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ABSTRACT

While partial preterism has not been a dominant interpretive method among the four traditional ways of interpreting the Book of Revelation, namely, preterism, historicism, futurism, and idealism, it seems to be the most convincing interpretation. The problem concerning this work derives from the two parallel arguments in partial preterism. On the one hand, the advocates of consistent partial preterism argue that the whole Book of Revelation including chapters 12-13 concerns God's judgment on the apostate Jerusalem. On the other hand, according to transitional partial preterism, a significant turning point comes in these two chapters in that in Rev. 12-13 John introduces God's judgment on Rome. To solve this problem and to suggest a proposed solution, the following are respectively investigated: historical survey of the interpretation of the Book of Revelation; the critical evaluation of the two arguments of partial preterism; a probe into the socio-historical and literary aspects of Rev. 12-13; intratextuality of Rev. 12-13; intertextuality of John and his Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian audiences; and a proposed partial preterism of Rev. 14-22.

The intertextuality of John's receptive production in terms of the NT, the OT and non-canonical intertexts is relevant to God's judgment of Rome as well as that of Jerusalem. For this reason, the intertextuality of the seven churches' productive reception plays a crucial role in determining the (partial preterist) meaning of Rev. 12-13 in particular, and of Revelation as a whole. This does not of necessity imply that the locus of meaning is in the audience, but that the communicative interaction among the author, the text and the audience decides the meaning. The partial preterist meaning of Revelation is not unlimitedly multiple but determinately controlled in that the intertextuality of John and his audience manifests only two choices: God's judgment on Rome and Jerusalem.

With consistent partial preterism, John provides the Jewish Christians with a direct solution, but with transitional partial preterism, he provides a direct solution for the Gentile Christians. Therefore, both solutions function complementarily and not contradictorily. It is reasonable to conclude that, on the one hand, the Jewish Christian audiences, who emigrated to Asia Minor in AD 66 and were converted by Paul's Ephesian mission in AD 52, were persecuted especially by the heretical Jews. Therefore,
using the OT and NT knowledge they might have interpreted Rev. 12 onward (and maybe Rev. 4-11 too) in terms of God’s judgment on the apostate Jews. The removal of the Jewish temple was absolutely necessary to relieve the stress on the first century Christians of persecution from the Jews. The annihilation of the Jewish system therefore removed the most formidable antagonist of the gospel and brought rest and relief to suffering Christians. On the other hand, the Gentile Christian audiences, who were acquainted with the pagan sources and daily experienced the Roman persecution, were not severely persecuted by the infidelic Jews and interpreted Rev. 12 onward (and maybe Rev. 4-11 too) in the light of God’s judgment on Rome. It can be deduced that John’s Jewish and Gentile audiences have the same form of locution and the same type of illocution in Rev. 12-13. But the perlocutionary act by which John achieves certain intended effects in his audiences in addition to those achieved by the illocutionary act is different to both the Jewish and Gentile audiences. In short, it is not a matter of ‘either ... or’ but ‘both ... and’. Therefore, the two lines of partial preterism do not exclude each other but should be taken into account conjointly.
OPSOMMING

Tussen die vier tradisionele interpretasievorme vir Openbaring - die preteristiese, historiese, toekomsgerigte en idealistiese vorme – is die gedeeltelike preterisme nie die dominerende metode vir interpretasie nie, maar die metode is skynbaar die mees oortuigende. Die probleem wat deur hierdie studie aangespreek word, spruit voort uit die twee paralelle argumente in die gedeeltelike preteristiese metode. Aan die eenkoant is daar die voorstaanders van die konsekwente gedeeltelike preterisme wat aanvoer dat die hele boek Openbaring, insluitend hoofstukke 12 en 13, oor God se oordeel oor die afvallige Jerusalem handel. Aan die anderkant, volgens die oorganklike gedeeltelike preterisme, kom 'n betekenisvolle wending in hierdie betrokke twee hoofstukke na vore, in soverre dat Johannes hierna in Openbaring 12 en 13 oor God se oordeel oor Rome handel. Om 'n moontlike oplossing vir hierdie probleem voor te stel word die volgende aspekte onderskeidelik ondersoek: 'n historiese oorsig van interpretasie van die boek Openbaring; 'n kritiese evaluasie van die twee standpunte rakende gedeeltelike preterisme; 'n diepe studie van die sosio-historiese en literêre aspekte van Openbaring 12 en 13; intratekstualiteit van Openbaring 12 en 13; intertekstualiteit van Johannes en sy Joods Christelike en heidens Christelike toehoorders en 'n voorgestelde gedeeltelike preterisme van Openbaring 14-22.

Die intertekstualiteit van Johannes se ontvangende produksie in terme van die NT, OT en nie-kanonieke intertekste is relevant tot God se oordeel van Rome, sowel as dié van Jerusalem. Om hierdie rede speel die intertekstualiteit van die sewe kerke se produktiewe ontvangs 'n noodsaaklike rol in die bepaling van die (gedeeltelike preteristiese) betekenis van Openbaring 12-13 in die besonder, en van Openbaring as 'n geheel. Dit impliseer nie noodwendig dat die lokus van betekenis in die gehoor gestel is nie, maar dat die kommunikatiewe interaksie tussen die outeur, die teks en die gehoor die betekenis bepaal. Die gedeeltelike preteristiese betekenis van Openbaring is nie onbeperk meervoudig nie, maar bepaalde beheer in dié dat die intertekstualiteit van Johannes en sy gehoor slegs twee keuses manifesteer: God se oordeel op Rome en Jerusalem.

Met die konsekwende gedeeltelike preterisme voorsien Johannes die Joodse Christene
met 'n direkte oplossing, maar met die oorganklike gedeeltelike preterisme, voorsien hy 'n direkte oplossing vir die heidense Christene. Dus funksioneer beide oplossings aanvullend tot mekaar en nie teenstrydig nie. Dit is redelik om aan die eenkant af te lei dat die Joodse Christene wat in 66 n.C. na Klein Asië toe geëmigreer het en tydens Paulus se sending na Efese in 52 n.C. tot bekering gekom het, hoofsaaklik vervolg is deur die ortodokse Jode. Hulle kon dus met die Ou en Nuwe Testamentiese kennis tot hulle beskikking Openbaring 12 en verder (en moontlik Openbaring 4-11 ook) in terme van God se oordeel oor die afvallige Jode geinterpreteer het. Die verwyding van die Joodse tempel was vir die eerste euse Christene uitsig noodsaaklik om sodoende die spanning te verlig wat geskep is deur vervolging deur die Jode. Die vernietiging van die Joodse sisteem het dus die mees gedugte teenstander van die evangelie uit die weggeruim en het rus en verligting onder vervolgde Christene bewerkstellig. Aan die anderkant het die heidense Christene wat bekend was met heidense gebruikte en daagliks Romeinse vervolging ervaar het, maar nie so ernstig deur die ongelowige Jode vervolg is nie, Openbaring 12 en verder (moontlik Openbaring 4-11 ook) in die lig van God se oordeel oor Rome geinterpreteer. Die afleiding kan gemaak word dat Johannes se Joodse en heidense toehoorders dieselfde lokusie gehad en dieselfde taalhandelinge in Openbaring 12-13. Maar die resultaat waardeur Johannes sektore reaksies by sy toehoorders verkry saam met die reaksie wat verkry is deur die taalhandelinge, verskil by die Joodse sowel as die heidense toehoorders. Samevattend is dit dus nie 'n geval van 'die een of die ander' nie, maar wel 'albei-en'. By die twee paralelle van gedeeltelike preterisme sluit die een dus nie die ander uit nie, maar albei behoort gesamentlik in berekening geneem te word.
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ABBREVIATIONS

A. General abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>anno Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>before Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>circa, about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>confer, compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch(s).</td>
<td>chapter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.a.</td>
<td>et alii, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed(s).</td>
<td>editor(s), edited by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>exempli gratia, for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esp.</td>
<td>especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>follows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>id est, that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mss.</td>
<td>manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>no place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par.</td>
<td>parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>translator, translated by, translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v(s).</td>
<td>verse(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Abbreviations for books of the Bible with Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book of the Bible</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>1 Corinthians</th>
<th>2 Corinthians</th>
<th>Galatians</th>
<th>Ephesians</th>
<th>Philippians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Ge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Co.</td>
<td>2 Co.</td>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>Php.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Nu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Dt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Jos.</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Col.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Jdg.</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ru.</td>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>1 Sa.</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>1 Ti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>2 Sa.</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>2 Ti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>1 Ki.</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>Tit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>2 Ki.</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>Phm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Ezr.</td>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td>1 Pe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>Ne.</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
<td>2 Pe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>1 Jn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>2 John</td>
<td>2 Jn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>3 John</td>
<td>3 Jn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>Jude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ecc.</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>SS.</td>
<td>Apocalypse of Abraham</td>
<td>Apo. Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>Apocalypse of Peter</td>
<td>Apo. Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>2 Baruch</td>
<td>2 Bar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>La.</td>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>2 Esdr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ezk.</td>
<td>Florilegium (or Eschatological Midrashim) from Qumran Cave 4 1 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>Pesher on Habakkuk</td>
<td>4QFlor. 1 Macc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>from Qumran Cave 1</td>
<td>Qumran Cave 4 1 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Numbered caves of Qumran</td>
<td>1QpHab. 1Q, 2Q, 3Q, 4Q, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td>Sibylline Oracles</td>
<td>Sib. Or.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Ob.</td>
<td>Temple Scroll from Qumran 11 QTem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Jnh.</td>
<td>Testament of Benjamin</td>
<td>T. Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Mic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Na.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>Zep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>Hag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Zec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>Testament of Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jn.</td>
<td>Testament of Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Testament of Moses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>Testament of Simeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Moses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Simeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Abbreviations of commonly used periodicals and reference works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>American Anthropologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcAc</td>
<td>Acta Academica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTh</td>
<td>Acta Theologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>American Journal of Semiotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJT</td>
<td>Asia Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Abr-Naharin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Haase, W. &amp; Temporini, H. (eds.) Aufsteig und Niedergang der römischen Welt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocrypha</td>
<td>International Journal of Apocryphal Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATJ</td>
<td>The Asbury Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSS</td>
<td>Andrews University Seminary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>Bulletin for Biblical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Horizons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Biblical Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblica</td>
<td>Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijdragen</td>
<td>Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Papers of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Sacra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>The Bible Translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB</td>
<td>Biblical Theology Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Critical Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CL</strong></td>
<td>College Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR</strong></td>
<td>Critical Review: a Journal of Books and Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR:BS</strong></td>
<td>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSR</strong></td>
<td>Christian Scholar's Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTJ</strong></td>
<td>Calvin Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTM</strong></td>
<td>Currents in Theology and Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EkkPh</strong></td>
<td>Ekklesiatikos Pharos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EvQ</strong></td>
<td>Evangelical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex Auditu</strong></td>
<td>Ex Auditu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ExpTim</strong></td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forum</strong></td>
<td>Foundations &amp; Facets Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GTT</strong></td>
<td>Gereformeerde Theologisch Tijdschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HBT</strong></td>
<td>Horizons in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helios</strong></td>
<td>Helios: A Journal Devoted to Critical and Methodological Studies of Classical Culture, Literature, and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HTR</strong></td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Title discussion

The term (partial) 'preterist' derives from the Latin word *praeter*, meaning 'past or beyond'. Hence, according to that view, the Book of Revelation is a picture of current events in the Roman Empire that were taking place or had just taken place in the recent past (Edinger, 1999:8). With regard to 'understanding' in the title of this dissertation, Thiselton's (1992:499-502) distinguishes 'understanding' from 'reading'. He sees these two terms as two different models of approach to texts and, therefore, two different views of the nature of texts themselves. The former is characteristic of a traditional posture, the latter of postmodernism. But in this dissertation, the two terms are used interchangeably.

This dissertation is limited firstly, to the study of the Book of Revelation 12-13, secondly, to the partial preterist perspective and thirdly, to an approach in the light of reformed intertextuality. Reformed intertextuality is contrasted to deconstructive intertextuality in which the Derridean uncontrolled indeterminacy of the meaning is stressed (see Morgan, 1985:13).

1.2. Problem statement

Although contemporary interpretations of the Book of Revelation employ various kinds of (interdisciplinary) methods of criticism,¹ they are based on and categorised into a number of traditional methods, namely (partial) preterism, futurism, historicism and idealism.² This work is an attempt to turn a problem of worn clothes (i.e. the preterism

---

¹ The word 'criticism' derives from the Greek word *κρισιμία* which basically means 'judgment'. 'Criticism' in this work does not mean a negative or destructive approach to the Bible (e.g. 'finding fault'), but means a sober scientific analysis on the grounds of every available insight and fact (cf. Du Toit, 1990:516; Muthuraj, 1996:257).

² As an advocate of the preterist-futurist interpretation, Luter (2001:461) correctly observes that
of the Book of Revelation) into the image of new fashionable garments (i.e. intertextuality). There are two lines of thought in the circle of the partial preterism of Revelation 12-13: one line, that of consistent partial preterism, believes that the whole content of Revelation is the story of the judgment of God on the apostate Jews at the end of the Jewish age in AD 70. The argument of the other line, transitional partial preterism, is that the main theme of Revelation 12-19 is God’s judgment on Rome. Albeit both Jerusalem and Rome are middle points in the Book of Revelation (Van Aarde, 2001:1172), which argument is correct? Is there any truth in either of the arguments? Are they in direct contrast to each other?

1.3. Methodology

1.3.1. The etymology of intertextuality as the focal method

In both contemporary literary criticism and current biblical studies there has been a growing interest in intertextuality as a literary and hermeneutical category. Intertextuality and the intertext⁴ are coinages in English formed under pressure from the French intertextualité. The Latin word is intertextum which means ‘to interweave’ or ‘intertwine’. Ever fond of word play, poststructuralist⁵ theories have mined the
to include the idealist perspective at the point of interpretation is to confuse later applicational procedure with interpretation, to put the cart before the horse. In other words, the idealism inevitably comes back into play in generalising timeless principles in the succeeding applicational process. In addition, the historicism is of marginal value, at best.

³ According to Polaski (1998:58), intertextuality is not so much a methodology as a theoretical term; or, rather, a theoretical term which may give birth to several different methodologies. In the same vein, Paul (2000:259) says, “intertextuality, as an approach, does not provide a method for interpretation, so much as highlighting the importance of considering the relation between the new context and the old in interpreting allusion and citation”. But as Clippinger (2001:190) holds, intertextuality refers to both a ‘method’ of reading that juxtaposes texts in order to discover points of similarities and differences as well as the belief that all texts and ideas are part and parcel of a fabric of historical, social, ideological, and textual relations. On the other hand, intertextuality can be explained as a ‘mindset’ in which a methodology is employed.

⁴ In connection with this notion of intertextuality, Derrida’s (1976:158) notorious statement “There is nothing outside the text” (or, literally translated: ‘There is no outside-text’) does not imply that nothing exists except text, but rather that everything relevant to reading, to textual analysis, including the context, is contained within the intertext. In other words, it states that textuality pervades everything (cf. Harty, 1985:11; Degenaar, 1995:12).

⁵ Here, a brief explanation of the transition from structuralism to poststructuralism is helpful to understand intertextuality as a poststructural method. The theory of structuralism itself arose
etymology of the word ‘text’ — ‘a tissue, something woven’ — for a metaphor to describe
the phenomenon of intertextuality (Davis, 2002:13). The Greek root of the Latin texo
is the stem τέκ-, found in the aorist form (ἐτέκον) meaning ‘to beget offspring’. Intertextuality, like textuality, is a strategic concept whereby the intermingling of all
texts, including the mental texts of readers, may be accomplished. This vast theoretical
space is the site, in effect, of all cultural citations. Intertext(uality) is a methodological
field and cannot be said to exhaust all reality (Harty, 1985:2-12).

1.3.2. The epistemology of intertextuality

Theoretical methodological attitudes within the domain of theological studies might
most successfully be analysed and evaluated by examining the epistemological
suppositions from which they derive. Epistemological frames can never be emptied
(Ryan, 1985:3, 39). Accordingly, without the epistemological shift, in a strict sense, a
methodological shift does not take place. And because of the epistemological
during the early part of the twentieth century as a critique of prevailing liberal humanist views
about the nature of language and meaning. Previously in the study of literature, it had been
assumed that both language and meaning were direct products of an author’s mind. Structuralist
theorists like Saussure and Lévi-Strauss challenged this assumption. They argued that the source
of meaning in language and texts was not the author; instead, they proposed that meaning be
understood as the product of preexisting, universal structures within language itself. Thus,
structuralists typically seek to analyse all narratives as variations of universal narrative patterns.
However, during the 1960s and 1970s, some philosophers and literary theorists had already
begun challenging certain assumptions of structuralism. This critical challenge heralded the rise
of ‘poststructuralism’. While structuralists have insisted that all language has at its core a basic,
universal structure that generates meaning, poststructuralists argue that this core, this basic
structure, is illusory – it is only a false trace, the result of language’s attempts to hide its own
contradictions and incompleteness (see Davis, 2002:11-12).

The term ‘textuality’, Degenaar (1995:11) explains, refers to the nature of being a text in a
textual world in which signs are dynamically interrelated allowing for new connections to be
made continually. At this stage, in addition, the definition of ‘text’ in this work is necessary
before further discussion on intertextuality. Deconstruction views a text as an intertextual event.
In the first place intertextuality refers to the interrelationships between texts in the normal sense
of the word ‘text’, as referring to the interweaving of signs in a book, article or poem. In the
second place intertextuality also refers to the interrelationships between texts in the less
common sense of the word ‘text’ as referring to any object of understanding (for the seven
different definitions of ‘text’, see Degenaar, 1995:7-10). In this work, ‘(inter) text’ primarily
refers to the normal sense of written material. Notwithstanding, because the unusual sense of
text, i.e. all objects of understanding, is not excluded, the life and times of John, culture, society,
politics, religion, and the context of John’s audiences are to be included in the process of
understanding Revelation.

Senekal (1999:73-77), who suggests Christ-centred sociology, accepts the fact that God is the
contradiction, the combination of different methodologies at times seems to be difficult. As pointed out by Carroll (1993:76), more traditional approaches might talk about 'echo', 'influence', 'borrowing', and 'quotation', though, to be fair to the concept of intertextuality. In biblical studies much work has already been done on intertextual matters, though without calling these by such a name. As a matter of fact, intertextuality describes a number of phenomena that are very old, very common and remarkably well

ultimate *causa sui* and in control, and he tends to bring back the *causa sui* (on a human level) in explanations of human and social behavioural phenomena. A paradigm shift depends on exegetes not hermeneutical tools, because the major change occurs not so much in the tool, but in the user of the tool. With regard to the presupposition of reformed hermeneutics, in contrast to worldly irrationalism and worldly rationalism, hermeneutical salvation, like all other aspects of salvation, is by grace alone. Exegetes act with hermeneutical responsibility only because God has acted on them, through the Spirit of Christ (Jn. 15:16; cf. Poythress, 1999:222). Hence, Gulley (2000:208) recklessly and too frequently uses the term 'paradigm shift', when he explains the latest cultural paradigm (e.g. narrative and reader-response theories) within the context of their growth out of the historical (e.g. historical criticism) and literary (e.g. canonical criticism, structuralism) paradigms. The change of locus of meaning from author to text to reader, according to Gulley, is also a paradigm shift.

One example comes from the integration of the socio-scientific approach and the literary approach. In the actual world of NT critical practices, some socio-scientific and literary approaches are indeed complementary and can easily be merged into an integrated approach, while other socio-scientific interpretations are incompatible with literary and rhetorical interpretations and cannot be considered complementary. The reason is that the relationship between critical approaches in the NT studies is determined by prior epistemological and philosophical presuppositions that cause differences within approaches to precede those between approaches (see Craffert, 1996:45). With regard to the possibility of integration of different methods, Erickson's (1993:123) remarks are pertinent: "There will need to be a genuinely philosophical basis to the hermeneutical work that is done. It is essential that hermeneuts understand that genuine ideational differences separate various hermeneutical systems. A given hermeneutic will need to be understood as part of a much larger system of thought, and that system will have to be carefully evaluated. ... The philosophical sophistication of different hermeneutical approaches is necessary for future hermeneutical works". In this regard, Heie (1996:148) is an exception in that his cross-perspective conversation (or perspectivalism: as an epistemological assumption, the world is perceived, processed, and articulated with one or another perspective, and a perspective has the power to make sense out of the rawness of experienced life, even though it cannot be proven or absolutely established) and moderate postmodernism allow him to reach an epistemological integration between radically differing perspectives (or methodologies). Heie (1996:151) further suggests five ideals for cross-perspectival conversation: reciprocity and mutual recognition, inclusiveness, equal voice, humility and charity. But he seems to fail to demonstrate the concrete possibility of the integration of conflict epistemology.

The following list of key concepts which are interconnected with intertextuality reveals that intertextual study is a multifaceted and elusive phenomenon indeed: quotation, source, influence, allusion, association, reminiscence, echo and reference. In addition, citing Laurent Jenny, Mettinger distinguishes 'intertextuality proper' (when a text alludes to or redeployes an entire structure, a pattern of form and meaning from an earlier text) from 'simple allusion' or 'reminiscence' (when a text repeats an element from an earlier text, without referring to the original meaning in the original context; see Mettinger, 1993:257).
known. Therefore, it can be concluded that intertextuality does not cause a major paradigm shift in hermeneutics, even though it has its own hermeneutical peculiarities. The figure below indicates the relation between epistemology and methodology in paradigm shift (cf. Mouton, 2002:140-141):  

![Diagram of paradigm shift](image)

10 In contrast to Bayer (2000:500-501), who argues that theology as a discipline of conflict and controversy is ill-grounded (i.e. ill-founded) with no certain knowledge of a necessary beginning and ending, the relation between epistemology and methodology in this dissertation is in principle in accord with the framework of (philosophical) foundationalism. The foundationalist's initial task is to establish an epistemological foundation for the construction of the human knowing project by determining the foundational beliefs or principles upon which knowledge rests. Actually, there are three primary aspects to the foundationalist picture of knowledge: the basic or immediate beliefs (or first principles) which form the bedrock; the mediate or nonbasic beliefs; and the basing relation, that is, the connection between basic beliefs and nonbasic beliefs which specifies how the epistemic certainty of basic beliefs can be transferred to nonbasic beliefs. The reformed epistemologists claim unequivocally that belief in God ought to be viewed as properly basic. The reality (i.e. noetic effects of sin) that sin distorts exegetes' thinking reminds them not only of their need to be self-critical and open to other's correction but also of their need for epistemic humility. Nonetheless, the combination of the epistemic humbleness and hope (or confidence) helps exegetes to avoid the pessimism of the relativist (see Moroney, 1999:449-450; Grenz, 2000:59-60, 75). In this regard, Mangis (1999:426) succinctly summarises that a Christian hermeneutics of humility and confidence will answer yes to the question — there is an authoritative heart of truth — but will answer no to the question — exegetes cannot know that truth with objectivity. Such positions of balance are always fraught with difficulty and tension. This position requires exegetes to humbly acknowledge their fallen humanness, that they are born in sin and confusion, separated from the only One who sees truth with objectivity. Exegetes' humbleness ('suspicion', to use Mangis term) is not to shake the foundations of their belief but to be true to the objective and authoritative truth. With the postfoundationalist (or the relativist) exegetes can accept the suspicion of their own subjective interpretation of truth but part company on the denial of the existence of an authoritative reality. In the case of the reformed epistemology, according to Plantinga (1983:72), exegetes are entirely rational, entirely within their epistemic rights, in starting with belief in God, in accepting it as foundation, and in taking it as premise for argument to other conclusions. One who takes belief in God as basis is not thereby violating any epistemic duties or revealing a defect in his/her noetic structure, which can include belief in God as foundation.
Intertextuality, although a term of relatively recent origin in literary theory, has accumulated a bewildering variety of definitions and uses (Polaski, 1998:58). Currently, intertextuality is a fashionable term, but almost everybody who uses it understands it somewhat differently (for the plural concepts of intertextuality, see Jonker, 1999:81-82; and for the related terms and their definition, see Mettinger, 1993:261-262). Originally the term was conceived and used by a critical avantgarde as a form of protest against established cultural and social values (Plett, 1991:3). Hence, Fox (2002:17), exemplifying the feminist poststructuralist Helene Cixous’s feminine texts, delineates this fact as follows: a commitment to intertextuality is a commitment to difference and to becoming Other. The politics of intertextuality and the postmodern are radical and concerned with ‘resistance’ and ‘change’. According to Barthes (1915-1980) and Kristeva, intertextuality is a revolutionary gesture directed by the modern text against the closure of the signifier in bourgeois or representational discourse (see Morgan, 1985:24).

The actual concept of intertextuality goes back to Julia Kristeva; but it was quickly taken over and reinterpreted by others (Nielsen, 2000:17). According to the

---

11 According to Sanders (2000:38), who sees the Bible as the dialogue between the OT and the NT, there are three principal ways in which the term ‘intertextuality’ is used in the literature currently. It is used first to focus on the chemistry between two contiguous blocks of literature, large or small. A second use is the recognition that all literature is made up of previous literature and reflects the earlier through citation, allusion, use of phrases and paraphrases of older to create newer literature, references to earlier episodes, even echoes of earlier familiar literature in the construction of the later. The third use is the recognition that the reader is also a text and that reading is in essence an encounter between texts. In other words, the reader is a bundle of hermeneutics, as it were, engaging a text that is itself a bundle of hermeneutics. Since the NT itself was composed and shaped in the period of textual fluidity, one has to be quite discerning in locating modes of intertextuality (Sanders, 2001:19; for the interfaith dialogue between Judaism and Christianity on the basis of the canonical intertextuality see Sanders, 2001:14-16). In this dissertation, all three uses the word mentioned by Sanders are taken into consideration. Intertextuality has a broad sense as Aune explains: “intertextuality is a way of reading a text which sees it as a network of references to other texts, a phenomenon which may be approached at the levels of the word, the phrase and the sentence, but which becomes particularly evident in terms of larger textual units within a composition which has parallels or analogues in the constituent literary units of other texts. Intertextuality plays a central role in both the production and reception of texts. Texts are necessarily written and read in light of the familiarity which both authors and readers have with earlier texts. While no two early Christian readers would have understood the Apocalypse in precisely the same way, it is also likely that particular congregations of readers would have a relatively homologous understanding of the Apocalypse because of their shared knowledge of antecedent texts” (Aune, 1991:142-143).
poststructuralist literary critic Julia Kristeva (1986:34), who systematically coined the term ‘intertextuality’ with reference to the Russian formalist Michael M. Bakhtin’s (1895-1975) concept of ‘dialogic orientation’, it contains a mosaic of citations or an

12 While Kristeva retains linguistic analysis as an essential tool of study, she feels the necessity to go beyond structuralist study, and even beyond semiotics as first conceived (Zepp, 1982:85, 89). In her doctoral dissertation, Revolution in poetic language, Kristeva (1984:59-60) insisted that the term intertextuality denotes the transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another, but since this term has often been understood in the banal sense of ‘study of sources’, she prefers the term ‘transposition’ because it specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation of the thetic - of enunciative and denotative positionality. Similarly, Plett (1991:20-23) introduces four transformations of intertextuality: (medial, linguistic, and structural) substitution, addition, subtraction, and permutation. Moyise (1995:111) is of the opinion that the task of intertextuality is to explore how the source text continues to speak through the new work and how the new work forces new meanings from the source text. In the 1980s in South Africa, W.S. Vorster (1988:120), for instance, urgently proposed the necessity of the intertextual study in Revelation in order to research the Book in a new perspective instead of source and redaction criticism. While the study of sources and influence of texts on other texts is the historical forerunner of intertextuality, Vorster (1989:19, 26) draws the differences between studies based on intertextuality and redaktionsgeschichte: the main difference seems to be the concept ‘text’. Viewing a text as a network of fragments of texts, which refer endlessly to other texts because of the absorption of other texts, is something totally different from studying the agreements and differences between a focused text and its sources. While redaktionsgeschichte focuses on the redactor and his activities, intertextuality takes seriously the fact that authors produce texts and that readers react to these texts by assigning meaning to them. Source-influence is not the focus point of intertextuality. In intertextuality meaning is assigned to the text by intertextual reading in accordance with the function of the intertexts of the focused text. In another place, Vorster (1993:394) goes on to delineate that “there is a total difference between an attempt where the NT is understood from the perspective of its ‘production’, and an attempt where it is understood from the perspective of its ‘growth’. The first approach (intertextuality) seriously considers that any allusion or quotation from another text forms an integral part of the new text. The latter (e.g. source criticism) regards the final text, which has relationships with precursor texts, as the result of a causal process.” Desrosiers (2000:87-88) correspondingly sets forth the opinion that “meaning is woven not only by parts of a text interacting with one another, but through the interaction with the sum of all texts which belong to a specific culture as embodied in its various individuals and groups. It is much more than mere ‘source hunting’. Source criticism has had the tendency to see the production of meaning in a very linear (diachronic) way, going from the source to the new document in which it is now included. Intertextuality, on the other hand, sees the interaction between source and text as something more interactive. As John transformed the meaning of his sources by making allusions to them, so they transformed the meaning of his text. Intertextuality, when used in its purest form, deals with transformation of meaning and transformation of reader. This is the challenge it offers to all who wish to enter Revelation’s semantic world”.

13 The Russian theoreticians emphasise the preserving functions of the intertext (quoting text). In contrast, French theoreticians see intertextuality as a decentralising and destabilising force. Explicit intertextuality can carry with it both ‘disruptive’ and ‘reconstructive’ features. This double movement of disruption and regeneration is precisely its raison d’être. (Boyarin, 1987:540-541).

14 The French critic Tzvetan Todorov has declared Bakhtin to be the twentieth century’s greatest literary thinker. Bakhtin’s original term ‘dialogic orientation’ is now called
absorption or transformation of other texts. Any text, according to her, is a network of traces of other texts and, in turn, forms part of a universe of corresponding texts. As a result, then, no text exists in a vacuum. Stated differently, all texts are embedded in a larger web of related texts. The texture of a particular text is thickened and its meaning extended by its interplay with other texts, especially when the reader recognises that the repetition of similar phrases and subject matter cues parts of an integral whole. Interpreters seek and find new meanings in earlier texts (cf. Tull, 1999:164; Wall, 2001:218-219). Thus, intertextual understanding is inevitable.

Accordingly, Fishbane (2000:39) distinguishes three stages of biblical intertextuality, namely, the proto-canonical stage, the canon-within-the-canon stage (i.e. intra-canonical 'intertextuality'). For Bakhtin (1981:426, 428), 'dialogism' is the characteristic epistemological mode of a world dominated by heteroglossia which is the base condition governing the operation of meaning in any utterance. Everything means, is understood, as a part of a greater whole – there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. Which will affect the other, how it will do so and to what degree is what is actually settled at the moment of utterance. This dialogic imperative, mandated by the pre-existence of the language world relative to any of its current inhabitants, ensures that there can be no actual monologue. Bakhtin calls attention to three loci where some sort of dialogue is operative. The first is the existence of a variety of other, foreign, even competing utterances already present in the environment into which the text enters, that attach themselves to the subject about which the text wishes to speak; the second, an internal dialogism operating within the text as it responds to the utterances in its environment; and the third, the active, sometimes competing responses of the audience (see Tull, 1999:167). In addition, as Van Wolde (1997:427) points out, two major differences are evident between Bakhtin and Kristeva (also see Duff, 2002:61): (1) Bakhtin is not only concerned with the relationship between texts but also with the relationship between text and reality, while Kristeva restricts intertextuality to the relationship between texts. At the same time Kristeva extends the concept of text further so that reality also becomes a text. (2) Bakhtin looks from the perspective of one text to other texts, while Kristeva does not look from the text but from the intertext or 'the book of the culture' of which a text forms a small part. These differences have become gradually bigger, because in the course of time the theories concerning intertextuality have been developed further into a more vague concept by French (post) structuralists and American postmodernists. However, according to R.N. Soulen and R.K. Soulen (2001:87), rather than to Bakhtin, whose influence arrived in the West only in the late 20th century, some scholars point to an essay by T.S. Eliot (1919) as generative of studies loosely classifiable as intertextual in nature. Eliot noted that texts do not arise de novo but are dependent on, extend, and renew the language, symbolic worlds, and metaphors of texts that preceded and, in their interaction with new social conditions, generated them.

With regard to the concept of a web, Beal (1992:22-23) argues: "The basic force of intertextuality is to problematise, even spoil, textual boundaries – those lines of demarcation which allow a reader to talk about the meaning, subject, or origin of a writing. Such borders, intertextuality asserts, are never solid or stable. Texts are always spilling over into other texts. No text is an isolated island". What makes intertextuality interesting, however, is that the shared webs of meaning and association that enable communication between people are never fully and completely shared (Tull, 1999:165).
intertextuality), and the stage of the canonical corpus itself together with its post-canononical effects, asserting the significance of intertextuality as follows:

Intertextuality is the core of the canonical imagination, that is, it is the core of the creative imagination that lives within a self-reflexive culture shaped by an authoritative collection of texts. The main reason for this is that a canon presupposes the possibility of correlations among its parts, such that new texts may embed, re-use, or otherwise allude to precursor materials – both as a strategy for meaning-making, and for establishing the authority of a given innovation. Put in a nutshell, intertextuality ... is a form that literary creativity takes when innovation is grounded in tradition.

