

✓

THE  
APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

STUDIES IN INTRODUCTION

WITH  
A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

BY  
ISBON T. BECKWITH, Ph.D., D.D.  
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT  
IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK, AND  
OF GREEK IN TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
LIBRARY

BAKER BOOK HOUSE  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Reprinted 1967 by  
Baker Book House Company

COPYRIGHT, 1919,  
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 67-18171

PHOTOLITHOPRINTED BY CUSHING - MALLOY, INC.  
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
1967

BS 2825  
B3  
c.2

10-27-69

## PREFACE

FOR the understanding of the Revelation of John it is essential to put one's self, as far as is possible, into the world of its author and of those to whom it was first addressed. Its meaning must be sought for in the light thrown upon it by the condition and circumstances of its readers, by the author's inspired purpose, and by those current beliefs and traditions that not only influenced the fashion which his visions themselves took, but also and especially determined the form of this literary composition in which he has given a record of his visions. These facts will explain what might seem the disproportionate space which I have given to some topics in the following Introductory Studies.

The Apocalypse is the one book of the New Testament whose theme is the doctrines of the Last Things, the fulfillment of the Kingdom of God, that is, to use the common theological term, the doctrines of Eschatology. But these had a growth, running through the periods of biblical history; and the Apocalypse, springing from the heritage of these centuries, contains much, especially as regards form, which belongs to this eschatological development. The more fully, then, one comprehends the earlier eschatology, its history, and the prevalence of its principal conceptions, the better is one fitted to understand the Apocalypse in its leading aspects. I have therefore given a rather long chapter to the eschatology of the Old Testament and late Jewish writers, together with that of the different parts of the New Testament. Reference is frequently made to this to elucidate the Apocalypse.

A second topic requiring somewhat extended notice is that of the late Jewish writings called by scholars *Apocalyptic*.

NT

written upon that part of the mantle that falls over the thigh, and in the case of a rider is especially conspicuous. There does not appear sufficient ground for the interpretation 'on his girdle,' Düst. *al.* — βασιλεὺς βασιλέων κτλ., *King of kings*, etc.: cf. 1 Tim. 6<sup>15</sup>. See on 17<sup>14</sup>.

(3) The great battle of the Messiah with Antichrist, 19<sup>17-21</sup>. See pp. 286 f. 17-18. This *prelude to the battle* is suggested by Ezekiel's prophecy of the assault of the nations upon God's people in the last days, and the overthrow of Gog with his hosts upon the mountains of Israel. The prophet is there bidden to call all the birds and beasts to assemble from every quarter and sate themselves on the flesh and blood of the slain (39<sup>17-20</sup>). The Apocalyptist in part follows his source verbally, and in part varies from it with characteristic freedom. The enumeration of the victims, including every rank and condition of men (v. 18), is given in a formula similar to that used in 6<sup>15</sup>, 13<sup>16</sup>. The redundancy is noticeable. — ἔνα: indef. art.; see on 8<sup>13</sup>. — ἐστῶτα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ, *standing in the sun*: where all the birds of prey would behold him; but why this specific phrase is chosen to express that idea is uncertain. Possibly some traditional representation may be contained in it. — τὸ δείπνον τοῦ θεοῦ, *the supper of God*: i.e. made, or given, by God; cf. Ezk. 39<sup>19</sup>, 'my sacrifice,' said of the prototype of this feast.

19-21. These verses announce in the fewest possible words the *great battle of Harmagedon* and its results. See p. 286 f. — συνηγμένα, *gathered together*: as described in 16<sup>13-14</sup>; see note there. — τοῦ στρατεύματος αὐτοῦ, *his army*: on the part taken by the Messiah's army see p. 731. — ἐπιάσθη τὸ θηρίον, *the Beast was taken*: the fate of Antichrist as given in this passage is different from that allotted to him elsewhere in eschatological writings. In 2 Thess. 2<sup>8</sup> he is slain by the breath of the Lord; in Ap. Bar. 40 he is bound and brought before the Messiah, who puts him to death; in Sib. Or. III. 73 he is burnt up. Here the Apocalyptist sees him delivered over to the same punishment as is finally awarded to Satan himself, whose representative he is; just as in chapt. 13 a similar form and appearance are given to him. — ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης, *the false prophet*: the description of his work added in the following

