

5/20/1019 11:00 AM

The Age Of The Parousia

A Review of the eschatological position of Samuel Frost
by Donald Perry.

The Parousia Of The Son Of Man written by Samuel Frost.

Why I Left Preterism by Samuel Frost

this document is under construction

I INTRODUCTION

The Parousia Must Be Defined As Either Time Or Proximity

Samuel Frost has by in large has changed the definition of the Parousia. Previously Christendom has understood Parousia to mean an unexpected visitation by Christ wrapping up the end of the age in judgment for all. Frost says the Parousia, or verses that have to do with what can be attributed to the Parousia in fact have to do with either 1.) that which is presently ongoing, the relationship for the Christian with Christ's proximity or 2.) time, that the day of ones death is near.

Frost does not deny the time statements:

Frost does not deny the future time statement of 1 Cor. 15:24, when Christ shall put down all rule and authority at the resurrection. By nature this Parousia must be broken into distinct parts separated by sometimes short, and sometimes long periods of time, also having to do with progression. The Parousia by nature is defined by Scripture as having to do with the end of an allowable period of time and the summing up of all things. Likewise, Frost does not deny the time statements as referring to the wrapping up of ones life.

Frost denies the time statements:

Frost does not use the time statements as they have been used in the past by Futurists and Preterists, he understands such statements as "*the time is at hand*" to have to do with proximity rather than winding down time. If proximity is the core truth of the Parousia then such time statements should have no meaning when it comes to 1 Cor. 15:24 or the day of one's physical demise. You can not have it both ways.

Proximity Does Not Replace The Parousia:

Yes, Scriptures does indicate that Christ is Sovereign over all things, and nothing is hidden from His sight. Nevertheless, this understanding does not negate the fact that Christians await the presence of Christ. Proximity does not replace the Parousia.

Frosts Foundation For Definition

For Frost, Christ's presence in the world as King of Kings and Lord of Lords is the driving force of his Parousia. Frost writes on Page 104 *"John's focus however, is not so much on the final consummative "coming" of the son of man, but on the present coming of the son of man, ..."* Having overcome the world through having always done the will of His Father, the Parousia is the ongoing presence of Christ through understanding Daniel 7:13,14: Page 7: *"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."* Because Christ is reigning in heaven, He is now "The Coming One", the focus is no longer on an fearful day to come.

Frost Use Of Parousia

The future coming at the end of the age will only be more of the same, Frost refers to it as "more light" coupled with the literal resurrection.

Page 61 "For Paul, then, **the Day has arrived and is yet hidden.** However, the "Day" will be manifest and everything hidden will be exposed and made known (Romans 2.5 ...) The *difference* in the present Day of the Lord is between what is not hidden, and "that day" (the last day) is manifestation of light. The sons of the righteous will clearly shine and be known, and the wicked will be known. There will be no further doubts. The matter will be settled once and for all.

Frost sets out to demonstrate to the reader that the second coming has predominately do with a present and ongoing Parousia in the following pages.

Page 12 Matthew 24.3, "what will be the sign of your coming?"
... In effect, what is the sign of your presence?

Page 17 Before we get into the usage of the Parousia in Matthew, all occurring in chapter 24, we must note other passages that are directly related to what we have covered so far. The first is found in Matthew 10:23 ... (10.20). This clearly infers that the Spirit would be given so that they can complete going through the cities of Israel ...

Page 21 His Parousia in glory, hidden to all except to those who have "eyes to see."

Page 22 “What is the sign of the Parousia – yours?” It is important to note that what they are asking for here is “the sign” (semeion) of his presence. It has already been established that the Coming One has come and is standing before them. They are not asking for that. ... They are asking ... what would be the sign of his Parousia when he would be absent from them? ... They are not asking where he will be (he will be in heaven).

Concerning James 5:7-9 (“*Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and bath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. ⁸Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. ⁹Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door.*”) Frost writes;

There is nothing here in terms of an imminent expectation, but everything here to denote an immanent arrival ... near, and ready to judge quickly. ... James is not waiting for the Lord to be present, but is acknowledging that his presence is a fact.

The Final Day Of The Parousia

Frost has the resurrection as according the Apostles Creed at the end of the ages. This coming has to do with 1 Corinthians 15:24-29 on page 54 “*Then comes the end ... For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death.*”. The body of the Parousia is not to be found here or there, in the past or in the future, but rather it is always in the present. Therefore, if we want to define and understand the Parousia we can do so by looking at the present.

