

© Copyright 1995, 2005, by Sam A. Smith

This document may be copied for noncommercial educational or religious use if distributed absolutely free to the end user.

This notice must be attached to all copies distributed.

All other rights reserved.

This document may not be used for any other purpose than stated above without the express written consent of the author. All commercial use of this document and/or the illustrations contained herein is strictly prohibited.

**What the Bible Says About the Future: ISBN 1-59872-275-1**

Published by *Biblical Reader Communications*/Sam A. Smith  
www.BiblicalReader.com

Softcover edition printed in the United States of America, December, 2005

All Scripture quotations are from the NIV, unless otherwise indicated.

Scripture taken from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION ©. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House. All rights reserved.

The “NIV” and “New International Version” trademarks are registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by International Bible Society. Use of either trademark requires the permission of International Bible Society

Scripture quotations taken from the New American Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. (www.Lockman.org)

The “NASB,” “NAS,” “New American Standard Bible,” “New American Standard,” “Amplified,” “LBLA,” and “La Biblia de las Américas” trademarks are registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by The Lockman Foundation. Use of these trademarks requires the permission of The Lockman Foundation. Cover photograph © Freestockphotos.com

To order print copies of this book: Visit Biblical Reader Communications on the Internet at:

**<http://orders.biblicalreader.com>** (ordering information), or **[www.BiblicalReader.com](http://www.BiblicalReader.com)** (general Internet site)

Quantity discounts are available.

## Appendix G:

### *The Amillennial Conception of the Kingdom*

Amillennialism views the millennial kingdom as a present reality, while in some cases acknowledging that some elements are still future. Thus, amillennialists view the age between the first and second advents of Christ as fulfilling the prophecies of both the tribulation and the millennium. Typically amillennialists view Satan as having been bound at the cross, the resurrection in connection with the kingdom as having occurred when the graves of some of the saints were opened at the resurrection of Christ (some amillennialists view the resurrection at the beginning of the millennium as entirely spiritual, not physical), Pentecost as being the sign of Christ's kingdom come on earth, and the persecution of the early church as fulfilling, at least in part, the prophecies of the tribulation.

There are two major forms of amillennialism—those who believe the kingdom is exclusively present (*e.g.*, C.H. Dodd), and those who believe it is both present and future (*e.g.*, G. Vos, H. Ridderbos, A. Hoekema). In both of these forms there is a failure to make the distinction between the initial spiritual aspect of the kingdom, which was indeed inaugurated with the proclamation of the gospel by Christ, and the physical/millennial aspect beginning with the millennium and extending into eternity. The confusion of these aspects of the kingdom leads to the incorrect conclusion that the millennial kingdom is now present. The question is: "By what process does the amillennialist confuse these two distinct aspects of the kingdom program?" That question will be the focus of our discussion in the following paragraphs.

Obviously, there could be no physical kingdom unless it began as a spiritual kingdom. The reason is that there can be no physical kingdom unless there are spiritually regenerate people to whom the promises of the kingdom can be fulfilled; thus it should be evident that any promise of a visible physical kingdom made in the Old

Testament implied an initial preparatory spiritual introduction, or phase. In fact, this idea is explicit in a number of Old Testament passages (Isa. 44:1-5; 21-23; Jer. 3:15; 23:14-18; 31:1, 27-34; Ezek. 11:19-20; 20:1-44; 36:25-32; 37:11-14, 21-28; 43:6-9; Hos. 6:1-3; 14:4-8; Joel 2:12-17, 28-32; Mic. 7:18-20; Zech. 13:7-9). Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the initial step in Christ's work of establishing His kingdom was spiritual, and consequently the initial manifestation of the kingdom was thus to be spiritual in nature. Of course, this initial work was rejected by Israel; hence the spiritual aspect of the kingdom, while present and available, and to some measure appropriated by the Gentiles, has yet to be appropriated by Israel. Since the physical aspect of the kingdom cannot be implemented until the prerequisite spiritual aspect has been received, the physical/visible aspect is in abeyance awaiting the spiritual regeneration of Israel. Thus, the picture of the kingdom presented in the gospels almost exclusively concerns the initial spiritual aspect since the kingdom program did not advance beyond that point during Christ's earthly ministry.