words identifies the 'false prophet' of this passage and 16<sup>13</sup> with the second beast of chapt. 13. While the language repeats that of 13<sup>13-17</sup>, and shows the justice of joining the false prophet and the Beast in a common doom, it likewise serves to warn the readers anew against the emperor-worship and its priesthood. — ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, *before him*: see on 13<sup>12</sup>. — τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός, *the lake of fire*: cf. 20<sup>10, 14, 15</sup>, 21<sup>8</sup>, 14<sup>10</sup>. The idea of a hell of fire, as a place of final punishment, found among other peoples and common in later Jewish thought, was retained in Christian eschatology; see p. 68. On brimstone see on 21<sup>8</sup>. — τῆς καιομένης: if this reading be adopted, the grammatical inaccuracy is due to the intervening gen. τοῦ πυρός. See text. note. — τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ . . . ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, *the sword from his mouth*: see p. 731.

(4) The imprisonment of Satan and the Millennial reign of the martyrs, 20<sup>1-6</sup>. See p. 287. A temporary binding of Satan, and a Millennial reign of the risen martyrs before the final kingdom, as described in this passage, do not appear elsewhere in the book nor in the Bible (on 1 Co. 15<sup>24 f.</sup>, see p. 98). But the doctrine of a partial realization of God's kingdom, and its continuance for a limited period before the era of its complete establishment, becomes common in late Jewish belief, as seen in the apocalyptic writers. This idea arose in the effort to mediate between two different forms of eschatological outlook. The earlier Hebrew hope was fixed on an earthly kingdom centering in Palestine, and ruled by Jehovah himself. But in the later eschatology the kingdom becomes transcendental and universal, its realm embraces the renewed heavens and earth, its members include the risen saints. Between these two stands the somewhat vaguely apprehended idea of an earthly messianic kingdom of limited duration, preliminary to the perfect consummation of the end. This conception is contained in this passage of the Revelation in its own peculiar form; it appears in a different and less definite form elsewhere, e.g. 2 Es. 7<sup>28 f.</sup>, 12<sup>34</sup>, En. 91<sup>12</sup>, Ap. Bar. 40<sup>3</sup>. For a kindred idea in Ezekiel, see pp. 36 f., 76 f. Our Apocalyptist in taking up the idea stands alone in limiting the sharers in this kingdom to a special class of the saints, the risen martyrs, thus introducing a first resurrection

to be followed by that of the remaining saints at the general judgment, vv. 4-5. The duration of this intermediate kingdom, when mentioned in apocalyptic writings, is always expressed in some symbolical measure. It is here made a thousand years, a number found elsewhere also in tradition; a long period is meant.

The representation of Satan first bound and then released for a brief period which is to end in his final doom is not found in earlier literature, Jewish or Christian. That it is entirely new with our author is however improbable. Something of the kind is implied in the very idea of an intermediate kingdom, before whose establishment the powers of evil must at least be restrained; and on the other hand the last great assault of the nations, everywhere expected among the immediate antecedents of God's final triumph, presupposes the removal of that restraint. Not quite parallel with this idea, but somewhat akin to it, and perhaps aiding in its growth, is that of the seizure of evil angels and spirits, and their reservation in prison or chains for their final punishment, as frequently found in later Jewish eschatology. Thus in En. 10<sup>4-6</sup> Azazel, a leader among the fallen angels, and in Jewish angelology a figure somewhat akin to Satan, is to be bound and imprisoned in darkness for an indefinite period, but at the day of judgment to be brought forth and cast into the fire. For kindred representations, cf. En. 21<sup>1-10</sup>, 54<sup>5 f.</sup>, Jub. 5<sup>10</sup>, Sl. En. 7<sup>1</sup>; cf. also 2 Pet. 2<sup>4</sup>, Jude v. 6, Is. 24<sup>21 f.</sup>

