

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1215 – April 8, 2012
Post-Tribulationism Problems

Turn to 1 Cor 10:32. We're working with eschatology and we want to be reminded that there are three basic views of eschatology - preterism, futurism and historicism. Sometimes these get blended together. For example some preterists blend with historicists because they argue it's not all fulfilled in AD70, some of it was fulfilled later in the Roman Empire. So understand there is some crossover but these are the basic categories: preterism which means past, prophecy was fulfilled in the past, historicism which means present, prophecy is being fulfilled in the present and futurism which means future, prophecy will be fulfilled in the future.

Preterism we already dealt with and their big thing is AD70; Jesus already came back a Second time in AD70. And His purpose in coming was to destroy the Jews; God is therefore through with the Jew. Some preterists split the Second Coming passages and argue that some of them refer to AD70 as a spiritual coming of Christ in the Roman Armies, obviously it wasn't physical because nobody saw Jesus, and other passages they argue do refer to a yet future physical coming of Christ. But most, if not all of Matt 24, the Olivet Discourse and the Book of Revelation have been fulfilled in AD70. That's preterism, past fulfillment.

Historicism we're not really delving into, it's not very prominent right now but I do want you to be aware on a basic level of what they're saying. Dan 9:27, Matt 24 and Rev 4-19 are in the process of being fulfilled during the 2,000 years of Church History, so the 70th week of Daniel is stretched out by historicism. How do they do this you ask? Well, they find prophetic significance to the collapse of the Western branch of the Roman Empire, they find prophetic significance to the rise of the first pope, to the rise of Islam, to the rise of the Nazi regime, etc...they say all those things were predicted by

prophecy. And so historicism is present fulfillment, prophecy is being fulfilled in the present.

Futurism is the view we espouse. Dan 9:27, Matt 24 and Revelation 4-19 we argue have not occurred in the past and are not happening in the present so they must be in the future. The 70th week of Daniel is still future and will take place literally. Our point is there are different programs God has going with the three people groups. 1 Cor 10:32, "Give no offense either to Jews or to Greeks or to the Church of God;" So right there in 1 Cor 10 Paul shows us you have three groups of people on the planet. One group is the Gentile nations and they originated out of the sons of Noah at the Tower of Babel; that's Gen 10 and 11; the nations are predicated on different languages because languages divide people, languages carry a thought form and transmit culture, that's why the Hebrew language is very static, that's reflective of the fact that the Scriptures are an absolute thought form. After the Flood 70 nations derive from the tower of Babel and they go on through history and divide. And there are saved people out of all nations because in the Book of Revelation it says Christ purchased men from every tribe, tongue, people and nation. And the nations have a place distinct from Israel and the Church in the future millennial kingdom.

Then we have beginning in Gen 12 the Jew beginning with Abraham. The Jewish nation was formed because of the apostasy of the nations. God created the Jew in order to basically do two things; give us the Scriptures and give us the Messiah. God contractually agreed to do three things for them. This is a contract which means it's guaranteed on the basis of God's character. God will fulfill His word in the contract and that marks out for Israel a destiny in the Promised Land. That has never been fulfilled in the way outlined in the original contract. So we see that has to ultimately be fulfilled in the future millennial kingdom.

So now we have Jews and Gentile nations in the kingdom, finally we have the weird thing called the Church and the Church has a destiny in the millennial kingdom too. But what we're trying to do is figure out how these three different groups of saved people, all saved by grace through faith, get to that future kingdom. The outworking of this is complex and that's the challenge of eschatology.

I think the basic argument, because not all people agree these are three distinct people groups, is solved by recognizing that they are distinct, not in how they are saved but in God's purpose for them. God is doing something unique with each of them and it is all a part of His grand doxological purpose. History is about the glory of God. History is not about salvation, salvation is a part of what brings glory to God but it's not the entirety of God's purpose. If it was what place do angels have in God's purpose? Angels don't have a plan of salvation. And yet they do bring glory to God. So our emphasis is on doxological purpose of God. God's plan is multifaceted; He has many avenues through which He is glorified.

We said Israel, to get into that future millennial kingdom has to go through a time of trouble, that Daniel put them on a calendar of 70 sevens or 490 years, only seven years remain and during that future period the nation Israel will be purged to faith in Jesus as their Messiah and she will say, "Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord." She'll call on her Messiah to save her and He will return to rescue them and establish the millennial kingdom.