Frost’s reasons for leaving Full Preterism are legitimate, in why I Left Preterism page 79 Frost writes “*Therefore, I posited history must have an end and found Scripture warrant for the assertion. What does the phrase “Last Day” mean? ... The end of History.*”. If Christ has come to put down all rule and authority, then there should be a day where there is no more sin. In Geneiss God said “*My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.*” I believe Frost has a valid argument here.

Progress in the Parousia.

The work of Parousia has to do with Christ’s having reigned from heaven having worked invisibly among the lost and visibly among the elect in many ways---- although nothing specific having to do with AD 70 or the “Last Day” by necessity. At the end the Parousia has come to its fullness, were in effect there is nothing more left for change, Christ has been fully vindicated over his enemies. And it is at this point in time that the resurrection and the final judgment of the living and the dead can take place not on earth on nessicity but in eternity.

The Abandoned Future Parousia

The Parousia that Frost leaves behind, is the expectation of that Parousia explained in Matthew 24. Frost's view has little to do with the Parousia as it has been understood among Futurists and Preterists, and has more similarity with an idealistic view, a Parousia melded together with all time.

I believe there is a validity to Frost's view, as he points out in Matthew 28:20 on page 29 "*I am with you always, even unto the end of the world*" that Christ is very much present, as he has identified concerning the coming of the Holy Spirit page 37, 39. Jesus Christ is He "*which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*" Rev. 1:8. But I do not believe we can take the things of the present and the past and refer them to a future Parousia. I do not believe that believers live in the Parousia.

See the following verses below:

Matthew 24 But of that day and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. [37](#)But as the days of Noe *were*, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. [38](#)For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, [39](#)And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. [40](#)Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. [41](#)Two *women shall be* grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. [43](#)But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. [44](#)Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? [46](#)Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. [47](#)Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. [48](#)But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; [49](#)And shall begin to smite *his* fellowservants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; [50](#)The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and in an hour that he is not aware of, [51](#)And shall cut him asunder, and appoint *him* his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

2 Thessalonians 1 “So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure: *Which is* a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer: **6**Seeing *it is* a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; **7**And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, **8**In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: **9**Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; **10**When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.

In Frost’s definition there is no great Parousia, such as can be attributed to AD 70 or which is now ominous swiftly winding down for a future day for the future.

The Futurist Parousia:

Frost focuses on the ongoing present rule of Christ in the context of the Parousia to give purpose and direction in life to the Christian. However, the Parousia has to do with the revelation of Jesus Christ in all His glory, where nothing of this world remains, 2 Peter 3:10-11. *“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness,”* I do not think it is possible for the Christian who has a sinful nature to be able to claim they are now in the Parousia. When John identified Christ in Revelation chapter one, he fell down as dead. The giving of the Holy Spirit is a message that Christ will not fill old wine skins with new wine, rather he puts new wine into new wine skins. And here with the Parousia again Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:50 “...flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of god, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption”. The Scriptures are always posing the idea that there must first be a resurrection to identify the Parousia and the judgment.

Frost says that the Parousia is identifiable today, one just needs ears to hear and eyes to see. I believe that in Frost's view, what should be in the future is now everywhere and it can be identified. I see this as a watered-down view of the Parousia, and that rather the Parousia has to do with a day of reckoning appointed by God unknown to every believer similar in type to AD 70 as well as in other times after the Gospel was presented in the world. The Parousia is the point in time where there is no more sin in the world, more so than a time of physical resurrection. [Our resurrection differs from Christ on this account, we have lived sinful lives and die for that reason, Christ had no sin.] How this occurred in the fall of Jerusalem was presented as a type of the already but not yet because there was no conversion of the living to the resurrection in AD 70.

Obsolete Arguments:

In the arguments that Sam Frost uses, many of these arguments have been obsolete for some time now. Preterists are all aware of where these verses are that answer, so there is no reason for us to list them now. Sam makes reapplication for obsolete proof texts but does not prove why they should be now be made applicable again. They do not prove anything conclusive to anyone who is familiar with eschatology from a Preterist point of view. Sam Frost is well aware of how these texts work in the consistent preterist worldview, it is mystery to me why he then will use them to try to prove consistency when he knows that they cannot change the argument to conclusively prove anything.

