

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Church and Last Things, Session 13, Immortality, God and Humans, Christ's Second Coming, Its Manner, Personal, Visible and Glorious

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Doctrines of the Church and Last Things. This is session 13, Immortality, God and Humans, Christ's Second Coming, Its Manner, Personal, Visible, and Glorious.

We continue our lectures now on the Doctrine of Last Things, or Eschatology, and let's ask for the Lord's help.

Gracious Father, thank you for being our God and making us your people through your Son by your Spirit. Encourage us to have a living hope in the return of our Lord and Savior, Jesus, because he is alive because he and other Biblical writers promise his return. Give us, may it be a blessed, a joyous hope for us; we pray through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

We moved from Ecclesiology, the Doctrine of the Church, to the Doctrine of Last Things and dealt with introductory matters three of them. The two ages contrast the present age from the age to come.

We then talked about the Kingdom of God and its various aspects. On top of a strong Old Testament background in the Kingdom of God, Jesus inaugurated the New Testament Kingdom of God in his public ministry. It was expanded mightily in his sitting at God's right hand and pouring out the Spirit at Pentecost on the church, but it is yet to be fulfilled in its fullness at his return, at his Second Coming.

Then, the third introductory aspect is the most important one, that is, the already and the not yet. Almost every page of the New Testament breathes this air, this atmosphere. The promises of the Old Testament are fulfilled in the coming of Christ and in his work and sending the Spirit.

That's the already. Already prophecies are fulfilled, but not-yet are they totally or finally fulfilled. The same New Testament witnesses fulfillment and yet points to things still to be fulfilled in their fullness on the last day.

Then, we talked about death and the intermediate state. We said, according to Scripture, death is not natural but unnatural. And we distinguished physical death from spiritual death, which is both spiritual death already.

Unsafe people are unregenerate. They are dead in their trespasses and sins. And if they die in their sins, they will experience the second death, which is biblical language for eternal separation from God or hell.

The second death is not yet. The first death occurs when people die physically. Intermediate state.

We said that the main Christian hope is not to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. That is a hope. But the main hope is the resurrection of the body for everlasting life on the new earth with God and all of the saints.

Nevertheless, the Bible does teach an interim state. It distinguishes the present state. It doesn't use this terminology, but the present state, life in the body, the interim or intermediate state, which is after death, before resurrection, and the eternal state, the final state, which is that which follows the resurrection of the body.

The Bible says quite a bit about it for believers. So, it's an intermediate heaven. Philippians 1 says it's better than Philippians 1:23. It's far better than being alive and knowing the Lord, which is, first of all, hard to understand because the intermediate state is abnormal.

We're outside of our bodies. That's not how God made Adam and Eve. That's not the way we are now as human beings.

It's not the way we'll be eternally. Pastors err when they extrapolate from the intermediate state to the eternal state and say our greatest hope is being with Jesus in heaven. No, it isn't.

Our greatest hope is being raised, God getting body and soul together again, and being with Jesus and all of God's people on the new earth. Nevertheless, there is an intermediate heaven. It's better in two ways than knowing the Lord now.

Number one, all sin is gone. Hebrews 12:23 talks about coming to the... What does it talk about? It's talking about the spiritual Mount Zion heaven, the spirits of just men made perfect, ESV, the spirits of righteous men made perfect. Perfect, without sin.

But the most important way the intermediate state is superior to the present one is we will be in the immediate presence of Christ. I desire to be with depart and be with Christ, Philippians 1, Paul says, which is far better. Philippians 1:23. Today, you will be with me in paradise, Jesus told the believing thief.

The essence of paradise is being with Jesus. And 1. Corinthians 5, the best intermediate state passage of all. Now, we are home in the body and away from the Lord.

We long to be away from the body and at home with the Lord. The undifferentiated Lord in the New Testament means Lord Jesus. And there it is again.

The intermediate state is better because sin is gone, but mainly, it's better because we're in the immediate presence of Jesus. Better indicates points to good and best by comparison. It is good to know the Lord in the body now.

It is better, Paul says it, Philippians 1:23, to depart and be with Christ. The best is yet to come. It's a resurrected, holistic, totally sanctified, glorified, and so forth, justified existence with the Lord on the new earth.

It's harder for unbelievers to show the intermediate state, but we did so. That is Luke 16, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Speaks of the intermediate state for both the righteous and the unrighteous.