Yet the fact that among theorists of intertextuality a wide variety of uses and applications of the term intertextuality can be found implies that intertextual analysis is no more a value-free, innocent critical practice than, for example, source and redaction criticism.16

For the proper understanding of intertextuality, the historical development of intertextuality between the 1960s and the 1990s is relevant. As Hatina (1999:30-31) observes, in the late 1960s and early 70s, intertextuality was associated with an antagonism toward the contemporary hermeneutical struggle, characterised by a crisis of representation which could no longer guarantee meaning, centrality and reference. Intertextual analysis is an alternative strategy to studying literary texts that would serve as an antidote to historically oriented approaches. This shift from historicism, with its tracing of literary origins and sources of influence, to intertextuality marked a dramatically different approach to literary studies (Landwehr, 2002:2). Though Kristeva's main emphasis was on language theory, the concept of intertextuality was inseparably connected with political idealism (see Kristeva, 1986:2).17 The agenda was

16 Intertextuality is not a time-bound feature in literature and the arts. Nevertheless it is obvious that certain cultural periods incline to it more than others. In the postmodernist period, intertextuality is apparent in every section of culture: literature, film, art, architecture, music, photography, and so forth, even if it is interpreted in different ways (Plett, 1991:26).
17 Intertextuality is not some neutral literary mechanism but rather at root a means of ideological and cultural expression and of social transformation (Aichele & Phillips, 1995:9). In Kristeva's interpretation, one easily realises the political meaning of interpretation: "There are political implications inherent in the act of interpretation itself, whatever meaning that interpretation bestows. ... To give a political meaning to something is perhaps only the ultimate consequence of the epistemological attitude which consists, simply, of the desire to give
nothing less than the subversion of the bourgeois establishment through the empowerment of the reader/critic to resist and combat the literary and social tradition at large. Hence, intertextuality is closely aligned with deconstruction in which language serves as the ground of existence and the world emerges as infinite text. Moreover, the poststructuralist focus on the role of the reader creates immediate discord with the historical critic who focuses on the author and the written text.

In the 1980s, efforts to make intertextuality a more systemised concept were made on the basis of reflection on the demerits of Kristeva's usage of intertextuality, which was thought to be too broad and not a systemised concept. The results of these efforts are semiotic intertextual analysis and hermeneutic intertextual analysis (Mertens, 1990:20).

In the 1990s, Phillips pointed out the undeveloped situation of intertextual research in the field of biblical interpretation. According to Phillips (1991:78-79), the usefulness of intertextuality as a conceptual category for illuminating various exegetical phenomena, such as textual citation, allusion, allegorical interpretation, typology, rhetorical and discourse structures, narrative structure, reader-response strategies, canonical and extra-canonical formation, and the like, has not been exploited by biblical exegetes in particular or, for that matter, by religionists in general. There is a conspicuous absence of a sustained theoretical reflection upon such matters as intertextuality and its practical importance for explaining the complexities and thickness of biblical texts. This situation seems not to have been changed, at least as far as the study of the Book of Revelation is concerned.

In the same vein as Kristeva, Barthes (1977:160-161; 1981:39), who distinguishes a 'text' from a 'work', argues that the metaphor of the text is that of the network (cf. Patte, 1995:95). A text, Barthes explains, is a new tissue of past citations. Bits of codes, formulae, rhythmic models, and fragments of social languages pass into the text and are redistributed within it, for there is always language before and around the text. Intertextuality, the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot, of course, be reduced to a problem of sources or influences. Epistemologically, the concept of intertext is what meaning” (Kristeva, 1982:78).
brings to the literary theory of the text the volume of sociality: the whole of language, anterior or contemporary, comes to the text. However, a ‘work’, according to Barthes, refers to the image of an organism, which grows by vital expansion, by development. The intertextual in which every text is held, in itself the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with the origin of the text. Intertextuality is a quotation without inverted commas, and asks of the reader a practical collaboration. Thus, in the intertextual analysis, the author may not come back in the text, and becomes a paper-author: his life is no longer the origin of his fiction. Barthes (1977:145-148) goes on to claim the following:

Linguistics has recently provided the destruction of the author with a valuable analytical tool by showing that the whole of the enunciation is an empty process, functioning perfectly without there being any need for it to be filled with the person of the interlocutors. The author is always conceived of as the past of his own book: book and author stand automatically on a single line divided into a before and an after. To give a text an author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing. Thus, the reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text’s unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the author.

At this point, Barthes, like most postmodern literary critics, less thinks of the role of an author at the cost of that of a reader.18 The present writer agrees with poststructuralists in their emphasis on the fact that literary texts, like biblical texts, are intertextual, but does not accept the claim that the role of the reader can be defined as that of an exclusive producer. Thus, the following classical statement is still valid in this dissertation: there is a text, a text has an author and this author writes for his readers. As a matter of fact, however, the role of reader in the process of interpretation has been ignored. As Voelz (1995:154-156) significantly maintains, a reader must be seen as a text. More accurately, the states, actions, hopes, fears, and knowledge of a reader’s life-experience comprise a text. In other words, as readers read, they read not only the signs

18 In terms of content and even of form, intertext and theme may indeed coincide, but they differ radically from each other in terms of their impact on the ‘reader’. In fact, a theme’s impact can be quite independent of the reader’s recognition of the theme. By contrast, intertextuality exists only when two texts interact. They cannot be an intertext without the reader’s awareness of it (Riffaterre, 1990:74-75).
of a given text in intertextual relationship to obtain a meaning for that text, but they read also their own life-experiences as textual signs and relate them to the signs and to the meanings of those signs on the various levels which comprise the given text, to make sense of their own life-experiences as textual sign, i.e. to apply the text to themselves. No one reads in a vacuum without his/her intention of an application of the text to his/her life.

Drawing on Gadamer's notion of a fusion of horizons, Brawley (1995:6-8) distinguishes between the diachronic approach represented by historical criticism and the synchronic approach including intertextuality, arguing that whereas the conventional approach focuses on a diachronic relationship between the precursor (text) and the successor (text), from the perspective of intertextuality the new text and the precursor depend on each other holistically in a synchronic relationship. The conventional approach breaks the precursor and the successor apart by insisting on the historical and literary context of each. According to the criteria of intertextuality, the related question is no longer how faithful the repetition is to the original. Rather, a reference to an old text locates the modern interpreter in a tensive ambience of echoes between the two texts, and the question is how the two texts reverberate with each other. "Because of the intertextual cross-reference", Riffaterre (1987:381) avers, "Each intertextual reading is

---

19 The fusion of horizons appears in many fields of contemporary hermeneutics. For example, as his book title 'New horizons in hermeneutics' suggests, Thiselton (1992:1) argues that texts may enlarge the horizons of readers. When this occurs, horizons move and become new horizons. Reading may also produce transforming effects. Kim (1999:80-81), who combines postcolonial, feministic, deconstructional and intertextual interpretations for understanding Rev. 17, holds that reading the text, as a flesh-and-blood reader, is not a discovery or reconstruction of the latent meaning of the text, but a process, through which something is newly raised up by mutual dialogue between the text and the reader. The fusion of horizons runs parallel to the concept of Paul Ricoeur's (1984:78-80) refiguration (mimesis III). To Ricoeur, the horizon (or world) is the whole set of references opened by every sort of descriptive or poetic text the reader has read, interpreted and loved. The horizon of the text and the world of the reader interpenetrate one another through the fusion of horizons; the reader belongs to both the experiential horizon of the work imaginatively, and the horizon of its action concretely. Drawing on Tracy's concept of 'analogical imagination', Conradie (1992:104) holds that interpretation is the search for similarities-in-differences between the text and the reader, and that in the act of interpretation, both the similarities and differences between the world (or horizon) of the interpreting subject or community (i.e. reader) and the world of the interpreted Christian classics (i.e. text) are crucial. In short, from these examples it can be concluded that apart from the author, the fusion of horizons of the text and the reader is usually presupposed in contemporary hermeneutics.
in fact a rereading, a revised interpretation of a preceding stretch of text”.

Greimas and Courtés (1979:161) argue that a work is not created on the basis of the artist’s vision but on the basis of other works opens up the possibility for a better understanding of the phenomenon of intertextuality. This phenomenon implies the existence of autonomous semiotic systems (or discourse) within which more or less explicit processes of construction, reproduction, or transformation of models take place. But in the case of John, the author of Revelation, it is clear that his God inspired vision is the primary source of his work. His intertextual knowledge is a second source, even though his vision and intertextuality frequently intertwine with each other.

In connection with the epistemology of intertextuality, Culler (1983:114-118) indicates two sorts of intertextual presuppositions, maintaining that, indeed, it is not difficult to make comparisons between the ‘logical presuppositions’ of linguistics and the ‘rhetorical and literary (or pragmatic) presuppositions’ which are central to the process of reading literary works. There are many ways in which rhetorical or literary (or pragmatic) presuppositions are signaled and produced by elements or constructions that carry no logical presupposition. The rhetorical (or pragmatic) presuppositions are defined not by the relations between sentences like logical presuppositions but by the relation between utterance and situation of utterance: an utterance of a sentence pragmatically presupposes that its context is appropriate. Hence, Culler comes to the conclusion that two limited approaches to intertextuality are possible. The first is to look at the specific (logical) presuppositions of a given text, the way in which it produces a pre-text, an intertextual space whose occupants may or may not correspond to other actual texts. The second enterprise, the study of rhetorical or pragmatic presupposition, leads to a poetics which is less interested in the occupants of that intertextual space which makes a work intelligible than in the conventions which underlie that discursive activity or space. In this work too, the logical and rhetorical presuppositions of intertextuality are taken into account.

Chandler (2002:16) summarises some defining features which are useful for considering degrees of intertextuality: (1) reflexivity (how reflexive or self-conscious the use of intertextuality seems to be); (2) alteration (the alteration of sources); (3) explicitness
(the specificity and explicitness of reference[s] to other text[s]); (4) criticality to comprehension (how important it would be for the reader to recognise the intertextuality involved); (5) scale of adoption (the overall scale of allusion/incorporation within the text); and (6) structural unboundedness (to what extent the text is presented or understood as part of or tied to a larger structure). If a text shows these six features clearly, the degree of its intertextuality is clearly evident.

Even though a wide variety of uses and applications of the term can be found among theorists of intertextuality, in this work the term intertextuality is used primarily with reference to the strategies used both by John to create Revelation and by his audiences to interpret the Book. To put it another way, the way in which the term intertextuality is used in this dissertation is that all literature is made up of previous writings and reflects the earlier works through citation, allusion, use of phrases and paraphrases of older books to create newer literature, references to earlier episodes, and even echoes of earlier familiar literature in the construction of the later frame. Consequently, the term intertextuality is used primarily with reference to the strategies used both by John to create Revelation (i.e. text production) and by his audiences to understand the Book (i.e. text reception). Thus, intertextuality is concerned with three aspects, namely, the author-oriented, text-oriented, and reader-oriented theories (cf. Linton, 1993:11, 23, 32, 33). Therefore, the concept of intertextuality in this dissertation, firstly, challenges the traditional approach, which assumes that there is one meaning in a text that can be deduced when one determines the author's intention. Secondly, it disagrees with the
New Criticism in which only the autonomous text plays the dominant interpretive role.\textsuperscript{23} The reader is considered to be merely a passive consumer of the text. Thirdly, it differs from the post-structural/deconstructional\textsuperscript{24} way which declares ‘the death of the author’\textsuperscript{25} (cf. Linton, 1993:11, 32). Although proclaimed as early as 1968, ‘the death of...
the author' (Barthes) did not actually occur in intertextual theory, for author and reader had, at least implicitly, always been a matter of consideration. To put it differently, one cannot proclaim the death of the author without proclaiming the death of the reader, because every author is a reader as well. And conversely, if s/he claims the existence of the reader, s/he must accept the author as well. The author of a text begins as reader of an earlier text (cf. Plett, 1991:26; Nielsen, 1992:127). As Landwehr (2002:4) observes, scholars of America intertextual criticism generally ignore the 'death of author' and stress on the importance of the author. Furthermore, intertextuality accords with the hermeneutical rule that 'Scripture interprets Scripture'. The intertextuality of the NT does not simply add a new and interesting angle to the historical-critical enterprise; it points exegetes towards a hermeneutical model in which OT and NT are 'interactive (or intertexture) mediums of the word of the Lord' in the dynamic process by which the reader understands and then submits to the Bible (Wall, 2000:546-547).

'Text-oriented' intertextual interpretation focuses on the intertextual relations motivated by the text. 'Reader-oriented' intertextual interpretation focuses on idiosyncratically motivated relations, primarily associations which the reader, for whatever reasons, includes in the process of meaning constitution. 'Author-oriented' intertextual interpretation tries to reconstruct hypothetically what intention caused the author to use intertextual relations, with what background knowledge, under what premises and with what intention s/he selected and embedded into her/his text certain reference texts, for what reasons specific reference and marking strategies were used, with what motivation

26 There is another difference between French intertextual critics and American critics. Whereas Barthes and Kristeva refuse to allow the concepts of 'author' or 'source' to overlap with that of anonymous intertextuality, American theorists, as Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein note, have questioned the firm boundaries between influence and intertextuality and even perceive these boundaries as virtually nonexistent (Landwehr, 2002:4).

27 Of course the reader attributes meaning to the text by the activity of reading, but at the same time s/he is guided by the data in the text. 'The text of the reader' is the total of meanings constructed by the activity of the reader on the basis of the instructions given by the text (Welzen, 1999:227).

28 In this connection, 'the text of the author' is the text made by the author, which has found its material expression in the written and oral product.
or intention entities were marked explicitly or implicitly, and so on. As a matter of fact, divine Authorship does not preclude a plurality of voices as the canonical text is produced and interpreted (Holthuis, 1994:85-86; cf. Phillips, 2000:233).

The diagram below demonstrates the locus of meaning of intertextuality in this work in connection with other methodologies (cf. Soulen & Soulen, 2001:235):

The appropriateness of intertextual analysis is supported by the genre of the Book of Revelation. As Perrin (1983:126, 128, 135) has maintained, one of the literary characteristics of the Book of Revelation as an apocalyptic prophecy is the extensive quotation of previously existing texts. The apocalyptic writers constantly used and re-used, interpreted and reinterpreted, the sacred texts of their tradition, especially earlier apocalyptic texts. Apocalyptic envisages a more dynamic interaction between the past
text and the present situation, whereby the text interprets the situation and the situation interprets the text, so that the text itself can be modified and rewritten. So an apocalyptic discourse is usually a mosaic of scriptural quotations and allusions, together perhaps with some reference to the experience of the writer and his community, generally couched in scriptural language. With regard to textuality in communication, Du Toit (1990:517-518) points out the important fact that “biblical science must not neglect the role of the text as the expression of the communicational meaning of the sender. To admit the polyvalence of text does not necessarily mean its omnivalence. The possibility of meaning of a text is subject to the fixed limitation from the extratextual situation, the intertextual context in which it stands and the intratextual encoding methods of the message itself. These combinations of life-context, intertext and intratext impose restrictions on the text understanding which makes meaningful communication really possible”. It should be noted that in this work, intratextuality, (inner-biblical) intertextuality, and (non-canonical) intertextuality are distinguished as the table shows:

1.3.3. The constituting/constraining criteria of intertextuality

What is problematic about current notions of intertextuality is not the huge scope of the boundaries which have increased, but the transposing of horizons of understanding into matrices which generate an infinite chain of semiotic effects. Actually, the reader should
not be left to construct textual meaning without external or given constraints\(^{29}\) (Thiselton, 1992:506). In fact, the identification of an intertext is an interpretation itself (cf. Mettinger, 1993:275).

The criteria which provide constraints for intertextual analysis can be outlined briefly as follows (Keesmaat, 1994:34-35; cf. Hays, 1989:29-32; Van Wolde, 1997:432-433):

1. **Availability:**\(^{30}\) Was the proposed source of echo available to John and/or original audiences?

2. **Volume:** To what degree is there explicit repetition of words\(^{31}\) or syntactical patterns? This also involves how distinctive or prominent the precursor text is within Scripture and how much rhetorical weight the echo receives in (the Apocalypse of) John. Volume should be measured on the phraseological plane and on other levels, for example, the replication of the form, genre, setting, and plot of their precursor. If on the level of plot, for example, a character in the successor text repeats the experience of a character in the

---

\(^{29}\) Some scholars do not permit uncontrolled intertextual studies. One example is that of Culler (1983:118) who has two presuppositions of intertextuality, that is, logical and pragmatic. He suggests two limited approaches to intertextuality: the first is to look at the specific presuppositions of a given text, the way in which it produces a pre-text, an intertextual space whose occupants may or may not correspond to other actual texts. The second enterprise, the study of pragmatic presupposition, leads to a poetics which is less interested in the occupants of that intertextual space which makes a work intelligible than in the conventions which underlie that discursive activity or space. Another example is that of Welzen (1999:233), according to whom there is a minimalistic and a maximalistic understanding of intertextuality. The minimalistic view considers as relevant only the architexts indicated in the fenotext by indicators. The maximalistic understanding sees intertextuality as a feature of every utterance. Every utterance has its home in a continually growing language system. This understanding leads to a never ending process of meaning by connecting the fenotext again and again to new and different intertexts. The maximalistic understanding is unmanageable because it is a hopeless task. So Welzen (1999:234) reaches the conclusion that a position in between is asked for. In this midway position a description of relationships of texts is possible in terms of transformation, including addition, deletion, transposition or replacement. The maximalistic understanding is unmanageable because it is a hopeless task. So Welzen (1999:234) reaches the conclusion that a position in between is asked for. In this midway position a description of relationships of texts is possible in terms of transformation, including addition, deletion, transposition or replacement.

\(^{30}\) The NT writers lived in a world of communication. Communication among Christians in the first century was not that of isolated communities but of ‘the holy internet’. For this reason, John the seer knew of the NT epistles and the Gospels and that, if he wished, he could get copies of them (cf. Brodie, 2001:108).

\(^{31}\) According to Hepner (2001:5-22), lexical analogies creating verbal resonances fall into five main categories in the study of OT intertextuality. The five categories of resonance are: (1) repetition of identical word roots, (2) resonance of dissimilar words that share two consonants, (3) resonance of anagrams, (4) missing resonances, and (5) numerical resonances. It seems that even in NT intertextual analysis, exegetes can use verbal resonances to help identify intertextual links between biblical narratives.

3. Recurrence: How often does John elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?

4. Thematic coherence: How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument John is developing? Does it clarify or illuminate John's discussion?

5. Historical plausibility: Could John have intended the suggested meaning? Could his audiences have understood it? Or, leaving the language of intentionality aside, is the suggested meaning plausible in the light of the plots which the intertext of the culture allows?

6. History of interpretation: Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes?

7. Satisfaction: Does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce a satisfying account of the effect of intertextual relation for the reader?

8. Socio-historical, cultural, and ideological setting and structure (cf. Keesmaat, 1994:33): If it were not for the study of the socio-historical setting, as Schoors (2000:45, 59) points out, the study of intertextuality would be a synchronic business which, in the end, means an ahistorical study. Such an approach does not belong to scientific discourse, but rather to homiletical discourse. A text, a phrase, or a motif that has been borrowed receives its full meaning only from the actual (social) context in which it has been adopted.

These criteria should be taken into account simultaneously. According to Brawley (1995:13), among the above criteria for intertextuality, 'availability' and 'volume' are crucial. Availability is decisive if it means consciousness of the cultural repertoire without which readers cannot catch echoes. Beyond the above criteria, there are other signs pointing to an intertext beyond the text. 'Ungrammaticalities' are clues for readers to move beyond the literal level of significance to an intertextual level.

---

A dissenting voice comes from Brodie (2001:109), arguing that similarities of theme, though helpful, are not decisive, but similarities of motif, action, and details provide strong evidence. Thematic coherence, however, is still a useful criterion of intertextuality in Revelation (esp. the Exodus theme).
Ungrammaticalities are conflicts which form obstacles to a construal of meaning as if they were grammatical anomalies or deviations from normal definitions. Ungrammaticalities are textual patterns that cannot be understood with the sole help of context, grammar, lexicon, and descriptive systems. As readers detect ungrammaticalities, they move to a network of relationships beyond the explicit text and perceive meaning in the interplay between text and intertext.

Sanders (2001:19) is of the opinion that one of the most obvious constraints on a writer who echoes Scripture is the factor of ‘recognisability’: for the reference to have authority the reader must be able to recognise that the paraphrase or echo was indeed from Scripture. In conclusion, without intertextuality, a literary work would simply be unintelligible, like speech in a language one has not yet learned (Jenny, 1982:34). Using the above-mentioned criteria of intertextuality, the question is no longer how faithful the repetition is to the original. Rather, the question is how the two (or more than two) texts reverberate with each other (cf. Brawley, 1993:430).

1.3.4. The validity of intertextuality in the reformed hermeneutics

Reformed hermeneutics in the 21st century is not only aided by a number of methodologies but also challenged by them. The variety of interpretations of

---

33 One of the most distinguished characteristics of reformed hermeneutics is its emphasis on the reality behind the text, namely God, the original Author of the Bible. Since God is the transcendent source of human rationality and the ultimate ground of linguistic meaning, God is capable of making his intentions known through a written text. Consequently, God’s central purposes and intentions are accessible through a correct interpretation of Scripture. One who is interested in the truth will naturally have an interest in the realities behind the text. God is the ultimate cause of the text, and it is a means of knowing him (see Walls, 1996:187-188). And as Moroney (1999:450) points out, the recognition of effects of sin on scholarship is also an important presupposition of reformed hermeneutics.

34 Combrink (1990:339), McQuilkin and Mullen (1997:71, 82) rightly reason that the impact of postmodern thinking on reformed (or evangelical) Bible interpretation is profound, both for understanding eternal, unchanging truth and for applying that truth to Christian lives today. On the one hand, postmodern hermeneutical methodologies present reformed (evangelical) scholars with serious challenges at three points, among others: (1) unchanging, ultimate truth does not exist; (2) language cannot accurately communicate thought to another person’s mind; and (3) the inadequacy of language is not necessarily bad because meaning is constituted of a combination of what is out there (objects and events, including the words of others) and what is in here (exegete’s subjective sense). On the other hand, postmodern thinking provides reformed scholars with unprecedented opportunities. There are some legitimate contributions from
Scripture is owing to the variety of endowments and experience contained in the various biblical perspectives. Insofar as these differing perspectives are true, they are ultimately reconciled in God (Glodo, 2000:151). If multiple hermeneutical methods do not permit unbridled speculation, they provide exegetes with an opportunity,36 not a crisis. A responsible and inclusive method, including author, text and reader-centred methods and synchronic and diachronic methods, is required (Combrink, 1990:332-333).

As Thomas (1999:46-50) avers, one of the great gains of literary approaches to the Bible, including intertextuality, must surely be a renewed interest in the final form rather than hypothetical earlier versions of the canonical text. Reader-oriented theories are a valuable corrective to any absolutist claims of objectivity for the text. However, the view that the readers endow the text with meaning implies the idolatrous position that the readers create the text in their own image. Exegetes can drastically curtail unbridled subjectivity in exegesis by executing competent diachronic and synchronic analysis (i.e. examining antecedent and contemporary factors) of both the historical and the literary contexts of any biblical text.37 Interaction between reader and text is not an end in itself (contra reader response).

postmodern thinking. For example, it alerts reformed exegetes to issues that they have not sufficiently addressed. As a result, they have to examine more carefully their own cultural and theological preunderstanding and are more modest in their claims to infallible interpretations.35 As Punt (1998:124-125) notes, some refer to the current interpretive landscape of NT studies as pluralist and describe the quest for the allusive meaning in NT interpretation as a war, and as a continuous fighting between different interpretive strategies. Unfortunately, increasing attention has been paid to the language, the literary forms, the symbols, myths, and stories in the Bible (i.e. to methodology) rather than to theology in the Bible (i.e. to content-theological results). Thus, many NT scholars display ‘methodolomania’ and contribute to the proliferation of methods.

Like Combrink, Phillips (1990:36) holds that the postmodern context compels a recognition of interpretive control and power that is exercised, whether exegetes care to admit it or not. The present context for engaging in critical exegetical praxis opens up before exegetes an opportunity for re-energising a discipline that has the opportunity and the responsibility of defining a new discursive context.

Correspondingly, Barton (1994:3, 14) also contends that biblical studies at the moment illustrate clearly the phenomenon structuralists used to be so interested in, the binary opposition, and a few such pairs will be enough to identify the two trends involved: diachronic vs. synchronic; historical vs. literary theory; what the text means vs. what the text means (or what readers may mean by it). Deliberate collaboration between historical critics and literary interpreters can be useful, because most biblical texts need both historical and literary skill if they are to be adequately interpreted.
As Vanhoozer (1998:134-135) correctly points out, intertextuality both confirms and challenges the traditional idea of canon.38 Canon confirms intertextuality by showing it at work. Reading the NT intertextually, listening in on the dialogue that occurs every time an OT passage is woven into the fabric of the NT, might possibly save Christianity from polytheism and anti-Semitism (Sanders, 2001:24). NT texts refer directly and indirectly to certain OT texts. The books within the biblical canon form a ‘separate cognitive zone’ and are ‘interrelated like the parts of a single book’. The canon encourages a play of meaning but only within carefully prescribed boundaries. But intertextuality challenges and then explodes the idea of canon as a fixed text. It does so in two ways. First, intertextuality challenges the idea that a text has a self-same meaning. In consequence, meaning is always in the process of forming, deforming and reforming. Second, intertextuality challenges the idea that Scripture interprets Scripture, that is, the notion that the biblical texts should ultimately be read in the light of one another. Thus intertextuality is the free association of diverse voices, the centrifugal force that explodes the centripetal constraint of canon. Meaning is not something located in texts so much as something that happens between them. It is precisely because this ‘between’ cannot be stabilised that intertextuality undermines determinacy of meaning.39 In

38 Along with Vanhoozer, Morgan (1985:13) observes that the notion of intertextuality apparently swings between the constructive and the deconstructive: on the one hand, it can be used to support the claim that intertextuality adequately accounts for the structure, meaning and function of all sorts of texts. On the other hand, it can furnish ammunition for an attack on the very idea of the ‘sign’ by focusing exegetes’ attention on the indeterminacy of meaning produced by the free play of ‘signifiers’ among numerous texts – as in Derrida. With regard to the concept of canon, for the reformed intertextual study, the view on the Bible is crucial. The text of the Bible, as a living unity, consists of texts, smaller units, and sequences of texts written down, eventually encompassing both the OT and the NT and growing into one canonical text. This historically grown unity is the living Bible believers all over the world live by from day to day (cf. Van Huyssteen, 1997:156). Indeed, intertextual study is useful in biblical studies, the Bible is not necessarily viewed as a severely gapped text (contra Wall, 2001:217).

39 No determinate meaning is linked with the typical postmodern condition, which is described with terms ‘radical, often conflicting, plurality of ever particular discourses and narratives’; postmodernity is contained in the triad ‘conflict’, ‘indeterminant plurality’ (or irreducible heterogeneity) and ‘particularity’ (or contextuality) (cf. Boeve, 1997:408, 425). Postmodernism accepts indeterminacy, polyvalence and subjectivity as necessary elements in the study of a reality. In the notion of intertextuality, the reader too is intertextual, that is, not an autonomous Cartesian ego but a potentiality arising from a cultural context. In postmodern intertextuality the reader is no more autonomous than the text. Reader and text are interdependent. The notion of reader’s competence (i.e. the intertextual awareness and linguistic and cultural abilities of reader) can be used in a postmodern sense, referring to the range of abilities and concerns that enable a reader to actualise a text in a way that is unique, valid and highly subjective. On the
consequence, from Vanhoozer's assessment it is clear that there are some constraints by which exegetes can prevent subjective and uncontrolled intertextuality. Hence, the socio-historical context of the author and the audience, the textual context, inner-biblical intertextuality, extra-canonical intertextuality are all able to play the role of useful constraints.

Although there can be the matter of priority, reformed hermeneutics should pay proper and balanced attention to the three elements of the foci in the process of interpretation, namely the author, the text and the reader. Concerning the autonomy of the text, the role of the reader, and authorial intent, Silva's (1994:237-246) argument is relevant here:

For interpretation to take place, there must be an author, a text, and an interpreter (reader or hearer), and it is precisely this three-pronged relationship that can create confusion. The theological perspective of the biblical authors is seldom expressed in explicit terms; rather, it is reflected in their composition of the text. Accordingly, close attention to the literary quality of narrative, even if considered in relative independence from its historical reference, can be of immense value in understanding the significance of the history which that narrative presents. In regard to the role of the reader, the danger is that, troubled by what appear to be extreme formulations, the exegetes may close their eyes to the invaluable contributions made by this movement. Whether they like it or not, readers can — and routinely do — create meanings out of the texts they read. While in certain cases the task of identifying what the biblical author meant is not the only legitimate way of proceeding, such a task is always legitimate and indeed must continue to function as an essential goal.

In connection with the validity of intertextuality in reformed hermeneutics, Adams contrary, in the reformed intertextuality embedded in modernist orientation, the reader's role is clearly defined by the text. Text is the object with determinate meaning. Readers are those who, if they follow the directives of the text, will arrive at its determinate meaning (see Keegan, 1995:4-5). As far as the focal method of this work — intertextuality — is concerned, the main difference between its use in the present work and in a postmodern exegesis is that the latter emphasises the 'undecidability' of the text, but the former stresses the 'pluri-decidability' (in D. Patte's term, see Patte, 1995:67) of the text (due to Revelation's pragmatic and symbolic characteristics).

Lategan (1992b:9) correctly argues that giving due recognition to the reader-mediated nature of texts does not mean that they thereby lose their identity, completely subjected to the whim of interpreters. For an example of the interaction between intertextuality and reader-response criticism (in James 2:25), see Wall, 2001:223.
(1990:13) indicates a significant point: the practice of basing a biblical theology not on biblical texts but on hypothetical ur-sources, oral stages, or on apocryphal material, misses the point of the modifier 'biblical' or 'reformed'. The influence of historical criticism is to some extent simply inescapable for most interpreters, because historical criticism is involved with such fundamental tasks as translation and textual criticism. However, the strength of the greatest biblical theologies, after all, lies not in their historical analysis (though it may be rigorous), but in the theological penetration and insight of their construals of the Bible. From Adams’s insistence it is evident that biblical intertextuality has priority and is more important than the intertextuality of non-canonical sources.

To define the position of reformed intertextual study, Plett's category should be given close attention here. Plett (1991:3-5) categorises attitudes towards intertextuality into three groups: (1) the progressives who try to cultivate and develop the revolutionary heritage of the originators of the new concept. Their representatives do not tire of quoting, paraphrasing and interpreting the writings of Bakhtin, Barthes, Kristeva, Derrida and other authorities. (2) The traditionalists who belong almost exclusively to the group of conventional literary scholars. Alerted by public reaction to the work of poststructuralists and deconstructionists, these scholars ask themselves whether the insights of the intertextuality debate can be applied profitably to their own concerns. (3) A third group emerges: the opposition to the new approach. Their basically negative attitude expresses itself in two different strategies of argumentation. The progressive, speculative ones are simply not understood; they are accused of subjectivity and irrationalism and an utter lack of scientificity. Yet even stronger is the opposition to the traditionalist, pragmatic variant. Anti-intertextualists do not tire of emphasising that they themselves have worked intertextually all along. The change in terminology did not bring about any substantial change. In Plett's three categories, the reformed intertextualist is a traditionalist who finds a profitable result for intertextuality for his/her own concerns, namely a constructive reformed interpretation of the Book of Revelation.

Reformed intertextuality is not based on the linear communication model in which the sender delivers a message via the medium to the receiver, who is a passive consumer of
the message. A circular or a spiral communication model, in which the sender, the medium, and the receiver are each unique contributors to the communication process, is the basis of intertextuality. This spiral communication model accords with hermeneutical epistemology. When the contributors are not correctly evaluated or operated, misunderstandings occur:

![Diagram of interaction among author, text, and audience in intertextuality](image)

The figure below depicts the interaction among author, (inter)text\(^{41}\) and reader in intertextuality\(^{42}\) (cf. Thiselton, 1999:167):

![Diagram of signifier and signified in intertextuality](image)

A responsible intertextual exegesis involves not only a responsibility towards the possible intentions of an original author, but also a willingness to include (at least implicit or secondary) meanings that were not intended but which arise in the dialogue

---

\(^{41}\) Zepp (1982:90), following Kristeva, holds that texts are at least doubly oriented: toward an 'inner' meaning (the web of the signifying system in question: i.e. intratextual meaning) and an 'outer' meaning (the discourse with other discourses, with social process: i.e., intertextual meaning), which are in dialogical relationship with each other (see Chapter 4 intratextuality and Chapter 5 intertextuality).