II COMMENTARY ON FROST

THE INTRODUCTION TO THE WORD PAROUSIA

Pages 1-12

The Definition of Parousia:

Frost defines the Parousia the Noun:

Pg. 3. *The Greek term parousia simply means “advent”, “arrival”, “presence”, “one is present” in terms of being. It was a commonly used word in the first century and even before. It is a noun.*

Pg. 3. *...we find ...”...God ... comforts the downcast ... by the coming of Titus ... by his coming” ... Here is simply “the presence of body” which really brings out the meaning of the term parousia. It is a bodily presence, an arrival of somebody that is present and accounted for. ... “Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, so now, not only as in my presence but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation ...” Here the term “absence” is used as an antonym, apousia. ... We must keep in mind at this point that all of these verses have parousia as a noun.*

Frost defines the Parousia the Verb:

Pg. 4 *“Now we turn to the verb pareimi which is the same meaning as parousia and the present principle form parousa may be the derivative for the noun. One is a noun the other is a verb. ...“(1 Corinthians 5:3). Here again Paul notes his being bodily “not there” yet so involved with the affairs of the church that he is present in spirit, ...”*

Pg. 5 *“From this analysis it is plain that Paul can use the terms Parousia and pareimi interchangeably. One is a verb, the other is a noun. Parousia and pareimi mean “advent” “presence” “arrival” or even “coming” as defined by their contexts.”*

Page 9. *“From all of this it is impressed upon research that pareimi is used far more often than the noun Parousia. It is easier to say, “I am present” verbally than to say, “the presence of me is here.” ... Nonetheless, both terms are the same in meaning. One is a verb, the other is the noun.”*

Frost proves Parousia has to do with a Noun. A **noun** is a type of word the meaning of which determines reality. Nouns provide the names for all things: people, objects, sensations, feelings, etc. And by Parousia Frost tries to show that the Lord is no longer absent but present.

Don Preston does not like Frost's definition for Parousia reasoning that Frost defines Parousia to only mean physically arrived.

Vine writes:

[3., [G3952](#), *parousia*]
lit., "a presence," para, "with," and ousia, "being" (from eimi, "to be"), denotes both an "arrival" and a consequent "presence with." For instance, in a papyrus letter a lady speaks of the necessity of her parousia in a place in order to attend to matters relating to her property there. Paul speaks of his parousia in Philippi, [Philippians 2:12](#) (in contrast to his apousia, "his absence;" See [ABSENCE](#)). Other words denote "the arrival" (See eisodos and eleusis, above). Parousia is used to describe the presence of Christ with His disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration, [2 Peter 1:16](#). When used of the return of Christ, at the Rapture of the Church, it signifies, not merely His momentary "coming" for His saints, but His presence with them from that moment until His revelation and manifestation to the world. In some passages the word gives prominence to the beginning of that period, the course of the period being implied, [1 Corinthians 15:23](#); [1 Thessalonians 4:15](#); [1 Thessalonians 5:23](#); [2 Thessalonians 2:1](#); [James 5:7-James 5:8](#); [2 Peter 3:4](#). In some, the course is prominent, [Matthew 24:3](#), [Matthew 24:37](#); [1 Thessalonians 3:13](#); [1 John 2:28](#); in others the conclusion of the period, [Matthew 24:27](#); [2 Thessalonians 2:8](#).

The word is also used of the Lawless One, the Man of Sin, his access to power and his doings in the world during his parousia, [2 Thessalonians 2:9](#). In addition to [Philippians 2:12](#) (above), it is used in the same way of the Apostle, or his companions, in [1 Corinthians 16:17](#); [2 Corinthians 7:6-7](#); [2 Corinthians 10:10](#); [Philippians 1:26](#); of the Day of God, [2 Peter 3:12](#). See [PRESENCE](#).

Note: The word apokalupsis, rendered "coming" in [1 Corinthians 1:7](#), AV, denotes a "revelation" (RV). For a fuller treatment of Parousia, See Notes on Thessalonians, by Hogg and Vine, pp. 87,88.

[Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words](#)

THE PAROUSIA IN MATTHEW

Pages 12-35

Pentecost identifies the reality of the Parousia:

Page 20. Concerning Matthew 10:23 *“You will not finish going through the cities of Jerusalem till the Son of Man be come.”* Frost shows by verse 23 that the coming of Pentecost foremost has to do with the Coming of the Lord and His reign on high. Page 20 *“They would not finish their mission of going through the cities of Israel until the son of man comes. . . . The son of man will come in the glory of the Father with his angels and then they will be emboldened to finish the mission they began: going through the rest of the cities of Israel, Samaria, and the “uttermost parts of the earth” in the wider mission of the nations. (Acts. 1:8) They will have received “power” from the Spirit of God to complete / finish the mission of going through the cities of Israel.”*

Frost’s uses Matt. 10:23 to show the Parousia at Pentecost instead of AD 70. But I do not believe that the context of 10:23 will allow this: *“And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.”*. It appears to me that the coming is just prior the AD 70 apocalypse.

The Transfiguration and Ascension is the Parousia:

The Parousia is not simply in the future it is in our present, that we should presently be living in a reality of this Parousia. This is that understanding of the Son of Man coming invisibly to the Father which only true Christians can see, this is the Parousia.

Page 20-21 *“The explicit emphasis on how soon this coming to the Father would be is noted by the fact that some standing there would also “see it” by revelation before they passed away. . . . It is here, I believe, that we see the risen son of man “coming to” the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7:13 to receive his “kingdom, power, glory and might” (Daniel 7:14). His Parousia in glory, hidden to all except to those who have “eyes to see.” Thus, his presence would require a visible symbol for his invisible exaltation. . . . The coming of the son of man in Matthew is down from heaven (“sent”) and after his death and resurrection is up to [the gr.] throne of the Father in heaven. This is the single Advent of the Coming One on two stages. The former stage was seen—even seeing his Parousia in the glory of the Father (Matthew 17:1...) The later stage . . . requires revelation in that now he is “hidden” in the heavenlies and is not seen.*

Page 93, 95. Frost shows that the coming to the Father is followed by His coming, and therefore coming in judgment *“to bring about new heavens and new earth through the ascended son of man.”* Elsewhere Frost indicates we are in the New Heaven and Earth. On page 95 Frost says the second coming should be defined by Psalm 2, in terms of His judgments on the kings of the earth. If this is the case has Christ’s coming a

timeless event? I believe it is and it is not in the already but not yet terms of things as defined by the Scriptures.

The Resurrection is the Parousia:

Nevertheless, Frost also tells of a coming separated to a future date yet to come for the end of the world. I would argue at this point, if Sam is going to strongly use the Parousia to define the Present then a future date by default is irrelevant. The change from a physical body to a spiritual body at the resurrection is not the emphasize of the resurrection as I understand it. Rather what changes is our ability to contain absolute holiness without sin, this is the substance and reality of the Parousia and Resurrection as I perceive it.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

The Gospel must first go throughout the world before the Parousia:

Page 27 Frost writes *“The gospel of the kingdom must be preached to all the nations, then the end will come” (24:14). This is in keeping with the mission of his harvesters and laborers who labor in the world, and the furtherance of the mission already started in Matthew 10.*” However different books in the NT show, depending on when they were written show different stages of the nearness of that day, as well as that in the epistles we read that the Gospel was preached in all the world-----Preterists are all aware of where these verses are, so there is no reason for us to list them now. Sam makes reapplication for these kinds of obsolete proof texts but does not prove why they should be now applicable again. They do not prove anything. Sam Frost is well aware of how these texts do not work.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

The unknown day must be the Parousia to come:

Page 31 Frost infers that the day of which the Son of God had yet to understand the day and hour of the end is the end of all ages: *“The demonstrative phrase, “that day” is the last day, the end point of the sunteleia of the age, and becomes a catch word in the NT epistles as we shall see.*” Again, Sam gives us nothing conclusive to demonstrate that this is the case, that this verse stands apart and cannot again refer to AD 70.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

The time immediately after the tribulation of those days is an unlimited time:

Here Frost tries to show that Matthew 24:21 is a proof text for Futurists.