The poor man, Lazarus, whose name is apparently important. It means he whom God cares for. He whom God regards.

And he does take care of him and takes him to Abraham's bosom at death. His side, an intertestamental way of speaking of intermediate heaven, paradise, bliss after death. But by contrast, we know the wicked rich man is wicked.

Because he wants to send somebody back to warn his wicked brothers that they might repent, the wicked rich man dies and goes to Hades, which here speaks of intermediate hell. Usually, Hades, similar to Old Testament Sheol, speaks of the grave.

But here, it plainly speaks of an intermediate hell. Because the unsaved man is in torment in the flames. Often, fire imagery is used to show the suffering of the lost in hell.

Here, there is not eternal hell but intermediate hell. And there is a great chasm between heaven and hell. There's no going from the one to the other.

And mainly, we see it's a place of terrible suffering and pain from which there's no escape. The main thrust of the parable is the law of end stress. The last point is the sufficiency of Holy Scripture to warn people of the coming wrath.

And to point people to the gospel. If they don't believe Abraham, Moses, and the prophets. Father Abraham speaks for God.

If they don't believe Moses and the prophets, they wouldn't believe even if somebody is raised from the dead. We're raised from the dead. Of course, when Luke writes these words, they're ironic because Jesus had been raised from the dead.

And many Jews had not accepted him. I think 2 Peter 2:9 also speaks of the intermediate state for unbelievers. But that's enough.

We move on to immortality. Traditionally, this has played a big role in the Christian church's thinking. Perhaps too big a role.

We need to say three things. Only God is inherently immortal. Contrary to annihilationism, he granted immortality to all human beings.

Thirdly, biblically speaking, it is better to speak of the immortality of human beings than of the immortality of the soul. First of all, God is inherently immortal. In 1 Timothy 6, we have these words of Paul.

I charge you, the apostle gives a charge to his apostolic delegate and disciple, Timothy, in the presence of God, 1 Timothy 6:13, who gives life to all things and of Christ Jesus, who in his testimony before Pontius Pilate made the good confession. I challenge you to keep the commandment unstained and free from reproach until the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he will display at the proper time. He was the blessed and only sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who alone has immortality, who dwells in unapproachable light, whom no one has ever seen or can see.

To him be honor and eternal dominion. Amen. God is said alone to have immortality.

The meaning is he alone is inherently immortal. Unfortunately, it is now being debated among evangelical Christians whether this next point is true. Traditionally, the church has affirmed, and I affirm, that God, the inherently immortal one, has granted immortality to human beings, in fact, to all human beings.

I keep looking at that text. It seems to be ascribing inherent immortality to the son. Perhaps it is the father.

Perhaps it goes back to I charge you in the presence of God. I think that might be right. Later on, we'll deal with views of hell.

One of those views is annihilationism. And there are different views on that. The best evangelical annihilationism and it is held by evangelicals, says Jesus, comes back.

He raises the dead. He judges the lost. And annihilationism is a view of hell rather than a denial of it as in universalism.

But then he punishes the wicked according to their just desserts. And when they have paid the penalty for their sins, the final stroke is their extinction of being by God. They are annihilated.

They are destroyed and no longer exist. That is not the church's historic position. I do not agree with it.

And there are five main arguments for annihilationism, which we'll visit later. We'll visit at least four of them later because one is right now. It's right at hand.

I can't avoid it. One of the five arguments for annihilationism, along with the fire imagery, says fire consumes. That means the wicked are going to be consumed.

The vocabulary of destruction, John Stott, godly man. And he was so cautious. And he held it in his heart secretly for 50 years.

But he finally was drawn out in a debate with a liberal Anglican. And he said it says they're going to be destroyed. It means what it says, which is just begging the question.

So sad for such a great scholar. What does it mean for them to be destroyed? As a matter of fact, he cites Revelation, where the beast and the false prophet are destroyed. Later on, I'll track through the book of Revelation because that announcement comes.

And then, in chapter 19, they're cast into the lake of fire. In chapter 20, they suffer eternal punishment. That is their destruction.

So, we need to let the Bible define its own terms. Anyway, five arguments for annihilationism are just a preview. The vocabulary of destruction means extinction of being.

Hellfire imagery means not eternal pain and torment but consumption. God's justice. It would be unjust of God to punish people forever for sins committed in time.

