

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Church and Last Things, Session 16, Signs of the Times, Showing Judgment, Revelation 20:4-6, Rule, Return Up, Resurrection. Amillennialism, Postmillennialism, and Premillennialism and Dispensationalism

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Doctrines of Church and Last Things. This is session 16, Signs of the Times, Showing Judgment. Revelation 20:4-6, Rule, Return Up, Resurrection, Last Judgment, Eternal Destinies, Amillennialism, Postmillennialism, Premillennialism, and Dispensationalism.

We continue our study of the Doctrine of Last Things, the Signs of the Times. We studied signs showing the grace of God, signs showing opposition to God, signs showing divine judgment, both wars and natural phenomena. We'll treat this quickly, briefly.

They both occur in Matthew 24, verses 6-7. You will hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that you are not alarmed.

This must take place, but the end is not yet. There's the biblical, the very language. For nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom.

Wars are a sign of the time. You say wars are always going on. That's right.

The signs are already. Could there be an intensification of wars toward the time of the second coming? I hope not, but my theology says yes. Yikes.

The same for what we've called natural phenomena. There'll be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are but the beginning of the birth pains.

Well, if Jesus describes these signs as the beginning of birth pains, there's a long delivery. But earthquakes and famines, again, are characteristic of the whole inter-advent period, precursors of the second coming, and presumably, these things will escalate in the not yet, something not to look forward to. We move to another major theme, and that is the millennium of Revelation 24 through 6. Good people have different views concerning this.

Contradictory exegeses of the same passage cannot be right. The theology expresses that exegesis can be right, and if we distinguish theology from exegesis, it is right in these different cases. But I'm not trying to smooth things over.

I'm saying we can learn from the different millennial positions and, at the same time, distinguish them. And let me begin by reading Revelation 21 through 6. And I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain. And he seized a dragon, that ancient serpent who's the devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years.

This is called the binding of Satan. It's one of the features any millennial view must take into account. And threw him into the pit, shut it, and sealed it over him.

This is important. So that he might not deceive the nations any longer, that is the explicit reason for the binding.

Until the thousand years are ended. After that, he must be released for a little while. Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom the authority to judge was committed.

Also, I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God. And those who had not worshipped the beast or its image and had not received his mark on their foreheads or their hands. They came to life and reigned with Christ for a thousand years.

The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is the one who shares in the first resurrection.

Over such a second death has no power. But they'll be priests of God and of Christ, and they will reign with him for a thousand years. I'm going to distinguish the different viewpoints.

I've already said that mutually contradictory exegesis of the same passage, of any passage, of anything, can't be true. Because the law of non-contradiction applies, something cannot be A and negative A at the same time in the same way.

It's illogical. It's irrational. Nevertheless, if I had these as transparencies and could lay them over one another, all four viewpoints, amillennialism, postmillennialism, historic premillennialism, and dispensational premillennialism, tongue twisters to be sure, the transparencies, the overlays, would have four events in common.

My wife, Mary Pat, really likes acronyms. They're not my favorite, but in honor of my good wife, I have an acronym. R-U-L-E, for these four fundamental events that all Bible-believing Christians from the first century to the 21st have agreed upon, and which all the millennial positions agree upon, my big idea is, that they're most important.

We should teach them, preach them, believe them, propagate them, stand on them, and have views on other matters, even including the millennial kingdom of Revelation 20, but subordinate the importance of those secondary views to the big ones. R, return of Christ, or second coming. U, up.

What in the world does that mean? I have to make an acronym, and if I say, uh, resurrection, I've got two R's in a row, it doesn't work. So, R-U, up, stands for the resurrection of the dead. Return of Christ, up, resurrection of the dead.

L, last judgment. E, eternal destinies. R-U-L-E.

The Lord is going to win. He is going to rule. We will see that, in eternal destinies, God wins.

It is a hard saying, but God is glorified in the fate of every human being, the lost as well as the saved. More about that when we discuss the last judgment, but for now, these four truths are held by all believers, including those who have distinct eschatological views of the millennium, which we'll treat momentarily.

R, the return of Christ, is a fundamental of the Christian faith.

U, up. God's going to raise all the dead. Christians disagree as to how many resurrections there are, but he's going to raise the dead.

L, there's a last judgment for the living and the dead. The dead will be raised. They'll be raised for the last judgment.

