

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Grace Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_grace-journal.php

JESUS MAY COME TODAY

WILLIAM R. FOSTER
Member of the Faculty
London Bible College

The present world unrest, with its mounting tensions, its political turmoil, and its wars and rumors of war, has undoubtedly caused a new appreciation by true believers of the certainty of their blessed hope. As the darkness of the age increases, the expectation of the daystar will become even more precious unto all those who "love His appearing" (2 Tim. 4:8 ASV). This is the star of hope to saints weary of this world and desirous of that life which is "very far better" (Phil. 1:23). In our moments of reflection upon this blessed hope our hearts sometimes beat with the anticipation of that day, and something of the sweetness of that expectation fills our hearts as it must have filled the heart of the saintly Bernard of Clairvaux.

Jesus, the very thought of thee,
With sweetness fills my breast;
But sweeter far thy face to see,
And in thy presence rest.

The expectation of the soon coming of our blessed Lord is one of our most satisfying experiences -- the silver lining of the turbulent clouds of our contemporary life, the spiritual goal in a world which has lost all sense of direction, a blessed hope when all hope seems to have vanished from the rosy optimism of yesteryear.

The Historical Antecedents of the Doctrine of Imminency

Historical studies of doctrine are of some value in the establishment of perspective in theological matters--to discover the doctrinal questions which center about any scriptural teaching; to discover the solutions proposed by godly men of the past centuries; to eliminate unfruitful and irrelevant doctrinal views which have been previously held; to discover the basic doctrinal positions which have established themselves in the minds of men concerning any subject. However, historical studies have definite limitations in the establishment of the validity of a doctrinal interpretation. In the early decades of the Christian church the apostles were present to guide the church into authoritative statements of truth either orally or through written epistles. In the decades and centuries after the passing of the apostles there was no authoritative voice other than the Scriptures to determine the accuracy of theological positions. Hence interpretations of the early and later Church fathers which are clearly contrary to the apostolic teachings must be rejected as erroneous teachings, or regarded as a failure to understand the apostolic teaching in all of its details. In the light of these valid principles the history of the doctrine of the rapture may be traced through the centuries of the Christian church.

The Patristic Confusion: The early Church fathers apparently had rather clear convictions concerning the relationship of the coming of Christ to the establishment of the Millennial kingdom. "The most striking point in the eschatology of the Ante-Nicene age is the prominent Chiliasm...that is the belief of a visible reign of Christ in glory on earth with the risen saints for a thousand years.... It was indeed not the doctrine of the church embodied in any creed or form of devotion, but a widely

This paper was delivered at the annual meeting of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches meeting in June, 1960, at Long Beach, California.

current opinion of distinguished teachers."¹ However, some of the early church fathers expected the appearance of the Antichrist and the period of tribulation to precede the actual advent of Christ to establish the Kingdom. Posttribulationists have seized upon these facts as one of their chief arguments in repudiation of a pretribulational rapture. However, before this could be admitted as valid evidence of the time of the rapture, it must be shown that these early Church fathers held the true apostolic teaching, and that they were not mistaken in their interpretation of the events of the end-time.

This apparent expectation of the early Church fathers must be balanced by a general expectation that the coming of Christ would be sudden, unexpected, and unpredictable. This poses an eschatological tension in the early Church which was not resolved because of their preoccupation with other doctrinal questions. The actual refinement of the details of eschatology has not been attempted until the past century. This tension in the early Church between the expectation of the Antichrist and the expectation of Christ was caused by emphases which were clearly a departure from the Scriptures.

(1) The interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures was coloured by the existing conditions of the early centuries. The early Church fathers were involved in bitter experiences of persecution and tribulation during the first three centuries of church history, and there seems to have been a tendency to equate their present state with that period which the Scriptures associated with the Antichrist. Irenaeus attempted to correct this tendency to apply future prophecies to present experience. He asserts that the end is not immediately at hand; warns the Church against false teachers who were propagating views about the identity of Antichrist; states that the division of the Roman empire into ten parts must occur before the Antichrist can arise.² It seems to be a valid observation that even the outstanding teachers misunderstood to some extent the nature of the prophesied period, and consequently tended to associate the Church with this period when the Antichrist was present.