The universalist passages. Evangelical annihilationists do not teach universalism, but they say surely it comports better with universalism for the wicked to be finally destroyed and be off of the scene entirely to fit with a passage like 1 Corinthians 15 when the son gives the kingdom over to the father. This happens so that God might be all in all.

Is his being all in all fitting with a portion of his creation suffering endlessly? The fifth argument is based on conditional immortality. One other argument for annihilationism merits attention. I'm reading *Hell on Trial, The Case for Eternal Punishment*, a book I wrote in 1995.

I regard it sort of as a basic Bible college text. I actually did three main books in this area, for good or for ill. So good to do a couple of books on heaven later on.

But anyway, another one was a debate for intervarsity with Edward Fudge. He argued for annihilationism. I argued the traditional view.

And then the big one, the big academic one, was *Hell Under Fire* for Zondervan, in which my partner in crime, Christopher Morgan, professor at California Baptist University, dean of the School of Christian Ministries, and I assembled a wonderful team, Al Mohler and J.I. Packer and Doug Moo, and just wonderful people. Bob Yarbrough is a really fine team to handle matters in an academic way, with respect for others, which is a hallmark, thankfully, of the things Morgan and I have done. Conditional immortality, conditionalism for short, although it's technically different, even in the literature, it becomes another name for annihilationism.

Here's the technical difference. Annihilationism means the wicked will be exterminated. That's the word I was reaching for, and my brain finally came in.

They'll suffer the penalty for their sins, and then they'll be exterminated. Conditional immortality, or conditionalism, is the view that human souls are not naturally immortal. They're mortal.

But that immortality is a gift given by God only to the righteous in regeneration, and who, as a result, live forever. Those who don't receive the gift of immortality cease to exist. But the unrighteous, because they lack the gift of immortality, are annihilated and cease to exist.

Clark Pinnock regards this issue as crucial. Clark Pinnock is an evangelical with the Lord now, known for changing his mind. He wrote a book on the inerrancy of Scripture with P&R Publishing.

That is wonderful, still, although he backed away from it. He held to eternal punishment, but as he drifted, he came to believe you can be saved without hearing the gospel. That's called inclusivism, if you have not heard the gospel, you get a chance after death to hear the gospel, and then if you don't believe it, you'll be annihilated. He changed his mind in many other ways as well, going from a five or more-point Calvinist to a five or more-point Arminian, and on and on.

He is still a godly man, still a brother; he does drive me crazy with this kind of language. I told you, I try to be fair to my opponents. I'll let you be the judge if he's fair. Quote: this is clearly an important issue in our discussion because belief in the natural immortality of the soul, which is so widely held by Christians, although stemming more from Plato than from the Bible, really drives the traditional doctrine of hell more than exegesis does.

I bite my tongue. Consider the logic: if souls must live forever because they are naturally immortal, the lake of fire must be their home forever and cannot be their destruction. I am convinced that the Hellenistic belief in the immortality of the soul has done more than anything else, specifically more than the Bible, to give credibility to the doctrine of everlasting conscious punishment of the wicked.

Close quote. Clark Pinnock wrote that in *The Destruction of the Finely Impenitent*. It's an article that he wrote.

I believe it was in the *Criswell Journal of Theology*, believe it or not, but I'm not sure of that. This argument, my response, well, first of all, first of all, God alone does possess immortality. Souls are not naturally immortal.

God gives the gift of immortality. It looks to me like to all souls. Why do you say that? Does the Bible directly say that? No, but Matthew 25:46, the single most important verse in the whole Bible, is what drives the doctrine of eternal destinies, not Hellenistic philosophy.

It is true that Plato and Aristotle believed in the immortality of the soul and rejected the resurrection of the body. Hence, the response to Paul on Mars Hill in Athens is when he ends up his message talking about the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. It drives them crazy.

That's Acts 17. It drives the philosophers crazy, and some of them just lose it. Others want to hear him another day because they like to hear new ideas.

Matthew 25, the parable of the sheep and the goats, ends up like this and they, the goats, the lost, will go away to eternal punishment but the righteous to eternal life. I'll deal with this later, but St. Augustine around the year 400 was right. The same adjective *aionios*, we'll talk about its meaning.