A closer parallel to our passage is found in Persian eschatology, where in the conflict between the supreme spirits of good and evil in the last days the dragon (cf. v. 2) Azhi Dahaka is conquered and kept bound for a period, but afterwards becomes free again and is slain (cf. Völter *Offenh.* 125). There is much plausibility in the theory that there lies behind such representations a common tradition. That Persian eschatology contained ideas in common with popular beliefs and apocalyptic conceptions held among the Jews of later times is well known, see pp. 79 ff. It would not be strange, then, if some such legend regarding the dragon as that given above should have been circulated in popular Jewish apocalyptic, and have been taken up by our author and transformed, as we have seen him in other instances using current traditions.

It is not difficult to understand how conceptions regarding an intermediate kingdom, if existing in popular apocalyptic,

should have entered into the visions of our Prophet. For membership in that kingdom, with its security from the power of Satan and the blessedness of reigning with the Messiah, must present itself to his mind as a gift of God's supreme favor. And what reward more glorious than that could be imagined for the martyrs, who in Christian thought and especially in this book stand foremost in the favor of God? The Revelation is specifically a book for the martyrs; everywhere the author seeks to fortify those who are facing persecution in the time then present with them and in the awful future till the doom of Antichrist. Current ideas of an earthly reign of the Messiah and the restraint of evil powers would furnish him a vision of the form in which steadfastness unto death shall receive its special reward. It is thus, we may believe, that under the influence of his dominant idea of the glory of martyrdom, transforming in his vision expectations cherished in contemporary apocalyptic, he sees the intermediate kingdom set up and the martyrs alone admitted to it. In other words, the millennial vision of this passage appears to be an outgrowth of familiar eschatological ideas transformed and glorified through the faith that God has a special guerdon laid up for the martyr.

The author's purpose in this vision furnishes the clue to the correct interpretation of the Millennium as an element in Christian eschatology. Its place in his thought he makes clear in limiting a share in it to the martyrs. These few verses standing alone in biblical utterances, and apparently deriving their *format* contents from an external source, have given occasion for controversy running through centuries and for vast practical delusions. Yet the chief aim of the author is clear. *He seeks to set forth under a striking apocalyptic form the assurance that the martyr's steadfastness wins for him the special favor of his Lord, and the highest life in union with God and Christ.* That is the meaning of the passage *for us*. When once we apprehend the fact that the essential truth of prophecy, as distinguished from its form, is not the revelation of a chronological program in the world's history, we cease to find here the prediction of an *eschatological era*, however closely the Apocalypticist himself may have associated form and substance;



see pp. 293 ff., 299, 301 ff. The dispensational limit under which the Seer here apprehends his truth may, or may not, be an integral element in it for him; yet for us, viewed in the light of the nature and course of prophetic revelation, the essential truth, which, stripped of its apocalyptic form, is expressed in the vision of the martyr's millennial glory, is that which is given in our Lord's saying, 'He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it,' Mt. 10<sup>39</sup>.

A large school of interpreters from early times have given to this passage a non-literal meaning. The view which under considerably differing forms has been most widely advocated from Augustine on is that the first resurrection here spoken of is the spiritual renewal of the Christian, and the preliminary kingdom is the reign of Christ in those thus renewed, or in his Church; the kingdom began at Christ's appearing; Satan's power has been restrained, especially through the redemptive death of Christ, but not yet entirely destroyed; the thousand years are a period symbolically measured, continuing to the last great conflict with Satan and followed by the general resurrection, the judgment, and the perfected state of the redeemed. The fundamental fault of the interpretations which follow even remotely this theory is that they mistake the nature of apocalyptic prophecy, and read into the vision of our Apocalyptist here a meaning of which he gives no intimation and which is at variance with his language. Apocalyptic prophecy is not allegory, and in our passage it is not possible upon any sound principles of exegesis to take the first resurrection as different in kind from that of 'the rest,' v. 5, which is described in vv. 12-13. Nor can the age-long struggle of the Church militant, or any partially improved condition of human society, answer to the picture of the millennial reign of the risen martyrs, glorious in its privileges and undisturbed by Satan now banished from the world. Recent scholars are very generally agreed in rejecting such interpretations as impossible.