(2) The interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures was coloured by a failure to observe the dispensational distinction between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant. Much of the language of the fathers of the first three centuries reflects Jewish ideas as seen in the common use of such terms as altar, priest, oblations, sacrifices, and offerings. This is evident to such a high degree that the scholar Neander wrote that we have "the whole system of the Jewish priesthood transferred to the Christian church."³ Hebert, an Anglican scholar, found that by the end of the second century the "importing of Jewish terms and ideas had increased fearlessly and freely."⁴ The American historian McGiffert believed that this drift had gone so far that there was in embryonic form "the historic Catholic system complete in all its main features."⁵ This transference of Old Covenant ideas into the Christian Church had also its effect upon eschatology. The dispensational distinction between Israel and the Church began to disappear, and consequently, those Old Testament discourses concerning the Antichrist and the tribulation became more and more a part of the patristic expectation. It may also be historically demonstrated that the expectation of the future coming of Christ faded until at the time of Augustine the coming of Christ as a future event was practically lost. Therefore, the doctrine of an imminent pretribulational rapture as a systematized doctrine could not develop in such a theological atmosphere.

The Amillennial Flood: The movement of the Church beyond the beginning of the fourth century was increasingly into the area of doctrinal confusion and error. Even though some notable ecumenical councils were held in the fourth and fifth centuries, and some famous doctrinal formulas were established, these facts only are the evidences of increasing doctrinal controversy. It is, therefore, not to be expected that any clarification concerning the rapture will be found in this area of Church

history. Indeed, the doctrinal trends of the first three centuries crystallized into amillennialism under the influence of Origen and Augustine. Posttribulationism is the natural progeny of this system of thought although it has often found its way into the premillennial camp as well. Origen turned the stream of doctrinal development into the maze of the allegorical method of interpretation, and Augustine developed the full system of Amillennialism by the interpretation of the prophecies of the second advent, resurrection, millennium, and tribulation as present experiences of this age rather than as future events.

The Middle Ages was a period of gross darkness for all doctrines, and in general throughout this time the Christians were content with the triumph of the Church in the present order and with the hope of the individual after death. Thus, the Augustinian system prevailed in these centuries. Some small sects continued an emphasis upon the expectation of Christ's return and the establishment of Christ's kingdom, but these groups were too small and persecuted to accomplish any systematic formulation of the rapture truth. In general the Reformers continued the Amillennial theology of the Roman church as their basic foundation. These Reformers did, however, look for the return of Christ. This emphasis upon an expectation of a future coming of Christ was a significant step in the return of the Church toward the true apostolic teaching. One additional development which prepared the way for the refinement of eschatological doctrine was the emergence of a pronounced premillennial doctrine among groups who were not influenced by Roman Catholic theology, e.g. In England, William Tyndale, Nicholas Ridley, Hugh Latimer; In France, the Huguenots; In Switzerland, the Anabaptists; In Bohemia and Moravia, the Brethren.

The general trends of the Reformation period continued into the following centuries with an increasing emphasis upon a future return of Christ. Although Amillennialism and Postmillennialism were still in the flood stage, there was a noticeable growth of premillennial support. Premillennialists have been generally found as a minority group in all denominational affiliations, and have numbered among its supporters such influential men as Bengel, Olshausen, Gill, Alford, Lange, Steir, Fausset, Elliott, and the Mathers. The recapture of the doctrine of the future return of Christ together with the restoration of the premillennial philosophy of history provided the basic foundation upon which a systematic and careful study of eschatology could be erected. Therefore, for the first time since the days of the apostles the Christian Church possessed the requisite conditions and knowledge to develop a consistent doctrine of eschatology.

The Modern Recovery: At the turn of the nineteenth century a strong reaction to Postmillennialism resulted in a renewed emphasis upon the personal coming of Christ and the consequent establishment of the Kingdom. Out of this revival of interest in prophetic truth there came into special prominence two differing approaches to the subject of Christ's return. Both of these approaches move within the realm of Premillennialism. The doctrine of Futurism was essentially a return of the method of prophetic exegesis found in the early Church fathers, essential to which is the teaching that the Antichrist will be a satanically inspired world ruler at the end of the age, the return of Christ is not until the end of the tribulation period at which time He will establish the Messianic kingdom. This doctrine of Futurism ends up in a posttribulation concept of the coming of Christ.