It means age along with the age defined by the context. The context of the age to come is characterized by the life of God, which is everlasting. The same adjective *aionios*, Augustine said, is used to describe both the fate of the lost and the saved.

Eternal punishment, eternal life. Does it mean different things? No, it means eternal punishment, eternal life. Because of that, I teach the immortality of human beings as a gift from God, who alone is immortal.

Nevertheless, I'll read my response to Piddick in a minute. Technically and biblically speaking, the immortality of the soul is not a biblical expression, but 1 Corinthians 15:53, and 54 contrasts our present bodies with our resurrection bodies. And it says the mortal must put on immortality.

Perishable, imperishable. Weak, powerful. Shameful, in burial, is not the right word, but glorious is the right word.

And then natural and spiritual. We'll deal with all that when we get to the resurrection of the body. But for now, it is the resurrected body of human beings, of whole human beings, that are technically called immortal.

That's why I would say, number one, only God is inherently immortal. Number two, it's a logical inference, since human beings suffer eternal punishment or eternal life, that God has granted immortality to human beings. But it's better to speak of the immortality of human beings, the whole persons, than of the soul because of the way 1 Corinthians 15 uses that adjective and noun, immortal and immortality.

Response to Pinnock. This argument for annihilationism or conditionalism based on the immortality of the soul has been vastly overrated for four reasons. First, although philosophy has influenced all periods of church history, including ours, and Clark Pinnock has been greatly influenced by various philosophies, I didn't write that though; those who have argued for a traditional view of hell have done so if we listen to their writings, because they believe that is what the Bible teaches.

This is true. For example, here comes the list of worthies: Tertullian, Augustine, Thomas, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, William G.T. Shedd, Millard Erickson, D.A. Carson, Douglas Moo, Jim Packer, to name a few of the stalwarts of orthodoxy. It is ludicrous to argue that they held to eternal punishment and eternal torment because they were influenced by platonic philosophy. If we take their own claims seriously, they believed in this terrible doctrine out of fidelity to biblical teaching, sometimes against their own natural inclinations.

Packer said it well. If you want to see people go to hell, something is wrong with you. Second, their view of immortality was not platonic but biblical.

They did not hold that the souls of humans were inherently immortal, as did Plato. Rather, acknowledging that God alone is immortal, 1 Timothy 6.16, as Paul says, they taught that the immortal God grants immortality to all human beings. Third, we need to define the concept of the immortality of the soul.

In fact, to avoid confusion, we might do well to abandon the expression. Some use the words the immortality of the soul to refer to the survival of the immaterial part of human nature after death. Though that is a biblical idea, it is better called the survival of the human soul or spirit in the intermediate state.

We confuse the intermediate and final states if we refer to the former by the expression, the immortality of the soul. We're not going to be immortal souls forever. We're going to be resurrected beings.

Most use the immortality of the soul to describe our final destiny. That, too, is misleading since our final state is not a disembodied spiritual life in heaven but a holistic resurrected one on the new earth. All things considered, it is better to talk about the immortality of people, not of souls.

This accords with the language of 1 Corinthians 15, which says of the resurrected righteous, quote, for the perishable must clothe itself with the imperishable and the mortal with immortality. 1 Corinthians 15:53. Finally, and most importantly, I do not believe in a traditional view of hell because I accept the immortality of human beings, but the other way around.

I believe in the immortality of human beings because the Bible clearly teaches everlasting damnation for the wicked and everlasting life for the righteous. Christ's second coming. Its manner, its timing, and then its function.

Three sub-points. Its manner. This is really like the ABCs of the second coming, but you know what? I think we start with the ABCs from the Bible, and then we build on it.

The second coming is personal, visible, and glorious, and I'm going to teach here by both affirmation and negation. You'll see what I mean. What how can we describe the second coming of Christ in basic terms? In the simplest terms, using the scriptures, of course.

It's personal. He personally will come again. Although there is a sense that, as we said earlier when we said every major aspect of the last things is already and not yet, one could consider the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost as the already appearing of Jesus.

But I said right then, that's true and fair enough, but it would be wrong to thereby deny a not yet coming of Jesus. That's what we're talking about here. Jesus' second coming is personal.

The Lord Jesus Christ, not humiliated, but glorified, is coming again. His coming at Pentecost is not this second coming. Acts 1:11.