On page 32 Frost writes: *“Thus, Matthew 24:4-14 encompasses the entirety of the Gospel enterprise in the world from the first century to “the end” ...”*

Page 32 *“Verses 15-20 mark the specific time in their own day”*

Page 32 *“However, in verse 21, Jesus denotes that great tribulation will continue throughout until there is no more tribulation, for “immediately after the tribulation of those days” the heavens and the earth shall pass away (24:29).”* But no, rather Matthew 24:21 has to do with the time of peace for deception of the apostates (2 Thess. 2:11) just prior to Rome coming a second time to shut Jerusalem in so that they will not escape. This is

because immediately after some tribulation there is a peace and safety. I Thess. 5:3 “*For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.*”. thereafter is, and I shall quote Sam here (Matt. 24:35) “*when the heavens and earth shall pass away*”.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

The end of the age is the time for the Parousia:

Page 32 Sam attributes Matt. 24:35 to the resurrections at end of the world “*when the heavens and earth shall pass away*”, where previously he uses this to mark the end of the age on page 29 concerning Jerusalem. Frost tries to say that the Bible uses “*age*” somehow, where it can refer only to AD 70 and “*ages*” to refer to time thereafter AD 70 using 1 Corinthians 10:11. However, “*Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.*”. Frost has done nothing but make an attempt to distance himself from the material.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

Time cut short refers to the time of absolute end:

Page 33 “*These great tribulations of wars, earthquakes, famines, pestilences, death and trial will not continue forever. They are cut short ...*” This is referring to Matt. 24:22. There is no proof that the text refers to one and not the other.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

Near is not near:

Page 33, the time marker of “*Near*” in Matthew 24:15 has nothing to do with near in relation to AD 70. At this point Frost promises to show that time markers in the NT should show something else besides “*near*” or “*at hand*”. On this page and the following Frost tries to minimize the tribulation of AD 70 and exaggerates the tribulations leading up to that point to show the “*Near*” marker as irreverent. Frost throws out AD 70 and therefore uses “*Near, even at the door*” to then therefore relate to all time equally. That these verse show that the Lord is near in proximity not near to bring catastrophizes, death, resurrections, and the very end of the OT world complete! Near now means nothing but a reminder of the past, as we are already in the very Presence of Christ. It is only to the unbeliever that Near is a word that should bring direction.

Obsolete Inconclusive:

Generation does not mean generation:

Page 34: Frost tries to show that generation has nothing to do with 40 years and that rather it refers to a kind of people good or bad. So, when we read Matt 24:34 “*Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.*” it can refer to a people. He waters down the quote as follows: “*This generation—the unregenerate---will not pass away until heaven and earth pass away*”. This is a common way Futurists deal with the passage to skip over AD 70. Although the argument works, why Jesus would need to show that the wicked will continue through tribulation is obviously not the

point that Jesus' was intending to make. Frost has taken Jesus out of context with a relevant message for Jesus in this text.

Inconclusive:

Use of fulfillments not fulfilled in the OT show a trend that must continue with Jesus relating to Jerusalem:

Page 35. If there is any fulfillment it foremost needs to be having to do with the Generation that killed their king. Frost tries to show that Christ's message about the end of the world and Jerusalem can be taken to mean something outside of Jerusalem to a later temple and people specifically. I believe this is true, but I do not believe Frost is using the correct method here.

THE PAROUSIA IN ACTS

Pages 35-40

Destruction of the world means destruction of the whole world.

Page 35. The beginning of the world is seen in Isaiah, the world here as in Peter is a spiritual world. God is unconcerned with the physical world.

Daniel 7:24 is the second coming:

Page 36. The only thing that the 2nd coming has to do with in relation to Daniel 7:24 is the reason for the time set forth for judgment, as can also be seen in Revelation 4. The second coming follows Christs ascension going toward the end of the book. Yet this is not the coming that effects the world outwardly, it is only that which effects the world inwardly unrelated to time and space. Here Frost tries to show that the Parousia is a hidden coming, yet Revelation 1 shows that it will be visible. And I would argue, even more so up to AD 70.

Flash Judgments:

Page 40 Because Frost has all but dismissed AD 70 “...*he comes like a ... lightning flash in his judgments.*” Frost has reduced the second coming to the happenings of robbers and lighting flashes.

THE PAROUSIA IN I THESSALONIANS

Pages 40-45

Always ready watchful and alert.

Page 44 Frost writes:

The darkness remains: "While people are saying, 'There is peace and security,' then sudden destruction will come upon them as labor pains come upon a pregnant woman, and they will not escape" 5:3.

What Frost means to convey here is that the "... Day already shines in dark places.". That is that "*The parousia before the Father, this is something that is---not will be.*" as Frost writes. That is that the judgment has already been set for the wicked, they are already in the grips of judgment and the Parousia. Yet at the same time Frost argues that the final effects of the Parousia are still to come at the end of time itself. I would agree with this, but not that the emphasis is on the already but rather on the not yet. The problem with emphasizing the Parousia for the present is one can be misled to conclude that the second coming is irrelevant and by default the belief lends itself to Consistent Preterism.