A second outgrowth of the prophetic awakening of the nineteenth century was Dispensationalism which asserts that Christ will come prior to the tribulation for the Church, and after the tribulation to establish His Messianic kingdom. Although this principle has been labelled by its opponents as "the height of speculative nonsense",⁶ the system is not new since Dispensationalism is actually the

recovery of the teaching from which the early Church departed in the early centuries. Dispensationalism asserts that a sharp distinction must be always maintained between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant, and that the Jewish concepts and ideas of the Old Testament have no relevance in determining the nature of the Church's ministry and polity. Israel as a nation has been set aside by God until the completion of the redemptive purpose in the Church at which time the Church will be raptured and God will deal with Israel in a final seven year period. If the early Church fathers had drawn the proper implications from their expectation of the sudden and unpredictable coming of Christ, they would have developed a proper dispensational pretribulational pattern. However, the pressure of Jewish ideas and customs moved them away from this possibility unto that which resulted in the covenant theology-amillennial pattern. The dispensational principle provides the proper key for the recovery of the apostolic teaching concerning the events of the future.

The Doctrinal Foundation of the Concept of Imminency

One of the chief reasons for the disagreement as to the time of the rapture is to be found in the failure to agree upon the significance of Israel and the Church. Those who sharply distinguish Israel and the Church are usually both pretribulational and premillennial. Whereas those who consider Israel and the Church as more or less the same entity may be premillennial in eschatology, they are normally posttribulational in ecclesiology. In the definition of the distinctions between Israel and the Church there is a necessity to develop an adequate concept of distinction. Some have been so impressed by the elements of continuity that they have overlooked the fact that the Scriptures do indicate that Israel and the Church must be understood as distinct phases of God's purpose.

The Chronological Evidence: (Dan. 9:24-27). The 70 weeks of Daniel's prophecy are determined upon the people of Daniel and upon the holy city of Daniel's people. The first 69 weeks or 483 years of this period were to be concluded at the coming of the Messiah, and after the 69 weeks Messiah was to be cut off. A distinct gap is to be found between the conclusion of the 69th week and the beginning of the 70th week during which two events were to take place, the crucifixion of the Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem. The intervening period is not defined as to length, but is to be characterized by war and desolation as it pertained to the Jewish people and city. The abomination of desolation associated with the 70th week is by Christ connected with the days immediately prior to His advent to the earth. The Church is the mystery related to the intervening period between the end of the 69th week and the beginning of the 70th week, and is not to be associated with the activities of the 70th week when God intervenes to conclude the specific promises given and determined to Israel alone.

The Hermeneutical Evidence: The literal meaning of the Bible is the first and controlling interpretation, and any double-sense interpretation must be regarded as suspect unless clear scriptural evidence exists to support the double sense. The term Israel must not be transferred into the term Church without clear scriptural justification. However, there is no evidence to indicate that the name Israel ever means other than a physical descendant of Abraham. Even the amillennial contention that the "Israel of God" in Galatians 6:15 refers to the Church is not contextually justified since Paul points out that the new creation in the Church involves both the circumcision and the uncircumcision. Thus, the "Israel of God" refers to Israelites like Paul who had become members of the Church in this age.

The Grammatical Evidence: (Rom. 11:25-26, Matt. 23:39, Luke 21:24, Acts 3:19-21). Each of these verses grammatically necessitate a period of time during which the divine purpose relative to

Israel is suspended, and predict a future time in which the purpose in relation to Israel will be resumed. The hardness which has befallen Israel will remain only until the fulness of the Gentile Church be brought in. The house of Israel is to be left desolate only until the day of spiritual vision for Israel when they greet their Messiah as the One who comes in the name of the Lord. The nation shall be captive and the city under the domination of the Gentiles only up to the end of the times of the Gentiles. The Messiah must remain in heaven only until the time appointed of God for the fulfilment of the promises given to Israel.