\(^{42}\) The interaction among the author, the text, and the reader in intertextuality is not new. According to Gadamer, interpretation is always the fusion of horizons. Both the text (and author) and the interpreter have a horizon that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point. But every act of interpretation transforms the horizon of both the text and the interpreter (see Gadamer, 2001:302-307).
with earlier (and sometimes later) intertexts (Nielsen, 2000:31). As pointed out above, in reformed intertextual study the biblical intertextuality in general and the OT intertextuality in particular are the most important elements. Reformed intertextuality should be grounded in the coherence of Scripture as a whole. In this phase, the argument between Steve Moyise and Gregory K. Beale is illuminating. Moyise (1995:110-111) provides the first serious attempt to apply the postmodern \(^{43}\) hermeneutical perspective of intertextuality to the use of the OT in Revelation. Working inductively, he argues that the intertextual approach is appropriate to the study of Revelation. Moyise uses the analogy of a fruit salad. In a fruit salad there are no more shiny apples, but pieces of apple mixed with other fruits and covered with syrup. While the connection remains between the apple on the tree and the apple in the fruit salad, one is struck more by the differences between the two forms of application than one is in the fruit-basket analogy. Thus, Moyise finds the ‘new meaning’ of the OT in Revelation (cf. Soulen & Soulen, 2001:87). Furthermore, in contrast to Beale, whose decisive element of the correct interpretation lies in finding authorial intention, Moyise (2001a:40) contends: “I am suspicious of those who claim that there is but one correct way of reading Revelation”. Actually, there are a number of important theories which have something to do with a proper understanding of Revelation. They can illuminate different aspects of the Book, just as the Four Gospels illuminate different aspects of Jesus.

G.K. Beale calls Moyise’s approach into question in the most comprehensive single work ever written on the subject of allusions to the OT in Revelation. Beale develops the analogy of a basket of fruit to express his viewpoint. Based both on conservative Hirschian hermeneutics and the Christian-theistic biblical worldview, he (Beale, 1998:51-52) argues that while an apple in a basket of fruit has been removed from its original context, it has not lost its identity as an apple. It has simply been placed in a new context. So when NT writers quote the OT, they are placing such texts in a new context and giving them ‘new significance’ within that new context, but they are not

\(^{43}\) Fowler (1989:4) explains that intertextuality, indeterminacy, and combination are characteristics of postmodernism, as genre/boundary, determinacy, and selection are of modernism.
altering what the original writer meant. Beale cites four presuppositions (Christ corporately represents Israel; history is a unified plan; the end-time has been inaugurated by Christ; Christ is the key to the OT) which he believes governed John's approach to Scripture. He then suggests that interpreters who agree with these presuppositions will conclude that John respects the original context of his allusions (see Moyise, 2001a:37). Indeed, Beale opposes the 'new meaning' of the OT in Revelation. Moreover, he insists that meaning derives solely from an author's intention (contra Moyise, 2001a:35-36), not from the creative processes of readers. Beale (2001:32) asserts that, while he concedes that readers can 'create' meaning, it is a meaning, implied at least by and partially derivative from authorial intent. If one goes further than this concession, then one places the reader in a sphere separated from all significant links to a text's original meaning, which appears to be Moyise's position. The ultimate goal of all readings is that exegetes' lives would glorify the divine Author of meaning. Although Beale's argument is reformed, if the reader's doxology is added his intertextual study is more embedded in reformed intertextuality. In his recent article on John's use of the OT, Paulien (2001:11, 22) compares Moyise and Beale and concludes that they have brought to the topic two sides of a necessary dichotomy. Both a hermeneutic of suspicion and a hermeneutic of retrieval are needed, and provide a necessary balance, for interpretation (contra Beale, 2001:32).

The following table can serve as a summary (cf. Van Wolde, 1997:430):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intertextuality: Text production</th>
<th>Intertextuality: Text reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diachronic</td>
<td>Synchronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causality</td>
<td>Analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexicality</td>
<td>Iconicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory relations</td>
<td>Potential relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presumed historical (i.e. diachronic) process by which the text came into being is important for a writer. As in historical criticism (esp. tradition, source, and redaction
criticism), which focuses on writer or redactor, text productive intertextuality is essentially diachronic or historical in nature. Thus, the text components are in fact viewed as indices, that is, as signs that are directly and causally determined by earlier text. But in the case of text receptive intertextuality, the final text product, which is compared with other texts in synchronic relationships, is important. The principle of causality is then rejected; its place is taken by the principle of analogy. Words are not viewed as indexical signs but as iconic signs, which denote the principle that phenomena are analogous or isomorphic. Similar and different texts are explained as being indirectly related to each other and as having a similar or iconic quality or image in common (see Van Wolde, 1997:430-431).

In conclusion, the time has come for a change in reformed hermeneutics. As a postmodern methodology, intertextuality gives reformed hermeneutics a real opportunity to listen and learn from Scripture with a high view of the Bible. Reading Scripture dialogically through intertextuality provides rich lodes within Scripture that are rarely explored. Since Scripture is transcultural and intertextual in nature, all its parts have depths that can plumb the very essence of the human experiment (Sanders, 2001:25). As Kruger (1995:108) pays attention to the perils of over-specialism in the methodology and of under-specialism in the primary writings of the NT, this work...
intends to pursue both sides, namely the methodological and the exegetical enterprises.

1.4. The central theoretical argument

The abundance of intertexts in use can contribute to a better understanding of Rev. 12-13 in the light of partial preterism, where previous exegesis has shown itself, or can be proved to be, inadequate. John’s Jewish audiences can interpret pagan intertexts in terms of the NT and OT (Beasley-Murray, 1990:193). The fact that John’s Hellenistic audiences are also equipped with knowledge of the NT and OT, besides the pagan sources, is evident from the fact that John uses and alters much of (NT and) OT intertextuality. Hence, both groups share a strong common knowledge. The central theoretical argument or the hypothesis of this work is that, although this is not a matter of ‘either ... or’ but of ‘both ... and’, the matter of priority for each group is significant. For Jewish audiences, the judgment of Jerusalem is still a priority, but for Gentile audiences God’s judgment on Rome takes priority.

1.5. The procedure

The purpose of Chapter 1, as the above research has shown, is to discuss introductory matters of this dissertation, including title discussion, problem statement, and methodological argument, especially to etymology and epistemology and their relevance in reformed hermeneutics to the focal method of this work, namely, intertextuality. In doing so, besides the comparison of intertextuality with similar methods, particularly source-redaction criticism and canonical criticism, it reaches the conclusion that, should it function with proper constraints, intertextuality plays the role of a useful hermeneutical method in reformed hermeneutics. With that the central theoretical argument is briefly completed.

In Chapter 2, firstly, a brief historical survey of the interpretations of the Book of Revelation between the 2nd and the 20th centuries makes clear the interpretive position of the partial preterism as an enduring approach. In particular, the present problems that science faces (i.e. a lack in theory) (see Rousseau, 1986:19, 23).
interpretational trend tries to find the general gist of the Book of Revelation by utilising the intradisciplinary methodologies integratively. Secondly, the two methods of partial preterism - consistent partial preterism and transitional partial preterism - are probed respectively together with their major modern proponents. In fact, the two groups compete so with one another that their merits cannot be neglected.

After evaluating the two partial preterisms, in Chapter 3 both the socio-historical context of the Book of Revelation and the textual context of Rev. 12-13 are investigated. The former manifests the early date of the Book as well as the actual persecution under Nero and the apostate Jews. For the latter, translation of Rev. 12-13, discourse (colon) analysis, surface structure analysis of Rev. 12-13, syntactical analysis of Rev. 12:10-12 and deep structure analysis of Rev. 12-13 are conducted to clarify the literary aspects of Rev. 12-13.

In the next chapter (Ch. 4), the study of the intratextuality of Revelation 12-13 (i.e. the inner-biblical interpretation of Rev. 12-13) proves not only the centripetal position of the two chapters in the Book of Revelation as a whole, but also ensures the parallels of words, phrases, themes, concepts, symbols and structures between Rev. 12-13 and the remaining chapters of Revelation.

Keeping in mind the results of Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, Chapter 5 probes firstly John's intertextuality of Rev. 12-13 for receptive production in terms of his OT, NT, and non-canonical intertexts, and, secondly, his audiences' intertextuality of Rev. 12-13 for productive reception in the light of his two audiences, that is, the Jewish Christian audience and the Gentile Christian audience. For the latter (John's audiences' intertextuality for productive reception), the socio-historical context of the two original audiences and the pragmatics of Rev. 12-13 are intertwined.

In the last chapter (Chapter 6), a proposed partial preterism of Revelation 12-13 is suggested and the final conclusion of this dissertation occupies the last part of this work. The problem of the two lines of partial preterism is not a matter of 'either ... or' but 'both ... and'. Nonetheless, the matter of priority for each group of John's audiences is significant. For the Jewish Christian audiences, God's judgment on Jerusalem is still a
priority, but for the Gentile Christians it is God's judgment on Rome that is the priority. This is taken into consideration in partial preterism of Rev. 12-13 in particular, and that of Rev. 4-11 and 14-22 in general.
CHAPTER 2.

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION AND TWO ARGUMENTS CONCERNING PARTIAL PRETERISM IN REVELATION 12-13

No book of the NT has provoked so much discussion or been so misunderstood by scholars as well as by laymen as the Book of Revelation. No part of the Bible has been as neglected in the mainstream church as apocalyptic literature. The interpretation of Revelation is even regarded as a virtual hermeneutical minefield (Luter, 2001:474). The Book of Revelation has been relatively neglected in NT studies. Here, a brief historical survey of the interpretation of the Book of Revelation is required, since it provides exegetes with a broad picture of partial preterism in other traditional interpretations.

2.1. Historical survey of the interpretation of the Book of Revelation

Swete (1980:ccvii-ccxix) concisely summarises the history of the interpretation of the Book of Revelation from the second to the twentieth century. This historical survey relies on Swete’s survey and concentrates on the four traditional approaches, that is futurism, preterism, idealism and historicism.

46 Van Voorst (1994:190) examines five reasons why and how the mainstream churches keep themselves at a distance from apocalyptic literature: a long history of mistrust of apocalyptic literature in the past (e.g. M. Luther); deep suspicion, even revulsion, of current gloomy apocalypticism; a negative reaction to its use in entertainment films; pastoral education that stresses an individualistic approach to eschatology rather than the more balanced biblical vision; and a lack of exposure to the apocalyptic in worship, especially in the lectionary.

47 Between 1965 and 1988 only one volume of *Neotestamentica* 22(1), the official South African NT journal, was dedicated to the Book of Revelation (see Du Toit, 1993:791). Apart from this volume, it seems that the useful and conservative commentary on Revelation by Groenewald in 1986 and Du Rand’s popular work ‘Want die einde is naby’ in 1986 were pioneering Afrikaans works. Since that time, the Afrikaans works by De Villiers, P.G.R. (1987) and Botha, J.E. e.a. (1988) are also worth mentioning. But there are very few academic commentaries on Revelation by South African scholars (see Du Rand, 1994a:36).

48 Malina’s (2000:5) insistence opposes the tenet of the futurism of Revelation: “Even though first-century Mediterraneans lived in a ruralised, peasant society, characterised by a present-time orientation, readers find endless reference to the distant future (even the twentieth and twenty-
2.1.1. The 2nd – 3rd centuries

The Ante-Nicene Church, although she seems to have produced very few expositions of Revelation, was certainly not indifferent to the chief problems which it raises: the coming of the antichrist and the hope of the thousand years. The chiliasm views of Justin Martyr (d. 165), Irenaeus and Hippolytus prevailed in Asia in the early decades of the 2nd century. But the Alexandrians50 — Clement (ca. 150-215), Origen (ca. 185-254), Methodius — interpreted the Apocalypse spiritually. The Latin fathers of the first three centuries carry on the line of interpretation started by Irenaeus (180) and Hippolytus of Rome (200). Melito of Sardis (170), Irenaeus and Hippolytus all wrote complete commentaries on Revelation, but none of these have survived to the present day. At this time, Victorinus of Pettau (d. 303) suggested the premillennial interpretation and the recapitulation theory (Gregg, 1997:28-34).

2.1.2. The 4th – 5th centuries

A new stage of apocalyptic interpretation is reached at the end of the fourth century, when Tyconius (ca. 390) wrote his epoch-making commentary. Tyconius trod in the

first centuries) in this book.”

49 ‘Historicism’ can refer generally to any sort of historical method. But it can also refer to a specific brand of historiography that flourished in the nineteenth century, especially in Germany, where it was known as Historismus. The ‘new historicism’ generally refers to work on the relationship between literature and history that has been directly or indirectly influenced by post-structuralist theory. But in this dissertation, historicism means specifically the church and world historical interpretation of the Book of Revelation (see Thomas, 1989:182). As Conzelmann and Lindemann (1988:281) indicate, the explanation of Revelation in terms of church and world history is not truly an exegesis of the text, but rather an application of the text to the particular situation. In fact, significance and application of meaning are open to change with each historical moment. It seems that the only aspect of application that belongs to meaning is exemplification, for that is the only part of application that is bounded by original intention. But in most applications of texts, meaning is not interpreted; meaning is assumed. Nonetheless, historicism is a useful method in that it can produce modern exemplifications so long as the original meaning is understood as being itself an exemplification of a broad and still valid concept (cf. Hirsch, 1984:215).

50 Tyconius (ca. 390), Augustine (ca. 354-430), Primasius (ca. 550), Alcuin (ca. 735-800), Rabanus Maurus (ca. 775-836) and Walafrid Strabo (ca. 807-849). In the earlier centuries of the Middle Ages, Primasius, Cassiodorus, Apringius, Bede, Beatus and most of the writers on the Apocalypse followed the Alexandrian school. There are, however, two exceptions: Andreas of Cappadocia (early 6th century) and Berengaud (9th century) mixed historical and symbolic interpretations (Gregg, 1997:30).
steps of Origen rather than of Victorinus: he inclined to a mystical exegesis, even if he did not altogether exclude literal or historical fulfillments. Tyconius had many Catholic followers. Augustine agreed in the main with Tyconius's interpretation of Rev. 20. The tension between the literal interpretation and the symbolic interpretation was mediated by Augustine's synthesis of eschatological teaching. Even though Augustine (ca. 354-430) understood the thousand years and the events of the End literally, his spiritual interpretation of the present and his location of the End in the distant future significantly reduced speculations about the End and expectations of its imminent advent. Augustine's view of eschatology became dominant (Collins, 1986a:229-230).

2.1.3. The 6th century

While Primasius and others were popularising the method of Tyconius in the Latin West, the Greek East made its first and only serious attempt to expound the Apocalypse. According to Jerome (5th century), the Greek churches rejected Revelation. When it first appeared it was not only attacked by the Eastern Christians, but, according to them, victoriously refuted; and it was looked upon by them as being at the best an obscure and bad poem on the Sun in spring (Bullinger, 1984:697). Eastern writers were more disposed than their Western counterparts to detect allusions in the Apocalypse to historical events. Oecumenius's interpretation of the six seal visions (Rev. 6:1-8:2), for example, reflects his emphasis on Jesus' earthly life (Wainwright, 1993:45). Andreas's interpretation of Revelation was a syncretism, blending the methods of Irenaeus, Origen and Tyconius, while at the same time the writer felt his way towards the later system of interpretation, which discovered in John's prophecy anticipations of the course of history.

2.1.4. The 9th century

In the West, one or two expositors succeeded at long intervals in breaking loose from the tradition started by Tyconius. Berengaud, a 9th century writer whose commentary has found a place in the appendix to the works of St. Ambrose, combines the mystical with the historical interpretation, and endeavours to make the Apocalypse cover the whole course of human events.
2.1.5. The 12th–13th century

Opinions about the millennium were more varied in the East than in the West. The Syrian writer Dionysius bar Salibi (12th century) revived the belief in a future millennium. And Bûlus al-Bûsi (13th century) of the Egyptian Coptic Church thought that the millennium lasted from 500 until 1500 (Wainwright, 1993:44). A more remarkable departure from the older interpretations is made in the *Enchiridion in Apocalypsim* of Joachim (1130-1201), founder of the Ordo Florensis. Of Joachim’s personal loyalty to the Roman Church there can be no doubt. But his method was speedily turned against the Church by less discreet followers (e.g. Franciscans of Paris in 1257). At this time, the development of a more concrete historicism can be seen in the works of Anselm of Havelberg (1129-1155) and Rupert of Deutz (1111-1129), though the later historicism emphasising a chronological division of the Book came from Joachim, who also originated the earliest forms of postmillennialism.

2.1.6. The 14th century

Early in the fourteenth century Peter John Oliva, another Franciscan, identified the antichrist with the Papacy or the occupants of the Papal Sea. This became a commonplace of apocalyptic interpretation among reforming sects and Churches. On the papal side, a counter-attempt to interpret the Apocalypse in the light of history was made by Nicolas of Lyra (d. 1340). He finds in it a forecast of the course of events from the time of Domitian to his own. He also insists that the millennium began with the founding of the Mendicant orders.

2.1.7. The 16th century

With the Reformation of the sixteenth century a new era of apocalyptic exegesis begins. The Reforming party\(^5\) inherited the method of Joachim and the Franciscans: the

\(^5\) The apparent lack of a commentary of the Book of Revelation by John Calvin has raised some interesting questions. It is noteworthy that Calvin spent the last eight years of his life intending to explain systematically the prophets of the OT, albeit not for the congregation in Geneva but instead for teaching and publication. On this basis, it seems that Calvin intended the
equation ‘the Pope, or the Papacy, is antichrist’ was the cornerstone of their interpretation. On the papal side, new methods arose, which at a later time found followers among the Reformed. Their authors were Spaniards and members of the Society of Jesus (e.g. Robert Bellarmini [1586/93], Cornelius a Lapide [ca. 1625], Johann Stephan Menochius [1630]). Francisco de Ribera (1537-1591) took his stand on the principle that the Apocalyptist foresaw only the nearer future and the last things, and offered no anticipations of intermediate history. His brother-Jesuit, Luiz de Alcasar (1554-1613), on the other hand, was a thoroughgoing ‘preterist’.

Martin Luther (1483-1546) was one of the first commentators to see Revelation from chapter 4 onwards as a prophetic survey of church history. His general approach to Revelation was followed by virtually all the Reformers and by Protestants well into the 19th century (Gregg, 1997:31-32). In the 16th and 17th centuries the Protestant exegetes generalised the world-church historical interpretation according to which the antichrist was applied to the Pope and his followers (Böcher, 1980:21-22). In the 16th century, Junius studied Revelation in terms of the ancient rhetoric. The genre of Revelation was regarded as a prophecy until that time (Wainwright, 1999:389-396).

2.1.8. The 17th—18th century

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were filled with the work of apocalyptic exposition. In England, Joseph Mede and two eminent Cambridge mathematicians, Sir Isaac Newton and William Whiston, found minute fulfillments of John’s prophecy from the days of Domitian to their own. On the continent, the same general system of interpretation was adopted, with varying results, by two no less eminent authorities, Vitringa and Bengel. On the other hand, Hugo Grotius (the pioneer of the literary interpretation of Revelation, 1583-1645) and Hammond trod generally in the steps of

exegesis of the prophets to be at least in part the necessary preparation for an eventual exegesis of Revelation. Calvin considered the Apostle John to be its author and did not show the slightest doubt about that. And nowhere is there any criticism of or doubt concerning the authorship and worth of this book of the Bible. The Church on the earth, the battle of faith, the coming day of judgment: these are Calvin’s keys to an understanding of Revelation. For Calvin, Revelation teaches the same doctrine as the Gospels and letters and thereby warrants no special approach (see De Boer, 1997:28, 35, 40, 42).
Alcasar. On the papal side the great Bossuet suggested the division of the prophecy into three historical periods: the age of persecution (Rev. 5-19), the triumph of the Church (Rev. 20:1-10) and the epoch of final conflict and victory (Rev. 20:11-22:13). At the end of the 18th century Eichhorn interpreted Revelation in terms of a great poem or a drama, which could be broken up into acts and scenes – the drama of the progress and victory of the Christian faith. A form of futurism was adopted by the Fifth Monarchy Men in the 17th century (Gregg, 1997:32). By the 18th century scholars had already recognised that apocalyptic language is poetic language and that therefore Revelation had to be interpreted as a work of poetry (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1989a:418).

Bocher (1980:21-27) summarises the 18th century (German) interpretation of Revelation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretational methods</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical-(author) contemporary historical</td>
<td>F. Abauzit (1679-1767), J.S. Semler (1725-1791), J.G. Herder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td>(1744-1803), J.S. Herrenschneider (1786), J.G. Eichhorn (1752-1827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World-Church historical interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viktorin von Pettau (304), J. Coccejus (1603-1669), C. Vitringa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1659-1722), J. Lange (1670-1744), J.A. Bengel (1687-1752),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastorini (1785/86), H.J. Stilling (1740-1817)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.9. The 19th century

While inheriting the methods of its predecessors, the (late) 19th century found itself in possession of new data by which it was enabled to correct or extend their application. In Germany (and England and America) the literary critical approach (source criticism) was powerful (e.g. D. Völter [1855-1931], C.H. Weizäcker [1822-1899], E. Vischer [1865-1946], A. Sabatier [1839-1901], G.J. Weyland [1860-1935], F. Spitta [1852-1924], J. Weiß, [1863-1914], H.J. Holzmann [1832-1910]). According to Böcher (1980:28), in the earlier half of the 19th century the author-contemporary interpretation
was dominant. But after Hofmann (1844), the world-church historicism became powerful with the interpretation of the eschatological-kingdom. In the middle of the 19th century, Friedrich Lücke (1771-1854), the father of the modern interpretation of Revelation, was the first to regard Revelation as an apocalypse. The figure below shows the trend of the interpretation of Revelation in the 19th century (cf. Bücher, 1980:28-36):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretational method</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Futurism</td>
<td>S.R. Maitland (1827), Issac Williams, Stern, Bisping, the Plymouth Brethern, John Nelson Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterism</td>
<td>Moses Stuart (1845)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.10. The 20th century

Between 1920 and 1934 very few early Christian writings were so courted by scholars but at the same time have so thoroughly elusive to their methods of interpretation. The elusive meaning of Revelation might be one of the reasons why serious critical scholarship largely neglected the Book of Revelation in the research period 1945 to 1980 (see Schüssler Fiorenza, 1989a:407). Jeske (1988:337) is of the opinion that if one work could be cited which gave impetus to modern (middle of the 20th century) study on the Apocalypse of John, it was the 1963 publication by André Feuillet, *L'Apocalypse: état de la question*. Feuillet's concluding hermeneutical proposal was that one must view John's Apocalypse as an attempt to articulate a Christian philosophy of history.

Murphy (1994:181) insists that the Book of Revelation received a fair amount of
scholarly attention in the early decades of the 20th century. But mid-century saw a decrease in such studies, perhaps because of a discomfort with apocalypticism. In the past twenty-five years or so there has been a resurgence of interest in apocalypticism and in Revelation. The table below shows 20th century trends in the interpretation of the Apocalypse (cf. Böcher, 1980:37-54):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretational methods</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historicism</td>
<td>Albert Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>T. Zahn (1838-1933), R. Kraemer (1929), William Hendriksen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.11. Recent development of methods for interpreting the Book of Revelation

Since reading is always exposed to the danger of incomprehension and misunderstanding, the reader must employ certain strategies to reveal the sense of the text in a way that does not succumb to the dangers of the text. Methods are not means to be applied mechanically to grasp the sense of the text. Methods should be understood as indicating the direction the exegetes should take in collecting observations about the text and as showing how the exegetes can most appropriately draw conclusions as to the meaning of the text. To put it differently, methods, as tools, have to make the text speak (cf. Egger, 1996:2, 8-10).

Although no methodology can ever guarantee or provide the true meaning of a text, methodological reflection is extremely important (Le Roux, 1995:186). The convictions of scholars in the New Testament Society of South Africa concerning the biblically responsible hermeneutics, seem to have gained ground gradually since the 1970s over a multidimensional, holistic, intra-disciplinary and/or integrated mode (cf. Patte, 1995:38, 49, 99; Moyise, 1998:101; contra Kaiser, 1994:69 and Russell, 1996:141).

In 1979, South African New Testament scholar, W.S. Vorster (1979:129) advocated that modern exegesis of the NT, including modern linguistics and discourse analysis, does not undermine the authority of the Bible. In his doctoral dissertation, Jonker (1993:110-112) contends that the proliferation of hermeneutical methods is a fact which cannot be ignored or avoided. The concepts synchrony and diachrony feature prominently in methodological discussions. These discussions can benefit from the insight that synchronical and diachronical procedures are not mutually exclusive, but do in fact complement one another. Jonker also believes that a multidimensional approach provides the framework within which the danger of an uncontrolled methodological variety can be managed, and within which the possibility of any exclusivist claims can be obliterated. A symbolic or metaphorical text, such as the Book of Revelation, is not confined as a simple or one-dimensional text, but rather as a complex. The use of several methodologies in a single exegetical practice would lead to the conclusion that several dimensions and several distinct readings of a text are equally legitimate and authoritative and thus engenders a multidimensional exegesis. To sum up, whatever the methodology in use might be, exegetes already acknowledge that a plurality of textual dimensions provides the basis for a plurality of different legitimate readings of a given text. Each exegesis elucidates one of the several meaning-producing dimensions of the text. But this does not mean that a text can mean whatever one likes. A theory that asserts the total relativity of everything is self-defeating, for the assumption itself would be meaningless (cf. Patte, 1995:38, 49, 99; Moyise, 1998:101; contra Kaiser, 1994:69 and Russell, 1996:141).

Clines (1996:293-294) defines the term 'holistic interpretation': it may be used as convenient interpretational strategies which have in common their opposition to what they see as the fragmentation of the work by other scholarly approaches. Therefore, it seems clear that the primary motivation for many holistic readings has been an instinctive or commonsensical dissatisfaction with the net results of historical-criticism. As a literary (synchronic) approach to

All exegesis needs to be multidimensional in the sense that it needs to acknowledge as equally legitimate several (rather than one) critical readings of each given text. A text (and this is surely true of the Book of Revelation) does not offer itself as a simple, one-dimensional puzzle, but rather as a complex, multidimensional puzzle, the pieces of which can be

written texts, holistic interpretation makes use of the normal analytical tools of literary criticism. In this dissertation, however, the term simply means ‘multiple, inclusive, total and various kinds of interpretation’ including synchronic and diachronic approaches. Martin explains the epistemological grounds of the holistic approach. Based on the knowledge of new developments in physics, biology, mathematics and other scientific disciplines, Martin’s (1987:370-377) underlying hypothesis is that the twentieth century revolutions signify a basic shift from a mechanical (critical) to a holistic (post-critical) paradigm. The epistemology of the post-critical, which means that the assumptions embedded in the dominant critical epoch have changed and critical work now operates within a more fundamental structure of objectivity, is neither subjective nor objective, but interactive. A holistic paradigm legitimates the search for connecting patterns and relations in place of atomistic discreteness by which exegetes never entirely succeed in Bible analysis. Barr (1986:401-405), who proposes the hologram as a helpful metaphor for the possibility of developing holistic approaches to biblical interpretation, holds that “exegetes must use multiple approaches, because each method reveals only partial truths and no one method may be expected to reveal things outside its basic perspective. Hermeneutical methods should be used in an interactive, holistic fashion and with a view to the desired result. The choice of methods is a strategic rather than an essential issue. Literary analysis must come first because generic and literary conventions determine how directly a piece of literature may be used for historical or social data. Social analysis most logically comes last, because it will at times draw on historical data”. When he criticises Barr, Fowler (1989:6, 17) avers that the passion for wholeness or totality has led to innumerable quests for a final solution. But the yearning for a hologram by Barr can lead to holocaust. Thus, Fowler alternatively suggests that conversation may be a better metaphor for postmodern biblical criticism than the hologram.

The time has already come to abandon the idea of the individual genius who can control the whole field of NT research. The present of excellence in the NT theology most probably lies in research based on collaboration-community projects, in other words, intra-disciplinary method (cf. Craffert, 1995:179).

As Tate (1997:xx) points out, in present scholarship, there are three different groups of theories regarding the locus and actualisation of meaning: author-centred (with attention directed to the world behind the text – e.g. historical critical method); text-centred (with the focus on the world within the text, or the textual world – e.g. new criticism and structuralism), and reader-centred (where the spotlight is trained upon the world in front of the text, or the reader’s world – e.g. reader response criticism, ideological criticism). Tate proposes an integrated approach in which meaning results from a conversation between the world of the text and the world of the reader, a conversation informed by the world of the author. Thus, the locus of meaning is not to be found exclusively in either world or in a marriage of any two of the worlds, but in the interplay between all three worlds (Tate, 1997:xxiv). Hermeneutics is a dialogue between the text, and reader, and the text and reader enter into a conversational covenant informed by the world of the author. The world of the author offers preparatory, foundational information for the dialogue between the text and reader (Tate, 1997:255).
organised into several different coherent pictures.

An uncontrolled multidimensional approach, however, leads to confusion and exegetical decomposition (or an uncontrolled methodological *pot-pourri*).\(^{56}\) Anyone can drastically curtail unbridled subjectivity in exegesis by executing a competent diachronic and synchronic analysis of both the historical and the literary context of any Biblical text (Thomas, 1999:50). This part, following the principle of the above statement, consists of three parts in which each literary\(^{57}\) (the apocalyptic rhetoric and the narratology), historical (the study of source and redaction and the socio-scientific approach) and theological interpretation (the canonical approach and the covenantal eschatology) makes a contribution to attaining an interactively holistic and balanced result in this study (cf. Telford, 2002:438).\(^{58}\) The above eclectic methods, of course,

---

\(^{56}\) On the one hand, Osborne (1993:65) is correct when he considers the Apocalypse to be a combination of prophetic, apocalyptic and epistolary material, and therefore a complex hermeneutic must be utilised in unpacking the many themes. On the other hand, his opinion is untenable when he argues that one must combine historicist, idealist and futurist perspectives in interpreting the Book. In fact, his mistake comes from his supposition that there is no need to dichotomise the relationship between Rome and the final empire of the beast/antichrist.

\(^{57}\) Literary analysis of the text should be a 'methodological first', followed by and fused with the different socio-historical (or social scientific) theories applied to their respective exegetical models. Thus, reading the text first, as the way of understanding the situation, will be one of the methodological points of departure of this work (Van Eck, 1995:89).

\(^{58}\) According to Telford (2002:432), in the field of biblical interpretation, three paradigms can be identified, namely, the historical paradigm, the literary paradigm and the theological paradigm. The Bible, in other words, can be viewed as history, as literature or as theology. From one perspective, the biblical texts are historical documents, which by careful analysis can yield information about the past. From another perspective, they are literary compositions and hence subject to all the possibilities and limitations that written self-expression involves, including multiple interpretations. From yet another perspective, they are religious (or sacred) texts, seeking to express a relation to what is perceived as the divine. Associated with these three broad perspectives, there is a series of concomitant aims, principles and assumptions, and generated by them are the various hermeneutical tools. Schüssler Fiorenza (1991:18-20) puts forward an integrated interpretation in which literary interpretation combines a theological-doctrinal and a historical-critical interpretation (see also Collins, 1986:241). But as Paulien (1988:170) maintains, the message of Revelation is misunderstood because current scholarly interest overemphasises the socio-historical and literary setting of the Book. Besides the useful insight of literary and historical interpretation, a broader and more theological method of exegesis is necessary to do justice to Revelation. Accordingly, in this paper, theological interpretation plays a combining (or dominating) role of literary and historical interpretation in order to find an interactively holistic and balanced ethos, since Revelation's greatest power lies in its theological message about redemptive-revelation history (cf. Barr, 1986:411-412). In brief, this section (2.1.11.), in principle, follows the same hermeneutical steps of Egger (1996:65, 151, 199): synchronic reading→ diachronic reading→ theological reading (for the detailed integrated approach, also see Tate, 1991:xx, 210). In addition, according to Egger (1996:8-10), the division
presuppose the authority of the Scripture and complement each other (cf. Combrink, 1990:334). This hermeneutical methodology is intended to surmount the tenets of both a cumulative and a separative multi-dimensional approach.\(^{59}\) Moreover, this presupposes that the processes/results of each method interact\(^ {60}\) — at least implicitly, circularly and cross-referentially — with the processes/results of the others.

2.1.11.1. Literary\(^ {61}\) interpretational methods

into synchronic and diachronic aspects makes itself at home in the discussion of methodology. In ‘synchronic’ (Greek for ‘simultaneous’) analysis of NT texts the text is explored in the form that it has at a specific point in its history (see Egger, 1996:64). In other words, synchronic analysis gives directions on how to find the relations between the elements within the text, and the relations between the text and extratextual elements. In every case, attention is also paid to the communications system in which the text is embedded. The analysis of a text ideally begins with an analysis that takes its immediate point of departure from the text under discussion, and its structure. The origin of, and changes in, a system (with texts this would be the use and revision of sources), on the other hand, is explored with so-called diachronic methods. Consideration of the dialectic relation between textual phenomenon and the sources of the text leads to a deeper understanding of the text. The goal of diachronic analysis is the reconstruction of the historical course along which the texts reached their definitive forms (see Egger, 1996:151-152).