THE PAROUSIA IN II THESSALONIANS

Pages 45-52

The Second coming is in the present:

Page 45, 47, 49. "It is a bit troublesome to see many respected translations give the appearance of the parousia as something to happen in the future." Elsewhere Frost emphasizes the necessity of creeds, here Frost is tending toward the hypocritical. If most translators believe the second coming is to be defined in these texts as in the future foremost, perhaps they are correct. Frost then translates. Below is Frost's translation compared to the KJV and is as follows:

And you who are being afflicted, rest with us in the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with angels of his power in fiery flames, who is now giving vengeance to those who know not God, to those not obeying the Gospel. Frost Translation pg. 47, 2 Thess. 1:7-8

And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day. KJV

... do not be so quick to be disturbed ... by our word, nor our letter that says the Day of the Lord is present... Frost Translation, pg. 49-50, 2 Thess. 2:2

That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. KJV

Page 47 Frost has changed the emphasis of Thessalonians away from a futurist view. Frost admits on page 104 that the Scriptures emphasize the Parousia is in the present. The Frost translation by default assumes and emphasizes various forms of Preterism.

A question that immediately arises here is; If the Parousia is presently being manifested why should a future revelation for the same change our present world view or change anything? If we are presently in the Parousia then we are presently wholly in the New Heavens and New Earth, and if we are presently in the New Heavens and Earth then we are no longer in the church age of Revelation 1-3. We are in the Parousia age or Heavens now age I would have to assume. Spiritually we are

caught up as defined in 1 Thessalonians 4:16ff. Frost argues that a future second coming will put us in the New Heavens and Earth (Page 32), but I believe that this must be regarded as a contradiction because Frost has already said that the focal point of the second coming is on the present and not on the future. I believe that Frost has disqualified his view from a valid and Scriptural second coming for these reasons.

Page 50 Concerning Frost's translation on 2 Thess. 2:2 Frost writes, "*This is certainly Paul's own view. ... Indeed "The Kingdom of God has come" (Perfect Tense). (Romans 13.12) ... And he avenges now.*"

The Transitional OT Temple Still Stands:

Page 51 Frost on 2 Thess. 2:

Let not any one deceive you in any way, saying that, 'The apostasy and the revelation of the man of the sin, the son of the destruction should come first ...'
2 Thess. 2:3 Frost

Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, ..." 2 Thess. 2:3 KJV

Concerning 2 Thessalonians 2 Frost has reversed the meaning here. However, 2 Thess. 2 is equal to Matthew 24, and the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem was on the same day in the year as it was destroyed previously. Frost proposes that the man of sin is the mindset of the wicked, who like Judas only magnify the work and life of the Christian, tribulation is necessary. All these things have seemingly nothing to do with either the past, audience relevancy, but only an ongoing present. All this would mean is that the 2 Thess. 2 "temple of God" as it refers to Jerusalem, still stands and is undergoing the same judgment.

I believe that certain aspects of this are true, but I do not believe them the way Sam does.

THE PAROUSIA IN I CORINTHIANS

Pages 52-61

Not Always but Rather concerning “Near”

Page 59 *It is tempting to read into Paul a mindset that is geared on pinpointing a date that he expected in his lifetime to occur that would signal the descent of the son of man from heaven. We have seen that this is not so, and that Paul has been grossly misinterpreted. ...the term “near” or “at hand” (enggas and enngizo in Greek) ...does not always carry with it a sense of time, but rather a sense of proximity.*

For Frost, the second coming has here in relation to the “at hand” and “near” verses, this has predominantly to do with where we are in relation to God, nothing in relation to His being absent—coming—then present.

Page 61 *“For Paul, then, the Day has arrived and is yet hidden. However, the “Day” will be manifest and everything hidden will be exposed and made known (Romans 2.5 ...) The difference in the present Day of the Lord is between what is not hidden, and “that day” (the last day) is manifestation of light. The sons of the fightwous will clearly shine and be known, and the wicked will be known. There will be no further doubts. The matter will be settled once and for all.*

THE PAROUSIA IN OTHER NT BOOKS

Pages 61-77

The second coming is a timeless event:

Page 70-71 *“When the chief Shepherd appears (phaneroo) you will receive the unfading crown of glory” (2 Peter 5.4) ... The revelation of the son of man in heaven, received by the Spirit given from heaven unites the believer with his presence –though hidden.”*