E, eternal destinies. R-U-L-E. Return of Christ, up, resurrection.

L, last judgment. E, eternal destinies. Human beings have been made by God to live forever, either as his people on the new earth, as resurrected people for all eternity, or as the lost in the lake of fire, in hell for all eternity.

R-U-L-E. Okay, all these views hold that, and yet, they disagree. I'm going to ask five questions about each of these viewpoints.

Number one, what is the nature of the millennium mentioned in Revelation 20:4-6. Two, to what does the binding of Satan refer? Third, what is the timing of Christ's return vis-a-vis the millennium? Four, how are we to conceive of the second coming? Is it a single event? Is it to be divided into two aspects? Resurrection. Is there one? Are there two? Are there three resurrections? One more time.

Describe the millennium. Two, describe the binding of Satan. Three, tell me about the timing of Christ's return.

Four, describe the second coming. Is it a single event, or is it divided into two aspects? That's four. Five, how many resurrections are there? One, two, or three.

I'm going to do the five questions for each of the four eschatological positions. Again, one more time, having emphasized their agreement concerning the second coming, resurrection, last judgment, and eternal destinies, that's where my emphasis goes. And in ministry, that's where I am sure, confident, and dogmatic.

Concerning all the details, I have my viewpoints, but I'm not as sure, and I'm not as confident, and I'm not as dogmatic. According to amillennialism, first of all, it's a misnomer because, literally, it means no millennium. Well, no millennium of the post or pre-millennial variety, but it doesn't believe in a millennium.

Sounds like amills don't believe the Bible. Not true. That is not true at all.

So, if that's what it means to you, call it something else. Some have called it realized millennialism because it views the church age as the millennium. I want to give stalwarts of the Christian faith as examples of each of the four viewpoints.

What are you trying to do? Trying to show that good people hold these views. Anthony Hoekema is an amill. Louis Berkhof, who after Charles Hodge Systematic Theology, was the dominant theology, the most popular theology in reform circles in the rest of the 20th century, perhaps.

Dan Doriani, professor of church history, theology. He could do exegesis, too. He's multi-talented at Covenant Seminary in St. Louis.

Hoekema, Berkhof, Doriani. How does amillennialism define the millennium? It is the present reign of the souls of deceased believers with Christ in heaven. That's a quote from Hoekema, page 174.

The present reign of the souls of dead believers with Christ in heaven. In other words, the millennium speaks of the intermediate state in terms of God's people. They reign with Christ.

According to amillennialism, it is not a future earthly kingdom of a thousand years or a very long time preceding new heavens and new earth. No, it's a way of talking about the church age. Well, a thousand years has already been 2,000 years.

J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., a mill, says most mills don't, but he says a thousand years, could well be a round number, a symbolic number from the book of Revelation, which is loaded with symbolic figures. So, I don't think that is the stumbling block. Some have made it out to be.

Millennium is the present reign of believers in the intermediate state with Christ in heaven. The binding of Satan means exactly what Revelation 22 says. He cannot prevent the spread of the gospel during the present age, presumably, as he has in previous ages.

Wait a minute, you say—the binding of Satan, good grief. The angel has a chain.

He seizes the dragon, the ancient serpent, who's the devil and Satan. By the way, 12:9 of Revelation is the best definition of the names of the evil ones in the whole Bible. Revelation 12:9, I think.

I better check. I hate to give wrong information out. That is correct.

In Revelation 20, in verse two, he is seized, bound, and thrown into a pit. It's shut and sealed over him. Give me a break.

All that is true. In other words, he is seriously bound. But here is the purpose clause, so that he might not deceive the nations any longer until the thousand years were ended.

Indeed, the gospel has gone out in the church age as never before, considering the message of the Old Testament and the good news of the kingdom of God as well. You say I can't buy that. Your evaluation of these things is your own.

My job is to set forth from the perspective of proponents of these views their views in a way they would approve. And I've done it for a long time. The timing of Christ's return since the millennium is the reign of believers with Christ in heaven.

Now, then Christ comes after the millennium. It's post-millennial, but don't say it because that's a whole other viewpoint. Both ah and post-millennialism hold Christ comes after the millennium.

According to ah millennialism or realized millennialism, the second coming is a single event. At the one event, believers are blessed and the wicked are judged. Oh, come on.