During this time the nations are also facing the horrors of judgment and they will have to decide whether they want to side with the rebels, the Jews who believe in Jesus as the Messiah and won't go along with the antichrist's program, or if they're going to go along with antichrist's program. The sheep-goats judgment of Matt 25 will be the decisive moment and the sheep who sided with the rebel Jews will go into the kingdom in mortal bodies to repopulate the nations. The goats will go to Sheol and ultimately to the Great White Throne judgment and be cast in the lake of fire.

Then comes the Church. The Church started in Acts 2 on the Day of Pentecost. There was not a Church in Jesus' day. Jesus said "I will build My Church," future tense, He hadn't been built yet and He wasn't in the process of building it yet, He would build it in the future. By the time of Ephesians Paul says the apostles and prophets were the foundation of the Church, implying it had already begun to be built. So we conclude that it began in Acts 2 after the ascension of Jesus Christ who poured forth the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and the Spirit baptized them into the body of Christ. That's what defines the Church. The Church is defined as those baptized into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit. The first to be baptized into the body of Christ were Jews, a subset of the Jewish nation who believed in the

Messiahship of Jesus. It then took in Samaritans in Acts 8 and they were baptized into the same body of Christ. Then came the Gentiles in Acts 10 and that didn't go over too well, there was a lot of argument over Gentile believers in the book of Acts. The Jewish believers said Gentiles had to become Jews in order to be Christians but in Acts 15, the first Church Council, the argument of Peter and of James won the day and it was decided - Gentiles do not have to become Jews in order to become Christians; Gentiles can become Christians just like Jews, by grace through faith. So we have a new thing start called the body of Christ.

Here's the problem. We've got Gentile nations, Israel and the Church. How do the destinies of these three groups work out in the final stages of history? How does each group relate to the time of difficulty that is coming upon the world? What's the relationship of these three groups to the 70th week of Daniel? The key in deciphering all this is to ask yourself which view is the best harmonization of the Scriptural data.

Now we've already dealt with preterism, past fulfillment, and its problems. So from here on out we're only dealing with futurism. All four views we will go through whether it's post-trib, mid-trib, pre-trib, pre-wrath, they all believe that the prophecy of Dan 9:27 of the 70th week of Daniel, which is amplified in Matt 24 and amplified again in Revelation 4-19, will be fulfilled in the future. Two weeks ago we started with post-tribulationism. Post-tribulationism says the rapture and the return occur together at the end of the 70th week of Daniel, they're not separated, they are part and parcel of the same event. In their view the church enters into the tribulation and as Christ is coming down to annihilate unbelievers He will rapture us up in the air so we don't get annihilated, then He'll kill everybody on earth and finally we'll come down with Him to earth. So it's like a group of people going out to meet a royal dignitary and ushering him back to town. It's all one big event, we're going to go up and meet Jesus to usher Him back to earth.

What post-tribulation has to prove is that the rapture and the return can be synced into one event; passages about the rapture and the return are not significantly different enough to merit separating them in time. But they are one event that occurs after the tribulation. One of the hidden presuppositions of this view is that Israel and the Church are the same, there's no distinction between Israel and the Church, there's only "one people of God." Whenever

you read those words you should know automatically you are not reading a dispensationalist. No dispensationalist uses the terminology “one people of God,” unless they’re critiquing it. One people of God means Israel is the Church, the Church is Israel, they just mean to say there are one group of believers God is working with. So posttribulationism doesn’t hold to any Church-Israel distinction so they can’t hold to any rapture-return distinction. That’s the hidden presupposition in post-tribulationism. Don’t lose the forest for the trees. There is the big issue here. Anyone who is a post-tribulationist rejects the distinction of Israel and the Church, they have to. So if you hold to a distinction between Israel and the Church and you think the Scriptures maintain the distinction then you can’t be a post-tribulationist because to be a post-tribulationism you have to put the Church on Israel’s calendar. And how are you doing that? How are you getting the Church in the 70th week of Daniel when the 70th week of Daniel is for Israel and for Jerusalem? That’s what the angel said; it’s for your people Daniel and your city. So to put the Church in Israel’s 70th week of Daniel is to say that the Church is identified with Israel.

