

DANIEL AND THE LATTER DAYS

Robert D. Culver

Moody Press Chicago Copyright, 1954

<http://rediscoveringthebible.com/Culver.html>

Preface

One of the first indications of the purpose of the dreams and visions of the book of Daniel is that it is to give light on things "hereafter" and during "the latter days." So it is no surprise to learn before one reads far in the book that Daniel is devoted largely to revelation of the future.

It is for this cause that Daniel never fails to attract the interest of the reader, whether he be worldly curious or devoutly faithful. A flood of literature on Daniel has been the inevitable result.

The "interest factor" is probably one of the strongest elements in my desire to prepare this my second treatise on the Book of Daniel. But the most important element in the desire was, and is, to test in the crucible of the entire written Word of God the Premillennial system of interpretation which I have been led to believe is the key to predictive prophecy in the Bible. I say to test--though candor might force me to say "to justify" or "to substantiate." For convictions of many years, based, I felt, on clear pronouncements of the Bible, have probably rendered the study something less than completely unprejudiced. Nevertheless, I have tried to be objective. How successful I have been will be judged by the reader.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to The Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. for permission to quote from *The American Standard Version of the Bible*, and to all others from whom such permission has been secured in every case in which permission was known to be required.

May the Holy Spirit bless these efforts and those who read, that they, like Daniel, may have their rest and stand in their lot at the end of the days.

R.D.C.

Preface to Second Edition

The present edition of *Daniel and the Latter Days* is essentially the same as previous printings except for correction of misprints, refinement of one or two points of exegesis, and a change of view with regard to interpretation of II Thessalonians 2:7-10. Although new literature on the "millennial question" has continued to appear, the last decade has not been especially fruitful--only enough to show that scholars have not forgotten about it. No evidence or argument has come to the author's attention which did not appear in earlier publications in similar form.

The author has supplemented his argument by "A Neglected Millennial Passage from St. Paul," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1956; "The Difficulty of Interpreting O.T. Prophecy," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1957; *The Sufferings and the Glory of the Lord's Righteous Servant*, Moline: Christian Service Foundation, 1958; "Daniel," *Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1962; and "Were the O.T. Prophecies Really Prophetic?" *Can I Trust My Bible?* Chicago: Moody Press, 1963.

Introduction

Nearly fifty years ago a very learned and devout Biblical critic wrote: "The commentaries on Daniel are innumerable. On no other book, save the Book of Revelation in the New Testament, has so much worthless matter been written in the shape of exegesis" (Charles H. H. Wright, D.D., Ph.D., *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 197). A recent critical writer (H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and The Four World Empires*) lists over 400 works consulted in investigation of one historical and one expositional problem in Daniel. Each year witnesses the publication of new commentaries on all or parts of the book. In view of all this one might reasonably ask, Why another book on Daniel? In the first place, let it be said that the fact that so much is being

written and read on the subject manifests a continuing lively interest in the **Book of Daniel**. Furthermore--and this is the real occasion for this treatise--there is a great need today for just such a work as the writer hopes this one will prove to be. To my knowledge no work of this type has ever been written in recent times. I have in mind a work that will first of all frankly take the Premillenarian approach, lay a sound basis for acceptance of that position in the whole of Scripture, and then proceed to show that this method of exposition alone can satisfactorily explain the **Book of Daniel**. Such a work should do justice to the linguistical data of the book and should approach the book in the original Aramaic and Hebrew. Several such works from Amillennial and Postmillennial writers are available--some quite recent, but nothing of the sort by a Premillennialist. Many Premillennial commentaries on Daniel have been written, to be sure, many of them of very superior quality, some of them less than worthless. It has not suited the purpose of any I have read to explain first the Premillennial eschatological position assumed, nor to show why it had been adopted. This is not blameworthy--it simply did not suit the purpose of the author to do so.

But a time has come when Premillennialists had better examine the foundation of their peculiar faith. Others are examining it and think they find it wanting in many respects. Pious men of unquestioned Christian faith are vigorously sponsoring other systems of eschatology. It will not do to ignore these men--it would not be honest to do so, nor would it exemplify the courtesy we expect from them. Neither can we "cast them out of the synagogue" of orthodoxy simply because they do not agree with us in some aspects of eschatology. The proper thing to do is to hear what they have to say, learn what we can from them, and then judge their sermons and their books as we judge our own--by the light of God's Word. To do so will be a wholesome experience for us all. It is a craven kind of Christian faith which fears to examine the content of its creed in the light of honest criticism.

The writer has tried to do just this and has learned much. He hopes that this book, which represents a part of the fruit of his research, will be of real aid to others who earnestly desire to know the truth of God about the

future as revealed in the Scriptures.

Some time I hope to write a commentary on all of Daniel--a commentary on every verse, giving proper attention to the critical, doctrinal, and practical aspects. But now my purpose is different. I wish to provide a basis for a consistent explanation of the book. If all the predictions concerning the nations culminate in Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century B.C., that is one thing. If they converge upon the events of the lifetime of our Lord in the first century following His first advent, that is another. If, however, prophecy of the nations is carried down to the end of the present age, that is still another. If Israel is to be restored to a position of national favor at the close of the present age, that is one thing. If God is finished with Israel as a nation, that is still another. To propose an answer to these questions on which Christians continue to hold divergent opinions is the purpose of this study. Since I write as a Premillenarian it will require that I first find a basis for the Premillennial view in the Bible as a whole, and then, using the original Hebrew and Aramaic of Daniel as the authoritative source, proceed to show that the Premillennial approach explains the prophecies of Daniel in the most satisfactory manner. It will be neither convenient nor necessary to treat everything in the prophecies, but only those portions which are pertinent to the main question. This question may be phrased, *Can Premillennialism give the best explanation of the predictions of the Book of Daniel?*

It is taken for granted that not everyone who may read this treatise will be pleased. Not the liberal critics, for I will treat this book with the reverence due a work inspired of God and hence accurate in historical details. Not the unconvinced Postmillennialists and Amillennialists, for I hope to show them that on the points at which we differ they are wrong. Not all Premillennialists, for I have been convinced that our critics and opponents have in the last couple of generations found many weak points in the writings and sermons of some of the less cautious and uncritical of our number, and have uncovered not a little unfounded prejudice, pride of opinion, error, and even of fanaticism in our midst. For this I can give them nothing but the heartiest

of thanks and pray that all my Premillennial brethren will do the same.

R. D. C.

PART ONE

The Premillennial View

Basic Definitions

It is always precarious to attempt a definition. There is always the possibility of excluding an essential or of including too much. This is true whether the area be politics, philosophy, religion or anything else. It is particularly true when the term to be defined has historic connections or has been a subject of controversy.

Yet definitions are necessary. For example, the whole world is agreed that democracy seems to be a good thing, but there is no general agreement on what democracy is. Something like this is true in millennial discussions. There must be some agreement, at least provisional agreement, as to what a millennium is before it can be decided whether it is not taught in Scripture (Amillennialism), or that Christ will come after it has run its course (Postmillennialism), or that Christ will come before it begins (Premillennialism).

But a difficulty arises--opinions of individuals within Premillennialism differ on details. Another difficulty follows--both the names and details of interpretation have changed over the centuries. At the present time there are some differences of thought within Premillennialism over reference to certain aspects of the doctrine. So one can hardly hope that even all Premillennialists will agree in all points of a definition.

An even greater difficulty is encountered because of the fact that in the last several generations the millennial issue has been woven into the expressions of two orthodox but distinct theological systems. I refer to what

is sometimes called *dispensational theology* and to the so-called *covenant* theology. Dispensationalists frequently suppose that the Premillennial viewpoint is exclusively held by their own school; contrariwise, some covenant theologians appear to believe that Amillennialism is a necessary adjunct to their system. The writer has even met some who suppose that Calvinism is opposed to Premillennialism; and, at the opposite extreme, a fairly recent work (*Modern Premillennialism and the Christian Hope*, p. 112) by an Arminian opponent of Premillennialism contends that the Premillennial view is really Hyper-Calvinism! Some express themselves as if one's stand on the Millennium determines his views on Christian ethics, salvation, and the church. It is true that it often does, but that there is no *necessary* connection the contemporary situation manifests, for among most shades of Protestant theological opinion (Calvinism, Arminianism, Covenant Theology, Dispensational Theology, etc.), there are both strong Premillennialists and Amillennialists, and probably a few Postmillennialists.

Now, this writer is not inclined to shrug his shoulders at all theological differences among Christians--though I do believe that sometimes they are overzealously championed. I do have strong convictions on all of these issues. But I do also most strongly affirm that the millennial issue, even though it may lead to differences in many areas, ought to be permitted to stand by itself for judgment. It ought not to be unnecessarily clouded by other issues. I insist that the question of the millennium in both the Bible and history of interpretation is essentially a question of eschatology, and that it ought to be permitted to remain so. It is true, to be sure, that some have interpreted the millennium as an aspect of the present age. But it will be the burden of this paper to show that view to be false--that the coming of the millennium is indeed an eschatological event.

I realize that it will not be easy to dissociate the millennial question from some of the theological bearings in which it is often placed. Theologians, like philosophers, are system makers. So it was to be expected that this Christian doctrine should become imbedded in a theological system. But, lo, the unexpected has happened, and it is embodied in various forms in

several systems.

In view of this fact, the writer is inclined to take issue with a recent writer from the Premillennial school who speaks at length of "Amillennial Bibliology," "Amillennial Theology Proper," "Amillennial Angelology," "Amillennial Anthropology," "Amillennial Soteriology," "Amillennial Ecclesiology"--all in the same plane of what he calls "Amillennial Eschatology." I think it mars what is otherwise one of the most scholarly and acceptable discussions of the millennial problem and of dispensationalism to appear in many years. (See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 107, Number 426, sixth in a series on the millennium by John F. Walvoord.) When Amillennialism has been championed by large sections of such theologically diverse bodies as the Roman Catholic Church, branches of the Lutheran Church, sections of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, Methodists, Southern Baptists, and notably by the Church of God (Winebrennarian group) it is sheer folly to create the fiction of a distinctive "Amillennial system of theology." It would be equally foolish to attempt a definition of a "Premillennial system of theology."

This writer does not claim to be immune to system making. Theology ought to be systematic, that is, it ought to manifest harmony in its various parts. But systematic theology as a rigid framework in which every difficult verse must fit will cost us much in error and controversy. So, even though for many years I have had very definite opinions in the field of Christian theology, I have made a conscious effort in this treatise to be unbiased by the system, as such, to which I hold. I am not inclined now to say a great deal about it at this juncture. Rather, without taking a polemical partisan attitude, would I follow the lead of Edward Bickersteth, a noted Premillennial writer of over a century ago, who says in the preface to the sixth edition of his *Practical Guide to The Prophecies*: "The author commends the subject with affection and humility to the attention of the beloved brethren in the ministry, and fellow Christians of every denomination. He trusts that his mind is open to conviction on being *shown a more excellent way*" (cf. also Augustine, *City of God*, XX, 30).

The investigation represented by this work has not confirmed quite everything I once accepted. Yet more and more it has become plain to me that the simple, literal, grammatical method of interpretation which led my teachers in my childhood and youth to the Premillennialist position will lead anyone to the same position, provided he leaves his biases behind. I am quite certain that I am a more convinced Premillennialist and have a better and more Biblical Premillennialism than ever before.

What is Premillennialism? The shortest, most concise definition by any scholar of note is probably that given by W. G. Moorehead (International Standard Bible Encyclopædia, art. "Millennium [Premillennial View]"). He first sets forth the proposition that the Millennium will be that time when "the kingdom of God shall have universal sway over the earth, and...righteousness and peace and the knowledge of the Lord shall everywhere prevail," then reduces the distinctive view of Premillennialism to the proposition that "the Millennium succeeds the second coming of Christ." This statement, it should be added, is that of an advocate of Premillennialism. Moorehead wrote before the Amillennial doctrine had been revived in its present vigorous form. His definition of the Millennium itself is entirely inadequate for the field of Millennial controversy today. In fact, his definition and doctrine are not too acceptable to Amillennialism.

Very near the same brevity is attained by S. H. Kellogg (Schaff-Herzog Ency. of Rel. Knowledge, art., "Premillennialism").

The most elaborate analysis and enumeration of the tenets of Premillennialism to be set forth recently comes from a Premillennialist converted, he says, to Amillennialism during his last year in seminary and twenty years of service on a foreign mission field. I refer to *The Basis of Millennial Faith* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1942) by Floyd E. Hamilton. He first sets forth what he believes to be "The General Theory," then treats in turn, "Historic Premillennialism," "Pre-Tribulationists," and "Ultradispensationalists." His ten pages (21-30) do present a quite adequate survey of the situation. Yet his enumerations and formulations are intended to

include all that which is, and has been, taught by most orthodox Premillennialists and not necessarily by the Bible itself. He has included the broadest latitude of opinion and hence mentions some views as distinctive to Premillennialism in general and to dispensational Premillennialism in particular which many of the best advocates do not hold. Further, they are stated in such a fashion that they may be most adaptable to refutation later in his book. For these reasons I cannot adopt his definition of the doctrine. I shall make no effort to state, defend, or refute any doctrine of eschatology, soteriology, ecclesiology, etc., held by any Premillenarian past or present except as it harmonizes with what may be derived from clear teaching of Scripture. Too long now we have been quoting authorities at one another to determine the "thus saith the Lord."¹

It was Johann Albrecht Bengel of Germany (1687-1751) who gave Premillennialism respectability in scholarly and ecclesiastical circles in the modern era by adopting an energetic Premillennialism himself and advocating it in his writings (cf. evaluation of Bengel in *The Prophecies of Daniel and The Revelations of St. John*, Carl August Auberlen, Eng. trans. Adolph Saphir, pp. 365-379). Contemporary writers have a way of supposing that Premillennialism in modern forms roots in the Plymouth Brethren movement. Such is not the case. Bickersteth (*op.cit.*), whose date is 1839, lists hundreds of books on eschatology, most of them favorable to the Premillenarian view, and almost all coming before the rise of the Plymouth Brethren but after Bengel. Yet, as Auberlen points out, Bengel was in error in many of his views of eschatology (for instance he believed in two eschatological millennia and set the date for the beginning of the first Millennium in the year 1836). But he was right in insisting on the central truth of the Premillennial doctrine. Yet how dreadful would have been the results to Christianity since Bengel if preachers and scholars had felt that all the view of Bengel had to be defended. Our twentieth century has in fifty years produced some sound expositors of Premillennial doctrine. Yet how few of them have fully avoided Bengel's error of date-setting. How few of them have written no words which will appear foolish a generation hence. Eschatology is especially susceptible to wild speculation. The eschatological portions of Scripture are most susceptible to

fanciful exegesis. Would that expositors might stick to the task of exposition and application and not attempt to add to revelations of Almighty God by intuition and speculation.

So, in enumerating what I believe to be the teachings of Scripture concerning the Millennium, I shall try to avoid making any affirmation which is not derived from the "thus saith the Lord" of Bible revelation.

My procedure shall be first to state the doctrine and then to present the Biblical evidence.

The essentials of the teachings of the Scriptures on the Millennium may be summarized in three propositions:

I. The Millennium is specifically (1) the period of time between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust, and (2) the period of Satan's imprisonment.

II. The Millennium is further qualified as (1) an initial stage of the everlasting kingdom of Christ, (2) a period begun by the visible return of Christ in glory to judge and rule the nations, (3) a period closed by the final eradication of all evil from God's universe at the final judgment of the wicked, and (4) a period during which the saints of the first resurrection will be associated with Christ in His reign.

III. In connection with the inauguration of the Millennium it is revealed that (1) the closing days of the present age shall witness the restoration of Israel to the land and the conversion of the nation, to be followed in the Millennium by the fulfillment of the Old Testament covenant promises distinctive to that nation, (2) a final personal Antichrist shall appear near the close of this present age who will become master of the world and will be destroyed by Christ at His coming, and (3) a period of great tribulation for Israel is to transpire under Antichrist's oppression, from which deliverance will be provided by Christ at His coming.

Some will question why certain particular teachings often emphasized by some Premillennialists are not included in the list. The explanation is the limitation of purpose. It is my intention to present only the essentials of doctrine for a consistent and Biblical premillennial eschatology--to list the *essentials* of the premillennial view which would be accepted by the majority of orthodox² Premillennialists.

Some Premillennialists will, of course, disagree as to the list of essentials. If so, I can say only that I think them mistaken. The Premillennialist brethren who feel that Antichrist is the Pope, for instance, will not agree with the second and third parts of III above. The brethren who think of the Millennium and the Kingdom as precise equivalents will disagree with most of II.

Some Premillennialists will think I have not included enough as essential. The pre-tribulationist who some years ago refused to sit on a Bible conference platform with a speaker who advocated the doctrine of a post-tribulation rapture would, no doubt, want the doctrine of a pre-tribulation rapture included. However, I have no doubt that reasonable and informed Premillennialists will all agree that some of the details of doctrine in this area must be based on inferences from passages rather than plain statements of "thus saith the Lord." Also some of the passages which concern questions of a secret or public rapture, the precise relation of the saints of the Old Testament to the saints of the New in the coming Kingdom, are capable of variant interpretation. There ought to be room for legitimate difference of opinion among the Premillennial brethren on these points.³

It is my sincere prayer that those who read the pages to follow will be convinced that these propositions are true. They are now presented with the most important Biblical evidence. I cannot present all of it, for even Augustine (*City of God*, XX, 30), after several times cutting short his arguments on eschatology, as he said, lest he should be "unduly prolix," finally adds, "There are many passages of Scripture bearing on the last

judgment of God,--so many, indeed, that to cite them all would swell this book to an unpardonable size."

CHAPTER I

The Millennium--Specific Reference

The Millennium is specifically (1) the period of time between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust, and (2) the period of Satan's imprisonment.

The word "millennium" (derived from Latin *mille*, thousand, plus *annus*, year) is simply a Latin translation of *chilia etee* in the Greek text of Revelation 20:2,3, etc. The word means, simply, a thousand years.

That it should be necessary to affirm here that it refers to a "period of time" seems odd. Yet it is necessary, for it has been vigorously advocated that it does *not* refer to a period of time at all. There are those who insist that there is no primary reference to either a literal period of a thousand years ushered in and closed by definite events or to an ideal period which is a symbol of something else.

The Book of Revelation makes mention of several periods of time--of "silence in heaven about the space of half an hour" (8:1); of four angels "prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year" (9:15); of "the holy city" to be trodden "under foot forty and two months" (11:2); of two witnesses who "shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days" (12:6). There is no clear evidence that any of these is to be taken in any other sense than a literal period of time. And, even if there were, each case would have to be settled individually. Actually, there is no convincing, self-evident Biblical testimony against the literal interpretation of this thousand-year period.¹ It would take a large book to treat completely the various devices which have been invented to avoid the clear literal teaching of Revelation 20:1-7, concerning a future period of one thousand years of time between the second coming of Christ and the final consummation of all time. I do not hesitate to

attribute all of them to the strong tendency in some system-making theology to force difficult but clear texts out of their true shape to fit a system.

Augustine had a theory of politico-ecclesiastical government to maintain, so, while admitting the literality of the years, he placed them in the present age out of their eschatological connection. Modern Amillenarians (Kuyper, Allis, Hamilton, Murray, Hendriksen, Warfield, Milligan, and others) have a theory that the eschatological future consummation must take place in a very short period of time, as man counts time, and hence must remove the strictures of the text to make their theory fit. They also have theories concerning the future of the church and Israel which do not fit well into the picture of a Millennium in which saints reign on earth with Christ and Israel blossoms again. So the Millennium must go.

That they are conscious of their difficulty in so disposing of the passage is clear from their writings. Many of them admit that the literal teaching of the passage is that the proposition of which this section is a discussion is a true one--that the Millennium is a one-thousand-year period during which Satan shall be bound, and which separates the resurrection of the just from the unjust. I have been much impressed by the obvious Christian devotion of some of these men and their plain faith that the Bible is indeed the Word of God. When I have permitted this portion and some other plain portions of Scripture to be shunted out of the center of discussion (where they must remain) I have even been impressed with the seeming cogency of their arguments. I am not even disposed to dispute their finding a much closer relationship between O.T. prophecy and the church in the present age. Nor does there seem to me to be any serious objection to the claims of many Amillenarian brethren that the Bible speaks of a present reign of the saints with Christ in heaven. However, as one of their own fellows in the Covenant Theology to which most of the contemporary Amillennialists adhere has observed: "I am deeply interested in what my Amillenarian brethren may present as counter arguments; but I am convinced that hitherto neither Augustine nor his followers have adequately dealt with this material in Scripture or as much as dented the millenarian argument which is involved in this material" (D. H. Kromminga, *The*

Millennium).

So, in the complete absence of convincing contrary evidence, I assert that the Millennium is a period of one thousand years of time and insist that it is one of the clear teachings of Scripture.

I have asserted that the Millennium is *specifically* the period of Satan's imprisonment and the period between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust. The thousand years are mentioned six times in the first seven verses of Revelation twenty. Three of these occurrences (vs. 2,3, and 7) apply it to the period of Satan's imprisonment. Once, in verse five, it refers to the period between the resurrections. The other two apply it to a period of time during which saints shall reign. But these references to the reign of the saints are in a different class from the others. The thousand years will complete the whole history of Satan's binding as well as of the resurrections of dead men. It will be only a preliminary stage in the reign of the saints in Christ's everlasting kingdom.

It is not an uncommon misconception among Premillennial believers that Christ's kingdom, the reign of Christ, and the reign of the saints are restricted to a one-thousand-year period. Revelation 20:4 ("and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years") and 20:6 ("they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years") have been thought to teach that the reign of the saints and of Christ shall come to an end at the close of the Millennium. How foolish it is to cite these verses in proof of such an assertion is seen at once in a close look at verse four. "Lived" and "reigned" are both in the same person, gender, and number, and tense in the Greek. There is no punctuation mark of any kind between them. Clearly, then, the thousand years modifies both the living² of the saints and their reigning. To insist on a reign of only one thousand years on the basis of this verse would require equal insistence on a living of only one thousand years, which simply will not do. And contrariwise, there are many passages which speak of the perpetuity of the reign of the saints in the kingdom of Messiah. On this point, and in relation to these verses, George N. H. Peters has

written the truth, as follows:

It is asserted by some (as *e.g.* Calvin, *Inst.*, B.3, ch.25) that our doctrine limits the reign of Christ *only* to the one thousand years. This is incorrect. While some Millenarians explain the "delivering up of the Kingdom" somewhat similar to our opposers, yet even nearly all--if not all--of these, so far as we have any knowledge of their writings, affirm that *Jesus continues* to reign in the same Kingdom, subordinately to the Father, *after* the close of the thousand years. The reasons for *the perpetuity* of Christ's Kingdom will now be presented, and the only passage that seems to militate against it will be examined. [He refers to I Corinthians 15:24.]...While the words "eternal," "everlasting," "forever," are sometimes employed to denote limited duration (*i.e.* duration adapted to the nature of the thing of which it is affirmed), yet such words as applied to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ *cannot* be thus restricted, because an unending duration intended by them is stated in explanatory phraseology (as *e.g.* Luke 1:32 "of his kingdom there shall be no end," etc.). The thousand years are *specifically* mentioned as *the period* of Satan's binding and of the time existing *between* the two resurrections, and of this era it is also asserted that Christ and His saints shall reign. The declaration of their reigning during this period does *not limit* the reign to it, but is added to indicate that the reign is already commenced and extends through this Millenary age. Jesus is not merely the king of "*an age*" but of "*the ages*" (I Tim. 1:17 Greek), and His Kingdom is united, not merely to "*an age*" but to "*the age of ages*" of "*eternal ages*," thus indicating its extension onward through the vast succession of time in an unending series. Hence the perpetuity of the Kingdom is freely declared in II Sam. 7:16; Heb. 1:8; Luke 1:32,33; Rev. 11:15; Isa. 9:7; ii Pet. 1:11, etc., and this is explained, Dan. 2:44, to be "*a kingdom that shall never be destroyed*," and in Dan. 7:14, "*His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*" Indeed, so expressive are these and kindred passages that even those who advocate *a transfer* of the Kingdom to the Father and some kind of an ending of the Kingdom, are still forced, by their weight and concurrence, unhesitatingly to acknowledge, in some form (as Barnes,

etc.) *"the perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom and His eternal reign."* Hence this reign, beginning at the Millennial era, is *not terminated* by the close of the thousand years...(The *Theocratic Kingdom*, Vol. 2,630,631).

It is not true, as both Amillennialists and Postmillennialists are wont to affirm, that a period of time between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust is affirmed by Scripture in this passage alone. There is at least one Old Testament passage which mentions a long period at the time of the consummation during which certain "high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth" shall "be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited" (Isa. 24:22,23). No satisfactory explanation of this strange passage was afforded until Revelation 20:1-10 was written, and even then only as the literal Premillennial interpretation was adopted. Dr. Nathaniel West possibly went too far in asserting dogmatically that several other Old Testament passages refer to the Millennium. He asserted this of Ezekiel 38:8; 37:25,26,28; Hosea 3:4,5; Psalm 72:7. Some of these *may* refer to the Millennium. Only Isaiah 24:22,23 *must* refer to it, in my opinion.

But, granting the objection to our doctrine: that it is supported by one passage alone, the fact remains that one passage does clearly teach it and one is enough.

Amillennialists have various methods of handling the reference to a "first resurrection" of the just and a final resurrection of the unjust mentioned in Revelation 20. The most common is that advocated recently by Floyd E. Hamilton, and very clearly stated by him:

The amillennialist...believes that the first resurrection is the new birth of the believer which is crowned by his being taken to heaven to be with Christ in His reign during the interadventual period. This eternal life, which is the present possession of the believer, and is not interrupted by the death of the body, is the first resurrection and participation in it is the millennial reign. (*The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 118.119).

Like most of the Amillennialists, ancient and modern, he traces support

for this view from several other Biblical passages which speak of a spiritual resurrection of believers at new birth. In John 5:24-29 he, following Augustine, even finds (and rightfully so) a spiritual and a physical (in that order) resurrection of believers in one paragraph. Yet for two simple reasons his argument is completely worthless. The first is that interpretation of what he calls a symbol in Revelation 20 must have a sound basis in the passage itself. It will not do to run off somewhere else and, finding a spiritual resurrection, cry, "See, Revelation 20:4-6 speaks of spiritual resurrection." This kind of exegesis leads to no certain results. And it is fortunate that most of our orthodox but Amillennial friends do not frequently use this method of exegesis except where the doctrine of Millennium is concerned. The second reason, suggested now already, is that no connection can be traced between even one of his references and Revelation 20:4-6.

Before leaving Hamilton, note that he regards the Millennium not as a period of time but as a condition of existence, and that it takes place in heaven.

Augustine, who is of importance to the discussion as the first acceptable exponent of Amillennialism, had a slightly different view of the nature and location of the Millennium. He placed the Millennium on earth during the present age. He felt that it consisted in the binding of Satan by the progress of the church. He thought it began with the first missionary expansion of the church from Judea and would end with the coming of Christ in the year 650, though he was not dogmatic about that date. He tried to adjust the Millennium with the sixth millennium of human history, following the Septuagint chronology, which he interpreted to place the end of the fifth millennium at about 350 B.C. (*City of God*, XX,8).

Thus, to Augustine, the Millennium is a period of time, and is the period of Satan's imprisonment, but by placing it in the present age, and by making the reign of the saints ecclesiological instead of eschatological his view is totally unacceptable. It simply does not fit the plain requirements of the passage in Revelation twenty.³

The comments of a great scholar, recognized by Christian scholars of all schools of thought as a worthy interpreter of Scripture, I deem to be worthy of note in concluding on this point.

I refer to Henry Alford, churchman, New Testament critic, scholar, and Christian. Commenting on Revelation 20:1 ff. he says,

It will have been long ago anticipated by the readers of this commentary that I cannot consent to distort words from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy on any considerations of difficulty, or any risk with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole church from 300 years, understood them in the plain literal sense: and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of consensus, which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where *two resurrections* are mentioned, where certain *ψυχαι ἐζησαν* (souls lived) at the first, and the rest of the *νεκροὶ ἐζησαν* (dead lived) only at the end of a specified period after the first--if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean *spiritual* rising from the grave--then there is an end of all significance of language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to any thing. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none⁴ will be hardy enough to maintain: but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which, in common with the whole primitive Church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain, and receive as an article of faith and hope (*Greek Testament with a Critically Revised Text*, etc. Vol. IV, pp. 732,733).

CHAPTER II

The Millennium--Further Qualifications

The Millennium is further qualified as (1) an initial stage of the everlasting kingdom of Christ, (2) a period begun by the visible return of Christ in glory to judge and rule the nations, (3) a period closed by the final eradication of all evil from God's universe at the final judgment of the wicked, and (4) a period during which the saints of the first resurrection will be associated with Christ in His reign.

(1) The Millennium is an initial stage in the everlasting kingdom of Christ.

It is inevitable that conflict with the Amillennial view should be engaged at this point.

Amillennialists, in general, hold that the Millennium is a symbol of the present age, that the binding of Satan took place at the beginning of the present age and that he will be unbound a short while before the close of this age.¹ They believe that all the Bible prophecies concerning the prodigious events to take place in connection with the coming of Christ will be seen by the living church before the Rapture. The Rapture is held to be simultaneous with the revelation of Christ in power to judge the wicked nations. The eternal state, without any transitional Millennium, will begin immediately upon the coming of Christ. They also hold that many of the kingdom prophecies of the Bible in Old and New Testaments alike refer to the church in this present, the "Millennial Age."² Certainly, they agree, none of them refer to a restored Israel in a future Millennium.

The arguments amassed to support these views fill entire books. The interested student will find them well expressed in able presentations by Murray (*Millennial Studies*), Hamilton (*The Basis of Millennial Faith*), Allis (*Prophecy and the Church*), Geerhardus Vos (*The Teachings of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Church*). All of these, except Vos, are recent writers.

It would take another book to respond to the men "blow by blow." But that kind of an answer is not the most convincing, anyway, even if the limitations of this treatise would permit it.

Therefore, I shall confine myself to presentation of the Biblical evidence for the Premillennial view that the Millennium is, indeed, an initial stage in the everlasting kingdom of God.

This can be shown to be true by demonstrating the truth of the following propositions: *First*, there is an everlasting kingdom promised to Christ (Messiah) in the Old Testament. *Second*, Christ claimed those promises for Himself when He came. *Third*, Christ and the apostles made it clear that in certain important aspects that kingdom was entirely future up to the time of our Lord's ascension and would remain so till the second coming. *Fourth*, the Bible places the future Millennium within that future kingdom, and places it at the very beginning of it.

The first two of these propositions are not opposed by any serious students of any conservative theological school of opinion so I shall merely state them with Bible references and move on to the last two, which are subjects of controversy.

(a) An everlasting kingdom is promised to Christ in the Old Testament. The following clear passages make this evident: Daniel 2:34,35,44; Daniel 7:13,14; Isaiah 11:1 *ad fin.*; Isaiah 65:17 *ad fin.*; Isaiah 66:22 *ad fin.*; Zechariah 14:1 *ad fin.* These are only examples of classes of passages which add up to hundreds of verses.

(b) Christ claimed these promises for Himself when He came. The following passages are cited: Luke 1:31-33; Matthew 1:1-3:7; Matthew 11:2-6. These verses are enough to establish the claim here made. That some spiritualize the Old Testament promises in favor of a different kind of kingdom from that which a literal interpretation gives us, and seek to find support for such spiritualization is not important to the discussion just yet. The fact

remains that those Old Testament predictions of an everlasting kingdom for Messiah are claimed for Jesus Christ in the New Testament. To this all believing scholars agree, so far as I know. It is difficult to see how one could be a believer in Christ as Saviour and view the matter otherwise.

(c) Christ and the apostles made it clear that in certain respects that kingdom was still future at the time of our Lord's ascension and would remain so till the second coming.

There are several passages which demonstrate the futurity of Christ's kingdom during His natural life. When He taught His disciples to pray, it was, "Thy kingdom come" (Matthew 6:10), and it was associated with a time when God's will would be done on earth just as in heaven, which from our perspective puts it in the then remote future. When certain of His disciples "thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear" (Luke 19:11), our Lord gave a parable which is conclusive in this discussion, and, I think ought to silence forever those who teach that "there is no trace in the Gospels of the so-called chiliastic expectation of a provisional political kingdom," i.e., an earthly millennium of chiliastic kind (Vos, *The Kingdom of God and the Church*, p. 68), and those who say that the church in the present age is the fulfillment *in toto* of the kingdom prophecies to Israel. I cite the parable in part.

He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received his kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading. Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities (Luke 19:12-17).

Then, after description of further judgment of his professed servants, the parable concludes,

But those nine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me (Luke 19:27).

Taken by itself, this proves that our Lord expected a long period of time to transpire, during which His rejection, crucifixion, ascension, and return would transpire before his kingdom should be established. Compare it with the parable of Matthew 25:14-30 and this certainly becomes a double certainty. Nothing else can be derived from a discerning reading of these passages.

That this futurity of his kingdom remained after the death of Christ and before the ascension is indicated by Acts 1:6-8. It will do no harm here to repeat what of necessity has been said often, that when the disciples asked Jesus if He would "at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" He made no effort to tell them that such future restoration would not take place, but informed them once more only that it was not for them to know "the times or the seasons." If their expectation of a future restoration of the kingdom to Israel were a false one, then Jesus, who said of the fact that He was going to prepare a place for them, "If it were not so, I would have told you," would likely have corrected their false expectation here.

Then, over half a century after the ascension, John wrote of a day when "the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever" (Rev. 11:15). This is eschatological prediction, as many of our Amillenarian friends agree. This being the case, it is indeed difficult to avoid the conviction that the kingdom of Messiah predicted in similar terms in Daniel is here, near the close of the Apostolic Age, still in the eschatological future.

Much more could be written on this point, but these facts I deem to be sufficient to establish that "Christ and the apostles made it clear that in certain

respects the kingdom was still future at the time of our Lord's ascension and would remain so till the second coming."

I think that some of the modern Premillennialists have gone too far in the direction of making the kingdom of Messiah exclusively future in *every* respect. Some of these same men have also erred in restricting the future kingdom to the millennium *only*, or at least appearing to do so.

The fact that believers in the present age are "translated into the kingdom" (Col. 1:13), that born-again believers appear to have entered the kingdom of God (John 3:1 ff.), that the course of the present age is traced as the history of "the kingdom of heaven" (parables of Matt. 13), and that kingdom aspects seem to be attached even to the ministry of the gospel during the church age (cf. Acts 8:12; 15:13-18; 20:24-27; 28:23) forbid that we declare every aspect of the kingdom future.

God is in the present calling out a "spiritual aristocracy," so to speak, who shall have positions of leadership in that future kingdom (cf. Acts 15:14, Luke 22:28-30). These people own Christ as king and are governed even now by the principles of heaven. In that sense the kingdom now promised to Christ is already His. And though it was suffering violence during our Lord's earthly life (Matt. 11:12), and continues to suffer violence from "the violent," who would take it by force (cf. parables of leaven, tares and wheat, etc., of Matt. 13), there is a present aspect of the kingdom. There is an area among saved men on earth where Christ reigns supreme.

But in the full sense the kingdom awaits establishment for the simple reason that the king is absent and away from the scene of that kingdom.