Amillennialists characteristically begin with the gospels in constructing their view of the kingdom. This is a critical error since the gospels do not present a fully developed theology of the kingdom. The theology of the kingdom begins in Genesis, with the Abrahamic covenant, and is developed from that point forward throughout the entire Old Testament. When we come to the gospels there is an assumption that the reader is already aware of the Old Testament antecedent theology. The nation to which Jesus came was not a particularly spiritual (righteous) nation, as is evidenced both from their history, and by their attitude toward the Messiah. It is apparent that an unregenerate nation could not enter into the physical/millennial kingdom without first undergoing a spiritual conversion. In other words, there was a spiritual aspect of the kingdom (regeneration and conversion) that had to be experienced before the physical/political/visible aspect of the kingdom first revealed in the Old Testament could be implemented. It is the spiritual aspect of the kingdom that Jesus came announcing and stating that it was "at hand" (Matt.3:2). It is a tragic mistake, owing to replacement theology and the spiritualization of prophecy, that amillennialists misidentify the initial, introductory spiritual aspect of the kingdom with its full expression in the millennium and beyond.

Since amillennialists form their conception of the kingdom from the gospels, and since the kingdom program in the gospels never moved beyond the initial spiritual introduction, due to the nation's rejection of their Messiah, amillennialists have incorrectly assumed that the spiritual aspect of the kingdom is the totality of the kingdom idea, though some point out that some physical aspects of the millennial kingdom are yet to come. Since amillennialism's allegorical picture does not conform to the picture given in the Old Testament, amillennialists are forced to argue that the Old Testament concept of the kingdom must be reinterpreted (allegorized) in the light of the "clearer" New Testament revelation (*i.e.*, the picture of the kingdom presented in the gospels – which as we have indicated is only a partial picture). This essentially redefines the Old Testament idea of the kingdom to conform to the amillennialist's view derived from reading the gospels in isolation from their antecedent Old Testament theological background. Of course the book of Revelation is problematic for amillennialists in that it was written after the statements made in the gospels, and still presents a picture of the kingdom that in every respect is the same as that presented in the Old Testament. The Amillennial approach to dealing with the inconsistency between their view of the kingdom, and Revelation, is to insist that "unclear" prophetic portions of Scripture (*i.e.*, any portions that presents a different picture of eschatology than amillennialism, such as Old Testament prophecy and the book of Revelation) must be understood in the light of "clearer" passages (*i.e.*, the spiritual aspect of the kingdom presented in the gospels). Thus to the amillennialist, the spiritual aspect of the kingdom derived from the gospels is the starting place in their view of the kingdom, rather than an element of the progressive program revealed throughout the Old Testament. [Amillennialists have suggested alternate interpretations of Revelation, such as "progressive parallelism" in a effort to disassociate the beginning of the millennium (chapter 20) from the second coming (chapter 19). However, such a scheme has many exegetical difficulties which amillennialists have been unable to resolve, not to mention the fact that they ignore other passages of Scripture that also picture the millennium beginning immediately on the heels of the second coming (*cf.* Zech. 14; Matt. 24-25; also see the discussion on pages 382-383).]

Three amillennial assumptions will be challenged here: first, the primacy of the New Testament in the interpretation (or reinterpretation) of the Old Testament; second, the accuracy of amillennialism's spiritual conception of the kingdom; and third, amillennialism's disregard of the message of the book of Revelation. Although underlying covenant theological assumptions are very important in understanding amillennialism, that subject has been covered in Appendix B: "*The Problem With Covenant Theology*," p. 259.

### **The reinterpretation of the Old Testament in light of the New Testament is theologically and hermeneutically unsound**

Amillennialists insist that Old Testament eschatology is framed in "pre-messianic" terms and must be translated into messianic terms (see, *A Case for Amillennialism: Understanding the End Times*, by Kim Riddlebarger. p.37). In other words, "Israel" in the Old Testament must be understood as the church, and the physical kingdom pictured in the Old Testament must be understood as the spiritual kingdom referred to in the gospels. Thus, according to amillennial rationale, the spiritual dimension of the kingdom seen in the gospels is the antitype of the physical kingdom archetype of the Old Testament (*i.e.*, the Old Testament prophecies of the coming physical kingdom predict the spiritual kingdom presented in the gospels.)