1 Thessalonians 4, the rapture passage speaks of believers, and 1 Thessalonians 5 talks about the judgment of unbelievers. That is true enough, but I will say you should just keep reading from one chapter to the next. Divisions are inspired and the same coming.

Both are a coming of judging, cursing, and blessing, or I should say blessing and cursing to get the order right. Resurrection is one general resurrection. Ah, there's two.

There are two in Revelation 20. It is true, but if there are two resurrections if we're to understand that the good Lord waits until the three chapters from the end of the Bible to let us know that up until now, there's one general resurrection, and that is agreed upon. That's okay.

It's biblical theology. Now, the Lord reveals what was viewed as a single event actually has two parts to it. And by the way, as Henry Alford showed a hundred years ago, a premium, a pre-mill, they came to life and reigned with Christ.

In verse four, Revelation 20, the rest of the dead did not come to life until a thousand years ended. Do you mean to tell me the same language that came to life has two different meanings in the space of two verses? It's possible.

As we saw previously, John chapter 5, verses 24 and 25 spoke of a spiritual resurrection. John 5:28, 29, right after it, a couple of verses in between spoke of the physical resurrection. Why couldn't it be the same thing here? That is, the first resurrection is the regeneration of God's people.

And the second one is the literal resurrection of bodies from the grave. I try to strike a balance between what I call eschatological omniscience. I have my tongue in my cheek right now and eschatological agnosticism.

It bothers me that some of my reformed brothers and sisters say, Oh, we don't want to study that because it brings prophecy charts and prophecy conferences and makes believers mad at each other. Well, guess what? It's a big part of the Bible's message. Don't give me this eschatological spiritual superiority agnosticism business.

You don't know better than the Bible. You don't know better than Jesus and his apostles studying the last things. The big message is important.

The R U L E return of Christ's resurrection, last judgment eternal. That's a pretty darn important thing. And that's the last thing.

So get over it, be a big boy or girl, and deal with the last things. You may not like everything your brothers and sisters do, but please accept one another as God in Christ has accepted you. Romans 15.

On the other hand, I chafe at the eschatological omniscience of some. Oh, my goodness. I'm overdoing it here.

What do you think the little toe in the left foot of the beast is? I have no idea. Some kind of rule king or, Oh, you're not, I'm not going to fellowship with you, brother. Uh, I have churches in my time back East.

I could not, it was allowed, wasn't allowed to speak in these churches because I could not sign in blood. I could not sign that. I agreed with them on their details of the rapture.

Well, I can't agree with them on the details of the rapture. I have no real dog in that fight, no real stake in the ground. And my goodness, are you serious about drawing lines like that? Anyway, God bless them.

I would offer them the right hand of fellowship. I hope they will give it back to me. But, uh, let's look at a chart of millennialism.

The line indicates the movement of history. The cross, of course, is Christ's death. You see his resurrection there, his Ascension, the millennium, it follows his Ascension.

It is the church-age view from the perspective of heaven and the people of God with Jesus. In effect, the amillennial millennium is the intermediate state of believers reigning with Christ. Amillennialism accepts the view of a not-yet major tribulation.

It's predicted in Daniel 12:1 and 2. We saw it in Matthew 24. Christ returns.

He meets believers in the air, and then both, uh, the dead who were raised and living believers return to earth. Wait, wait a minute. Wait a minute.

1 Thessalonians 4, the believers are raptured. That's totally different than the second coming to earth. Well, it may be good.

People disagree, and I'll not fight you over it. It won't keep me from giving you the right hand of fellowship, and furthermore, inviting you to a meal.

I'm not inviting everybody who hears this to a meal in my home, but to me, an expression of fellowship is exactly that. I would break bread with you as it were, but in first Thessalonians four, and this doesn't prove the amillennial position. Basically, I don't think you can prove any of these positions.

I'm trying to promote understanding and mutual adherence and emphasis of the four verities. Ah, there it is. Oh, now I need my Greek New Testament.

I'm sorry. Ah, there it is. 1 Thessalonians 4:17.

Okay, good, good, good, good, good. As a word here, uh, then we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet. That's my word.

I want to meet the Lord in the air. And so, we will always be with the Lord upon 1 Thessalonians meeting to meet. Now you say that's the rapture of the church, totally different than the returning to earth.

Maybe it is, but it is interesting to me that this word is used in times near the first century times in the, in that timeframe to indicate believers going over the boundary of one political entity, one state into another to welcome royalty and bring the king or the prince back into the other state. That fits very well with an amillennial conception or a post-millennial conception of meeting the Lord. So maybe you think there are two separate comings because that's what you've been taught.

