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Introduction

The main objective of this article is to study the divine purpose of the period designated in Revelation 20:1-6 as “a thousand years,” usually referred to as the millennium. This purpose is stated in verse six: those who share in the first resurrection will be priests of God and of Christ and will reign with Christ for a thousand years. They are called “blessed and holy.” The immediate content of this reign is summed up at the beginning of verse four: “Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed.” These words indicate that the primary purpose of the millennial reign of the saints with Christ is a work of judgment.

This article will attempt to clarify how the millennial reign of the saints is related to judgment. In the first section we present a brief historical survey of what major traditional views of the millennium have to say about this relationship. Part two deals with contextual questions about the connections of Revelation 20:4-6 with its immediate context in the book of Revelation as well as with the larger context of Scripture.

Major Millennial Views

In recent literature four major millennial views have been identified: amillennialism, postmillennialism, historic premillennialism, and dispensational premillennialism. How is the purpose of the millennium, and more particularly, how is the purpose of the millennium as stated in Revelation 20:4-6, perceived in each of these theories? The answers to these questions have to be brief and succinct.
These views made their appearance in a historical order and in specific historical settings on which there is a fair amount of agreement. They have been traced in general surveys as well as in a number of limited studies dealing with specific periods or individuals. Because the historical context and sequence shed light on the emphases found in the different views, they will be discussed in the order in which they emerged in the history of the church. Due to the limitations of the article, a discussion of postmillennialism is omitted.

Premillennial View of Early Church Fathers. It is generally admitted that the earliest millennial view found in the writings of the church fathers is a premillennial view. Justin Martyr (Dialogue With Trypho, chaps. 80 and 81) explains to Trypho “that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged, [as] the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare.” He appeals to Isaiah 65:17-23 and 2 Peter 3:8 in support of this belief. As final proof, he refers to the fact that “there was a certain man with us, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied, by a revelation that was made to him, that those who believed in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that, thereafter the general, and, in short the eternal resurrection and judgment of all men would likewise take place.”

Apparently Justin Martyr believed in a thousand year reign of resurrected believers in Christ in a rebuilt and enlarged Jerusalem here on earth. This millennial reign would be followed by the general resurrection and judgment of all men. Although Justin mentions the last and general judgment as following the millennium, he does not comment on the statement in Revelation 20:4 that judgment is given to those who are seated on thrones, nor does he discuss the purpose of the millennium. It is significant, however, that Justin has the resurrected saints dwell in the earthly Jerusalem, although there is no hint of that in Revelation 20.

Early church fathers who held premillennial beliefs are Papias, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Commodianus, Victorinus of Pettau, Lactantius, and others. Although there are differences in their opinions, they all believed that the millennial reign of the saints with Christ would take place on earth, but little explanation is given concerning the reason for this millennial reign.

Irenaeus comes closest to stating its purpose when he writes that the just (raised in the first resurrection) by means of “the kingdom which is the commencement of incorruption, . . . are accustomed gradually to partake of the divine nature,” and that “it behooves the
righteous first to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers, and to reign in it, when they rise again to behold God in this creation which is renovated, and that the judgment should take place afterward. He then goes on to describe the fecundity of this renovated earth by quoting a supposedly dominical saying from Papias, and by adducing passages from Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel. These descriptions of the millennial kingdom are not to be interpreted allegorically of celestial blessings but of real earthly conditions, asserts Irenaeus in the closing chapters of his famous work, Against Heresies.

In reaction against the sensual and material descriptions of the millennial kingdom, especially by heretical writers such as the Gnostic Cerinthus, and because of the allegorizing and spiritualizing hermeneutic of the school of Alexandria, the church fathers Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Jerome opposed any form of chiliasm, that is, any concept of an earthly millennial kingdom. Augustine, who originally believed in an earthly millennial reign of the saints, later became the most influential opponent of chiliasm. Because of their emphasis on the carnal pleasures of the millennial kingdom, Augustine states that those who believe such things “are called by the spiritual Chiliasts, which we may literally reproduce by the name Millenarians.”