To do that you have to have the rapture and the return syncing after the Tribulation and that means the passages that describe these two events are identical, that they do not have significant enough differences to merit separating them into two distinct times. The problem with that is, what do you do with the differences that show up in rapture and return passages. If there are differences then they can be separated and considered as separate in time. If the differences don’t really matter, they can be combined. But as long as there are unexplained differences it opens the door to bifurcating them into two events. It’s not like people want to be hair-splitters here, but think about the First and Second Coming of Jesus. It was all mixed together in the OT. For example, Zech 9:9 is the first coming, Zech 9:10 is the second coming and yet there appears to be no gap of time, it appears it’s all one coming, the prophets couldn’t sort this out. Again, Isa 9:6a is the First coming and 9:6b is the Second Coming; over and over you see verses that are back to back with no apparent gap of time in between. But there was enough of a difference so the rabbi’s had a real problem with this. How can our Messiah be humble, mounted on a donkey and at the same time ruling with absolute power from sea to sea? One of the rabbinic solutions in the OT was that they had two Messiah’s coming. They had the Messiah ben Joseph who would be the humble Messiah and they had the Messiah ben David who was the

reigning Messiah; it was their way of harmonizing these two pictures. They recognized that you couldn't just combine them into one, there had to be two things. There was enough difference to separate them into two. Where they erred is they made them two Messiahs rather than two comings of one Messiah.

So what we're saying here by way of analogy is the rapture and the return are an illustration of what we had in the OT with the Coming of Christ, namely it's got two parts to it. Just as the coming of Christ was split into two parts, now the second coming of Christ is split into two parts, the rapture for His saints and the return with His saints in His kingdom. So is there enough difference in these texts to merit saying the second coming is broken into two parts? That's the issue.

Just to review, we're going through a chart I had you start, if you take notes, in the left column is the Rapture and you wrote, destiny of the Church next to that, in the right column is the Return and you wrote, destiny of Israel next to that. In the first row we said "All of those "in Christ" and only those are resurrected or translated" and we went to 1 Thess 4:16-17. The point is those "in Christ," that's a technical term for those baptized by the Holy Spirit. Nobody in OT Israel is ever said to be baptized by the Spirit into Christ. No OT saint was ever "in Christ." Every time you look it up in a concordance, it's always talking about believer's post-Pentecost. And the point is that the rapture is for all and only those "in Christ."

But the Return, on the other side, speaks of the resurrection of dead OT saints but not the transformation of any living saints. Dan 12:2, the resurrection of these to everlasting life. And when Jesus speaks of His return in Matt 24 where He's telling them what it will be like for Israel in the 70th week of Daniel He doesn't mention their resurrection. It's not there. The resurrection is not mentioned in the Olivet Discourse and there's no information there about any transformation; it's just information about gathering Israel from the four ends of the earth, alive so far as we can tell, to take them into the millennium, no rapture there. Now there is a section in Matt 24 which we'll get to that post-tribulationists try to say is a resurrection and rapture and we'll get to that in a moment. But at this time, where you would expect to find a transformation of the living along with

resurrection, it's not found in association with the Return but it is found in association with the Rapture. That's a difference.

The second row: what event immediately follows the Rapture event? We go to heaven to the judgment seat of Christ. We're going to be resurrected and taken to the judgment so we can be presented before the Father as a pure and spotless bride. There is no discussion in rapture passages of the inauguration of the millennial kingdom, the judgment of nations, none of it, it's all missing. It's talking about all believers are going to be resurrected and go to the Father's house.

On the right side of row 2, what event immediately follows the Return event? The judgment of nations with the sheep going into the kingdom in natural bodies and the goats being destroyed. So there's another difference here with respect to what immediately follows. At the Rapture everyone is resurrected and taken to the judgment seat of Christ and the Father's house, at the Return not everyone is resurrected because you have to have people go into the kingdom to re-populate the nations, otherwise you can't have death in the kingdom. Think about it, if everyone is resurrected immortal in the kingdom then how can you have death in the kingdom like Isa 65 describes? Granted the conditions are much better but there's still death. So not everyone is resurrected at the return, you can't mix the rapture and the return together, it doesn't fit.