The apostles continued to look as the ascended Christ went up. By the way, we might misunderstand the ascension. After our Lord's resurrection, he appeared to those disciples various times.

Where was he when he didn't appear to them? Was he hiding out in a cave in Judea somewhere? I don't think so. That is, the ascension in Acts 1 is a public event for the sake of the disciples and apostles. It is not the first time Jesus goes back to the Father.

To the dying thief, he says, today you will be with me in paradise. On the cross, Jesus said, also on the cross, Father, into your hands, I commit my spirit. The Lord was in and out of the Father's presence.

He didn't need the ascension to return to the Father. The ascension was a public event. By my token, it's one of Jesus' nine saving works.

His incarnation and sinless life are essential prerequisites for the heart and soul of his saving work, his death, and resurrection, and they're followed by five saving events that come from his death and resurrection, his ascension, his sitting at God's right hand, his pouring out the spirit of Pentecost, his interceding for the church, and then his second coming is the final manifestation of his saving events. Nothing takes away from the cross an empty tomb but two precursors, five results. Incarnation, sinless life, death and resurrection, ascension, session, ascension, session, Pentecost, I left out.

Pouring out the spirit is his saving work as much as dying on the cross. The cross and the empty tomb are more basic. Pours out the spirit, intercedes, and comes again, five essential ramifications, one of which is the ascension.

The ascension is his public transference from the lowly, limited sphere of the earth to the heavenly, transcendent sphere from which he, Acts 5:31, pours out the spirit, gives the gifts of repentance and forgiveness, and continues to do him, to give his words and to do his acts through his apostles by his spirit. So, they're looking up, and the angel says, Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into heaven? Jesus, who has taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way you saw him go into heaven. Perhaps that means on the clouds, but that's not the main point.

The main point is he will return personally. Teaching this truth by negation. Although Pentecost could be viewed as the already return of Christ, it is not the not-yet return of Christ.

It is not the full, final return of Christ because, number one, the manner of that is visible, is personal, sorry, is personal. Number two, it bleeds over into this one, it is visible. Especially in the 19th century, it became popular among evangelicals to teach that it's a partial truth that God comes and takes his believers when they die.

As a matter of fact, a whole practice, a whole theology, and practice revolve around things like deathbed conversions and so forth. Actually, there is such a thing, but it is not a good idea to wait until then. The whole thing was kind of off of the center, beside the point.

The whole thing was strange. Anyway, believers at death go to be with the Lord. As to how the mechanics work, I'm not sure, but that's not the second coming.

That's a negation on this one. The second coming is personal. It is visible.

Revelation 1:7, every eye shall see him, especially those who opposed him. And then Matthew 25:31 is, why are so many eschatological passages misunderstood? I don't get it. If you simply read the verses in context, you do get it.

Now, we don't understand everything about eschatology. My goodness, you'll see in the end, I'm going to urge people to have their own views of some of the details, even including the millennium. My students just keep at me until I tell them what my own view is.

It's not my big deal to do that, but I emphasize four truths, and this is the first of them. The second coming, the resurrection of the dead, last judgment, eternal destinies. I'm sure of those truths.

I would preach and teach them God's very truth. I do build my teachings on the last things around them, not around some of the other details. They don't seem to be as clear to me, and I'm not going to fight and divide over others concerning those things.

I'll teach those things. We ought to be aware of them, but in any case, the return of Christ is a verity. It's one of those four foundational truths.

By the way, the church from the 20th century to the 21st century has held to the return of Christ, resurrection, last judgment, eternal heaven and hell, eternal new earth and hell. Matthew 24:27. I said the wrong verse.

There's where that Matthew 24 got moved to, right there between 25 and 20. Verse 23. If anyone says to you, look, first, I'll just read the verse out of context.

27. For as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will be the coming of the son of man. Some have said, that means his coming is going to be quick.

Well, maybe his coming will be quick, and maybe in other places, even here, teach that, but this isn't teaching the timing of his coming. It's rather teaching the visibility of his coming. Look at the context.

Verse 23 of Matthew 24. If anyone says to you, look, here is the Christ, or there he is, sun, young moon is the Christ. No.

The Watchtower society of the so-called Jehovah's Witnesses that's the return of Christ. No. Do not go out.

Do not believe it. If they say, look, he's in a room. Do not believe it.