And it might be right, but it's not the only way to understand the evidence. Christ meets believers who are alive in the air and returns to earth with them. The first resurrection is regeneration, actually.

The second resurrection is the bodily resurrection of the righteous and the unrighteous, including the unbelieving dead. There is the last judgment, followed by the new earth and eternal hell. That is what we call eternal destinies.

To do this right, I need to give time for questions. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

I can't due to the nature of the beast. Post-millennialism, same five questions. First of all, let me give some outstanding Christian people.

Jack Davis of Gordon-Conwell Seminary. John Jefferson Davis, Jack Davis. B.B. Warfield.

There was a giant in the faith. He was a post-millennialist. Jack Collins, professor of Old Testament and Covenant Theological Seminary.

When I taught there, I was happy to have on the faculty pre-mills, post-mills, and amills. There were pre-mills and post-mills way smarter than I was. Oh, the predominant view was amill, I suppose.

I think that's probably right. But the other guys were there, totally respected and appreciated. We didn't fight about it.

We, I never ran around giving polls or taking polls, but I know they emphasized the four truths because they were Christian believers who had held to an orthodox theology and they believed in the return of Christ. They believed in the

resurrection of the dead, the last judgment. They believed in the eternal destinies of believers and unbelievers.

Keith Matheson of Ligonier Fellowship, Ligonier-R. C. Sproules Ministry, wrote a book called Post-Millennialism. Basically, whatever he has done is good. I don't agree with everything anybody writes.

I agree with everything the Bible says, but I can't understand it all. That's my problem, but I have great respect for Keith Matheson. Sam Storms has written a book on amillennialism.

I don't agree with all of that. I think he kind of overdoes it sometimes, but ah, Anthony Hoekema, there you go. That would be a good representative book for amillennialism.

Anthony Hoekema's *The Bible and the Future*. Post-Millennialism, Keith Matheson, a book by that very title. Jack Davis Christ's Victorious Kingdom is another good book on that theme of teaching post-millennialism.

You're going to see real quickly that the answer to the five questions for post-mills, post-millennialists, we abbreviate post-mills, are very similar to those for amills with one exception. By the way, there's pre-mill, amill, post-mill. Do you know the pan-mill view? I don't know what the details are, but it's all going to pan out in the end.

Sorry, sorry. Post-millennialism, millennium, the present age will gradually merge into the millennial age as an increasingly larger proportion of the world's inhabitants are converted through the preaching of the gospel. Hoekema, 175.

He's not a post-mill, but he fairly presents the viewpoint. The present age will gradually merge into the millennial age as an increasingly larger proportion of the world's inhabitants are converted through the preaching of the gospel. Boy, we have to be fair in theology.

It is true at the turn of the 20th century, 19th into the 20th, there were many secular post-millennialists. But, good grief, Keith Matheson, Jack Davis, B.B. Warfield, Jack Collins are not secular post-millennialists. I emphasize it's through the preaching of the gospel that the world will be Christianized.

Do I agree with that? No. I really love their emphasis on the preaching of the gospel and their optimism about the gospel. Remember I said before Stanley Granz's book, *Millennial Maze*, says we're locked in our exegesis.

We're never going to agree. It's impossible. I hope we can agree on those four points.

That's biblical. I agree we're not going to agree on these other details because theologies generate answers, and systems generate answers in science, philosophy, and theology. We have answers, but can't we at least distinguish exegesis from theology? And if I disagree with the post-millennial exegesis of Revelation 20, and I do respectfully disagree, their theology is right.

Surely, we should not be pessimistic about the preaching of the gospel around the world. Pardon my moans and groans. It's part of the lecture series.

Now, notice that the present age will gradually merge. Post-millennialism, unlike pre-millennialism, is an example of gradualism. The leaven of the gospel leavens the whole lump gradually.

The mustard seed gradually grows into the mustard tree. By contrast, pre-millennialism is catastrophism. Christ comes kaboom, and brings the kingdom.

This is not catastrophism. This is gradualism. Slowly, over centuries, the gospel breaks into cultures, and more and more of the world is Christianized.

Once again, I'll say it. It's gospel post-millennialism, not secular. At the turn of the 19th and the 20th century, with advancements in science, transportation, and medicine, people thought the millennium was going to be here.