The third difference: the tone of the rapture and return passages. What's the tone of Rapture passages? One of joy, one of blessing. Christ comes to rescue His body into the joys of eternity. Think of it; He comes to rescue us, to receive us to Himself that where He is we may be also, it's a joyful expectation. There's no fear, no catastrophic judgment in rapture contexts, it's all joy. But at the Return what's the tone? You're talking about catastrophic judgments here. That's a theme not found at all in contexts like John 14, 1 Thess 4 and 1 Cor 15. You don't find Jesus coming in judgment to rescue His Church. You find judgment when Jesus comes against the nations and Israel. Look at Matt 24:29, "But immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened," etc. Verse 30, "and then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of the sky with power and great glory." Why such mourning, why such sadness, why this

tone? Because they weren't prepared. And suddenly now it's too late. It goes on to v 35, "Heaven and earth will pass away," this is the Hebrew way of talking about the universe in that period and here's a comparison made with the Flood - the Flood was the passing away of the first universe, we live in the second universe and he's talking here about the destruction of our universe. In v 37 He likens it to the flood, "For the coming of the Son of Man will be just like the days of Noah. 38 For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, 39 and they did not understand until the flood came and took them all away, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." In verse 39 who was taken away by the flood, believers or unbelievers? The unbelievers; Noah and his family weren't taken away, unbelievers didn't understand until the flood took them all away, notice, A-L-L, all of them, no unbeliever was left after the Flood. Poor Jesus, so naïve to believe in a global, mountain covering flood. Now verse 40-41, "Then there shall be two men in the field; one will be taken, and one will be left. 41 Two women will be grinding at the mill; one will be taken, and one will be left." This is the passage some post-tribulationists use to say is a rapture, the taking away, those taken are taken in the rapture, those left are those left for judgment. The problem is that's exactly the opposite of the analogy with the Flood. Who were the one's taken in verse 39? Those who didn't understand; unbelievers. Who were the one's left after the flood? Noah and his family, Peter says eight people were left after the Flood. What were they left to do? To re-populate the earth. The world we live in, our civilization began with 100% believers on earth and look at what's happened. What's the next civilization going to begin with? 100% believers again. So, in vv 40-41 who are the one's who are taken? Unbelievers. Who are the one's left? The believers. Why are believers left on the earth? To re-populate the earth during the kingdom. So the one's taken are not taken in the rapture, they're taken in judgment, it's the removal of all unbelievers from the face of the planet so we can start fresh again, just like after the Flood.

On the other side, the Rapture, its 180 degrees opposite, Christ is gathering believers to Himself and leaving unbelievers on earth for judgment. So this is a radical difference, there's a big, big difference here. You can't just put these two events together and say they're essentially the same thing. People who do that have to resort to the rubber Bible technique to get that to happen.

Row five the difference between coming for and coming with His Church. At the Rapture “Christ comes *for* His globally-dispersed Church” but at the Return Christ comes *with* His Church to earth. Two prepositions there, coming for someone is not the same as coming with someone. You’ve got to come for someone before you can go anywhere with them. And all the Rapture passages focus on Christ coming for His Church and He resurrects them physically. You know, to be absent from the body is to be face to face with the Lord, in our souls, we don’t get our resurrected bodies the instant we die, we get them on the day of the Rapture. Now what we are like in this in-between period is another whole study in itself. But at the Rapture He comes for us, on the other side, at the Return He comes with us to earth. Acts 1:11 says He will come just like He departed and in Rev 19 He’s coming on the clouds of heaven bringing the armies of heaven with Him all clad in white, riding on white horses, we’re with Him, the marriage of the lamb has already occurred in heaven. So it appears that He comes with His bride, the Church at the Return.

The sixth row, what is the relationship of the Church to the wrath of God? The coming period is known as a time of wrath, this was associated with the day of the Lord in the OT, it was all Israel and the nations, they are the ones linked to the wrath of God. In the NT the Church at the Rapture is rescued from the wrath of God. Now the wrath is a term out of the OT, it’s related to the day of the Lord and it referred to this period when God was supernaturally judging the cosmos, disrupting the normal course of human events, it’s an intense period of difficulty, the wrath of God. The Church is to be delivered from this, by means of Rapture we say, taken physically off of the earth. Here’s the debate on this- the post-tribulationist has to explain how the Church can remain on earth during this wrath and not come under the wrath of God. They have some answers for that, we’ll get into those but I want you to see from the chart first; they’ve got to handle it, they’ve got to come up with some solution to that problem. The Church is supposed to be delivered from the wrath of God. How does that happen if we remain on earth?

On the right side, if you’re a post-tribulationist the Church is on earth through the entire period of wrath, believers and unbelievers dwell on the earth at that time. So do all people experience the wrath of God? In Rev 4-19 do believers and unbelievers experience the earthquakes? Or just the

unbelievers? Everybody does. Who's causing the earthquakes? Earthquakes aren't caused by men, they're caused by God. Who is it that's breaking the seals in the book of Revelation? It's the Lord Jesus Christ. What are the seals? The authorization to begin to re-claim the earth, what is rightfully His, it's His property, He purchased it, He's coming to take it. So how are believers kept from the wrath? That's a question we'll work with in a minute. Post-trib has to answer that.