Amillennial View of Augustine. In Book 20 of his influential work The City of God, he presents another interpretation of Revelation 20. The first resurrection he interprets to be the resurrection of the soul to new life. The second resurrection, which comes at the end when Christ returns and the final judgment takes place, is the resurrection of the body. The thousand years is for him either the period between the first and the second comings of Christ, or it stands for the whole duration of this world. He seems to prefer the first interpretation. The binding of Satan begins with Christ’s first Advent. Satan cannot now seduce the elect to eternal damnation, although he can still tempt them. The abyss in which the devil is cast is “the countless multitude of the wicked whose hearts are unfathomably deep in malignity against the Church of God.” The thousand year reign of the saints is the present reign of the believers with Christ, whether in the body or in the soul, to be followed by the eternal kingdom after the second resurrection and the last judgment. Commenting on the phrase, “And I saw seats and them that sat upon them, and judgment was given” (Rev 20:4), Augustine assures his readers: “It is not to be supposed that this refers to the last judgment, but to the seats of the rulers and to the rulers themselves by whom the Church is now governed.”
For Augustine, therefore, the purpose of the millennial reign is identical with the purpose of the church or kingdom militant in the Christian era. The judgment given to those seated on the thrones refers to the government of the church by its rulers (which, of course, are none other than the bishops). The Augustinian view of the millennium had a prevailing influence in the Catholic Church for more than a thousand years. It has come to be referred to as the amillennial view, although some scholars would prefer to give it a different name.

Early Protestant Views. The early Protestant Reformers also accepted the Augustinian view of the millennium and rejected chiliasm expectations. Paul Althaus summarizes Luther’s view:

Now Luther agrees with the catholic church in its rejection of chiliasm. He too does not interpret Revelation 20 in terms of the end of history but as a description of the church. The millennium lies in the past and was brought to an end through the coming of the Turks or with the papacy becoming the Antichrist. Luther’s theology, in distinction from that of the official teaching of the church, however, once again revives the eager expectation of the coming of Jesus common to the early Christian church.

John Calvin also rejected chiliasm, considering it a childish fiction not worth refuting. According to Calvin, the number “one thousand” in Revelation “does not apply to the eternal blessedness of the church but only to the various disturbances that awaited the church, while still toiling on earth.” Heinrich Quistorp, in his book Calvin’s Doctrine of the Last Things, observes that Calvin’s exegesis of Revelation 20:1-6 “is by no means convincing,” and suggests that the millennium “is an eschatological event, but is not in itself the end nor yet the eternal kingdom of God.” Some Lutheran and Reformed confessions condemned chiliasm teachings as Judaistic and fanatical, especially because they were associated with Anabaptist beliefs and with the excesses of the Muenster revolution. In such an atmosphere the purpose for the millennial reign did not have a chance to serious consideration.

Post-Reformation Views. In the Post-Reformation era a revival of a more balanced premillennialism occurred, and many Protestant interpreters in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries believed that the thousand year reign of the saints would begin at Christ’s second coming with the first resurrection, the bodily resurrection of all who had died in Christ, and would conclude with the second resurrection, the resurrection of the wicked, and the last judgment. The thousand
year reign was widely understood as a reign of Christ with the saints on earth.

**Dispensational Premillennialism.** In the nineteenth century, as a result of the teaching of John Nelson Darby, a new form of premillennialism took shape: dispensational premillennialism. The differences between historical premillennialism, as it is now designated, and dispensational premillennialism we cannot describe here. The former considers the church to be the spiritual successor of Israel and holds that the millennial reign of the saints with Christ on earth includes the believers from all the eons of time. The latter believes that the church will be raptured away from this earth and spend the millennium in heaven, while a restored Israel under Christ as the Davidic King will fulfill the promises made to literal Israel in the Old Testament. However, in neither case is the unique connection between the reign of the saints as priests of God and Christ for a thousand years and the fact that judgment is committed to them satisfactorily explained. Walvoord, for instance, distinguishes seven future judgments and suggests that Revelation 20:6 will be fulfilled in the reign of the resurrected saints with Christ over the millennial earth, where people still live in natural bodies, and in that way the saints will judge the world. It is hard to see that such an explanation is based on a sound interpretation of the passage. However, recent studies point to a different solution, as we intend now to show.