1-3. τὴν κλεῖν τῆς ἀβύσσου, *the key of the abyss*: cf. 9<sup>1</sup>. — ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα: as in 5<sup>1</sup>, the prep. is probably not to be distinguished from ἐν, with the dat.; cf. 1<sup>20</sup>, where ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς is used to repeat ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ, v. 16. — ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος κτλ., *the old serpent*, etc.: the dragon and the serpent, which are common in eschatological myths, are here, as generally in late Jewish demonology, expressly identified with Satan; cf. 12<sup>9</sup>. For the nom. in the appos. see p. 224. — ἔκλεισεν καὶ ἐσφράγισεν κτλ., *locked and sealed it over him*: for sealing to give special security cf. Dan. 6<sup>17</sup>, Prayer of Manas. 4, Mt. 27<sup>66</sup>. — ἵνα μὴ πλανήσῃ κτλ., *that he should not deceive the nations*,

etc.: the purpose of Satan's imprisonment is to prevent his activity in misleading the nations to war against the saints (v. 8); they are secure against his wiles throughout the Millennium. The punishment of torture to be inflicted upon him comes later, v. 10. — τὰ ἔθνη, *the nations*: the nations are here, as in v. 8, conceived to exist still, though according to 19<sup>21</sup> they had been destroyed. For this retention of conflicting ideas see on 15<sup>4</sup>, also pp. 722 f., 745. — δεῖ λυθῆναι, *he must be loosed*: Satan must in the ordering of God be released for the great conflict, which according to eschatological tradition was still to come.

4. εἶδον θρόνους κτλ., *I saw thrones*, etc.: the vision and the language are suggested by Dan. 7<sup>9, 10, 22</sup>. — ἐκάθισαν . . . ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς, *they sat upon them and judgment was given unto them*: it is not clear who occupy the thrones and administer judgment, nor what act of judgment is meant. Two views are maintained. (1) God and a heavenly assessor, or assessors, in judgment, occupy the thrones and award to the martyrs their place in the millennial kingdom. (2) The martyrs are seated on the thrones, and it is given them to rule and judge the nations of the earth. The second appears to be preferable. The co-sovereignty of the risen martyrs with Christ through the thousand years is the one dominant thought of the passage. If the author meant here to speak also of their entrance on the millennial state, as an award of judgment, we should expect specific mention of God or Christ, or both, as the awarders, as in 2<sup>26</sup>, 3<sup>21</sup>, 20<sup>11</sup>; there is nothing in the book or elsewhere to suggest any others as the vicegerents of God set to make an award of this kind. But the words, 'judgment,' *i.e.* the function of judging, 'was given to them,' would be inappropriate to a company to which God belonged. On the other hand, αὐτοῖς must refer to the subj. of the vb., or to αὐτοῖς, the thrones thought of as identical with the occupants; the second clause could not then mean, an award was given by the occupants of the thrones to the *saints*. Lk. 22<sup>30</sup>, Mt. 19<sup>28</sup>, 'Ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' where ruling and judging are essentially synonymous, support the view that the subj. of the vb. is the martyrs. Judging is inseparably joined with ruling. The martyrs occupy thrones, and the power of