I am acquainted with the fact that some will scoff at what they call a carnal interpretation of the kingdom--with a literal throne, living men as subjects, glorified saints as rulers. But the word carnal has both good and bad senses. Carnal as applied to existence in human bodies and government in literal human ways is not necessarily bad. The Bible never says it is. Carnal as applied to the sin nature and all it stands for is bad. It was Bengel who said,

They who believe that the Millennium is coming will be found to have the true meaning, rather than those who contend that this period present age has been the Millennium; nor do they delay the course of the sun, who speak against it....There is no error, much less danger, in saying that the thousand years are *future*, but rather in interpreting these years, whether future or past, in a carnal sense (*Gnomon of the New Testament*, p. 920).

And if to admit the literal meaning of Revelation 20:1-10, applying it to a future kingdom of Christ on earth, is carnal, then let us all be carnal, for it was Jesus who said to His own disciples: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke 22:28-30). It is small wonder that Vos (*op.cit.*, 70) declares of this that "the words are figurative." His Amillennialism is just simply inconsistent with a literal interpretation. So, wherever a literal interpretation is inconsistent with the system, a figurative one is substituted.

(d) The Bible places the future Millennium within that future kingdom, and places it at the very beginning of it.

This is an important step in our argument--one that I do not recall ever being taken by the Premillennial writers whom I have read. One can prove that there is a Millennium future and that there is a kingdom future, but he must still establish some sort of relationship between the two before kingdom prophecies and Millennial prophecies can be correlated.

Please observe that the view adopted here does not equate the Millennium and the kingdom. The Bible nowhere does that. Complete identification of the two has given Amillennialists some of their best ammunition (see Allis, *Prophecy and the Church*, 236-242). If, as we have shown, the Millennium is a period of only one thousand years, and is specifically the period of time between the two resurrections and the period of Satan's binding, of which

period it is affirmed that the saints do reign, then it is not identically the same as the kingdom of Messiah which *lasts forever*.

Now, to demonstrate that the Millennium is within the future kingdom of God on earth and that it is the initial stage of that kingdom, the following four pieces of Scripture information are submitted.

First, we are twice informed (Rev. 20:4,6) that the saints reign with Christ during the Millennium.

Second, we are also informed in unmistakable terms that when Christ and the saints once *begin* to reign over the kingdom of God on earth they *continue to do so* forever. I refer to the seventh chapter of Daniel. No respectable interpreter of any school (including the unbelieving higher criticism) denies that the one who as "one like the Son of man" takes possession of the kingdom of men, when the history of nations has run its course, is the Jewish Messiah. Of this, Daniel 7:14 says, "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Observe that Messiah's "dominion is an everlasting dominion." The Aramaic word here twice rendered dominion is *sholtan*. The evidence furnished by the usage of this word is that it has reference to dominion in the sense of sovereignty (right to rule) rather than of realm (area of rule). It is the word used several times in Daniel of God's sovereignty as well as that of kings and sub-rulers. In this case, then, it is affirmed that Messiah's sovereignty over His kingdom is eternal. Some might object that the word "eternal" can mean only as durative as the nature of the thing it describes, and hence limit the duration. But the verse also affirms that this sovereignty "shall not pass away" and of the realm in which he exercises sovereignty that "his kingdom" is "that which shall not be destroyed." It is hard to conceive of terminology which would more adequately and unequivocally express unending rulership.

Concerning the relationship of Messiah's saints to that kingdom, Daniel 7:18 tells us, "The saints of the most High shall take the kingdom [A.S.V., "receive the kingdom"], and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." Discussion of the Aramaic words used here would only confirm that the strict meaning of the English translation is also the strict meaning of the original. It describes active reception of the kingdom, and rulership in the same, forever. The same is affirmed once more in verse 27 of the same chapter in very similar terms.

Two points have now been established--that the saints will reign with Christ during the Millennium and that when once they begin to reign they do so forever. At this point the temptation is acute to treat the passages which speak of the close of the Millennial age and others which are *supposed* by some to refer to the close of the Millennial age and which are thought to be in conflict with these views of the continuity and perpetuity of the saint's reign. I beg the indulgence of the reader to let me pursue my argument, believing the clear passages cited to be sufficient to establish my main point. An unpublished paper on the subject, "The Cosmic Dissolution," which I wrote in 1942, treats the objections quite fully. A condensation of that paper appears in Appendix I at the close of this book, for the benefit of the inquiring readers. Premillennialists will find therein a view of the close of the present and of the Millennial age not usually advocated by recent Premillennial writers.

In the *third* place, it follows that since we are told that the saints do reign during the Millennium, and since they continue to reign when once they begin to reign in the kingdom age, there is only one place to put the one thousand years, and that is during the kingdom of Messiah. The facts do not admit of any other possibilities. The Millennium cannot be previous to the kingdom, for the saints will not reign (Amillennialists notwithstanding), as the Millennium passage affirms, until the kingdom is delivered unto Messiah. The Millennium cannot follow it, for the kingdom age never ends. It must be during the kingdom.

Fourth, and finally, the Millennium must be placed at the very beginning of the kingdom age, because, once it is settled that it is in the kingdom age of the future, the facts of reason and of the structure of the Book of Revelation will allow no other place for it.

Reason would lead us to assume that when once the kingdom of Christ has been firmly established and been long in process there could be no recrudescence of evil such as takes place late in the one thousand years (Rev. 20:7-10). Neither would it be reasonable to suppose that the final judgment of the wicked at the close of the Millennium should be indefinitely postponed.

But, aside from reason, the structure of the Book of Revelation, whether the parallelistic, continuous-historical, or futuristic interpretation be taken, will allow no place for the future Millennium except immediately after the Son of God returns with His saints as King of kings and Lord of lords. This coming is described in Revelation 19:11-21. Immediately there follows the story of the initiation of the Millennium. Establish the futurity of the Millennium in the kingdom age, as we have already done, and, by any reasonable interpretation, it will fit the structure of this book only at the beginning of the kingdom age.

This will be elucidated in the development of the sections which now follow.

(2) The Millennium is a period begun by the visible return of Christ in glory to judge and rule the nations.

It has been seen that the Millennium is an initial stage of the Kingdom and that the inauguration of the Millennium and of the Kingdom are synchronous.

Once this is seen, the establishment of this proposition is only a matter of citing passages. Perhaps the best of all is the second Psalm, which, in unmistakable terms, declares that when Jehovah places His "Son" (v. 12) and

sets His "king upon my holy hill of Zion" (v. 6), He will also give His son the "heathen" (nations) for an inheritance (v. 8), and to His king He declares, "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

Any reader who is in doubt about this matter should read Psalm 72, Isaiah 11, Joel 3, Zechariah 14, and Matthew 25. Nothing that could be written here would be as convincing as the content of these chapters from the Bible itself.

(3) The Millennium is a period closed by the final eradication of all evil from God's universe at the final judgment of the wicked.

Premillennialists, in common with all Christian believers, recognize that God will bring every deed of men and angels into judgment. Rewards for good deeds and punishments for evil deeds are a necessary part of a world which Christians recognize as being moral in its constitution and government. That all judgment of believers for evil, judgment in the penal sense, that is, took place at Calvary in Christ, all informed orthodox believers will agree.

It is on the time, place, and circumstances of the final judgment, when believers whose sins already have been punished in Christ are separated from those whose sins must be borne by themselves in an eternal and dreadful hell, that disagreement appears.

Charles Hodge (*Systematic Theology*, Vol. III, pp. 845-851) lists the following doctrines concerning the final judgment of all men which he says always have been shared by all parties and geographical and ecclesiastical divisions of orthodox Christianity.

1. The final judgment is a definite future event (not a protracted process), when the eternal destiny of men and of angels shall be finally determined and publicly manifested....

2. Christ is to be the judge....

3. This judgment is to take place at the second coming of Christ and at the general resurrection....

4. The persons to be judged are men and angels....

5. The ground or matter of judgment is said to be the "deeds done in the body"....So far as those who hear the gospel are concerned, their future destiny depends on the attitude which they assume to Christ....

6. Men are to be judged according to the light which they have severally enjoyed....

7. At the judgment of the last day the destiny of the righteous and of the wicked shall be unalterably determined.

Now, there is probably small doubt that Dr. Hodge has outlined correctly the general teaching of the church. That his summary is true *in general*, even Premillennialists ought to agree. However, while not fomenting any quarrel over the term, "general resurrection," I insist that Premillennialists should require a different understanding of it to allow a Millennium to stand between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust. And, if Dr. Hodge means by his seventh proposition that the eternal destiny of the saved man is not "unalterably determined" the moment he puts his faith in a finished work of Christ at Calvary, then Christians of all Millennial persuasions should disagree. I suppose that his meaning is that the eternal destiny is publicly declared at that time.

The essential difference between the three common views of the Millennium in relation to the judgment are as follows:

Postmillennialists believe that there is to be one resurrection of all men to be preceded immediately by the coming of Christ and to be followed immediately by one judgment before which all men shall appear. This resurrection and judgment shall follow an earthly Millennium during which the

earth shall be covered with the gospel message and the majority of men will be saved.

Amillennialists believe the same as to resurrection and judgment, except that they, in general, have a more pessimistic view of the course of the world down to the coming of Christ, and deny the existence of any future earthly Millennium.

Premillennialists share the views of Amillennialists concerning the general course of the present age, but disagree on the other details.

Premillennialists believe that at the second coming of Christ there will be a resurrection of the saints only, that at His coming He will destroy the wicked living, that the righteous will enter the Millennium to people the earth during the Millennium and that the glorified saints of former ages shall join with a restored Israel in ruling the world during the Millennium. At the close of the Millennium the resurrection and final judgment of the wicked will take place.

This view is not without its difficulties. Premillennialists may be asked where the righteous living shall come from to people the earth during the Millennium if all the righteous are translated at its inception. They may be asked whence arises the rebellion at the end of the Millennium if only saved people enter the Millennium. The parable of the tares and wheat, and of the drag-net in Matthew 13 are presented as objections to a removal of the righteous by resurrection before the wicked are removed in final judgment.

It is the writer's firm conviction that these questions cannot be answered except as the view of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9 herein defended is adopted. A Premillennial system of eschatology without the seventieth week of Daniel (see chapter on the seventy weeks) as the structure of premillennial end-time events is, in my opinion, unable to answer these embarrassing questions of the Amillennial school.

Now, the Premillennialist believes in this order in the end of the affairs of this world primarily because it is taught in Revelation 19 and 20.

These chapters present, first, the coming of Christ, then the judgment of wicked men with Antichrist and his false prophet. Now appears the binding of Satan, followed by the thousand years during which saints of a "first resurrection" are said to reign. At the end--and not till the end--of the thousand years, the judgment of the "Great White Throne" is said to transpire. In this judgment there is not the slightest trace of the presence of saved men, at least not in the capacity of the judged. There is not the slightest evidence that in this judgment even one person shall be declared righteous and sent into eternal life. The wicked among the inhabitants of earth at Millennium's end are led by a released Satan to rebel against God. But they are destroyed by fire from heaven, the devil is cast into the lake of fire, forever, and then these now dead wicked rebels are resurrected together with the wicked dead of all ages to stand before God, and receive condemnation to the everlasting fire of hell which has so recently swallowed their father the Devil. The righteous are not mentioned in the judgment. It must be admitted that they are not expressly excluded. But they do not need to be--the information given in chapter 19 and in 20:1-6 adequately settles the question of their destiny.

But though Revelation 19 and 20 may be the simple basis of the doctrine, it does not want support in other parts of Scripture. That this is the case is admitted even by Carl Aënotheus Semisch, whose article on "Millenarianism, Millennium" in the Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopoedia of Religious Knowledge* is one of the most antagonistic and vitriolic to be found in any Protestant literature. Nevertheless, opposed to the doctrine as he was, his admissions very nearly constitute a capitulation. His remarks follow:

There are, however, passages, which if interpreted strictly, and exclusively according to the letter, afford some ground for the millenarian doctrine; as, for example, the sitting at the table with the patriarchs in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 8:11), the drinking of the fruit of the vine (Matt. 26:29), and the eating of the passover in the kingdom of God (Luke 22:16), etc. Finally, it cannot be disputed that the Book of Revelation (20:44 sqq.) contains the fundamental characteristics of millenarianism. The

explanation of Augustine, that the thousand years (Rev. 20:4) had begun before his day is ruled out by the fact that this period is put after the destruction of Antichrist (19:19 sqq.). Nor is the first resurrection (20:4), which is set over against the state of the other dead not yet resurrected (20:12 sqq.), to be explained of the first stage of blessedness in heaven (Hengstenberg), or of regeneration (Augustine). It can refer only to a bodily resurrection (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, art. "Millenarianism, Millennium").

Semisch thus rightly rejects all Amillennial explanations of the separation between the resurrection of the just and unjust by the Millennium. What explanation does he, then, propose? None whatsoever. His quite helpless admission immediately follows:

In view of the difficulty of separating figure from real fact, we conclude that the millenarianism of the Book of Revelation is a hieroglyph, whose meaning has not yet been satisfactorily solved (*ibid.*).

Abraham Kuyper (*The Revelation of St. John*, pp. 275 ff.) is not so frank as Semisch, but quite as unsuccessful in interpreting the one thousand years. After rather vague argument from Psalm 90:4 and II Peter 3:8,10, he reaches the conclusion that "the 'thousand years' in connection with the Consummation are not a literal but a symbolical indication." An astounding and quite unbelievable declaration then follows:

In other writings a sixfold repetition of a thousand years would require a careful explanation, but such a necessity can never apply to the doings of God, and hence in the Book of Revelation, where it concerns not the doings of men, but of Almighty God, it is out of the question....When we have a writing in hand in which the rule applies that the numbers have no numerical, but a symbolical significance, one has no right to surmise the opposite use of the number, unless this modified use is very clearly indicated.

Such statements are very shocking, indeed, when viewed in their bare meaning. Does not Moses clearly suppose that the six days of God's activity in creating to have been real (cf. Ex. 20:8-11)? Were the seventy years by which God punished Judah by the Babylonian Captivity real and wholly real? Mr. Kuyper is being piddling in his arguments! He is saying that no numerical notation in the Book of Revelation is to be taken literally unless it can be proven to be so! May I insist with all the force that paper and ink can bear when inscribed with words that such reasoning is folly--sheer nonsense--unless we wish to abandon the use of the Bible as a source of information about God and His ways altogether. If the first rule of Bible interpretation, in all of Scripture, is not, "Take the words in the primary grammatical sense unless there are clear contextual reasons for doing otherwise," then we may as well abandon the use of the Bible as a divine revelation. It is not revelation but confusion. These one thousand years are real unless proved otherwise! The reverse of Kuyper's statement is the truth.

Thus, without the slightest hesitation, I return to the proposition: The Millennium is a period (of one thousand years begun by the resurrection of the righteous dead and characterized by the reign of the saints), closed by the final eradication of all evil from God's universe at the final judgment of the wicked. I base this assertion squarely upon the twentieth chapter of Revelation and challenge the opposers to show us why I should not so do.

This doctrine is required also by the twenty-fourth chapter of Isaiah, which has been aptly called "The Little Apocalypse."

That the prophecy is eschatological in its reach is clearly indicated by the last verse in the chapter (v. 23) for it speaks of the time "when the LORD of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." The same is indicated by verse 21, in which of the events described it is said, "It shall come to pass in that day." "In that day" is not uniformly used of the Day of Jehovah, but in the prophecies of the Old Testament is very nearly always so used. In this connection it is certainly so used.

Now, following a description of events (vs. 1-20) which are very nearly exactly duplicated in the judgment predictions of Revelation 6-19, these striking words appear:

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously (Isaiah 24:21-23).

Delitzsch (*Commentary on Isaiah*) says of verse 23: "What the apocalypticist of the New Testament describes in detail in Revelation 20:4, 20:11 sqq., and 21, the apocalypticist of the Old Testament sees here condensed into one fact." And such is precisely the case. We would extend the reference back to verse 1 and say that what the apocalypticist Isaiah sees in one chapter of 23 verses the apocalypticist John sees in 15 chapters (Rev. 6 to 21). It is as Jennings says (*Studies in Isaiah, in loco*), "We must place the two prophecies together in order to correctly understand either."

The crisis of Isaiah's prophecy (vs. 20-23 above) corresponds precisely with Revelation 19:11-21:1 ff. First, the Lord punishes the hosts of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. These "hosts of high ones" can be none other than the angelic spirits of wickedness which in Daniel are seen standing behind the nations of men, and who are represented in Revelation 12:9 as being cast out of the heavens by Michael and his angels into the earth (12:13). Once on the earth they "and the kings of the earth upon the earth" are shortly "gathered together into the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison." This is Old Testament language for incarceration in Sheol or Hades. C. Von Orelli writes of these words (*Prophecies of Isaiah*, 142,143), "The figure is taken from State prisoners, who at first have been imprisoned without regard to the degree of their guilt, but then on the day of judgment are

condemned or acquitted according to its extent." This punishment and incarceration is exactly parallel to the destruction of the armies of Antichrist as described in Revelation 19:11 ff., and to the binding of Satan in the bottomless pit (Rev. 20:1,2). "And after many days shall they be visited," says Isaiah. Orelli translates, "and they are shut up together as captives in a dungeon, and kept in ward, and visited after a long time." The Hebrew *umerobh yamim*, literally, and from a multitude of days, does mean a long time. The visitation described is a divine visitation according to the uniform Hebrew usage, and can be for either deliverance or judgment. In this case it appears that both usages are united in one reference--visitation in the sense of deliverance, because we learn not only from Revelation 20:12-14 but also from I Corinthians 15:22-24 and John 5:28,29 that the wicked dead are to be raised from the dead. But it is a "resurrection of damnation," as John 5:29 specifies, so the sense of visitation for judgment is also involved.

I do not regard this prophecy in Isaiah as mere confirmation of a Premillenarian interpretation of Revelation 20. By itself it requires an explanation of the eschatological future that is similar to, if not identical with, the Premillennial doctrine in the specific length in years, of that period which is at once the final age of time and the first age of the eternal kingdom of heaven and earth. The only specification is that the time be of some great length, as is required by *robh yamim*, many days. We must refer to Revelation 20 to learn how many days.

(4) The Millennium is a period during which the saints of the first resurrection will be associated with Christ in His reign.

This doctrine has been mentioned in several steps of our previous discussions of Millennial doctrines. Now some of the more particular facts must be presented.

There are two principal passages on which this doctrine is based. The earlier is Daniel 7, which reveals that

the saints of the most High shall...possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever....And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all the dominions shall serve and obey him (Daniel 7:18,27).

For reasons which I shall develop fully in the chapter on the Prophecy of the Four Beasts and the Ancient of Days, I am quite convinced that Gabriel had just one group of saints in view here--saved people from the covenant nation Israel. I am in agreement with Auberlen, who writes:

By the "people of the saints of the Most High," to whom dominion is then to be given (Dan. 7:18-27), Daniel evidently could only understand the people of Israel, as distinguished from the heathen nations and kingdoms which were to rule up till then (2:44); nor have we, according to strict exegesis, a right to apply the expression to other nations; hence we cannot apply it immediately to the church" (*Daniel and Revelation*, 216).

Auberlen then reports that Roos, Preiswerk, Hofmann, Hitzig, and Bertholdt, representing both Millenarian and anti-Millenarian schools of thought in Germany one hundred years ago, are in agreement.

Of the saints' participation in the reign of Christ in His future kingdom there are many direct references in the New Testament. That these who participate are the church of the Pauline epistles there cannot be the slightest doubt. References to such begin at Matthew 5:5 and continue throughout the New Testament. Among some of the clearest references are II Timothy 2:12; Luke 12:32; I Corinthians 6:9,10; I Corinthians 15:50; Galatians 5:21; Ephesians 5:55; James 2:5.

However, the principal passage, that passage in the New Testament which compares in strength and significance to Daniel 7 in the Old, is Revelation 20:4-9.

This must now have our consideration:

And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

With these passages before us, what information do we seem to have about the reign of the saints with Christ? The paucity of information on certain aspects of the question forbids that we make any statements that are very minute in scope. But the following seem to be quite distinctly revealed.

First, the saints of both Old and New Covenants shall share in the reign of Christ. I do not intend that this doctrine be construed to mean that all distinctions between the people of God gathered to the Lord in Old Testament times and the Church of Christ gathered to Him in New Testament times are necessarily to be cast away. My views do not coincide wholly with those of some of the brethren of Covenant Theology at this point. On the other hand, the extremes of some of the brethren with a dispensational emphasis, I think, are frequently more in error. However, I do not regard this question as particularly germane to the issue at this point of the discussion. I am merely affirming what Daniel 7 makes clear about Israel and what the many New Testament passages cited above make clear about the church--that both shall share in this reign. I do not know just what the relation of the two bodies will be during the kingdom.

But, in the *second* place, it seems clear that both groups shall be associated in the administration of the reign. The passage in Revelation 20 makes no distinctions, yet does indicate that all shall share in the same resurrection and reigning with Christ. In much the same way that "they also which pierced him" are selected for special mention among the people of the whole world that shall see Christ when He comes (Rev. 1:7), the martyrs are selected by way of eminence among the saints of the resurrection. Resurrection has a special meaning for them (see Rev. 20:4; cf. 6:9-11), just as the appearance of Messiah at His second advent will have a special meaning for the nation that "received him not" at His first advent. However, the fact that the martyr saints of the first resurrection are set in opposition to "the rest of the dead" which "lived not again until the thousand years were finished," all of whom are unsaved and destined for damnation, makes it evident that all the righteous dead from Abel onward are included in this resurrection, and hence also in the life and reign of the Millennium and presumably of the ages to follow (see Appendix II for further discussion).

Two passages in Matthew require this feature--8:11, which speaks of how "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," and 19:28, which informs us that the apostles of the New Testament Church shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the *twelve tribes of Israel* "in the regeneration." It seems that it is in their capacity as apostles and not just as Jews that this shall take place. So he would be a hardy man, indeed, who would dogmatically state just what distinctions are to prevail between the groups of the redeemed in that day. The author has some opinions, but must confess that they are founded mostly on conjecture.

Now, before we leave this discussion of the characteristics of this last transitional age between time and eternity, the writer would like to venture an answer to the anti-Millennial teaching which has beset these doctrines in modern times. Kuyper, Murray, Hamilton, Allis, Vos (all of the Amillennial persuasion) use different types of rationale and Biblical arguments, but the

one most commonly appearing is that the insertion of one thousand years between the beginning of the consummation and the completion of it is out of harmony with the clear passages in earlier portions of the Bible, which are said to teach that the consummation shall transpire in one uninterrupted series of events at the second advent. Kuyper (*The Revelation of St. John*, pp. 271,272) says:

Christ's teachings with respect to this, both in St. Matthew 24 and other parts of the Gospels, contain nothing that even remotely suggests any such interval, and directly contradict it. One does not tally with the other. In the Gospels and apocalyptic writings the parousia is not presented as the succession of a series of events of long duration, but as a drastic action which is immediately connected with the resurrection of all the dead, with the last judgment, with the destruction of this world and the rise of a new world on a new earth under a new heaven. It is inconceivable therefore that between the parousia of Christ and the Consummation there would again ensue so tremendous an interval of a thousand years.

Hamilton (*op.cit.* 126) remarks that "other resurrection passages must be torn apart so that this idea, that is, of a millennium, can be inserted somewhere." Others contend that Revelation 20 is obscure and ought to be interpreted in the light of others that are said to be clear.

Now, there is a certain amount of truth to these contentions. The entire picture of the events which shall close human history, as such, is very frequently presented in such a way that one might receive the impression that all would happen at once. This is particularly true of most of the Old Testament prophecies.

But as men so well versed as most of these writers well know, this is due, not to the fact that God made it a matter of revelation that the events were to be of short duration, but to the fact that the element of time simply is not usually present in the prophecy, and *time* was not the subject of revelation.

There have been various ways of describing this characteristic. As to cause, on the human level, the explanation lies in the fact that the prophets were primarily seers, that is, men who *saw* revelations. What they saw they described. But, time is one element that cannot be put in a picture, either of past or future events. The element of space, or depth, is difficult to transcribe on a picture. So, while the prophets were given to know the nature of coming events, they were not usually given the time of them. This feature of Bible prophecy has been frequently called the lack of perspective. Many of my Premillennial brethren who know this fact have not taken proper cognizance of it and hence sometimes make some incautious (at best) statements about prophecy. Dr. Gaebelien, following Seiss (*The Last Times*, I have lost the page reference), declares that "prophecy is history prewritten" (*The Prophet Daniel*, 1). Pettingill entitles his commentary on Daniel, "*History Foretold*." Now, if history concerns anything it is the precise relations of events *in time* and, that certainly in *past* time. So prophecy, even though it does predict historical events, certainly is not a preview of history taken in the strict sense. Even where time is made a subject of revelation, as for instance in the prophecy of the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 and of the thousand years in Revelation 20, great gaps in chronology are omitted, which disqualify these prophecies for the technically historical character sometimes assigned to them.

Another, and more important, reason why events that turn out to be disparate and successive are presented in prophecy as single and nondisparate, is that it has pleased an all-wise revealing God to make revelation of details of the future progressive.³ The prophecies of the Old Testament did not make clear that there would be two advents of Messiah. They predicted both the suffering and the glory, and even the order of them, but not the interval which separated and continues to separate them. There were wise reasons for this in the hidden counsels of God. We see some of them now in a way that even our Lord's apostles did not see them till after Jesus ascended into heaven.

Somewhere there is a divine decree to the effect that contrary to justice, Messiah be crucified for sins He did not commit, in order that we should not

die for the sins we do commit. If Old Testament prophecy had been full and complete and in exact perspective, with reference to this fact, it is doubtful that the decree of God would ever have been carried out. But God's decrees are all carried out--only because the same God who ordains the end ordains also the means.⁴ Now, with reference to the atoning death of Christ, the feature of Old Testament prophecy referred to above was one of the means to that end.

Yet prophecy moves onward from Genesis to Revelation. The perspective is improved and the details, even with reference to time, progress toward a complete picture in three dimensions of space and in the fourth dimension, time. All reputable Biblical scholars recognize this fact. As the death of Christ drew near, He explained that He would die, how He would die, how long He would stay dead, and how and when He would rise.

Now, with reference to order of events, and as to the separation of details concerning the close of the ages of time, God's Word in no place lifts the veil completely. There are some questions which will never be settled until history has run its course and time proceeds no longer. But, on the other hand, there are some others on which a little light is given in the early Old Testament prophecies, and still more in the apocalypses of Jesus recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Then in the Epistles some of these subjects are lifted up for more complete explanation. And, finally, in Revelation a few features are given such complete treatment that not only the nature of certain events, but also their precise order and space in time are clearly delineated.

In the opinion of this writer, the order of the resurrections of good and evil is one of these. The relation of the same to the future of Israel, the final Antichrist, and the inauguration of the everlasting kingdom of God on earth are others.

All objections to the literal interpretation of Revelation 20 on the basis of supposed lack of harmony with the nature of Bible prophecy root in a misunderstanding of these basic facts.

Everything about prophecy would teach us to expect that if anywhere some of the enigmas of eschatology would be unraveled, it would be exactly where they are--in the last portion of the final book of Scripture--just a few words from the end of the book, and just before the holy pen of divine inspiration of Scripture would be laid down forever.

Now I proceed to my final proposition in explanation of the Premillennial View.

CHAPTER III

The Millennium--Related Events

In connection with the inauguration of the Millennium, it is revealed that (1) a final personal Antichrist shall appear near the close of the present age who will become master of the world and will be destroyed by Christ at His coming, (2) a period of great tribulation for Israel is to transpire under Antichrist's oppression, from which deliverance will be provided by Christ at His coming, and (3) the closing days of the present age shall witness the restoration of Israel to the land and the conversion of the nation, to be followed in the Millennium by the fulfillment of the Old Testament covenant promises distinctive to that nation.

Before I write further, may I beg the indulgence of any of my brethren who may read this with some disappointment over what may be omitted from the list of things commonly believed among us. What of the Rapture of the church, the great Apostasy, the Seventieth Week of Daniel, etc.? Why in discussing events which are said to be connected with the inauguration of the Millennial reign of Christ are these not mentioned? Once more, attention is called to the purpose of this section of the book--to set forth the basic tenets of all orthodox Premillennialism with their general Biblical basis. To elucidate my own views on some of these things and then describe my views as essentials held by *all orthodox modern Premillennialists* would immediately bring upon me the

unwanted charge of bigotry. W. G. Moorehead, C. A. Auberlen, S. P. Tregelles, Nathaniel West, A. J. Gordon, A. C. Gaebelein, H. A. Ironside, Robert Anderson, David C. Cooper, Edward Bickersteth, Joseph A. Seiss, and other of modern Premillennial writers, held in repute, disagreed on some details of these questions. To insist that some of these were true to essential Premillennialism while others were not is not mine to say. I think they all were sound in the faith and true to the basic teaching of the Scripture on eschatology. So at this point I am not treating some of these doctrines, deeming them not distinctive features of Premillennial eschatology.

Later in these pages I intend to show how the Premillennial system alone satisfactorily explains the Book of Daniel. In process of doing so I intend to take my stand on some of these questions--not as an arbiter of orthodoxy, but as an interpreter of Scripture. I shall explain what I think some plain, and some rather obscure, passages of Scripture have to say on these subjects. But, at the same time, I will not deny the possibility that some others who take contrary views, and yet maintain the essential framework, are quite as true to Premillennialism as I. Of course, I will not think they are as accurate in their interpretations as I; otherwise I would join them.

Now, to address attention to our threefold final proposition, consider first, that

(1) A final personal Antichrist shall appear near the close of the present age who will become master of the world and will be destroyed by Christ at His coming.

This particular proposition will not require extensive treatment--not because there is any paucity of Biblical material on the subject; indeed, the very contrary is true, but because it is not a matter of *necessary* disagreement among the various schools of Biblical Eschatology. That is, while it is an essential feature of Premillennialism and, I think, receives its best exposition in Premillennialism, it is not peculiar to Premillennialism. On the other hand, the view stated here is not common to all exponents of Christian

theology. In all branches except the Premillennial there are those who disagree.

In general, there have been four diverse views of the doctrine of Antichrist. There has been what we may call the "*Principle of Evil*" view. Advocates of this view propose that Antichrist is only an ideal personification of the evil powers of the world, always till the end in opposition to the Kingdom of God among men. At different times in the past this has been associated with or identified with many current movements.

"*Institution of Evil*" is an appropriate name for the view that some institution, as the Roman Empire, is the "Man of Sin" or Antichrist. This is common among "Praeterist" commentators on the Revelation. Another is the "*Person of Evil*" (not personification) view. Advocates of this view hold that Antichrist is a person. However, throughout the present age Bible interpreters have identified many different persons with Antichrist.

Still another view combines portions of these two views into what I call an "*Organic View*." This is that since the fall of man both good and evil have had their representatives and have been manifested in two lines of development, always in opposition. It is further believed that each reaches an ultimate manifestation in a member of the human race, the one in Christ, the other in Antichrist. These shall meet in final conflict at the close of this present age, our Lord slaying Antichrist at His *parousia*.

Not uncommon among unbelieving critics is the view that at the time of the writing of the New Testament there was a belief current among the Jews and Christians that a final personal Antichrist would appear. But, contend advocates of this "Popular Fallacy" view, the current view was false, and John in his first epistle made reference to it only to try to correct it.

The Premillennial view is the Organic View. Amillennialists, agreeing as they do with Premillennial teachings concerning the course of the present age, also frequently agree in general with this view of Antichrist.¹

Postmillennialists naturally find such a doctrine embarrassing, but not infrequently admit belief in such a doctrine. Deane, in Ellicott's *Old Testament Commentary*, gives a Postmillennial interpretation of the prophecy of the image and the stone in Daniel 2, yet, in commenting on the conduct of the little horn of Daniel 7:25, says, "It appears that the little horn, the Antichrist of the last days, or the beast, will be successful for a time in his blasphemies and persecutions, but in the end he will be destroyed." Charles Hodge, whose lucid expositions of Christian doctrine are justly famous, labors hard to make Antichrist other than a final person who is victorious over the people of God in the period just before the coming of the Son of man. That he is not completely satisfied with his own efforts is manifest, and he rather despairingly says in comment on one of the passages, "We do not pretend to be experts in matters of prophecy" (*Systematic Theology* III, 825).

Dr. A. H. Strong was a strong advocate of the Postmillennial view in his day, and his *Systematic Theology* is still a standard. He summarizes his view of the Millennium as follows:

Through the preaching of the gospel in all the world, the kingdom of Christ is steadily to enlarge its boundaries, until Jews and Gentiles alike become possessed of its blessings and a millennial period is introduced in which Christianity generally prevails throughout the earth. (*Systematic Theology*, p. 1008.)

Yet, in spite of this postmillennial doctrine of a Christianity steadily expanding to final triumph, he adds:

There will be a corresponding development of evil, either extensive or intensive, whose true character shall be manifest not only in deceiving many professed followers of Christ and in persecuting true believers, but in constituting a *personal Antichrist* [italics mine] as its representative and object of worship (*ibid.*, p. 1008).

This writer is ready to admit that this is an entirely too brief and limited survey of the views of Antichrist to give a complete picture. There is far more diversity of opinion even among Premillennialists (some of whom have believed that the papacy is the Antichrist) than it is possible to treat fully

here. Yet I think it has been made sufficiently clear that our doctrine of Antichrist is well enough grounded in the Bible itself so that many serious students of all orthodox eschatological schools have taught in effect that "a final personal Antichrist shall appear near the close of the present age who will become master of the world and will be destroyed by Christ at His coming."

The cornerstone of the doctrine we teach is II Thessalonians 2:1-12.

Many other passages speak of Antichrist, but the ones which precede this important passage in holy Writ awaited the information therein for their full explanation. Just as Revelation 20 is the cornerstone of the doctrines of resurrection and of judgment, so is II Thessalonians 2 the cornerstone of the doctrines of Antichrist. The passage reads as follows:

Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him; 2 to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand; 3 let no man beguile you in any wise: for *it will not be*, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, 4 he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. 5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? 6 And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. 7 For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work: only *there is* one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. 8 And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming; 9 *even he*, whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, 10 and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. 11 And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie: 12 that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in

unrighteousness (II Thessalonians 2:1-12 A.S.V.).

An examination of these verses, as they appear before us in the American Standard Version (much to be preferred to the A.V.), yields the following information about Antichrist:

- (a) A notable evil person called "the man of sin," and "the son of perdition" (v.3) and "the lawless one" (v.8) shall some day "be revealed" (v.3).**

- (b) The revelation of this Man of Sin is to take place before "the day of the Lord." This is presumably quite shortly before the day of the Lord.**

- (c) Associated with his revelation as the Man of Sin will be "the falling away." This falling away can be interpreted only as an apostasy from true religion as the unmistakable testimony of the lexicons and the testimony of the New Testament and Septuagint uses of the Greek word *αποστασια* require.**

- (d) The Man of Sin will oppose God, exalt himself, demand divine honors (v.4), and in a general way consummate in himself a full embodiment of opposition to God and His Christ.**

- (e) The coming of the Man of Sin will be the fruition of the working of evil forces, called "the mystery of lawlessness," now in operation (v.7).**

- (f) The coming of the Man of Sin is being stayed by a certain *thing* "which restraineth" (v.6) that his coming may be "in His own season." Just what this thing which restrains is, the passage does not explain, but it is clear from the language ("and now ye know that which restraineth," etc.) that the Apostle Paul expected his readers to understand. Verse five relates that Paul had informed the Thessalonians orally while he was with them. Oh, that we might have a record of those discourses! How many problems of eschatology it might settle!**

Before discussing this further, note:

(g) The coming of the Man of Sin will not take place till the removal "out of the way" of a certain person "that restraineth now" (v.7). (The gender of the Greek participles, *κατεχον*, neuter singular, and *κατεχων*, masculine singular, fully justifies the distinguishing of two restrainers, one impersonal and one personal.)