\(^{59}\) In a multi-dimensional model several methods (or disciplines) working independently of one another take a certain problem or group of problems as an object of research. They examine the problem, starting from their own epistemological and methodological presuppositions, using the theories and concepts, methods and techniques particular to each discipline. The difference between a multidimensional (or multidisciplinary) approach and an interdisciplinary approach is that the second one, unlike the first, stresses the interaction, i.e. reciprocity between different methods. Multidisciplinarity is characterised by a sequential relationship, interdisciplinarity by a cooperative relationship between the two (or more) disciplines (see Du Toit, 1990:515). Although the model of interdisciplinarity is often recommended in the NT hermeneutics, the realisation of the model has remained out of reach. Unlike multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary approaches, an intradisciplinary approach in the general epistemological sense refers to the borrowing of concepts, methods and techniques from one science by another and the integration of these elements into this science. The history of theology is an example par excellence of intradisciplinary borrowing, adaptation and integration. This intradisciplinary approach is applied to this work (see Van der Ven, 1998:43-49).

\(^{60}\) On the possibility of integration between narratology and historical critical methods, De Boer (1992:40-41) reasons that the narrative-critical method can be used by those who have a historical-critical agenda: once one fully understands the ‘world of the story’, one can then move to a reconstruction of the ‘world of the intended reader’. The narratological method itself, of course, is ahistorical, but its results (with suitable safeguards against anachronistic and inappropriate application) can be fruitfully applied in historical-critical endeavours and exercises, particularly when the focus remains on the finished form of the document.

\(^{61}\) By ‘literary interpretational methods’, the present researcher means (1) a way of seeking out the author’s original intention by means of the analysis of structure and the component elements of the text and (2) the application of the principles of contemporary literature to Revelation (cf. Paulien, 1995:245). The three components – author, reader, and text – are the basic elements in literary approaches. Worldview (or point of view) is presupposed to be the starting point of all
The Book of Revelation is an apocalyptic-prophetic letter\textsuperscript{62} with a strong eschatological alignment. This means that Revelation does not merely supply the calculation of the ultimate occurrences (as in historicist and futurist approaches), but that it is the prophetic communication of God's words and the witness of Christ to an audience (Du Rand, 1991:25).

2.1.1.1. Apocalyptic rhetorical approach

Rhetorical appeals to ethos seek to persuade the audiences\textsuperscript{63} by demonstrating the credibility and authority of the speaker (cf. Kennedy, 1984:15). Ethos, then, is an attempt to grasp power (the authority) to represent oneself and the world in a given rhetorical situation. Greek and Latin rhetorical theorists recognised that ethos was an essential element of persuasive speech (Carey, 1998:732). In order to acquire his authority of speech in Revelation, John evidently manifests the original source of his message in the very first verse of Rev. 1 (God and Christ), instead of using pseudonimity, which is a common rhetorical tactic in the apocalypse. Thus, because John's ethos is based on the divine authority, his rhetorical impact on his audiences is a kind of divine persuasion (cf. 'the voice speaking from heaven' in Rev. 14:13) (cf. Kennedy, 1984:158).

It seems that the Apocalypse of John manifests little acquaintance with Greco-Roman

\textsuperscript{62} The combination and integration of the various genres by the author of the Apocalypse raises interesting questions, since Revelation certainly appears to be a combination of literary genres: prophecy, apocalypse, letter, poetry, hymn, dramatic narrative and historical narrative are all evident and integrated in Revelation. Hence, a sound understanding of Revelation involves a balanced appreciation of its prophetic-apocalyptic-dramatic themes (Voortman & Du Rand, 1997:91-92).

\textsuperscript{63} The term 'audiences' is used intentionally in this dissertation, because it is a neutral term to reader and hearer. Actually, John's audiences attended liturgical service to listen to this message. It is worth mentioning the liturgical characteristics of Revelation (Jordan, 1999:20): the whole Book of Revelation takes place in and as a worship service. There is a call (ch. 1), an examination of sins (chs. 2-3), a declaration of the kingdom and forgiveness (chs. 4-5), the reading of the Scripture (the book and trumpets), preaching based on the reading (Rev. 10:8-11), a sharing of sacrament (the bowls and marriage supper), and a call to go forth and take the gospel out (the river of ch. 22, and the call of the Spirit and bride, Rev. 22:17).
rhetorical theory; nevertheless, the rhetorical or persuasive dimension of the Apocalypse is clear in its explicit efforts to dissuade the audience from particular practice (e.g. eating food offered to idols) and to encourage specific dispositions (e.g. allegiance to the God of Israel and his anointed Lamb) (Marshall, 2001:176).

By advocating the use of rhetorical criticism of Revelation, Schüessler Fiorenza (1991:26) warns against identifying any one of the three modes of rhetoric – deliberative, forensic (judicial) and ceremonial (epideictic) – as central at the expense of the others. Revelation’s epistolary framework and its demands for deliberation and decision function as ‘deliberative rhetoric’ in the assembly of the community. Its indictments, warnings, testimony for Christ, and narrative symbolisation of divine judgments, as well as its promises and depictions of the heavenly liturgy and its hymnal praises identify it as ‘forensic’ and ‘ceremonial rhetoric’ (cf. Du Preez, 1979:221; DeSilva, 1998b:799, 803). In connection with rhetorical criticism, as Du Rand (1993:254) notes, in order to achieve effective communication, the symbolic, apocalyptic and poetic language of Revelation has to be analysed. Because rhetoric is always enacted as a reciprocal interaction between readers and author, an apocalyptic rhetoric can refer to the ways in which speakers and writers not only use apocalyptic

64 In regard to the effective communication in Revelation, John’s typological construction, derived mainly from the OT prophetic books, is worth noticing. This functions as a significant rhetorical device in that it is an effective means for his Jewish readers who are accustomed to the OT. Furthermore, it unfolds a clear and contemporary meaning of the antitype of the OT type, which is clear to John’s audiences. The destruction of Babylon in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for instance, is the shadow of that of the Roman imperial ideology (and the false Judaism) particularly in Revelation 17-18 (cf. the Exodus typology in Rev. 15). In short, an important aspect of the persuasive power of Revelation is its ability to set the audiences’ present situation and their present world in the narrative context of authoritative Scriptures by reminding them of what has always been a cardinal feature of Christianity in Christ (see DeSilva, 1998b:795, 806).

65 Symbolism is the figurative form and content through which the message of Revelation as divine communication may be intelligibly illustrated and conveyed. In Revelation, symbolism does not merely exhibit meaning; it also elicits meaning. Apocalyptic symbolism thus has an openness which implies the possibility of multiple meanings, since it is not possible categorically to restrict a symbol to only one meaning. The first audiences of Revelation shared with the author a framework of reference, so that they were able to assign a more controlled meaning to the symbolism than, say, a modern reader (see Du Rand, 1993:243).

66 The constituents (topoi) of apocalyptic rhetoric which can be applied to the Apocalypse of John are: (1) first person account, (2) dramatic elements, (3) righteousness versus injustice, (4) intercession, (5) dialogue with the Divine or emissaries, (6) disclosure of the coming wrath of God, (7) the heavenly journey (contra Marshall, Travis and Paul, 2002:307), (8) myriads of
themes, forms, arguments, and style but also share their common symbolic world in order to address and persuade people in their everyday situation (Brummett, 1991:10; Lemmer, 2000:5). The author of Revelation constructed a symbolic universe that made intelligible both the audiences' faith that Christ is Lord and their daily experience of injustice and suffering at the hands of Caesar (Verhey, 1997:348; cf. Schüssler Fiorenza, 1991:124; Reddish, 1995:222).

The rhetorical force of the Apocalypse teaches the audiences to see the world from a certain perspective, to see the plot of the world as a contest between the powers of beasts and saints. Revelation intends to reveal not the future but the present; more precisely, it intends to reveal the true nature of Roman culture to those who may be blinded by its gaudy dress. Its rhetorical purpose is to remake the lives of its audience (Barr, 2000a:4). At this point, it is clear that one of John's main intentions is to correct the distorted thought of his audiences.

The following figure schematically describes the contrast between the symbolic world and the physical world in Revelation, which forces John's audiences to choose between them (see Van der Watt & Voges, 2000:403-404 for the same metaphorical structure in the Gospel of John):

---

angels as role players, (9) disclosure of the Divine in heaven or on his throne, (10) disclosure by means of visions, (11) excessive symbolism as rhetorical encrypting, (12) interpretation of various disclosures, (13) disclosure of the plan of the Divine for his people, (14) the narrator finds himself in a different heaven and (15) doxology (Lemmer, 2000:12).

67 John creates a new intellectual world — symbolic world or intertextual world — but this is not a creatio ex nihilo. Instead, he artistically fuses Jewish-biblical sources, his contemporary political context, Christian viewpoints into an integrated whole (cf. Du Rand, 1989:100; Klauck, 2001:698).

68 The audiences of John were persecuted by both the Roman Empire and the Jews. Accordingly, many references to the Roman Empire in this paper can also be applied to the false Judaism expressed as Jerusalem (Chilton, 1985:165; Gregg, 1997:399; Lightfoot, 1997:311-312).
As Van de Kamp (2000:40, 43) observes, due to his education or his natural talent, John is accustomed to his contemporary rhetorical techniques and capitalises on various kinds of rhetorical devices, including symbolic numbers, repetition, metaphor, simile, setting, character and plot, in order to shape and correct the ethos of his spiritually young audience (mainly epideictic and deliberative rhetoric; cf. Kennedy, 1984:74; Johns, 1998:767; Collins, 2000:412). The following rhetorical techniques make John’s audience remember the message efficiently and dramatically during the liturgy, i.e. the oral performance (Rev. 1:3; 2:7):

1) Symbolical numbers: e.g. 2 = witness; 7 = totality or completion; 3 = trinity; 3 1/2 or 42 months = the (short) period of persecution and that of God’s protection (Rev. 11:3; 12:6).

2) Setting: the throne as the central symbol on which God as a round character sits and expands his rule outwardly. The throne visions (21 times = 7 x 3) as the encompassing frame of all the events in Revelation appear whenever the awful crisis-events occur in order to manifest God’s sovereignty (Duvenage & Amsenga, 1999:12).

3) John uses off-stage narration to describe Babylon’s fate. By contrast, he uses first person narration to describe the New Jerusalem. The form of narration – on-stage – encourages the reader to identify with the New Jerusalem.

69 Malina and Pilch (2000:13-14) explain these symbolic numbers in terms of the socio-scientific mode: in antiquity, concern with numbers was characteristic of astronomy. Since John, the astral prophet, envisions alternate reality in the sky during his altered states of consciousness, it comes as no surprise to find a peculiar array of numbers. They go too far in their conjecture, however, that all the numbers in Revelation have their roots in cosmological considerations (concerning the apocalyptic numbers, see Dunn, 1990:331-332).
(4) Tense: the destruction of Babylon, for instance, is shown by three tenses (Rev. 18:9, 11, 15, and 19) in which the eschatological aspects of the destruction of evil are stressed.

(5) Many parodies or antitheses emphasise the importance of keeping the power of discernment.

(6) Inclusio: Rev. 1:8 and 21:5-8 manifest the eternal God who begins and completes history and creation. The image of God sitting on the throne is not so much inactive as faithful and everlasting. Three other inclusios are ἐκκλησία (Rev. 1:4, 11 and 22:16), John’s urgent expectancy of the fulfillment of his prophecy (Rev. 1:1, 3 and 22:6, 7, 12, 20; see Gentry, 1999:124-125), and the Exodus motif (Rev. 1:6 and 20:6; Ford, 1993:245, 249). In addition, it seems to be a broad inclusio in Revelation 1 and 22 (cf. Barr, 1998:12). For example, the first (Rev. 1:3) and the sixth (Rev. 22:7) makarisms of the prologue and epilogue frame Revelation with an invocation and penultimate benediction; the former calls the gathering community to worship while the latter exhorts the dispersing community to fellowship (Hatfield, 1987:178).

(7) The sexual image: this enables the audience to recognise the seductive powers of evil (for a typically feministic response to this imagery, see Garrett, 1998:474).

(8) The use of passiva divina: this stresses the sovereignty of God even over Satan (Rev. 13:5; Peerbolte, 1999:9). The passive voice occurs twelve times in Rev. 12, and all but four (ὡφθη in Rev. 12:1, 3, ὠργίσθη in Rev. 17, ἐστάθη in Rev. 12:18) of these may be categorised as divine passive: ἡρπάσθη (Rev. 12:5), εὑρέθη (Rev. 12:8), ἐβλήθη (Rev. 12:9), ἐβλήθησαν (Rev. 12:9), ἐβλήθη (Rev. 12:10), ἐβλήθη (Rev. 12:13), ἐδόθησαν (Rev. 12:14), τρέφεται (Rev. 12:14). In Rev. 13, the passive voice occurs twelve times as well. Of the total passives, the following are categorised as divine passives: έθεραπεύθη (Rev. 13:3), ἐδόθη (Rev. 13:5 – twice; 13:7 – twice), γέγραπται (Rev. 13:8), έθεραπεύθη (Rev. 13:12), ἐδόθη (Rev. 13:14, 15), έθαυμάσθη in Rev. 13:3 and ἀποκτανθῆναι in Rev. 13:10 (twice) are not divine passives. By using the divine passive, John injects the notion of secrecy as well as underscoring the acts of the sovereign God through his agents (see Hurtgen, 1993:103, 110).

(9) Pseudonymity as the most universal means of achieving apocalyptic ethos is abandoned (cf. Carey, 1998:750).

(10) The language of Revelation is highly repetitive. John appears deliberately to be setting up aural echoes and cross-references throughout his work. The repetition of words reinforces the incompatibility of piety and idolatry by subtly moving the
audience to see bipolar oppositions (Rev. 4:8-14:11; 14:11-14:13; 14:7-14:9-14:11; 14:11-19:3). These aural/oral echoes remind the audience of other parts of Revelation, creating an environment for mutual reinforcement and interpretation (see DeSilva, 1998b:800-802; 1999:73-75).


(12) Dramatic ‘irony’ lies in the fact that the liturgy, which is supposed to bring blessing to the chosen people and to be efficacious and salvific, is now punitive and destructive. For instance, the seven plagues by the seven bowls which are used in the liturgical and sacrificial service. And ‘remembered’ (Rev. 16:19) as a liturgical word normally brings about divine compassion and deliverance. But in the text under discussion Babylon is remembered for cursing and annihilation (cf. Ford, 1987:329).

(13) John takes what he wants from the OT, makes various changes and weaving in order to enrich the rhetorical effect of the allusion (Moyise, 1999:112).

(14) Other verbal devices: in Rev. 12, three rhetorical verbal devices are interesting: (1) initial alliteration (ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ in Rev. 12:15; ποιήσαι πόλεμον in Rev. 12:17); (2) pun (paronomasia: recurrence of same word or word stem: τέκνη τὸ τέκνον in Rev. 12:4; καιρόν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἠμέτο καιροῦ in Rev. 12:14); and (3) homonym (parechosis: recurrence of different words with similar sounds: ἔχει ἔκει in Rev. 12:6). In Rev. 13 verbal play also appears in various forms of word play and repeated use of the parallelism: (1) initial alliteration: ἀλάσοςς θηρίον in Rev. 13:1, κέρατα ... καὶ κεφάλας ... κεφάτων ... κεφαλάς in Rev. 13:1, ἐθεραπεύθη καὶ ἐθαμάσθη in Rev. 13:3, ποιήσαι πόλεμον in Rev. 13:7, καταβολὴς κόσμου in Rev. 13:8, πᾶσαν ποιεῖ in Rev. 13:12, πῦρ ποιῇ in Rev. 13:13, ποιεῖ/πάντας in Rev. 13:16, μικροὺς/μεγάλους, πλουσίους/πτωχοὺς in Rev. 13:16, χάραγμα/χειπός in Rev. 13:16; (2) pun: βλασφημίας ... βλασφημήσαι in Rev. 13:6, τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας in Rev. 13:6; and (3) homonym: οὖ ὦ in Rev. 13:8, ἔδοθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι in Rev. 13:15, ἔξακοσιοι ἔξηκοντα ἐξ in Rev. 13:18 (see Hurtgen, 1993:104, 109, 116).
The dualistic viewpoint\(^7\) and the conflict between (faithful, sovereign, eternal and salvific) God and (seductive, destructive and tentative) Satan come to the fore in these rhetorical devices. John's intention is to communicate with his audiences and to persuade them through the symbolic world (i.e. through the heavenly perspective), in which the above-mentioned rhetorical devices stress the risen Christ's rule of the cosmos. From an apocalyptic rhetorical viewpoint, the beleaguered audiences are encouraged and corrected not only by the recognition of the false aspect of the Romans and false Judaism but also by participating in Christ's rule depicted in the symbolic world of Revelation, while their real situation is unchanged.

To summarise: as Reid (1983:242) lucidly remarks, on the negative side, the rhetorical function of the apocalyptic in the Book of Revelation enhances hatred and fear of a clearly defined enemy (i.e. the Romans and false Judaism). On the positive side, it turns one's cause into a holy crusade, thereby making its adherents a Chosen People who are duty-bound to work in God's service and who will eventually triumph despite temporary afflictions. The gist of Revelation (or the \textit{stasis}) in the apocalyptic rhetoric is that the audience should identify themselves with the triumphant Christ and equip themselves with the heavenly standpoint depicted in the symbolic world John suggests through the evocative and apocalyptic language. This ethos is in accord with De Wit's (1995:189) remarks on the function of the apocalyptic vision: the apocalyptic texts provide audiences not only with hope for the future, but also with orientation to a praxis with their own 'identity', which they should sustain, against a different, alienated praxis. As Johns (1998:784) clearly observes, the most significant battle in the Apocalypse is thus a battle for perception fought on the rhetorical battlefield. At stake are the hearts, perceptions, and allegiances of the Asian believers, who should find a survival strategy (cf. De Wit, 1995:190).

2.1.11.1.2. Narratological approach

Narrative criticism focuses on the final, given form of the text as an assumed, coherent

\(^7\) Like the Gospel of John and 1-2-3 John, Revelation does contain a dualism, but this is not frozen or fatalistic. People, for instance, can cross from death to life through repentance (Rev. 22:17) (Poythress, 2000:46; cf. Roloff, 1993:12).
literary whole. Narratology provides a methodology\textsuperscript{71} that encourages close attention, in a new and fresh way, to what the text says and how it actually says it (De Boer, 1992:48). Narratological approach regards the meaning of texts as inseparable from the form in which they are expressed. Narrative criticism is a text-centred approach in that it reads texts in terms of their intention rather than that of the real author.

The Book of Revelation can be regarded as a functional narrative (cf. Barr, 1998:175). Not only are the visions that form the content of the Apocalypse narrative in nature; ‘apocalypse’ as a genre of revelatory literature also has a narrative framework. Through its (apocalyptic) narration, Revelation offers its audience encouragement and a perspective based on Christ’s two comings and their significance in an oppressive situation (cf. Boring, 1992:703; Du Rand, 1993:261). In actual fact, there are almost as many plots as there are commentators. How each commentator arranges the material depends on what s/he is looking for (Barr, 2000b:1). Nonetheless, Revelation can be divided into three phases in the construction of narrative:\textsuperscript{72}

(1) Through his ascension, Christ became the ruler of the universe (ch. 1) – the narration of the past.

(2) Jesus sends messages to the churches (chs. 2-3) and inaugurates both the New Covenant and the universal salvation by judging the apostate Jerusalem and/or the Romans (chs. 4-19) – the description of the time of John.

(3) Christ will consummate his covenant by inaugurating the New Jerusalem (chs. 20-22) – the story of the future.

\textsuperscript{71} As Du Rand (1991a:26) aptly maintains, the application of narratological insights to plot development, point of view and reader response, as well as employing some insights from the socio-cultural milieu, enables the text as dramatic narrative to deliver its own message even more dynamically.

\textsuperscript{72} The understanding of Rev. 1:19 that causes many scholars to take a linear/progressional approach to the structure of the Book of Revelation (i.e. Rev. 1:9-20 [the past]$\rightarrow$ Rev. 2:1-3:22 [the present]$\rightarrow$ Rev. 4:1-22:5 [the future]; contra Hall, 2002:280-283) actually foreshadows an under-girding cyclical/recapitulational view. But the macro temporality of Revelation is clearly a three-fold linear/chronological progression (i.e. Rev. 1 [the past]$\rightarrow$ Rev. 2-19 [the contemporary time of John]$\rightarrow$ Rev. 20-22 [the future]) in which cyclical (micro) temporality exists from slightly different perspectives.
Each phase is grounded in the person and the redemptive work of Christ. The narrative plot can be shown by the expanding scope of God's people, i.e. the kingdom of God (see Du Preez, 1979:216-218):

In terms of plot analysis, at the heart of the notion of plot is the idea of a causal connection between events in a sequence. The plot analysis of Revelation demonstrates that the progression is primarily a literary and not a chronological sequence, although the broad contours of chronological series may be embedded in the literary format. The plot of Revelation is a W-shaped structure that begins with a steady condition (ch. 1), moves downward into the unstable condition of the Early Church (chs. 2-3), moves upward (chs. 4-5) into the stable condition of heaven, moves downward due to a series of threatening conditions and instability (chs. 6-19), and at the end moves upward to a new stable condition (chs. 20-22) (cf. Resseguie, 1998:166). This W-shaped structure shows the dynamic and suspenseful development of Revelation's plot in which the (Messianic) Holy War motive plays a vital role.

73 Schüssler Fiorenza (1991:36) suggests a slightly different narrative structure of Revelation, that is a concentric pattern in which the W-shape and the core portion (Rev. 10:1-15:4) come to the fore.

74 In Revelation 2-3 as a micro level of Revelation, the V-pattern is shown in that all letters to the seven churches have a common structure i.e. address→message (mainly including censures)→promise. The tripartite structure of each letter demonstrates a V-pattern in which progress from stability to rupture and then back to a stable condition becomes clear (cf. Long, 1996:94). Accordingly, Jack's (1999:197-198) deconstructive reading of Revelation is untenable: (a) if Revelation is read as a nightmarish struggle for control of the audience, nothing is stable and fixed; (b) the world of Revelation is plural and confusing like an anarchic landscape of worlds in the postmodern plural condition. Similarly, Pippin (1994:252, 262) as a postmodern, feminist, deconstructive advocate, regards the New Jerusalem as unstable due to her misapprehension that τὴν ἀβυσσόν (Rev. 20:1) makes all boundaries useless. But one of the central messages of Revelation is that the Church tabernacles in heaven (Rev. 7:15; 12:12; 13:6); the corollary of this is that the false church tabernacles in τὴν ἀβυσσόν (Chilton,
Though a narrative gist should be constructed throughout the narrative, its gist can usually be identified especially through the beginning and end of the narrative (cf. Carey, 1998:741). Consequently, the stable conditions and clear perspectives as revealed in Revelation 1 and (20)-22 are important in establishing its ethos. Consequently, while the ethos of the seven churches is unsteady, that of John (derived from Christ) is reliable in the plot of Revelation.

In connection to the narrative gist of Revelation, the following four narratological viewpoints are the crucial ground for the normative (ideological) point of view (cf. Resseguie, 1998:7, 33, 39, 44-47):

(1) From the spatial viewpoint, the throne, the Lamb and the two witnesses, for instance, as central characters transform their perimeters. In connection with the setting in apocalyptic rhetoric, the throne has a special spatial viewpoint. The one who sits on the throne in the Book of Revelation never leaves the throne to step directly into the action of the narrative. The character of God on the throne, however, is developed essentially through interaction with all creation. The throne is in the very centre of heaven where God’s sovereignty is fully acknowledged. Its juxtaposition with earthly struggles and opposition to God’s rule emphasises God’s purpose to overcome all opposition and to establish his kingdom on earth. God is visible in his relation (dialogic interaction) with men and events (Rotz, 1998:363, 392; Du Rand, 2000:534). The area around the throne is often noisy because of the startling sounds, thunder and lightning. In connection with the special viewpoint in Revelation, the two great cities claiming dominion over John’s congregations were ‘Jerusalem’ and ‘Rome’, and John attempted to strip both of their claims. Jerusalem is portrayed as the site where Jesus was crucified and the two witnesses were slain (Rev. 11:8-9). Jerusalem has no more claim over the churches than any other earthly city. Rome is also disqualified as unworthy to claim centrality, but the denunciation is much more striden (Rev. 13:1-7). Rome is the enemy of God, nor the


75 The cognitive and existential aspects of a given culture, the evaluative elements, have been designated by the term ‘world view’, i.e. ‘viewpoint’ (Barton, 1996:211).

76 The ideological point of view refers to the beliefs and values that shape the work, and which the narrator wants the reader to adopt. Located beneath the surface of the narrative, this viewpoint represents the author’s value, norm, attitude and general worldview.
centre of reality. In John's narrative the true centre of space is the throne of God in heaven. The centralisation of time around worship in Revelation supports this special analysis. The activity in this area is mostly given over to worship (Friesen, 2001:153, 162-163).

(2) From the phraseological viewpoint, for example, the first person (limited) narrator narrates in (intentionally abnormal) Greek with Hebraic thinking. In Revelation, John's dialogue and monologue are mixed.

(3) From the psychological viewpoint, the reaction of characters to events in Revelation is twofold: they either respond with amasement, praise and terrified fear that results in their glorifying God, or they react to God's judgment by cursing God's name and remaining obdurate. The audience is forced to choose between them. Furthermore, a psychological domain is brought about, in which the boundaries of time and space have faded away and God's salvation is manifested, because the events in heaven reflect those on earth (Peerbolte, 1999:11).

(4) The temporal viewpoint of Revelation is compatible with the NT eschatology demonstrating that the past Christ event determines the present and the future course of events. Thus, it is the Christ-centric eschatology, not the time-lapse eschatology that determines the temporal point of view in the Book of Revelation (cf. covenantal eschatology). In the Lamb — in the history of Jesus Christ, his incarnation, death and victory — the end, the goal of all history, is already revealed and is now at work in the church through his Spirit in contrast, the Jewish hope of salvation remains strongly directed toward the future (see Rissi, 1966:113). Another characteristic of the temporal

---

77 The phraseological viewpoint is found in the level of words, phrases and titles. What a character says and how s/he says it assists exegetes in identifying this narrative viewpoint.

78 The psychological viewpoint presents the thoughts and feelings of characters disclosed through narrative comments or their own speech.

79 According to Friesen (2001:157-161), in Revelation at least five different kinds of time are highlighted: (1) 'Worship time' is the first and most important kind of time in Revelation, because it spans heaven and earth (Rev. 4:18). (2) The second kind of time encountered throughout the Book of Revelation is John's experience of 'vision time'. (3) The 'present time' is described as the time when the Gentiles trample the outer court of the temple (Rev. 11:2) and the time when God protects the woman from the dragon (Rev. 12:6, 14). (4) John provides his audience with an indirect experience of another quality of time that belongs to the period following present time. 'Vindication time' belongs to the period after the 42 months. This period lasts 1,000 years. (5) The faithful enjoy 'new time' in the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21-22). The narration of present time, vindication time and new time — learned by John in vision time and mediated in worship time — is an attempt to define the character of present time. Present time, properly understood, is for repentance and testimony.
plane of focalisation (viewpoint) of Revelation is the combination of analeptic and proleptic signals. Like the hymns in Rev. 7:10-12 and Rev. 11:15-18, the doxology in Rev. 12:10-12 betrays both analeptic (the kingdom of our God ‘has come’: ἑγέρσετο) and proleptic signals (Rev. 12:10-11 refers to the coming of New Jerusalem in Rev. 21-22) (Harris, 1989:158, 308).

The normative (ideological) concept (cf. the stasis in the apocalyptic rhetoric), as emphasised by John — the narrator — on the basis of the above four viewpoints, concerns its narrative gist. It stresses that world history is under the control of God and that readers have to choose between the below/earthly viewpoint and the above/heavenly viewpoint. John’s ideological point of view throughout Revelation is the execution of God’s salvation and judgment with a Christological emphasis (cf. Du Rand, 1991a:29).

By using the sociological analysis, DeSilva’s (1992:380) observation on the ideology of Revelation is similar to the above normative viewpoint. He lays stress on the fact that John develops a different ideological landscape in which the emperor (and the apostate Judaism) is no longer in the central position, but rather off-centre and antagonistic towards the centre, which is now represented as God, or the Lamb.

The distance between narrator and audience is a critical factor in the apocalyptic narrative. By identifying himself with his audience (Rev. 1:9), John enlists himself in a partnership of interest (cf. Carey, 1998:744). As a first-person narrator, John participates and identifies with his readers. In fact, a central aspect of John’s narrative

---

80 With regard to the ideological viewpoint of the doxology in Rev. 12:10-12, it is noteworthy that it announces for the first time in the text that the defeat of Satan is linked to the martyrdom of the saints. Moreover, the doxology associates the coming of God’s kingdom with the death of the martyrs, not specifically with the judgments of God as in many cases in Revelation (cf. Harris, 1989:158).

81 From Rev. 4 onwards, the narrator (John) reduces the complex readership of Chapters 2-3 to that of a single, ideal reader by stressing that only the faithful, for example, will qualify for God’s rewards (Rev. 14:12; 15:2; 21:27; 22:15). On one hand, John widens the gap between himself and the communities with whom he is in relationship. In this way, he opens up new opportunities by mediating the inaccessibility of divinity. Thus, the audience and narrator are united in a unique experience of living in the presence of God. Consequently, John’s intention is to stimulate his audiences into a receptive response. The struggle, for instance, between and the mingling of the opposites of acceptance and exclusion (Rev. 2:5, 7) shows that for the audience the will of the Lord is found in dialogue (Long, 1996:101-102). Moreover, the narrator identifies himself and the audience with the expected or ideal experience of every Christian as the
technique is a sort of deflecting of the audience’s identification with the various narratees – from the extradiegetic (i.e. external to [not part of] any diegesis\(^2\)) narratee of the whole vision (i.e. real reader), to the specific church recipients of the messages (i.e. narratee), to the character John, who hears of the fate of the saints and martyrs (Barr, 2000a:4). As Gnatkowdki (1988:98) elucidates, to read the narrative of Revelation successfully, the real reader must identify with the implied reader (esp. ‘the conqueror’ as an ideal model of both the historical and modern reader).

A distinctive characteristic in the narrative gist of John is the identification of identities among John, his readers and Christ from the above (i.e. heavenly) standpoint, in which the stable condition (i.e. the eschatological coming of the kingdom of God through Christ’s reign) is established after the conquering of the unstable (Satan, the Romans, and false Judaism). In sum: John tries to bring about a performative response of his readers/hearers through his functional narrative and rhetorical devices on the basis of the conviction that they are under Christ’s rule. Those who adopt the apocalyptic rhetoric and the narratology of Revelation perhaps downplay the historical, ‘real-world’ connections of the Book and highlight its construction of a story in which the conflict between good and evil comes to the fore (e.g. see the strong emphasis of the alternative symbolic universe by E. Schüssler Fiorenza and D.L. Barr; regarding the idealistic character, see Clarke, 1995:209). For this reason, the historical interpretation of Revelation is indispensable.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) ‘Diegesis’ means the (fictional) world in which the situations and events narrated occur.

\(^3\) Narrative criticism is often criticised for being non-historical or a-historical. Certainly, narrative criticism is not the appropriate method to ascertain answers to historical questions one might ask in relation to an ancient document like the Bible, but this does not mean that it vitiates historical concerns. A narrative critic must be conversant with the historical information the implied reader is meant to have, that body of common knowledge assumed in the world of the story (Stamps, 1997:234-235). Historical and literary (e.g. rhetorical) inquiries are, at root, cooperative and not contesting. Philosophically, most forms of historical and rhetorical criticism presuppose a shared model of communication that attempts to triangulate (1) the intent of an author (2) in the formulation of a text (3) that forms or informs a reader. It should also be noted that all interpretive approaches to the Bible are byproducts of intellectual traditions and other cultural influences; hence even the most adamantly a-historical brands of rhetorical criticism, for instance, are themselves historically conditioned (Black, 1995:275).
2.1.11.2. Historical interpretational methods

The Book of Revelation originated in a historical way, not in a vacuum, and can therefore be understood in the light of history. It is impossible to understand an author and to interpret his words correctly unless he is seen in the proper historical context. Nevertheless, it is true that Revelation has suffered from anachronism or ethnocentrism (Malina, 2000:5). The Johannine church is located in Asia Minor, and much in the Johannine writings show how stimulating influences – images and ideas – not only from the Hellenistic world but also from the Palestinian sphere as well as from Jesus himself, are unmistakably present and play a decisive role (cf. Gerhardsson, 1979:94).