judging, ruling, the nations is given to them. Cf. 2<sup>26</sup>, 1 Co. 6<sup>2</sup>. This general statement of the first sentence is then repeated and amplified by the rest of the verse. In regard to the nations remaining as the objects of such rule see on v. 3. — τὰς ψυχὰς κτλ., *the souls of those that had been beheaded*, etc.: in 6<sup>9</sup> the Seer had beheld under the heavenly altar the souls of those already martyred; their number has now been filled up (6<sup>11</sup>), and they are all admitted to their reward. The acc. depends upon εἶδον. — πεπελεκισμένων, *beheaded*: i.e. by the ax. The word denoting a mode of execution at this time generally superseded in the empire by the use of the sword has here the sense of *slain*. — διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ, *because of the testimony of Jesus*: for the gospel's sake; see on 1<sup>2</sup>. The phrase is general and includes all Christian martyrs; while the following words, καὶ οἵτινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν κτλ., *and such as worshiped not the Beast*, etc., specify a particular class among these. For clauses of this kind connected by καί, *and*, see on 16<sup>6</sup>. The words must refer to actual martyrs, since all who refused homage to the Beast were put to death, 13<sup>15</sup>; also ἔζησαν, which as v. 5 shows must mean *lived again*, makes it clear that these words do not (as some take them) refer to such as remained alive till the millennium. This particular class of martyrs is brought forward with emphasis in order to assure the readers of the glory awaiting those who remain steadfast in the great temptation to emperor-worship; cf. 13<sup>14-17</sup>. — ἔζησαν, *lived*: for ζάω, equivalent to ἀναζάω, *live again*, a frequent use, cf. v. 5, 1<sup>18</sup>, 2<sup>8</sup>; see on 13<sup>14</sup>. The new spiritual life in Christ cannot be thought of here; the context shows that the revival from physical death is meant. See p. 738. — The Apocalypticist is here concerned with the risen martyrs only. The faithful remaining alive at the time are entirely outside of the present vision; nothing is said or implied in regard to them.

5-6. οἱ λοιποί, *the rest*: all except the martyrs, both the righteous and the unrighteous. 'The rest' cannot be understood of the unrighteous only, on the supposition that all the righteous had already risen in the first resurrection; for v. 4 limits the millennial kingdom to the martyred; further, the scrutiny of the books, vv. 12, 15, to determine the issue of judgment, implies the presence of the righteous as well as the un-

righteous at the general resurrection. — ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη, *the first resurrection*: i.e. the resurrection of the martyrs, as contrasted with that of all others at the general resurrection; there is no thought of two resurrections of the same persons. — μακάριος, *blessed*: see on 1<sup>3</sup>. — ἅγιος, *holy*: wholly set apart and belonging to God. — ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος, *the second death*: see on 2<sup>11</sup>. — ἔσονται ἱερεῖς κτλ., *they shall be priests*, etc.: cf. 1<sup>6</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup>, Is. 61<sup>6</sup>. Reference is made to freedom of access to God and Christ; see on 1<sup>6</sup>. The thought of a priesthood forming a medium of blessings to the nations (so, some com.) has no place in the context.

*Textual notes, 19<sup>6</sup>-20<sup>4</sup>.* 19<sup>6</sup>. λεγοντες Q most min some anc com Ws WHmrg Alf Bouss al; λεγοντων AP some min and anc com Tr Ti WH Blj Sod al; λεγουσων K; λεγοντας some min R. The first is not easily accounted for, unless original. See Ws Ap. 137. — αλληλουια, see on v. 1. — 7. αγαλλωμεν KAP some min edd; αγαλλωμεθα Q most min R. — δωμεν K\*Q many min anc com R Ti WHmrg Sod Bouss RV al; δωσομεν K\* A LeH WH Ws Alf al; δωσομεν P some min Sw al. — 9. Before αληθινοι, A some min Ws LeH WHmrg Alf insert οι; wanting in most sources and edd. — του θεου in nearly all sources is placed before εισιν, but after it in K\* some min R, and before αληθινοι in K<sup>c</sup> some min. — 11. καλουμενος wanting in AP many min some vers; bracketed by Alf WH al. — 13. βεβαμμενον AQ most min anc com R most edd; περιεραμμενον K\* Ti; περιεραντισμενον K<sup>c</sup>; ρεραντισμενον P some min WH RV. See WH Notes on Select Readings, in loc. — 17. After δειπνον, R with a few min some vers adds τον μεγαλου. — 20. της καιομενης KAP Prim most edd; την καιομενην Q all min R Alf Bouss Sod, probably a correction. See Ws Ap. 137. — 21. For εξελθουση, R reads εκπορευομενη, uncertain origin.