Now, who are these? Let it be freely admitted by all that to the present time no one has brought forward a fully satisfactory explanation, though many from Tertullian on to the present moment have expressed opinions. The writer has noted at least six different views.

B. B. Warfield writes that he is convinced that the "thing which restrains" was the Jewish state and that the "one who restrains" was James the Just of Jerusalem. The state came to an end and James died in the latter part of the first century, and after that the Man of Sin in the person of the Roman emperors had undisputed power to persecute the church. The Jewish state, while it lasted, did shelter the church. (See Warfield, *Biblical and Theological Studies*, chapter xvii.)

Tertullian, and a host since his time, have felt that the prophecy was fulfilled in the Roman state and the emperors, who as the representatives of human government put a restraint on evil.

Alford, Ellicott, and Riggenbach (in *Lange's Commentary*) are representative of the many who have thought that the restraining thing is human government, in general. The rulers, by this view, are usually determined to be the "person who restrains," or, as in the view of Ellicott, the person is only a verbal personification of government. There is much that commends itself to this writer in this view--it accords well with the disintegration of sovereignty in the rulers pictured in the clay of the prophecy of Daniel (chapter two).

Riggenbach (in *Lange's Commentary, en loco*) lists a number of German and Swiss commentators who held the restraining powers to be religious, rather than political. The Apostle Paul himself, the Apostles generally, the proclamation of the gospel, and the church itself, have all been proposed.

Similar to these views is the conception that the "thing which restrains" is the church of Christ, which by advocates of this view is expected to be taken to heaven by the rapture, before the appearance of Antichrist. Those passages which speak of the Lord's people as the "light of the world" and "the salt of the earth" and various philosophical arguments are marshalled in support. The Holy Spirit, in the church, is then the "one who restrains." Some feel that both the neuter and masculine have reference to the Holy Spirit. In either case the removal of restraint is presumed to come at the time of the rapture of the church. This view is advocated in the Scofield Bible (Introduction to II Thessalonians and note *en loco*). An able presentation of the view is that of Henry C. Thiessen (*Will the Church Pass Through the Tribulation?*). However, even Dr. Thiessen admits that his argument is inferential and cumulative, not based emphatically on a single declaration of Scripture.

Still another view is simply that the restraining thing and the restraining one are the same, and that it is to be identified as the decree or providence of God. By this view, that which chiefly restrains lawlessness and the coming of the Man of Sin is the decree of God which has set the time and circumstances. If this is the correct view, it accords well with the language of Revelation 6:1-7, wherein the going forth of the four horsemen in each case comes only after a divine order to "Go" (A.S.V.).

And now my inquiring reader wants to know what my own opinion is. My "cradle faith" about the question was the doctrine of Scofield and of the host of American Premillennialists of the past generation. I am not now ready to oppose it. I am, however, ready to confess that I feel that the precise relation of the rapture of the church to the coming Great Tribulation has been purposely veiled by the Lord for moral reasons. I have heard and read the

arguments of the Pre-, Mid-, and Post-Tribulationists, and have been much impressed by many of them, to say nothing of the evidence of Scripture which I have been bound to survey in the preparation of this book. I have the personally expressed opinion of the heads of at least three Pre-millennial schools of higher learning that any just presentation of this subject by a Premillennialist must recognize these three respectable opinions. This irenic spirit I think will come to prevail. E. S. English's recent series in *Our Hope Magazine* entitled "Rethinking the Rapture" was, I think, a harbinger of more gracious understanding of our differences in matters of this sort. I have mentioned these last two facts (f and g), not because they are essential to maintenance of the Premillennial view of Antichrist, but because they appear in this foundational text and cannot be ignored in such a treatment. Our position neither stands nor falls upon the particular interpretation given them. They have been and will probably continue to be moot among Premillennialists.

(h) The success of the Man of Sin shall be accomplished by means of Satanic power and divine providence (9-12). It has always been Satan's intention to organize all humanity against God. It shall be the purpose of God in the time of the Man of Sin to permit him to do so.

(i) The Man of Sin shall not prevail forever, but he shall be slain by Christ "with the breath of his mouth" by Christ's own "manifestation" at his "coming" (*parousia*, v.8).

One could easily wish that Paul had added the information to which he refers when he says, "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" (v.5). Then we might know for certain what the thing which now restraineth, and the person whose removal shall permit the Man of Sin to rise, will be. We know enough, however, to gain a grasp of the general doctrine of the Man of Sin.

It is not necessary at this point to develop the doctrine further. It is enough to affirm that the same doctrine is found with reference to one called

"The Antichrist" (I John 2:16), "The Beast" (Revelation 13:1 ff.) in the New Testament, and "the little horn" (Daniel 7:8), the "prince that shall come" (Daniel 9:26), and "the king" who does according to his will (Daniel 11:36), of the Old Testament. Christ referred to him as one who would come in his "own name" (John 5:43).

The second part of the proposition is that

(2) A period of great tribulation for Israel is to transpire under Antichrist's oppression, from which deliverance will be provided by Christ at His coming.

This doctrine is to be distinguished from the teachings found in Scripture to the effect that the present age is to progress in evil and lawlessness to the end, true as that may be. It is also to be distinguished from the many judgments which have fallen, and continue to fall, on apostate Israel. It is something unique in the history of Israel.

Unlike the doctrine of Antichrist, which is quite fully outlined in one passage of Scripture (II Thess. 2:1-12), this general doctrine is presented in many seemingly detached fragments. Yet there can be small doubt, indeed, that they do relate to one event (or series of events) commonly known as the Great Tribulation.

I shall present the doctrine in relation to (a) testimony to the fact, (b) the special character of it, (c) the agency by which it is brought about, (d) the length of its duration, and (e) the method of its termination.

(a) Testimony to the fact of a great tribulation for Israel in eschatological times:

There are two primary texts which predict the coming of a period of great tribulation for Israel shortly before that period of the consummation known as the day of Jehovah.

The earlier is Jeremiah 30:4-11, the most significant portion of which is verses 4-7, which follows in the American Standard Version:

And these are the words that Jehovah spake concerning Israel and concerning Judah. For thus saith Jehovah: We have heard a voice of trembling, of fear, and not of peace. Ask ye now, and see whether a man doth travail with child: wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces are turned into paleness. Alas! for the day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it.

This is sufficient in itself to prove that in Jeremiah's time a period of great tribulation, unique in all their history, was yet ahead for the nation of Israel--both houses included.

That this was to take place in what we now know would be very remote times is also clear. I mean to say that this tribulation can be only that associated with their return to the land in times immediately antecedent to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ.

First, observe the similarity of language to passages which describe the advent of the Day of Jehovah (cf. vs. 6b and 7 with Joel 1:15; 2:11).

Second, note that the remainder of the chapter describes a restoration of Israel to follow this tribulation, a restoration which is complete and final.

This aspect of the problem will receive more complete treatment in the section to follow.

Now, these prophecies of Jeremiah were well known to Daniel (*vide*. Daniel 9:2). So the revelation given to him on the subject of Jacob's coming trouble was not the introduction of a new subject. Observe the clear lines of the second of these references and the advance in detail. This also is cited from the American Standard Version, as follows:

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who

standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever (Daniel 12:1-3).

Observe that here, as in the Jeremiah passage, the absolute uniqueness of the coming time of Jacob's trouble (Hebrew *tsarah* is used in both passages). In the one case it is said to be "so that none is like it," and in the other, "such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." In the first case, it is Jacob's trouble, and in the other, the time of trouble for "thy people," that is, Daniel's people, Israel. It can hardly be doubted that both prophets wrote of the same thing.

That it is something final, to take place in eschatological times, I regard as completely demonstrated by the context following. Observe the connection between the last part of verse one and verse two. Having just mentioned the coming time of trouble, Daniel continues: "And *at that time* [italics mine] thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Here are all the main events of eschatology--a resurrection of the righteous and of the unrighteous, a judgment when the books are open (*vide*. Rev. 20:12,15) is set, and rewards both for good and for evil are given out (cf. further Daniel 12:3). Now, all this is joined *in time* (it is one of the clearest revelations about time in Old Testament prophecy) with the time of Jacob's trouble. "And at that time" (*uvaeth hahi*) clearly fixes this tribulation period in that portion of Israel's history which is yet future--and, incidentally, is sufficient proof in itself that God is not yet through with His people Israel, as a people.

(b) The special character of Israel's Great Tribulation.

Israel's suffering will not be without purpose--it will be the infliction of divine wrath upon the apostate nation, a final "indignation" which will be the means of eliminating the unrepentant and of bringing about the very repentance of the repentant.

Both Isaiah 26:20 and Daniel 11:36 speak of a coming time of divine "indignation" *zaam* which is presumed to be something which all men will suffer. Yet Isaiah 26:20 (cf. also Jer. 10:10) also speaks of how God's people (Israel) will be spared and of how the inhabitants of the earth will suffer the wrath of God.

Other passages in the Old and New Testaments predict hard times for men in general immediately before and during a part of the Day of the Lord. How can these facts--that Israel shall both suffer and be spared--be reconciled?

I think the answer is to recognize that the Bible presumes a restoration of Israel to their ancient land while still in unbelief, that in their land they will suffer the same distresses which all men in that dreadful day of God's indignation will suffer, that for Israel it will be a peculiar refining process by which the incorrigibles will be removed and those willing to be saved will be gathered in to God. Some such transaction will be necessary to bring about the conditions necessary for a restored Israel to enter the kingdom of Christ in the Millennial age.

Now, just such an interpretation of the indignation on the nations of mankind, an indignation which becomes a tribulation for Israel, is set forth in Ezekiel 20:33-44. There are some admittedly obscure statements in this passage. I have never felt I understood just what is to be the order of time in the events described as related to other events of the end-time. There is some palpable conflict with our faith that Israel shall be restored to the land while still in unbelief and the statement in verse 38, the "rebels...I will bring them forth out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter

unto the land of Israel." I am confident that the fulfillment will make clear the seeming difficulty. Neither do I understand the reference to "the wilderness of the peoples," where a part of the judgment is said to transpire. Yet I do know that several other prophecies predict that God will have transactions with Israel in a wilderness in the end-time. So I am prepared to expect an unraveling in spite of the difficulties. The difficult portions of the prophecy do not do away with the fact that some of it is very plain. Moses predicted that prophecy would be like this (*vide*. Numbers 12:6-8). That God will bring Israel into tribulation issuing in a separating judgment is clear. The most significant part of the passage follows:

As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, surely with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with wrath poured out, will I be king over you. And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with wrath poured out; and I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I enter into judgment with you face to face. Like as I entered into judgment with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I enter into judgment with you, saith the Lord Jehovah, And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant; and will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me; I will bring them forth out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am Jehovah (Ezekiel 20:33-38 A.S.V).

A divine judgment coupled with a spiritual transaction which will remove the rebels and bring the rest into spiritual harmony with God by means of a covenant is predicted. It will be something just as striking and significant as that at Sinai in the "wilderness of the land of Egypt." Nothing of the sort has been in Israel's history since Ezekiel's prophecy; it awaits a future day.

(c) The agency by which the tribulation of Israel shall be brought about. The passage in Ezekiel 20 to which reference has just been made lays

emphasis on one aspect of Israel's tribulation which can be brought about only by God in Christ as the judge of all men (cf. John 5:22). But the Scripture leads us to believe that most of the peculiar suffering of Israel during this time of the indignation of God will be brought about by a great evil king of a Gentile nation, as in the days of old.

Zechariah 12:2 ff. implies a general Gentile war against Israel in the end-time. Zechariah 14:1 ff. describes the spectacular conclusion to it. Daniel 11:36-45 reveals how the leader in this opposition at the last will be the great final Antichrist who will vex the inhabitants of "the glorious land" of Israel. But the passage that definitely connects Israel's last agony with the Antichrist is the prophecy concerning the little horn of Daniel 7:8,11 and 19-22. I shall treat this passage somewhat at length in proper season. Here I wish only to call attention to the fact made clear therein, that the same final and last of all Gentile kings, who shall be destroyed utterly by Christ at his second coming, will also oppress the saints of God. Viewed in the contextual connection, those saints can be none other than God's ancient people Israel.

(d) The length of the Tribulation's duration:

Several passages lead us to believe that the tribulation is of divinely limited duration.

The first passage, in order of presentation, if not of importance, is Matthew 24:22, which reads:

"And except those days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened" (A.S.V.).

There are two reasons why this certainly refers to the tribulation of Israel at the end-time. The first is that verse 21 clearly identifies it with that end-time tribulation described in Daniel 12:1, to which reference has already been made (see (a) above). Jesus says, verse 21, "For then shall be

great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be." This identification is clear and unmistakable. The other reason is that this tribulation is set at the time of "the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet" (Matt. 24:15, cf. Daniel 9:27, 12:11). This same abomination is selected for further treatment by Paul (II Thess. 2:1 ff.) and there plainly related to the times of the Antichrist of the end.

So we are fully justified in relating these words of Matthew 24:22 to the time of Israel's great tribulation. The statement that "those days shall be shortened" is admittedly difficult. That the length of each individual day should be less than our usual twenty-four-hour day seems manifestly *a priori* out of the question. The only possible meaning, it seems to me, is that God already has set definite limits on the *number* of days it shall last.

The precise number of those days is given to us (as was recognized as early, at least, as Augustine) as 1260 days, also given as forty-two months, and as three and one-half times (years). The passages are Daniel 7:25, Revelation 11:2 and 12:6,14. The first (Dan. 7:25) reveals that Antichrist (the little horn) "shall wear out the saints of the Most High...and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time." That this must be three and one-half times is evident. Keil writes (Commentary, *in loco*), "The plural word *iddanim* (*times*) standing between time and half a time can only designate the simple plural, i.e., two times used in the dual sense, since in the Chaldee the plural is often used to denote a pair where the dual is used in Hebrew." In Revelation 12:14 the exact Greek equivalent of "time, times and half a time" is used with reference to the persecution of Israel in the endtime. Revelation 12:6 specifies 1260 days and Revelation 11:2, forty-two months. There are those who will controvert the Revelation passages, insisting that they have no reference to Israel's end-time tribulation. I think my view can be sustained, but even granting that it could not be, the evidence from Daniel 7:25 remains, and is conclusive.

(e) The terminal events of the Great Tribulation:

It might satisfy the requirements of this treatise to ignore the question of how the period of Israel's great tribulation begins. There is some disagreement among Premillennialists on the beginning events of the tribulation of Israel. This is by reason of the fact that all do not accept the same view of the Book of Revelation. However, the way in which the period closes is in no question whatsoever. So necessity is upon me to treat its conclusion, and it seems best at least to suggest what seems to be the best information about its beginning.

Two events, it appears, will signalize the beginning of the Tribulation. One is a divine permission delivering Israel into the hands of Antichrist (Dan. 7:25). The other is the beginning of a final persecution of Israel, to be led by Antichrist. This will take the form of a requirement of worship of Antichrist as God, with severe sanctions against disobedience (Dan. 7:25, II Thess. 2:4). I have no doubt, personally, that this will take place in Israel's land in a restored Jewish temple of God which will at that period of time be owned by God as His own (Rev. 11:1 ff.). I recognize that some of my Premillennial brethren do not agree on this point, and I do not press it now.

A third event, which seems evident to me will happen at this time, will be a standing up of Michael, the Archangel, to fight on behalf of God and His people Israel against Antichrist. It seems to me that this takes place in a spiritual realm, and may well be quite invisible to living men on earth. At any rate, both Daniel 12:1 and Revelation 12:7 speak of such an occurrence in this connection.

Those who find an outline of end-time events in the prophecy of the seventieth week, Daniel 9:27, find these events introduced by the breaking of Antichrist's covenant in the midst of the week.

(3) The closing days of the present age shall witness the restoration of Israel to the land and the conversion of the nation, to be followed in the Millennium by the fulfillment of the Old Testament covenant promises

distinctive to that nation.

It is probably at this point that Premillennialism enters into sharpest disagreement with current forms of Amillennialism. Most of the recent writers of that school (Leupold, Young, Allis, Hamilton, Murray, Pieters) contend that all promises to Israel in the Old Testament which remained unfulfilled after the rejection of Messiah were transferred to the church. In his recent, *The Seed of Abraham*, Pieters contends that the Jew as a racial entity is wholly a fiction at the present time--that the Jew is nothing more today, so far as the promises of God are concerned, than the advocate of the false religion of Judaism.

With this view Premillennial theology clashes--head on. The Scriptural evidence for our view is in itself sufficient evidence also for refutation of this prime negation of Amillennialism.

Postmillennialists have not usually objected to faith in a restoration of Israel. However, they have not usually presented it as so extensive and important as Premillennialists conceive it to be. David Brown, probably the most able defender and exponent of postmillennialism, felt that the nation of Israel would preserve its national identity and that some day all Israelites would be saved (*Christ's Second Coming, Will It Be Pre-Millennial?* pp. 433-437).

The Biblical material on this subject is immense. Many pages could be filled with quotations of Scripture passages which promise or imply the future restoration of Israel. I cannot present all of them. My method will be to classify the evidence under twelve arguments and to present representative strong texts in connection with each. It will not be possible to avoid a certain amount of overlapping between the arguments. Therefore, the reader will be asked to regard the various propositions as steps in one cumulative Biblical argument rather than as distinct and separate. These several steps in development of the Biblical material follow.

(a) There are numerous Old Testament predictions which treat of a repentance and restoration of Israel in eschatological times which is distinct and separate from that which followed the Babylonian captivity. Perhaps the most precise text on this subject is Hosea 3:4,5, which reads:

For the children of Israel shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifices and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim; afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king, and shall come with fear unto Jehovah and to his goodness in the latter days (A.S.V.).

These words suppose that for a long period of time the children of Israel will be without the symbols used in the true worship. This fits neither the period of the Babylonian captivity nor the period after the restoration, but rather this present age.

A genuine, sincere, and effective return of all the people to the worship of Jehovah, and a cherishing of the Davidic house (if not David himself) is also involved in the prophecy. This provision of the prophecy is quite as foreign to the period of captivity and restoration as the ones mentioned above. Finally, this return is said to take place "in the latter days." A later discussion of this technical phrase, in the treatment of the prophecy of Daniel 2, in the second part of this dissertation, establishes that the consummation of the affairs of men in eschatological times is always included in the measure of time specified by this phrase. This being the case, it is to be supposed that the same is true here, and that some future final restoration is in view. Of no less importance is Ezekiel 37. In this chapter (vs. 11-28), Ezekiel prophesies that both the northern and southern divisions of the nation will be brought back (21,22), something which did not take place in the return from Babylon; that the Davidic dynasty will be restored and given dominion over both houses (22-24), that the restoration will be permanent, forever (25); that God will Himself come to dwell with them (26,27), as John prophesies of the coming eternal kingdom (Rev. 21,22); that all the nations will be blessed

forevermore in and through this arrangement (28). Such things have never taken place in Israel's past, and when viewed in connection with the last three chapters of the Revelation, can be understood only as taking place after the return of our Lord Jesus Christ in power and glory.

I would be willing to rest my case right here. This evidence is sufficient enough--but there is much more.

(b) The perpetuity of the nation of Israel, in spite of repeated apostasies and restorations after divine chastening, is predicted.

I shall simply present two passages from the Pentateuch and three from the Prophets of the Old Testament, permitting the Scriptures to speak for themselves:

And yet for all that, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them; for I am Jehovah their God; but I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations, that I might be their God: I am Jehovah (Leviticus 26:44,45, A.S.V.).

*For from the top of the rocks I see him,
And from the hills I behold him:
Lo, it is a people that dwelleth alone,
And shall not be reckoned among the nations
(Numbers 23:9, A.S.V.).*

Therefore fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith Jehovah; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be quiet and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with thee, saith Jehovah, to save thee: for I will make a full end of the nations whither I have scattered thee, but I will not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will in no wise leave thee

unpunished (Jeremiah 30:10,11, A.S.V.).

But fear not thou, O Jacob my servant, neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be quiet and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith Jehovah; for I am with thee: for I will make a full end of the nations whither I have driven thee; but I will not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will in no wise leave thee unpunished (Jeremiah 46:27,28, A.S.V.).

Behold, the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; save that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith Jehovah. For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth. All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, who say, The evil shall not overtake nor meet us. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old....And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them, saith Jehovah thy God (Amos 9:8-11, 15, A.S.V.).

(c) There is at least one Old Testament prophecy which in unmistakable and utterly unambiguous language predicts a national restoration of Israel in yet future Messianic times.

I refer to the prophecy of Isaiah 11:1-12:6, one of the most complete oracles in the whole Bible concerning the future of Messiah and Israel. The passage begins with a prediction which seems to point primarily to his first advent:

And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a

branch out of his roots shall bear fruit. And the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah (Isaiah 11:1,2, A.S.V.).

Then there follows prediction in which the first and second comings seem to blend at first, and then the second alone appears.

And his delight shall be in the fear of Jehovah; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither decide after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth; and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins (Isaiah 11:3-5, A.S.V.).

Now, it is perfectly clear after the end of the third clause in this passage, that the *parousia*, that is, the second advent, has taken place. Verses six to nine following describe conditions in that final kingdom of earth's history, the Millennial kingdom. It is a time of universal peace and prosperity among all of God's creatures. Verse 10 adds that the peoples of the earth shall seek Christ, in that day--something, by the way, which can never, and will never, take place during this present age.

After this recitation, clearly a recitation of kingdom (or Millennial) conditions, appears this significant statement:

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord will set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, that shall remain, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea (Isaiah 11:11, A.S.V.).

Most writers of every school rightfully regard this as the strongest

single text in the entire Old Testament supporting the Premillennial doctrine of the restoration of Israel. Observe:

In the first place, the events described are "in that day," that is, in the day of Christ's *parousia* described in the context immediately preceding.

In the second place, there will be a *second* gathering of a "remnant" of Israel. This can refer only to the fact that just as once before, in the times of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, God gathered His people (the Hebrew means to gather, rather than recover) from the nations in which they had been scattered, so shall He do again. Our Amillennial opponents suppose that this second gathering was the one under Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, and that the first was the bringing up of Israel out of Egypt into Canaan in the days of Moses and Joshua. Support for this is supposed to be found in verse 16. However, the exodus from Egypt was not a "gathering" out from among nations into which they had been scattered. They were all in Egypt and had grown into a nation there, concentrated in Goshen, not scattered in the nations. Also, the exodus was not the rescue of a "remnant," but the rescue of the whole nation. And, finally, it must be recognized that the "second" gathering, referred to in verse 11, is "in that day," the day of Messiah's appearing, not the day of the heroes of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The Amillennial objections have not a leg to stand on.

In the third place, this restoration is of a "remnant," after chastening and judgment, described elsewhere in Scripture, not of the entire nation, as was the case in the exodus.

Finally, the remainder of the prophecy (11:12-12:6) describes conditions which have never prevailed either in Israel or in the church (granting that it referred to the church) to the present moment. This must be a future restoration.

(d) The Scriptures speak of a restoration of Israel which will be absolute and permanent.

There are many passages which speak thus; the one now cited is among the clearest.

And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink of the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given to them, saith Jehovah thy God (Amos 9:14,15, A.S.V.).

This is clear unequivocal language. No straightforward, literal, objective treatment of the passage can derive any meaning from it contrary to the one advocated in this paper. Israel is to be restored to the land, and the covenant promises of material and spiritual blessings to that nation, as a nation, are yet going to be fulfilled.

(e) Jesus predicted events in the future which presuppose the restoration of Israel to Canaan and the re-establishment of the ancient tribal organization of the nation.

Peter had just reminded our Lord that His followers had remained with Him during the years at great personal cost. And He responded by telling Peter: "Verily I say to you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judgment the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28). Jesus makes mention of the "regeneration," Greek *Palingenesia*. It is an unmistakable reference to the new order of things on earth after the second advent. Now, in this era, the twelve apostles will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Our opponents hardly know what to make of this text, for it is so devastating to all antichilastic theories. Unless the nation of Israel is to be revived and restored, this prophecy has no meaning at all. Another passage with the same general meaning is Luke 22:28,29:

But ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (A.S.V.).

(f) In his most important eschatological address, Jesus suggested that a period of Jewish rulership of their ancient city, Jerusalem, would follow on the conclusion of this age, which He called "the times of the Gentiles."

This famous prophecy is found in Luke 21:24:

And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled (A.S.V.).

There is not space in this treatment for a thorough discussion of what is often called the Olivet Discourse. Suffice it to say that the address was given in answer to questions addressed concerning the promised destruction of Jerusalem, the time of Jesus' second coming, and the signs of that coming. Whatever may be said concerning the earlier portions of the address, as to whether they refer to Jerusalem's destruction or to Christ's second coming, it is certain that in verse 24 our Lord is looking far past that event of A.D. 70. Now, says Jesus (if we may interpret), this condition in Jerusalem, with Gentiles in charge of things and using the city for their own purposes, shall continue to the end of the time God has allotted for Gentile supremacy. But after that, the return of Jerusalem to its rightful owners shall take place. This can never happen aside from the repentance, conversion, and restoration of Israel.

(g) It was the plain belief of the apostles, even after the death and resurrection of Jesus, that the kingdom would be restored, as of old, to Israel.

This belief is expressed plaintively in Acts 1:6: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

I think the precise significance of this question is often missed because the immediately preceding context is ignored in referring to it. Luke informs us that the Lord appeared to the disciples in the days following the resurrection. Now, the important thing to note is the subject of His conversations with them. Luke gives us that in Acts 1:3, which I present in full:

"to whom he also showed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God." For forty days the Lord, intermittently of course, explained to the disciples the "kingdom of God." This He did to men whose minds were steeped in the Old Testament promises to Israel in connection with that kingdom. It were vain, of course, to suppose that the bearings of that kingdom on the present age were not discussed--but the fact remains that after forty days of this instruction the Jewish disciples still believed that some time in the future the kingdom would be restored to them. Jesus did not tell them that their hope was false. He did not reprove them for a "carnal" view of the kingdom. He informed them only that it was not for them to know the time at which the restoration would take place.

It is no mistake that has led countless defenders of the Premillennial doctrine to this text in defense of it.

(h) The Apostle Paul declared that a time is coming in which "all Israel shall be saved" and that in such a context that the national repentance and conversion of the nation, if not national restoration, is a necessary inference.

The paragraph which summarizes Paul's teaching is Romans 11:25,26:

For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel

shall be saved: even as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob (A.S.V).

The context of this promise, which requires that we understand the national restoration of Israel--by way of repentance and conversion--has been summarized by Alva J. McClain as follows:

Is He, God, done with Israel as a nation? The apostle recoils from such a suggestion, and proceeds to show that the rejection of Israel is even now not total, but only partial. And even this partial rejection is not final, but only temporary. Three facts are adduced to prove that God has not cast off His people forever. First, there is a **PRESENT ELECTION** within the nation (1-10). He has spoken of this before, but he now points to himself, an Israelite among the saved, as an evidence to this election. Furthermore, the existing situation is very similar to that in the days of Elijah when in the whole nation there was but a small remnant who had not bowed the knee to Baal. So now there is a remnant according to the election of grace. As to the rest, they have been hardened, and their eyes darkened. Nevertheless, we are not to suppose that this is the end of Israel's national hopes. There is to be a **FUTURE RESTORATION** of the nation back to the divine favor (11-24). Israel did not stumble that he might fall irretrievably. There was a beneficent purpose in permitting all this to take place. Through the fall of Israel great riches have been brought to the Gentile world, and if his fall meant much to the world, certainly his future reception back into favor will mean much more. If, on account of unbelief, certain Israelite branches have been broken out of the tree of God's favor and Gentile branches have been grafted in, we are not to forget that God is able to graft the Israelite back into the place of favor. For, after all, they are the natural branches; God's favor came into the world through Israel. As a matter of fact, they shall be grafted again into their own tree. There is to be a final **SALVATION** for the nation (25-32). (*Romans Outlined and Summarized*, pp. 36,37.)

Such is the argument of this chapter and the hope of the Apostle Paul.

(i) The Scriptures describe a future time when a temple of God in the Jewish city of Jerusalem shall be appropriated by God as His own and be misappropriated by Antichrist.

There are two passages of New Testament Scripture involved in this argument. The first is Revelation 11:1,2:

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and one said, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. And the court which is without the temple leave without, and measure it not; for it hath been given unto the nations: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months (A.S.V.).

This prophecy came to John nearly thirty years² after the temple of Herod was destroyed by the Romans. So the prophecy does not refer to that temple. It was not the heavenly temple "which the Lord pitched and not man," for this is to be desecrated by nations which will also trample the city. It is in Jerusalem, as the words "holy city" specify. Furthermore, even without taking into consideration the action of measuring, which many interpreters think symbolizes God's appropriation of a rebuilt temple at the beginning of the seventieth week of Daniel, it is plainly said to be "the temple of God." So much for the fact--a Jewish temple is to be built in Jerusalem and appropriated by God.

Now, Paul predicts that this temple (it could hardly be another) shall be misappropriated by Antichrist for his own blasphemous worship. After pointing out to the believers at Thessalonica that the "man of sin...the son of perdition" shall be revealed before the day of the Lord, he adds concerning this wicked man that he "opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God."

This agrees precisely with what the Revelation says concerning the

"Beast" (or Antichrist) in the thirteenth chapter of that book.

This is another truth supporting the teaching that the nation is to be restored to their land and their God as in the days of old.

(j) The Revelation predicts a resumption of God's dealing with Israel in the sealing of 144,000 Israelites, organized according to their tribal divisions.

I recognize that there are problems in connection with this fact. The tribal names, for instance, are peculiar and differ from the usual. No one seems to be very sure of the reason why. Yet this does not justify our saying--what in effect the anti-millenarian interpreters of Revelation do say--that the passage is totally without known meaning, being wrapped in unreadable symbolism. The passage is still in Revelation, chapter 7, and certainly means something. I quote:

After this I saw four angels standing at the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that no wind should blow on the earth, or on the sea, or upon any tree. And I saw another angel ascend from the sunrising, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a great voice to the four angels to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we shall have sealed the servants of our God on their foreheads. And I heard the number of them that were sealed, a hundred and forty and four thousand, sealed out of every tribe of the children of Israel (Revelation 7:1-4, A.S.V.).

In the four verses which follow, it is specified that 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes were sealed.

Let our Postmillennial and Amillennial friends explain this for us. They find many faults in our explanation that this applies to 144,000 Jewish servants of God in the Tribulation period. Let them tell us when it is if it is not then. It could not be in the period before John, for history bears no

record of it and it would be completely anomalous in that time. In the centuries since it has not happened. The facts are that it fits no known period except the future, at the end of this present age.

(k) The prophets speak as if the honor of Jehovah God is at stake in the restoration of Israel in a final and permanent way.

God has a stake in the restoration of Israel. The honor of His name and the validity of His covenant-keeping mercy depend on it, according to several passages. In connection with several chapters in Ezekiel in which the final restoration is predicted, this appears:

I had regard for my holy name, which the house of Israel had profaned among the nations whither they went. Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: I do not this for your sake, O house of Israel, but for my holy name, which ye have profaned among the nations, whither ye went (Ezekiel 36:21,22, A.S.V.).

Peters (*The Theocratic Kingdom*, II, 53) says in this connection that evidently the condition of Israel at the time of their future restoration will be one of unbelief. Only because the time in the plan of God for the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom shall have arrived will God move in mercy again to restore the nation.

"Because" the nation has been overthrown and its uplifting is a necessity, "because" the heathen ridicule the Covenant and its promises, God will perform this work, and, by an astonishing process, bring this rebellious nation to heart-felt obedience and most fervent allegiance" (Peters, *ibid.*, 53).

This is related to the following final argument, and that which concerns the next argument applies with equal force on this one.

(l) The Bible reveals that the very worthiness of God as the object of

the faith of the patriarchs requires that He yet restore Israel and fulfill the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

In Romans 11:28 Paul writes that Israel is yet "beloved for the fathers' sake." This means that God's present care for His ancient people is, at least in part, out of respect for the faith of "the fathers" who believed God and expected Him to fulfill His ancient promises. After writing of the faith of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the writer to the Hebrews observes:

These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth (Hebrews 11:13, A.S.V.).

Not all of the promises of God to the patriarchs have been fulfilled yet. Of course, as the New Testament makes clear, some of the promises have come true in Christ, in the benefits of His redeeming work at Calvary. But all the distinctive promises to Israel wait for complete fulfillment. We know that unbelief and resultant chastening are the cause. But God has made a promise concerning the overruling of the unbelief, and to this promise Paul must have turned his mind as he wrote that Israel was still "beloved for the fathers' sake." I refer to a passage in the Pentateuch, the portion of God's Word in which this series of arguments began. After detailing the dread results of disobedience--banishment from the land--God says:

They shall confess...then will I remember my covenant with Jacob; also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land. The land also shall be left by them, and it shall enjoy its sabbaths....And yet for all that, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them; for I am Jehovah their God; but I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations, that I might be their God: I am Jehovah (Leviticus 26:40, 42-45, A.S.V.).

I can think of nothing more utterly compelling and appropriate with which to close my remarks on this theme than the prophecy of Jeremiah 33:25,26.

Thus saith Jehovah: If my covenant of day and night stand not, if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and of David my servant, so that I will not take of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and will have mercy on them.

PART TWO

The Premillennial Approach to the Book of Daniel

As was pointed out at the beginning of this dissertation, the primary thesis is that the Premillennial system of eschatology is taught by the Scriptures themselves, and that the Premillennial system alone can satisfactorily interpret the eschatological portions of the Book of Daniel. In the foregoing section I have sought to establish as fact the proposition that the general teaching of the whole Bible supports the Premillennial eschatology. That the Bible teaches one system of doctrine, not many, must be the faith of all who believe it to be the saving Word of God. This being the case, we may reasonably expect that the Premillennial eschatology, developed in general outline in the previous section, will, if correct, provide the key to understanding the details of eschatology presented in the Book of Daniel. Contrariwise, any other system should meet impassable obstacles and create unmistakable confusion in interpreting so eminently eschatological a book as Daniel.

Except as deemed absolutely necessary, I have not made great use of Daniel's predictions in the previous section. This was because it was felt that it would be best to treat all the pertinent portions of Daniel consecutively and separate from the general discussion of Premillennialism. The place to treat Daniel's prophecies has now appeared.