Finally, the sixth one, the issue of signs, indicators. At the Rapture there are no signs indicating its nearness. Instead of looking for signs what are we supposed to be looking for? Jesus Christ. It never says, look for the antichrist and when you find him then start looking for Christ, no passage says, look for earthquakes and when you see earthquakes then you know that the rapture is about to happen. All the rapture passages just say look for the Lord. Isn't it strange that never is there any sign or event that must happen before the rapture can come? Another point we'll return to later. But on the right side, at the Return numerous signs are associated with the near return of Christ to the earth." What's the fig tree all about, Jesus uses the parable in Matt 24, when you see all these things, recognize that He is near, right at the door. What things? The abomination of desolation for one, if that's not a sign I don't know what is. So there are no signs for the Rapture and many signs for the Return. That's another major, major difference. You can't sync these together in one event; they've got to be separate.

Alright, that's the comparison, there are more contrasts, these are just a few to get you on track to see what's going on. So the first point I make about post-tribulationism is that the rapture and the return are not necessarily the same. There are enough differences in these two sets of passages to argue that they can indeed be separated, that they are referring to two different events. The post-tribulationist has to prove that they cannot be distinguished and that's a very hard argument to make. I do not believe they have ever made it.

The second problem with post-tribulationism is, we'll cover it separately again, but, if every believer is in his resurrection body at the end of the Tribulation, who goes into the Kingdom. Where do people get natural bodies to re-populate the kingdom? If the rapture happens at the Second Coming and every believer is resurrected then there aren't any people around with

reproductive capacity to re-populate the earth. So how do they respond to this? One thing they try to do is generate living survivors in natural bodies out of the 144,000 witnesses of Revelation 7. You've heard about them, apparently they're Jews because there are 12,000 from each tribe of Israel. They try to say they are not believers but after the rapture they do believe in between the rapture and our arrival on earth and they become the people who re-populate the earth in the kingdom. One problem is that they are all males; and you'd have a problem trying to reproduce anybody in the millennium if you're going to start it with all males. So that hasn't proved very useful.

The next idea that they to use to get natural bodies is from repentant Jews in Matt 24:30. If you look at Matt 24:30 people are going to see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of the sky, because in the post-tribulation idea the rapture is happening when all of this is going so they see the Son of Man and they repent, but they repent too late to be caught up with the Church so they're kind of left there. The problem with that is that if you don't get raptured you get destroyed, there are no second chances at that point, either you believed and were raptured or you are destroyed. So that doesn't have much hope.

So what's happened is most post-tribulationists today try to use, if you work out all the numbers in Daniel, when Christ comes back there's a 75 day period of cleansing prior to the millennial kingdom and they say that somehow during this 75 day period believers happen. The problem still is that anyone that's left goes immediately either to the sheep and goats judgment or the judgment of Israel in the wilderness and that's it. There are no second chances after the Return of Christ. This is one of the habitual weaknesses of post-tribulationism, trying to get the Kingdom started with people in natural bodies when they don't appear to be around.

So a last idea is that post-tribulationists just deny the earthly millennium altogether. Forget trying to have people left in natural bodies. We can't find a solution. Jettison the millennium and we've covered that in other classes so we're not going to go into that. One of the fundamental points to make, however, on the earthly millennium, is that history is unfinished without an earthly millennial kingdom and we'll deal with that next hour. Why do we say that? Because the Adamic mandate was to have dominion over the whole

earth. The first Adam failed to fulfill that mandate. So if there's no earthly millennium then that mandate remains unfulfilled. So you've got to have the second Adam coming to fulfill that mandate and have dominion over the earth. That's why history is unfinished until man, a genuine member of humanity has dominion, so you have to have a 1,000 year kingdom when Christ will finish what Adam failed to finish.

A third problem for post-tribulationism which we mentioned earlier, is that the Church is said to be delivered from the wrath of God, but if it remains on earth how is that accomplished? Turn to 1 Thess 1. I hope you realize as we go through these how complicated an issue this thing is and why it is that it takes a lot of men studying a lot of years to put this stuff together and figure it out. One person cannot do this; it has to be figured out by a lot of people interacting with each other on the pieces. 1 Thess 1:10 says we are "to wait for His Son from heaven, whom the Father has raised from the dead, that is Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come." We could repeat it, in 5:9. "For God has not destined us for wrath, but for obtaining salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ."