The Mystery Evidence: (Eph. 3:5-10, Rom. 11:25-26). The mention of the new revelation given to the apostles and the prophets is recorded by Paul in Ephesians 3:5-10. The significance of this new revelation has been variously explained. The Amillennialist understands that the lack of Old Testament knowledge concerning the Church is only in terms of degree rather than in terms of absolute-ness. Therefore, according to amillennial theology the Church is only a clearer concept of the same divine purpose embraced in the Old Testament under the name Israel. However, Paul does not give support to this concept of progressive revelation for the linguistic and grammatical sense demand a revelation "at this present time" of that which was not revealed in the former generations. The Old Testament has no teaching concerning the equality of Jew and Gentile in one body since Israel's promises were always in terms of national pre-eminence (Isa. 2:1-4, 61:5-6). The mystery which Paul announced to the Romans does not relate to the dispersion and hardening of Israel since this had been clearly foreseen in the Old Testament, but it does relate to the newly revealed information that the predicted future of Israel must await the completion of the pleroma of the Gentiles which constitute the Church.

The Scriptural Foundation of the Doctrine of Imminency

Any scriptural doctrine must be understood in the perspective of its context both immediate and extended. The revelation of truth cannot be given completely at one time since finite man must comprehend "line upon line, and precept upon precept." In order to observe the full scope of any doctrine it is necessary to trace the development of revelation from its beginnings unto its full-orbed picture. The doctrine of the second coming of Jesus Christ is one subject which has a long progression of development in the Scriptures. From the faint outline of the ultimate victory of the seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15 to the minute detail of the Revelation of John is a progression similar to that of bringing a picture into focus.

The Old Testament Perspective: From the general viewpoint of the Old Testament the two advents of Christ were telescoped into one coming. Even the prophets themselves did not fully understand the far reaching implications of the words which they had written. Many Old Testament prophets puzzled in their minds concerning the significance of that which the Spirit has witnessed to them when He spoke concerning the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow (1 Pet. 1:11). The conundrum was the unravelling of the suffering and reigning themes which they believed were to occur in relation to the Messianic advent. This Messianic advent was expected to be the great watershed which divided the former times of Jewish history from the latter times of Jewish prophecy. The long awaited day of the Lord which the prophets announced as imminent was regarded as the time of the Messianic intervention into the sequence of human history for the destruction of Israel's enemies and the fulfilment of Israel's promises. Even the famous prophecy of the 70 weeks of Daniel has a demonstratable gap between the 69th and 70th week only from the clear perspective of the New Testament revelation.

The Early Messianic Instruction: The early ministry of Christ was carried on in the midst of Israelites whose conceptual background was essentially that of the Old Testament although the reigning theme of the Messianic ministry had clearly overshadowed the suffering aspect in the popular opinion. Even John the Baptist announced that the Messiah of whom he was the forerunner was one who would baptize in the Holy Spirit and in fire. When the unquenchable fire of judgment did not immediately fall, the forerunner began to ask "Art thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" After Christ had gained a following of disciples, He began to clarify their understanding concerning the unresolved problem. In this instruction the Messianic advent appears for the first time as a double advent separated by a period of indeterminate length.

The parables of Matthew 13 were designed to clarify the disciples' minds concerning the ancient Jewish conundrum. Here was the unrevealed secret to gain an entrance to the door of understanding which had so long remained closed. The period of time was to be devoted to sowing the seed in the field of the world amid Satanic opposition and treachery. The unquenchable fire is now to be associated with "the consummation of the age" when the great harvest will take place, and the wheat and the tares be divided. "The consummation of the age" is to be understood as that brief and climactic period of time which is equivalent to the 70th week of Daniel's prophecy and the Old Testament "Day of the Lord." Now to discerning eyes an intervening period of time could be seen between "the year of Jehovah's favour" and "the day of vengeance of our God" (Isa. 61:2).

The stewardship parables of the gospels are built around the key ideas of a departing master, a long absence, responsible servants, and a period of judgment and reward in association with the Master's return. Much of the parabolic structure is built upon Jewish concepts associated with the Day of the Lord when Jehovah would intervene to reward the faithful and to punish the wicked. However, the concept of the departure and the return of the Master is related to the new revelation made by Christ. Since the absence of the Master is not defined as to length, the day of divine intervention into human affairs is an event which is to be regarded as always imminent.

The Later Messianic Instruction: The shadow of the cross introduced a new urgency in the ministry of Christ in the instruction of His disciples. Some of His most notable discourses were given in the last days of His earthly life prior to the cross. These discourses were particularly important since they clarified many areas of the apostolic thinking concerning the events and ministry beyond the cross. The Olivet discourse indicated future world history from the perspective of the actual events and their significance. The Upper Room discourse revealed the privileges and the possessions of the believer from the perspective of Church ministry. In each of these major areas of instruction Christ clearly defined the relation of the apostles and disciples to the second advent of Christ and the consummating judgments upon the world.