A time of great peace, and world blessing, and health, and prosperity, and boom. World War I put the kibosh on that. So secular post-millennialists became something else.

Bible-believing ones said, take the big picture. Numbers two through five are the same as amillennialism. The binding of Satan means he can't prohibit the spread of the gospel now as he could before Pentecost.

Time in Christ's return, one-second coming, which involves both the blessing of God's people and the judgment of the lost. The second coming is unified. One resurrection, one resurrection.

A universal resurrection of the saved and the lost. We need to look at the chart because there's another important difference. And that is, Christ's death, resurrection; ascension are all the same.

The millennium is not conceived of as it is in amillennialism, as the reign of Christ's saints is with him in heaven. It is rather earthly. It's the gradual permeation of human culture and civilization by the spread of the gospel.

But notice, in general, post-millennialism holds to an already tribulation fulfilled in AD 70. I agree with that, but it tends not to believe in a not-yet tribulation before the return of Christ. Why? It doesn't fit its program of the gradual Christianization of the world.

Could there be an exception to the principle that every major document is both already and not yet? I don't know of one. It creates a problem of post-millennialism. I once heard Vern Poythress, a brilliant New Testament scholar, and theologian of Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, do a talk at the ETS before people of all different viewpoints on these things.

He had them laughing. He emphasized, he didn't say it the same way, but he emphasized the four verities and brought unity. And he, with tongue in cheek, said that he was amill and a post mill, although he really is amill, and they knew that.

He said I'm a non-quantifiable post mill. By that, he meant he regards the Achilles' heel of post-millennialism as the problem of knowing how do you calculate when the percentage of the world's people are converted, and then you look for Christ's return. And historically, I'm not maligning anybody, anybody, but historically the second coming, the hope for it has kind of waned under this system.

If they could somehow combine that, that's important because they downplay the imminence passages because, presumably, the gradual gradualism pushes the second coming way off in the future. And imminence is downplayed, if not lost. The rest is like amills.

So mills and post mills have a lot in common. Give Rodney Storch credit; he was a mill. He was teaching a men's bible study, and the men said they wanted to hear the other viewpoints.

So he invited Jack Collins, a post mill, and Michael Williams, an email from Covenant Seminary, to meet and talk with the men and give their viewpoints. And afterward, Dr. Williams said to me, he said, well, Jack and I sounded alike. Now it was a condensed presentation, but it did emphasize the similarities between post- and amillennialism.

Thirdly, historic premillennialism. Representatives, George Ladd, a famous New Testament scholar of Fuller Seminary, is famous for his wrangling with John Walvoord in their books. Walvoord represented dispensationalism of a non-progressive variety, and George Ladd represented historic premillennialism, and there were some sparks.

J. Barton Payne, formerly of Covenant Seminary, wrote the *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy*, in which he tried to explain every prophetic verse. It was a big monster, as

you might imagine. I could pick contemporaries. Donald Carson and Doug Moo, I understand.

I'll pick David Chapman, my former colleague at Covenant Seminary, a fine scholar indeed. Historic premillennialism disagrees and differs, not on the verities, but on the distinctive, especially vis-a-vis Revelation 20, 1 through 6. The millennium is not the present reign of Christ's saints with him in heaven, which, by the way, they should affirm as the Bible's truth. So, we distinguish theology from exegesis.

But that's not the proper exegesis of Revelation 20:1 to 6, premill say. And it's not the gradual Christianization of the world, as postmills say, through the preaching. That's not the millennium, although they should be optimistic for the gospel, distinguishing theology from exegesis.

No, no. The millennium is Christ's reign on earth for a thousand years after. You say, what is post and what is pre in this business, in these viewpoints? It's the return of Christ.

Christ comes postmillennium. Here Christ comes premillennium. As a matter of fact, in contrast to postmillennial gradualism, premillennial is catastrophic.

Christ come, kaboom, he brings the millennium. It's not a gradual deal. It is a miraculous, immediate deal.

Christ's reign on earth for a thousand years, or a very long time, J. Albert Buswell Jr., after his return and before the eternal state. Christ returns, earthly millennium, resurrection, last judgment, eternal state. The binding of Satan means exactly what the text says, our premill brothers say.

Confining it to this particular path. That's where it occurs in this passage. This means he will be unable to deceive the nations in the future millennium.