2.1.11.2.1. Historical criticism

At a meeting of the Reading the Apocalypse Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature in San Francisco, November 1997, D.E. Aune joked that he had written the last 19th century commentary. What he meant was that the trend today is away from

________________________

84 As Du Toit (1990:516) aptly underscores, historical criticism has been criticised in the past when reasons for the denigration of the authority of the Bible were sought. The problem with historical criticism lies not so much in the methods such as source criticism, tradition criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism, as in (1) the person of the investigation, (2) in the presuppositions by which s/he approaches these methods, and (3) in the way in which s/he manages her/his presuppositions (cf. Muthuraj, 1996:260). “Historical-literary critics are servants and not masters of the Word of God. They come or should come to the Bible to listen. Only in the context of listening in the Spirit, even in the midst of historical-literary analysis, will they be enabled to discover the meaning of the texts both in their historical and in their present meaning” (Ellis, 2001:16). The present researcher, in principle, does not agree with historical criticism, in particular its atomic view of the Bible, and instead focuses in this section on the historical aspects of the text, the author and the audience of Revelation. Du Rand (1993a:256) summarises the most important (historical critical) theories concerning the compilation of Revelation, which constitute the background against which a possible division of its contents can be understood, as follows: (1) The interpretation based on sources and tradition history expounds Revelation as a collection of sources with theological elaborations. The interruptions to the logical flow and temporal sequence of the visions attest to this (e.g. Rev. 7:1-7; 10:1-11:14). (2) Other scholars are of the opinion that a Jewish apocalypse (written in Hebrew and Aramaic) has been translated into Greek by a Christian redactor (Vischer, Ford), or that Jewish and Christian apocalypses have been combined (Weiss). But the uniform character of Revelation's language and symbolism debar such a combination of sources. (3) According to the revision theory, a Jewish or Christian writing has been revised and worked over in order to obtain historical sequence and theological progression (Völter). (4) The fragment theory (Bousset, Charles) seeks to regain the original unity of the book by identifying all the insertions. Both written and oral traditions could have played their part.
rigorous, historical-critical analysis of the Apocalypse towards impressionistic readings of the Book. Narrative readings, feminist readings, literary-critical readings, even sexual desire readings of the Book of Revelation are all the rage (Paulien, 1998:61). Once cut loose of its historical-critical moorings, Revelation is indeed an open text and it is difficult to see upon what basis some readings might be judged less authentic than others (Newport, 1997:160). As a matter of fact, even though a historical-critical reading of Revelation is not popular compared with various intradisciplinary readings, a diachronic reading is required for a well-balanced result.

2.1.1.1 Sources

Despite its language, its repetition of theological themes, and the possibility of literary compilation, in its final form Revelation displays a uniform character (Du Rand, 1993a:257). In other words, on account of its patent unity Revelation does not invite regular source criticism. Nonetheless, John’s profusion of quotations must be explained. John, as the author and redactor, is ever the consummate master of his sources, employing them with surpassing skill to create a canonical masterpiece (cf. Mazzaferri, 1989:56-58, 195; Ryken, 1992:489). Here, it should be kept in mind that there is no contradiction between the Divine origin of the prophecy of the Apocalypse and the labour of thought on the part of the writer who, in drawing it up, gave it its shape (Godet, 1984:304).

Aune (1997:cx-cxvii) identifies three major source-critical theories of Revelation: (1) the compilation theory (Boismard, Ford, Rousseau, and Sierlin); (2) the revision theory (Charles, Gaechter, Kraft, and Prigent); and (3) the fragmentary theory (Bergmeier and Bousset). Revelation, however, is clearly a literary composition and a theological work of an author who gleaned his material mainly from the OT, from the Jewish Apocalypse, from pagan mythological sources (compare Rev. 12 with the Greek Python-Leto-Apollo myth; Collins, 2000:394; cf. Van de Kamp, 1990:335) and from the NT (esp. the Olivet Discourse; Ryken, 1992:489) or the early Christian faith and the praxis based on John’s vision. Therefore, as Schüssler Fiorenza (1989b:17-18) avers, John drew on and fused together traditions, motives and patterns which are at home in very different cultures.
2.1.11.2.1.1.1. The OT sources in Revelation

John's paramount source is the OT, especially the Major Prophets, and most of all Ezekiel and Daniel, although he avoids direct citation. Revelation is replete with OT quotations and allusions because of John's lifelong familiarity with the OT. Chilton (1990:20-21) lays stress on the fact that John follows Ezekiel no less than 130 times, step by step including the pattern of the covenant lawsuit as well as the language, imagery, structure and so on. On the other hand, according to Mazzaferri (1989:194), Daniel is John's primary source for vivid imagery in his urgent message of imminent persecution and judgment (cf. Botha, 1970:135; Swete, 1980:cliii; Beale, 1999a:152). Consequently, it is not unlikely that John gives the true interpretation of the OT. In other words, Revelation is meant as a lens through which the OT, concerning the eschatological coming of God's kingdom, has its fulfilled meaning in the New Covenant (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:262-263).

Two themes of the OT in Revelation need to be considered:

(a) The theme of the Holy War (i.e. Messianic War) between chaos monsters and God, one of the dominant Jewish apocalyptic traditions, may be used by John to identify the imperial cult, represented by the beast from the sea and the other beast, with the ultimate powers of evil (Carey, 1998:757; Collins, 2000:406; cf. Pss. 74:13-14; 89:9-10; Job 9:13; Isa. 27:1; 51:9-11; Ezk. 32:2-8). As Bauckham (1993a:233) rightly insists, John makes lavish use of militaristic language in Revelation as a Christian war scroll but this should be taken in a non-militaristic sense. For John, victory for the Christian comes through martyrdom rather than armed violence (cf. Goranson, 1997:458).

(b) Concerning the eschatological Exodus-based theme in Revelation, Casey

---

85 The OT source and characteristics in Revelation can be supported by the fact that Marcion rejected Revelation on the grounds of its Jewish character (Mounce, 1998:38).

86 Similarly, Bauckham (1993b:67-73) is of the opinion that three major symbolic themes of Revelation are: (1) the Messianic War (Rev. 1:16; 19:21; 22:16; cf. Christ as the Root of David, the Lion of Judah, and the Sword of God), (2) the eschatological Exodus (Rev. 5:6; 15:2-4; 16:18; cf. the Passover Lamb image and the Sinai theophany), (3) the witness (Rev. 1:5; 2:13; 3:14; 6:9; 11:7; 12:17; 19:10; 20:4). In this work, (1) and (3) are combined.

87 The word 'Exodus' in this work denotes not only the physical deliverance from Egypt but the whole range of inseparably connected events and experiences of the people of God. In other
(1987:41-42) rightly points out the copious intertextuality between Revelation and Exodus: the identity of the people of God as kings and priests (Rev. 1:5-6, 5:9-19; Ex. 19:6; cf. Ford, 1993:149), the judgment of God upon his people's enemies (Rev. 8:6-11:19, 15:5-16:21; Ex. 7:20ff., 9:20-21; 10:21ff.; 15:23), and the inheritance of fellowship with, comfort from, possession of, and victory by God (Rev. 7:1-17, 14:1-5, 15:1-5, 20:1-6, 21:1-8; Ex. 3:12, 8:22f., 9:4, 10:23, 15, 33). In the above-mentioned intertextuality, the identity of John's audiences needs more caution. Revelation 1:5-6 and 5:9-19 (cf. Rev. 15:1-5) introduce the identity of John's audiences as a kingdom (or kings, or conquerors; cf. Rev. 15:2; 20:6) and priests (Rev. 7:15; 14:4; cf. Nu. 3:11-13, 8:14-18) in the light of Ex. 19:6. It is noteworthy that the identity of the prophet is missing in these passages, since John probably intends to make clear his audiences' identity in the first chapter and then wants to show their mission as prophets later (e.g. Rev. 11).

In summary: John is the legitimate heir to the OT prophets. By using the resources of the past (the OT), John as a Christian prophet connects them with the present and then delivers the related meaning to the future (Rev. 1:9; Botha, 1970:132). In a creative way for his readers' new situation, John gathered up and interpreted the OT materials, which he regarded as relating to the eschatological fulfilment of God's kingdom in Christ. The degree and scope of the eschatological coming of God's kingdom in Revelation is wider than that of the OT.

words, it covers the deliverance of Israelites from Egypt and the Red Sea, from the vicissitudes of desert life, and from their enemies during their forty years of wandering, including their experiences of God's gracious acts in accordance with the covenant, and his constant watch over them, particularly his presence and guidance to the Promised Land. Here Kio's four components of Exodus as symbol of liberation are pertinent: (1) 'judgment' as the means of liberation. The scope of judgment includes the Israelites who disobeyed God, as well as the series of plagues that afflicted Egypt and the pagan nations. (2) 'Election' as the act of liberation. (3) 'Suzerain-vassal covenant' as the seal of liberation. And (4) tabernacle as the presence of the Liberator. The four components of the Exodus symbol are a persistent feature in the Apocalypse (see Kio, 1986:121, 122-127; Achtemeier, Green & Thompson, 2001:563).

The Book of Revelation contains over 200 allusions to the OT. It can profitably be studied by asking how John weaves these allusions into his composition in order to meet the needs of his audience. However, one of the ways that he does this is to force his readers/hearers to enter into a dialogue with the text (Moyise, 1995:137).
Apart from the Book of Acts, in particular, the Olivet Discourse (Mt. 24; Mk. 13; Lk. 21) in the Synoptic Gospels has strong similarities with and relevance to Revelation (cf. Van Bruggen, 1988:318-319):

(a) Their framework and theme are parallel e.g. the mixture of the destruction of Jerusalem (Mk. 13:14-23 par.) and the Parousia (Mk. 13:24-27 par.). For the references to the Jerusalem fall, compare Rev. 6, namely, the opening of the seals with Mt. 24:7, 9, 29, 34 and Lk. 23:27-31. Also compare Rev. 11:1 with Lk. 21:21-24; Rev. 13:11 with Mt. 7:15 (Lightfoot, 1997:312-313; Bahnsen, 1999:13-14). The Jerusalem fall is an anticipatory action of the consummation of God's kingdom as well as a direct result of Jesus' crucifixion (Van der Walt, 1962:284-285, 324).

(b) Several signs, which portend the fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia in the Discourse and in Revelation, are homogeneous (Mk. 13:28-29; cf. Lightfoot, 1997:318).

(c) The graphic language used by Jesus and John to describe the attending events is metaphorical and consistent with OT prophets (Sproul, 1998:47-48).

(d) If the author of Revelation is Christ's disciple John (and the present writer continues to think so), the fact that only the Gospel of John omits the Olivet Discourse is significant, since John might have intended to treat it in Revelation.

Whatever the precise truth of the matter, John had access to the Synoptic Gospels in sufficiently stable form. John employed them freely, much like his OT materials. Notably, his major concern was their eschatological emphases (Mazzaferri, 1989:51). The above-mentioned similarities support the insistence that in a sense, the Book of Revelation is John's extended version (or exposition) of the Olivet Discourse (cf. Sproul, 1998:135). In addition, the Synoptic Parousia parables (e.g. Lk. 12:37-38), which were widely used and familiar in the Early Church, were also very important sources of John's emphasis of the eschatological paraenesis (Rev. 3:3, 20; 16:15; Bauckham, 1993a:103-104).
2.1.1.1.2.1.1.3. The non-canonical sources in Revelation

John was no doubt quite familiar with the Jewish apocalyptists of the intertestamental period, and in some instances there seems to be a direct allusion to them (for the 53 selected texts excerpted from the primary non-canonical sources, see Boring, 1995:548). Furthermore, as VanderKam (1999:316, 318) indicates, Near Eastern and Greco-Roman apocalypses provide not only comparative literary evidence but also more possibilities for examining usage and social location. The relation, however, is in general superficial (Mazzaferri, 1989:49). As Swete (1980:clviii) argues: John definitely does not use these non-canonical sources with anything like the distinctness with which he refers to Isaiah, Ezekiel or Daniel, or to sayings of Christ which are in present Gospels (cf. Kümmel, 1972:325; Kistemaker, 2001:353).

In short: the core from the sources of Revelation is that John as a creative collector might have used the sources, familiar to his audiences mainly from the OT and the NT, for his purpose. The New Covenant, the imminent persecution and God's judgment on the apostate Judaism, the fulfilled God's kingdom, the anticipation of the Parousia and the Holy War motif are accentuated in order to encourage and alert his audiences.

2.1.1.2.1.2. Redaction

As Schüssler Fiorenza (1989a:415) puts it, the current progress in the historical-critical analysis of Revelation moves in a way parallel to that of other NT writings. Just as in other areas the stress on source and form criticism has been replaced by a stress on redaction criticism, so in the scholarship on Revelation the source and compilation theories have given way to the scholarly consensus that Revelation is the theological work of one author (cf. Lohse, n.d.:35). John, as a redactor, edits and redacts his materials — the OT, the NT, Jewish apocalypse, and oral tradition. His rearrangement and redaction do not contrast to the inspired message of Revelation.\(^89\) In connection

\(^89\) As Swete (1980:clv) rightly observes, John's pictures are truly creations, the work of the Spirit of prophecy upon a mind full of the lore of the earlier revelation and yet free to carry its reminiscences into new and wider fields of spiritual illumination. But in contrast to Roloff (1993:13), it is not so strongly subjected to the progress of theological interpretation (or
with the redaction, Du Rand (1994:558) states clearly that the arrangement of material is presented according to a certain plan or plot in which the theological perspective (i.e. redactional emphasis) on God functions dominantly. And he is of the opinion that the main message of Revelation is the coming of God’s Kingdom on the earth as in heaven. In a sense, the redactional emphasis and the normative viewpoint share the same intention or concern. At this stage, John’s redactional emphases, rather than the purely hypothetical, rule-of-thumb redaction theories, are probed (cf. Egger, 1996:158).

2.1.11.2.1.2.1. John’s redaction of the OT sources

(a) In at least two instances John modifies the language of Daniel in order to heighten the eschatological awareness of his readers. In Rev. 1:1 and 22:6, the phrase ἀ δεῖ γενέσθαι is followed immediately by ἐν τάξεῖ and a few verses later by ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς/ ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστίν. Secondly, in contrast to Daniel (e.g. Da. 12:4), John is told not to seal the book, ‘for the time is near’ (Rev. 22:10). The heightened eschatological outlook is associated with the death and resurrection of Christ. In other words, John’s situation has affected how he reads the Book of Daniel (Moyise, 1995:58).

(b) As Casey (1987:34) justly posits, John departs from the Jewish understanding of the Exodus when he proclaims that it is not history but a hope fulfilled in Christ that has inaugurated the new and greater Exodus, and a paradigm of God’s continuing activity on behalf of his people. So in the midst of Revelation’s apocalyptic images of cosmic evil and struggle there can be detected John’s conviction concerning the continuing meaning of the Exodus: God remains his people’s redeemer, the judge of their oppressors, the guarantor of their eternal inheritance. John revises the Jewish understanding of Exodus to the paradigm of God’s works in terms of Christology. John

90 In connection with the theme of God’s kingdom in Daniel, Wenham (1986:132-133) correctly points out that Danielic passages (esp. the heavenly son of man and the desolating sacrilege) should be seen as the primary background for the NT concept of the kingdom of God for several reasons: (1) Daniel’s kingdom has linguistic affinities with the NT references to the kingdom of God; and (2) Daniel provides a good conceptual background in that the Gospel’s teaching about the kingdom of God is understood in the context of the Jewish eschatological hope for a new age and for God’s restoration of his people Israel (cf. Da. 4:3, 34; 6:26).
uses the Exodus-based theme as a golden thread in his redaction in order to intensify a more universal salvation and judgment and a more intimate relationship of his readers with God in Christ than those of Exodus (Rev. 7:9; Ex. 19:12; Ford, 1993:248; Beale, 1999b:91).

(c) Despite the impressive similarities between Revelation and Ezekiel (e.g. the prominent role of the Spirit, the corresponding prophetic calling of John/Ezekiel, their analogous literary structure with the four visions, see Van de Kamp, 2000:14-15), the differences are no less significant. On the side of the audiences, they are invited to reappropriate Ezekiel’s visions through the lens of Revelation itself. What is required of the audience is to work out the implications of calling Rome a Beast and to act upon them. In other words, John’s use of Ezekiel involves the reader in a hermeneutical challenge (Moyise, 1995:82). Through the well-designed covenantal structure of Revelation, John might have intended to convince his audiences of the fact that God’s covenant is fulfilled in Christ (cf. Chilton, 1990:20-21).

(d) Given the wide biblical background of the Holy War (2 Chr. 20:1-30; Pss. 18; 20; 44; 60), the theme is reshaped in John’s Christian theology and according to his own creative redaction. Revelation deliberately transposes physically bellicose conduct or preparedness in order to declare a spiritual (and universal) thesis of suffering witness (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:211, 224).

2.1.11.2.1.2.2. John’s redaction of the NT sources

(a) It is interesting to compare John with Paul. Although their temporal gap is not significant and they share a similar social setting (and a common Christian tradition) in the first century Greco-Roman world, there is a difference ‘in emphasis’. Differing slightly from Paul, John’s exclusivism is strongly accentuated in order to give an answer to the identity problem of his young audiences converted from the Jewish world and the Hellenistic pagan world (contra Cheung, 1999:208; see the name calling [or vilification] and the strong boundary).

(b) Since John’s major NT source is the Olivet Discourse, the Jerusalem fall (and a/the Parousia of Jesus) are the salient facts in Revelation. Christ will judge the perfidious Judaism, which rejected Him, and will choose his universal church for his new covenantal partner in the cosmic salvation up to his Parousia.
(c) The Synoptic Parousia parables might have played a significant role in the composition of Revelation in that John, by using the eschatological paraenesis, must have given them to his audiences (Bauckham, 1993a:104).

In summation: on balance, John redacts, in particular, the OT and the NT materials and intends to invite his audience to interpret them in their new situation. As the Exodus community John’s audiences, who experienced the New Exodus in Christ, have to become involved in the eschatological Holy War against the beast (Rome and false Judaism) in a non-militaristic way (cf. Ford, 1993:248). And by interpreting the Olivet Discourse and the Synoptic Parousia parables, John unequivocally stresses that since the new covenantal era has been inaugurated the Christians have not only to keep their exclusive identity (as kings, priests and prophets; Ford, 1993:257) but also to become alert.

2.1.11.2.2. Socio-scientific approach

To begin with, general remarks on the recent development of the socio-description and the socio-scientific analysis of the Book of Revelation are necessary to understand the Book properly. The most promising (social) approach to a concerned biblical text is one that continues to employ old methods and questions, but that is also supplemented by the questions social scientists ask and the models they employ. The socio-scientific method enriches the socio-historical approach (Van Rensburg, 2000:570, 579). Thus, in spite of the title ‘the socio-scientific/etic approach’, the socio-historical/emic approach is also used in this work.

91 Social-scientific approaches, which came to prominence in the 1970s, pay attention to the analysis of the social and cultural context(s) of the text and its environment using models, theories and perspectives from the modern social sciences (Wenham & Walton, 2001:88).

92 Concerning the concepts of emic and etic in the NT socio-scientific interpretation, Craffert (1995a:15, 28-29) provides a succinct summary: Emic descriptions are accounts as perceived and explained according to the experience, folklore and conceptual categories of the natives. These can be supplemented by the analysis and description of the ethnographer, that is, by etic accounts. Etics are external analyses and explanations by means of the models reflecting the theories, methods and canons of the social sciences. Interpretive anthropology looks for ways to live with the interdependence of etic and emic concepts and categories and the contamination of the one by the other while avoiding ethnocentric imposition. As rehabilitated concepts for a discourse in interpretive anthropology, emics and etics are used in at least two distinct ways.
Murphy (1994:196-198) delineates the socio-scientific approach to Revelation: the degree of rigor with which this approach is applied in Revelation varies from the use of the socio-scientific models and paradigms as heuristic metaphors to more sustained attempts to use models systematically:

(1) By realising the persecution of John’s audiences, Collins (2000:398) uses the sociological concepts of cognitive dissonance and relative deprivation, and psychological model of catharsis.

(2) Thompson (1990:194) makes use of sociology of knowledge, arguing that John creates an alternative knowledge to the public knowledge of his environment.

(3) Du Rand (1993:246) reads Revelation from a socio-psychological point of view with the help of emphasising the symbolic world created by John.

(4) DeSilva (1992:375, 393) and (Rääsänen, 1995:165) apply contemporary sect analysis to Revelation and find it to be the literary product of a sectarian group. Certainly, the mission to the Gentiles had had some remarkable successes by John’s time, but while figures are impossible to come by, the actual number of Gentile Christians toward the end of the century can hardly have exceeded a few thousand. As late as around AD 200 the much-travelled Origen assessed the number of Christians in proportion to the whole population as quite small (see Rääsänen, 1995:152). In this connection, one generally conceives of John’s adversaries as a minority group, a sect within the larger Christian community. This is not self-evident, however (see also Goranson, 1997:455; Van Aarde, 2001:1168).

(5) In contrast to DeSilva (1998b:805; 1992:393; and E. Schüessler Fiorenza, J.H. Elliot, Du Rand and W.A. Meeks), Harland (2000:107, 117) rejects the sectarian theory and expresses the opinion that while the early Christians might firmly reject certain aspects

First, emics and etics may be used for distinguishing between our concepts and categories and theirs. Whether one talks about the categories and concepts in this culture in distinction to that culture, or calls it emics and etics or experience-near and experience-distant concepts, the differences between cultural systems need in some way or another to be indicated. Second, emics and etics may be redefined as describing different interpretive interests in a single interpretive process. Emics (as learning to behave like natives) may be used when focusing on establishing the native’s point of view and etics (as a perspicuous contrast of separate cultural systems) when focusing on a comparison between two cultural systems.

John’s visionary response is not merely an esoteric sectarian answer to a crisis or even a distorted dissertation on Christian being, but a theological witness of God’s purpose for this world (Du Rand, 1996c:52).
of the values, conventions and institutions of surrounding culture and society, they
might also maintain or adapt others, without necessarily undermining their own
identity.\textsuperscript{94} Ignatius, L.L. Thompson, B.J. Malina, W.C. van Unnik, R. Bauckham and D.
Balch concur with Harland. Nevertheless, Harland's conjecture that John could not
recognise the distinction between non-cultic honour for the emperors and imperial ritual

(6) Malina and Pilch (2000:37) apply the cultural-anthropological models of the altered
state of consciousness to Revelation, especially to the phrase ἐν πνεύματι (for a
dissenting voice, see Boring, 1995:563). Here, the problem is whether ἐν πνεύματι (Rev.
1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10) is the human spirit of John or the divine Spirit. When John was
ἐν πνεύματι, according to Rev. 1:10 and 4:2, his normal sensory experience was
replaced by visions, which were given to him by the divine Spirit. In Rev. 17:3 and
21:10 ἐν πνεύματι is used in the sense of visionary transportation (cf. Ezk. 11:24). Thus,
ἐν πνεύματι is a theological claim to emphasise the divine origin and purpose of the
revelations (Du Rand, 1996b:60-63). John is not so much interested in describing the
psychological mode\textsuperscript{95} of his visionary experience in the Spirit as he is in convincing his
audiences of the divine authority of his prophecy (Du Rand, 1996c:45).

(7) When he probes the meaning of the Jerusalem fall in a socio-scientific way, Esler
(1995:243-245) notes that a war represents a game of challenge and response played out
on the largest scale. The Mediterranean pattern of challenge-and-response mentioned
above emphasises that a grant of honour to the victor in a conflict is balanced by the

\textsuperscript{94} With regard to the identity in Rev. 12-13, only by embeddedness in the group (of John) can
one be saved. The righteous group is the one where persons bear witness to the Lamb, are self-
effacing and keep the commandments of God (Rev. 12:11, 17). The witness of Jesus (or the
offspring of the woman) becomes the fictive kin group by which persons will perceive their
identity. While the 'if he who has an ear' (Rev. 13:9) statement and following parallelism use
the singular form of the pronoun ὁ ἀνήρ (anyone), the strong group grid community is in view,
which is also indicated by the use of the plural 'saints' in Rev. 13:7 and 10. The slight reference
to the faithful group as 'the one who has understanding' (Rev. 13:18) underscores group — not
merely individual — identity. In the Apocalypse of John the whole community is usually in view
with the use of the singular verb (see Hurtgen, 1993:104-105, 112, 119).

\textsuperscript{95} A typical psychological example of altered states of consciousness is that of Greenfield
(2001:622), who equates altered states of consciousness with the symptom in which the mind is
not being accessed. Childhood, dreaming, schizophrenia, fast paced sports and raves are all
examples of the mind not being accessed. It is not being accessed for different reasons: lack of
connectivity (childhood), lack of strong sensory stimulation (dreams), an imbalance of
chemicals (schizophrenia), or a degree of competition from other stimulations (fast paced sports
and raves) (see Greenfield, 2001:622).
shaming of the loser. There is abundant data from literary and even numismatic sources that the shameful public exposure of the people who had been vanquished played an essential part in every triumph. As a result, the public display of the Jerusalem temple vessels along with the booty and hundreds of Jewish prisoners before the *triumphatores* involved the dishonour of God, who had been unable to protect them from the triumphant Roman’s viewpoint. Thus, by permitting the fall of Jerusalem as a major theme of Revelation, God himself was dishonoured and regarded as a defeated god. Therefore, it is necessary for God to judge Rome in order to restore his honour and to manifest that He is the God of gods. John engages the topics of honour and reciprocity as a means of reorienting his audiences towards the dominant culture (or, if they are already in agreement with John, confirming their orientation). John shames Rome, and thus the political, religious and economic arrangements it represents, as a source of vice and degradation in the world (Rev. 14:8). John censures the imperial cult as a violation of the primary patron-client bond which should be honoured – namely, that bond between each person and the creator God. The audiences who seek honour, therefore, should seek it by avoiding participation in those allegiances which violate that primary bond (Rev. 13:11-17). John also engages the topic of purity to define the members of the Christian groups (Rev. 3:4-5; 14:12; 17:4-6; 18:2-3). In this regard, the rhetorical goal of John is to urge separation from the facets of the audience’s social world which he depicts as ‘unclean’ (DeSilva, 1999:106).


(9) By utilising the symbolic-interactionistic analysis96 based on a social-psychological perspective, Theunissen (1999:200-201) finds the author’s contention that John not so much consoles his audience as exhorts them. This audience was not suffering from concrete external persecutions but from a problem of group-identity. However, it is

---

96 Robert Park is a founding father of symbolic interactionism. Historically, symbolic interactionists have treated the issues surrounding race and race relations from within a postassimilationist, structural perspective, even as they have rejected various biological determinisms and Marxist, colonial and structural-functional models in which racial groups become essentially a kind of epiphenomenon (Denzin, 2001:244).
sometimes difficult to distinguish consolation from censure in Revelation, because John, as the writer of consolation, had to praise (or console) and censure his audiences’ attitude and response towards suffering. Here, the epideictic rhetoric of Revelation comes to the fore (cf. Chapa, 1994:154). Albeit Theunissen tries to challenge the traditional insistence of the real persecution in Revelation, he thinks less of the correlation between, on the one hand, the identity problem and the internal problem, and on the other hand, the external suffering which causes the internal problem and the identity problem.

(10) Edinger (1999:9-10), following the Jungian approach, detects different strands of contextual reference running throughout the tapestry of Revelation: (a) one of the strands is a description of ‘past’ concrete events in the history of Israel – with the outstanding example being the Babylonian Exile in BC 586. (b) A second strand refers to ‘present’ (John’s time) concrete events. (c) A third strand is a description of ‘future’ concrete events in the 21st century. (d) A fourth strand is the eschatological strand; but to use a slightly more psychological term, it is the ‘pleromatic’ strand, meaning Revelation refers to events entirely outside of time that are taking place in the eternal or pleromatic realm of the psyche. (e) Finally, the truly ‘psychological’ strand is probably the most important category: namely, a symbolic expression of the coming of the Self into conscious realisation in an individual psyche.97

Although the results of the above-mentioned socio-scientific methods are valuable (cf. a negative voice against using the socio-scientific model, see Beale, 1999b:1121) here, attention must be paid to the criticism of Van Rensburg (2000:570): “The ‘pure’ socio-scientific method suffers from the fact that the practitioner’s one-sided focus is on temporary theories and models, and that the information from the period of the book concerned is handled as secondary”.

Indisputably, the socio-historical context of John’s young community (esp. during 66-70 AD) is that it suffered not only from external pressures but also from inner compulsions.

97 This psychological biblical criticism is not a method but an approach to Scripture that seeks to add its perspective (the psychological dimension of human expression) to essentially all the avenues of biblical criticism, whether concerned with authors or readers or critics (see Soulen & Soulen, 2001:150).
The former derives from the State, the Greco-Roman society\textsuperscript{98} and the Jewish synagogue (Rev. 2:9; 3:9; 13:16-17; 17:4; for the gruesomely widespread Neronic persecution of Christianity as a \textit{religio illicita}, see Gentry, 1989:222, 286-299). The latter comes from the false prophets within the Asia Minor churches (Rev. 2:2). The argument of the latter seems that the way for the community to survive would be through compromise in form while preserving the essential meaning unharmed, or else the community could no longer survive. By recognising the strong connection between formal and essential compromise, John also advocates formal accommodation in order to intensify the identity of his \textit{young} audiences (DeSilva, 1992:384).

In his significant socio-rhetorical argument, DeSilva (1998a:87-88) states that words denoting \textit{honour} and honouring appear rather frequently in Revelation (τιμῶν: 6 times; δόξα: 17 times; δοξάζω: twice). He goes on to claim that beyond the bare occurrence of lexical entries, however, John indicates honour and \textit{shame} through terms indicating approval (or blessedness) and disapproval (e.g. punishment or judging), through physical replications of status (e.g. crowning, bowing, imprisoning, leaving corpses unburied),\textsuperscript{99} through identifying an action with a virtue or vice (chief components of honour and dishonour) and through discussion of status through birth or other ascribed means. Revelation's engagement with honour language, therefore, goes well beyond its use of the word group.

In reality, John is intensely interested in the question of whom to honour, and at what cost that honour is to be safeguarded. John attempts to catch his audience up in the

\textsuperscript{98} It is not inappropriate to conjecture that Revelation in an epistolary form might have been circulated not only in the areas of the Diaspora but also in Palestine, since (1) every year Christian Jews gathered for Passover and the major feasts in Jerusalem; (2) the geographical (and communicational) significance of the seven cities in the Roman Empire in Revelation in which mobility and communication were exceptionally high; (3) in the early days, survival of the local (persecuted) body of Christ depends on a network of support; (4) hunger for news of the Messiah’s return made every morsel of information potentially significant (cf. Thompson, 1998:54, 58-59). With this background in mind, it is highly likely that John’s readers could access the Gospels, especially the Olivet Discourse. Further, the message of Revelation could be crucial especially to the Christians in Jerusalem, who had similar (identity) problems and needed their solutions.

\textsuperscript{99} This shameful state of lying unburied is too short (for three and half days [Rev. 11:9]) compared with the eternal reign of Christ (Rev. 11:15), in which Christ and the faithful enjoy honour together.
sense of gratitude and the immensity of the honour of God and the Lamb, by whose
death people from every nation have been ransomed from a servile status. What is more,
they have been ascribed the honourable standing of priests serving God, enjoying the
honour of face-to-face access to the Divine Patron. At this stage, two conspicuous
elements, honour-shame and client-patron, are interacted (cf. DeSilva, 1998b:791-792).

Honour and shame cultures rely on lying and deception as a key strategy to maintain
and augment honour and avoid the risk of being shamed. Lying and deception are
regular phenomena in the first-century Mediterranean world, which was the cultural Sitz
im Leben of the Book of Revelation. Among the seven typical types of deception and
lies (i.e. concealment of failure [Ge. 18:13]; concealment of unintentional failures [Lk.
10:29-37]; false imputation [1 Ki. 21]; avoiding quarrels or trouble [Mt. 6:1-18];
mischief [Jn. 8:24-30]; in defense of kin and fictive-kin [Jos. 2]), avoiding trouble is one
of the most important reasons for lies in Revelation (e.g. Rev. 2:20). According to John,
however, honour does not come from avoiding trouble (with the Roman authority or the
apostate Jews), but from public loyalty to Jesus who redefines the true meaning of
honour and shame. In Rev. 2-3 (e.g. Rev. 2:2, 9, 14; 3:1, 9, 15), Jesus exposes
deceptions, redefines true honour and shame and strikes a pose as the All-knowing Lord,
a critical posture in an honour and shame society. In subsequent chapters, false prophets
will be unmasked, the master deceiver Satan curtailed, the faithful rewarded beyond
imagination; those who have engaged in lies and deception will have no place in the

In addition, the following six phrases are notable (Malina & Pilch, 1993:12; DeSilva,

(1) John preserves a set of seven (perfect) makarisms, strung throughout his visions
seven makarisms frame the whole of the book, pointing to the call to remain exclusively
loyal to the Lamb and separated from the idolatry and luxury of the dominant culture.
To stand honoured in God’s sight and to remain within God’s favour, John’s audiences
can gain honour through victory and lose it through defeat, where it is replaced by
shame (regarding the three functions [ecclesiological, ethical and eschatological] of the

(2) Φοβήθητε τὸν θεόν (Rev. 14:7) means the nurturing respect for God's honour and a caution not to affront God and fail in one's obligations to one's divine benefactor.

(3) In Revelation *God's wrath* can be regarded as a culturally contextualised expression of God's honour against all kinds of challenges. John is forcing his audiences to choose eternal honour or temporal honour, which becomes dishonour *sub specie aeternitatis*.

(4) In Revelation as a covenantal prophecy in epistolary form, the *reciprocal covenantal honour* is accentuated. To repay honour is the apposite response to one who bestows honour — God — the Suzerain par excellence in New Israel grants John's audiences honour through his Embassy (or the Broker of God's royal patronage i.e. Christ).¹⁰⁰ John's readers should repay honour to God through worship, victory and covenantal loyalty. God as the Suzerain is able to honour one vassal more than another, creating a hierarchy of honour (Rev. 22:12). Thus, this reciprocal honour is not static but dynamic and hierarchical (Oakman, 1993:203; Olyan, 1996:204-205).