20<sup>1</sup>. For κλειν R reads κλειδα, with some min and anc com. See Blass § 8, 1; Win § 9, 2, e. — 2. ο οφεις ο αρχαιος A LeH Tr Ti Ws WH al; τον οφιν κτλ KQ all min anc com R RV WHmrg Bouss Sod. — 3. After εκλεισεν, R adds αυτου, with a few min. — 4. For το θηριον R, with some min reads τω θηριω.

*Criticism of 19<sup>1</sup>-20<sup>6</sup>.* 19<sup>1-3</sup>. The larger number of critics connect this passage, or at least vv. 1-3, directly with chaps. 17-18, though with various omissions. Most of those who assume the presence of Jewish documents in the book make the passage a part of one of these; so Vischer, Weyland, Pfeiderer, J. Weiss, al. These all omit, as Christian interpolations, 19<sup>2b</sup>, like the corresponding reference to martyrs in 17<sup>6</sup>, 18<sup>20, 24</sup>; so also the mention of the Lamb in v. 7. The excisions of Spitta (192 ff.), who assigns the passage as a whole to his Jewish document J<sup>2</sup>, are characteristic; in v. 1, ὄχλου πολλοῦ, because superfluous; in v. 2, ἐξεδίκησεν . . . δεύτερον εἶρηκαν ἀλληλουια, because referring to martyrs at Rome; v. 4, because it is a repe-

tion of a redactor's error in 5<sup>8</sup>, where the prostration of the Elders and Living Creatures, while holding harps and bowls in their hands, is inconceivable. Völter (*Offenb.* 47) and Erbes (102), though assigning parts of the passage to an interpolator, make it as a whole Christian, and connect it, the former with 14<sup>20</sup>, the latter with chapt. 18. Schoen (138) joins it with 16<sup>21</sup> as part of the primitive Christian plan. J. Weiss (120 f.) thinks that in vv. 4-10 the Seer represents himself in heaven, whereas in the context he is on earth; Weiss therefore makes vv. 4-10 an interpolation, while assigning the chapt. as a whole to his Jewish source Q.

19<sup>9-10</sup>. Numerous objections are raised by critics against these verses: the introduction of an indefinite speaker; the insertion of the verses between two passages, the exultant hymn and the appearing of the warrior Messiah, with which they are thought to have no connection; inappropriateness of the declaration 'these words are true,' which belongs at the close of the book, and is actually found there (22<sup>6</sup>); the inexplicableness of the Seer's act of worship in 22<sup>8</sup>, if occurring and reproved here; the exact duplication of these verses in 22<sup>6, 8f.</sup>; the misinterpretation of 22<sup>9</sup> contained in the explanatory clause added at the end of v. 10, ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία κτλ. — These objections have been noticed in the Com. It does not appear that v. 9 is open to valid criticism. Some of the objections to v. 10, however, must be acknowledged of weight. The Seer's impulse to offer worship to an angel is explainable at the close of the book (see note there). If it occurred at any earlier place, it would seem more natural in the presence of one of the twenty-four Elders in 7<sup>13f.</sup>, or of the awe-inspiring angel of chapt. 10, or in the case of the angel of this scene, at his first appearing in 17<sup>1</sup>. In the particular juncture of this passage there appears no so extraordinary manifestation as to account for it. Furthermore, there is no sufficient explanation of the act of homage in 22<sup>8</sup>, if forbidden here. The conclusion, then, suggests itself inevitably that the present passage, v. 10, has crept into the text from the latter; it is inserted as a sequel to οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοί here, as it so stands in 22<sup>6-8</sup>. And this conclusion is confirmed by the exact repetition here of much of the language of that passage, and by the almost certain supposition that the words ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία κτλ. in this verse are a comment inappropriate here and suggested by 22<sup>9</sup>. See Com.

19<sup>11-18</sup>. Objection is raised to the representation of the warrior Messiah here as at variance with the Christ of the N. T.; the passage therefore, the assumed Christian additions being omitted, is referred to a Jewish document; so, Vischer, Spitta, Weyland, J. Weiss, *al.* Völter who makes it Christian assigns it to his Cerinthian addition. Many critics reject the mention of the name 'The Word of God,' v. 12 *b*, as inconsistent with v. 12 *c*, and brought in from the Johannine doctrine of the Logos, without any appropriate relation to the context. These objections have been spoken of in the Com.