In Luke 21:36 the Saviour promised to His followers an escape from that awful period when the powers of the heavens shall be shaken (21:26). The consequence of the escape is further defined as the privilege of standing before the Son of man. Some theologians interpret this promise as being only that of an escape from the harmful effects of this period by virtue of divine preservation. However, this is clearly impossible in the light of Luke's remarkable historical parallel in Luke 21:20-24. In terminology as well as in principle the destruction of Jerusalem was a vivid precursor of the more extensive and universal destruction which is to be associated with the consummation of the age and with the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles. The remarkable feature of the judgment upon Jerusalem was that an opportunity would be given to the believers to escape out of the locality of the

vengeance and wrath of God. The Christian believers were to minister patiently and faithfully in the assurance that God would provide for their deliverance from this imminent wrath. Historically this was fulfilled when the Christians fled across the Jordan to the little city of Pella when the first signs of Roman encirclement appeared. In the extended eschatological picture which Luke records in 21:25-36 the same sequence is evident. All believers are called upon to live under conditions of imminency, maintaining spiritual expectancy and scriptural separation. The Day of the Lord will come suddenly and unexpectedly upon those unregenerate who dwell upon the face of the earth, and will enclose them in a snare from which there is no escape. However, the true disciples are promised a deliverance out of the locality of this universal vengeance in order that they may stand before the Son of man to receive His reward for faithful service.

In the Upper Room Christ began to speak to His own beloved disciples concerning His approaching departure from them. In response to Peter's question as to Christ's immediate destination the reply was given, "Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but later on you will follow me" (John 12:36 Berkeley). The reason for the absence and the delay in the disciples' departure is explained in John 14:1-3. The period of Christ's absence was to be a time of preparation for the coming of the disciples. In the Father's house He would prepare many abiding places where there would be room enough for all. The time of preparation is to be concluded by a single coming again on the part of Christ for the purpose of taking the disciples to the place prepared in heaven. This idea of going to the Father's house in heaven was quite foreign to the thinking of the disciples. Their conscious hope was that Christ would immediately establish His kingdom on earth, and that they would remain in the earthly sphere to reign with Him. The thought of going to heaven first was a new revelation. The destination and purpose of this coming are entirely distinct from that of the coming to the earth after the period of tribulation. The coming of Christ is only to welcome the disciples and to lead them back to the prepared places. This coming is in reality the taking of the disciples out of the world to escape from the judgments associated with the Day of the Lord, and in order to stand before the Son of man in the place which He has prepared for them.

The Epistolary Clarification: In the shadow of the cross the disciples understood from the lips of the Master Himself that the second advent would have two aspects--one a special coming designed to bring the disciples out of the sphere of world history into the heavenly abiding places; the other a well-known coming into the sphere of world history in wrath and vengeance upon the ungodly. In this special coming was the blessed hope of the disciples which was to cheer their hearts in their times of trial. "Let not your heart be troubled... I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also" (John 14:1-3). This promise of deliverance from the vengeance associated with the Day of the Lord at the consummation of the age became the hope and the expectation of the Christian Church in the apostolic era. The Church's expectation of the blessed hope was built upon the foundation of the words of Christ Himself, and the Holy Spirit merely directed the apostles into a more detailed understanding of the nature of this hope.

Especially in the Thessalonian epistles Paul has the subject of the coming of Christ upon his mind, and throughout the epistles this theme breaks through into the consciousness of Paul even while he discourses upon themes not directly related to the coming. Careful examination will reveal that Paul's concept of the coming is exactly that which Christ made known to His disciples in the shadow of the cross.

1 Thessalonians 1:10--The true believers were looking forward with patience and confidence for the great event when Jesus shall appear unto His own people. This attitude toward His coming is continuous since they know not the exact hour or time of His appearance. This imminent return of Christ is precisely that coming again promised by Jesus to His disciples in the Upper Room, and conversely, the wrath is that day of vengeance spoken of by Christ in the Olivet discourse from which the disciples were to escape.