(5) As Malina and Pilch (1993:12) observe, any perusal of the Bible, including Revelation, will readily reveal how the God of Israel requires *total submissiveness*. It would seem that the whole of the ancient Mediterranean world was authoritarian: total submissiveness to 'authority' and high regard for a person's ability to endure pain were regarded as honourable. In fact, God is essentially a powerful and mighty God who expels all other deities, e.g. the deceiving authority/power of the Roman Empire in John's time. In Revelation, by showing a dichotomy between his authority and that of other deities, God commands his people to choose the right one related to Christian identity.

(6) The social utility of *name-calling* (or vilification)¹⁰¹ is an exercise in boundary

---

¹⁰⁰ In this connection there is an aspect of John's Christology in Revelation, which needs to be emphasised. John is above all an interpreter of Jesus. In many ways his understanding of Christ is advanced; so that he ascribes to the risen Jesus the attributes of God himself (Rev. 1:12-20). Christ, like the Father, is seen in Revelation as 'the mediator' of creation, redemption and the final kingdom, while to the kingdom itself is ascribed that of 'our Lord and of his Christ' (Rev. 11:15). Consequently, the central doctrine of Christ in the Apocalypse is not only akin to that found elsewhere in the writings of the NT; it is also, in its own right, a 'high Christology' (Smalley, 1994:152, 163).

¹⁰¹ Collins (1986b:318-320) aptly shows the role of vilification in Revelation: the vilifications of the Jews (Rev. 2:9-10; 3:9), the Roman Empire (Rev. 13:1-7), and of rival teachers (Rev. 2:14-15; 20-23) reflect conflicts over values, clashes of symbolic universes. John's polemic is part of the struggle of Christians in Asia Minor to survive physically and to establish an identity.
maintenance in that it declares who is in and who is out and in this connection — even more important — it strengthens the self-identity of the in-group (cf. Balaam, Jezebel, the whore of Babylon, the beast; Barr, 1986:410).

The core message of Revelation emerging from a socio-scientific study is that only the authoritative God (as the divine Patron) exclusively deserves the honour and forces the faithful to choose true and eternal honour instead of temporal honour and eternal dishonour (cf. Heb. 10:32-34; 13:13-14:2; 2 Co. 4:16-18). As Oakman (1993:209) tellingly summarises, John’s overriding theme throughout Revelation is that God alone is honourable, that God’s patronage alone is reliable and worthy of trust, and that God’s vengeance upon the whole dishonourable system is sure. Actually, most of the seven cities were dominated by their patron gods and goddesses and their temples and shrines (Ford, 1993:246). The tribute, which God alone is worthy of receiving, will be reliably as legitimate heirs to the heritage of Israel. To put it differently, John’s use of vilification (or apocalyptic hatred) functions to define a strict boundary between the seven churches and non-Christian Gentiles and apostate Jews on the basis of monotheism, belief in Christ as the Lord. The Book of Revelation as well as extra-canonical apocalypses deploy clothing and adornment motifs frequently to express eschatological, ethical and theological values. Apparel and decoration in Revelation also clearly delineate boundaries, on issues such as who is in/out, pure/impure, and honourable/dishonourable (Rev. 1:13; 3:4, 17; 4:4; 6:11; 7:9, 13; 12:1; 15:5; 16:15; 17:4; 18:16; 19:7, 13; 21:2-9; 22:14). Clothing and ornamentation make vivid through items of covering and decoration not only the identity but also the loyalty of those who are followers of either Satan or the Lamb. Characters arrayed in certain items of apparel exhibit values that speak louder than words. It appeals to the visual and the sensual — the eye — and reinforces the uncompromising character of the message to John’s audiences (see Neufeld, 2002:676-686).

At this point, the insiders and outsiders in Revelation are noteworthy. From the perspective of Romans and Greco-Asiatics (western Anatolia), the ultimate insiders were the Roman citizens. From the Jewish perspective, the strictest criterion which would have defined the purest insider was the worship of the God of the Jews combined with the rejection of any other claims to divinity and worship. From the Christian perspective, all who were ignorant of Jesus and his work would have counted as outsiders. In other words, the major criterion for Christian insiders would have been the acknowledgement of Jesus as the anointed Son of God. Thus, outsiders in the Book of Revelation are of three groups: (1) the nearest outsiders are the Jews (synagogue of Satan in Rev. 2:9; 3:9), (2) local polytheists and Christians (Rev. 2:6), and (3) the Romans (Rev. 2:13; Rev. 12-13; see Collins, 1985:188, 201-204; Simpson, 1998:19-20).

The use of the term ‘beast’ (Rev. 13:1, 11; 14:9, 11) obscures the humanness and the legitimate claims to gratitude and loyalty which the emperor (or the apostate Jews) might make on the audiences. Labelling ‘Rome’ (or ‘Jerusalem’) Babylon has a similar effect, replacing public discourse about the character and destiny of Rome (or the apostate Jews) with Jewish scriptural discourse about the character and fate of Babylon, and replacing any appreciation of connection with Rome (or Jerusalem) as a path to lasting peace, order and prosperity with a picture of ‘fornication’, a debased and debasing relationship and a counterfeit relationship as well (e.g. Rev. 2:20-21; 14:8) (see DeSilva, 1999:109).
redistributed to clients (Rev. 2:7; 7:15-17; 21:4-7). Moreover, John consistently emphasises the honour and glory of the faithful by describing it in terms of the metaphors/images of a banquet, wedding, victory and name-calling. John advocates an eternal honourable identity of the faithful in Revelation by their submission to God, and accentuates the dynamic reciprocal honour between God (as the covenantal Patron) and John’s readers (as trustworthy clients) through Jesus (as the Broker of God’s patronage; see Kümmel, 1972:322). For this reason, the conflict aroused in Revelation serves the purpose of promoting group solidarity and cohesive identity.

As Craffert (1995:174) argues, in the socio-scientific interpretation, the NT texts are first and foremost treated as alien cultural documents.\(^\text{105}\) Therefore, questions such as what they have to say to 21\textsuperscript{st} century Christians, are subordinate to the question of what they did or could possibly have said in their own cultural setting. Therefore, at this phase, theological interpretation is necessary to complement the historical interpretations as well as the literary interpretations of the Book of Revelation.

2.1.11.3. Theological interpretational methods

Unlike other Jewish apocalyptic books, the Book of Revelation claims to be inspired by God as a prophecy. Moreover, the conception of salvation history, in whose centre Jesus stands, lies at the basis of Revelation’s philosophy of history, gives to it the tone which comes from the certainty of salvation (Kümmel, 1972:323; cf. Ellis, 2001:117). So a probe into the revelation history of God in the Book of Revelation is absolutely indispensable. Du Rand (1996c:52) correctly points out the significance of the theological meaning of Revelation: “The real power of Revelation, on a communicative level, does not lie only in its symbolism, compositional, or historical perspectives, but in its theologically evocative power. … Primarily the theological message of Revelation is to be understood theocentrically”.

\(^{105}\) Craffert (1995:179) argues that socio-scientific interpretation does not abandon the theological message of NT documents but relocates the source of that message in a first-century meaning system. It is only after the anthropological turn that it becomes possible to really understand the so-called theological viewpoints and insights of the NT. Nevertheless, as he (1995:174) admits, it is evident that in the socio-scientific interpretation, the NT is not in the first instance any longer treated as a sacred or canonical text.
2.1.11.3.1. Canonical approach

There are certainly family resemblances between an intertextual understanding of the Bible and the canonical approach. Both approaches wish to read the text in its totality of textual and intertextual networks, codes and systems. But the canonical approach to the Bible wishes to rush to closure and to control the ownership of the Bible in ways unimaginable to the intertextualists. An intertextual study of the Bible need not confine itself to questions about canonical intentions. Yet both approaches recognise certain fundamental points: the texts are intertextual because texts are always in dialogue with other texts. In short, a canonical approach presupposes the conceptual framework of intertextuality (Carroll, 1993:77; cf. O’Day, 1990:259).

Those seeking to understand the canonical approach have often encountered a considerable amount of confusion, not only because the discipline offers differing methodologies, but also because these methodologies are not completely explained (Clarke, 1995:196). Regardless of this methodological puzzlement, this section, in principle, will attempt to explicate the principles and tenets of the canonical approach as defined by B.S. Childs in his emphasis upon the final form of the text.

Although all hypothetical theories of source and redaction need not impede the current use of the Book of Revelation, the fact that the entire book as we have it is canonically accepted is of the utmost importance (cf. Childs, 1985:41). With regard to the canonical approach of Revelation, Clarke’s (1995:204-215) process is appropriate: (1) canonisation of Revelation (canonical process); (2) canonical position of Revelation (i.e. broader context or macro-canonical analysis); and (3) canonical shape of Revelation (i.e. immediate context or micro-canonical analysis) (cf. Wall, 1992:274-275). In connection with (1), until the time of Constantine, who used the Book’s imperial imagery for self-promotion, Revelation was not recognised as canonical in some important regions of the early Catholic Church. But the canonising church, in recognising Revelation’s inspiration, included it as part of the Christian biblical canon (AD 397 – the Synod of Carthage) because of its normative character for subsequent generations of believers. As Wall (1992:278) concludes: throughout history, certain groups of believers have elevated the importance of Revelation as their ‘canon within a canon’. For other
believers, the presence of Revelation in the NT is a mere technicality.\textsuperscript{106}

Regarding (2), the NT canon in its final form is the product of an intentional process. The Book of Revelation is the Bible’s ‘conclusion’ and should be interpreted as such (Wall, 1992:279). Revelation effects a canonical \textit{inclusio} with the first chapter of Genesis in which a canon-logic comes to the fore, in that a faithful Creator God has kept the promise to restore all things for his Kingdom (Groenewald, 1986:15).\textsuperscript{107} The interpretation of Revelation is not only assisted by reading it in its fixed canonical position and relationship to Genesis, but also in its general canonical relationship to a number of other biblical writings or collections of writings (see Clarke, 1995:210-214):

(a) Revelation echoes something of the Exodus motif (Ex. 7-11; Rev. 15-16); (b) going further, Revelation has a number of close affinities with the OT prophets\textsuperscript{108} (esp. the similar vocabulary, symbolism and prophetic nature in Daniel and Ezekiel: see the sources of John); (c) the final concern is the consideration of Revelation’s canonical setting within the NT (esp. the Olivet Discourse, the Johannine writings, Acts, Ro., 1, 2 Co., Gal., Eph., Php., 1, 2 Th., Heb.,\textsuperscript{109} 1, 2 Pe. and Jude\textsuperscript{110} [see John’s NT source]).

\textsuperscript{106} The very fact of varying opinions, rather than universal acceptance of any list arbitrarily imposed by a general council, shows that the general acceptance of the contents of Revelation in particular (and the NT in general) was the result both of the inescapable voice of divine authority, and of human attestation (Froom, 1950:109).

\textsuperscript{107} The (re)creation motif in Revelation emphasises the eschatological identity and mission of Christianity in the New Covenant: the expelled Satan (cf. Ge. 3; Rev. 12:9); the destruction of Babylon (Ge. 11; Rev. 18); the faithfulness’ cleansing of sexual immorality (Ge. 6; Rev. 14); God’s judgment is spoken of in terms of de-creation (Rev. 6:12-14; Chilton, 1990:196); Christ as the re-creator (the New heaven and the New Earth; Ge. 1:26; Rev. 21:5); the epithet of Christ as the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Ge. 49; Rev. 5:5); beasts are destined to be subdued by the first Adam and the last Adam (Ge. 1; Rev. 19:11); the motif of the presence of God (Ge. 3:24; Rev. 22:4) (cf. Ryken, 1992:505; Coetzee, 1993:320; Du Rand, 1994b:561; Clarke, 1995:210; Poythress, 2000:21).

\textsuperscript{108} John purposely borrowed from the OT prophets for at least two reasons: first, in order to provide an enhanced, yet familiar eschatological medium with which his audiences would be familiar, and second, to give further credibility and authority to his message. Although there are affinities and intertextual dialogue between Revelation and the OT prophets, John offered a profound reinterpretation of the whole OT in the light of his understanding of Christ (Clarke, 1995:231-214).

\textsuperscript{109} The canonical relevance of ‘Revelation’ to ‘Hebrews’ is: (a) the fact that both employ the Exodus typology; (b) their strong liturgical tones; (c) the New Covenant through Christ; (d) the New Jerusalem imagery in their concluding Chapters. Regarding (d), both would appear to have the actual post-70 situation in view when a restructuring of the symbolic world that the temple represented was called for on all sides. Thus, both works are grounded in a more general discursive exercise that was taking place both inside and outside Judaism in the wake of the
The canonical shaping (3) attempts to discover traces within the text itself of how the biblical author intended the material to be understood: (a) although the issues of Revelation’s unity and structure will continue to be a matter of debate, the canonical critic must focus primarily upon the final form of the Book rather than upon its underlying sources. (b) Childs (1985:517) draws attention to the fact that ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ἸΩΑΝΝΟΥ as the title of Revelation (i.e. John’s ‘paratextuality’, to use G. Genette’s term) has the canonical significance that the Book is to be read in conjunction with the larger Johannine corpus. The point is not to harmonise Revelation with the other Johannine writings, but rather to affirm that there is a larger canonical unity in the church’s scriptures. The readers of Revelation might have read and understood the Book from other Johannine writings. The title of Revelation reflects the ancient tradition of the canonising agents and the Early Church, who ascribed authorship to the Apostle John. (c) In the prescript of Revelation, the eternal message

---

110 As Wall (1992:279) correctly notes: while the interpreter should not place too much importance on the order of writings within the NT, such a perspective does allow one to construct an overarching canon-logic that provides an added dimension of meaning to the whole NT and to individual compositions within it. Hence, at this point, the canonical relevance of ‘Revelation’ to ‘Jude’ is worth noticing (cf. Childs, 1985:492; concerning further instructive parallels between them, see Robinson, 1981:227):

(1) Both frequently imply the OT (and Jewish apocalypses). To Jude the OT citations demonstrate that the alternative of unbelief is there from the beginning and is nothing new (Jude 5, 7, 9, 11, and 14). Similar to John, the suffering of the church is common in every period. But God has inaugurated the eschatological coming of his kingdom, even though his church suffers inwardly and outwardly.


(3) The universality of their readership (a catholic epistle, Jude 1; Rev. 1:4).

(4) The eschatological tension between pure faith and heresy or compromise (Jude 4; Rev. 2:9, 15; 18:4).

(5) Concerning God’s judgment, Jude 14-16, for instance, picks up its language specifically in Rev. 9:16 to describe the fact that the Lord comes with his holy myriads to execute judgment upon all, to convict all the Ungodly for all their ungodly ways. Jude 16 identifies the ungodly with the Judaising apostates (cf. 2 Pe. 2:10, 18; Jordan, 1997:14-15).

According to the above relevance, it is clear that Jude, situated just before Revelation, leads the Christian church into the last canonical book in which the wider and deeper scope and meaning of the eschatological coming of God’s kingdom through the Lord’s judgment are accentuated. By playing the role of the conclusion of the Bible, the Book of Revelation is the evident manifesto of Christian eschatological hope, of the Triune God’s victory over Satan, of the church over the false church and all its signs. Unfortunately, in the canonical interpretation of Revelation, almost all scholars one-sidedly stress the role of Rome (cf. Kümmel, 1972:327; Clarke, 1995:212).
of God is emphasised in, for example, the number seven symbolising the universal churches in every period (Childs, 1985:517). (d) For the last Book of the Bible such canonical control (Rev. 22:18-19) is especially needful in the epilogue of Revelation. The conclusion of Revelation repeats many of the themes presented in the introduction. In this way, Revelation's prescript and epilogue function again as an immediate canonical inclusio (see John’s rhetorical devices; cf. Barr, 1998:12). In short: by playing the role of the conclusion (climax) of the Bible, the Book of Revelation is the evident manifesto of Christian eschatological hope, of God’s victory over the Satan and of the church over the false church and all its signs.

2.1.11.3.2. Revelation history based on the (Christological) covenant eschatology

In the Book of Revelation, as the last book of the Bible, the history of the revelation actually comes to a conclusion. Put differently, in Revelation the history of God’s revelation reaches its conclusion with the revelation of Christ’s glory which has been concealed (Snyman, 1971:12).

111 In the study of revelation history and covenantal eschatology, basic and central aspects are the absolute sovereignty of God (i.e. God’s central place in every history must be honoured), personal covenantal communion with God, life-giving Godlike attitude through his Word and Spirit (i.e. the relation of the specific event to God’s redemptive work must be fully taken into account in the development of revelation history), the specific function of a person in the Bible (prophet, priest, king, apostle must be respected), and historical attitude and eschatology (cf. Helberg, 1992:425-427; Kleijn, 2001:10). Three realities, which occupied an important place in the thought of the early Christians (of course, including the author of Revelation), are especially remarkable: (1) the reality of the belief in the living God; (2) the new life-reality of redeemed Christians; and (3) the reality of the OT as source. As theological, soteriological and historical relations with their features of fulfillment, discontinuity and continuity allowed early Christians to understand the OT message freshly, so they also offered a key to the meaningful integration of the OT in the 21st century exegetes (see Van der Watt, 1989:62-63, 76). However, drawing heavily on social-science perspectives in the first century ancient (present-oriented) world, some criticise revelation history and realised eschatology as anachronistic theological concepts (e.g. Van Aarde, 2001:1167). Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that both revelation history and the eschatological scheme of ‘already but not yet’ are the most prominent theological concepts in the NT.

112 In his Christ-centred eschatology, König (1970:535-536) convincingly maintains that the NT speaks of the entire history of Christ in strictly eschatological terms. Christ realised God’s creation goal for us (especially his incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection); in us (by his operations through the Holy Spirit); and with us (at his Parousia). Therefore eschatology is not to be derived from τὰ ἐσχάτα, ‘the last things’, but from ὁ ἐσχάτος, ‘the last One’ (and from telos, the fulfilled End): Jesus Christ, because this is the purpose that Jesus realises, i.e. God’s creation goal. Eschatology is thus teleological Christology.
Covenant language is not prominent in the Apocalypse. Indeed, the actual term, διαθήκη, appears only once, in the vision of the heavenly ark of God’s covenant in 11:19. But John frequently alludes to the idea of a covenant relationship between God and the seven churches in this Book, and associates with it the naturally corresponding motif of redemption (Smalley, 1994:155-156).

The Book of Revelation as *a covenantal epistle* through its various visions and hortatory expressions graphically portrays the inestimable honour and worth of the church’s covenantal relationship with her Suzerain, the Lord Jesus Christ. And the whole concept of vassal obligation within the covenant relationship is built upon the prior (and continuing) goodness of the Suzerain. In fact, for the vassal it is the highest honour to perform the stipulations in spite of ensuing suffering, even death (Du Preez, 1979:221; cf. Poythress, 2000:20).

As Strand (1983:251-254, 264) appropriately elucidates, the (unilateral) vassal-suzerainty covenant obviously appears both in Revelation 2-3 and in the whole Book (cf. Shea, 1983:81; Chilton, 1990:17; Oakman, 1993:203):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Preamble</th>
<th>Revelation 2-3</th>
<th>The Book of Revelation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the Suzerain, Christ under appropriate symbolism</td>
<td>Who Christ, the Suzerain, is: 1:5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Historical Prologue</th>
<th>Indicative of past relationships (presupposed in the ‘I know your works’ statement)</th>
<th>What Christ has done for his vassals: 1:5b-6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Stipulations</th>
<th>The prescribed course of action for each congregation in view of its circumstances</th>
<th>Call to loyalty and faithfulness: chs. 2-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Call upon Witnesses</th>
<th>The repeated imperative to ‘hear what the Spirit says to the churches’</th>
<th>22:16a, 17a, 20a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Blessing and Curse</th>
<th>The promise to the victorious and the warnings of unfaithfulness</th>
<th>22:7a, 14a, 18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The images of Christ as the Suzerain in the Apocalypse reflect the three tenses of God

(1) The \textit{past} activity of the Christ: the slaughtered Lamb is an image of Christ's past work on the cross. The references to the historical Jesus are concentrated on the death/resurrection/exaltation. The aorist \textit{ἐνίκησα} is repeatedly used for the once-and-for-all redemptive work of Christ (Rev. 3:21; 5:5).

(2) The \textit{present} work of the Christ: despite the strong eschatological orientation of the Apocalypse, there are even more references to the present activity of Christ than to the future activity. In the present Christ is the exalted King of the universe. His blood shed in the past is effective in the present (Rev. 12:11); He is present in and to the churches (Rev. 1:13; 2:1; 3:19). Above all He speaks (Rev. 1:1; 2:7, 2:24; 4:1; 16:15; 22:6; 22:20). It is clear that Christ works in the present as King, Priest, and Prophet. The present participle \textit{ὁ ἕλκων} is used for the faithful Christian's response to Christ's call to follow him actively in the present.

(3) The \textit{future} work of Jesus: most of the (forthcoming) future activity of Christ is related not to the historical future between John's writing and the \textit{eschaton}, but to the Parousia. Christ will consummate the kingdom of God in his Parousia (cf. Beale, 1999a:173).\textsuperscript{114}

From the above-mentioned activities of Christ, it is evident that most attention is focused on the activity of the historical Jesus (his death and resurrection) and the present activity of the exalted Christ. It is vested in the person of Jesus Christ who binds together the past, the present and the future (Groenewald, 1986:26). Therefore the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{113} The present activity of Christ means the work of Jesus from his ascension to the time of John. And Revelation regularly uses loose oscillations between future, present and aorist tenses in the visionary passages (e.g. Rev. 13:1-8, 11-18). The oscillation is natural because the historical referent is future, the visionary experience is past, and the present tense can encompass both past and future through the categories of historical present, present for the future, and possibly gnomic present (cf. Poythress, 1993:45).

\textsuperscript{114} The Book of Revelation contains the vision of the consummation of the Kingdom of God by means of the consummation of God's covenant (cf. Du Preez, 1979:215; Chilton, 1990:17). Similarly, Van der Waal (1990:125, 170) is of the opinion that Revelation speaks in a grand way of the administration of covenantal judgment over Israel that rejected Christ. In Rev. 22:1-2, for instance, the paradise covenant is completed in that Adam's commission as God's vassal to build, to keep, to rule, is restored. Thus, Barr's (1998:173) claim is untenable: in fact everything described in Revelation has already occurred.}
message of Revelation should be understood Christologically and eschatologically: the kingdom of God is already present on earth in the Christian community which has the task of making visible God’s purpose with this world. John’s ecclesiology, as Smalley (1994:156) believes, is covenantal and redemptive in its general character, as well as being fully corporate (cf. Rissi, 1966:34). The Christian communities have already become God’s visible representatives through their personal confession and pious lifestyle (cf. Coetzee, 1993:309).115 Everything John writes centres around the person and work of Jesus. In a sense, Johannine theology is nothing but Christology, and his Christology is his soteriology (Gerhardsson, 1979; Smalley, 1994:50; cf. Warren, 2002:352). Put another way, the church’s ethos is Christological in that the ontological *imitatio Christi* for the visible Kingdom of God on earth as in heaven is the core of Revelation (cf. Wall, 1992:334; Reddish, 1995:220).

This fact is closely connected with the NT eschatology in which ‘already’ and ‘not yet’ make all generations relevant (Bandstra, 1992:23; Beale, 1999b:134). The depiction of Jesus standing in front of the throne proves that his consistent ministry brings about the fulfilment of redemptive work instead of God the Father.116 After finishing ‘the not yet’ event, Jesus sits on the throne (Rev. 22:1). Nevertheless, the focal point of the ‘already’ and ‘not yet’ of the eschatological salvation is not so much the linear concept of history (i.e. a time-lapse category) as the kingdom of God and the rule of Christ on the throne as the main symbol (cf. Schüssler Fiorenza, 1989a:419). In Revelation 1:4, for example,

115 Concerning the identity of John’s community, *βασιλεία* (Rev. 1:6, 9; 5:10; 11:15; 12:10; 17:12, 17, 18), kingship (or dominion; to rule in Jesus’ name; to be royalty for God) is a better translation than kingdom. Due to the past Christ-event (Rev. 1:5; 5:9), *βασιλεία* has the present/inaugurated eschatological/dynamic/active sense in its textual context. Nevertheless, John’s readers are able to execute their kingship on earth through the suffering prophetic witness and the priestly mission (Bandstra, 1992:17-18, 23; Poythress, 2000:29). Accordingly, ‘the kingdom of God’ in this work is synonymous with ‘God’s dynamic kingship’.

116 Throughout the Book of Revelation God is the one defined by Christ, the one who shares even his throne with Christ (Rev. 3:21; 12:5; 22:1, 3), so that the fluidity of the figures tend to fade into each other (i.e. blurred or soft boundary); there is a sense in which Revelation is Christ’s story (Thompson, 1990:790; Boring, 1992:707, 718; Bauckham, 1993b:64). In connection with the balanced eschatology of Revelation, the centre of salvation history lies in the Christ-event, which has already taken place; so that in Christ time is divided anew. Thereafter, the Christian church looks forward to a final appearance of Jesus; but, at the same time, it looks back to that moment when history was invaded in a new way by that which is supra-historical. In the scheme of Revelation, this means that theology is more important than chronology (Smalley, 1994:150-151).
the linear concept of time is broken through in its third term (εἰκωσταύοινος instead of
εἰκόνα). This has great significance for the understanding of God and time in Revelation.
God's future is not that He will be as He was and is, but that He is on the move and
coming towards the world. As the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχομένος), God now already sets
present and past in the light of his eschatological arrival, an arrival which means the
establishment of his eternal kingdom, and his indwelling in the creation renewed for

In other words, as a prototypical victory the decisive battle on the cross makes possible
all other victories of his followers up to his Parousia. Because the eschaton of the
Kingdom of God has arrived through the Christ-event, a 'new moral order' has been
made possible and Christians are to live accordingly. The Christian commitment to non-
violence\textsuperscript{117} is an eschatological commitment demonstrating to the world their

\textsuperscript{117} In contrast to Revelation's non-violent character, Garret (1998:474) has a dissenting opinion:
Revelation's approval of violence and implicit disparagement of women threaten to undermine
the Book's central truth. Moreover, John's feminine imagery is dangerous because it promotes
an ethos in which women are not allowed to control their own bodies and their own destinies
and in which violence against women is condoned. Although Garret (1998:470) is sometimes
correct when she observes John's use of the OT feminine 'expression' (imagery), she fails to
recognise its consistent characteristic in John's non-violent 'meaning' (cf. Baurkham,
1993b:77). To take this feminist line of reasoning further, Pippin (1992:50, 80, 105) argues that
the body of woman as the object of male desire is marginalised or violently destroyed. She goes
on to even insist: "The misogyny which underlies Revelation is extreme. ... The virginal
144,000 male followers of the Lord are allowed to enter the Bride (the New Jerusalem). This
scene is disturbing because the imagery is that of mass intercourse. ... All the apocalyptic
females are erotic images with erotic power over man". But Pippin's analysis has been criticised
and her conclusion of misogyny rejected by some scholars. "The terms for stripping and
nakedness, for instance, are terms from military vocabulary of urban siege. Forensic, not
salacious elements dominate the text. It is her (the whore Babylon) ornamentation that is
described in detail in Rev. 18, not her body" (Callahan, 1999:57; cf. Rossing, 1998:490). Some
recent interpreters have expressed ambivalence about the female imagery in Revelation,
objecting to the virgin/whore dichotomy in John's symbolic system, categories reflecting a
culture that emphasises male control of female sexuality. However, Joy Schroeder (1995:180-
181) correctly argues that the vision of Rev. 12, for instance, has an enduring message for
Christians, both male and female. Unlike the numerous authors throughout Christian history
who assume that there is an ancient and treacherous alliance between woman and Satan, John
points to their primordial enmity. The enmity between the serpent and the woman in Ge. 3:15
prefigures Satan's persecution of the Church. In connection with feminist readings of Revelation,
as Jack (2001:161-162) points out, for feminist biblical critics, Revelation is an important text.
Its coded language and multiple layers of meaning mean that it is open to the many approaches
that fall under the umbrella of feminist criticism. Its use of female symbols and characters is an
obvious starting point for any reading from a feminist perspective. However, whether a purely
feminist reading gets to the heart of the text is another matter.
confidence that they do live in a new age (cf. De Villiers, 1987:138). The faithful can survive in a nonviolent way in this distorted world by realising the fact that God controls the beginning and the end. In John’s worldview, history is the sphere in which God has wrought redemption. Though John depicts evil realistically, his book is basically not pessimistic but sanguine. For that reason, the main subject matter of Revelation is the victory of Christ for his oppressed church (Rev. 1:7, 8; 17:14) (Botha, 1970:136; Gentry, 1989:127). Christ is going to reconfirm his universally visible reign and rule over the world, which has been managed not so much in a concealed way for a long time (Snyman & Floor, 1969:57-58) as in a similar way, in particular, as in the Gospels and Acts.

To sum up: the core of Revelation from revelation history on the basis of the (Christological) covenantal eschatology is that the dynamic kingship of God has been fulfilled in the period of the New Covenant, which Christ as the Lord of the new aeon has to consummate by his Parousia and by the churches’ undertaking. As Pohlmann (1997:64) correctly observes, the deeper one probes into the Apocalypse and its worldview, the closer the interpreter will get to the central uniting covenant of God. The faithful have to perform as kings, prophets and priests even though they are suffering in the present situation (cf. Kümmel, 1972:322; Collins, 2000:406). The Parousia is to consummate the visible realisation of God’s kingship as well as ultimately to solve the identity tension (Rev. 21:3; 7; 22:4).

118 For example, the fact that Rev. 7 and 10-11 as interludes depict not the period of escape but that of perseverance shows that Revelation emphasises the positive and active involvement of Christians, not out of but in the world. This point stresses not the apocalyptic but the prophetic character of Revelation of which the goal is always to direct God’s people toward right action in the present (cf. Chilton, 1985:155). Thus, Dunn’s argument is not persuasive: due to his pessimistic viewpoint of the present world, John’s hope is focused on the New Heaven and the New Earth (Dunn, 1990:333). For the pessimillennialists of premillennialism and amillennialism, while the Christ event gave an invisible, spiritually mortal blow to Satan, it did not give him a visible, historically mortal blow (North, 1987:xxi). God’s victory in heaven, to be sure, guarantees his coming victory on earth (see the seven beatitudes and the δεῦ γενέσθαι of the sovereign divine will in Rev. 1:1 and 22:6; Kümmel, 1972:322).
2.1.11.4. Concluding summary: the multimethodological interaction of recent approaches

The multimethodological integration of different methods is very complex, not only because the epistemological presupposition is different among them, but also because the integrating factor among all different approaches is that of 'experience' (cf. Lategan, 1995:33). However, from the above multimethodologically interactive interpretation, the interlocking/interdependence of processes as well as that of outcomes is obvious:

(1) Apocalyptic rhetoric and narratology dovetail in that both attempt a careful analysis of Revelation's linguistic, social and ideological contexts on the basis of communication theory. Thus, the investigation of the socio-historical meaning of Revelation relates to rhetorical-narratological analysis (compare the \textit{stasis} of the apocalyptic rhetoric with the normative [ideological] viewpoint).

(2) Rhetorical effect on the various sources is inferred from source criticism (e.g. compare the Exodus motif with \textit{inclusio}). The rhetorical \textit{inclusio} (i.e. John's urgent expectancy of the fulfillment of his prophecy) accords with the early date of Revelation.

(3) Narratological standpoints interact with John's redactional emphasis. The person and works of Christ in the covenantal eschatology are the basis of Revelation's narrative plot.

(4) In a sense, a socio-scientific approach enhances the possibility of the source and the redaction.

(5) The points of canonical approach (e.g. the relevance of Revelation as the climax [conclusion] of the Bible is related to Genesis and Jude) link up with those of the revelation historical advocates (e.g. the emphases of the New Covenant and climactic universal salvation history in Christ in Revelation). Owing to its innate methodological characteristics, the canonical approach is also interconnected not only with the study of source and redaction but also with apocalyptic rhetoric.

(6) The study of the source is a preliminary to a theological interpretation since the former clarifies the intertextuality of Revelation in a canonical approach and revelation history.

(7) A socio-scientific approach is the basis of covenantal eschatology in that the insights into the socio-historic context of the first century (esp. AD 65-70) derived from the
former illuminate and are indispensable for the latter (compare the reciprocal covenantal honour with the unilateral [vassal-suzerainty] covenant).

(8) Revelation history does not close one's eyes to the idealistic outcomes of apocalyptic rhetoric and narratology because in the former the Messianic War/judgment/salvation motif is accentuated.

Although the results of literary, historical and theological interpretations in the research into the core of Revelation are not exactly same, they interact and have a remarkable common ground.\(^{119}\) This corresponding holistic interpretation manifests several kinds of complementary elements in the core of Revelation: the divinely persuasive, the stable (unlike the deconstructive opinion), the reciprocally honourable, the climactic, the eschatological (Christological Kingship), the cosmic (or universal), the optimistic (and triumphant), the dynamic covenantal, the prayerfully testifying, the (in)tolerable, and the perpetual (or trans-temporal) ethos.