The concept of the reinterpretation of the Old Testament by the New ought to be highly disturbing to those that think about it, and it indicates that covenant theology is eventually headed toward a crisis in its understanding of biblical inspiration and canonicity. Why? Because if one must reinterpret the Old Testament in light of the New Testament, it is implicit that the Old Testament revelation, at face value, is inconsistent with the New Testament—otherwise why the need to "reinterpret" it? However, one of the principal arguments for the canonicity of the New Testament books is that their teachings are thoroughly consistent (at face value) with the truths previously taught and accepted from the Old Testament. When the amillennialists claims that the Old Testament must be reinterpreted to conform to the New Testament (or what he conceives that teaching to be), he is calling into question the inspiration of the New Testament canon. One can't have it both ways. Either the New Testament books have the same concept of the kingdom as the Old, in so far as the Old Testament speaks, or those books don't

belong in the canon. Since it has already been determined that the New Testament books belong in the canon, we may correctly assume that the very early church—which did not have the benefit of either amillennialism or covenant theology to guide them—viewed those books as literally conforming, doctrinally, to the teachings of the Old Testament.

If the historic criterion upon which the New Testament canon was received is valid, (*i.e.*, that all subsequent writings for which inspiration is claimed must be doctrinally consistent with all prior writings already received as inspired), then it stands to reason that the Old Testament cannot be reinterpreted in light of the New Testament without invalidating the New Testament claim to inspiration. This does not mean the New Testament may not shed further light on a subject, or introduce additional truth—as long as the original truth is conserved in the process. Historically and theologically the Old Testament is not dependant on the New; rather, it is determinative. That is to say, New Testament truth must conform in every respect to Old Testament truth. On the other hand the New Testament, as a subsequent revelation, is dependant—which explains why the New Testament writers were careful to link their teachings to the Old Testament (which is the principal use of the Old Testament in the New). When amillennialists state that the New Testament must be seen as the final authority in the interpretation of the Old, what they actually wish to do is to disconnect the New Testament from its antecedent Old Testament theological context (which determines its meaning), so they can then interpret New Testament eschatology according to their own amillennial and covenantal assumptions, and then pour that reformulated eschatology backwards into the Old Testament, and forward into the book of Revelation.

So, what is the relationship of the New Testament to Old Testament eschatology? Is the New Testament the final authority in interpreting the Old? *Yes*—in theory. I say “in theory” because the New Testament seldom interprets the Old Testament. The usual use of the Old Testament in the New is as proof-texts, which implies that the meaning of the Old Testament is apparent at face value, and explains why so often quotations are made without any explanation of the quoted material at all. Let me state it this way: If one finds an

actual interpretation of an Old Testament passage in the New Testament, that interpretation is definitive, and it will always be literal (never a “spiritualization”). There simply are no instances where the New Testament spiritualizes the face-value meaning of the Old Testament. Of course there are many passages in the New Testament that allude to Old Testament texts simply to illustrate a concept or support an element in the premise of an argument, or by way of allusion, illustration, or analogy, but such uses do not constitute interpretations, and generally have no bearing on the actual grammatical and historical interpretation of the Old Testament text. In a much overworked example, some amillennialists point to Peter’s use of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2:16 as proof that since Peter declared the Joel prophecy to be fulfilled at Pentecost, some elements of the prophecy must have been fulfilled non-literally, since none of the celestial signs associated with Joel’s prophecy literally occurred at Pentecost; and thus the true meaning of the Joel passage can only be understood when it is “spiritualized” in light of the New Testament. However, the flaw in this reasoning is that Peter did not state, nor did he imply that the prophecy of Joel was completely fulfilled at Pentecost. Peter, in an effort to explain the phenomena of tongues simply said that “this” (*i.e.*, the tongues phenomenon, *cf.* v.15) was the same thing Joel described; thus, validating the use of tongues based on a literal understanding of the statements in Joel. To suggest that the other elements of Joel’s prophecy (blood, fire, smoke, *etc.*) are to be understood allegorically because they were not literally fulfilled at Pentecost is to forget that sometimes the fulfillment of some elements of a prophecy may be separated in time—just as the first and second advents of Christ were separated in time—though often viewed within the same prophecy from the Old Testament perspective (*cf.* Isa 61:1-3). [We must bear in mind that the coming of Christ, viewed from the Old Testament perspective as a singular event, actually unfolds as two comings, with a parenthetic age between them. This means that Old Testament prophecies that combine elements of the two advents fall into a special case, as far as understanding the temporal relations of the various prophetic elements. To construct a general principle of hermeneutics (*i.e.*, the validity of allegorical interpretation) on such a special case, as amillennialists seek to do with the Joel 2:28-32 passage, is simply not sound. General principles of hermeneutics must be based on general observations, and there is no general support in the New Testament for the allegorization of