19<sup>17-21</sup>. Critics for the most part agree in joining this passage with vv. 11-16, and assigning it to the respective sources assumed for those verses.

20<sup>1-6</sup>. Vischer (68 ff.) raises a number of objections to vv. 4-6. The millennial reign of the saints is not clear, since there can be no subjects,

all men except the saints having been destroyed in the battle against the Messiah, 19<sup>21</sup>. Further objection is raised to the general judgment; at the first resurrection all martyrs are raised, but in this number would be included all the faithful, since all who refuse to worship the Beast are martyred (13<sup>15</sup>); all saints then share in the millennial kingdom and only the wicked are not raised in this first resurrection; why then another judgment? Why do not the messianic kingdom and world renewal follow the battle at once? Why an interregnum? Spitta (208 ff.), in part for the reasons given by Vischer and in part on other grounds, refers vv. 4-7 to a redactor; the context (20<sup>1-3, 8 ff.</sup>) belongs according to him to his Jewish source J<sup>1</sup>, but these verses cannot belong there, as they contain Christian allusions; moreover a twofold resurrection is unknown to Jewish apocalyptic and O. T. tradition. The indefiniteness of the persons seated on the thrones points to an original connection in which this was clear. Erbes (109), rejecting from his primitive apocalypse a twofold resurrection and a preliminary kingdom of the martyrs, refers the whole passage 20<sup>1-10</sup> to his redaction of the year 80.

The principal grounds upon which these various criticisms of our paragraph, 19<sup>1-20</sup>, are based have been touched upon in the Com. Apart from details there discussed, there are two general lines of argument which appear to establish the place of the paragraph, with perhaps the exception of a short sentence or two, in the original work of the Apocalyptist from whom the book as a whole has come. (1) The passage as a whole and in its parts agrees with the author's plan, his leading thoughts and his manner, as seen in the Summary (pp. 286 f.) and in the Com. After the fall of Rome, just such a sequel is demanded with its note of triumph and anticipation of the end thus begun, with its swift overthrow of the beasts, Satan's earthly agents, hitherto central figures, and with some special promise for those who are faithful even to martyrdom. And it is not supposable that the form of the sequel here given has displaced another. It is true that the reign of the martyrs in a preliminary kingdom is peculiar to this passage; but it is not in actual contradiction with the author's eschatology as given elsewhere; see pp. 165, 735 ff. (2) In language, idioms, and grammatical mannerisms the paragraph agrees with the book in general; and, what is significant, almost every verse shows parallelism with other parts of the book, as may be seen from the following examples, which could be multiplied. In chapt. 19 compare v. 1 with 7<sup>9, 10, 12, 12<sup>10</sup></sup>; v. 2 with 15<sup>8, 16<sup>17</sup>, 17<sup>1, 5</sup></sup>; v. 3 with 14<sup>11</sup>; vv. 1-5 with 5<sup>6-14</sup> (see p. 720); v. 6 with 6<sup>1, 14<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>17</sup></sup>; v. 7 with 21<sup>9 ff.</sup>; v. 8 with 18<sup>16</sup>; v. 11 with 6<sup>1-2, 3<sup>14</sup></sup>; v. 12 with 2<sup>18, 17</sup>; v. 15 with 1<sup>16, 2<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>19</sup></sup>; v. 16 with 17<sup>14</sup>; v. 19 with 16<sup>14</sup>; v. 20 with 3<sup>11-17</sup>. — In chapt. 20 compare v. 1 with 9<sup>1</sup>; v. 2 with 12<sup>9</sup>; v. 4 with 6<sup>9</sup>; v. 6 with 2<sup>11, 1<sup>6</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup></sup>.

XX. 7-XXII. 5. *The End.* See pp. 287 ff.

(1) The destruction of the nations in their last assault upon the citadel of God's people; and the final doom of Satan,