**The Millennium According to Revelation 20**

In recent times considerable attention has been given to Revelation 20 in general and to verses 4-6 in particular. One prominent issue in the debate is its relationship to the rest of the Book of Revelation, and especially to chapter 19:11-21 and to chapters 21 and 22. Amillennialists such as Hoekema, Cox, and White argue that Revelation 20 constitutes a recapitulation of the Christian era, followed by the general resurrection of righteous and wicked, the last judgment, and the eternal kingdom. Premillennialists such as Deere, Hoehner, and Townsend have presented convincing exegetical and theological arguments interpreting chapter 20 as part of a continuous sequence of events starting with Christ’s second coming to destroy the apostate powers of the end time (Rev 19:11-21), followed by the millennial reign of the resurrected saints and culminating with the resurrection of the wicked, the final judgment, and the everlasting kingdom. Adventist interpreters for the last hundred and fifty years have espoused a historical premillennial interpretation of Revelation 20. Scholars such
as Strand, Shea, and LaRondelle have set forth exegetical and structural reasons for this interpretation.

Another much debated issue is the interpretation of the expression “they came to life” (vs. 4, ἐγέρσαν). Whereas amillennialists, following Augustine, have interpreted this phrase to refer to the coming to life of the soul in the new birth, premillennialists have understood this to refer to the bodily resurrection of the righteous, which is the first resurrection, in contrast with the resurrection of the wicked at the end of the millennium (vs. 5). Adventists agree with a number of other premillennial interpreter that this first resurrection includes believers of all ages who have died in Christ and are raised at Christ’s second coming.

This view is completely in harmony with Paul’s eschatological affirmation in 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17 that when the Lord descends from heaven with the sound of the trumpet of God, “the dead in Christ will rise first.” Speaking about the same resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:52, Paul assures us that “the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable.” This must refer to the resurrection of the just, for the wicked will certainly not be raised with imperishable or immortal bodies.

**Contextual Insights.** We now wish to explore the meaning of the statement “Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgement was committed” (vs. 4). The reference to thrones raises the question, “Where are these thrones located? In all occurrences of the word “throne(s)” preceding Revelation 20, reference is made to the throne of God or to thrones associated with the throne of God, with three exceptions. The three exceptions are references to the throne of Satan (2:13) and the throne of the beast (13:2; 16:11). These facts strongly favor a heavenly location for the thrones in Revelation 20:4.

This conclusion is strengthened when we ask the question, Who are seated on these thrones? Many suggestions have been made in regard to their identity. An obvious possibility are the twenty-four elders mentioned earlier as sitting on thrones (4:4, 11:16). This possibility is argued by Mealy, who, nevertheless, in the end suggests that, “what makes the best sense of the data in Rev. 20:4 is the notion of an invitation [emphasis his]: an invitation to a possible paradoxical interpretation which adds layers of meaning on top of the straightforward reading.” Deere also discusses the possibility of the twenty-four elders as well as other suggestions, such as the martyrs mentioned in the latter part of verse 4, or the apostles on the basis of Matthew 19:28, but in the end concludes that, “it is more likely that all the saints are in view.” Scholars such as Ladd, Beasley-Murray, and Hoehner agree that those who are seated on the thrones are all the saints of all ages, who have been raised in the first resurrection.

We ask next, what happens to these saints who come to life in the first resurrection? Before Jesus was crucified, He promised to His disciples He would go to prepare a place for them. He also promised, “I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also,” John 14:3. This is a clear
promise that Christ would take the redeemed to the place where He resides, namely to the Father’s throne. Paul comforts fellow Christians with the hope that those raised in the first resurrection, together with believers still alive at Christ’s second coming, “shall be caught up . . . in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air” (1 Thess. 4:17). The immortalized saints will be taken to heaven, and that is where the book of Revelation pictures the innumerable multitude of the redeemed before the throne of God (Rev 7:9-10; 15:2-4). We conclude, therefore, that the thrones on which the resurrected saints of all ages are seated are located in heaven and not on earth. The thousand year reign of the saints with Christ is a heavenly reign and not an earthly one.45

It is evident that this interpretation differs from the prevailing understanding of both historical and dispensational premillennialists. The former usually locate the thousand year reign of Christ with the saints on this earth, although the descriptions of this reign tend to be somewhat vague.46 The purpose of this reign is interpreted as providing an opportunity for the manifestation of Christ’s righteous and beneficent rule over a world in which Satan cannot deceive the nations.47 Dispensational premillennialists have seen a double aspect of the millennial reign of Christ and the saints. Christ rules in a restored Jerusalem over literal Israel and over the Gentile nations of the earth. The immortal saints dwell in heaven but in some way participate in Christ’s rule on earth.48 They reign with Him as priests of God and of Christ. This view of the millennial reign is based on a hermeneutic of literalism, making a sharp distinction between Israel and the Church which even to some dispensationalists has become problematic.49 It is our conviction that both positions have failed to understand the true purpose of the millennial reign. It is to that purpose that we now turn.