the Old Testament. Even Paul's statement in Galatians 4:24 is not an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament text, but simply the telling of an allegory based upon Old Testament material – a considerable difference. If the New Testament provides evidence of the validity of the allegorical interpretation of Old Testament passages, there should be significant general evidence of that; however, such is not the case. In justifying allegorical interpretation, amillennialists can only make their case by twisting a handful of examples of the use of the Old Testament in the New, while ignoring the overwhelming body of evidence that the New Testament writers understood the meaning of the Old Testament to be the literal meaning.]

Does the use of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2:16 justify the reinterpretation of the Old Testament in light of the New? Absolutely not. In fact, it confirms to us the literal understanding of Old Testament prophecy by the New Testament speakers and writers. Take another look at Peter's argument. His argument is that the literal statements in Joel's prophecy explained the literal phenomenon of tongues. Did you notice the fact that Peter didn't "spiritualize" or reinterpret Joel's prophecy in any way? In fact, Peter assumed that merely quoting this passage with its obvious literal meaning and completely without any further explanation would suffice as Old Testament validation of the Pentecost phenomena. If anything, Peter's use of the Joel passage illustrates that the New Testament is built upon a common literal understanding of the Old Testament—including prophecy.

Amillennialism's view of the kingdom is admittedly inconsistent with the Old Testament, as well as with the book of Revelation. The Amillennial conception of the kingdom is derived from a combination of covenant theological assumptions about the nature of the church and a reductionistically flawed concept of the kingdom as essentially spiritual. This tragic mistake made by amillennialists could have been avoided had they observed the simplest of all principles of biblical theology: that antecedent truths are determinative, and subsequent statements must always be understood in light of the truth that has already been established. However, amillennialists have turned the process of biblical theology on its head, and as a result they have reaped and continue to perpetuate great theological error.

### **Amillennialism's spiritualized conception of the kingdom is incorrect**

The fact that amillennialists concede they must reinterpret or “spiritualize” Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom is *prima facie* evidence that their conception of the kingdom is fundamentally at odds with the plain statements of the Old Testament (and with the New Testament book of Revelation). As we have seen, the amillennial concept of the kingdom is based entirely on the introductory/preparatory spiritual aspect of the kingdom presented in the gospels. The fallacy amillennialists make is in misidentifying “the part” (in this case the introductory element) as “the whole.” It is true that the gospels and the New Testament letters say virtually nothing about the physical kingdom. However, the prophetic expectation of the physical kingdom was so well established in Old Testament theology as to have been axiomatic in Jesus’ time. Jesus clearly had no interest in establishing the physical kingdom at his first coming because to have done so would have precluded redemption on the cross – which was, in itself, a pre-requisite to regeneration, and thus to the establishment of the kingdom. The promise of the kingdom could never be fulfilled to an unregenerate people, and if Christ had not been rejected and died on the cross there would have been no redemption, and no regeneration – thus no kingdom. However, to base one’s view of the broader kingdom idea on the perspective of the gospels alone, completely disconnected from their Old Testament context, is incredibly shortsighted, particularly in light of the fact that Revelation, written after the discourses of the gospels took place, teaches precisely the same concept of the physical kingdom as does the Old Testament.