Page 75 *“The Lord is not slack concerning “the promise” which of course is the “promise of the parousia” already mentioned. We know where he is. We know what is to come. We know what will be made manifest: His Presence. There is no slackness here, and there certainly isn’t any delay since no time has been made known.”*

THE PAROUSIA IN HEBREWS

Pages 77-93

The Coming One has indeed Come and is not Coming:

Page 77 *“As we shall see, these latter times are marked by the fact that the Coming One has indeed come and is not coming. The end of the ages have come as well, heralding the fact that the latter times have begun. The latter times are the times of the exaltation of the son of man before the Father.”*

Focus upon the present and not the Future:

Page 88 *“They need “patience (hupomone) while doing the will of God so that they will upon death receive the promise of rest already mentioned. That is, “while yet a little time,” they must endure hardships. The coming One will come in his own time, but in the meantime, living by faith is critical (10:37)”*

THE PAROUSIA IN REVELATION

Pages 93-105

He is coming now:

Page 94, 96. Frost tries to prove that the second coming is going on now by John's use of words and phrases in the active inductive. "The revelation states, "Behold! He comes with the clouds" (1.7), echoing Daniel 7.13, "And Behold, I saw one like a son of man coming on the clouds to the Ancient of Days." His "coming on the clouds" is, therefore, durative or perpetual. It is what he is doing now." I would agree to some degree. However what Sam is implying here is that there is a uniform standard that leaves out the fact that He did come in judgment in a conclusive way already. The second coming is not a coming that is spread all over time, but rather is something that is written which sums it up. Sam has not properly defined what the Bible calls for in a second coming. Rather in context we read "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." Note the word "shall" here and that it pertains to those who pierced Him, that would be those in the first generation, that is the first 40 years.

On page 96 Frost says concerning the second coming "It is not his visible decent at the end, but rather his coming in terms of the here and now, while seated at the right hand of the father, his parousia before God." This is not what Revelation is about, see chapters 1-3.

Page 96 What Sam is indicating is that the time of Grace is over, which it is not. Christ threatens the sword, He is not presently using the sword in Rev. 2:16. "Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth." has to do with a world process and judgment.

Page 99 Frost uses Rev. 2:23. In context "And I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not. 22Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds. 23And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Here Revelation does not define a continual coming but a future coming. Granted, knowing Christ's future coming has present effects, however it is not ongoing in the sense that Frost leaves us with. Rather Christ's coming is set "into great tribulation" here and for our knowing and an ongoing example not an ongoing coming.

Page 104 "His parousia is a given fact." Frost tries to show that Hebrews 9:24 has to do with Christ's coming to the Father. However, this coming in Hebrews has more to do, if not equally to do with his coming to the cross: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

Page 104 "John's focus however, is not so much on the final consummative "coming" of the son of man, but on the present coming of the son of man --- who has come, is, is now coming (there is no Future Indictive used with the phrase in Revelation--- 1.4, 8; 4.8). "The One Who Was, Is, The One Who Comes --- the Coming One." The Bible rather has foremost to do with Christ coming and making a final change. Christ is not more so the coming one in the full

sense of the word minute by minute. Truly He is sovereign over all His creation minute by minute. The intention is that He will come in the future and separate the sheep from the goats one time, and in the mean time not come, but build His church that the gates of Hell will not prevail against it. The second coming cannot be watered down to every day happenings, but it is to define our everyday happenings. That the Son of God came yesterday, and He is coming again today is false, that He is coming equally every day. Yes, in one sense this is true, but the over arching theme is He has not come and is reserving either punishment or reward, heaven or hell.

Time is no more:

Page 104 Frost tries to show that time is no more at the second coming, and that this has not happened yet. However, this phrase simply means “your time is up” not that literally there is no more time.

THE END

WHY I LEFT PRETERISM

A review of Samuel Frost's book
named above by Donald Perry

The tribulation goes in one direction, not backwards.

February 27, 2019

Review of the 2012 edition, same photo same title, same package. In the Foreword of Why I Left Full Preterism pg. vii Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr., Th. D does a lot of complaining about Full Preterists. He writes: "One serious problem with the full preterist movement ... is it's naivete. Unfortunately what Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr., Th.D does not realize is that calling someone naivete backfires when you cannot back it up with something substantial and convincing. When Gentry and Frost stop complaining, take the Bible serious enough to win some Full Preterist debates, then they can use the N word and it will mean something.