In conclusion, this section (2.1.11. recent development of methods) tends to focus on specific passages and limited materials in Revelation, rather than treating the Book's development of all kinds of elements in a progressive fashion throughout its entire scope. The salient emphasis of the Book of Revelation unfolded by this limited study is that the eschatological coming of the Kingdom of God can be accomplished by identifying Christians' eschatological identity with that of Christ in the New Covenant (cf. Friesen, 2001:209). This identification of Christians' honourable and dynamic identity with Christ (as kings, prophets and priests) should and could be performed by their prayerful witness up to the point of death (like Jesus and the ethos of Acts), non-violent (unlike the Zealots; Sproul, 1998:119) but active submission to God in all their spheres of life\(^{120}\) (unlike the retreatist pietism of Essene), and uncompromising endurance (like the idea of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles of John, but unlike the

\(^{119}\) After understanding Revelation in terms of 'the inherent literary plot of the theological narrative itself', Du Rand comes to the very consistently coherent conclusion that the gist of Revelation is the theocentric unfolding of God's kingship on earth as it is in heaven (Du Rand, 1996c:53).

\(^{120}\) For example, in interpreting Rev. 20-21, Van der Watt (1991:262-264) justly points out believers' responsibility to their environment: Christians must not only manifest the redemptive will of God but also confirm their salvation in a broken environment, although it is not the faithful but God who is the ultimate Saviour of the ecosystem (cf. Rossing, 1998:495).
Laodicean church). All these phases are derived from both the Christ event and the Jerusalem fall that are the grounds of the eschatological hope for all Christian generations as well as John's audiences. The core of Revelation has two aspects: (1) absolute intolerance in terms of the identity of John's audiences, (2) absolute tolerance for the visible fulfilment of God's Kingdom in the New Covenant in terms of the mission of John's readers/hearers.

The real emphasis of the Apocalypse is no less relevant today than the day it was written. Above all, the exclusive exhortation through the core of Revelation has a significant relevance to modern Christians living in a pluralistic postmodern world in which both the absolute truth and the identity of the faithful are easily compromised. Today, too, the true Church of the Lord has to demarcate itself from the rebellious pseudo-church, so as not to share in the plagues which will be the latter's lot (Van der Waal, 1990:126). The absolute intolerance in the core of the Book of Revelation is applied only to Christian's identity, while the tolerance/universality in the ethos is necessary for the visible realisation of God's Kingdom in the New Covenant (Barton, 1996:211). At this point, the wisdom of God is crucially required in order to maintain, adapt or reform others, without necessarily undermining our own distinctive identities.

2.1.12. Summary

From a historical survey of the interpretation of the Apocalypse and as Groenewald (1986:21-22) notes, generally speaking, the swing of the pendulum of interpretational methods has moved between two extremes: a consistent literary interpretation and a metaphorical or symbolical interpretation. From the earliest time, the literary interpretation was dominant. From the time of the church father Origen to the time of the Reformers, the symbolic interpretation came to the fore. But with the recognition

---

121 Yarbro Collins (1986a:229-230) also argues that at least since the time of Origen, the crucial issue in the interpretation of Revelation has been whether to take it literally or spiritually. One focus of the controversy in the early church was the prophecy contained in Rev. 20:1-6. Some early Christian writers such as Papias (ca. 130), Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian (d. 220) believed that this passage predicted an earthly kingdom of God which would follow his second coming and last a thousand years (that is, premillennialist). It is on this basis that premillennialists today often claim that the early church was uniformly premillennial (cf. Gregg,
of the weaknesses of a symbolic interpretation, other ways have been found. Some followed the contemporary-historical method in which the historical context of the author and the audience received proper attention. In contrast to this method (contemporary-historical) is the end-historical interpretation. The world historical interpretation appeared too.

As the Church has struggled to understand the Book of Revelation over the last two thousand years, four long-established schools of interpretation have emerged: preterist, futurist, idealist and church and world historical. Because there is a measure of truth in each of the above captions, an interaction is feasible. However, it seems that the idealist, futurist, and church and world historical approaches are not pertinent to finding ‘what it meant’ but are helpful for searching for ‘what it means’. For the proper interpretation of Revelation, the (partial) preterist approach, with the help of recently developed methods, is indispensable.

2.2. The interpretive placement of the partial preterism

At least from the time of Luther onwards, and perhaps even before this, the Book of Revelation has provided a useful weapon in the arsenal of those who have wished to launch an attack upon the papacy, and a means by which the demonisation of that institution could take on the appearance of having divine sanction. Little wonder, then, that Catholic expositors in the 16th and 17th centuries spent considerable time and energy in seeking to meet this challenge (cf. Newport, 2000:71).

1997:29). But Origen argued that the passage ought to be interpreted figuratively.

122 Until the nineteenth century most premillennialists used the church and world historical approach, while today the usual premillennial emphasis is futurist (Gregg, 1997:xiv).

123 In his recent article on counterfeiting in the Book of Revelation, Poythress (1997:413) suggests an example of ‘what it means’ based on ‘what it meant’. In the same vein, Warren (2002:352) points out that “interpretation must be based on understanding how God was speaking to and working in the lives of the author and recipients of the message in the original context, thereby providing a basis for weighing the validity of interpretations and applications of the text today. In the case of the Book of Revelation, the implication of this hermeneutical principle is too often ignored”.

124 Sproul (1998:228) defines ‘preterism’ as an eschatological viewpoint that places many or all eschatological events in the past, especially during the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. Full preterism assigns all of these events to the first century. Partial preterism assigns many of these events to the first century, but not the second coming, the resurrection and the final judgment.
Although something like modern preterism of at least the early part of Revelation existed in the church as many as a thousand years before the time of the Spanish Jesuit Luis de Alcasar (1554-1614) from Seville, it is widely agreed that partial preterism has its origin with Alcasar, and probably with the motive of removing the sting from the Protestant use of the Antichrist prophecies against the Papacy (cf. Platt, 2000:14). The very root of Alcasar derives from Hentenius's influential work, which summarised Revelation as follows: the Apocalypse was written in the time of Nero and its prophetic section consisted of two parts, chs. 6-11 (or 1-11) which dealt with the separation (or victory) of the church from the synagogue and chs. 12-19, which were concerned with the destruction of Roman paganism (Heinze, 1998:148).

According to Alacasar's commentary on Revelation titled 'Vestigatio Arcani Sensus in Apocalypsi' published in 1614 (the 2nd edition is 1618125), Rev. 1-11 is about the opposition between Judaism and Christianity. Rev. 12-22 deals both with the war between Roman paganism and the Church and with the victory of the Church. Therefore, in Rev. 12:6 John aims at depicting the picture of the Roman church which Peter and Paul founded. Peter and Paul had to escape from a peaceful milieu due to a short period of forthcoming hostility. Since Michael is Jesus, Rev. 12:7 pictures the war between Jesus (and his ministers) and paganism. Alcasar comments on Rev. 12:15-16 in a very interesting way: Nero is a magician, who can spew water like a river, but is assassinated not for religious reasons but because of his human ambition, as explained by the earth swallowing the river. Rev. 12:17 describes the persecution of Nero in the entire Roman Empire (Prigent, 1959:80).

The Dutch Protestant Hugo Grotius (or van Groot, 1583-1645), published his Annotations in 1644, following Alcasar's method. He held that Rev. 4-11 contained the history of the persecuting Jews, with the seals covering the period from Christ to the Jewish War and the trumpets covering the events leading to the fall of Jerusalem. He maintained that chs. 12 to 20 are limited to the Christian victory over pagan Rome, with the destruction of idolatry (see Froom, 1948:510, 523; Prigent, 1959:84; Stefanović,

125 The date of Vestigatio Arcani Sensus in Apocalypsi held at the Ushaw College Library, Durham, UK is 1619. Alcazar's 900-page work on the Apocalypse, published posthumously, was the fruit of some forty years' labour (Newport, 2000:71-72).
1996:44). Grotius was the first Reformed scholar to deny the popular application of 'the beast' to the Papacy. Since that time, the trickle of followers has become a flood (Ford, 1982:138-139). Hammond (1605-1660), called the 'father of English biblical criticism', was apparently the first English cleric to abandon the protestant historical school for the Jesuit counterview and followed Grotius closely in his preterist views. The first beast of Rev. 13 is, according to him, restricted to pagan Rome. The land beast is applied to the heathen priests, and the persecution results from the edicts against the early Christians. But in Hammond's arguments, it is notable that the awkward combination between preterism, historicism and futurism appears (cf. Froom, 1948:525). Alcasar applied Rev. 20 to the final persecution by the Antichrist, and the day of judgment; and chs. 21 and 22, referring to the New Jerusalem, he made description of the glorious and endless triumphant state of the Roman church. As a matter of fact, Alcasar was moved to proffer the preterist theory of counter-interpretation against the Reformers.

Wainwright (1999:391-392) introduces the history of the (partial) preterist interpretation during the 17th-19th centuries: after Alcasar, the preterist interpretation was also advocated by the Roman Catholic J. B. Bossuet (1689). After 1770, preterism was widely practised by G.H.A. Ewald (1803-1875), F. Bleek (1793-1859), F. Delitzsch (1813-1890), J. Wellhausen (1844-1918), G.C.F. Lücke (1791-1855), and W.M. De Wette (1780-1849). Johann G. von Herder (1744-1803) followed Firmin Abauzit (1679-1767) of Geneva in explaining Revelation as a prediction of the downfall of Judaism. In 1791, Johann Gotteried Eichhorn126 (1752-1827) saw it as a prophecy of both the destruction of the Jewish state and the fall of the Roman Empire. And since 1830 numerous British and American scholars have followed Eichhorn (e.g. Samuel Lee of Cambridge and Samuel Davidson). Meanwhile, in the 1840s C. Fritzsche, F. Benary, F. Hitzig, and E. Reuss argued that 666 signified Nero Caesar. During the 19th127 and early

---

126 Preterist interpretation of the Apocalypse found fertile soil among German rationalists. The credit for the revival of Alcasar's preterism has usually been given to J.G. Eichhorn (1752-1825), German biblical scholar and orientalist who carried out the basic idea of Herrenschneider's (1786) commentary, which regarded the Apocalypse as the drama of the progress of the Christian church, being composed of three acts: (1) the dissolution of Judaism (Rev. 8-12), (2) the abolition of the heathen (Rev. 13-20:10), and (3) the final universal triumph of the Christian church by the doctrines of Jesus. The scene of the seven seals was seen as a prelude to that apocalyptic drama (Stefanović, 1996:54-55).

127 Since the last half of the nineteenth century, a great number of British and American
20th centuries, Moses Stuart (1780-1898), who introduced the preterist approach to the Apocalypse into America, and James Snowden (1919) advocated preterism. Therefore, it can be deduced that the earlier form of partial preterism is the transitional one.

The principal modern advocates of the partial preterism are the Tyler School in Texas called 'the Christian Reconstructionists' whose eschatology is postmillennialism. While they are a minority in contemporary research into Revelation, partial preterism seems to be regarded as an appropriate interpretation in the context of the grammatico-historico method, since its advocates cautiously analyse the symbolism of Revelation and take into account its historical setting in the first century. As Ford (1982:139) puts it, scholars have practised a preterist reading of Revelation. Samuel Lee (1783-1852), a professor from Cambridge, reinstalled preterism into the discussion in Great Britain. Philip C.S. Desprez (d. 1879), English clergyman, and Frederick D. Maurice (1805-1872), Anglican theologian, built their arguments on the basis that Revelation described the events preceding the fall of Jerusalem (see Stefanović, 1996:54-57).

128 The Christian reconstructionists espouse the following distinctives: (1) Regeneration — salvation by grace through faith — is man's only hope both in this age and in the age to come. (2) The continuing validity and applicability of the whole law of God including, but not limited to, the Mosiac case laws is the standard by which individuals, families, churches and civil governments should conduct their affairs. (3) A victorious view of the future progress of the kingdom of God (i.e. postmillennialism) prior to the return of Christ is foundational for the building of a Christian civilisation. (4) Presuppositional apologetics as opposed to evidentialism establishes that God's Word is self-authenticating and is the judge of all other supposed authorities, human reason included. (5) A decentralised social order where evil government is only one legitimate government among many other governments, including family government and ecclesiastical government, is the basis for a free and orderly society (see North & DeMar, 1991:81-82).

129 In the late nineteenth century, several developments led to the decline of postmillennialism. Beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, postmillennialism began once again to be seriously studied. Renewed interest in the English Puritans and the simultaneous rise of Christian Reconstructionism led to a rethinking of several areas of theology, including eschatology. This has resulted in the publication of several important works on eschatology by noted postmillennial authors such as Rousas J. Rushdoony, J. Marcellus Kik, Greg L. Bahnsen, Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr., John Jefferson Davis, Gary De Mar, R.C. Sproul, and D. Chilton (Mathison, 1999:48, 52; cf. Smalley, 1994:180). However, in the circle of partial preterism, few amillennial advocates, for example, Jay E. Adams, also exist.

130 By mentioning several exegetes including Beckwith, Swete, Ramsay, Simcox, Moses Stuart, and F.F. Bruce, Ford (1982:138) insists that certainly the most popular approach in critical and scholarly circles is preterism. In fact, there are not many preteristic commentaries on Revelation compared with those commentaries written from the other three traditional viewpoints.

131 Symbolism is not a denial of historicity but a figurative method of communicating reality (Mounce, 1998:212). John uses tensive symbols, which have a more ambiguous relationship with their referents, and are thus 'polyvalent', opening up diverse possibilities of significance. In contrast to tensive symbols, steno-symbols are described as having a single referent and so are 'monovalent' and somewhat limited in their capacity to evoke multiplicities of meaning (Paul, 2001:136).
the strength of partial preterism lies in the fact that Revelation must have had some meaning for John's contemporaries. There can be no valid exegesis without granting the primary assumption of partial preterism, i.e. the direct application of the scriptural contents to the local and temporal needs of the persons addressed. It is axiomatic that Revelation must first be understood as a document arising from a particular historical matrix. At this stage the distinction between full(y realised) preterism and partial preterism is necessary to confirm the concept of partial preterism.

The following table concisely demonstrates the differences between them (cf. Mathison, 1999:235-236):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full preterism</th>
<th>Partial preterism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coming (parousia) of Christ</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resurrection and rapture</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day of the Lord</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132 Rev. 4:1 is used by advocates of Dispensationalism to support their 'rapture theory'. But the rapture theory is based on a misunderstanding of the Christian doctrine of the ascension of the Church. The partial preterists believe that the definite ascension took place positionally with Jesus, in whom the faithful are seated in the heavens (Eph. 1:20; 2:6); the progressive (experiential) ascension takes place liturgically with Jesus every week, in the celebration of the eucharist (Heb. 12:22-24); and the final (culminative) ascension will take place with Christ at the end of history (1 Co. 15:50-55; 1 Th. 4:17) (Chilton, 1990:149).

133 Osborne (1993:64-66) rightly observes the significance of God's judgment or theodicy in Revelation: "In perusing the literature I have been unable to find a major article or monograph on the issue of theodicy in the Book of Revelation. Yet, I find that this is a major theme in the Book, occurring in virtually every section (chs. 2, 5, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20). God's sovereignty as the primary theme in Revelation is especially manifested in divine retribution, which at one and the same time visits righteous judgment upon God's enemies and vindicates the saints for all they have suffered at the hands of the wicked". Retribution is seen as part of the character of God, visited upon the pagan (Rev. 1:7) and the Christian (chs. 2-3) alike.
Mathison (1999:237-238) believes that the primary strength of full preterism is the strong desire of its proponents to maintain the veracity of Jesus and the apostles. They realise that if Jesus was a false prophet, then Christianity is a false religion. They demand an interpretation of the Bible which takes the language of imminence seriously and which strives for consistency. To date, only a few responses to the full preterist position have been published. Gentry (1997:555-560) as a partial preterist criticises hyper, radical or full preterism sharply in terms of (1) its creedal failure. First, no creed allows any Second Advent in AD 70 or any other type of resurrection than a bodily one. Second, the hyper-preterist system leaves the NT Christian (in our post AD 70 era) without a canon. If all prophecy was fulfilled prior to AD 70 and if the entire NT spoke to issues in the pre-AD 70 time frame, we do not have any passages directly relevant to us. (2) Its hermeneutical failure is that when a contextually defined passage applies to the AD 70 event, the hyper-preterist will take all passages with similar language and apply them to AD 70 as well. But passages specifically delimiting the time frame by temporal indicators (such as ‘this generation’, ‘shortly’, ‘at hand’, ‘near’, and similar wording) are to be applied to AD 70, while similar sounding passages may or may not be so applied. (3) Regarding its resurrection error, there is a serious problem with the removal of the physical resurrection from systematic theology. Because of its spiritual-only resurrection opinion, the hyper-preterist view tends to diminish the significance of the somatic implication of sin. Consequently, the physical world seems to be superfluous in the hyper-preterist viewpoint. (4) Concerning its Christological implications, if AD 70 ends the Messianic reign of Christ, then the glorious Messianic era prophesied throughout the OT is reduced to a forty-year interregnum. And finally, as to historical and ecclesiastical errors, hyper-preterism has serious negative implications for ecclesiastical labour. Is the Great Commission delimited to the pre-AD 70 era, due to the interpretation of ‘the end’ by hyper-preterists (Mt. 28:20)? Is the Lord’s Supper superfluous today, having been fulfilled in Christ’s (alleged) Second Advent in AD 70 (1 Co. 11:26)?

Unlike hyper-preterism, partial preterism admits the futuristic elements in Revelation 21-22 (see Sproul, 1998:170). Nonetheless, the argument of hyper-preterism is important for this dissertation, since it has the same basic views on Revelation 12-13 as the partial preterism.
The chart below illustrates graphically the partial preterist view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AD 70 (already)</th>
<th>Still future (not yet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A coming (parousia) of Christ</td>
<td>The coming (Parousia) of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A day of the Lord</td>
<td>The day of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A judgment</td>
<td>The resurrection of the dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The end of the Jewish age</td>
<td>The rapture of the living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The (final) judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The end of history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though presently enjoying strong growth, partial preterism is a decidedly minority viewpoint even among evangelicals. Nevertheless, the view of a first-century great tribulation is not a newcomer to the prophetic debate, as one can discover from the writings of such influential Christian scholars as John Calvin, John Lightfoot, John Owen, Matthew Henry, John Gill, Thomas Scott, Adam Clarke, Philip Schaff, David Brown, F.W. Farrar, Milton Terry, Benjamin B. Warfield, J. Marcellus Kik, and Loraine Boettner, to name but a few. Nor does the partial preterism principle arise in these relatively recent centuries. In fact, a preteristic understanding of the great tribulation appears among early church writers. For instance, Origen (AD 185-254) and Eusebius (AD 260-340) clearly hold this position (see Gentry, 1999b:13).

2.3. The presuppositions of partial preterism

One essential presupposition of partial preterism is the perception that Revelation should be interpreted in the same way in which other NT books are interpreted.\(^{134}\) As

\(^{134}\) This statement does not neglect the unique characteristics of the Book of Revelation. It would be naïve to assume that one can do justice to the interpretation of Revelation without responsibly dealing with some of the special interpretive considerations that apply uniquely to it. Unlike other biblical epistles, Revelation is a prophecy, as it repeatedly affirms itself to be (Rev. 1:3; 22:7, 10, 18, 19). And Revelation was written as apocalyptic literature, a style of writing popular in John’s time, but obscure to modern readers. Indeed, in Revelation, a literal-where-possible mode of operation, which premillennialists and futurists follow, raises more problems than it solves (Johnson, 2001:11). Poythress (1993:46) points out that there are four levels of meaning to which exegetes need to pay attention in a book marked by visionary symbolism, such as Revelation: linguistic, visionary, referential and symbolic level. Many premillennialists
Thomas (1992:38) notes, because in broad perspective the Apocalypse is prophetic in nature as is the rest of the NT, a different set of hermeneutical principles is not needed to interpret it. A normal grammatical-historical methodology is the natural and necessary interpretive framework. Revelation, no differently from any other NT writing, is set in a particular first-century situation (Harrington, 1993:16). Therefore, the historical setting of the author and his readers must be investigated thoroughly. It must be remembered, as a sound principle of interpretation, that when a book or epistle is addressed to a particular church or people it has primary reference to their condition, needs and times. It must be intelligible to those to whom it is addressed (Clark, 1989:14; cf. Du Rand, 1988:68). This first presupposition of partial preterism is supported by Malina’s cultural-anthropological insights on the present-time orientation of the first century Greco-Roman Mediterranean world (Pilch & Malina, 1993:166-169; cf. Malina, 2000:5):

Like other peasant societies, the societies of the Hebrews, Israelites, Judeans, Galileans, and Pereans all held the present as their first-order temporal preference; the past was their secondary preference; and the future was a very distant and nearly unthinkable third choice. ... Thus, to read the Bible is to enter a world immersed in the present. ... The fact is there really is no expressed concern for the future in the Gospel story. And it would appear that the same holds for the entire NT. ... For example, a book such as Revelation was to console a present generation. It looked to their present. It did speak of events and persons who were forthcoming but not future. Something is forthcoming when its later presence is already guaranteed by its present presence. ... The conceivable, possible future is a domain exclusive to God, for whom all things are possible.

In fact, the supporters of partial preterism (also called [John’s] contemporary historical interpretation or Zeitgeschichtlichkeit) interpret Revelation both with its very this-worldly, socio-political references and with its fully symbolic and theological overtones (cf. Wright, 1996:342).

neglect the possibility of the presence of a visionary and a symbolic level for the sake of a literalistic interpretation. In contrast to futurist, premillennialist and literalistic interpreters, the partial preterists consider the above-mentioned four levels of meaning fully. As Poythress (1993:51) rightly notes, a grammatico-historico interpretation of Revelation, against the background of the struggles of the seven churches, urges exegetes to take into account apocalyptic style and moves exegetes in the direction of a more ‘preterist’ interpretation, in which Revelation refers to events in the Roman Empire and is obviously symbolic in character.
Although Luter (2001:463) mistakenly argues that "with the exception of chapters 13 and 17, the view chosen (the early or the late date of Revelation) does not significantly alter the interpretation of the book", the matter of date is not only basic but also crucial in the interpretation of the Apocalypse of John. Since an early date (AD 64-69) is also one of the most important presuppositions of partial preterism, its focus is the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70\textsuperscript{136} or God's judgment on Rome in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century. Even though the number of supporters of the early date is fewer than that of the late date (AD 95), there are many strong reasons for the early date in the Book of Revelation. As Gentry (1989:18-19) notes, Revelation scholars tend to fall into two general camps. These are usually classed as 'late' (ca. AD 95) and 'early' (pre-AD 70, generally determined to be between AD 64 and AD 70).\textsuperscript{137} There are even some noted early date scholars who hold to dates during Claudius's reign in the mid-AD 40s (e.g. Züllig, Grotius, and Hammond), but this position is quite rare. Although the time span separating the two general camps of Revelation interpreters (about 30 years) is not as broad as that which separates Danielic scholars (around 400 years), the catastrophic events separating the two Revelation dates are of enormous consequence. Those events include most prominently: (1) the beginnings of the Roman persecution of Christianity (AD 64-68); (2) the Jewish revolt and the destruction of the temple (AD 67-70); and (3) the Roman civil war of AD 68-69. The compaction of the time frame in question should not be deemed of little consequence. A basic rule of hermeneutics is that a writing's date of origin must be ascertained as precisely as possible. As Clark (1989:17) notes, the date of the writing is important, not merely as a matter of historical knowledge, but

\textsuperscript{136} In his explanation regarding redaction criticism, Egger (1996:184) correctly emphasises that the following problems are extremely important for the NT texts: (a) the destruction of Jerusalem; (b) the passage of the Christian message from the Jewish to the pagan world; (c) the development of church discipline; (d) the delay of the Parousia; and (e) (related to the history of the texts themselves) the question of literary dependency. It seems that Egger's four points, excluding (c), have to do with John's redactional emphasis. The following is a partial list of the advocates of the early date of Revelation in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} century: Neander, DeWette, Credner, Reuss, Bauer, Zeller, Häse, Gueriche, Volkman, Scholten, Aube, Renan, Maier, Hilgenfeld, Hauersrath, Krekel, Thiersch, Ewald, Wiesler, Breyschlag, Gebhardt, Immer, Görres, Haweis, Adams, Alexander, Ashcraft, Boettner, J. Brown, D. Chilton, J.B. Jordan, D. Clark, C. Van der Waal, R.C. Sproul, De Mar, G. North, K. Gentry, J. Edwards, A.A. Hodge, C. Hodge, J.M. Kik, J. Owen, W. Ramsey, J.S. Russell, M. Stuart, M.S. Terry and G. Vos (cf. Wilson, 1993:587).

\textsuperscript{137} Throughout the nineteenth century the majority of NT scholars favoured a pre-AD 70 dating of Revelation, most placing the date shortly after Nero’s death during the half-year reign of Galba (AD 68-69) (Wilson, 1993:587).

(1) Internal evidence

(a) The theme of Revelation in Rev. 1:7 deals with Christ’s judgmental coming upon the generation of those Jews\(^{138}\) (and the Romans) who crucified him (cf. Stuart, 1854:273; Chilton, 1990:64). Such being the case, only a pre-AD 70 date could be expected, for what event subsequent to the AD 70 destruction of the temple parallels the magnitude and covenantal significance of this event? Surely the destruction of the Jewish temple and the gruesome Jewish War with Rome must be in view here. In terms of Jewish calamity and woe, what events near the reign of Domitian could equal those that transpired just after Nero’s reign? Domitian’s persecution seems to have involved personal actions against several individual local Christians, a few (Christian) relatives and certain prominent Romans rather than an attack upon the church as such (Ellis, 2001:35).

(b) The temporal expectation of John in using of μελλω, τάχος, ἔγγυς shows that Revelation calls for the imminent events to come upon the Jews (Rev. 1:7; 2:9; 3:9), the Church (Rev. 1:9; 2:9-10, 16; 3:2), and the Roman Empire (Rev. 3:10) Johnson (2001:20) correctly argues that Revelation gave first-century Christians insight into the purposes of God in their time.\(^{139}\) Therefore, interpretations of the visions that lie

\(^{138}\) In connection with the persecution of the seven churches by the Jews, the argument of Ellis (2001:35-37) regarding ‘Prayer against Heretics’ (i.e. the birkath ha-minim, the twelfth of the ‘Eighteen Benedictions’ used in the synagogue service, or the Shemoneh Esreh) is proper to support the early date of Revelation, instead of propping up the later date (ca. AD 85-90) of the NT in general, and Revelation in particular.

\(^{139}\) Like idealists, Schnackenburg (1966:201-202) disagrees with this opinion and argues: “John sees in the events of his own time the beginning and dawning of the end, and he paints the future strictly eschatological events in contemporary colours. There is no temporal dimension for him – only the content of time is important. The events during the final days can occur at any time and establish the faithful in the moment of decision. That was Jesus’ intention in his Olivet Discourse on the final days – and the same is true of John’s intention”. But Schnackenburg ignores Revelation’s genre of ‘letter’ at the cost of ‘prophecy’, which has a direct and contemporary relevance for the recipients.
completely beyond the original audiences' frame of reference are suspect. The fact that the decades of AD 60s best fulfill the requirements is evident from a number of considerations. First, the Jewish war of AD 67-70 witnessed the deaths of tens of thousands of Jews in Judea, and the enslavement of thousands upon thousands more. Second, the first persecution of Christianity by Imperial Rome occurred from AD 64 to AD 68 (ending at the death of Nero). Third, from June, AD 68, through December, AD 69, the Roman Empire endured a gruesome and severe civil war that almost destroyed the Empire, and that had reverberations throughout the Empire. In consequence, nothing in or around Domitian's era had anywhere near the dramatic significance of these events for all three (the Jews, the Church, the Roman Empire) of these cultures.\textsuperscript{140} Regarding the Jews, the temple was already gone and, since Vespasian, the Jews throughout the Empire had been forced to pay the Didrachma (known as the ‘Jewish Tax’). Concerning Christianity, the persecution of Domitian (if it did, in fact, occur) was the second persecution of Christianity, was not as severe or long-lasting, and did not result in the death of any inspired apostle (see Thompson, 1990:167; Wilson, 1993:605). With regard to Rome, although Domitian was assassinated, the impact on the Empire was negligible in that a relatively orderly transfer of power followed.

\textit{(c)} The identity of the sixth king (Rev. 17:3, 6-13) is Nero if the kings’ list of Rev. 17 begins with Julius Caesar (BC 49-44). Perhaps the most decisive representative of those who reckon the emperors from Julius is the Jewish writer Flavius Josephus whose dates (AD 37-101) overlap the very period of John and the NT. Josephus was also a Jew from Palestine, and his works were written for both the Romans and the Jews. In his \textit{Antiquities} he calls Julius the first who transferred the power of the people to himself.\textsuperscript{141} Marshall's (2001:90) study suggests strongly that there is no justification for omitting the three soldier-emperors (Galba, Otho and Vitellius) from any list of emperors.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{140} Although Ramsay (1994:77) assumed that the Flavian persecution was an organised attempt to exterminate the Christians, and not a merely sporadic though stern repression such as occurred repeatedly during the second century. The persecution was an extremely cruel and bitter public movement against the Christians. Unlike Ramsay, Thompson (1990:15-17) has questioned the extent and even existence of a Flavian persecution.\textsuperscript{141} If the word \textit{μιαν} in Rev. 13:3 is translated 'the first' rather than 'one', as in the RSV and other modern English translations, the head that was mortally wounded was the first emperor. Since Julius was assassinated, he would be the head with the mortal wound. Thus Revelation would begin the enumeration of emperors with Julius (Wilson, 1993:599-600).
Although this does not specify the exact year of dating, it does clear obviate a late date for Revelation (contra Schüssler Fiorenza, 1991:97).

(d) Concerning the contemporary integrity of the temple in Rev. 11, it can be deduced that the most natural interpretation of Rev. 11 would suggest that the references to the cultic structures have behind them the literal temple complex, for only Revelation clearly refers to Jerusalem (see Wilson, 1993:604). The episode of the two witnesses in Rev. 11 was used by nineteenth-century scholars to assert that the earthly temple must be standing at the time of the command (Rev. 11:1-2; Marshall, 2001:96). Why would there be no reference to its being already destroyed in such a work as this, a work that deals with judgment upon Jerusalem? It is inconceivable that a book of the nature of Revelation could fail to mention its already having been destroyed, if Revelation were written after AD 70 (cf. Ellis, 2001:33). Most commentators who favour the Domitian date, from Charles (1920:274) to Aune (1997:cxixi), claim that Rev. 11:1-2 was written before AD 70 by a different author (contra Friesen, 2001:143).

(e) With regard to the gematria 666 in Rev. 13:18, the two leading options before the textual critic in the present instance are 666 and 616. Perhaps the change is intentional, seeing that the Greek form Neron Caesar written in Hebrew characters (נרונ קסאיא) is equivalent to 666, whereas the Latin form Nero Caesar (נרו קסאיא) is equivalent to 616 (Metzger, 1971:752; Wilson, 1993:598; cf. Bell, 1979:98; Marshall, 2001:93). Thus, rather than either being inconsequential to or overthrowing the Nero theory of 666, the textual variant provides a remarkable confirmation of the theory. Thus, Revelation’s time of writing is before Nero’s death, June, AD 68.

(f) In Revelation there is quite conclusive evidence that the era in which John wrote was one in which Christianity was still largely affected by and strongly attached to the Jewish community (cf. Rev. 2:9; 3:9; 7:4-8; 14:1ff.; 21:12). Historically, this simply was not the case in the post-temple era after AD 70 (also Clark, 1989:18). The cleavage between Judaism and Christianity was too radical. Barnabas (13:1), soon after the fall of Jerusalem (ca. AD 100), posited a radical ‘us/them’ distinction between Christians and Jews. Hence, this factor of the *Sitz im Leben* is indicative of a pre-70 date for Revelation.
(g) The imagery of the looming Jewish War is also an important factor supportive of the early date. As a matter of fact, much of Revelation's vivid imagery lends itself admirably to the catastrophic events of the Jewish War (Rev. 6:3-6; 7:1-7; 11:1-2; 14:19-20; 16:21). If traces of the Jewish war do exhibit themselves in Revelation, it can be deduced that Revelation was written prior to the Jewish War. Therefore, exegetes need not resort either to an ex eventu interpretation or to forming critical hypotheses.

(h) Furthermore, other epistles of the NT clearly seem to refer to certain passages in the Book of Revelation. If this is so, then Revelation antedated those epistles (cf. Heb. 12:22; 2 Pe. 3:10, 13; Rev. 21:2). If Peter, who referred to Revelation, perished in the persecution under Nero, Revelation must have been written prior to Peter's death (Clark, 1989:19-20).

These considerations make it sufficiently clear that Revelation was written in the Neronian era and that it had special reference to the events of that day. In fact the purpose of Revelation was primarily to meet the situation then confronting the church.