1 Thessalonians 5:1-11--Paul discusses at some length the theme of the Day of the Lord, that climactic period of vengeance associated with the consummation of the age. Since Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2:3 associates this Day of the Lord with the revelation of the man of Sin, the Day of the Lord must be equivalent to the 70th week of Daniel's prophecy. This period of vengeance will come suddenly without any expectancy as a thief in the night when the unregenerate are priding themselves upon their peace and safety. However, the true believers are not to be overtaken by this imminent period of wrath for they will be experiencing another imminent event, the rapture. Paul argues in verses 9-11 that the imminent expectation of the believers is not wrath but deliverance. This deliverance is to be effected through translation since verse 10 is almost an exact resume of the details of the rapture in the preceding chapter. The correspondence continues since both in 1 Thessalonians 4:18 and 5:11 Paul refers to the expected comfort which may be received by the believers from the doctrine of the rapture.

2 Thessalonians 2:8-17--In 1 Thessalonians 5 Paul contrasted the believers with the unbelievers, and here also an extensive contrast is developed. However, there is a progression here beyond the former teaching. 1 Thessalonians 5 indicates the spiritual lethargy and indifference of the unregenerate as the condition in which the Day of the Lord will suddenly overtake them. 2 Thessalonians 2:8-12 indicates the subsequent experiences of the unregenerate within the period of the Day of the Lord. 1 Thessalonians 5 indicated also the regenerate nature of believers who were of the light and of the day so that the Day of the Lord would not overtake them as a thief. 2 Thessalonians 2:13-17 indicates the nature of the experience to be expected by those who have escaped this day of wrath. The believers will be obtaining the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ while the unbelievers are being deceived by the Antichrist.

Revelation 3:10--The believers at Philadelphia had most certainly been informed concerning the period of trial which was to be universal in geographical extent, future in chronological time, and penal in judicial consequences. This hour of trial is not to be an experience for the true believer. To be kept from evil by non-participation is one thing, but to be kept from a period of time necessitates an actual removal from the scene of history. The immediate connection of the promise of deliverance with the announcement of a coming related to the rewarding of the saints has real contributory significance in the establishment of the imminent pretribulational rapture. Therefore, the promise to the church at Philadelphia continues the same emphasis which has already been traced from the words of Christ in the shadow of the cross to the doctrinal expositions of Paul to the Thessalonians, and now to these concluding words of the Spirit spoken to the churches.

Jesus may come today. This is our blessed hope, a hope which is never more precious than it is now in the miasmatic fog of our contemporary world where all seems to be lost and nothing gained. However, Christians need to be reminded that the experience of the blessing of this hope is in direct proportion to the degree of our conscious meditation upon its possibility. Tragically many Christians are living in tomorrow and not in today. Jesus may come today. Tomorrow may never arrive. Our

dedication of life tomorrow can be of no value if Christ should come today. Our determination to witness to the lost tomorrow will be too late if Christ should come today. Our purpose to seek restoration with our brother tomorrow will be only an unfulfilled plan if Christ should come today. God's business is always done today. Every day has its quota of commitments which cannot be postponed until tomorrow. "As fellow workers we appeal to you not to accept the grace of God without using it...for He says...now is a specially acceptable time; now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:1-2).

Jesus may come today, but He may not come until tomorrow. The Christian has no reason to lay down his tools until He comes. "Occupy till I come" the departing master exhorted his servants, and it would be a tragic dereliction of duty to be found idle when He comes. "Hold fast till I come" says the Lord of the churches. How tragic then it would be to have lost that deposit of truth which has been committed unto us. The Christian must learn to live today as if it were the last, and to plan for tomorrow as if it were certain to occur. Our blessed hope is not an eschatological escape mechanism to avoid the realities of today. It is a powerful stimulant to motivate us to do our utmost while yet it is today. Wherefore, beloved brethren, let us continue to live in expectation of "that blessed hope, even the glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus" (Tit. 2:12).

DOCUMENTATION

1. Phillip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, II, 614.
2. Irenaeus, Against Heresies, 5, 26, 1.
3. Augustus Neander, Church History, I, 408.
4. Charles Hebert, The Lord's Supper, I, 33.
5. A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought, I, 147.
6. Attributed to B. F. Newton who sharply contended with Darby over the rapture question.