It will not be necessary to treat all of the book. The chapters which are primarily predictive in their most significant portions are two, seven, nine, and ten to twelve (really one prophecy). Of these four distinct sections, large portions deal with incidental facts related to the revelation of the material and to predictions which were fulfilled before and during the lifetime of our Lord Jesus Christ. These portions are not germane to our discussion. Evangelical Christians of all shades of eschatological opinion are in quite general agreement (there are a few exceptions) on these portions as far as interpretation is concerned. Therefore treatment of large portions will be omitted entirely, and treatment of some other portions will be complete enough only to prepare the reader for the portions at issue. It is the writer's purpose to eliminate all matter irrelevant to the main point at issue. The discussion must begin with an analysis of the entire book. This will be followed by treatment of:

The Prophecy of the Great Metallic Image and of the Stone which struck it (2:28,29,31-45)

The Prophecy of the Four Great Beasts and of the Ancient of Days (7:2-27)

The Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (9:23-27)

The Prophecy Concerning Daniel's People among the Nations, especially at the Time of the End (10:14; 11:36-45; 12:1-12).

CHAPTER IV

Analysis and Outline of the Book of Daniel

The writer gave much time to study of the Book of Daniel over a period of several years without discerning the crucial importance of the structure of the book to an accurate interpretation of it. I am now quite convinced that the almost indispensable key to the book is the structure. This structure is at

once the most obvious and elusive feature of the book.

Although the book contains much history and is accurate in its historical statements, an outline according to historical sequence of the events described is out of the question. The oracles are not in chronological order. Even if rearranged in chronological order, they would not admit of logical arrangement or analysis in such position.

There are two possible outlines--one according to the languages used (and I believe according to the argument of the book), another according to some more mechanical features of the book, namely, the standpoint of the writer, the character of the contents, and the agency of revelation. Though the author held to the second for several years, he was led to part with it through reading the writings of Carl August Auberlen (*The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John*). He is now convinced that this treatment which divides the book in two parts, at the end of chapter six, has bases that are only obvious, not real--that it really obscures the marvelous development of the thought of the prophecy. Because of the prevalence of this treatment, however, I shall now present it and then present the one which in my own opinion should replace it.

1. Outline According to the Standpoint of the Author, the Character of the Contents, and the Agency of the Revelation.

(1) The standpoint of the author.

In all of chapters one through six, and in verse one of chapter seven, the writer of Daniel speaks in the third person. Not once therein does Daniel refer to himself in the first person, even though he represents others as referring to themselves in the first person (*vide*. 4:4,13,18, *et al.*). Even when it appears that it might have been convenient to present himself in the first person (*e.g.* 2:14,16; 4:8,19), he does not do so. Beginning with chapter seven verse two, and throughout the remainder of the book, Daniel almost always speaks in the first person (*vide*. 7:2,8,9,15; 8:1,3; 9:2,3,4; 10:2; 12:5). (An

exception is found in 10:1.) On this principle, the book divides at the end of chapter six.

(2) The character of the contents.

The same first six chapters which are written in the third person with reference to the author are quite uniformly historical in character. There are predictions (chapter 2), but prediction is secondary and presented almost incidentally to the narrative. On the other hand, chapters 7 through 12, all written in the first person, are uniformly predictive. There are brief historical statements, but these are subordinate to the predictive element, and used chiefly for the dating of the oracles.

(2) The agency of revelation

In the first six chapters the only¹ agency of prophecy is the writer himself, empowered, of course, by the Holy Spirit. No divine beings appear as purveyors of divine revelation. But in the last six chapters the agency is supernatural. The revelator appears to be the angel Gabriel throughout. In chapter seven (v.16) he is introduced only as "one of them that stood by" and he is a part of the vision itself. In chapter eight (v. 16) Gabriel is introduced by name, not this time, apparently, as a part of the vision, and from there on Gabriel is clearly the agent of revelation and the interpreter of Daniel's vision (cf. 9:21).

Thus, the outline, by this system, appears to be (1) Daniel's historical record, revealed by Daniel and written in the third person, chapters one to six; (2) Daniel's predictive record, written in the first person, and revealed by Gabriel, chapters seven to twelve.

In spite of these striking facts, observe that the seeming symmetry of the division into two portions of exactly six chapters each is only palpable, not real. Each of the first six chapters is, indeed, a distinct portion, but the last six chapters consist of only four distinct portion, *viz.*, 7, 8, 9, and 10-13. Observe also that the three phenomena on which the divisions are based

do not concern the meaning of the passages involved at all. I think that these phenomena are *incidental*, perhaps even accidental, not related to the argument of the book.

As I think of the many commentators on Daniel whose works I have read, I do not recall that one of them based any important aspect of his interpretation on this widely accepted analysis. Evidently the advocates of this analysis do not attach great importance to it. Its chief usefulness has been as a convenient framework on which to hang the twelve chapters, that is, chiefly as an aid to the memory. As such, I have no objection to it.

There is another phenomenon of the book, however, which cannot be accidental, and which this writer thinks is not incidental. He believes it was intended by the divine Author as the key to the interpretation. I refer to the languages of the book.

2. Outline According to the Languages of the Book

Chapter one (and to verse 4 of chapter 2, where a change comes at a very natural break) and chapters eight through twelve are written in Hebrew. Hebrew was the language of Daniel's people, the language in which the oracles of God were made known to the covenant people, Israel. Chapters two through seven are written in Aramaic. Aramaic was not at the time of Daniel the language of Israel. We now know that it was then, had been for some time, and continued to be for several centuries the lingua franca of the ancient world. What *koine* Greek was to the nations of earth during the Greek age, what Latin has been among most of the nations of the Western world up to modern times, what French is to international diplomacy now, Aramaic was to the Neo-Babylonian empire in some respects and in almost every respect during the Persian period. It is not only possible, but entirely probable, that Daniel's book was not issued to the reading public in the Babylonian era at all, but during the Persian era.

It will be seen, then, that chapter one and chapters eight to twelve are in Hebrew, appropriate for a message concerning and addressed to the Hebrew

people. Chapters two to seven are in Aramaic, appropriate for a message concerning Gentile people and kings, and though addressed to God's people, is instructive also for those same Gentile peoples and kings.

The most ingenious current higher critical explanation of the phenomenon of the languages (originated by C. C. Torrey) is that chapters one to six are earlier in composition than the last six chapters, and originally were written in Aramaic; that later, about 165 B.C., another author wrote chapters seven to twelve in the Hebrew language; that these two portions were issued to the public by this second author as one work, and that the two parts were joined and the joint covered by translating chapter seven into Aramaic and chapter one into Hebrew. This, it is said, was to give the whole an appearance of unity. The chief lack of this theory is one shred of evidence in its favor.

The explanation which I wish to offer is that the author of Daniel had two related but distinct kinds of messages to deliver. One was a message of judgment and final defeat to the Gentile world, of whom the chief representatives of the time were Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, and Cyrus. The other was a message of hope and deliverance for God's oppressed but precious holy people, the Hebrews. The appropriate language for the first was Aramaic, the appropriate language for the second was Hebrew.

The *first section*, then, is chapter one (and a very brief portion of chapter 2) written in Hebrew. Chapter one is obviously an introduction to the whole book explaining (1) the circumstances giving rise to the history of the book, (2) the identity of the author and his associates, and (3) the events which placed the author in the position he holds in the history of the book. These facts, in themselves, are sufficient reason for making the chapter a separate division of the book. It is separated from the portion immediately following by the change in language. The use of the Hebrew language is justified fully by the fact that the events told have no connection or meaning with the future of Gentile history--rather with an heroic episode in Hebrew history.

The *second section*, chapters two through seven, forms a distinct section in subject matter. Every portion of the section primarily concerns a Gentile nation *per se* and its rulers, relations, and history. Israel *per se* does not once clearly enter the picture till the very last, and then in rather oblique and enigmatic references (7:18,21,25,27). As might be expected, the entire portion is in the common language of the Gentile nations of that area--Aramaic, the *koine* of the Middle East till long after the conquests of Alexander and the prevalence of his Greek.

The *third section*, chapters eight through twelve, which constitute the final section of the book, is another distinct portion in subject matter. It has primary reference to Israel's future, a future which is intimately connected with the destruction of all Gentile powers, and in conflict with those powers to the end. This is appropriately in the Hebrews' own language. By this analysis Daniel falls in logical order as follows:

Title: "Daniel's Prophecies Concerning the Nations of the World and the Future of Israel in Relation to Them"

I. Historical Introduction to the Book (chapter 1)

II. The Nations of the World--their Character, Relation, Succession, Destiny, etc. (chapters 2-7)

III. The Nation of Israel--its Relation to Gentile Dominion and its Future in the Plan of God (chapters 8-12)

It should be added that several Premillenarians have taken cognizance of this structure of the book without seeing also the distinctive features of it. On reading Tregelles (*Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel*) again, I observe that he has not only seen the Gentile and the Jewish sections as such, but also traced some of their special significance (*vide*. pp.7-9).

My reasons, in summary, are chiefly (1) the languages of the book and (2)

the subject matter, which need no further explanation, and (3) the progress of doctrine. This third reason I now wish to treat at somewhat more length. Chapter two is clearly a Gentile dream for Gentiles. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon was, in fact, the one to whom God gave the dream of the future. It concerned the future of Gentile dominion and was presented as a Gentile king would like to see it--glittering, strong, majestic, and quite human in its outward aspect. Tregelles says (*op.cit.*, p. 11): "Here all is presented as set before the king according to *his* ability of apprehension---the external and visible things being shown as man might regard them." The consummation of these kingdoms in a complete destruction and replacement by a divine kingdom contains no single hint of any heroic or important role by God's people Israel. They do not once enter the scene. Chapter three, chapter four, and likewise chapters five and six concern chiefly events in historical kingdoms of the past. The treatment of certain Israelites is prominent but mainly as revelation of the obdurate unbelief and spiritual ignorance of the Gentile kings. These kings learn something of the rule of the Most High God in the history of these chapters. Chapter five concerns the historical close of the Babylonian dominion.

This same Gentile-centered thought prevails through chapter seven also, except that near the end of this chapter, the end of the Gentile portion of Daniel, a shading off which leaves Israel, Israel's God, and Israel's future in the center of the scene of interest, takes place. Between verses 18 and 28 of this chapter, a people known as "saints" or "the people of the saints of the Most High," appear no less than five times--chiefly in conflict with the final representative of and consummate form of Gentile dominion. On any principle of *historical* exegesis, these saints can be no other than God's ancient people Israel. No worthy exegete claims that Daniel could have had any other primary understanding of the reference. In the opinion of this writer, it is simple *eisegesis*, or reading into the passage what one wants it to mean, to find "the church" or "the whole body of the redeemed" in this prophecy. That later prophets may have elaborated prophecy so that some things here affirmed of Israel (*e.g.*, reigning with Christ) are likewise affirmed of other people of God may well be true, but the simple fact remains that in Daniel, the saints

are Israelite.

Now, the significant thing is, that here at the end of the Aramaic section, precisely where one might expect the most detailed description of the consummation of Gentile dominion (as it is in the treatment of the fourth beast, the ten horns, and the little horn), the future of Israel is first woven into the story. From thence to the close of the book, Israel remains the cynosure. The importance of this division to a careful Premillennial treatment is as yet only partially apparent. That it gives proper place to the future of God's elect nation is the most obvious advantage.

Of even greater importance is the fact that certain differences in *prophetic method* and *divine chronological method* are to be discerned prevailing in the two sections. The progress of Gentile dominion is given in continuous succession in chapters two and seven, the two predictive portions of the Aramaic section. I mean to say that there are no breaks or gaps in the prophecy hinted or suggested. And so long as it is seen that here God is giving an Old Testament prophecy of the Gentile rulership of world government down to, and including, the present age, the principles of the most strict Premillennial and Dispensational interpretation of Scripture are not violated and need not be brought to bear to insert a gap which the facts of the prophecy do not show. On the other hand, in chapters eight to twelve, in which three distinct oracles concerning Israel appear, there are at least two in which it is clear that Israel's prophetic future is not seen in complete perspective. The beginning, in conflict with the nations but in covenant union with Jehovah, is clearly seen. But an unlimited period of time when Israel's history is run out of covenant union with Jehovah is completely unrevealed. That there is such a gap or blank is clear. The future of Israel during that blank is entirely unknown. In due season these features will be developed in the dissertation. For the present, let it be said only that they do exist.

And since they do exist, let it be added that only a Premillennial theology can give any satisfactory explanation of the strange but natural division of the book and these strange features of the divisions. It is

precisely at this point that the Premillennial theology first demonstrates its superiority as a method of interpreting the Book of Daniel.

An Amillennialism which joins itself to the notion that all the promises of the Old Testament to Israel as a nation are now transferred to the church, and which supposes that God is now through with Israel as a nation, must face the fact that Daniel does not regard the nation so. Indeed, having traced the future of the nations of earth down to the coming of Christ in His kingdom, the same Book of Daniel reveals the existence of Israel as a nation at the time of the consummation of Gentile history and predicts a glorious future for Israel as a nation in the kingdom of God which will be established at the coming of Messiah in power and glory.

A Postmillennialism which in another day regarded the Bible as the Word of God could not explain this future of Israel either, even though some Postmillennialists (*e.g.*, Hodge) did believe in a future conversion of the nation. There is no place in Postmillennialism for an Israel restored to a position of national favor (as set forth in Romans 11) nor for Christ ruling over the world from the Jewish throne of the ancient dynasty of David. Recent Postmillennialism is also usually *modernistic*, that is, infidel with reference to the doctrines of the deity of Christ and the inspiration of Scripture, etc., so quite naturally has no satisfactory explanation for these prophecies which is in harmony with the faith of the saints. But Premillennialism recognizes the futurity of Christ's Millennial Kingdom and expects the restoration of Israel to national favor. Therefore a satisfactory explanation for the strange division of the Book of Daniel and of these other features is possible.

Premillennialists believe that even though in salvation there is now no difference between men with respect to the favor of God, with reference to the future government of this world the situation is different. God is expected to restore Israel to his land and to a position of national favor. The present age is a hiatus or gap in Israel's special relationship with God. Thus the Premillennial interpretation has an explanation for the continuity of Gentile development seen in the Aramaic, or Gentile section of Daniel, and for the

hiatus in Israel's development as set forth in the Hebrew section.

It may be asked, Why, if there is no gap in the predictions of Gentile dominion, is the whole present age passed over almost without a single identifiable event--especially when this has been the age of the supremacy of Gentile power?

The answer lies in the purpose of God and the method of God in revelation.

The history of the Babylonian period is passed over quite as silently, except for reference to Nebuchadnezzar as its king. In fact, except for the mere notices of the rule passing from one to another of the succession of kingdoms, there are few identifiable events in any of the prophecies. It is only as the Gentile power comes into conflict with Israel and to termination in the reign of Messiah that its detailed history appears to be of any interest to the Spirit of prophecy.

Further discussion of this aspect of the prophecies of Daniel will be given in connection with the prophecy of the great metallic image of chapter two.

CHAPTER V

The Prophecy of the Great Metallic Image and of the Stone Which Struck It

DANIEL 2:28, 29, 31-45

The Aramaic portion of the Book of Daniel begins in the midst of verse four of chapter two and extends to the end of chapter seven. So the verses now before the reader are in the Aramaic language. The writer has prepared a translation of the entire Aramaic section. Occasional references, with proper notice, will be made to this translation. The principle quotations, however, will be made from the American Standard Version. Where there is real advantage

in doing so, recourse to the original Aramaic will be made.

The Scope and Nature of the Prophecy

28 But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and he hath made known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed are these: 29 as for thee, O king, thy thoughts came *into thy mind* upon thy bed, what should come to pass hereafter; and he that revealeth secrets hath made known to thee what shall come to pass (Daniel 2:28,29, A.S.V.).

Nebuchadnezzar had a dream which he used to test the ability and willingness¹ of his staff of wise men to interpret. When none of them could either tell him what his dream was or reveal what it meant, opportunity was finally given Daniel to tell and interpret the dream. This he did, the record relates, by the power of God working on his behalf.

These two verses are among the opening words of the prophet in telling the dream and interpreting it.

These verses are of importance to this study because of the fact that they indicate what the *nature* and *scope* of the revelation to follow would be. The first significant statement is that it was the purpose of God to make "known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days." This means that the scope of this dream-revelation of the future includes at least some events within that period of time known as "the latter days," and there is at least a possibility that all will take place in that period.

The actual Aramaic expressions translated "in the latter days" is

(*be'achraith yomayya*). A literal translation is "in the latter part of the days," though it is doubtful that the usual translation can be much improved. About this phrase as used here there are several important observations to be made.

First, this phrase is an exact Aramaic translation of the Hebrew *be'acharith hayyamim*, and is an idea lifted *en toto* out of the general prophetic literature of Israel. It is spoken by a Jew who was versed in that literature. Hence, its meaning is to be determined by its usage in that literature, not by its meaning in any other.

Second, "the latter days" cannot be restricted in meaning to the understanding which the heathen king Nebuchadnezzar may have had of it. This restriction some have tried to make, but the very phrase selected by Daniel was one already pregnant with meaning for any informed Jew.

Third, "the latter days" in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament refers to the future of God's dealing with mankind as to be consummated and concluded historically in the times of the Messiah. Some commentators have sought to prove that the term refers to the future in general (Havernick, *et al*), but without success. Whenever the scope of an Old Testament prophecy is measured by these words, either in the Hebrew or Aramaic sections, the times of Messiah are always within the scope of that prophecy.

The expression appears in the following passages, each one a predictive prophecy: Genesis 49:1; Deuteronomy 4:30, 31:29; Numbers 24:14; Jeremiah 23:20, 30:24, 48:47, 49:39; Ezekiel 38:16; Daniel 2:28, 10:14; Hosea 3:5; Micah 4:1. An examination shows that while many events previous to eschatological times are within the scope of the prophecies limited by the expression "latter days", in not one is the conclusion of all human history in the consummating events connected with the yet future establishment of the Messianic Kingdom on earth out of sight. Otherwise, the events would be only in *future time*, not necessarily in "the latter days."

It is not true that Messianic times alone are denominated thus. Many events of what is now Old Testament history are placed "in the latter days" (as *e.g.*, the tribal divisions of Israel in Canaan. Cf. Gen. 49:1 ff.), but the reach is always beyond those times to Messiah's times. And let it never be

forgotten that the Old Testament prophecies of Messiah always have in view the consummation of things in what we now know as Messiah's second advent. The importance of this fact cannot be overemphasized in relation to the interpretation of the second chapter of Daniel.

Fourth, this term in Greek translation is used by the New Testament writers with the same meaning. Peter regarded the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost next after Jesus' resurrection as an event of "the latter days" (Acts 2:17-21. Cf. Joel 2:28 ff.). Again, in his second Epistle (3:1-4), Peter prophesied of the coming of men who would *in this present church age* scoff at Biblical eschatology. This, he said, using a very literal Greek translation of the Hebrew words, would take place "in the last days."

Fifth, interpretation of "the latter days" must allow it to include not only the first advent and the second advent with the coming of Messiah's future kingdom, but also the age intervening between the advents in which we now live. We are now, and have been since Jesus came, in the latter days (cf. passages under *fourth*, above).

Sixth, and finally, the term, "the latter days," is to be distinguished from "the time of the end," which is mentioned in Daniel. The ideas are related but not identical, as will be seen later.

Now, there is no reason whatsoever for believing that Daniel was using this technical term in any other than its usual meaning. So eschatological prediction is to be expected in the prophecy of chapter two.

The second significant statement of Daniel in preparing the mind of the king to receive the prophecy was that the contents of it would relate to "what should come to pass hereafter." The Aramaic is *Mah di lechewe' 'achare denah*. More literally translated, it is "what things [thing] should be which are after these things [this thing]."

The best explanation, that elaborated by Keil (*op.cit., in loco*), is that

the king had gone to sleep with the affairs of his kingdom on his mind. He wondered, what any thoughtful king like the great Nebuchadnezzar might have wondered, how his reign would end, and how his dynasty, founded by his father, Nabopolassar, would fare. Nebuchadnezzar's own affairs of state were "these things" after which other "things" would take place and concerning which God was to make revelation. Hence, a recital of the succession of rulers and kingdoms to follow Nebuchadnezzar was to be expected.

To sum up, Daniel 2:28,29 leads us to expect, in the prophecy to follow, a recital of the course of the nations from Nebuchadnezzar's own time down to the setting up of the final Messianic kingdom.

The Details of the Dream

31 Thou, O king, sawest, and, behold, a great image. This image, which was mighty, and whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the aspect thereof was terrible. 32 As for this image, its head was of fine gold, its breast and its arms of silver, its belly and its thighs of brass, 35 its legs of iron, its feet part of iron and part of clay. 34 Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon its feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces. 35 Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, so that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth (Daniel 2:31-35, A.S.V.).

These five verses are a recital of the actual dream of Nebuchadnezzar, evidently shown by divine revelation to Daniel also. The objects seen consisted of a great image of a man "mighty" in size, "bright" in color or sheen, and "terrible" in aspect. Details of the image specifically mentioned were the head of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass (or copper), the legs of iron, the feet of iron and clay mixed. (No toes are specifically mentioned at this point.) Also, a stone was seen--a stone cut

out from a mountain by no human hands; "the wind" is mentioned, and finally, the earth.

The action involved in the dream was simple but very impressive. The polymetallic image did nothing--it simply stood where set, shining and terrible to behold--and the king look and continued to look at it. Then, quite dramatically, the stone appeared. Some commentators speak of it as a rolling stone, but it is not said to be such in the text. It is simply related that the stone struck the image upon the feet. Upon this, the image collapsed, disintegrated into fine particles like chaff, and then "the wind" (it is not said what wind) removed the particles. The stone which struck the image then expanded into a "great mountain and filled the whole earth."

The Noneschatological Portion of the Interpretation

36 This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. 37 Thou, O king, art king of kings, unto whom the God of heaven hath given the kingdom, the power, and the strength, and the glory; 38 and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens hath he given into thy hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all: thou art the head of gold. 39 And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee; and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. 40 And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron, forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that crusheth all these, shall it break in pieces and crush. 41 And where as thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, it shall be a divided kingdom; but there shall be in it of the strength of iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. 42 And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. 43 And whereas thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron doth not mingle with clay (Daniel 2:36-43, A.S.V.).

The terms eschatology and eschatological have been used several times in this dissertation, and now appears "non-eschatological." The basic term "eschatology" refers to the study or science of last things, that is, the last events in connection with the current age. From the standpoint of the present church age, all eschatological events are yet future. From the standpoint of the Old Testament believer, all events connected with Messiah's coming--whether the first one or the second (as we now discern)--were eschatological. To us the events of the first advent are historical and only those of the second are eschatological. When I refer to non-eschatological portions, therefore, I refer to portions relating to events previous to the second advent and previous to other events associated with the close of this present age.

There are problems aplenty and disagreements many about the details of interpretation in this portion. However, most of the differences of opinion are between the interpretation of evangelical believing Christians and that of the unbelieving, anti-supernatural, higher criticism. I am speaking particularly of the contemporary situation, though, historically, the lines of battle usually have been so arrayed.

Among Christian interpreters, as long as there has been any record of opinion, the almost uniform identification of the four successive kingdoms has been Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.

The unbelieving higher criticism always has taken exception to this, owing to the fact that if Rome is the fourth kingdom, then even by the latest date any scholar has ever dared to propose for the composition of Daniel (*ca.* 165-164 B.C.), the book still contains valid, supernatural, predictive prophecy.

This paper is addressed to men who believe that the Bible is the Word of God, hence we shall not labor extensively to answer the arguments of unbelief. As Tregelles has written, "To understand the Scriptures aright, we have no occasion to go beyond the limit of the Scriptures themselves" (*Remarks on the*

Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel, pp. 11,12). The primary Biblical evidence for the view that the four historical kingdoms are Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome is herewith presented. It is clear and unmistakable, notwithstanding the learned obscurantism of the unbelieving attempts to render it inconsistent and incomprehensible.

The head of gold represented the king Nebuchadnezzar and his kingdom. "Thou art the head of gold" (Daniel 2:36) settles that matter. Verses 37 and 38 specify that Nebuchadnezzar's was a world-wide kingdom--in divine grant--even though this energetic king, during a long reign, never got to the point of taking possession of all of it. It is also certain that the symbolism of the head of gold included the kingdom of Babylon as well as Nebuchadnezzar its king, for in verse 39 the expression, "another kingdom," requires this, as well as the well-known fact that all Assyro-Babylonian kings were considered identical with the state. Further evidence that Babylon is symbolized is the fact that in other prophecies gold symbolizes that kingdom (*e.g.* Isa. 14:4).

Also Jeremiah 27:5,6 specifies that world dominion was given to Nebuchadnezzar at that time.

The breast and arms of silver symbolize Medo-Persia. It is the favorite claim of unbelieving higher critics that Daniel's author, presumed to have lived in the second century B.C., had an entirely mistaken view of the history of the Middle East and the Near East during the sixth to third centuries B.C., and ignorantly supposed that the Medes were a separate second kingdom which supplanted Babylon (they cite Daniel 6:1), the Persians a separate third kingdom which supplanted the Medes (they cite Daniel 10:1), the fourth and last being the Greek. During the Greek prevalence, according to this theory, Daniel was written, and hence the Roman could not have been foreseen. It is said that the author expected the Messianic age to follow immediately after the Greek.

However, the facts of Daniel are plainly otherwise. A kingdom containing two elements, known respectively as Medes and Persians, succeeded the Babylonian kingdom. Darius the Mede took the kingdom from the last Babylonian

king (Daniel 5:30), but the Median king is said to represent the "Medes and Persians" (Daniel 5:28) and he ruled his kingdom by "the law of the Medes and Persians" (Daniel 6:26). Furthermore, Daniel 8:20 speaks of Media and Persia as parts of one realm rather than two separate realms. Not only so, II Chronicles 36:20 shows that the Bible writers thought Persia followed the Babylonian kingdom without any intermediate Median kingdom. The Medo-Persian kingdom was frequently called simply Persian because of the ascendancy of that side of the coalition. The so-called Median kingdom has its fictional existence not in the mind of the author of Daniel, but only in the minds of those Biblical critics who for *a priori* reasons must find historical inaccuracy in Daniel. History knows of no Median empire, and neither does the Bible. The belly and thighs of copper symbolize the Graeco-Macedonian empire, founded by Alexander and continued by his successors. Attempts to identify this with Persia have failed--and the latest, by Rowley (*Darius and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel*, University of Wales Press Board, Cardiff, 1935) is no less a failure than the others. Correspondence between the Medo-Persian empires of chapter two, symbolized by the breast and arms of silver, and the two-horned ram of chapter eight is unmistakable. That ram is specifically said to be "Media and Persia," and the he-goat kingdom of chapter eight, which succeeded it, is said to be Greece. The Bible clearly identifies the third kingdom as Greece.

The fourth kingdom is Rome. It is symbolized by the legs of iron with the feet of iron mixed with clay. This cannot be proved by citing references in the Bible which say that Rome succeeded to the empire of Greece, for there are no such references. Rome probably did not exist in the sixth century B.C. At least, no extensive kingdom of that name existed. However, there is sufficient evidence that the Rome which history informs us followed the last stage of the Grecian period is at least included in the fourth empire envisioned in this prophecy. This evidence owes its existence to the fact that this one empire, which had no existence at all in Daniel's time, is given most detailed treatment herein. This is surely a divine providence.

Observe that though parts, such as the legs, feet, and toes, are

mentioned in the interpretation, they together symbolize only one "fourth kingdom."

Every detail speaks unmistakably of Rome.²

It is "strong as iron"--iron being the strongest known metal in Daniel's day. At its height, Rome stands in history as the strongest of all imperial powers. The short sword of the Roman soldier and of the Roman mercenaries, was then the symbol of the greatest power of all time.

Like iron, it "breaketh in pieces." Iron was also the hardest known metal in Daniel's time, and could be used to cut copper, silver, or gold. And, Rome not only *could* but *did* break up all the other conquered kingdoms and erased the national and political character of the other kingdoms of the world. Rome was unique in this respect. Babylonian institutions and culture, to a great extent, conquered both the Medo-Persians and the Greeks. But when Rome took over, the world became a Roman world--so Roman, in fact, that the expanding Western world today still bears the plain mark of its Roman origin. It is still markedly Roman in character.

Furthermore, of this iron kingdom it is said that it "subdueth all things." This also is characteristic of Rome. Gibbon wrote: "The empire of the Romans filled the world, and when the empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. To resist was fatal and it was impossible to fly." Two millennia ago, Rome gave the world the ecumenical unity which the League of Nations and the United Nations organizations have sought to revive in our time. The modern attempts are not original at all (as many of our contemporaries suppose), but are revivals of the ancient Roman ideal which never since the time of Augustus Caesar has been wholly lost. It is probable that the *Pax Romana* (Roman peace), the peace of a well-ordered prison with plenty of iron gates, steel doors, trained guards, and high walls is the best the world will ever achieve till Jesus comes.

Of great significance, also, is the fact that the iron of this kingdom is

in its later stages mixed with clay. This is interpreted to mean that "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron does not mingle with clay" (v. 43).

This interpretation, however, requires some interpretation. Who are "they" who mingle themselves? The Aramaic word translated "they shall mingle themselves" will furnish part of the answer. It is *mitharbin*, a reflexive participle. Aramaic participles have gender and number, this one being masculine plural. It appears to be so in agreement with the two masculine singular nouns of the preceding clause--*parzel* (iron) and *chasaph* (clay). Hence, the conclusion (the only possible one, I think) is that the participle modifies the two nouns. So the best interpretation is that the "they" of our English version refers to the iron and clay, and that the whole sentence means that whatever the iron symbolizes in the fourth kingdom shall be thoroughly but incohesively mixed with "the seed of men" (clay) in that kingdom. "The seed of men" can hardly refer to anything other than mankind in general as opposed to some king or dynasty within the kingdom.

Anyone who is acquainted with Roman history can hardly avoid the conclusion that this refers to the influences of the masses which grew in the Roman state. During the days of the Republic it was an orderly and lawful influence. As the nature matured and grew more corrupt, it became something close to mob rule. This was something that Daniel could hardly have named. It could be described only if it was to have meaning.

*The Salient Principles of Interpreting History
of the Nations to Be Seen in the Great Dream Image*

Before moving on to the last, the eschatological portion of the dreamimage and its interpretation, some attention must be given to some general conclusions and principles which seem to prevail in proper interpretation of the whole. We may expect that conclusions regarding earlier portions will hold

for the later portions, and thus some light from that which is now history will shine on what is partial fulfillment and yet future fulfillment of predictive prophecy in the final stage of the dream. The writer discerns four principles which prevail.

(1) A continuous succession of world dominions down to the coming of Messiah's kingdom

As previously noted, the prophecy covers the "latter days," inclusive of all time from Daniel's own down to the consummation. Verse 44 speaks of the "kings," obviously in the sense of the realms they ruled, as being destroyed at the end. If this refers to the four, then in some sense the four kingdoms endure to the consummation. There is no hint of any gap or hiatus in the picture. And if Jesus' reference to the "times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24) is to the same period and aspect of history as this prophecy (and it can hardly be doubted), then no other kingdom than these four is to be expected before the final kingdom of Christ.

Now, this writer recognizes that in some prophecies of the future of a people, an unseen gap or hiatus does sometimes interrupt the continuity. He is convinced, however, that this occurs only in the case of the prophecies of Israel, and that in relation to a period when that people is out of national favor with God. The writer does not refer to that "lack of perspective" present in prophecies where *continuity* is not a subject of revelation. He insists that continuity is a part of the subject of revelation here--that the continuity of Gentile world dominion down to the end of it in the establishment of an Israelitish dominion under King Messiah is predicted.

That the Roman power shall assert itself in a more active way at the end, and that the old headquarters at Rome may even be restored, may very well be. But, from the standpoint of this prophecy, that will not be a resurrection of something now dead but rather a strengthening of something which even now lives. Many of the most honored names of Premillennial scholarship are of men who shared this view, among them Tregelles, Seiss, and Ironside.³

Observe that this truth is supported by the division of Daniel advocated in this paper. A gap that pertains primarily to a period of time when Israel is out of divine favor would be totally out of gear in a prophecy relating to a period when Gentiles enjoy the divine favor of world dominion and of which the subject is Gentile succession.

The force of these facts will grow on the reader as the argument proceeds.

(2) A progressive division of sovereignty, reaching a climax in the ten toed stage of the image prophecy

This is to be seen not only in the symbolism of the image, but also in the events and movements of which it is a prediction. The details of the image reveal progressive multiplication of the significant parts. There is, first, *one* head symbolizing one absolute ruling element. There is, next, a division into *two* arms and *two* breasts--reflected historically in the coalition of Medes and Persians in the empire of Cyrus. The belly and thighs reveal more plurality in the Aramaic original than in the English translation, for *miohi*, belly, is a plural word, possibly better translated, bowels. In the Grecian kingdom there was further division of sovereignty--traditionally considered to be fourfold. In the Roman stage, symbolized the legs, feet, and toes, there is, first a twofold and then a tenfold division, that is, two legs, two feet, then ten toes. Taking the key of progressive division of sovereignty within the world-kingdom, this must refer to the twofold division of the Roman empire which prevailed after the division into East, with capital at Byzantium, and West, with capital at Rome. Further, there is the manifold division into ten⁴ indicated by the toes. This might be thought to refer to the present divided state of the Old Roman Empire, but it seems more likely to refer to some situation at the end of Gentile dominion.

(3) A progressive deterioration in the character of the authority of the ruler

A deterioration is indicated by four things in the image and interpretation--at least one of them of unquestionable divine intention. They are, first, deterioration in the worth of the metals: gold, silver, copper, iron (and clay); second, deterioration in position from the head to base of the image; third, a divinely certified indication of growing deterioration in the words of verse 39, "and after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." A fourth is suggested by Tregelles from the fact that the specific gravity (or mass per unit of volume) decreases from head to foot. His words are:

It may be worthy of observation that the metals in the image lessen in their *specific gravity* as they go downwards: iron is not so heavy as brass, and thus their weight is so arranged as to exhibit the reverse of stability, 4 I derive "ten" as the number of toes on the image. There is not absolute proof that "those kings" of verse 44 refers to ten toes, but it seems likely. Mr. Young (*The Prophecy of Daniel*) objects that "this view must be rejected as exegetically untenable. It makes too much of the symbolism" (p. 78). However, Mr. Young does not think it making too much of the symbolism to arbitrarily introduce "the true Israel of God, the church," for which there is no exegetical basis whatsoever in this chapter. There is real evidence for the ten kings, but certainly none at all for Dr. Young's church.

68

even before we reach the mixture of clay and iron (*op.cit.*, 15).

These four phenomena I take to be indicative of the importance of this aspect of the prophecy, even granted that some of them may be accidental. One may well wonder just what elements in Gentile history were to grow progressively inferior. Extent of territory could not be meant, for each of the four kingdoms grew progressively larger in area. And if the view advocated herein (see later exposition) is correct, it continues to grow. Neither is the deterioration with respect to strength, for that also grew with each kingdom. Several considerations lead to the conclusion that it is the character or quality of the authority in rulership that is intended.

In the first place, the deterioration of the metals is primarily in

quality or value. This would be matched by quality of value in the kind of the ruler's authority.

In the second place, the Bible elsewhere describes the kind of rulership exercised by Nebuchadnezzar as something unique, not likely to appear again in the non-Babylonian successors to the world rulership. The words follow:

I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come: and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the LORD (Jeremiah 27:5-8).