If the Tribulation is a time of God's wrath and the Church is immune from God's wrath how do you keep the Church in the wrath of Daniel's 70th week? Here's how they do it. Post-tribulationists have to resort to various schemes to explain the presence of the Church inside Daniel's 70th week when it wasn't part of the first 69 weeks. Some writers," now here's how some try to do this, "Some writers try to eliminate the wrath of the day of the Lord from the seven year Tribulation and confine it to the moment of Christ's return. Let's draw a picture of what this is and try to understand what's going on here. What they try to do is say here's the 70th week, here's the rapture and return of Christ. The wrath of God occurs on the day Christ returns, that they say is the day of the Lord, all that other stuff up to that point is not the wrath of the Lord, so the Church is protected from the wrath because everything up to that very day is not the wrath of God, it's the wrath of Satan or the Antichrist, but not the wrath of God and that way we are kept from the wrath of God, they say. Well, one problem with that is that who opened the seals in Rev 6? Satan? The Antichrist? No, there was only one found worthy to open the seals, the Lamb standing as if slaughtered, the Lord Jesus Christ. So everything that occurs in that 70th week of Daniel occurs only because who authorized it? The Lord Jesus Christ. So you can't legitimately say the wrath

of God doesn't come till that very last day. The whole thing is the wrath, see the problem?

So others have tried to use the protective method. Their idea is to say that we'll be protected like God protected the Jews in Egypt during the Exodus plagues. See, they'll say, God has done it before, He can do it again. Sounds like they've got biblical precedent, and I'll grant it's a lot better than the first solution. The problem with that is it fails because during the Exodus no suffering came upon believing Jews but during the 70th week of Daniel lots of believers will be martyred. Lots of them will be killed for not going along with the antichrist's program. But in Egypt all the Jews were in Goshen and nothing happened in Goshen. So during the 70th week of Daniel believers will not be protected in the way the Jews were protected in Goshen. So that's a difference, the precedence is similar but not identical. It doesn't work, it's a good idea but it just doesn't fit the text, believers die in mass in this future period and they're crying out for justice.

Let's go on to a fourth point, when do you place the judgment seat of Christ and the marriage of the Lamb if the rapture and return occur at the same time? Think about it, if the rapture doesn't occur until the return of Christ, and we go up as He's coming down and we come right back down to the earth then how do you have time for the judgment seat? How do we have time for the marriage? We're going to have the entire judgment seat of Christ in the air on the way down to earth? See the problem? You have to have some time for these events. So when then do you put these events? You can't put them before because the Church is raptured because the church has to be removed from earth before these events can happen. Texts in the book of Revelation indicate that the marriage occurs in heaven before the return of Christ to earth," if you read the sequence of events in Rev 19:7-9, "Let us rejoice and be glad and give the glory to Him, for the marriage of the Lamb has come and His bride has made herself ready." ⁸It was given to her to clothe herself in fine linen, bright *and* clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints. ⁹Then he said to me, "Write, 'Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb.'" Then the return doesn't occur till verse 11, "And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse, and He who sat on it is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness He judges and wages war." Verse 13 "*He is* clothed with a robe dipped in blood, and His name is called The Word of God." The Second Coming is not going to be a Sunday School

picnic. Verse 14, “And the armies which are in heaven, clothed in fine linen, white *and* clean, were following Him on white horses. Who are the armies there, coming down with Him on white horses if not the Church? He came *for* us, He resurrected us, He judged us and rewarded us at the judgment seat of Christ, and now we’re coming *with* Christ to the earth to operate in His Kingdom.

In conclusion, post-tribulationism is a failure to coherently organize texts related to the Church and future prophecy. It strains the text to associate texts related to the rapture and the return and make them one event.

Next week we’re going to deal with pre-wrath view that was popularized by Marv Rosenthal but it actually started by a man by the name of Van Kampen who was a very wealthy Christian publisher. If you have mutual funds you might recognize that name, Van Kampen. He was known for running his businesses strictly according to biblical principles. But he’s put forth this next view; he puts the rapture about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way through the Tribulation. So we’ll work with the pre-wrath view next week, and then the mid-tribulationism and finally pre-tribulationism which I think is the only view that recognizes properly the distinction between Israel and the Church. All these others confuse the issues.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012