### **Amillennialism disregards the message of the book of Revelation.**

In considering Revelation, it is worth remembering that Christ is the revealer in this book, and His revelation is thoroughly consistent with the message of the gospels. While there are symbols employed in the book, it is unreasonable to suppose that the underlying structure of the book itself is symbolic, especially since it comports in every detail with both the Old Testament and Christ’s teaching in Matthew 24-25. The sequence of future events presented in Revelation is this: the tribulation prophesied in Daniel 9:24-27, the

second coming of Christ, the destruction of opposition to Him, the resurrection of the dead, and the rule of the resurrected saints with Christ during the millennium. Whatever symbolism may be employed in describing the particulars of these events, the underlying reality of the events and their sequent relationships cannot be symbolic – otherwise there would be no underlying reality to which the symbols in the book could be correlated, and the book would be completely devoid of doctrinal meaning. In other words, whether we completely understand the symbols or not, the events they represent are real and their sequent relationships are clear, and it is highly significant that with respect to the events in common, the relationships are precisely the same as given in both the Old Testament (as understood literally), and in Christ’s Olivet discourse in Matthew 24-25 (as understood literally). Any theology that fails to adequately account for this fact is turning a blind eye to the truth – and this has certainly been the case with amillennialism. Even supposing that due to the symbolic nature of the book we knew nothing about the particulars of the tribulation, the second coming, the resurrection, and the millennium, we would at least know that the millennium follows the second coming and the associated resurrection, and only the premillennial view is consistent with this observation. [Those who deny premillennialism have proposed various work-arounds to the obvious premillennialism of the book of Revelation. Some have suggested that the book contains only spiritual or moral truths, others propose that the things to which the book refers are in the past rather than the future. Of course both of these views are unsatisfactory because they propose that the book has little or nothing to say about the future, yet it clearly claims to be eschatological (1:19) – and there is clear evidence that the early church understood this to be the case. One of the most widely held views (the prototype of which originated in the fifth century with an amillennialist named, Tychonius) is called “progressive parallelism.” Progressive parallelism is essentially a scheme for reversing the order of events in chapters nineteen and twenty to fit amillennialism (*i.e.*, kingdom > second coming), rather than premillennialism (second coming > kingdom). This scheme proposes that Revelation gives the history of the church from the first coming to the second coming in seven parallel accounts, or “recapitulation cycles” (chapters 1-3, 4-7, 8-11, 12-14, 15-16, 17-19, and 20-22) – *i.e.*, telling the story seven times in different ways. By breaking the text between chapters

nineteen and twenty, amillennialists are able to claim that the second coming (chapter 19) occurs at the end of a cycle, whereas chapter twenty (which describes the millennium) occurs at the beginning of the next cycle, so that in terms of chronology, chapter twenty actually does not follow chapter nineteen, but starts back with the first advent of Christ. Of course this whole structure is only artificially superimposed on the book, and there is actually nothing to indicate that the text should be “cut and pasted” in this way. In fact, such a view is completely unnatural since the section from 19:11 to 21:8 comprises one long series of copulative statements, each beginning with “*kai eidon*” (“and I saw”). It is almost as if the text were structured in such a way as to prevent a break anywhere between 19:11 and 20:8. (Remember too that Zechariah 14 and Matthew 24-25 present the same premillennial picture as Revelation 19:11-20:8.) That amillennialists would advance a view so grossly contrary to the grammatical structure of the text and its larger biblical context, again illustrates their disregard for the message of this book. It appears that amillennialists will accept any theory as to what the book of Revelation means, no matter how contrary to the obvious intent of the book, as long as it doesn’t require them to abandon amillennialism; and in this their theological and interpretive bias is evident. Perhaps they would do well to recall Christ’s final word to the church, which was a stern warning not to alter the message of this book (Rev. 22:18-19).]

The fact that Revelation presents a solidly premillennial picture of the future is all the more significant when we realize that it is the final prophetic statement of the New Testament, and in terms of its eschatological structure it is unchanged from the picture presented in the Old Testament (though certainly more detailed). What is the implication here for amillennialism? Simply this: Amillennialists have misunderstood the general nature of the kingdom, because they have rationalized the nature of a part (the introductory spiritual aspect) for the whole (which includes both the spiritual and the physical aspects). This has led to the need to deny the patently premillennial teachings of both the Old and New Testaments, and to allegorize those teachings so as to conform them to erroneous amillennial and covenantal assumptions.