In the same vein are the words of Daniel to Belshazzar:

The Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father the kingdom, and greatness, and glory and majesty: and because of the greatness that he gave him, all the peoples, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he raised up, and whom he would he put down (Daniel 5:18,19, A.S.V.).

In the third place, the very language of Daniel 2:39 indicates a deterioration in relation to the position or authority of the king. The kingdom of silver was to be "another kingdom inferior to thee." It was not to be a kingdom inferior to *his kingdom*. That it was not, for Persia outreached Babylon by far. But in the character of the sovereignty of its rulers, Persia was inferior to Nebuchadnezzar--and so also with the remaining two kingdoms.

A resumé of the history of world dominion from Nebuchadnezzar onward will present to the reader's mind precisely what is involved in deterioration of character of authority and also support the conclusion that such is the kind of deterioration involved in the imagery.

Nebuchadnezzar ruled by divine right as an absolute monarch. The Medo-Persian kings who succeeded the Babylonians were not above the law as Nebuchadnezzar was, but were subject to the laws of their own realm--bound by the legal entanglement of their own decrees (cf. Daniel 6:14,15). Alexander and his Greek successors ruled by no dynastic or royal right at all, but solely by virtue of great personal gifts and powers which enabled them to organize and control great armies. The Roman emperors, and even the early kings who reigned before the republican and imperial periods, ruled largely by the will and choice of the populace. Republicanism, which followed the monarchial period, soon degenerated into something like mob rule, especially after it merged into the imperial period. Some of the greatest emperors were affected by the passing opinions of the Roman mobs. In our own times, which if they appear in the prophecy must be in the fourth period, government in the West has tended to become nearer to the dead level of socialism, and even "the dictatorship of the proletariat." Our American republic (ofttimes miscalled democracy) is based on the supposition that sovereignty rests in the people--that government is only by the consent of the governed. As Lincoln so eloquently put it, it is "government of the people, for the people, and by the people." Tregelles discerns the deterioration in the character of the authority of the rulers, but does not clearly distinguish it from the division of sovereignty in Rome (*op.cit.*, pp. 14-18).

(4) A progressive improvement in the hardness of the metals and in their Strength

The one seeming exception is the clay, which, though in a vitrified form, is harder than iron, but is not very strong. However, this element is introduced as an extraneous element in an otherwise unbroken progress in

strength. This is reflected in the increasing strength and prevalence of each of the kingdoms. I take it that while the clay represents the ultimate in debasement of the character of sovereignty, it does not represent the ultimate in the strength of the kingdoms.

The Eschatological Portion of the Interpretation

Now comes the dénouement. The last, or eschatological portion of the prophecy is reached. When the final, that is, the Roman, age of Gentile history is prevailing, when a climax of division of sovereignty has been reached, presumably many nations being organized into some kind of a loose union in which all men give *their* authority to a ruler or head of some kind, when Gentile power is at its height of strength (though dangerously brittle by reason of a low grade of sovereignty, *then* the end comes.

44 And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. 45 Forasmuch as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure" (Daniel 2:44,45, A.S.V.).

It is in this section of the oracle that the Premillennial system of eschatology makes its initial challenge and shows its superiority. All students, whether believing or unbelieving, recognize this as prophecy of the founding of the Messianic kingdom. Believing students in recent times have been divided in interpretation between the Premillennialists, who see the fulfillment in the final establishment of the kingdom of Christ at his second coming, and Amillennialists and Postmillennialists who see the fulfillment in the first advent and the events of the present age. The chief differences between the Amillennialists and Postmillennialists being that the

Amillennarians place more emphasis on the place of Christ's judgment on the nations at the end of this age.

Thomson pretty well sums up the view of our Postmillennial opponents when he writes: "Whenever the setting up of this Messianic kingdom is placed, whenever it is held as occurring, it is certain it fits most naturally the Christian Church" (*Pulpit Commentary, Daniel, p. 73*).

Leupold makes the Amillennial position quite plain when he says of the kingdom of the stone:

It shall, in fact, be a force that will be operative in the overthrow of all the kingdoms that the world produces--"All these kingdoms," for it "shall crush and bring to an end." The kingdom of God does that in part by the overthrow of the ancient and entrenched wrongs that are characteristic of all the world powers. Note how feudal systems, slavery, and caste systems--institutions of the world powers--yield before the Spirit of Christ in His Church. To some extent this overthrow is still future, for the final victory of the church coincides with the day of judgment. Then Christ and his saints shall judge and overthrow whatever of sin or wrong still remains. In this overthrow there must be included also the gentle victory of the gospel, which makes its gracious influence felt and conquers, but not with violence and bloodshed. Though thus engaged in continually overthrowing what the world constructs, such effort shall not wear out God's kingdom: "but it shall stand forever" (*Expositions of Daniel, pp. 125,126*).

The discerning reader will readily observe that both of these systems (Postmillennialism and Amillennialism) rest on a theory of church-kingdom identity--that the kingdom of God and the church are precisely identical. This is a position which cannot be sustained by Scripture, despite valiant attempts to make the Bible support it. This subject has been treated in the first section of this dissertation, and the views of Amillennialism and Postmillennialism will not be refuted at this juncture, except to observe some inconsistencies which would seem to be introduced into the Scripture if their

theories were to be adopted.

If, as it is contended, the smiting of the image by the stone, and the subsequent actions predict the establishment and growth of the Christian Church in the present age, observe what inconsistencies and objections follow.

(1) *The church, which clearly is not a political establishment, is made to be a political establishment just as were Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, and Rome.* Even in its outward organization, the church's members are to be subject to "the powers that be" and to "render unto Cæsar." To adopt the church-kingdom theory in interpreting this passage, one ought rightly to adopt the Roman Catholic religion, which claims that the church is a political establishment.

(2) *It substitutes a quiet imperceptible growth of the church in gradual conquering of the fourth kingdom for a violent, catastrophic sudden destruction of the kingdom of the Gentiles.* Some of our opponents speak occasionally of the stone as a rolling stone, and suppose a progressive destruction of the image. Others speak of quiet growth of the stone in replacing the kingdom of the image. But in the Scripture (and let all interpreters stick by it) the stone smites the image with a single, violent, catastrophic blow; forceful winds remove the fragments, and the stone *then*, after the removal of the Gentile kingdoms, becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. If it is possible for words to describe violence, these are they!

(3) *It postulates that the church either has overcome the Gentile kingdoms or will yet do so, when, as a matter of fact, it never has done so, and, according to the Bible, never will.* Postmillennialists may consistently claim to believe that the church will yet conquer the world. But Amillennialists who share with Premillennialists the view that good and bad will grow together throughout this age, and even with them (though on the basis of some different Scripture passages) expect great apostasy at the close of the present age.

(4) *The view that the smiting act is the spread of the gospel is utterly out of harmony with what is known of the Christian ethics of the New Testament.* Christians are not to supersede the authority of those that rule, but are to be subject to them. Their place is to suffer, if necessary, at the hand of rulers rather than to destroy and replace them.

Recent history, with the downward trend of human events, has all but destroyed Postmillennialism, leaving only Amillennialism to challenge the Premillennial view seriously.

Dr. Seiss, who wrote in a day when Postmillennialism was a serious challenge, has well summarized the arguments against that view to be found in this passage (*vide Voices From Babylon*, 84-86). Auberlen also has shown the failure of Postmillennialism to interpret this passage on account of its wrong view of the present age (*op.cit.*, 216-233).

Amillennialism, on the other hand, except for the church-kingdom theory adopted by many of its advocates, is less out of harmony with the Scriptures at this point and hence the present writer's duty is less with respect to its refutation.

I add only that Young's argument that the teaching in verse 44 (that the kingdom is eternal excludes the doctrine of a one-thousand-year kingdom) has no weight at all against the view of the millennium adopted herein. The view of this writer is that the millennium is only an initial stage of an everlasting kingdom (*vide Appendix I*).

The Premillennial view alone permits a natural interpretation of this chapter. There is to be no Messianic kingdom established on earth until the governments of Gentile nations have run their course. When the kingdom comes, it will be entirely of divine establishment, without human agency; it shall replace the Gentile political establishment with a divine political establishment, and shall stand forever.

Any other system of eschatology must spiritualize the passage or else

ignore the plain facts of it.

CHAPTER VI

The Prophecy of the Four Great Beasts and of the Ancient of Days

DANIEL 7:2-27

As in the case of chapter two, portions of this chapter and questions not related intimately to eschatology will not receive any extended treatment. We may rejoice that in general all schools of believing opinion agree on the large part of the chapter. It is only where variant views of the *rôle* of the church in the present age and eschatology enter that the disagreement comes. And it is just at this point that the premillennial eschatology again shows its superiority.

It is generally agreed that chapter seven relates to the same subject and scheme of prophecy as chapter two (exceptions are Hitzig and Bonnar¹). The correspondences are too close to be missed or explained away. The differences between the dream prophecy of chapter two and the vision prophecy of chapter seven are chiefly as follows: (1) The *dream* was not seen originally by a man of God but by a heathen monarch, hence it was something that would appeal to such a man and which might be readily explicable to his intellect. The *vision* was seen by a holy man of God, and hence in terms more readily explicable to his intellect. (2) The *first* presented the history of nations in their outward aspect--majestic, splendid; the *second* in their inward spiritual aspect--as ravaging wild beasts. This might be elaborated to say that the first is a view of the history of nations as man sees them, the second as God sees them. Since the same general subject is treated in this vision as in the dream of chapter two, it is natural that the same general principles present in that prophecy should follow here--the same series of powers, the same continuity of rule, degeneration in character of authority, division of sovereignty, and increasing strength of the kingdoms.

However, it is not to be expected that this will be mere repetition of the prophecy of chapter two under different figures. We might expect some elaboration and enlargement of details. And, this is just what does take place in chapter seven. The fourth (Roman) kingdom which in chapter two is given no more particular treatment than the first three is here picked out for special treatment. Furthermore, the final Antichrist who does not appear at all in chapter two is here introduced (as a "little horn") and identified as the final king of the fourth kingdom.

Since, as has been pointed out, chapters two to seven relate particularly to Gentile affairs, but chapters eight to twelve to Israel's future, it might be expected that there would be some sign of a transition to that subject in the last portion of this oracle. This is precisely what does happen. A shading off which leaves Israel, Israel's God, and Israel's future in the center of the scene of interest takes place. Israel is seen at war with Antichrist in the closing verses of this prophecy and the prophecy closes with Israel in possession of the long promised kingdom.

I shall not burden the reader with the inclusion of a particular commentary on the main details of the vision of Daniel. The chapter should be clearly in the reader's mind, however, if he is to appreciate the difficulties and understand the arguments.

Postmillennialists see the succession of Babylonia, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome in the four beasts which appear on the scene. They also see the Messianic Kingdom in the coming of the kingdom of one like the Son of man. The "little horn," who blasphemes and makes war on the saints of the Most High, is conceived to be the Pope or the Papal system, and the saints are conceived to be the church of the present age. The ten kings (symbolized by the ten horns) are usually taken to be either ten successive emperors of Rome or ten contemporaneous kings ruling in various parts of the Roman empire. Different postmillenarians interpret the ten horns differently, but all agree that they are historical kings now long dead. The victory of the kingdom of Messiah is conceived to be gradually accomplished within the present age, but to be

consummated at the second coming of Christ.

Amillennialists (I am citing the views of Young) see the same succession of four kingdoms in the four beasts. However, the beast with his ten horns, and finally with a little horn, is said to represent three stages of the Roman kingdom: The first stage, indicated by the beast itself, lasts till the destruction of the Roman empire, say about the middle of the fifth century; the ten horns represent merely that a number of kingdoms will succeed to the Roman kingdom and shall rule; the little horn represents a final Gentile king who shall be destroyed by the Lord at His second coming. The "saints" of the vision are the church of the New Testament, who will suffer special persecution near the close of this age.

The strict Premillennial interpretation, advocated by this writer, holds that the four beasts are the same four kingdoms set forth by the orthodox Postmillennialists and Amillennialists. In this the major believing schools of thought agree. But thereafter the agreement disappears. We hold that the horns represent Roman kings, that those kings are contemporaneous within the Roman period, that they are not yet known but are the same as those symbolized by the ten horns on the first beast of Revelation 13:1 ff. We hold the identity to be practically demonstrated by the obvious similarity of the visions and the principle of progressive revelation of divine truth. It is hardly likely that two such similar figures would symbolize different things. Of these ten, John specifically says (Rev. 17:12), "And the ten horns that thou sawest are ten kings, who have received no kingdom as yet; but they receive authority as kings with the beast, for one hour." This, I think, settles the fact of their contemporaneousness. Furthermore, the connection of Revelation 17, even apart from a futuristic interpretation of Revelation in general--the connection, I say, with obviously eschatological events, settles the futurity of these ten kings and places them in an eschatological context.

75

The "little horn" we hold (in common with most commentators) to be the Antichrist. Antichrist I hold to be a person who will arise in the end of this age, who will gain mastery over the whole world for a brief period, and will be

destroyed by the Lord at His second coming (II Thes. 2:1-9; Rev. 13:1-10).

The "saints" I hold to be no different from "the people of the saints" in the passage before us (see below). They are the Israelites of the end time who will at last inherit the kingdom of David with Christ Himself reigning as their king.

Finally, the kingdom of the Most High, said to be "an everlasting kingdom," is none other than the Kingdom of Christ, of which the first stage is the Millennium, elsewhere treated in this dissertation.

That the Premillennial interpretation alone is a satisfactory explanation is demonstrated by the following:

(1) The facts of the prophecy demand that the kingdom of Messiah follow the kingdom of the Gentiles--that its very establishment awaits the destruction of those kingdoms, being at no point of its history contemporaneous with those kingdoms.

The kingdom of Christ is not represented as being established till after the final beast of the series "was slain, and its body destroyed, and it was given to be burned with fire." This is in complete harmony with the prophecy of chapter two. There the kingdom of the stone does not gradually grow up during the final stage of the image's prophetic history, but the stone kingdom comes with force, destroying violently the image. After the destruction of the image, after its very dust has been blown away, the stone becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth.

This is the basic fact that Amillennialists and Postmillennialists must face. This fact alone discredits both systems of interpretation. It simply is not possible to have an earthly kingdom of Messiah present during the Roman period of Gentile history and harmonize it with the facts of these two prophecies.

Related to this is another:

(2) The kingdom of the Most High succeeds a final form of the Roman kingdom, a form in which that kingdom has not to the present moment appeared.

The Roman kingdom is symbolized by a diverse beast which, in addition to other less significant features, had on its head ten horns. These ten horns are "ten kings" (v. 24). Among these ten horns another "little horn" arises. That he arises while the ten are still prevalent is required by the fact that this little horn uproots three of them (vs. 8, 24). He arises later than the ten, and in this sense is "after them" (v. 24), but while they still prevail as kingdoms.

Furthermore, if three of these were plucked up by one on his arising, it is obvious that the horns are intended to represent contemporaneous, not successive, kingdoms.

This same final stage of tenfold division is symbolized also in the prophecy of chapter two. True, it is latent there, not specific, but it is there nevertheless. In the first description of the image, no further division of details is made after the mention of the feet (2:33). But in the interpretation it is further specified that "thou sawest the feet and toes" (2.41). It sounds to me slightly like sophistical reasoning to hear it said that no mention is made of ten toes (Young). Anyone who ever counted the toes of a normal man would know that if this image of man had toes there would be ten of them. That the toes were to symbolize kings is the evident meaning of verse 44a. I present the portion to make this clear.

42 And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. 43 And whereas thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron doth not mingle with clay. 44 And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed... (Daniel 2:42-44, A.S.V.)

To argue with the Amillennialists that "those kings" of verse 44 are the four successive kingdoms is out of harmony with the facts of the symbols and their interpretation. In only one case, the head of gold, are the king (Nebuchadnezzar) and the kingdom equated. Furthermore, the connection of the "toes" in verse 42 and of the "kings" in verse 44 is too close to allow any conclusion except that the toes do represent the kings destroyed by the coming Christ.

Now to the present moment, the Roman kingdom has not assumed this form. Grant even that the number ten is intended only to represent a large but indefinite division of the empire (which may possibly be true), and the fact remains that the "little horn," whom many Amillennialists as well as the majority of Premillennialists recognize to be the final Antichrist, has not yet appeared among them and uprooted three. Until he does, the kingdom of Messiah is in a definite and unique sense a future thing.

Related to this fact is still another:

(3) The kingdom of Messiah clearly follows the appearance of Antichrist and his destruction, which events are still in the future, as explained by the New Testament.

Auberlen says: "Here for the first time in the development of revelation, the idea of Antichrist is clearly unfolded, because here for the first time the entire course of the development of the godless and God-opposing world is clearly surveyed down to its end" (*op.cit.*, 39). Observe further that in this first clear unfolding of the doctrine of Antichrist, his personal existence is at least suggested by his description (eyes of a man, mouth speaking great things, etc.) and by his actions (making war with the saints).

Nearly all Postmillennialists, Amillennialists, and Premillennialists unite in affirming that the Man of Sin of Paul and the Antichrist and first Beast of John are the same as this "little horn" of Daniel seven.

Innumerable reasons can be advanced for rejecting the prevalent view of Postmillennialists that the Pope or the Papal system is Antichrist. However, there is one grand reason which makes all the others unnecessary. That reason is that Paul makes it clear in the second chapter of II Thessalonians that the appearance of the Antichrist is an eschatological event to take place only at the end of this present age. As we have shown elsewhere in this paper, his coming is associated with certain events which at the present moment are still future. (Please refer to the discussion of Antichrist in the first section of this dissertation.)

But now we call on our Amillennialist friends to look, and to look steadily for a moment, at the fact that the kingdom of Messiah which they contend was established at the beginning of the present age is in this chapter specifically predicted to appear after the appearance and destruction of Antichrist, and *only* after the appearance and destruction of Antichrist. In the next place:

(4) The kingdom established by Messiah at His coming is a kingdom of power and glory, not one of suffering and cross-bearing.

This is evident in both chapters two and seven. The language is applicable only to an all-prevailing, irresistible, glorious, civil as well as religion kingdom. This utterly does away with the Postmillennial view. It also militates against the Amillennial view, for though they do allow that in final manifestation the kingdom will be thus, they postulate a present *earthly* kingdom of Christ under the same figure when the figure will not allow it.

They are placed in the unenviable position of trying to have their logical cake and eat it too. Their church kingdom they try to relate to the "saints" in the passage, but the saints are clearly not the kingdom here, but the ones who after a period of suffering receive a kingdom. So even granting (which I do not) that the saints herein are the New Testament church (Young, Keil, Leupold), their theory will not fit.

Finally,

(5) The Kingdom of the Most High is Jewish in some definite sense, just as our Premillennial doctrine affirms of the coming kingdom of Messiah.

In verse 14 it is affirmed that "one like unto a son of man" is to receive the world dominion, and that this is the final everlasting dominion. Commentators, almost with one voice, agree that this is Christ possessing His kingdom. But let it be remembered that Christ or Messiah is a Jewish conception and the very name specifies His office as Jewish king.

In the verses following 14 it is four times affirmed that the "saints" shall possess the kingdom, presumably Messiah's kingdom. The identity of these "saints" or holy people is the important question. In my opinion Auberlen was precisely correct when he wrote:

By the "people of the saints of the Most High," to whom dominion is then to be given (Dan. 7:18-27), Daniel evidently could only understand the people of Israel, as distinguished from the heathen nations and kingdoms, which were to rule up till then (2:44); nor have we, according to strict exegesis, a right to apply the expression to any other nations; hence we cannot apply it immediately to the church....The prophet's words refer to the re-establishment of the kingdom to Israel, concerning which the disciples asked our Saviour immediately before His ascension: and our Lord, though refusing to reveal to them the date or chronology, did in no way negative the subject matter of their question, and thereby confirmed it (Acts 20:6,7) (*op.cit.*, 216,217).

This matter is crucial for the Premillennial view, and needs full examination.

The fact that the church of the New Testament is to be joined with Christ in the rulership, as set forth in Revelation 20, is irrelevant to the question. That is a New Testament revelation. The question is, Does this chapter affirm

that Israel, the covenant nation, shall have a place in that kingdom, and in a real sense possess it? If so, then, a national restoration is in the plan of God for that nation.

There are five references to this group (v. 18): "the saints of the Most High," *qaddishe elyonin*, the same expression is used in verses 22 and 25. In verse 22 they are also simply called "saints," *qaddishim*, and in verse 27, "The people of the saints of the Most High" *am qaddishe elyonin*.

To one versed in the Old Testament Scriptures, these can be understood in only one fashion--of the covenant nation Israel. Consider the evidence. The Hebrew adjective equivalent to the Aramaic *qaddish*, saint, is *qadosh*. In Exodus 19:6 it is used of Israel and of Israel only in her peculiar relation to God as His covenant people. In Leviticus 20:7,26 it is used in the same sense as also in Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2,21. The Hebrew noun *qodesh* is also equivalent to this Aramaic word, and is used of Israel and of Israel only in this special sense of describing a people peculiar to God. This use appears many times.

However, one need look no farther than the Book of Daniel itself to find who the "saints" or "holy people" are. Chapter eight may contain eschatological material, viewed in a typical fashion, but most interpreters of every school of eschatology unite in regarding it as primarily a prophecy of the conflict of the Jewish people with the Greek kingdom of history, especially as it developed between the Jews and Antiochus Epiphanes. Now, in verse 24 the Jewish people are called by this name: *am qedoshim*, in the English versions translated, "the holy people" but in the Hebrew literally (cf. A.S.V. margin) "the people of the saints." This is as near a linguistical equivalent of the name given the people of Daniel 7:27, "the people of the saints of the Most High," as is possible. Even Dr. Keil, Dr. Leupold, and Dr. Young, whom I regard as the leading advocates of the Amillennial approach to Daniel, think that this expression refers to the Israelites in chapter eight. Why not, then, the same in chapter seven? There is only one answer. It does not harmonize with the exigencies of their eschatological system.

Again, Daniel 12:7 mentions the "holy people" (*am quodesh*). There also, as in chapter seven, they suffer for three and one-half times (or years). The correspondence with the suffering of the saints of chapter seven for the same period of time (7:25) is unmistakable. Neither can it be seriously questioned that this refers to the same tribulation of Israel prophesied in 12:1. There these folk are called "the children of thy [Daniel's] people," and "thy [Daniel's] people."

Dr. Keil, for all his learning and unquestionable piety, is certainly in error when he writes:

The circumstance that in Daniel's time the Israel according to the flesh constituted the "holy people," does not necessitate our understanding *this* people when the people of God are spoken of in the time of the end, since then the faithful from among all nations shall be the holy people of God (*Commentary on Daniel*, 491).

The whole point is that Daniel was referring to his own people when he used these terms, and whatever the New Testament may add does not contradict this simple fact.

Dr. Delitzsch, the famous collaborator with Keil on the Keil and Delitzsch commentaries, regarded it "as an essential progress in prophetic theology...that the following three ideas are recognized in their intimate connection:--1. Israel in prophecy is not merely a type of the church; 2. that Israel has yet a future; and 3. that before the last judgment there shall be a time of a glorious kingdom of God" (Auberlen, *op.cit.*, 219). With these words of Dr. Delitzsch, all Premillennialists will heartily agree.

These facts demonstrate sufficiently that Premillennialism, and only Premillennialism, gives a satisfactory explanation of "the Prophecy of the Four Beasts and of the Ancient of Days."

CHAPTER VII

The Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks

DANIEL 9:24-27

The difficulty of the verses which now lie before us is evident to anyone who has even attempted a cursory examination of them. As they stand in the Authorized Version, they are more than enigmatical. Pick up almost any two commentaries from the same school of eschatology, and it is not likely that there will be agreement on the meaning of all the details of interpretation. Premillennial writers of two or three generations ago were very far apart on the details. Much of the same diversity appears in Premillennial contemporary writers.

For example, take only what is usually called the *terminus a quo* of the prophecy. Tregelles thinks it was the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the Persian king, 454 or 455 B.C. (*Remarks*, 99), and that it is the decree of Artaxerxes recorded in the second chapter of Nehemiah. Anderson advocated the same decree but set the date at 445 B.C. West, quite to the contrary, adopted the view that it was the decree of Cyrus recorded in the first chapter of Ezra and dated it tentatively at 536 B.C. (*Thousand Years in Both Testaments*, 129). Auberlen adopted still another, the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and advocated the seventh chapter of Ezra as the description of it. The same diversity of opinion prevails among Premillennial as well as other writers.

These difficulties manifest in the diversity of opinion among devout and learned men have not, however, prevented general agreement on the main significance of the prophecy. Interpreters of all schools have conceded, "notwithstanding all minor differences as to the details of this prophecy, that the central meaning of the seventy weeks was to be sought in the life of Christ; and the diversities in the interpretation of details may all be reduced to those that flow from three sources, a difference in the starting point, a difference in the chronology of the life of Jesus, a difference in the chronological methods selected by the various commentators as a basis"

(Havernick, quoted by Auberlen, *op.cit.*, 92). Thus belief (with rare exceptions like Stuart in America and Hofmann in Germany) always has presented a united front against unbelief which would attempt to find the fulfillment of the prophecy in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. I caution the reader, however, not to construe these foregoing remarks to mean that this writer feels that the *terminus ad quem* of the full seventy weeks is to be found in any event near the earthly lifetime of our Lord, for such is not my opinion.

I mean to say only that the 490 years of the prophecy run at least to the lifetime of Jesus, in which case the prophecy puts to rout the unbelieving higher criticism which sees nothing of minute prediction in the book beyond the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

In full harmony with the division of the Book of Daniel into a Gentileslanted portion and a Hebrew-slanted portion, the division falling at the conclusion of the Aramaic section (7:27), this oracle concerns Daniel's people and them alone. It is given in answer to the very Hebrew prayer of a Hebrew prophet in very Hebrew style. Furthermore, in the mind of the prophet it develops out of the problem of the seventy years of captivity of the Hebrew people in Babylon.

Now, as we come to the prophecy itself, we may expect that details of former oracles of the book will be enlarged and some of the mysteries cleared up. Chapter two gave the grand outline of four Gentile kingdoms to be succeeded by a fifth and last, the kingdom of God Most High. The seventh chapter developed around the same grand outline, but enlarged the revelation concerning the fourth, introducing also the final Antichrist, and presented him in conflict with God's holy nation, Israel. It also showed that Israel would have a peculiar and special place in the kingdom of the Most High. However, as chapter nine opens, the people of Israel are in dispersion and captivity under a foreign king--and their land in heathen hands, their holy city Jerusalem a heap, and their temple a ruin. It will be around the future of that land, that city, that temple, and the Hebrew people that this chapter's revelations will gather. There will be revelation concerning the immediate future, during which

the temple and city will be restored to Daniel's people; there will be promise of the coming of their Prince Messiah to consummate that restoration at the end of a specified time, an enigmatical prophecy of His rejection and death, to be followed by the destruction of their city, and more remotely by an unhappy and tragic liaison between Israel and the false Prince, the Antichrist, introduced in chapter seven.

Omitting the introductory prayer and vision of the prophet, we come immediately to the apocalypse of Israel's future given by Gabriel's mouth to Daniel.

24 Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. 25 Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: it shall be built again with street and moat, even in troublous times. 26 And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined. 27 And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease: and upon the wing of abominations *shall come* one that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate (Daniel 9:24-27, A.S.V.).

It is difficult to attempt any scientific discussion of these verses in the space of a chapter in a dissertation. Many books have been written to set forth particular interpretations. Several have been written within the last ten or fifteen years. To attempt to evaluate this literature which runs into the hundreds of volumes is impossible, and probably useless also. Therefore,

my procedure will be to learn what can be learned from the Scriptures themselves, largely without reference to other works--not that the other works are without value, but because it is simply beyond the scope of this book to treat them.

Many Premillenarian scholars have found nothing in these verses which requires any interpretation essentially distinctive to Premillennial eschatology. To illustrate: though Amillennial Dr. Young views the weeks as symbolical periods--not specifically either days or years, Postmillennial Dr. Barnes views the weeks as of years, and Premillennial Dr. Auberlen also views the weeks as years; the three men are in general agreement as to the full scope of the prophecy. They think that the seventy weeks run their full course by the time the history of the early chapters of the Book of Acts has run its course. Auberlen thinks it was at the time of the death of Stephen or thereabouts. It was signaled by the turning of the apostolic witness from the Jews to the Gentiles. In this Barnes agrees approximately. And though Young would frequently disagree with Auberlen's Premillenarian views on other matters, he announces no essential disagreement on this score, merely expressing a rather hopeless ignorance of any event with which the conclusion of the seventy weeks may be said to occur.

There are, however, some features of this prophecy which cannot be placed in the past--there are some which are unmistakably eschatological. Dr. Keil, who certainly had no Premillennial leanings and devotes many pages to refutation of the Premillennialism of Auberlen and Hofmann, saw a prediction of Antichrist in the "prince that shall come" (v. 26).

But, while recognizing that there did seem to be an eschatological element in the prophecy, Keil could not offer a satisfactory explanation of the bearings of the whole prophecy on eschatology, though he devoted sixty-five pages of his commentary to these four verses. His contention is that the *terminus ad quem* of the seven weeks is the appearance of Christ and that the appearance of Christ is also the *terminus a quo* of the sixty-two weeks, the cutting off of Messiah (interpreted as defeat of Christianity at the close of

this age) being the *terminus ad quem* of the sixty-two and the *terminus a quo* of the seventieth and last. The sixty-two weeks, then, cover the present age, except for the one week at the end, which will close with the second coming of Christ to destroy Antichrist. This, I submit to the readers, is something close to nonsense, supported neither by an objective treatment of the passage nor by judicious examination of many better explanations.

Premillennialism, and only Premillennialism, has a better explanation to offer. For long ages past there have been those who saw a better explanation of the passage, and they have been Chiliasts or, as we now say, Premillenarians.

In pursuance of the purposes of this book, I now present the features of the book which require the Premillennialism I support for a rational explanation. The presentation will take the form of five propositions.

1. The seventy weeks are 490 years, which relate wholly to the then future of Israel.
2. The seventy weeks are divided into three periods of seven, sixty-two, and one, which follow one another and run successively.
3. The first sixty-nine weeks ran out during the lifetime of Messiah and before His crucifixion.
4. The death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, both mentioned in the prophecy, are events which follow the close of the sixty-ninth week and precede the beginning of the seventieth week.
5. The seventieth week pertains to a seven-year relationship between the Antichrist and Daniel's people Israel, in eschatological times, and concludes with the second advent of Christ.

(1) *The seventy weeks are 490 years, which relate wholly to the then*

future of Israel.

The opening words of chapter nine discover Daniel pondering on the conclusion of a matter which related wholly to the fortunes of his people Israel. He knew by studying the prophecies of Jeremiah (cf. Jer. 25:11) that the duration of the Babylonian servitude was to be seventy years. Daniel had a personal interest in this duration, for (cf. Dan. 1:1 ff.) he himself had been among the first band of captives which Nebuchadnezzar had taken from Jerusalem in the year 606 B.C.

He may well have wondered in this, the sixty-ninth or seventieth year (the first year of Darius was probably about 536 B.C.) of his own captivity, if God meant to begin counting the seventy years from the date of his own captivity (in 606 B.C.) or if one of two other possible dates might be intended. A king (Jehoiachin) had been taken captive with a large group, including the prophet Ezekiel, in 598 (cf. Ezek. 1:1 ff.). And it was about twelve years after this that the Judaeen kingdom came to an end with the deposing of Zedekiah and the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. If the second date were the one intended, then Daniel's and his people's release would have to wait eight or nine more years, till 528 B.C., or, if the third, till 516 B.C. One can well imagine that Daniel wondered if he might live to see the release come.

It is to be observed (if we may anticipate the details of the prophecy) that Daniel was in somewhat the same position as the saints in the years shortly before and after the birth of Jesus. If they knew the prophecy of the 490 years--483 of them to run out before the appearance of Messiah--they may well have wondered if the starting point when the command went forth to "restore and to rebuild" was the decree of Cyrus (536 B.C., Ez. 1:1 ff.), the first decree of Artaxerxes (Ez. 7:1 ff.), or the second decree of Artaxerxes (I do not choose to discuss here the identify of the king or kings) described in the first chapter of Nehemiah. The difference in time between the first of these and the last is no less than ninety years. I think this explains the quiet expectancy of Simeon (Luke 2:25 ff.) and of others at the time of

Christ's birth, "looking for the consolation of Israel."

At any rate, Daniel's pondering and prayer related only to the fortunes of his people, and he was thinking in terms of a Hebrew prophecy of seventy years. No doubt--and I think there is no room to doubt it--he wondered also if the end of the seventy years would usher in the advent of the long-promised Messiah Prince to save Israel and rule the nations.

When the answer of the Lord came, by way of the mouth of Gabriel, the answer also is specifically said to relate to Israel: "Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city." No reputable interpreter would claim that Daniel's people were any other than Israel, according to the flesh, and that his holy city was other than Jerusalem, the capital of Judah. This is precisely what would be expected, as previously noted, in this the distinctively Hebrew portion of Daniel's prophecies.

Let the Postmillennial and Amillennial commentators look long and steadily at this fact. This prophecy is a prophecy for Daniel's people and Daniel's city. No alchemy of Origenistic spiritualizing interpretation can change that. This prophecy must be something which promised the restoration of the people to the divine favor, return to their land, revival of their capital city, and restoration of the ancient line of kings who reigned there. The specific details of the latter part of the prophecy serve only to emphasize this truth.

As to the claim, herein, that the weeks of the prophecy are weeks (lit. sevens) of years, little really needs to be said, even though volumes have been written on the subject. I have examined many commentaries on the subject and have yet to find one serious commentator who taught otherwise, unless he had some private theory to defend by interpreting otherwise.

The most untenable view of all is the one that these sevens are only symbolic periods (Keil, Young, Leupold, *et al.*). This makes the assigning of proportional lengths to the divisions into seven, sixty-two, and one mean

precisely nothing, whereas I hold it to be obvious that a precise value was to be assigned. Anything else would make the Scriptures misleading to readers who expect the Bible to make sense. Even symbols should make sense--but a view (like Keil's) that lets seven equal approximately 560 years, sixty-two something more than 1900 years, and one a wholly unknown number of years, is not sense. It is nonsense.

Dr. Alva J. McClain (*Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks*) has aptly summarized the evidence for the view that the weeks referred to are sevens of years. After pointing out that there is nothing in the passage to indicate that the "week" is a seven of days, as the English versions seem to suggest, and that the Hebrews had a "week" or "seven" of years which was just as familiar to them as the week of days, he presents the following reasons for believing that Daniel had reference to the seven of years. I quote:

In the first place, the prophet Daniel had been thinking not only in terms of years rather than of days, but also in a definite multiple of "sevens" (10 x 7) of years (Dan. 9:1,2). Second, Daniel also knew that the very length of the Babylonian captivity had been based on Jewish violation of the divine law of the Sabbatic year. Since, according to II Chronicles 36:21, the Jews had been removed from off the land in order that it might rest for *seventy* years, it should be evident that the Sabbatic year had been violated for 490 years, or exactly seventy "sevens" of years. How appropriate, therefore, that now at the end of the judgment for these violations the angel should be sent to reveal the start of a *new era* of God's dealing with the Jew which would extend for the same number of years covered by his violations of the Sabbatic year, namely, a cycle of 490 years, or "Seventy Sevens" of years (Dan. 9:24).