The Purpose of the Millennial Reign. It is said of those who are seated on the thrones that “judgment was committed” to them (vs. 4). What is the significance of this statement? What is this krima (Greek) or judgment that is given or committed to the saints on the thrones? Some have interpreted the word krima in this passage to mean the rule of the saints.50 However, a careful study of the context would suggest that the word krima here refers to judgment. God’s eschatological
judgments constitute a major theme in the latter part of Revelation, as is evident from 14:7; 16:5, 7; 17:1; 18:8, 10, 20; 19:2, 11; 20:12, 13. We concur with Mealy’s assessment that, “In Rev. 19:11-20, 15, the theme that is consistently dwelt upon is that of judgment [emphasis his], and, in particular, that negative form of judgment which deals with the eschatological encounter between God and his Christ on one side, and the unrepentant on the other.”

The question naturally arises: what is the role of the saints in this eschatological judgment? Could it be that the answer is found in the questions with which Paul chides litigating saints in Corinth? “Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?” and “Do you not know that we are to judge angels?” These questions suggest that the saints will be involved in the eschatological judgment of Satan, the fallen angels, and the wicked who have rejected God’s salvation. Scholars from different millennial persuasions have recognized the connection between 1 Corinthians 6:2-3 and Revelation 20:4-6: (so, Hoekema, Walvoord, Beasley-Murray, Deere, and others. Frequently they associate this judgment by the saints with Daniel 7:22, 27; Matthew 19:28; and Luke 22:30.

The fact that Revelation 20:6 emphatically states that the resurrected saints “shall be priests of God and of Christ,” and as such shall reign with Christ a thousand years, indicates that during this millennial period they will exercise a priestly function. The priesthood of all believers is firmly established earlier in the New Testament (1 Pet 2:5-9; 2 Cor. 5:17-21). The priestly function of God’s people in this world is “to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ” (1 Pet 2:5), to “declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light,” (vs.9). In that function they are entrusted with “the ministry of reconciliation” and with “the message of reconciliation” (2 Cor 5:18, 19). Is this the priestly function referred to in Revelation?

In three places in the book of Revelation the redeemed are referred to as priests. The first reference is somewhat similar in wording to Peter’s statement (1 Pet 2:9), when John states that Christ has “made us a kingdom, priests to his God and Father.” This passage seems to refer to the priesthood of God’s people in the present world. The second reference is in a song of praise to the Lamb which says, “thou wast slain and by thy blood didst ransom men for God from every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and hast made them a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign in the earth” (Rev 5:10). Although the phrase “hast made them a kingdom and priests to our God” again seems to refer to a present reality, the future tense of the final phrase, “and they shall reign on earth” suggests a future
fulfillment. It is not surprising that some interpreters would link the latter phrase with the millennial reign of the saints in Revelation 20:4-6\(^7\) and take it as an affirmation that that reign takes place on earth.

The third reference is Revelation 20:6. The context of Revelation 20:4-6, however, as we have seen, is a context of judgment. The saints will indeed reign on earth, as is clearly promised in a number of Scriptures (Matt 5:5; Rom 4:13). But the reigning on earth refers to the time when the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven and God will dwell with His people on this earth (Rev 21:2-3). The priestly reign of the saints in judgment takes place in heaven.

Before God will execute the final judgment upon Satan and his angels, and upon the multitudes of lost humanity who have rejected the salvation offered them through Christ’s sacrifice, Christ, together with the saints of all ages, will open the books of heaven and sit in judgment. This is a process that will take time. As priests of God and of Christ the redeemed will be given to judge the world and even the fallen angels (1 Cor. 6:2-3). We suggest that this is the true meaning and purpose of the words in Revelation 20:4, “I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed.”
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