For as lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will be the coming of the son of man. You will not miss it. Don't worry about it; oh man, I was asleep, and then I missed a second.

No, you're not going to miss it. It is going to be a huge public event. Do I sound like I'm contradicting the secret rapture doctrine? Yes, I am.

I understand those who believe in that saying. This is not talking about that. This is talking about the later second coming. Well, I'll just say this.

The second coming is not only personal, but it is visible. It is not the coming of God at death to take believers. I'm not even sure the Bible exactly says that that way, but that is off the mark.

The second coming is personal and visible, and in contrast to the first coming, it is glorious. Jesus came for the first time in humiliation. He was born in a stable and put in a cattle trough.

The birds have their nests. The foxes have their dens. I might have reversed that, but the son of man has no place to lay his head.

At least some of the time, it sounds like he's a homeless person. This is not the Lord of Glory being received. He should have been received by his people.

Oh, my goodness. The ultimate humiliation is his execution by the covenant people and then his burial. They buried the body of the son of God.

This is a sick world. There's something really wrong with that, but thank God, whereas the first coming was in humiliation, oh, I understand there were even sparks of his glory then. I believe in the transfiguration.

I believe the signs in John's gospel reveal his glory. I get it, but it's not for no reason that the post-reformation Lutherans and reformed distinguished between the two states, state of humiliation and state of exaltation, and when Jesus comes again, we're not talking about any humiliation. We're talking about mega-glorification.

We've already read it once. We'll probably read it a few more times, back to the sheep and the goats.

Matthew 25, 31. When the Son of Man comes in his glory and all the angels with him, this is his retinue. This is his train.

Here are his attendants. Here's a king coming with his entourage. There you go.

Then he will sit on his glorious throne. The nations of the earth are going to be gathered before him, and he will judge them, not decide their destinies. That's beforehand.

That's based upon their response to him during their lives, but assigning their destinies. I started to say something about Wesley before, and now I'm back on track with that. We don't understand everything about the last things.

John Wesley spent thousands of hours on horseback evangelizing the British Isles, all right and did a marvelous job. I have a friend who is a wonderful brother in Christ, who calls himself a Wesleyan and loves Calvin. I am a Calvinist who loves Wesley, probably not as much as he loves Calvin because Wesley really hated Calvinism.

But anyway, I appreciate John Wesley's and Charles Wesley's hymns. It must be our favorite hymn writer in church. My goodness.

Along with John, the slave trader. John, help me. The former slave trader who wrote all those hymns, John and John Newton.

Thank you. John Newton is that gentleman. Very good.

More contemporary artists. But we sing Wesley's hymns with great joy in our hearts. The Wesleys did so much good.

I do part company with their theology, and they would consider my theology in systemic error, and I would do the same to them, but I surely receive them as brothers in Christ and rejoice in them. Anyway, John Wesley, all those hours on

horseback, he translated the Bible into different languages. He wrote all kinds of stuff.

He made comments on the whole New Testament and the whole Old Testament, wrote a treatise on original sin, and did some computations in his mind. Return of Christ. Resurrection of all the dead.

Just based on the number of people Wesley knew in the world in his day. Can you imagine now? What is it? Seven billion or whatever? Last Judgment. Assigning people their destinies.

He figured it was going to take 100,000 years to have all that done. I laugh. He's a brilliant man, okay? I laugh.

I get the point. There's an awful lot of stuff going on. Somehow, I don't think it's going to take so long, but it just illustrates to me that we don't know all these details.

It does sound like, you know, the Israelites in the wilderness, even if you have the, you know, the Old Testament numbers are a problem. I get that. Still, you have muchos people.

There are some difficulties understanding all of that, right? Do you talk about billions of people? The Lord will do what he will do, but we don't understand it all. I'm not saying it's going to take 100,000 years. I'm just saying one good man did some computation, and that's what he came up with.

Christ's second coming in its manner is ABCs, but we need the ABCs as our foundation. Personal. It is not the coming of the spirit at Pentecost.

Visible. It is not the invisible coming of God at the death of believers if that's what he does. It is glorious.

It is not his coming at the first coming in humility. In our next lecture, we'll take up more detailed and controversial matters concerning the timing of the second coming of Christ.

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Doctrines of the Church and Last Things. This is session 13, Immortality, God and Humans, Christ's Second Coming, Its Manner, Personal, Visible, and Glorious.