Furthermore, the whole context of the prophecy demands that the "Seventy Sevens" be understood in terms of years. For if we make the "sevens" of days, the entire period would extend for merely 490 days or a little over one year. Considering now that within this brief space the city is to be rebuilt and once more destroyed...it becomes clear that such an

interpretation is altogether untenable.

McClain's last argument rests on the fact that in the book of Daniel, wherein the word "week" appears in only one other passage (10:2,3), it is stated that the prophet mourned "three full weeks," the meaning is obviously weeks of days--but is indicated by the addition of days *yamim* to the word *shabhuim*, weeks. This, he rightly argues, indicates that a change from the usage in chapter nine is meant.

The arguments are valid. And, I repeat, most of the best commentators of every school recognize that whatever the problems of adjusting the seventy weeks to the facts of subsequent history, weeks of years are probably meant. Thus a basis for exposition of the prophecy is laid in the fact that the seventy weeks are 490 years, which relate wholly to the then future of Israel. (2) *The seventy weeks are divided into three periods of seven, sixty-two, and one, which follow one another and run successively.*

Some of the proof for this statement must of necessity await the development of the following propositions. Yet, the statement is needed at this point in the argument, if only as an observation as to the simplest and most obvious meaning of the text. Says Gabriel: "Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks" (v. 25). Then later he mentions that one "shall make a firm covenant with many for one week" (v. 27).

I think it is perfectly clear to the unbiased reader that Gabriel intended Daniel to know and discern that there would be two periods of the seventy weeks before "the anointed one, the prince," and one afterward. There is a comma after "seven weeks" in the English versions, indicating a break in thought. There is also an *athnach* in the Hebrew at this point, indicating (sometimes) a break in thought. But neither the comma nor the *athnach* are sufficient to require the conclusion that a complete break in thought is intended at that point. If so, then (as Keil insists) the angel meant that

"from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem shall be seven weeks"--period. The obvious explanation of the seven weeks, or forty-nine years, has been recognized by hundreds of critical readers and by far the majority of evangelical commentators as the period during which, as the verse goes on to say, Jerusalem "shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troublous times." It is true that there is no precise information in the latter books of the Old Testament as to how long this period of rebuilding the city was. We do know that even after the decree of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah (the latest acceptable date for the *terminus a quo* of the prophecy) there were delays and much opposition, as we learn in the Minor Prophets as well as in Nehemiah. I, for one, in the absence of any better information, am fully prepared to assert that whenever the decree went forth, forty-nine years later the work was done. The second period of sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, then covers the period from the completion of the work on the city to "the anointed one, the prince." The terms *mashiach nagidh* are both indefinite, and could literally be rendered "Messiah, a prince." I shall not enter into the arguments for the position that this is a designation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is so generally accepted among the class of commentators whom believing Christians accept, and so little controverted in current or past Christian literature of the believing kind, that it is unnecessary. The only real problem is to establish the event in the life of our Lord to which reference is made. It is obviously some occasion when His official claims as the anointed priest-king and ruler among the people should come officially before the people. There are only two possible occasions, it seems to me (and the commentators bear this out)--the baptism and the triumphal entry.

Now, the significant thing about this period of 483 years (seven plus 62 weeks) is that if our accepted calendars and chronologies are correct, it is *almost* exactly 483 years from the latest possible date for the beginning of the weeks (decree of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah) to the closing years of Christ's life, which brings us very close to the time of the baptism and triumphal entry. If there were no further evidence than this remarkable correspondence between the interpretation and the facts of history, there would be strong presumption of

truth in its favor. However, if the reader will examine "*The Coming Prince*" by Anderson, whose mass of data is simplified in much more readable form by McClain (*op.cit.*), he will find much more precise and striking correspondence even than this. I am not personally competent to judge Anderson's scientific data, nor to say categorically that I am sure his calculations are correct--but I can say that even if Anderson is wrong on some of the fine points of his thesis--if we accept the ordinary solar year and the usual date for the decree of Artaxerxes rather than the revised dates and the prophetic year of 360 days, the correspondence is too close to be accidental and is a remarkable confirmation of the view adopted here of the division of the weeks.

The final week of the seventy is mentioned in verse 27. It appears strangely after a verse which seems to describe events not belonging to any of the weeks. The details of these verses will be treated under the propositions which now follow.

(3) *The first sixty-nine weeks ran out during the lifetime of Messiah and before His crucifixion.*

Having now seen that the sixty-nine weeks have as their point of termination "the anointed one, the prince," more special attention must now be given to this terminal point.

Neither the A.S.V. translation nor the Authorized ("the Messiah, the prince") is wholly satisfactory. The Hebrew words are used absolutely; that is, they are without prefixes, suffixes, articles, or modifiers of any kind and are in what is called the absolute state. They stand in immediate juxtaposition, as follows: *mashiach naghidh*.

Leaving this passage, for the present, in every use of the word *mashiach*, anointed (adjective, masculine, singular), except three, it is used substantively with a pronominal suffix (that is, a possessive pronoun) or with a possessive noun. It is in all these cases "his anointed," "mine anointed," etc., or "the Lord's anointed," etc. In the three other cases the word is used

attributively, and hence they do not bear on the use in our passage where the word is a substantive in use.

This being the case, it can hardly be otherwise intended than as a descriptive proper name--*Messiah*, or translated into English, *Anointed*. Priests and kings (and on at least one occasion a prophet also) were by Hebrew custom inducted into office with the anointing ceremony. Prophecy assigned to the coming deliverer of Israel all of these office. This being the case, it seems clear that the official position of Christ as the final great prophet of whom Moses spoke, the great high priest who would in his own self accomplish the work of bringing the nation to God, and the great "shoot out of the stem of Jesse" who would consummate the kingship of David's dynasty, are meant. Messiah, then, was His primary name with reference to Israel, and He gathers up all His functions in relation to that people.

The other word in the series, *naghidh* (A.S.V., the prince) is translated captain, ruler, leader, governor, prince, and is frequently used of the function of the kings of Israel, being first used of Saul. Significantly, it is seldom used of any except an Israelitish ruler of Israelites. Usually it is of "my people," "Israel," "the camp," or some other designation of Israelites. For this reason it seems likely that it applies to Messiah's supreme position among Israelites rather than to His yet future mission to judge and rule the nations.

So, the terminus of this prophecy of sixty-nine weeks is the appearing of Christ as the Messiah-leader of "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" to whom alone, in His first advent, our Lord said He came. The events of the second advent are completely out of sight still at the conclusion of the sixty-nine weeks.

As previously indicated, there are some who suppose that the event which placed our Lord before Israel as their *Messiah Nagid* was the baptism. But the baptism had no reference to the presentation of Christ to man--it was rather a self-dedication of Christ to God, and act which procured for Him the Father's

approval, but since it had no reference to Israel evoked no response from them at all.

The plain fact is that at no time in His life did Christ plainly and publicly present Himself to Israel as their *Messiah Nagid*, except at the time of the so-called triumphal entry. It is the opinion of this writer that no other event fits the language of this text and the record of history (so also Seiss, Ironside, Anderson, McClain, et al.).

The crucifixion it could not be. Important in time and eternity as that event was, it certainly was not a presentation of Christ as the *Messiah Nagid* of Israel--and all the attention given by some writers to Pilate's inscription on the cross does not make it so. The fact that settles this is the language of our prophecy. The terminus of the sixty-nine weeks is described as *Messiah Nagid* in verse 25. It is clearly some presentation of a person that is meant--not an era within the sixty-nine weeks. Then verse 26 plainly goes on to say, "And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing." These words have been interpreted in various ways. Some think that the cutting off refers not to the death of Christ, but to His loss of that which was rightly His as Messiah (so Keil) and is equivalent to "shall have nothing" in the same verse. This may very well be true, but if so the crucifixion was merely the final step in that loss, if such it is. With the majority of the commentators, therefore, and also in harmony with the first meaning of *Karath* to "cut off," which usually specifies a violent kind of death, I take it to refer to the crucifixion.¹ Note that this death of Christ was to take place "after the threescore and two weeks" (v. 26). There can be no honest difference of opinion about that--the cutting off of *Messiah* is "after" the sixty-two weeks. It is not the concluding event of the series of sixty-two weeks. Neither is it said to be the opening event of the seventieth.

It is simply after the seven plus sixty-two weeks. The Hebrew *weachare* (and after) does not designate how long after--it could be immediately afterward or a thousand years afterward--but it must be after.

It should not be necessary to discuss whether the *Messiah Nagid* of verse 25 and the Messiah of verse 26 are the same. By any fair consideration of the obvious meaning of the passage, they cannot be otherwise, as most agree.

(4) The death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, both mentioned in the prophecy, are events which follow the close of the sixty-ninth week and precede the beginning of the seventieth week.

It will not be necessary to repeat the evidence for stating that the death of Christ was to take place after the conclusion of the sixty-ninth week. Attention must now be directed to the statement following the reference in verse 26 to Messiah's being cut off. The whole statement is as follows: "And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary."

It is of utmost importance to see that whatever is meant by the destruction of the city and sanctuary, it is joined in time with the cutting off of Messiah as "after the threescore and two weeks." Dr. Keil labored at length to prove that the sixty-two weeks began with some event in the earthly life of Christ and that they end with the last strokes of victory for the church in this present age, the church being the "city" which the angel predicts will be built. Leupold, reflecting an interpretation common in his church, holds the same view. However, Young, Amillennial in his theology like Keil and Leupold, rejects this interpretation of the prophecy as untenable and frankly admits that the seven plus sixty-two weeks come to an end before the death of Christ and maintains that the death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem described in verse 26 take place in the seventieth week.

But the language of verse 26, both in the Hebrew and in the English of the American Standard Version, clearly specifies that the cutting off of Christ and the destruction of "the city" by "the people of the prince that shall come" not only follow the close of the sixty-ninth week but precede the beginning of the seventieth.

I do not feel called on to labor at length the view that the destruction of the city is that of Jerusalem by the Romans in the first and second centuries A.D. It has been always the prevailing interpretation.

Neither is there any difficulty with our Amillennial friends over the identity of "the coming prince," or, as the version has it, "the prince that shall come." Keil and Leupold recognize him as the final Antichrist, said to be "coming" because already selected for prophecy in *direct language* in chapter seven as "the little horn," and in *type* in chapter eight as "the little horn." Young thinks otherwise, but is outweighed on his own "team."

That the opening of the seventieth week is subsequent to the events of verse 26 is manifest by the text itself. The seventieth week is not picked up for mention till verse 27 is reached. When that point is reached, it is introduced by a *waw consecutive*,² indicating that the contents of verse 27 are subsequent and consequential in relation to verse 26. All attempts to place the events of verse 26 (the cutting off of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem) in either the period of the sixty-two weeks (Keil and Leupold) or in the seventieth week (Young and a host of writers in the past) stumble and fall on the simple language of the text itself. There is but one natural interpretation--and that is the one which regards the events of verse 26 as belonging to a period between the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks, when God has sovereignly set aside His people Israel, awaiting a time of resumption of covenant relationship in the future, after Israel has been restored to the land.

This writer cannot help but reflect on the possible explanation for a man like Dr. H. C. Leupold, who issued a lengthy, and in many respects valuable, commentary on the Book of Daniel in 1949 without so much as a reference to this "gap," "hiatus," or "intercalation" in this prophecy. Surely he knows that some of the greatest names in Biblical study in Germany, England, and America are listed among the advocates of these things. I think of Nathaniel West, Samuel Tregelles, Joseph Seiss, Sir Robert Anderson (who merits this

distinction)--if we are to ignore the host of popular writers who have given these views currency in the last several generations. One feels moved to suggest courteously to Dr. Leupold that there are some writers outside the Lutheran fold who have written worth-while treatments on Biblical questions, and that at least a few of them were more versed in English than in his beloved German. He could profit by giving them some attention.

(5) The seventieth week belongs to a seven-year relationship between Antichrist and Daniel's people Israel in eschatological times, and concludes with the second advent of Christ.

This is required by the language of the last verse of this prophecy, verse 27, which reads as follows:

And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate.

To develop this proposition in full would require a book at least as great in bulk as this book. The reader who is informed in eschatological matters will recognize that here the writer must for the sake of brevity deny himself the privilege of following the theological trails very far beyond the strict limitations of the text before us. Indeed, it is not necessary to go beyond the verse itself to demonstrate the truth of this proposition.

In the *first* place, the ordinary rules of grammar establish that the leading actor of this verse is the Antichrist--the great evil man of the endtime. "He shall make a firm covenant" etc.--thus the verse opens. A more literal reading of *wehighbir berith* is: "And he shall cause to prevail a covenant." If the pronoun "he" were present in the Hebrew, a case might possibly be made for the introduction of an entirely new personality into the story at this point. However, there is no pronoun--only the third masculine

singular form of the verb indicating that an antecedent is to be sought, and that of necessity in the preceding context. There is only one antecedent admissible, according to the accepted rule that the last preceding noun which agrees in gender and number and agrees with the sense is the antecedent. This is unquestionably the *naghidh habo*, "the coming prince" of verse 26. He is a "coming" prince, that is, one whom the reader would already know as a prince to come, because he is the same as the "little horn" on the fourth beast of chapter seven. He is a Roman prince because he is of the people who destroyed Daniel's city after the restoration of the first seven weeks, and also because the "little horn" of chapter seven can be only a Roman prince. He is Antichrist, because Paul and John clearly identify this personage of Daniel's prophecy as a final evil personage--the final Antichrist.

In the *second* place, the parties with whom the Antichrist of this verse deals can be identified only as Daniel's people Israel. His dealings are *larabbim*, literally, "with the many." It is significant that this word *rabbim* is used in Isaiah 52:14 of the Jewish nation which rejected Christ at his first coming, and in Isaiah 53:12 of the same Jewish nation whose sins He bore. But even aside from this evidence, which, of course, is not conclusive in itself, the opening words of Gabriel's prophecy remain--these seventy weeks were decreed on Daniel's people Israel, and on Daniel's city of Jerusalem.

Furthermore, this evil prince is presented in chapter seven as persecuting the "people of the saints," who have already been identified in this paper as Israelites, for a period of "a time, times, and half a time." The correspondence of this period (which easily could be interpreted as three and one-half years) with the three and one-half years of this verse (second half of the week) during which this prince shall be not a blessed anointed prince but an abomination, is too close to be accidental. They unquestionably point to the same thing--persecution of Israel by Antichrist.

In the *third* place, this verse places a certain blasphemous act of Antichrist in the seventieth week, which act is elaborated in II Thessalonians and in the Revelation and definitely placed in an eschatological setting. I

have in mind the word *weal kenaph*, rendered in the common English version, "and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate." The American Standard Version renders it, "and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate." Leupold renders it, "and upon the wing of abominable idols shall the destroyer come." Young translates it, "and upon the wing of abomination (is) one making desolate."

The record of discussion of the translation of these words is simply tremendous. The translation which appeals best to me recognizes the same person, Antichrist, as the subject of all the verbs in the verse down to the last clause, and which would then translate the whole verse: "And he shall cause to prevail a covenant with the many for one week, and at the middle of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease, and upon the wing of detested things desolating, even unto consummation, and that determined shall be poured out on the desolator." More will be said of this translation later.

The important thing to know is that almost every reputable commentator of every school, and that includes even the unbelieving higher critics, discovers an act of desecration of the Jewish temple either specifically prophesied or shaping the form of language used. There are almost no exceptions. The Greek translations, both of the Seventy and of Theodotian, whose translation has for many centuries replaced the version of the Seventy in the Greek Old Testament, plainly imply the same. The Greek of the Seventy is *epi to hieron bdelugua tes eremoseos*, rendered by Boutflower, "over the temple there shall be an abomination of desolations." Theodotian is the same except for the singular number of the last word. Furthermore, this is connected immediately in the verse with an act of Antichrist said to take place in connection with Antichrist's causing "sacrifice and oblation" to cease.

Now, it should be clear to everyone that such acts as these cannot take place except that Jewry be worshiping in a rebuilt Jewish temple under some kind of an arrangement or league with Antichrist. It also seems clear that just such an arrangement is predicted in the words of our text: "And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week."

Now will the reader observe that the future existence of a Jewish temple is predicted in Revelation 11:1,2; that the same passage also predicts that for forty-two months (the three and one-half years of Daniel 9:27) the holy city shall be trodden under foot. The correspondence with this prophecy can hardly be accidental. Furthermore, in a passage whose interpretation cannot be questioned, Paul predicts that just before his destruction by Christ at his second advent, Antichrist shall sit "in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God" (II Thes. 2:4).

These predictions of Paul and John can hardly be wrested from their obvious relationship to Daniel 9:27, and I say this demonstrates the truth of our proposition that the seventieth week belongs to a seven-year relationship between Antichrist and Daniel's people Israel in eschatological times.

A *fourth* reason for this view is that the last events of the seventieth week are said to be: "even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate." A better translation of the last phrase is "upon the desolator." If the first translation be adopted, a full end of idolatry and persecution of God's people is specified; if the second, then the final destruction of Antichrist. In either case, the concluding event of the week must be the coming of Christ in glory to destroy Antichrist and to rescue his people.

A *fifth* reason, not based on my own fallible interpretation of the text, nor on the tracing of a connection of this text with similar events in the eschatological portions of Paul's and John's inspired writings, but upon what appears to be the interpretation of Christ Himself, is this: that our Lord interpreted the event which marks the mid-point of this seventieth week to be in the period of time immediately preceding His own advent in power and glory. The Septuagint translation of this passage, as already noted, contains the expression *bdelugma ton eremoseon*, intended quite evidently as a translation of *shiqqutsim meshomem* in the Hebrew text. It is not a very good translation, it must be admitted, but it does not distort the essential meaning of the text, which is evidently a reference to some consummate act of

sacrilegious idolatry. Now, our Lord made reference to this phrase in His Olivet discourse and quoted it almost exactly as it appears in the Septuagint.

It is true that Daniel contains the same expression in the Septuagint rendering of 12:11. But I see no reason for asserting that Daniel referred to one of these in particular (as Tregelles does), for it seems quite obvious that the reference is to the same event in both cases. The taking away of the regular sacrifices is connected with the setting up of this abomination of desolation in both passages. I think he had both texts in mind.

The important thing may easily be lost in the confusion about the translations. But it need not be, for it is as obvious as can be. Jesus simply said in this, the most extensive of his eschatological discourses, "When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place...." (Matt. 24:15). He said this to indicate that the appearance of this abomination of desolation would be a sure sign of the immediate end of the age and of His coming in glory. He had just said, "But he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto the nations; and then shall the end come" (v. 14). In such a context, I repeat, the setting up of the abomination must be understood as a sign of the immediate end of the age. This is further emphasized in the words which follow. These verses (16-28) describe a time of tribulation and persecution for God's people. Verse 22 adds that the time will be shortened, that is limited. (This must have reference to the fact that it will extend for only the three and one-half years of Daniel's prophecy.) Then verses 29 and 30 add, "But immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the son of man...coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

I regard this as incontrovertible evidence that Jesus placed the seventieth week of Daniel's prophecy in the last seven years of this present age, thus specifying that it would be the last seven years of human history

before His own return in power and glory.

The *sixth* and final reason for believing that the seventieth week is yet future and ends coincidentally with the coming of Christ in His kingdom is that the scope of the prophecy set forth by Gabriel (Daniel 9:24) requires that the last week terminate no earlier than the coming of Christ in His kingdom at the second advent. I mean to say it presupposes the rule of God among men and the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.

Gabriel said: "Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy."

There are six infinitive clauses:

- (1) to finish transgression,
- (2) to make an end of sins,
- (3) to make reconciliation for iniquity,
- (4) to bring in everlasting righteousness,
- (5) to seal up vision and prophecy,
- (6) to anoint the most holy.

Three common views have been adopted among believing commentators concerning the scope of these six clauses. The least acceptable one, advocated notably by Stuart, is that which views all six of these blessings as following the conclusion of the seventy weeks, which conclusion is said to be in the events connected with the destruction of Antiochus Epiphanes. The idea is that the seventy weeks specifically concern the remaining years of Israel's submission to and persecution by Gentile power. This is thought to terminate with Antiochus. The six blessings are then said to be simply the Messianic Kingdom, conceived in a Postmillenarian fashion. Another, championed notably by Barnes among the Postmillennialists, by Young and Mauro among the Amillennialists, and by Auberlen among the Premillennialists, regards the

seventy weeks as terminating shortly after the death of Christ and the six blessings as being conferred within the seventy weeks. These men feel that "it was by the cutting off of Messiah that the six predictions of verse 24 were to be fulfilled" (Mauro, *The Seventy Weeks*, 43,44). Mauro states the view succinctly: "When our Lord ascended into heaven and the Holy Spirit descended, there remained not one of the six items of Daniel 9:24 that was not fully accomplished" (*ibid.*, 53).

A third position, adopted by Thomson (Daniel, *Pulpit Commentary*) among the Postmillennialists, by Keil and Leupold among the Amillennialists, and by almost all the Premillennialists of the past seventy-five years (West, Anderson, Gaebelien, Kelly, Tregelles, Seiss, Ironsides, McClain, Cooper, Brooks, Larkin, Chafer, Bauman and many others) is that these six blessings arrive in full only at the termination (immediately after) of the seventieth week. These men generally recognize that the *basis* was laid in the grand providence of God which took place at the death of Christ but contend that the full effecting of these blessings comes only at the second advent. The following considerations settle the matter in the favor of the third view.

In the first place, the seventy weeks are preserved throughout the verse as a *singular* subject of all the infinitive clauses. *shabuim shibim*, "seventy weeks" is indeed plural, but the verb, *nechtakh* (simple degree, passive voice, third person, masculine gender, *singular* number), translated "decreed," shows that Gabriel regarded the seventy weeks as a *single* unit in the divine determination. *Seventy weeks IS [not are] determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city*. This being the case, if the accomplishment of one of these six can be fixed at the second coming of Christ, the full accomplishment of them all awaits the same event.

In the second place, it can be shown that at least the last of these six awaits its accomplishment at the second advent of Christ. Keil devotes five pages to proof of this point. Leupold also give much attention to the same point. The promise is "to anoint the most holy," or, according to the American

Standard Version margin, "to anoint a most holy place." The Hebrew, *limshoach qodesh qodashim*, is literally "to anoint a holy of holies."

Now, Young disposes of all of Keil's weighty and cogent argument, as well as the linguistic evidence, with a single stroke of the pen. But this cannot rightly be done. The simple fact remains, as Keil demonstrates, that the American Standard Version marginal reading gives the sense of the passage: "to anoint a most holy place," that is, a temple of Jehovah God of Israel. The linguistic evidence is unquestionably in this direction. In only one passage in the entire Old Testament (I Chron. 23:13) can these Hebrew words be used of any other than the temple or some one of its parts. It would be exceedingly strange for Gabriel to depart from the usual meaning here in a passage so closely tied in thought to the rebuilding of Solomon's temple.

And "if thus the anointing of a most holy is here announced, then by it there is given the promise, not of the renewal of the place already existing from of old, but of the appointment of a new place of God's gracious presence among His people, a new sanctuary....Since this statement is closely connected with those going before, and they speak of the perfect setting aside of transgression and of sin, of the appearance of everlasting righteousness, and the shutting up of all prophecy by its fulfillment, thus of things for which the work of redemption completed by the first appearance of Christ has, it is true, laid the everlasting foundation, but which reach their completion in the full carrying through of this work of salvation in the return of the Lord" (Keil, *op.cit.*, 348,349).

As an Amillennialist, Keil's views of the course of events after the second advent naturally differ from mine. But his arm and pen are mighty in proof of the essential contention here, namely, that the blessings of these seventy weeks promised in the passage arrive at the conclusion of the series of seventy, a conclusion which is marked by the second advent of Christ in power and glory.

For these six reasons, furnished almost entirely by the language of the

text of Daniel itself, it is evident that our proposition is correct, that, indeed, the seventieth week belongs to a seven-year relationship between Antichrist and Daniel's people Israel, in eschatological times, and concludes with the second advent of Christ.

SUMMARY

In summation on the prophecy of the seventy weeks, five facts appear: that (1) the seventy weeks are 490 years, which relate wholly to the then future of Israel; (2) the seventy weeks are divided into three periods of seven, sixty-two, and one, which follow one another and run consecutively; (3) the first sixty-nine weeks ran out during the lifetime of Messiah and before His crucifixion; (4) the death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, both mentioned in the prophecy, are events which follow the close of the sixty-ninth week and precede the beginning of the seventieth week, and (5) the seventieth week pertains to a seven-year relationship between Antichrist and Daniel's people Israel, in eschatological times, and concludes with the second advent of Christ.

In support of the crucial fifth of the propositions cited above, six arguments have been set forth, as follows: (1) the grammar of the passage indicates that the "*prince*" of verse 26 is none other than the Antichrist of end-time prophecy, and it is he who makes a covenant, thus associating the prophecy with eschatological events. (2) The "*many*" with whom this prince makes a covenant are shown to be none other than Daniel's people Israel, thus placing that ancient people in an eschatological situation. (3) The blasphemous act of the prince in desecrating the temple, described in the words, "For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate," is placed by Paul (II Thes. 2:4) and John (Rev. 11:1 ff.) in an eschatological setting. (4) The prophecy specifies that the seventieth week will end forever (v. 27) Jewish idolatry and persecution, or, on the basis of an alternate translation, with the final undoing of Antichrist--neither one possible short of the second coming of Christ. (5) Our Lord Himself interpreted this prophecy as a prediction of events at the close of this age (Matt. 24:15); and (6)

finally, the scope of the prophecy which is said (cf. v. 24) (a) to finish transgression, (b) to make an end of sins, (c) to make reconciliation for iniquity, (d) to bring in everlasting righteousness, (e) to seal up vision and prophecy, and (f) to anoint the most holy, requires that it include end-time events.

Finally, it appears that only a Premillennial system of eschatology can approach a full explanation of the details of this prophecy or utilize all the facts of it. Postmillennialism fails because of its wholly wrong view of the course of this age. Amillennialism fails because it does not wish to recognize the peculiarly Israelitish flavor of the prophecy, which promises a rich future for Israel *after* the return of Christ in glory, and the *rôle* of Israel in conflict with Antichrist during the last years of this present age. On the other hand, our doctrines of Antichrist, of the restoration of Israel, and of the Great Tribulation find not only support but [also] their chronological unraveling in this prophecy.

CHAPTER VIII

The Prophecy Concerning Daniel's People Among the Nations Especially at the Time of the End

DANIEL 10:14; 11:36-45; 12:1-3

The last three chapters of Daniel are one oracle, not three. In this respect the chapter divisions of Daniel do not do the book justice. Up to the end of chapter nine the chapter divisions do separate distinct prophecies, but the chapter divisions between chapters 10, 11, and 12 serve only to confuse the reader, for the section is one prophecy. If the parts were united, they would compose one chapter of seventy-nine verses (chapter two has 49).

The prophet's experience herein is a marvelous culmination of growing spiritual experience in the life of Daniel, and in his function as a prophet and seer. In chapters two and four he interprets the dreams of another; in

chapter five he interprets a divine writing; in chapters seven, eight, and nine he sees visions of his own and in the *rapt* state one (Gabriel) appears to interpret his dream to him. But in this last culminating prophetic experience, he seems to see visions in the *natural* state--divine revelations evidently are brought before him in his ordinary waking condition (*vide*, 10:4-7).

A large portion of this prophecy has been suspected by many evangelical scholars as spurious. It is often said to be overlaid with a Targum. Suspected portions are 10:1, 15-21; 11:1, 5-25. No convincing textual evidence, however, has ever been produced against these sections. Really, about all this criticism has done has been to sort out most of the noneschatological material.

In harmony with the procedure in the previous portions of this dissertation, I shall treat in detail only those portions which relate to eschatology. Here, however, a real problem arises. How much of these chapters is eschatological?

Before entering into a formal discussion of this problem, a sketch of the whole prophecy is in order. This I shall present in the form of an outline.

OUTLINE OF THE PROPHECY

I. The Introductory Revelation (chapter 10)

1) The circumstances of the Revelation (1-4)

2) The description of the revealer (5,6)

3) The effect of the revelation (7-9)

--on Daniel's companions (7)

--on Daniel (8,9)

4) The reason for the granting of the revelation (10-12)

5) The scope of the prophecy (13,14)

6) The strengthening of the prophet (20,21)

7) The encouragement of the prophet (20,21)

II. Prophecies Concerning the Nations as They Move Toward Final Conflict with Israel (chapter 11)

1) Introduction (1)

2) Prophecy concerning Persia (2)

3) Prophecy concerning Grecia (3,4)

4) Prophecy concerning the historic king of the south and of the north (5-20)

5) Prophecy concerning the vile person, last of the so-called kings of the north (21-35)

6) Prophecy concerning the willful king (36-45)

III. Prophecies Concerning Israel at the time of the end (chapter 12)

1) Concerning the great tribulation (1)

2) Concerning the resurrection of the dead (2)

3) Concerning the final reward of the just (3)

4) Concerning the disposition of the prophecy (4)

5) Concerning final questions (5-12)

Conclusion to the Prophecies of Daniel, final words to the prophet (13)

Eschatological Sections of the Prophecy

There is small doubt in the minds of any except a very few that the first portion of chapter 12 is prophecy concerning "last things"--in the theological nomenclature, "eschatology." Events connected with the resurrection of the dead and final rewards and punishments can hardly be otherwise.

If there were a clean break in thought between chapters 11 and 12, it might be possible to say that all of the previous section of the prophecy relates to events of now past history. But such a break does not exist.

Rather, a chronological connection is clearly provided between the last of chapter 11 and the first of chapter 12 by the opening words of chapter 12. Referring to the destruction of a certain king whose career is predicted in the last part of chapter 11, chapter 12 opens thus: "And at that time (*ubhaeth hahi*) shall Michael stand up," etc. Thus a clear connection with the eschatological prediction of chapter 12 is established for the last portion, at least, of chapter 11.

On the other hand, the predictive portion of the prophecy, which begins with 11:2, deals with ancient kings and kingdoms throughout the early portion of the chapter. First, the kings of Persia, then the king of Greece, and next the kings of Egypt and Syria after the age of Alexander come to view. This brings us down to verse 20. Commentators are quite in agreement up to that point. From verse 21 onward, however, there is not this agreement. A "contemptible person" is introduced in verse 21 and traced through verse 35. By far the majority of commentators feel that he is none other than Antiochus Epiphanes--the little horn of chapter eight. A very few think he is the Antichrist of the end-time. Keil feels that he is primarily and directly Antiochus and typically Antichrist--just as he feels about the little horn of

chapter eight. Some of these interpreters think that Antiochus is the theme of the prophecy to the end of chapter 11.

My own opinion (following the majority of recent Premillennial commentators) is that the prediction relates to Antiochus from verse 21 to verse 35, but that beginning with 36, Antichrist, by the designation of "the king who shall do according to his will," is the theme of the prophecy, to the close of chapter 11. With the view mentioned above, that Antiochus is described in verses 21-35, and that the history detailed is typical of Antichrist's future career, I have no quarrel. Yet I do contend that verses 36-45 are *directly* predictive of the career of Antichrist and of him alone.

In pursuance of this contention, I present a brief of the evidence that the prophecy concerning the willful king in Daniel 11:36-45 is an eschatological prediction relating to the career of the final Antichrist:

(1) The scope of the prophecy, as indicated by the angelic revealer, permits, if it does not demand, an eschatological element in the prophecy. I have reference to Daniel 10:14, which reads: "Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for the vision is yet for many days." There are two expressions here, designating the scope of the vision--"latter days" and "for many days." The first is a technical term taken out of the previous prophetic literature of Israel, and always in Scripture includes some eschatological reference. This is recognized by the vast majority of evangelical scholars of all schools of eschatology. Leupold's comment (*in loco*) is quite typical: "In all instance that we know of, this term reaches out into the Messianic age. Obvious instances are Genesis 49:1; Numbers 24:14; Isaiah 2:2. We believe that the same is the case in this instance." The other expression, "for many days," is literally "for the days." Whether it be taken as referring to the "latter days" or only, as most commentators allow, to long extended futurity, this expression also counts for an eschatological reach to this prophecy.

For those who believe in the accuracy of predictive prophecy, it is of most importance that

(2) the correspondence of the predictions of chapter II with now past history breaks down at the end of verse 35. I mean to say that if verses 36-45 were intended to refer to Antiochus, the last great Seleucid king, then the author appears to be guilty of introducing error into the Scriptures. There is nothing known in history which corresponds to the prediction of Daniel 11:36-45. Evidence of this is the utter confusion in the commentaries of those who insist that Antiochus is the chief figure down to the end of the chapter.

(3) The statement in 11:36 that "he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished" suggests that the fulfillment of the predictions of the willful king is in eschatological times. "The indignation" is another technical term out of Israel's prophetic literature, referring frequently to the wrath of God on men in the last times. We have previously dealt with the Great Tribulation of Israel in the end-time. During the time of that tribulation of Israel, God will be dealing in wrath with the Gentiles also, and frequently that wrath on the nations of men is called *zaam*, "indignation." The word appears twenty-two times in the Old Testament, and while it does not always refer to this particular indignation, it sometimes does. Isaiah 26:20 is a good illustrative passage. It is not conclusive, of course, but it does bear some weight.

Of greater weight is the fact that

(4) this predictive section corresponds so precisely with other unquestionable predictions of Antichrist that the identity of the reference can hardly be doubted. Leupold, Young, and Keil of the Amillennial school as well as most of the Premillennial writers agree in this. The behavior of the "little horn" of chapter seven, the "man of sin" of II Thessalonians, and of "the beast" of Revelation 13 is so strikingly similar that on this basis of correspondence alone a strong case could be built. This king not only does according to his will, but he "shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods" (11:36), just as John reveals (Rev. 13:6) of "the beast." He also "shall magnify himself above all" (11:37), just as Paul says of the man of sin (II

Thes. 2:3 ff.). He meets his end at the end of "the indignation" (11:36,45) and that in an unusual manner, just as Revelation 19:20 says the "beast" will come to his end. Each one of these features is found, as indicated above, also in chapter 7 in relation to the "little horn."

(5) Another expression, "at the time of the end" (11:40), seems to indicate eschatological times. I do not feel that this evidence, taken by itself, can be pressed too far, for obviously the end of whatever series of events is in the mind of the author is designated by the expression, "time of the end." This is not necessarily a series reaching on to the consummation of the ages. However, it is quite clear from 10:14, which fixes the scope of the prophecy to include "the latter days," that the "time of the end" in this prophecy is with reference to the period consummated by the establishment of the Messianic kingdom.

(6) The conclusive and decisive evidence for an eschatological setting of the prophecy of the willful king (Dan. 11:36-45) is (as noted in passing above) the phrase at the opening of chapter 12. This phrase is "And at that time."

Then follows a listing of three of the most important events of eschatology--the great tribulation of Israel, the resurrection of the dead, and the final reward of the righteous. It is unquestionably true that if the career of the willful king and his conflicts with the king of the south and the king of the north are at the time of these things, then he is none other than the final Antichrist.