That's what it's talking about. The timing of Christ's return. Listen, in the space of three verses, it talks about two resurrections.

So yeah, but the rest of the whole Bible doesn't. This is an example of biblical theology unfolding and getting more truth as the story moves along. Post-denominals say, yeah, it's moved along pretty far.

What difference does it matter? Three chapters from the end of the Bible, we learn more details. The universal resurrection, as a matter of fact, has two phases and two aspects. That's not illogical, and it's not.

It's definitely possible. I'm sorry. I'm confusing my apples and my oranges.

In historic premillennialism, the second coming is still, since the church goes through tribulation. I just did dispensational premillennialism. I apologize. Much study makes me get confused here.

Like amils and postmills, historic premills. By the way, the language is just jaded. That makes dispensational premillennialism non-historic.

I don't know who set this up. I didn't. The language is prejudicial against dispensationalists.

I admit it. It's what we have to work with. The second coming is a single event.

They do not believe in a pre-tribulational rapture the way dispensationalists do. Oh, but they still do believe in two resurrections, and that's what I said. Sorry.

Christ comes before the millennium. His coming is what causes it. The second coming, one event, blesses his people and judges the wicked.

Two resurrections. Yes, so I spoke well. I just had numbers four and five.

I was mixing them up. Sorry. There's a resurrection before the millennium.

There's a resurrection after the thousand years is done. The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended. Let us see a chart here and see if we can make sense of these things.

Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension are all the same. The millennium is not the reign of Christ's saints with him in heaven now, although that's true. It's just not what Revelation 20 is talking about.

Good theology, bad exegesis from this viewpoint. I can say that with a good attitude. It is not the gradual Christianization of the world through the preaching of the gospel in between the comings of Christ.

That's not even right. Yes, we should be optimistic of the gospel, but it looks to us like things are going to get worse and worse. Premills have been accused of that of being pessimistic.

I don't see why you couldn't believe in that general picture, along with an optimism of the gospel. I'm trying to be fair. Christ meets believers, 1 Thessalonians 4, dead and alive, and returns to earth after the tribulation period.

As a matter of fact, premillennialism has three tribulational views. Dispensationalism says Christ comes before the tribulation, so it's pre-tribulational, premillennialism. All these are premillennialism.

Either he comes pre-trib, premill, mid-trib, premill, or post-trib, premill. Maybe we'll sort that out in our next lecture, at least briefly, definitely anyway. Pre-tribulation, premillennialism means Jesus comes to take the church out of the world before the tribulation, so the church doesn't suffer in the tribulation, and is coming to earth after the seven-year tribulation, inaugurating the millennium.

Catastrophism again. Mid-tribulational premillennialism says the church is going to go through some of that stuff, but not the worst. No, the church is spared from the wrath.

Jesus comes, raptures them out, mid-trib, three and a half years later, approximately, comes to earth to set up the millennium. Post-tribulation, which is what this is, is historic, so-called historic premillennialism, and agrees with post mills and mills, one phase of the second coming. Christ comes, and the church meets him in the air, just like the representatives of the town, cross the state boundary to meet the king, and they escort him back in.

I'm not saying that's right. I'm saying it is not impossible. It could fit the language of 1 Thessalonians 4. Unlike amills, who say the millennium is Christ reigning in heaven now with his people, unlike postmills that say it's a gradual Christianization through the preaching of the gospel, the millennium is a future earthly kingdom.

Not especially Jewish, as in traditional dispensationalism. It does hold the two resurrections. Resurrection before the millennium, especially of Jews, because it's believing dead who have died before the millennium, I should say, not especially Jews.

The remainder of the dead after the millennium, especially the unbelieving dead at that point, believers who died during the millennium, would be raised then as well. But the emphasis is unbelieving believers are raised, just like it says right here. The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended.

That's the resurrection, especially of the unbelieving dead, for God's judgment. New heavens and new earth are the same as the other viewpoints. In our next lecture, we will summarize the teachings of dispensational premillennialism.

You better believe with a healthy review of these three viewpoints, and we will thus conclude our study of the millennium.

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Doctrines of Church and Last Things.

This is session 16, Signs of the Times, Showing Judgment. Revelation 20:4-6, Rule, Return Up, Resurrection, Last Judgment, Eternal Destinies, Amillennialism, Postmillennialism, Premillennialism, and Dispensationalism