On page 78 Frost writes: "Granted classic orthodox preterism, which has a long history, has not done the work that needs to be done in order to rescue it from Full Preterist attacks."

On page 80 Frost writes concerning Orthodox Peterism "I want to continue to focus on the analogy of the leaking dam ... Not all the i's are dotted, or the i's crossed."

These two quotes are revealing. You do not cross i's (you cross t's) nor should one be writing books about how one can do one thing to do another if you don't have a coherent reason for doing it. Frost and Gentry have got themselves into a serious matter, what happens when their leaking dam breaks?

On page 80 Frost tries to show that Corinthians and the Thessalonians show that the final cessation has its focus foremost on our future in another dispensation where there is an end to the world the flesh and the devil. But if that is what Paul is teaching us today, how is Paul at the same time admonishing the Corinthians and Thessalonians with these words "We shall not all sleep"? Revelation 1-3 show judgment soon to come to them, "Because thou art lukewarm..."

Frost and Gentry admit that they don't have the coherent answer, yet they write a book complaining about people who are confused, is this naivete?

There is in fact an answer that will cross all the t's and dot all the i's.

The answer is, when you pick up the Bible, no matter where you read, read it like you are reading about something relevant first to whom it is addressed. Thereafter, realize that all it has to do with what concerns God and man, and that neither has changed. And therefore ultimately all of it equally applies to you in the same way it applied to them. Some of this will vary depending on certain situations. The methodology is clearly irrefutable.

That means, for example, when you read 2 Thessalonians 2:4 concerning the holy and perfect temple of God, that although this is something that can never be recreated in its perfect physical type to which Thessalonians is addressed, it still has equal idealistic relevance today for the reasons I just stated above.

I am now talking about a form of idealism for that time, and for now we are in a state of literal futurism, we are in the already but not yet. There will therefore be a literal coming that will not be idealistic, This can not be called Redirectionism. This means that things do not get better and better Reconstructionism. It means that as the Gospel is preached you get the same kind of deal as what you had in the book of Revelation to some degree.

On page 80 Frost writes "...it did not take much to see that Paul and Jesus have two very different "ends" in mind. ... " pg. 81 "Some things were fulfilled then, and some things were not." This is a big problem. What should rather be consistent foremost is both Paul and Jesus will give us admonition for two very similar ends, one at AD 70 and one today, conditions vary depending on whether you were in Rome, Jerusalem, or someplace else. And first you would have to hear the Gospel. There are certain laws that have been revealed in the way God works after a nation has heard the Gospel for 40 years, a generation. There is judgment and vindication! The Bible does not define the very end in AD 70, there is no Bible verse that says "Jesus came", we only have "Come Lord Jesus". Paul or John only define us as waiting. The Christian is here to wait for the Lord to come and pass judgment while he sees to it that the Gospel [i.e. to trust in Christ and believe He died for you secures your salvation] is preached.

Pg. 79 "Therefore, I postulated that history must have an end, and found scriptural warrant for this assertion. What does the phrase "last day" mean?" Frost goes on to assume a progressive coming [pg. 81 "Some things were fulfilled then, and some things were not."] where things must happen arbitrarily for reasons he will not be able to define outside the Gospel and outside the New Testament from verses he has dismissed to AD 70.

"Last day" in the Bible has its focus on an absolute end with judgment and vindication over the rebellion as in Revelation 20: "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." Where Frost is headed is to a place where it will happen arbitrarily, and not rather through and because of the Gospel. It does not happen without vindication. Johnathan Seraiah has said in his book *The End of All Things* pg. 169 "...in the first century, the "vindication" of Christ was a crucial event for the future of the church. ... At the end of the world there will be no need to "vindicate" Christ ..."

When there is to be an end of all things, an absolute end in the last days singled out by the Scriptures, it is because these days are numbered by God's grace for the judgment of the great day, 2 Peter 3:9 "The Lord is ... not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.". The reasons for this is clearly defined for preaching, repentance, persecution, and then a Last Day, but

not the other way around standing on its head as defined by Postmillennialists.
There is persecution by mankind as the Gospel is preached, and there is judgment.

The answer is simple, read the Bible like it is equally relevant to you.

Postmillennialism does not work very well with Jesus, Paul or the Bible.
The correct eschatology is what I would call Idealism-toward-Futurism-already-but-not-yet.

THE END