But, having settled that some of the last portion of Daniel 11 refers to Antichrist, it remains to show that the portion begins at verse 36. Tregelles was convinced (though not without qualifications) that the prophecy shifted to Antichrist with the mention of "a contemptible person" (v. 21). The parallel of the history of this person in chapter 11 with the history of the "little horn" of chapter eight led Tregelles in this direction, inasmuch as he regarded the little horn of chapter 8 as Antichrist. That there is much to lead one in this direction is clear. Verse 35, for instance, places the

persecuted saints of this section in the "time of the end," and this is called "the time appointed" in both verses 27 and 35. Furthermore, there is much obvious parallel between the respective careers of Antiochus and of Antichrist. So, while I feel that Antiochus' career (chapter 8, 11:21-35) is adumbrative of Antichrist's, it also appears that the prophecy of Antichrist (11:36-45) may be reflected backward to Antiochus. To one acquainted with the technique of the prophets, this will not appear strange. It is one of the commonest of phenomena to find events of similar nature, but separated widely in time, united in one prophetic oracle. Barnes calls it the "law of prophetic suggestion." Delitzsch said that prophecy is "apotelesmatic." This being the case, Keil is correct when he says: "These circumstances...show that in the prophetic contemplation [Daniel 11:20-45] there is comprehended in the image of one king what has been historically fulfilled in its beginnings by Antiochus Epiphanes, but shall only meet its complete fulfillment by the Antichrist of the end" (*Commentary*, 462,463). The interested reader will find a very good history of the interpretation of Daniel 11:36-45 in Keil's *Commentary*, 461,462.

My reasons for dividing off the directly eschatological prediction at the beginning of verse 36 are four.

In the *first place*, a natural break in the thought appears at this point--a break which sets off the last ten verses from the previous narrative. This break is noted by the American Standard Version. The same version also makes a break at the end of verse 39, but the obvious sense of the passage is that the same willful king is discussed on both sides of the break.

In the *second place*, as many have noted, the known correspondence of the history of the past (during the age of Antiochus) breaks off at the end of verse 35. Since nothing in the past is known to correspond with verses 36-45, it is quite proper to look for such correspondence in the future,

In the *third place*, a totally new subject is introduced at the beginning of verse 36. Up to that point the immediate portion of the chapter is dealing with the king of the south (Egypt), the king (Antiochus) of the north (Syria),

and their conflicts one with another and with Israel. Here, however, the willful king is a third party in conflict with both kings.

In the *fourth place*, since this fourth party may be identified by correspondence with other predictions of Antichrist, as Antichrist, it seems most likely that the point at which his career is begun in the prophecy (v. 36) is the place at which to begin the eschatological interpretation. Begin somewhere it must, and it is not possible to introduce it later in the chapter.

The Crucial Eschatological Data

In a commentary, all portions of this eschatological section would call for attention. However, the purpose of this dissertation, to establish that Premillennialism alone can adequately explain all the book, requires that we turn our attention only to the verses which occasion disagreement among the various schools of eschatology.

With the main portion of the prophecy of Antichrist (11:36-45), there is no necessary quarrel either with Amillennialists or with Postmillennialists. Reputable representatives of both these schools join with Premillennialists in recognition of the fact of Antichrist, and of the general character of his person and career. Neither is there any disagreement over the final reward of the righteous (12:3). All Christians are in agreement on this.

The conflict arises chiefly with the recent expressions of Amillennialism over three things: first, the predicted conflict of Antichrist with Israel (11:41,45), the tribulation of Israel (12:1), the resurrection of the dead (12:2). Few commentators provide extended treatment of these at this stage of their commentaries, for the same subjects (except for the resurrection) appear much earlier in Daniel and hence the views have been expressed previously. I shall follow their example in making my remarks as brief as possible--and for the same reasons.

(1) The conflict of Antichrist with Israel (11:41,45)

The passages involved are now presented, as follows:

He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall be delivered out of his hand: Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon....And he shall plant the tents of his palace between the sea and the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him (Daniel 11:41,45, A.S.V.).

Premillennialists have a reasonable explanation of this passage. The passage means literally what it says. He (Antichrist) shall seek to destroy Israel in his own "glorious land" (Palestine) and to obliterate the then revived worship of Israel in the land. This is the most obvious explanation of the statements that "he shall enter also into the glorious land," and that "he shall plant the tents of his palace between the sea and the glorious holy mountain." Most commentators of all schools admit that this is, indeed, the *literal* meaning. We further believe that the prophecy, "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him," is fully explained in a literal fashion by Paul (II Thes. 2:2 ff.) and by John (Rev. 19:11 ff.). This interpretation accepts the doctrines of a final Antichrist, of a restoration of Israel to the land in the latter part of this age, and of a millennium during which Israel is blessed to follow this age.

Postmillennialists and Amillennialists have almost nothing but hopeless guesses to offer by way of interpretation of this section. The Amillennialists especially, since they generally believe in the literal existence of the Antichrist in the last days and in a literal interpretation of the willful king, are hard put to explain these verses.

I submit Dr. Young's comments on verse 45--hopeless confusion of literal interpretation, symbolical interpretation, and of pure speculation--as constituting their own refutation and a demonstration of the inability of Amillennialism to interpret this passage.

The *tents* of his pavilion is about equivalent to *his royal pavilion*.

This he will plant (note that the future is employed. We are dealing with the language of predictive prophecy) as one plants a tree, i.e., he will establish between the sea and holy mountain of Delight (lit., between seas to the mountain of the delight of holiness). The plural, *seas*, is poetic (cf. Deut. 33:19) and the reference is to the Mediterranean Sea. The *glorious holy mountain* is Jerusalem or Zion. Hence, the king is to make his final stand between the Mediterranean Sea and Jerusalem. This statement cannot possibly apply to Antiochus, since he died at Tabae in Persia. It should be noted that in placing the destruction of the great world power which opposes the people of God near to Jerusalem, Dan. is in harmony with other similar references (cf. Joel 3:2, 12 ff.; Zech. 14:2). However, inasmuch as such names as Egypt, Moab, Edom, Ammon, etc., are employed in these verses in a symbolical sense, so also is this present description employed. Precisely what is the significance is difficult to determine. At any rate, the great final enemy of the people of God, the Antichrist, will make his last stand and will come to his end in territory which is sacred and holy (peculiarly delighted in by the people of God--note the expression *mountain of the delight of holiness*--does this have reference to the church?). His end will be complete, apparently brought about by the glorious return of the Son of God from heaven" (*op.cit.*, 253).

I rejoice, of course, that Mr. Young plainly affirms his belief in the validity of predictive prophecy here. It gives me assurance that I read the writing of one who believes in a supernatural Christianity and a divine Christ--one with whom I can have true Christian fellowship. His affirmation that Antichrist is the king herein gives added fellowship in the Word and leads me to believe that we share the "Blessed Hope." I do not rejoice, however, that while insisting on the literal meaning of the prophecy down to the mention of things which plainly pertain to God's people Israel and to their land--in an eschatological setting--he immediately shifts into a symbolical interpretation.

There is absolutely no justification for interpreting the prophecy of Antichrist's end in a literal Palestine and then interpreting "the mountain of

the delight of his holiness" as the church, unless it is a system of theology which will not accept the restoration of Israel. And I think it is this prejudice alone which explains this shift. Neither is there any evidence that the other nations mentioned in the chapter are symbolical only.

In similar fashion, Leupold declares that "the picture is apparently taken from the location of Jerusalem, and so Jerusalem again appears as the prototype of the church of the last days" (*op.cit.*, 523). Keil, while frequently referring to the people of this chapter as the people of God, or Israel, plainly indicates that it is not the ancient people Israel but the church of the last days (*op.cit.*, 482). The fact is, the people are not referred to as God's people (which could, indeed, taken absolutely, refer to the church) but as "the children of thy people" and "thy people" (12:1), that is, Daniel's people. Everyone knows who they were--the people of Israel.

(2) *The tribulation of Israel* (12:1, A.S.V.)

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

Precisely the same situation prevails with reference to this prediction that holds concerning the one just treated. The recent Amillennial writers follow Keil in admitting, what Premillennialists also believe, that this describes conditions of the last days under Antichrist. But, contrary to the Premillennialists, they transfer all the references to Israel to the church. My discussion on the tribulation of Israel in the first part of this book and the remarks just previous on the conflict of Antichrist with Israel pertain here also.

(3) *The resurrection of the dead* (12:2, A.S.V.)

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

This is an important text, and more than passing attention must be given to it.

I think that Gaebelin was gravely in error and most inconsistent when he wrote:

Physical resurrection is not taught in the second verse of this chapter; if it were the passage would be in clash with the revelation concerning resurrection in the New Testament....We repeat, the passage has nothing to do with physical resurrection. Physical resurrection is, however, used as a figure of the national revival of Israel in that day (*The Prophet Daniel, 22*).

The thing so utterly unacceptable about this is that Gaebelin adopts the very "spiritualizing" or "symbolizing" principle of interpretation which our opponents adopt--and that in the midst of a passage where everything else is esteemed (by Gaebelin and all Premillennialists) to be literal, not figurative. He does with this passage precisely what the Postmillennialists and Amillennialists do with the reference to a first resurrection in Revelation 20. Thus he throws away the hermeneutical advantage of Premillennialism. Gaebelin's categorical assertion is so utterly without foundation that it does not merit further attention. As Robinson says: "If a resurrection of the body is not here declared, it will be difficult to find where it is, or to imagine words in which it can be" (quoted by Biederwolf, *Millennium Bible*, 236). Tregelles asks, "If the language of this verse be not declaratory of a resurrection of the dead, actual and literal, is there any passage of Scripture at all which speaks of such a thing as a resurrection?" (*op.cit.*, 168).

Now, granting, with the almost unanimous support of all believing interpreters, that physical resurrection is here predicted, to what resurrection does it refer? Biederwolf (*op.cit., in loco*) has classified the views as follows:

(1) To the general resurrection at the end of all things.

(2) To a limited resurrection immediately after the tribulation, and prior to the last and general resurrection, and one confined to Israel.

(3) To a resurrection of the righteous just before Christ's second coming, and of the wicked at the end of time, no notice being taken by the angel of the hiatus between them.

(4) To a resurrection of all that sleep in the dust after the time of great tribulation; the good, at that very time (immediately after), and the wicked later, at the end of all time, with no notice taken by the angel of the hiatus or intervening time.

The first of these views, that the reference is to the so-called general resurrection at the end of all things, is championed by many Amillennialists and Postmillennialists. The second, third, and fourth views are views adopted by different Premillennialists. Several of the rationalistic commentators as well adopt view 2.

The second view is acceptable to pre-, mid-, and post-tribulation rapturists (among the Premillenarians). So also is the third view. The fourth is distinctive to the post-tribulationists. Nathaniel West (*Daniel's Great Prophecy*, 197) adopts approximately the same view as the fourth, though he seems to see no prediction of the resurrection of the wicked here.

Now, it must be frankly admitted, by all except the most narrowly partisan, that any one of these four general views is exegetically admissible.

The simple fact is that this verse is only the first in a long series of biblical revelations which directly, and in clear language, predict the resurrection of the dead. This being the case, the questions of Premillennialists concerning the order of the resurrection of the righteous in

relation to the tribulation and the millennium cannot be expected to be answered here. It must be admitted, however, that the close connection (joined by *waw*, and) of verses one and two gives West, Reese, and other advocates of a post-tribulation rapture strong support.

On the other hand, if the second view is adopted, no question concerning the relation of the rapture of the church and tribulation even enters the picture.

Without being dogmatic, I advocate the second view as being the one most acceptable. My reasons are as follows.

(1) The language favors a selective, or limited, resurrection rather than a general resurrection.

The first clause is *werabbim miyyesheme admath aphar yaqitsu*, "And many from the sleepers of the land of dust shall arise." "Many," *rabbim*, is less than all. Some insist (without warrant) that Jesus expanded this to mean *all* in John 5:28. But the word *rabbim* remains. And Dr. Keil, who, being an Amillennialist, might have wished that the word were *kal*, "all," says that we cannot "obtrude upon *rabbim* the meaning of *all*, a meaning which it has not and cannot have, for the universality of the resurrection is removed by the particle *min*, which makes it impossible that *rabbim* = *haribbim*, *hoi polloi* = *pantes* (cf. Rom. v. 15 with v. 12)" (*op. cit.*, 482). Keil's reference to *min*, "from" is correct. I quote him again on this point:

The partitive interpretation of *min* is the only simple and natural one, and therefore with most interpreters we prefer it. The *rabbim* can be rightly interpreted only from the context. The angel has it not in view to give a general statement regarding the resurrection of the dead, but only discloses on this point that the final salvation of the people shall not be limited to those still living at the end of the great tribulation, but shall include also those who have lost their lives during the period of the tribulation (*op.cit.*, 481).

If the reader will revert to my comments on the resurrection of the martyr saints of Revelation 20:4, he will see how well this view coincides with our doctrine of the resurrections and the Millennium (*vide.* also Appendix II).

(2) The Hebrew of the passage permits, and according to many of the best authorities, demands a translation favoring this view.

The translation, brought to the attention of the English reading public by Tregelles (*op.cit.*, 162 ff.) and advocated before him by Jewish commentators Saadia Haggaoon (10th century) and Aben Ezra (12th century), was favored by Seiss and Fawsett, and was fully adopted by Nathaniel West. As given by Tregelles, it is: "And many from among the sleepers of the dust of the earth shall awake; these shall be unto everlasting life; but those the rest of the sleepers, those who do not awake at this time, shall be unto shame and everlasting contempt."

In favor of this translation is the plain fact (already advanced) that the resurrection is to be selective. And it may be added, so far as the specific language of verse three is concerned, it is only of righteous people. If the resurrection of "all" were intended, *rabbim* would have to be changed to *kal*. The main question is, Does the Hebrew demonstrative *elleh*, which appears at the head of each of the last two clauses, bear the meaning of "these...those"? It must be admitted that this does not appear in either of our common English versions. However, the Brown, Driver, and Briggs Lexicon (most authoritative in the English language) gives this as one of the possible uses, and lists Deuteronomy 27:13, Joshua 8:22, Isaiah 49:12, and Psalm 20:8 as illustrations. This being the case, the proposed translation seems to be acceptable.

My closing remarks on this verse I wish to be, that the case of Premillennialism is not in the least affected by it. Taken in the usual translations of our English Bibles, it is capable of natural interpretation in a Premillenarian fashion. If Daniel 12:2 were the only verse in the Bible on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, a case for a "general

resurrection" at the end of time might be constructed. But, as the facts stand, the doctrine of two resurrections taught clearly in the New Testament remains as the best interpretation of Daniel 12:2--and I think the *only* acceptable one.

With these remarks the case is rested with the reader. I think the thesis of this book has been sustained: that the whole Bible teaches a Premillennial eschatology, and that eschatology alone can satisfactorily explain the predictions of the prophet Daniel.

APPENDIX I

The Time and Extent of the Coming World Dissolution

It is commonly taught by orthodox Protestant theologians of about every variety of millennial persuasion, that before the final age begins there shall be drastic changes in the present natural order.

Several texts are thought to relate to such a change, but, without controversy, the most graphic is II Peter 3:10. In order to clarify some of the Biblical material relating to the consummation of the ages and to round out some details of my own premillennial views, this discussion of the subject matter of II Peter 3:10 is added. As originally prepared in a monograph, these lines extended to over one hundred pages. I have tried to compress and condense the material as much as possible here.

The passage follows as it appears in the American Standard Version: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

It should be observed that the A.S.V. margin renders the last part of the verse "shall be discovered (*eurethesetai*) instead of "shall be burned up" (*katakaesatai*). The oldest manuscript evidence is for the marginal reading,

though the exact text is not fully certain.

A bit later Peter writes: "According to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth" (II Peter 3:13). The promise to which he refers can hardly be any other than that of Isaiah 65:17 and 66:22, wherein a new heavens and a new earth are twice predicted.

THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED

Two main problems are involved in interpreting II Peter 3:10 and these related texts: (1) When does this event (or when do these events) occur--at the beginning of the Millennium or at the close of it? and (2) What are the extent and nature of the changes involved--are they an annihilation or a renovation, and if renovation, how drastic are the changes involved?

Most readers will be acquainted with the fact that the majority of modern Premillennialists have identified (or at least synchronized) this conflagration with the judgment of the great white throne described in Revelation 20.

Amillennialists and Postmillennialists, generally, merely associate the event with the second advent of Christ and with the so-called "general judgment."

The view advocated herein is that as to *time* the new heavens and new earth anticipated by Peter and the other prophets are to appear at the beginning of the Millennium, and that in *nature* and *extent* the conflagration which introduces the new heavens and new earth shall consist of a strictly limited renovation rather than annihilation of the existing natural order. The recent Premillennialists who advocate this view are not numerous. However, George N. H. Peters, whose exhaustive work (entitled *The Theocratic Kingdom* etc.) sets forth his views, is a notable advocate of it. To him the present writer owes a debt of thanks for suggesting many of the arguments now to follow.

THE TIME OF THE CONFLAGRATION

To conserve space and words, the views of the writer with the evidence for them will be briefly stated. The reader will kindly attribute what may seem to be excessively terse or dogmatic forms of statement to the present desire to conserve space, words, and the reader's time.

The time of the great conflagration is to be at the beginning of the Millennium, during the period immediately adjacent to that aspect of the second coming of Christ known as the revelation.

Evidence for this statement follows:

1. The Old Testament prophets uniformly declare that a judgment of fire, similar to the one Peter describes, shall immediately precede the establishment of the future Messianic Kingdom.

One is faced with a problem in selecting only the plainest passages, they are so very numerous. Joel 2:30,31 is an example: "And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth: blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke...before the great and terrible day of Jehovah cometh."

Another of this type is Malachi 3:1-3: "...and the Lord, whom ye seek will suddenly come to his temple....But who can abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap."

A third is Malachi 4:1: "For, behold, the day cometh, it burneth as a furnace; and all the proud, and all that work wickedness, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up."

This scriptural evidence renders it certain that when Peter wrote of the coming Day of the Lord with its attendant fiery judgments, he was broaching no new subject--as is indicated by his words: "seeing that ye look for these things." The Jews had been looking for such consuming fire to presage the

coming kingdom of Messiah since the days of the Old Testament prophets.

2. The Old Testament repeatedly states that disturbances in the material heavens, of a type identical with those described by Peter, shall transpire immediately before the establishment of the kingdom. What has just been shown to be true of the "fire" of Peter's prophecy is now shown to be true also of the heavenly disturbances--"the heavens shall pass away with a great noise." A good representative of passages on this subject is Isaiah 34:4 in a context clearly associated with the beginning of the coming Messianic Kingdom: "All the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll," etc. Such words as these are frequent in the Old Testament. The astonishing thing is that Premillennialists generally unite in applying them to events at the beginning of the Millennium without seeing any connection with II Peter 3:10 or considering their possible relation to the new heavens and new earth of Revelation 21 and 22. Other passages are Haggai 2:6,7; Joel 3:16; Isaiah 13:13; Isaiah 51:6.

If anyone should argue that some of the passages speak of disturbances at the beginning of the Millennium and others of disturbances at its close, he should read Hebrews 12:26 (quoting Hag. 2:6), in which the Lord distinctly promises, "Yet once more [not twice] will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven."

Thus the Old Testament (dispensational and prophetic charts and teachers notwithstanding) places the coming cosmic disturbances at the beginning of the coming kingdom, not at some point one thousand years along the course of it.

3. New Testament writers are just as definite in placing a judgment of fire at the inception of the kingdom as are the Old Testament writers. Most convincing is Paul's testimony: "And to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus" (II Thes. 1:7,8). Another is Revelation 16:8,9, which portrays a fiery judgment under the fourth vial. Most

Premillennialists of today feel that this event transpires in a period shortly before the inception of the Millennium. No one can read these plain words with an unprejudiced mind, it seems to me, and not feel that the New Testament predicts a judgment of fire at the commencement of the coming Kingdom.

4. The Bible declares that the coming kingdom shall occupy a regenerated earth from its beginning; therefore the purifying effects of this prophetic dissolution must be at the beginning, rather than at the close of the Millennium. The two most important passages are Isaiah 65:17-25 and 66:22-24. The first begins with a presentation of the new heavens and earth: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth." Then follows a description which Premillennialists almost unanimously unite in saying to be Millennial. The second is similar. It begins, "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I make, shall remain before me, saith Jehovah." Then, again, follows a Millennial scene, *viz.*: "so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah. And they shall go forth, and look upon the dead bodies of the men that have transgressed against me," etc. Hold in mind that this is all related to the new heavens and new earth. It was this same which Peter expected "according to his promise" (II Peter 3:13).

I do not see how the conclusion can be avoided that the Spirit of prophecy in Isaiah intended that the impression be conveyed that the coming Messianic Kingdom shall occupy from the first "new heavens and [a] new earth."

5. The immediate context of II Peter 3:10 indicates that Peter had in mind something which would occur at Christ's second coming, and not in a period still remotely future at the revelation of Christ. A hasty reading of the third chapter of II Peter brings to one's attention several significant expressions demonstrating this proposition. They follow: "Where is the promise of his coming?" (v. 9); "...comes as a thief" (v. 10); "...ye look for these things" (v. 14). These brief notices indicate that Peter did not question the possibility that people whom he then addressed might live to see the

inauguration of the very things he describes in verse 10. How inconsistent such statements are with the view that verse 10 describes events known to be at least a thousand years away needs only to be noted to be appreciated.

6. A perpetual and continuous kingdom such as is repeatedly promised demands that no such destruction as is often urged be placed at the end of the Millennium to interrupt the continuity of that kingdom. It should be remembered that even though a change in the mediation of rulership of that kingdom is predicted (I Cor. 15:23-28), an abolition of the earthly realm is nowhere promised--unless II Peter 3:10 be the exception. Contrariwise, the perpetuity of the kingdom is repeatedly asserted in the most positive terms, as follows:

(1) The angelic announcement to Mary, the human mother of the Messianic King, carefully specifies that "of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32,33).

(2) The saints of the Lord are commonly associated with Christ in an eternally enduring kingdom, as, for example, in Daniel 7:18, "The saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever."

(3) The scriptures further specify the perpetual continuity of the kingdom itself *per se*. Daniel 2:44 states: "And in the days of those kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people...but it shall stand forever" (cf. also Dan. 7:14).

(4) The limit of a thousand years, which is by premillennial interpreters of Revelation 20 frequently attached to the "kingdom" as such, is not a limit on the reign of Christ or of His saints, but rather the limit of the imprisonment of Satan and of the period between the resurrections.

7. Christians are exhorted on the basis of this predicted dissolution,

as if it were something they should expect to see if they should live to the end of the present age rather than as if it were something at least a millennium away. The entire third chapter should be read to appreciate this fact. The most significant portions are the phrases in verses 11-14: "looking for and earnestly desiring the coming...beloved, seeing that ye look for these things," etc. Is this not the same hope of the second coming of Christ with the same attendant moral lessons as those set forth in Mark 13:32-37, Matthew 24:42-51, and Luke 21:25-36? The inquiring reader will be rewarded by comparing these chapters with the third chapter of II Peter.

For these reasons I am convinced that the great prophecy of II Peter 3:10, and many other predictions of the coming dissolution with the resultant new heavens and new earth refer to events at the inauguration of Messiah's kingdom. That there may be further changes at the conclusion of the thousand years, perhaps in connection with the judgment of the great white throne (Rev. 20:7-15) is entirely possible. However, if so, the Bible seems to be silent about it. This view is not without its difficulties, but I believe that many of them are dissipated as proper consideration is given the question of the extent of the predicted dissolution and the nature of the new heavens and new earth.

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE COSMIC CHANGES

If the coming conflagration is to be at the time of a "general judgment," certain possibilities exist--possibilities which no one will expect to find explained and defended in this premillennial treatment of eschatology. If it is to come at the end of the Millennium, certain others exist. And if it is to come (as I have sought to show) at or near the beginning of the millennial period, then still other possibilities appear.

Briefly, as I have considered the possibilities, it seems that--*the cosmic disturbances described in II Peter 3:10 shall consist of a limited renovation involving the death of all living wicked men at the revelation of Christ and such changes in the realms of inanimate material, of vegetable,*

animal, and human life as are necessary to produce conditions which the prophets declare shall prevail during the coming kingdom age.

All this is best described, to use Jesus' own word for it, as a "regeneration."

This statement may be reduced to four propositions.

1. The prophetic dissolution shall consist of a renovation, rather than an annihilation.

(1) In proof is the fact that nowhere in the Bible, unless II Peter 3:10 be treated as an exception, is the annihilation of the cosmos taught.

(2) Further, the words of II Peter 3:10 do not in any sense require annihilation. "Shall pass away" translates *pareleusontai*, the root of which is *parerchomai*. The Authorized Version translates this come, come forth, go, pass, pass over, transgress, and past. The standard lexicons offer about the same shades of meaning. Never does it mean annihilate, so far as I have been able to determine. The meaning is rather to pass from one position in time or space to another. And, even granting the most destructive ideas as the meanings of *luthesetai* (be dissolved) and *katakaesetai* (be burned up, if we adopt the *Textus Receptus*), the words certainly do not describe annihilation.

2. The prophetic dissolution is by Scripture confined to a strictly limited renovation, affecting certain aspects of the cosmos only.

(1) In the first place, to insist that the materials of earth must be cremated to remove sin is to insist on an erroneous doctrine of sin--that the seat of sin is in matter rather than in the spirits of free agents.

(2) Further, the Bible declares categorically that so long as the earth remains, the order of nature will stay constant and without interruption. I cite Genesis 8:22: "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold

and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease" (cf. also v. 21).

(3) The several passages in the Bible which seem to require or imply absolute dissolution of the earth or destruction of the order of nature are in every case limited by the context to less drastic changes. An example is Genesis 6:17 (see also 6:7,13), "And I, behold, I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh...*everything that is in the earth shall die*" (italics mine). Yet the context shows that eight human beings and a ship loaded with animals and provender, and of course, specimens of all water life, escaped. (Similar phenomena occur in Deut. 32:22; Nah. 1:5; Micah 1:4; Isa. 13:9-14; Isa. 24:19,20; Amos 9:9, and others.)

3. The future conflagration at the coming of Christ shall involve the destruction of Antichrist and his forces.

II Thessalonians 1:7-10 predicts a fiery destruction of wicked men at the revelation of Christ. Fire is mentioned in connection with the destruction of Antichrist at our Lord's return (Rev. 19:20). There is no good reason for separating these things.

Is it possible that the Lord may destroy all wicked men at His appearing? It is asserted by Paul (II Thes. 1:7-10) that "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus...in flaming fire" He shall "render vengeance to them that know not God...who shall suffer...eternal destruction." These words promise a truly dreadful judgment. But if they are applied to the destruction of all men at our Lord's second coming, they prove too much. Amillennialists will be quick to ask, Who will populate the earth during the Millennium if at its inauguration the righteous are all glorified and the wicked are killed?

If one adopts the pretribulational view of the Rapture, he can suppose the formation of a new group of saved men during the tribulation to enter the Millennium in natural bodies and to propagate the race during the 1,000 years.

Many pretribulationists, however, postulate another "rapture" and resurrection

for tribulation saints only at the end of the tribulation. This would still leave no people to live as natural men on earth during the Millennium.

If one adopts the posttribulational view of the Rapture, then there certainly would be no people to live as natural men on earth during the Millennium. The saved would all be in glorified bodies, in which condition Jesus said there would be no function of propagation. If the judgment on the wicked of II Thessalonians 1:7-10 is to be regarded as universal, then the wicked would all be dead.

Two live possibilities appear as solutions. One is to interpret this statement in II Thessalonians 1:7-10 in a limited sense, applying it only to Antichrist, his armies, and possibly other incorrigible rebels against the Lord. A number of passages (Zech. 12-14 especially, Matt. 25, etc.) appear to fall in line in support of this view. Another possibility suggested by a recent writer is that the eye of Paul, here functioning as a "seer," is including a whole series of events in his line of prophetic vision and has included elements of the final judgment after the 1,000 years. This has strong appeal, though proof is lacking.

Whichever of these possibilities is adopted (and the present writer prefers the former), the possibility of a Millennium remains. The proposition affirming the destruction of Antichrist and his forces at Christ's coming is true in either case.

Perhaps the advance of Biblical studies in the hands of reverent scholars will give us more certain light at this point. Problems like this one should give all prophetic interpreters "humble pause" as they seek to teach the Bible.

4. The renovation of the cosmos at the coming of Christ will involve such changes in the realms of inanimate material, of vegetable, human, and animal life as are necessary to produce conditions which the prophets declare shall prevail during the coming kingdom age.

The Old Testament prophets (especially Isaiah) are replete with predictions of the beauty and perfection of that coming age. The whole of nature and of society is to be restored as it was (or would have become) before the fall. There is not space here to treat those prophecies, save to say that society will be full of joy and gladness. Sin and rebellion are said to be repressed till the close of the thousand years, when (according to Rev. 20) it will be interrupted for a short time, after which earth, entirely cleansed of every vestige of sin, shall continue in uninterrupted peace forever.

However, it is also predicted that the introduction of these improvements will be attended by numerous unusual supernaturally superintended physical wonders in the earth (earthquakes, etc.) and in the heavens (stars falling, etc.)--all directed toward moral ends. That is, these natural wonders (described, I think, in much detail in Revelation 6 to 19) shall be judgments on men living at that time, and constitute what is called the Indignation.

Now, if Peter's great prophecy is to be fulfilled at the beginning of the Millennium, then it must have reference to these phenomena. "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise" must refer to the same event as Isaiah 34:4, a clear millennial passage, "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their hosts shall fade away."

"The elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat" is more difficult to understand because of questions about the meaning of "elements" (*stoicheia*). If, as the A.S.V. margin suggests and a host of commentators likewise, it refers to heavenly bodies, then it may have reference to the same heavenly changes set forth in the preceding clause. However, this word is used five times in the New Testament outside of II Peter 3. In every one of these it has clear and unquestionable reference to false moral and spiritual principles, and hence is also translated by our word "rudiments." If this is the meaning in II Peter 3:10 and 12, then it would seem to refer to the coming judgments on false religion, false philosophy, etc., as set forth in Revelation 17, 18, and 19.

If the word has reference to the actual elements of the matter of terrestrial earth, it could be applied to the widespread physical changes which shall precede the establishment of the kingdom.

Which of these three meanings (all of which have precedents in classical Greek literature) is the correct one does not seem possible to determine finally. It is not necessary to determine. All that is incumbent on us is to show that it is nothing more than the prophets frequently affirm will take place at the inception of Messiah's coming kingdom. This, I think, has been done.

The "works" which shall be "discovered" are undoubtedly the works of man: literature, art, architecture, etc., all of which will be subject to the searching discrimination and judgment of the Son of God when He shall come. It is quite remarkable that the same Peter who made this prophecy spoke definitely of this subject on another occasion, and in a fashion which fully harmonizes with the interpretation just now placed on his words in the epistle. I refer to his words to the Jews at the temple, as recorded in Acts 3. After calling for repentance and referring to the second coming of Christ, Peter says: "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old." Christ will remain in heaven until He comes again, when He will restore all things which the Old Testament prophets predicted. I think there can be small doubt, indeed, that Peter (in Acts 3:21 above) had reference to the very changes which the prophets indicate shall introduce the coming kingdom, and that he was referring to the same in II Peter 3:10 and 12.

4. Finally, *this whole affair is best described and integrated by the name "regeneration," the word which our Lord Himself used of it.*

Jesus used this word of His coming kingdom when He told the apostles:

"Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration [Gr. *palingenesia*] when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also

shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28). The word means new birth. A standard lexicon says it is "that signal and glorious change of all things (in heaven and earth) for the better, that restoration of the primal and perfect condition of things which existed before the fall of our first parents, which the Jews looked for in connection with the advent of the Messiah, and which the primitive Christians expected in connection with the visible return of Jesus from heaven" (Thayer, *Greek English Lexicon of the N.T.*).

Observe that Paul uses the same word of the believer's new birth (Titus 3:5), that in reference to the same fact he also speaks of it as a "new creation" (II Cor. 5:17), and further specifies that old things have passed away, and that all things have become new.

Everyone knows, though, that even after new birth the believer still has sin in him. This will be removed completely at death or at the rapture of the saints (I The. 3:13).

This comparison is at once an answer to those who object that if the new heavens and new earth begin at the inauguration of the kingdom, then there can be no sin at all in it, as is described in Revelation 20.

These things are well summed up by Paul, when he writes: "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Rom. 8:19-21).

Will the reader permit a restatement of the main propositions as a summary?

The time of the great coming conflagration is to be at the beginning of the Millennium, during the period immediately adjacent to that aspect of the

second coming of Christ known as the revelation.

The great cosmic disturbances described shall consist of a limited renovation involving the death of all living wicked men at the revelation of Christ and such changes in the realms of inanimate material, of vegetable, animal, and human life as are necessary to produce conditions which the prophets declare shall prevail during the coming kingdom age. All this is best described, to use Jesus' own word for it, as a "regeneration."

APPENDIX II

Interpretations of the Millennium

REVELATION 20:1-7

Throughout this treatise I have sought to conserve the reader's time and to retain his interest by excluding discussion of matters not precisely germane to the points under discussion.

Nevertheless, in the interests of fairness to opponents, and in order to demonstrate more fully the truth of my proposition that "the Millennium is specifically (1) the period of time between the resurrection of the just and of the unjust, and (2) the period of Satan's imprisonment," this appendix is added.

It becomes more evident, after examination of many treatments of Revelation 20:1-7, that the literal interpretation is self-evidently the only acceptable one. And this is said with due respect to the names of many great men in the field of Biblical exegesis who insist, on the contrary, that little or nothing in these seven verses is to be taken literally--some of whom insist even that there is no numerical notation in the entire Book of Revelation which is to be taken literally.

It will not be convenient to classify the views of the "thousand years"

or Millennium simply as Postmillennial, Premillennial, or Amillennial. Nor will a division be made solely between the figurative (or spiritual, topical, metaphorical, or nonliteral) and the literal interpretations, though, so far as the thousand years is concerned, such classification is feasible. The method to be followed will be to classify the different views according to the specific interpretation given the Greek words *chilia etee*, translated "a thousand years" in the English versions. Then, in connection with each of these views of the thousand years, the variations in interpretation of the details of the prophecy will be added. I have excepted the Premillennial interpretation from treatment in this appendix, inasmuch as this view is adopted and explained in the entire book.

Without pretending to have exhausted the number of variations of interpretation of the "thousand years" of Revelation 20 advocated since John wrote the words on Patmos, at least seven distinct views besides the Premillennial view are to be discerned. That is, there are at least these seven which have important differences and have been held by able orthodox Christian theologians. The views of Swedenborgians, Russellites, Seventh Day Adventists, and other groups not usually regarded as orthodox do not come within the limits of this survey.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt exhaustive description of every variation of a view. Therefore the course followed will be to name, state, and describe each view as set forth by its leading advocate or advocates. The effects of the view of the interpretation of the rest of the passage will be presented also. Most of the refutation is reserved for a brief treatment of the linguistic arguments at the close.

