate the difference. Turn over to Acts 25. This is Festus. Festus had just arrived from Rome and he went up to Jerusalem where he had a whole gang of Jews trying to get him to bring Paul to Jerusalem so they could kill him along the way. But Festus responds this way in verse 4, "Festus then answered that Paul was being kept in custody at Caesarea and that he himself was about to leave *shortly*." And there's the word. Now what sense does the word have here? Obviously that he's leaving in the near future. How did we know that? Because of the context. Festus says, no, let's not bring Paul down to Jerusalem, I'm about to leave myself so there's no reason to bring him down. Which foiled their little plot but the point is that the word can mean a near future event just like preterists say, something about to happen.

But look at Acts 12:7, here's the same word, exact same word but in this context Peter is in prison and there's an angel leading a jail break. This is the kind of thing angels do, get people out of Alcatraz that God wants out. "And behold, an angel of the Lord suddenly appeared and a light shone in the cell; and he struck Peter's side and woke him up, saying, "Get up *quickly*." There's

the word, translated quickly. How was the angel using the word? Was he using it like we saw in Acts 25 of an event soon on the horizon? Or is he using it of haste, let's get out of here now and fast? On the double? He's using it of getting out of there fast. Well how did we know that? Because of the context. This is a jail break here, there's no time to dally around.

So there are these two meanings and the fight is about which meaning these terms have in Second Coming contexts. And if you're a preterist and you've decided they must refer to a near time frame, that first meaning, then you have to stay on that track and interpret everything accordingly. But it seems to me, lacking any historical report of Jesus coming back on the clouds in AD70, that it is highly improbable that the Second Coming already occurred and that those texts therefore do not mean in a near time frame but that when the event of the Second Coming occurs it occurs very rapidly. It's the idea that, for example, if you hear a gun shot guess what? You're not dead. Sometimes you see a person duck when they hear a gun shot. That's not doing anything; the bullet has already gone by, its velocity is far greater than the velocity of sound, the sound is the bullet breaking the sound barrier. So if you hear a gunshot you're safe. You're not safe if you never hear it, then you're dead. That's how quick it is and that's the sense of the Second Coming contexts, it happens so quick that by the time it's happened it's already too late; you don't have time to prepare when it occurs. So what's the lesson? Get prepared right now so you're ready when it does occur.

Now we've seen this before haven't we? When did we see this before? What did John the Baptist come announcing in the gospels? Repent for what is at hand? The kingdom is at hand. The point of those "at hand" statements is not to say that the kingdom had already arrived or that it was certain to arrive within a short period of time, it was simply to say that if you repent Israel the kingdom will arrive. But if they did not repent then it would not arrive since repentance is the condition of the kingdom coming. So the bottom line is that these terms are emphasizing imminency, something hanging over the threshold of history, ready to arrive at any moment. The kingdom was that way during the gospel period. It truly could have come but it did not come because the condition for its arrival was not met by the Jewish nation.

But the bottom line is when we come to the return of Christ passages and it uses these words "at hand" does our interpretation of these words abandon

literal interpretation? It's been 2000 years and He still hasn't come. Is that an allegorical interpretation? Preterists tell us, we are literal at this point and you are allegorical. Well, I'm sorry to disappoint you but yes, we are being literal. Look these words up in the lexicon and you'll find there are two uses that are literal, not one. Literal is not the issue. The issue is how are the words being used in the context? The context decides which of the two literal meanings is intended by the author. And as Charles Clough says, "The New Testament emphasis upon the quickness of Christ's future coming points to its supernaturalness and unpredictability." That's the point of these terms in Second Coming contexts. When Jesus returns it will occur quickly. There won't be time to prepare.

So to review, we have given two counter arguments to preterism. Number one, the picture of the Second Coming that we get from NT texts doesn't fit what actually happened in AD70 so preterists have to allegorize the text to make Jesus' coming the Roman Armies in AD70. The second counter argument is that the terms for "at hand" and "soon" have a second meaning, you don't exhaust it by simply saying they mean "soon in a near time frame." That doesn't exhaust the literal meanings because a second literal meaning is whenever it comes, it comes quickly. That's the point that Jesus was making, because we see right in Jesus' own words, right here in the Olivet Discourse He Himself is thinking that way when He's using these words because of the way He illustrates His coming is to say it's like lightning, "as lightning comes from the east and flashes even to the west, so will the coming of the Son of Man be." We may have a lightning storm approaching soon but that's not the same as when we're talking about the speed of lightning. Jesus is talking about the second sense.

ⁱ David Chilton, *Paradise Restored: An Eschatology of Dominion* (Tyler, TX; Reconstruction Press, 1985), 224.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012