For want of any more descriptive term, I label the simplest, and probably least acceptable, of all views as

1. *The Agnostic View: The "thousand years" are an unintelligible hieroglyph.*

This view has been unconsciously adopted by the many preachers and writers who either explicitly or implicitly pass by the entire Book of Revelation as if it were totally incomprehensible. However, at least one has specifically adopted this, in a formal way, as his view of the Millennium. After surveying the Biblical support for the Chiliastic doctrine, he admits that "there are...passages, which, if interpreted strictly and exclusively according to the letter, afford some ground for the millenarian doctrine" (art. "Millenarianism, Millennium," C. A. Semisch, Schaff-Herzog *Ency. of Rel. Knowledge*, third ed. revised and enlarged). He adds, "It cannot be disputed that the Book of Revelation (20:4 sqq.) contains the fundamental characteristics of millenarianism." Then, after rejecting the views of Hengstenberg and of Augustine, he states his own view as follows:

In view of the difficulty of separating figure from real fact, we conclude that the millenarianism of the Book of Revelation is a hieroglyph whose meaning has not yet been satisfactorily solved (*ibid.*).

The writer recently heard a very learned gentleman from New Zealand give a lecture¹ in which he asserted that probably the Book of Revelation was a "cryptic letter" from the "concentration camp" on Patmos, and that as read to the seven churches of Asia was furnished with some sort of key to the symbols-- a key which unfortunately has been lost and is probably beyond recovery. In the lecture he did not apply this theory to the text now under consideration, but it may be presumed that if the occasion arose he would do so. His view, probably shared by others, seems to be essentially agnostic so far as the symbolism goes.

There is something to commend about this view. There is certainly more in the Book of Revelation, and specifically in 20:1-7, that any one interpreter is likely to discover. Yet there is nothing essentially esoteric or cryptic about the passage as it stands. The problems are no greater than those which prevail in most apocalyptic and predictive sections of the Bible. It is not likely that many will care to associate themselves permanently with Semisch's agnosticism.

2. *The Postmillennial View: The "thousand years" are a literal period of time at the latter part of the present age, to be terminated some time before the second advent of Christ.*

An explanation must be offered quickly. Though all Postmillennialists agree that the "thousand years" of Revelation 20 refer to a literal period of time, they do not all agree that there will necessarily be one thousand literal years of it. That is, some suppose the the "thousand years" stand figuratively for a long period of time.

Postmillennialism is of comparatively recent origin. Several of the best advocates of the view attribute its origin to Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), an English Arminian theologian who near the end of his life adopted Arian views of the Godhead. A. H. Strong, for example (*Systematic Theology*, 1014), writes: "Our own interpretation of Revelation 20:1-10, was first given, for substance, by Whitby."

The best known statement of the Postmillennial position is probably that of A. A. Hodge (*Outlines of Theology*, 450 ff.). With his customary force, skill, and brevity, Mr. Hodge has presented the case as follows:

What is the Scriptural doctrine concerning the millennium?

1st. The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, clearly reveal that the gospel is to exercise an influence over all branches of the human family, immeasurably more extensive and more thoroughly transforming than any it has ever realized in time past. This end is to be gradually attained through the spiritual presence of Christ in the ordinary dispensation of Providence, and ministrations of His church.²

2nd. The period of this general prevalency of the gospel will continue a thousand years, and is hence designated the millennium.

3rd. The Jews are to be converted to Christianity either at the

commencement or during the continuance of this period.

4th. At the end of these thousand years, and before the coming of Christ, there will be a comparatively short season of apostasy and violent conflict between the kingdoms of light and darkness.

5th. Christ's advent, the general resurrection and judgment, will be simultaneous, and immediately succeeded by the burning of the old, and the revelation of the new earth and heavens.

Hodge, then, seems to feel that the "one thousand years" are a literal period of one thousand years, and that they will run their course in the latter portion of this present age.

However, David Brown, certainly the most voluminous writer in support of Postmillennialism, has taken a slightly different view. He writes:

One remark, however, I must request the reader to bear in mind....I attach no importance, in this argument, to the precise period of *a thousand years*. It occurs nowhere in Scripture but in one solitary passage. There are reasons for taking it definitely and literally; but to some these reasons appear slender. They think it means just a long indefinite period; agreeing with us, however, as to its being yet to come (*The Second Advent*, 27,28).

There are variations in the minor points among Postmillenarians but most would agree on the general scheme of Hodge above. Another orthodox and scholarly advocate of Postmillennialism was A. H. Strong. I cite his views as characteristic of most orthodox Postmillennial doctrine.

The binding of Satan is presumably the restraint put on the devil by the ultimate prevalence of Christianity throughout the earth--when Jew and Gentile alike became possessed of Christianity's blessings (*Systematic Theology*, 1008).

The first resurrection (Rev. 20:4-6) is

not a preliminary resurrection of the body, in the case of departed saints, but a period in the latter days of the church militant, when, under special influence of the Holy Ghost, the spirit of the martyrs shall appear again, true religion be generally quickened and revived, and the members of Christ's churches become so conscious of their strength in Christ that they shall, to an extent unknown before, triumph over the powers of evil both within and without (*ibid.* 1013).

Strong feels that the release of Satan (Rev. 20:7) for "a little season" indicates that

at the close of this millennial period, evil will again be permitted to exert its utmost power in a final conflict with righteousness. This spiritual struggle, moreover, will be accompanied and symbolized by political convulsions, and by fearful indications of desolation in the natural world (*ibid.* 1009).

Thus the "little season" is the great tribulation period.

The destruction of Satan, Gog and Magog, the general resurrection and the general judgment of the great white throne are held to be at the second advent, some time after the close of the millennium.

It should be seen that Postmillennialists have not generally held that the second advent closes the Millennium, for by Strong's view, the "little season" is said to intervene. It is after the Millennium--but how long after is not declared.

It needs to be added that many advocates have felt that neither the church nor the world may be conscious of either the beginning or the close of the Millennium. Brown makes this clear:

Let no one suppose I expect that the beginning and end of this period will be so clearly discernible as to leave no room for doubt on any mind. On

the contrary, I think there can hardly be a doubt that it will follow the law of all Scripture dates in this respect--of Daniel's "seventy weeks," and of the "twelve hundred and sixty days" of Antichristian rule. The beginning and end of the former of these periods is even yet a matter of some controversy, etc. (*op.cit.*, 28).

The period during which Postmillennialism was at its height of acceptance was the latter half of the nineteenth century and during the first quarter of the present [twentieth] century. Among the great theologians of this era, Strong, C. A. Hodge, A. A. Hodge, C. A. Briggs were Postmillennial.

Postmillennial writers of the more popular sort were Albert Barnes (*Commentaries on the New Testament*) and David Brown, to mention only a couple. Snowden (*The Coming of the Lord*, 1919) and Carroll (*The Book of Revelation*, 1916) are among the most recent thorough-going Postmillennial orthodox writers.

During the "golden age" of American Protestant Modernism, which came to an end with World War II, Modernists adopted a kind of Postmillennialism to which earlier advocates would have given no approval (*e.g.*, Rall, *Modern Premillennialism and the Christian Hope*). It was based more on the theory of evolution and humanism than on any interpretation of the Bible, and need not occupy our attention here. The present heirs of Modernism, the Neo-orthodox and Neo-liberal people, are scarcely more optimistic about the course of the present era than Premillenarians, and so are not inclined to Postmillennialism. Postmillennialism has no strong, vocal present-day advocates. But it is not likely that it is dead. It seems probable that any period of prolonged peace in the world would provide the climate in which a revival of Postmillennialism might take place.

3. Augustinian Amillennialism: The "thousand years" are probably a literal designation of the length of the present age, to be closed by the second advent of Christ. The reference is to the course of the church on earth during this period.

Note the word "probably." I think Augustine would have approved the use of this word in this connection. As will be seen, he had a wholesome restraint in stating his views on some features of Bible prophecy which could well continue to be emulated.

Augustine's views on eschatology, among many other subjects, are set forth in *The City of God*, the result of thirteen years of labor (A.D. 413-426). The part which relates to the Millennium is Book XX, chapters 6 to 15. This will be found in "The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series," volume II, translated by Marcus Dods. It is safe to assert that until this section of Augustine's great work is mastered, one cannot fully appreciate the millennial discussions which have followed since his day. It is almost, if not wholly, true that all Amillennial and Postmillennial systems have been postscripts to *The City of God*.

Having just now read the entire section in *The City of God* again several times, I do not feel that it can be positively asserted that Augustine was convinced that the thousand years should be taken literally. He seems to say so, but he is not unequivocal. His nearest approach is in chapter 10. There he seems to say that the Millennium may be either the last one thousand years before the consummation, into which the present age falls, or it may be the entire period of the world's history, called one thousand years because one thousand as the cube of ten would be "the number of perfection to mark the fulness of time" (*ibid.* XX, 6). He seems to lean toward the first of the two possibilities. But, in either case, whether he thought the one thousand years to be literal or a figure, he believed the term stood for a real period of time, whether one thousand years or six thousand years.

At any rate, he believed the whole present age to be in the Millennium and that the termination of the present age and of the Millennium would be approximately synchronous. It also appears that he followed the Septuagint chronology (it is believed that he did not know Hebrew) and thought the sixth thousand years of human history to be well in progress when the present dispensation began. He also evidently believed that at the end of six thousand

years of history, Christ would come again and end the current age (*City of God*, XX,7). He specifically rejects the idea that the Millennium is a future age after the close of the present dispensation.

Later on, he makes it clear that he feels the Millennium refers to the course of the church in the world, and the reign of saints to be a present situation on earth, except insofar as the unity of the church living and dead involves a secondary reference to the saints in heaven as well.

His basic position on the Millennium is clarified as he goes on to give his views on the rest of Revelation 20.

"The first resurrection" (Rev. 20:4-6) he holds to be a spiritual resurrection--the same as that "resurrection" or "regeneration" described in John 5:26,27. It is the same as personal salvation. It is participated in only by the saved, as he says, "in the first resurrection none have a part save those who shall be eternally blessed" (*ibid.* XX, 6).

The second resurrection described in Revelation 20 is a physical resurrection of all men, according to Augustine. He speaks of it as a resurrection "of judgment" (XX, 6) almost as a Premillennialist, but he goes on to clarify his statement and show that he means only that the saints, all of whom participate in spiritual regeneration (first resurrection), shall not be "judged" (damned) in this second or physical resurrection at the consummation, even though they do participate in the resurrection.

He concludes:

So are there these two resurrections,--the one the first and spiritual resurrection, which has place in this life, and preserves us from coming into the second death; the other the second, which does not occur now, but in the end of the world, and which by the last judgment shall dismiss some into the second death, others into that life which has no death (*ibid.* XX, 8).

On the binding of Satan, he asserts that it has regard to the nations (as Rev. 20 says) but that this means "no doubt, those among which the church

exists." Later he clarifies this to mean that Satan will not be able to seduce the elect of the church militant. This binding took place at the beginning of the present age when Christ first bound the "strong man" in order that he might "spoil his goods" (he cites Mark 3:27). This binding he seems to conceive of as a judicial act of God rather than of some specific historical event such as the death of Christ, the founding of the church, the work of the first missionaries, etc.

On the loosing of Satan, he writes that it refers to revived ability of Satan to seduce the nonelect of the church visible. He seems to relate the Biblical references to a final great tribulation, the great apostasy, and the Antichrist to the "little season" during which Satan is to be loosed. This he places at the end of the present age but before the consummation (*i.e.*, before the "general resurrection" judgment, etc., *ibid.* XX, 8). He leaves the problem as to whether the "little season" is within the one thousand years or immediately afterward an open question (*ibid.* XX, 13).

These are the main features of Augustine's view. It bears repeating that his views are of utmost importance to present-day millennial discussions, for about every orthodox Amillennial or Postmillennial view since Augustine has embodied some of the main features of his view. Indeed, the very passages of Scripture which Augustine used in support of his arguments appear often in contemporary amillennial literature.

To recapitulate the main features of Augustine's view: The thousand years is an expression, whether figurative or literal he is not certain, standing for a literal period of time. The Millennium relates to the present age--either this age is the Millennium or is contained in it; the present age and the Millennium terminate approximately synchronously. The reign of the saints is during this age and it is on earth through the appointed leaders (clergy, etc.) of the visible church. The first resurrection is spiritual and is the regeneration of the individual believers whereby they become members of the body of Christ, that is, of the kingdom of God. The second resurrection is physical and refers to the resurrection of all men at the consummation. The

binding of Satan consists of Satan's being deprived of any ability to seduce the elect. The loosing consists of revived ability to seduce the nonelect.

The "little season" will come at the end of the current age when Antichrist, the great tribulation, the apostasy, etc., will come. This will be followed by a general resurrection and a general judgment.

It remains to be added that in the main Augustine's view is, and has been, the view of the Roman Catholic church.³

4. Modern Amillennialism, the Modified Augustinian School: The "thousand years" is a figurative expression designating the course of the present age from the death of Christ to the second advent. The reference is to the reign of the saints with Christ in heaven.

It will be seen at once that this is the Augustinian view with one major change and a few minor ones. The major change is that the reign of the saints in the Millennium is said to take place in heaven rather than on earth, as in the view of Augustine. An important minor change is that recent Amillennialists have clearly broken with the idea that the Millennium is to be taken as a literal designation of the literal length of time. Instead of setting any particular date, precise or approximate, for the end of the Millennium, the length of the Millennium is simply conceived to be the length of the present age. Some adjustment of this kind was inevitable in Amillennialism when once A.D. 1000 was passed.

An able contemporary representative of the school is Hendriksen, whose views are set forth in a recent book (*More Than Conquerors, an Interpretation of the Book of Revelation*). Following the "recapitulation" or "parallelistic" method of interpreting the Apocalypse, he believes that with Revelation 20 the prophecy returns to the beginning of the present age. The "order of events" has the following "sequence." He says, "Christ's first coming is followed by a long period during which Satan is bound; this in turn is followed by Satan's little season; and that is followed by Christ's second coming, that is, His coming unto judgment" (page 222). Concerning the binding of Satan, he writes:

"This work of binding the devil was begun when our Lord triumphed over him in the temptations in the wilderness." Then, after citing and discussing Matthew 4:1-11, Luke 4:1-13, Luke 10:17,18, John 12:20-32, Colossians 2:15, and Revelation 12:5 ff., he asserts that the "binding and casting out or falling of Satan is...associated with the first coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He feels that it consists of reducing Satan's power to keep the nations from the light of divine revelation and the saving gospel--almost unrestricted till Jesus came. Satan has been so bound that Christ may, in this age, draw men of every nation unto Himself (*ibid. in loco*).

This school dissociates itself completely from the Postmillennial optimism which expects a kind of literal Millennium in this age. Hendriksen makes it clear that he believes the binding of Satan is only in certain limited respects. The imprisonment (or binding) has respect to earth and living men; the reign of saints has respect to heaven and dead believers.

The first resurrection is the "translation of the soul from this sinful earth to God's holy heaven" at the death of the believer (Hendriksen, *ibid. in loco*). The second resurrection is the resurrection of the bodies of all men at the consummation.

Some of the recent writers who hold this modified Augustinian view of the Millennium, though disagreeing somewhat on details, are A. T. Allis, G. L. Murray, Floyd Hamilton, W. Hendriksen. There are many others whose expressions are friendly to this view but who, to the knowledge of the present writer, have not made published statements specifically upon interpretation of the "thousand years."

5. Modern Amillennialism--B.B. Warfield School: The "thousand years" is a figurative expression signifying the "intermediate state." It is a kind of literary figure of speech whereby the present age is viewed from the standpoint of its enjoyment by the dead saints in glory.

Warfield's views are set forth in the last chapter of a posthumous

collection of his writings entitled, *Biblical Doctrines*. On account of his importance in twentieth century theology, and because there are some distinct features in his Amillennialism, his view deserves special classification. I have called Warfield an Amillennialist because he denies any connection of the "thousand years" with a reign of Christ or His saints on earth, either after Christ's second coming or before it. It may be true, as former students of his classes have told me, that he regarded himself as a Postmillennialist.

While his theories are ingenious, they are not convincing. I know of no prominent writer who has heartily endorsed and adopted his views of Revelation 20. A system such as his which makes both a "little season" and "a thousand years" stand for the present age is not impressive to most minds. Likewise, having declared that the one thousand years stand for the *condition* of the disembodied saints in glory, he presently has the same expression stand for the *duration* of the present age also. Except that this view was expressed by a noted scholar, whose expositions of Christian doctrine in some other areas are justly famous, it is doubtful that his view of the Millennium would have made any impression on the Christian public.

6. Modern Amillennialism--William Milligan School: The "thousand years" is a figurative designation of the idea of completeness or perfection. This perfection has reference to the salvation of the saints in their present state on earth, and to the present binding of Satan.

Milligan's views are rather well known and generally highly regarded even among those who disagree with him. The fact that he is the writer on Revelation in the commentary on the Scriptures known as *The Expositor's Bible* has served to give his views great currency. His views were adopted by A. Plummer, who cites and quotes Milligan at some length in his exposition of the Book of Revelation in the commentary set known as *The Pulpit Commentary*. It should be noted that in *The Expositor's Bible*, Milligan presents his view as suggestive rather than dogmatic. His words are as follows:

The thousand years mentioned in the passage express no period of time.

They are not a figure for the whole Christian era, now extending to nearly nineteen hundred years. Nor do they denote a certain space of time, longer or shorter, it may be, than the definite number of years spoken of, at the close of the present dispensation, and to be in the view of some preceded, in the view of others followed, by the second Advent of our Lord. They embody an idea; and that idea whether applied to the subjugation of Satan or to the triumph of the saints is the idea of completeness or perfection. Satan is bound for a thousand years, that is, he is completely bound. The saints reign for a thousand years, that is, they are introduced into a state of perfect and glorious victory" (*The Expositor's Bible, Revelation, 913*).

Like Warfield, Milligan feels that the "little season" is the whole Christian age, when, as regards the nations, Satan is loosed. This is quite contrary to the more common Amillennial view that during this period he is bound as regards the nations. With minor differences, Milligan's views on other details are pretty much the same as the common Amillennial view.

7. Modern Amillennialism--Preterist School: The "thousand years" is a figurative expression signifying (according to Swete) a great epoc in human history." The reign of saints has reference to the triumph of Christianity which began with the victory of the church over paganism in the Roman Empire and continues to the present.

This view was advocated notably by Henry Barclay Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John*, second ed., 1907) and more recently in this country by Albertus Pieters (*Studies in the Revelation of St. John*, 1943, 1950) among orthodox scholars.

Most of our contemporary Amillennialists draw a sharp break between chapters 19 and 20, but, like the Premillennialists, the advocates of the Preterist View recognize that the first resurrection, the binding of Satan, and the one thousand years follow the defeat of Antichrist related in chapter 19.

In respect to most of the details of the prophecy, the views are similar to the

Postmillennial scheme. Details of interpretation are very similar to those of David Brown and B. H. Carroll, Postmillennialists. In fact, except that this system finds the fulfillment of the prophecy of the binding of Satan and the first resurrection in the past, it would have to be called Postmillennial.

Swete thinks that the Millennium began with the breakup of the Beast ("Roman world power") and the False Prophet ("pagan system of priestcraft and superstition"). This is followed by a long period of "Christian supremacy during which the faith for which the martyrs died would live and reign;" the war with God and Magog to follow is the recrudescence of evil at the end of the present age (*op.cit.*, 266).

"The binding of Satan is the divine restraint put upon the devil so that he was unable any longer to 'deceive the nations,' that is, to bring about a restoration of that paganism" (Pieters, *op.cit.*, 307).

"The three and a half years stand for the period of struggle with paganism, and the thousand years for the succeeding period of uninterrupted triumph of Christianity over it" (*ibid.* 307).

To my mind, this is the most satisfactory of all views, except the Premillennial interpretation. It has the least inconsistency and has regard to the place of Revelation 20 in the order of events in the Book of Revelation. Yet it has in it all the weaknesses of the various varieties of the Augustinian view, and for that reason is to be rejected.

In concluding this survey, let it be observed that all of these views reject the possibility of a future reign on earth of Christ and/or His saints lasting one thousand years. It bears repetition that many advocates of these views admit that, taken literally, the chapter does teach such a doctrine. Let it be observed also that even though some of those described accept a literal meaning for "one thousand years," not one of them attempts an interpretation which could be called "literal." No one, of course, feels that every last word is to be taken literally. The "key" and "chain" of verse 1 are self-evidently

figures of some kind. So, as Dr. Albertus Pieters says:

...the most prominent line of cleavage among interpreters is between those who, with due allowance for figures of speech, take the vision literally, and those who consider it a symbol. The former see here a description of events that must come to pass substantially as written, at some future time: The latter understand it to be a symbolical presentation of some spiritual truth, or of events that happened long ago (*op.cit.*, 282).

Thus, with allowance for some oversimplification, it can be said that on the one side are the nonliteral or symbolical interpretations and on the other the literal interpretations. Some Post- and Amillennial writers have held to a literal one thousand years, while holding to a figurative interpretation of the remainder of the details, and for that reason must be classed as advocates of a figurative interpretation.

Most of the really significant arguments against the literal interpretation and in favor of various figurative ones relate to five expressions in the passage before us. Besides these, there are numerous subsidiary arguments, given different emphasis by different writers. However, these five, which are generally supposed to find foundation in the language of the passage, appear over and over again in the literature on the subject. These must now be treated briefly.

1. *The use of the word 'soul' (psyche) in Revelation 20:4.*

John writes that following his vision of the binding of Satan he "saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark on their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" (Rev. 20:4).

Many of the Amillennial writers argue from the use of the word "soul," as

does Hamilton, [that]

...the first resurrection is the new birth which reaches its culmination and consummation when the soul of the believer leaves the body and goes to reign with Christ in heaven. The deliberate choice of the word "soul," which almost universally means soul as distinct from the body, as applying to the believers now reigning with Christ in glory, seems to make it plain that the first resurrection is just that (*The Basis of Millennial Faith*, 132).

The answer to this will not be in denial that the word "souls" does probably refer to disembodied souls. The obvious connection with Revelation 6:9-11 where disembodied souls is clearly meant makes it very likely that the same is meant here. Rather, the answer will be found in determination of the relationship of these "souls" to the group who are said to have "lived and reigned."

Observe that whoever the "souls" are, the ones of whom it is said at the end of verse 4, "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years," [they] are obviously the same persons of whom John says in the beginning of verse 4, "I saw thrones and they sat on them, and judgment was given unto them." Who are these? Who are the ones entered as subject of the verb *ekathisan* (they sat) and who must be the antecedent of the pronoun *autois* (unto them)? They are not the devil (20:2) or the angel (20:1) or the slain beasts and their armies (19:19-21). They can hardly be other than those described in 19:14 as follows: "the armies which are in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and pure." Commentators unite in recognizing these as the redeemed of the ages. The clear necessity for some antecedent to the pronominal subject of the first verb, and to the pronoun "them" in verse 4, is the reason why the "recapitulation" theory cannot be adduced to make a break between chapters 19 and 20. So whoever the "souls" are, they are certainly not the total of participants in the first resurrection. They are mentioned only by way of eminence, to show the fulfillment of their prayer for deliverance and vindication before their enemies (6:10).

This argument is not only without force but easily becomes an occasion for a true understanding of a better explanation of the Book of Revelation.

2. The use of "resurrection" (anastasis) in Revelation 20:5.

After relating the events above, John adds that "the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished" and then, evidently referring to those before who "lived and reigned with Christ," says, "This is the first resurrection" (Rev. 20:5).

Now, say those who interpret figuratively, this resurrection is that of the soul spiritually dead in trespasses and sins unto spiritual life in Christ, that is, the first resurrection is essentially the new birth, followed by spiritual exaltation with Christ at death.

This argument is discussed in chapter I. This much only I add here. The word *anastasis* (resurrection) is never elsewhere in the New Testament used of anything except physical resurrection, except Luke 2:34, in which the context furnishes another meaning. The word appears forty-two times in the New Testament. Of the thirty-nine appearances outside this chapter, thirty-eight have clear reference to physical resurrection. It will surely require overwhelming evidence to establish spiritual resurrection as the meaning of the word *anastasis* in Revelation 20. A few who accept the literal physical resurrection view suppose that John described a physical resurrection but intended it as a symbol of a spiritual resurrection. But the burden of proof rests with these. If this view is taken, the argument will have to be supplied from some source other than the idea of resurrection or the word *anastasis*.

3. The binding of Satan in Revelation 20.

Amillennialists point out that Satan had deceived all the nations, except Israel, previous to our Lord's first coming, and had them in his power. After Christ came, the gospel came to the nations and they began to be freed from his power in the sense that members of all nations become Christians.

The Amillennialists' basic text in explaining the binding of Satan described in Revelation 20, and in equating it to these historical facts, has been Mark 3:27. Other passages speak of Satan's "falling" (Luke 10:17,18), his being "cast out" (John 12:31), of Christ's "despoiling" Satan (Col. 2:15). All these are properly associated with the first coming of Christ. Thus the reasoning is, to use the words of Hendriksen:

Hence, in close harmony with all these Scriptural passages--and our exegesis must always be based upon the analogy of Scripture!--we conclude that also here in Rev. 20:1-3 the binding of Satan and the fact that he is hurled into the abyss to remain there for a thousand years indicates that throughout this present Gospel Age, which begins with Christ's first coming and extends nearly to the second coming, the devil's influence on earth is curtailed so that he is unable to prevent the extension of the church among the nations by means of an active missionary program (*op.cit.*, 226).

It must be readily admitted that the analogy of Scripture cannot be ignored in interpretation. However, it has a limited bearing on interpretation. For example, the "lion of the tribe of Judah" (Rev. 5:5) can hardly have any connection with the fact that the devil is described as the "adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion" (I Pet. 5:8). Where there are strong reasons for believing that analogy exists, it helps us; otherwise not. In a chapter like Revelation 20, where the binding of Satan is placed after a chapter describing the second coming of Christ with the saints of heaven following, and where there is no intrinsic evidence for a break in consecution, the analogy hardly applies. The stubborn fact remains that the binding of Satan in Revelation is placed in an eschatological setting wherein the resurrection of the dead takes place, especially of the persecuted and martyred dead. This cannot fit into the Amillennial scheme of things. Furthermore, the "chain" in the hand of the angel, the "key," and the "seal," all speak of an absolute binding, as even Milligan declares. That Satan is absolutely so bound at the present time, even in the sense advocated by Hendriksen and his company of commentators, both the present world situation and the Bible deny. Well down into the course of this "Gospel Age" Satan was still free to deceive the

nations to the limit of his ability, for Paul writes: "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the eyes of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (II Cor. 4:3,4).

4. *The statement that "they...reigned with Christ" (Rev. 20:4).*

Those who adopt a symbolical interpretation of these words claim that the Scriptures speak of the reign of the saints with Christ as prevailing now, not in the future after Christ's second coming. Passages frequently cited are Romans 5:21 ("even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life"), which is thought to make that eternal life in Christ the one and only reign of the saints, and II Timothy 2:12, I Peter 2:9, and Colossians 1:17. My comment and answer must be brief--and I do not intend to be curt.

Certainly there is such a present relationship with Christ as "reigning with him" which does exist. But that does not prove that such was what John was talking about. As noted elsewhere in this book, I do recognize that there is an important sense in which the saints of this age do now participate in Christ's present kingdom. That this is the precise equivalent of the reign of the saints in Revelation 20, or in the numerous passages in the Old Testament (*vide* Dan. 7:14,22,27) in which the saints of God are promised universal and eternal dominion, must be specifically denied (see my comments on Daniel 7 in chapter VI). There is nothing in Revelation 20 or elsewhere which requires such a view.

5. *The statement that "they lived (ezesan)...with Christ."*

It has been frequently pointed out by those who interpret this passage in a figurative way, that the word "lived" is a form of the Greek word *zao*, which means "to live" rather than to be resurrected or to live again. Such being the case, it is argued that the word is very fitting for spiritual exaltation rather than physical resurrection. Barnes (*Commentary, in loco*) argues at

length for a spiritual significance for the word, as do others.

It must be readily admitted that the Greek word does sometimes, even in the book of Revelation, have such a meaning, for example, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead" (Rev. 3:1). The same *may* be true of the same word in Revelation 7:17, and some think also in 13:14. Yet in other passages physical life is meant (*e.g.*, Rev. 19:20; 16:3). So, as far as the general use of the word is concerned, it may be used either of physical or of spiritual life.

In my opinion, both literal and symbolical interpreters have generally erred in treating this word. The evidence does not prove (as some Premillennialists think) that the word means to *live again*. When Jesus spoke of the impartation of eternal life ("and they that hear shall live," John 5:25), He used this word. But He did not mean "live again," for natural men have never been alive spiritually. He meant that they would come into possession of spiritual life. It might be better to say that the state of being alive came to pass for them. Thus the word essentially means to be alive, not to become alive. If this were not the case, John would not write, using the same word with *achri* "again", that "the rest of the dead lived not again" (Rev. 20:5).

Now, in Revelation 20, John sees the hosts who return with the Son of God alive and reigning with Christ. It is true that he makes no reference to their "becoming alive." It makes no difference that he did not; it is necessary that a resurrection shall have taken place, as the statement in verse five that certain others, in contrast with these, "lived not again" until after the Millennium, shows. And, in the case of the martyrs at least, beheaded and dead, resurrection would be necessary (see following).

Consider also that where a bit later it is said that "the rest of the dead lived not again" until after the Millennium, that physical resurrection is necessarily understood. They are the wicked dead, and hence spiritually as well as physically dead. Since they never had spiritual life, they cannot be

said to live "again" spiritually.

So, though the word *ezesan* (they lived) does not specify resurrection of the body, it certainly does not militate against it.

The following facts may be admitted to show that the resurrection of the bodies of the righteous dead is involved in verse 4. (1) *ezesan* (they lived) is a form of the word that is used at least twice in the Revelation of our Lord in His resurrection body--"I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore" (Rev. 1:18, cf. also 2:8). (2) In each of these cases the word *ezesan* is parallel with the expression in Greek "became dead" (*egeneto [or egenouen] nekros*), which suggests that His being alive was the result of "becoming" also. (3) Most importantly, what "they" who live and reign do is "with Christ" and presumably in the same sense. In the same sense that Christ is alive, they are alive. In His case it is in the resurrection body, and, therefore, in their case the same. All recognize that resurrection of the body is eschatological. We may expect that the events of this verse, then, are likewise eschatological.

There are other arguments used by those who reject the literal interpretation--some rational, some Biblical. It is beyond the scope of this effort to treat them more than they have been treated in the main body of the book. With this, therefore, I close.

Footnotes:

Part I Premillennialism

1 Enumerations of tenets of Premillennialism will also be found in *Schaff-Herzog Ency. Of Religious Knowledge*, art., "Millennium," C.A. Semisch; *The Millennium in the Church*, D.H. Kromminga, 242,ff. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1945; *Millennial Studies*, G.L. Murray, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1948; and in *Prophecy and the Church*, O.T. Allis, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1945.

2 *Contra Russellites, Latter Day Saints, et al.*

3 Cf. English, "Rethinking the Rapture," art. no. 6, *Our Hope*, Dec. 1949

Chapter 1

1 See Appendix II for discussion of nonliteral interpretations.

2 I have not been greatly impressed with the view of Alford and others that ἐζήσαν (they lived) is the equivalent of "they arose from the dead," i.e., were resurrected—even though such meaning might strengthen the Premillennial position. The condition described as "they lived" is certainly a result of resurrection but does not constitute resurrection.

3 Augustine, after mentioning the view which he later calls Chiliast or Millenarian, seems to admit that he once held the chiliastic view. He also admits that it is only a sensual interpretation of the Millennium that is objectionable in Chiasm (*op.cit.* XX,7).

4 Alford was overpresumptuous. David Brown (*Christ's Second Coming. Will It Be Pre-Millennial?*) for one argued at considerable length that both the resurrections of Revelation 20 are figurative or "spiritual." The first refers, says he, to the ultimate victory of the church in and over the world; the second, to a recrudescence of evil just before the final judgment (see pp. 234-239). Carroll (*The Book of Revelation*, Broadman Press, Nashville, 1916, 1942; pp. 231,232) shares this view.

Chapter 2

1 This period, when Satan is unbound, is assigned by some Amillennialists to Daniel's seventieth week.

2 Keil and Leupold, *e.g.*, hold that the nation of Israel and the city of Jerusalem in the prophecy of the 70 weeks are symbolical of the New Testament Church.

3 In a sense, this is only the face of that truth of which lack of perspective is the obverse.

4 As Dr. A. J. McClain, my teacher of systematic theology, often said, "Contingency of human act is no sign of contingency in the divine plan."

Chapter 3

1 St. Augustine, for example, believed in a final personal Antichrist, whom he thought would reign three years and six months at the close of this present age (*City of God*, XX, 13).

2 This argument is valid, of course, only on the ground that the late date of composition of Revelation is the correct one. It seems to the writer that the late date is correct, but, if not, the loss of this argument does not do away with the others.

Chapter 4

1 Nebuchadnezzar, even though he saw a dream which Daniel interpreted, was not an agent of prophecy. Actually, both the dream and the interpretation were given to Daniel. See chapter two of Daniel.

Chapter 5

1 The linguistic evidence, supported by rational arguments, is to the effect that Nebuchadnezzar did not forget his dream at all, as the Authorized Version indicates. Rather, because he had not forgotten the dream he could use it as a test of his wise men. One may imagine what a story the king might have heard if the wise men had supposed he had forgotten the dream! So agree most critical commentators and A.S.V. margin.

2 By "Rome" I do not mean necessarily the specific government with headquarters in Italy, but simply that system which Rome began and which became imbedded in what is today called "the West."

3 Since completing the manuscript of this book, there has come to the writer's hands a fine work on Daniel, in the British Premillennial tradition, by Mr. G. H. Lang. In this work of 238 pages (*The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel*, Third edition, 1942), the author adopts the same views of the continuity of succession, and very much the same view of the nature of the fourth kingdom. His views on this point are to be found on pages 24-38 of his book. The writer of this book is grateful for this confirmation, coming from a quite independent source. He is sorry that it was not known earlier in the preparation, that full attention might have been given to it.

Chapter VI

1 I am indebted to rather full presentation of the views of Hitzig and Bonnar by Thomson in his volume *On Daniel in the Pulpit Commentary*. I have not been able to locate *Das Buch Daniel* by Hitzig and *The Great Interregnum* by Bonnar for my own reading.

Chapter VII

1 The word *Karath* is used almost without exception of one of two things: either the making (cutting off) of a covenant or of the violent death of man or beast. There is no sound reason for departing from the usual idea of violent death here. A different word *gazar* "cut off," but with nearly identical meaning, is certainly used of the death of Christ in Isaiah 53:8, where it is said, "He was cut off (*nighzar*) from the land of the living."

2 *Waw consecutive* is the conjunction "and" prefixed to a verb in such a way as to indicate a close consequential relation to a preceding verb.

Chapter VIII

1 Rationalistic interpreters think it predicts a resurrection immediately after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, but that Daniel was mistaken.

APPENDIX I - none

APPENDIX II

1 I have since seen a small work by this writer, Mr. E. M. Blaiklock, in which his view is rather fully set forth (*The Seven Churches, An Exposition of Revelation*, chapters two and three. Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, London: n.d.)

2 I have omitted Hodge's lengthy list of Scripture references.

3 A footnote in the official Roman Catholic Bible in English (*The Holy Bible Douay-Rheims Version*) on Rev. 20:3 reads: "...the souls of the martyrs and saints live and reign with Christ in heaven, in the first resurrection, which is that of the soul to the life of glory."