(2) External evidence

As Wilson (1993:597) argues, the Book of Revelation provides an abundance of internal evidence for determining the earlier date. Yet that evidence has been largely ignored or misinterpreted by most twentieth-century scholars. Instead, they have preferred to accept the external evidence of the date given to the document written by Irenaeus at the turn of the third century. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, is considered to be the most important witness and deserves initial consideration. Thus, with regard to external evidence, the tendency of late date advocates to rely heavily on Irenaeus is not

---

142 Aune (1997:cxvii-cxxxiv) also weighs in on the question of redating the Apocalypse, suggesting that it was written in two different editions. The first edition (which consisted, for the most part, of Revelation minus the letters of chs. 2-3) was produced by the author around AD 70 and articulated the trauma experienced by the author following the disastrous Roman-Jewish War (AD 66-73). The second edition was probably turned out in the last decade of the first century (or perhaps AD 117). Aune also argues that there are substantial stylistic and theological differences between the two editions. Although Aune's argument above is hypothetical and a typical type of source criticism, his redating of Revelation should not be ignored out of hand.
unreasonable, not only because he is an indisputably important church father whose very stature demands his hearing, but also because he speaks directly to the issue of date at hand. The evidence from Irenaeus that is deemed so compelling is found in Book 5 of his *Against Heresies* (ca. 180-190) in Latin (at 5:30:3; and in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* at 3:18:3 in Greek). However, three of the major problems with the generally accepted translation should be considered: (1) The reference of ἐωρᾶθη (‘was seen’). (2) The significance of the time reference: οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνοῦ ἐωρᾶθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμερέας γενεᾶς (‘no long time ago was it seen, but almost in our own time’). (3) The overall internal confusion in Irenaeus suggested by the incompatibility of Irenaeus’s statement on Revelation (cf. Wilson, 1993:598).

Concerning (1) the reference of ἐωρᾶθη (‘was seen’), what is the subject of this verb? Is it ‘him who saw the Apocalypse’ (i.e. John) or ‘the Apocalypse’? Gentry (1989:49), following F.J.A. Hort, reaches the conclusion that it is ‘John’ who is the subject of the verb. Thus, John could have suffered twice, under both Nero and Domitian.

Regarding (2) the significance of the time reference (οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνοῦ ἐω -ρᾶθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμερέας γενεᾶς), this statement of Irenaeus is difficult, since Irenaeus wrote his great work about AD 180-190, nearly a century after the closing of Domitian’s reign, and his birth was probably at least a quarter of a century later than the death of Domitian (cf. Marshall, 2001:95).

With regard to (3) the overall internal confusion in Irenaeus, his statement at 5:30:1 (and 5:8:5-6) is problematic: “In the fifth book he speaks as follows concerning the Apocalypse of John, and the number of the name of Antichrist: as these things are so, and this number is found in all the approved and ancient copies”. Irenaeus’s mention of ancient copies of Revelation indicates his awareness of its circulating ‘at a much earlier time’. It would seem that the ‘ancient’ character of the ‘copies’ would suggest something more ancient than the ‘end of Domitian’s reign’, which Irenaeus speaks of as ‘almost in our own generation’. If Revelation were written pre-AD 70, then its date would be about three decades older still.

To sum up, it is no accident that allows exegetes to find not only particular personages
(e.g. Nero), cultural structures (the Jewish temple) and historical events (the Neronic persecution and the Jewish war) that harmonise well with the Neronic era, but also even time-frames for these that fill out the picture of the era of which John wrote. It is likely that Revelation was written after the outbreak of the Neronic persecution in late AD 64 and before the declaration of the Jewish War in early AD 67. AD 65-66 seems to be most likely. Because of this early date, most of the tribulations in Revelation took place before AD 70 and the victory of Christ and the faithful in the New Covenant is strongly stressed (Gentry, 1989:336).

However, many critics, for example Kistemaker (2001:39), oppose partial preterism because they assume that Revelation interpreted by the partial preterists is only pertinent to John’s audiences. But Jordan (1999:9) plausibly defends its relevance for today’s world together with the other books of Bible: the short history from AD 30-70 is a type or model for the long history of Christendom from Pentecost to the Second Coming. In the same vein, Adams (1966:49) correctly avers that it is important to note that as in other books which were written in order to meet contemporary problems (almost all of the epistles were of this sort), Revelation abounds in principles, exaltations and promises which have been applicable to every succeeding age (cf. Marshall, Travis & Paul, 2002:325). The Book of Revelation, although addressed to the seven churches, has its lessons for all ages; just as the epistles of Paul addressed to the churches of Galatia and Thessalonica are authoritative to all other churches of the Christian faith (Clark, 1989:16). The fact that most of Revelation refers to John’s contemporary events does not rob the 21st century Christians of any future promises, value or lessons of the Book.

143 A slightly different view is that of Bell (1979:102), who maintains that Revelation was not prompted simply by persecution of the Christians, but by general political and social upheaval which led John to envision the end of the Roman empire and the inauguration of God’s kingdom. There was only one period in the first century AD turbulent enough to evoke this strong a reaction from Christians, and that was the year and a half following Nero’s death. The only circumstances that could have moved John to write were those of AD 68-69, and it is to that time that the Apocalypse must be dated. Although Bell’s dating of Revelation in AD 68-69 seems to be reasonable he nonetheless underestimates the external persecution of the seven churches by Rome and the Jews.
2.4. The partial preterist understanding of Revelation 1-11

At this stage, the partial preterist reading of Rev. 1-11 is definitely necessary for a proper understanding of Rev. 12-13.

2.4.1. Revelation 1

Here, a special note on Rev. 1:1-7 is required in that ‘must shortly take place... the time is near ... He is coming’ is the key to a correct understanding of the whole Book of Revelation. As Clark (1989:22) notes, some endeavour to limit this expression to Rev. 2-3. But since the same expression occurs in the last chapter of the Book it is evident that it must refer to the bulk of the message. ‘Short’ can mean nothing else but close at hand or very soon. The time is near, John warns, emphasising the contemporary relevance of his prophecy. He repeats this warning at the end of the Book (Rev. 22:6-7, 10). The end of the world was approaching – not the destruction of the physical universe, but the passing away of the old world-order, the governing of the world around the central sanctuary in Jerusalem (Chilton, 1990:55).

The partial preterists suggest that the passage ‘He is coming’ in Rev. 1:7 does not predict the literal Second Coming (i.e. the Parousia), but is a figurative description of Christ’s coming in vengeance to destroy Jerusalem, not in person, but using the Roman armies in AD 70. The principal features of the prediction are: (a) Christ’s coming; (b) his coming with clouds; (c) every eye will see him, even those who pierced him; and (d) all the tribes of the earth (or land) mourn at his coming (Gregg, 1997:57).

(a) The expression ‘coming of the Lord’ is used in many contexts that do not appear to be referring to the Second Coming (e.g. Rev. 2:5; 3:20; cf. Dt. 33:2; Isa. 19:1; Zec. 1:16; Mal. 3:1-2; Mt. 10:23), thus leaving open the possibility of another meaning here (see Van der Waal, 1981:59).

(b) The expression of the Lord coming with clouds is used in the OT with reference to historic judgments not associated with the end of the world (Ps. 104:3; Isa. 19:1) and may be so understood here as well.

(c) Jesus placed the time of his coming with the clouds within the lifetime of some of
his contemporaries (Mt. 16:28; 24:30, 34; 26:64). This would allow one to understand ‘they who pierced him’ as the actual generation that crucified Christ, which would be the natural understanding to the literalist. Who are ‘those who pierced him’? Although it is true that the Romans were responsible for physically nailing Christ to the cross (Jn. 18:30-31), the divine curse indisputably falls squarely upon those who instigated and demanded it: the Jews (Gentry, 1989:123).

(d) The Greek word for ‘tribe’ is φυλή, which in Scripture most frequently refers to the Jewish tribes. In TDNT Maurer (1974:246) notes that the LXX with few exceptions has φυλή so that this becomes a fixed term for the tribal system of Israel. The reference to the ‘tribe of Judah’ in Rev. 5:5 definitely carries that connotation (cf. Rev. 7:4ff.; 21:12). In addition, the Greek word for ‘earth’ in Rev. 1:7 is γῆ, which most usually means either: (1) ‘earth, globe’ or (2) ‘land’. Thus, upon purely lexical considerations, the term can be understood as designating the Promised Land. This is also indicated by the fact that Rev. 1:7 is a blending of Da. 7:13 and Zec. 12:10. Zec. 12:10 refers to the land of Israel (Gentry, 1989:128-129).

It seems that Rev. 1:7 announces the theme of the Book, the coming of Christ in judgment upon Israel in order to establish the Church as the new covenantal kingdom (Chilton, 1990:64). Of course, to the transition partial preterists, the coming in Rev. 1:7 indicates God’s judgment on Rome as the main opponents of the seven churches.

2.4.2. Revelation 2-3

As Scobie (1993:606) notes, there is a broad consensus today that the letters were not written separately, sent to each church and later collected (the older view championed by Spitta), but were published as a block along with the rest of the Book. Each church would thus receive not only the letter addressed to it, but also the letters addressed to the other six churches. Interpreters of the (partial) preterist, and the spiritual schools, and many futurists as well, understand the letters in Rev. 2-3 to be addressed to the actual,

144 Shea (1983:74-75) stresses the covenantal formula in Rev. 2-3 (also see Strand, 1983:253-254). A number of aspects of covenant language appear to be featured prominently throughout the Apocalypse. These features relate to the overall structure of the seven letters (Rev. 2-3): (1) Preamble: each of these seven letters begins with a different title for Jesus as the Suzerain,
historical churches named in them, and by extension to any churches that may find themselves in similar circumstances to theirs. However, those of the historicist school, and some of the futurist school, have called attention to certain parallels between the individual letters and successive periods of church history, from John's day until the end. They conclude that the seven letters present a panorama of the age of the Church (see Gregg, 1997:62). But in an article aimed at assessing the degree to which the letters provided any data concerning the wider Roman Asian context, Scobie (1993:608, 613) concluded that the local references which have been detected in the letters can be classified as consisting mainly of allusions to (a) events in the past history of the cities; (b) topographical features of the sites; and (c) aspects of contemporary life in the cities. Most recent sociological treatments of Revelation seek to analyse the 'symbolic universe' of the Book but acknowledge the importance of understanding this in relation to the social, economic, historical, and political situation of the author and his audiences, even though their perceptions of that situation vary.

It seems that Rev. 2-3 not only deals with conditions in the seven churches, but in doing so prepares them for scenes through which they are soon to pass in the cataclysmic events connected with the destruction of the Jewish state/Rome. Thus John's audiences are fraught with watchful and wise solicitude for the endurance and triumph

"These are the words of X" (in which "X" in each case is filled by a new and different title for Jesus). (2) Historical prologue: a refrain that occurs in each of these letters immediately following the title given to Jesus is, "I know your works..." This expression refers to past relations between the Suzerain Jesus, who has been identified by the preceding title, and the church, which is his vassal. (3) Stipulations: following the evaluation of the nature of the past work of each of the churches, there follows a statement of counsel. Instructions are given for a course of action to rectify deficiencies described in the preceding sections of the letters. (4) The witnesses and blessing-and-curse elements: the obvious witness present at the end of these letters is the Spirit, mentioned in the constantly present formulaic statement, "If anyone has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches" (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22). Besides the blessing, the potential curse is also present, but only irregularly. When it is present, it is always mentioned before both the blessing and the witness of the Spirit. In short, it is likely that John intends to emphasise the covenantal character of Rev. 2-3 for his audiences who are the new covenantal partners of God.

In particular, Rev. 2:9-10 sheds light on the historical situation of John's audiences in which the anti-church Jews and the pagan Romans cooperate. The mention of imprisonment (Rev. 2:10) rules out the likelihood of the kind of lynch mob actions that appear in Acts. Since a local synagogue would not have the authority to imprison or execute, Rev. 2:10 must point to the Roman authorities. What began as a verbal assault from a local synagogue has, in the author's mind, become an actual threat to life and liberty from the Romans. For that reason, the Romans and the Jews are cited together by John as agents of Satan (see Setzer, 1994:100-101).
of the churches in the tribulations of their day (cf. Clark, 1989:43).

2.4.3. Revelation 4

For transitional partial preterists, Rev. 4 terminates with Rev. 11, which reaches the climax at that point with the sounding of the seventh trumpet and the judgment upon the anti-church Jews\(^{146}\) (cf. Clark, 1989:44). Consistent partial preterists, however, carry the seventh trumpet on into the subsequent chapters and make it include the seven vials.

In Rev. 4:1, strongly alluding to Ps. 29, John the seer is introduced, most probably, to a heavenly courtroom scene. The Judge sits on the throne (Rev. 4:2) where He is about to hand down sentence upon the accused (cf. Ps. 29:10; Gregg, 1997:84). The plaintiffs are the martyrs of Christ, whose complaint against their persecutors is recorded later in the vision (Rev. 6:9). The accused (Jerusalem) is about to be condemned. The repetition of the expression \(\text{μετὰ ταῦτα}\) at the end of Rev. 4:1 identifies the present material as the previously announced “things that are about to happen after these things (\(\text{μετὰ ταῦτα}\))” (Rev. 1:19). Since John was told (in the first century) that these things were ‘about to take place’, a first century fulfillment is anticipated.

2.4.4. Revelation 5

According to Gregg (1997:92), the scroll with the seven seals (Rev. 5:1) is the sentence handed down by the Judge against Jerusalem (AD 66-70) for its part in shedding “all the righteous blood” of the martyrs (Mt. 23:35).\(^{147}\) John has entered the courtroom at the end of the trial, just in time to hear the sentence delivered. The absence of a qualified person to loosen the seals and open the scroll has provided the dramatic setting for the introduction of the Protagonist of Revelation, Christ (Rev. 5:6). Jesus will proceed to

---

\(^{146}\) Du Rand’s (1991a:30) opinion is similar: Rev. 4-5 functions not only as the introduction to the narration about God’s execution of salvation and judgment in the universe on the grounds of the role of the Lamb in Rev. 4-11, but also as the closing chapter of Rev. 1-5.

\(^{147}\) Early-date preterists agree with those historicists who see the seal-breaking as fulfilled in the fall of Jerusalem. They point out the unmistakable similarities between the images used here and those of the Olivet Discourse (Mk. 13 and par.: Mt. 24; Lk. 21:5-36), in which Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (Gregg, 1997:141).
proclaim what the sealed book says in the trumpets and implement it in the bowls of judgment. Therefore, in a broad sense, it seems that the recapitulation theory of the three seven series is not incorrect, because there are lots of parallels between the seals, trumpets and bowls.\textsuperscript{148} Gregg (1997:96) remarks that as the One slain by the leaders in Jerusalem, Jesus shares the same grievance against her as do the other plaintiffs (Rev. 5:6ff.) namely that, as a victim of her injustice, He has the right to be vindicated against Jerusalem (Lk. 11:50ff.). The new song (Rev. 5:9) praises God for his work of redemption in Christ.

In his doctoral dissertation on the background and meaning of the sealed book of Rev. 5, Stefanović (1996:75) believes that the most frequent view within the preterist approach holds that the sealed book of Rev. 5 contains God’s fore-ordained secret plans and decrees of judgments that were about to fall upon the dwellers on the earth. Boring (1989:101), believing that Revelation is a pastoral letter directed primarily to the first-century Christian church, interprets the sealed book as containing ‘the ultimate future, the outcome of all things, the final scenes which contain the key to the whole story of history and make it worthwhile’.

Alcasar, the founder of the preterist school, is the first commentator on Revelation who treated the sealed book of Rev. 5 more extensively, dedicating to it no fewer than ten folio pages of his \textit{Vestigatio Arcani Sensus in Apocalypsi}. Alcasar held that the contents of the sealed book were given in Rev. 6-11, which described the conflict of the church with Judaism and represented God’s judgment on his enemies (see Stefanović, 1996:44).

2.4.5. Revelation 6

With the breaking of the first seal (Rev. 6:1), the progression of events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem begins. Horses\textsuperscript{149} (Rev. 6:2) represent war. Since the holocaust

\textsuperscript{148} In a sense Jordan (1999:25-26) is correct when he opposes the recapitulation theory: “The seals open the book; the trumpets are the proclamation of the contents of the book; the bowls are the application of those contents”. Nonetheless, it is true that the thematically recurring parallelism between the three series should not be negelected.

\textsuperscript{149} As a prominent consistent partial preterist, Jordan (1999:27-28) has a different opinion on the horses: the sequence of the horses is the sequence of evangelism and conquest. First comes
of AD 70 was preceded by three years of war between the Jews and the Romans, some take this rider on the white horse (Rev. 6:2) to be Vespasian or Titus at the head of the Roman armies. Alternatively, the rider could be Christ, seen as going forth to war against his murderers through the calamities about to be revealed. In Rev. 6:4, the second horseman represents the loss of peace from the land (a preferred translation to earth) of Israel. Besides the war that the Jews were fighting against the Romans (suggested by the first seal), there were civil wars among the Jews themselves. The black horse (Rev. 6:5) represents famine or shortages of food (cf. La. 5:10). Indeed, the Jews in Jerusalem suffered terrible food shortage during the Roman siege. Because of the internal fighting and starvation of the Jews, conditions in besieged Jerusalem in AD 70 could readily be described in the terms found in Rev. 6:8. The reference to the means of death, sword, hunger, death (i.e. pestilence), and beasts of the earth are a deliberate echo of Ezk. 14:21, where 'sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence' are called God's four severe judgments on Jerusalem. The fact that the martyrs (Rev. 6:9) are asking for the avenging of their blood upon those who dwell on the earth (or land) (Rev. 6:10) suggests that their persecutors were still alive on earth at the time John saw this vision. Prior to AD 70, the main persecutors of the righteous Christians were the leaders of the Jewish nation, headquartered in Jerusalem (Lk. 13:33) (see Gregg, 1997:102-125).

150 In Ezekiel God used these means to inflict judgment on the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in BC 586, which was a precursor of this event, similar in detail and in significance, in AD 70.

the Word of God, proclaiming Jesus as King. White is the colour of the Bride. Red is the colour of war. This is not a picture of political warfare, but of the kind of conflict Jesus predicted. In other words, it is the conflict experienced in every society when the gospel comes, and it is the conflict experienced by the Jewish and Gentile believers in the period Revelation specifically deals with. The third horse, the black, seems to have to do with famine, but this is not an economic famine of ordinary food. The black horse depicts the gradual starvation of the old order, while the gifts of the new order are protected and preserved. The green horse brings actual physical conflict, the outbreak of a final violent conflict between those clinging to the old order and those converted to the new. This is what happened in the late AD 60s in Jewry, and it happens each time the kingdom of God comes to a new people. This is the sequence of events that brings the kingdom of God to every nation of the world, fulfilling the great commission. It did not happen before AD 30 because the kingdom was sealed up; but now it begins, and it will continue until Jesus returns at the end of (Jewish) history. Jordan's argument is based on his argument that the Book of Revelation is not concerned with the war between the Jews and the Romans, which resulted in the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem. Rather, Revelation is concerned with evangelism, faithfulness, martyrdom and the vindication of the saints who stand firm. In short, Revelation is about how Jesus began his kingdom at his ascension (Jordan, 1999:13, 20).

150 In Ezekiel God used these means to inflict judgment on the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in BC 586, which was a precursor of this event, similar in detail and in significance, in AD 70.
In Rev. 6:12-17 the same terms are used by Jesus in predicting the disaster that would befall the Jewish nation in that generation (Mt. 24:29, 34). That event is not simply a tragic historical incident. It was a grand providential epoch; the close of an aeon; the winding up of a great period in the divine government of the world. The persecuted Christians had often been compelled to flee and hide in dens, mountains and in the catacombs; but now in Rev. 6:15-17 the tables are turned and the persecutors are fleeing and hiding. This may have been intended as an encouragement to the suffering saints of John’s day, to show that their time of triumph was approaching (cf. Clark, 1989:58).

2.4.6. Revelation 7

The reason for inserting a vision of this sort here, prior to the breaking of the seventh seal (Rev. 8:1), is that the first six seals have been described with a focus on their effect upon the apostate nation of Israel (Gregg, 1997:126). The question naturally arises whether anyone will be spared the effects of these judgments when they fall. Thus ‘before’ any wind of disaster can blow across the land, God identifies his faithful ones and sets them apart for a separate fate (cf. Clark, 1989:59). Prior to the conquest in BC 586, God took care to identify his own and to separate them for safety during the holocaust. This fact was symbolically portrayed to Ezekiel (Ezk. 9) in a vision of an angel marking God’s faithful with an ink mark on their foreheads. Here a similar vision is given to John prior to the fall of Jerusalem. the number 144,000\(^\text{151}\) (Rev. 7:4) symbolically represents the Judean Christians, who fled from Jerusalem prior to the siege and thus escaped the holocaust. That the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem actually escaped to Pella prior to the siege is a matter of history. In regard to Rev. 7:9, the Lord shows John ‘the great throng\(^\text{152}\) of Gentiles who will be saved as a result of God’s disowning his rebellious people and seeking a new covenantal partner (cf. Isa. 49:20-22;

\(^{151}\) That the people symbolised by 144,000 lived in the first century is confirmed in another passage, which calls them the ‘firstfruits to God’ (Rev. 14:4). If this 144,000 referred to some future group living is the end times (as the futurists believe), one would expect them to be called the ‘lastfruits’. It cannot be admitted that Jews alone constituted the 144,000. Because the servants of God (Rev. 7:3) are to be sealed, 144,000 embraces many more than the Jews (Clark, 1989:60). If 144,000 includes only Jews, it has no relevance to the Gentile Christian audience of John.

\(^{152}\) Alternately they are Christian martyrs, slain by certain Roman emperors after the fall of Jerusalem (Gregg, 1997:134).
Hos. 1:10; Ro. 9:24ff.; 1 Pe. 2:9f.). In AD 70 Judaism came to a formal end and the universal gospel was proclaimed to all nations (cf. Mt. 22:7-9).

2.4.7. Revelation 8

For Israel, the trumpet was an instrument used to rally the troops for war or to warn of an enemy invasion. Likening the upcoming judgments to the sounding of trumpets (Rev. 8:2) suggests that God himself is making war against his enemies in apostate Israel ('land' being the preferred translation to 'earth' in Rev. 8:5). The entire series of the seven trumpets is concerned with the Jewish war of AD 66-70, the last day of the Jewish commonwealth. In Rev. 8:8, the symbolic expressions of a huge mountain and the sea depict the Jewish state collapsing and the resultant dispersion of the Jews throughout the Gentile world (cf. Mt. 21:21). There is also a somewhat literal fulfillment of the words a 'third of the sea became blood' (Rev. 8:8) and of the destruction of fish and ships (Rev. 8:9). As Josephus described in The Jewish War, 3:10:9, the Romans pursued many Galileans onto the Sea of Tiberius and slaughtered them there. The turning of fresh water sources bitter and toxic (Rev. 8:10) may be in part a literal result of the decaying corpses that lay in the Sea of Galilee and in the river as the result of war. However, this fouling of the waters has symbolic significance, occurring as it does here to the nation of Israel (cf. Ex. 15:25-26). The name of the fallen star is wormwood (Rev. 8:11), a term used in the Law and the Prophets to warn Israel of its destruction as a punishment for apostasy (Dt. 29:18; Jer. 9:15; 23:15; La. 3:15, 19; Am. 5:7). By combining these OT allusions, John makes his point: Israel is apostate, and has become an Egypt; Jerusalem has become a Babylon; and the covenant-breakers will be destroyed, as surely as Egypt and Babylon were destroyed. Regarding Rev. 8:12, assigning these events to the times of the Jewish War, Chilton (1990:240-241) writes: The imagery here was long used by the prophets to depict the fall of nations and national rulers (cf. Isa. 13:9-11, 19; 24:19-23; Ezek. 32:7-8, 11-12;

153 Concerning the fire from the altar in Rev. 8:5, Jordan (1999:29) is of the opinion that the seventh seal held back the Holy Spirit, who is now poured out as fire. The fire poured out in Rev. 8:5 is not a picture of wrath as such. Rather, the reference is to the tongues of fire that came from the Spirit in Acts 2.
154 The bitter waters could also mean the poisonous doctrine that flows from the corrupted temple, in contrast to the laver of cleansing water that God had put there (Jordan, 1999:30).
Joel 2:10, 28-32; Acts 2:16-21). Ruler after ruler of the Roman Empire and the Jewish nation was assassinated and ruined. All these rulers were quenched suns and darkened stars. Concerning Rev. 8:13, Chilton (1990:241) argues that the prophetic warning of Israel's destruction is often couched in terms of eagles descending upon carrion (Dt. 28:49; Jer. 4:13; La. 4:19; Mt. 24:28). Indeed, a basic aspect of the covenantal curse is that of being devoured by the birds of the air (Ge. 15:9-12; Dt. 28:26, 49; Pr. 30:17; Jer. 7:33-34; Ezk. 39:17-20; Rev. 19:17-18). In short, the first four trumpets (Rev. 8:7-13) correspond to disasters inflicted by the Romans on the Jews in the Jewish War (AD 66-70) (see Chilton, 1990:229-242).

2.4.8. Revelation 9

The fallen star (Rev. 9:1) is clearly not a literal star, for the personal pronoun 'to him' is used regarding the star. Gregg (1997:171-200) summarises the partial preterist interpretation of Rev. 9 as follows: The fifth trumpet (Rev. 9:1) probably depicts the demonic spirits rendering the besieged Jews irrational and self-destructive. Besides the physical conflicts and disasters that came upon the Jews in the war against Rome, there was great spiritual and moral deterioration in the Jews' own society. The locusts in Rev. 9:3 refer to demons. The desire of men to die (Rev. 9:6) may refer to the fact that, during the siege of Jerusalem, the horrendous crimes perpetrated by the inhabitants caused many to wish for the Romans to break through the wall and destroy the city to put them out of their misery. Chilton (1990:244-245) dates the five month period155 (Rev. 9:5) earlier than the siege: this may refer in part to the actions of Gessius Florus, the procurator of Judea, who for a period of five months (beginning in May of 66 with the slaughter of 3,600 peaceful citizens) terrorised the Jews, deliberately seeking to incite them to rebellion. Florus was successful: Josephus dates the beginning of the Jewish War from this occasion. As to Rev. 9:7-12, though the locusts themselves are no doubt a portrayal of armies of demons that afflicted the Jews during their conflicts with the Romans, the description is perhaps mingled with some features of the demonised Zealots who made life so miserable for their fellow Jews during the siege. That they

155 The statement in vs. 5 and 10 that these locusts were to hurt men for 'five months', may grow out of the fact that the life of a locust is about five months; and from the other fact that this terrible condition was short (Clark, 1989:67).
have hair like women (Rev. 9:8) may actually be a reference to their transvestitism, as Josephus depicts in *The Jewish War, 4:9:10*). The king of the locusts (Rev. 9:11) is Satan himself (cf. Jn. 8:44; Rev. 2:9; 3:9). Many of the troops that came into Palestine, described in the figurative language, had been stationed previously at the Euphrates (Rev. 9:14). That this invasion was scheduled so precisely ‘for the hour and day and month and year’ (Rev. 9:15) emphasises that it was a specifically predestined event (cf. Lk. 21:6, 31-32).

Regarding Rev. 9:16-19, the timing of this invasion may be placed at the very end of the Jewish War when the Romans actually broke through the wall of Jerusalem and swarmed into the city, or it may refer to the initial invasion of the Romans in AD 66. The former view is amenable to transitional partial preterists (e.g. M. Stuart, J.E. Adams, D.S. Clark) who see this trumpet as essentially the end of the section dealing with Israel, and who see everything after Rev. 11 (or 13) as dealing with the judgment upon Rome. But for consistent partial preterists, this trumpet does not depict the end of the war, and the final siege is depicted by the seven bowls later on. In connection with Rev. 9:20-21, as Josephus in *The Jewish War, 5:13:7* reports, the Jews heeded the insane ravings of the false prophets who assured them of deliverance and victory right to the very end.

2.4.9. Revelation 10

The mighty angel (Rev. 10:1) is, no doubt, Jesus himself (Clark, 1989:70; Jordan, 1999:31). His face shining like the sun is a feature mentioned in the vision of Rev. 1:16. What is the book in Rev. 10:2? Clark (1989:70) insisted that the reasonable explanation is that this book is the same book, which is sealed with seven seals in Rev. 5. Chilton (1990:261), however, holds that the book is essentially the Book of Revelation itself. Jay Adams (1966:67-68), on the other hand, sees the little book as a prophecy separate and additional to the first (contained in chs. 4-11). The second prophecy in Rev. 13-19

---

156 Here, Jordan (1999:31) is again different from other partial preterists in that Rev. 9:16 has nothing to do with Roman campaigns against the Jews in AD 68. An army of two hundred million angels rides the horses of the Church to do battle with the enemy, and to kill men by converting them, putting their flesh to death with the fire of the Spirit breathed from their mouths. It is the spiritual warfare of the Church against the world that is in view.
concerns the fall of Rome. As to why John was not permitted to record the sayings of the seven thunders (Rev. 10:4), Clark (1989:71) answers: no doubt they were too terrible to write. Chilton (1990:262) insists that the message was intended for John's ears only. The sealing of the message of the seven thunders signifies that some things God has in store were not to be fulfilled in John's time. The completion of the mystery of God (Rev. 10:7) refers to the fact that the predominantly Jewish nature of the church was to be ended by the destruction of the temple. Chilton (1990:265) and Adams (1966:67) remark that the mystery itself is that of which Paul frequently speaks, namely that the Gentiles should come into the church on an equal footing with the Jews, without first having become Jews themselves (cf. Eph. 3:3-6). The action of eating the little book (Rev. 10:10), and reference to how it affected the mouth and stomach, is an imitation of the identical actions of Ezekiel (see Ezk. 3:1-3, 14). Ezekiel's prophecy was about the destruction of Jerusalem at the hands of the Babylonians in BC 586. John's similar action is also connected with his prophesying the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70. The command that John must prophesy again (Rev. 10:11) is taken by transitional partial preterists to be an indication that the second prophecy will not concern Israel. Hence John is told he must next prophesy about many peoples, nations, tongues and kings (Rev. 10:11). On the other hand, consistent partial preterists believe that the book simply adds an international dimension to the continuing predictions of God's dealings with Israel, stressing particularly the impact of the fall of Jerusalem upon the global mission. Consequently, John's prophecy regarding the fall of Israel and the establishment of the New Covenant encompasses the nations of the world (Gregg, 1997:202-214).

2.4.10. Revelation 11

The partial preteristic understanding of Rev. 11 is crucial, because it functions in the direct textual context of Rev. 12-13. In Ezekiel 40-47 a man measures the temple with a measuring rod. In Rev. 11:1 John is given a rod for the same purpose. In both cases, the action depicts the defining of the true spiritual temple in view of the impending destruction of the physical structure in Jerusalem. As in the case of Rev. 7, so here also between the sixth and seventh trumpets there is an interlude conveying the same thought with different symbols. The idea is that God is now protecting the true temple from the
outpouring of his wrath. The outer court (the court of Gentiles; Rev. 11:2) accordingly represents apostate Israel (cf. Isa. 1:12), which is to be cut off from the number of the faithful New Covenant people. Forty-two months (Rev. 11:2) may be the length of the Jewish War or of Nero’s persecution of the saints – both of which were of approximately that duration. According to Clark (1989:77), the two witnesses (Rev. 11:3) may be thought of as personifications, or as personal representatives of religion and government (cf. Adams, 1966:69). Chilton (1990:276-277) offers a different suggestion: they represent the line of prophets, culminating in John the Baptist, who bore witness against Jerusalem during the history of Israel. The fact that these witnesses are members of the Old Covenant rather than the New is shown by their wearing of sackcloth. Chilton concludes: the two witnesses, therefore, summarise all the witnesses of the OT, culminating in the witness of John (see ‘until they finish their testimony’ in Rev. 11:7). Jordan (1999:31) is of the opinion that the two witnesses are a symbol of the 144,000 faithful who proclaim the Word of God to Jewry. They are Spirit-empowered (olive oil fed) lampstands in the dark world, an image taken from Zechariah 4. Thus, it can be deduced that the apostolic preaching of the Good News symbolised by the two witnesses is vindicated after their death by the destruction of Jerusalem (Hopkins, 1965:45). The 1260 days (Rev. 11:3) are either of the Jewish War, of Nero’s persecution, or both. The ‘beast’ in Rev. 11:7 symbolises the cosmic powers of evil (Satan and his cohorts) personified by the Jewish persecutors of the Church (Hopkins, 1965:45).

Chilton (1990:279-280) comments on the beast (Rev. 11:7) and remarks that the enemy of God and the Church is always the beast, in its various historical manifestations (Ps. 87:4; Isa. 51:9; Da. 7:3-8, 16-25). The location of the two witnesses’ death is said to be in Jerusalem\footnote{In the Bible, Jerusalem is sometimes mentioned along with another city of either equal or inferior stature in the particular context (e.g. Ge. 13:13; 14:18-19; 18:20; Jdg. 19:12; 2 Sa. 5:1-3; 1 Ki. 3:4-15; Ps. 78:60; Isa. 10:11). In connection with the reference to ‘Sodom’ in Rev. 11:8, Isa. 1:9-10 and 3:9 play the role of intertexts. When the prophet Isaiah describes the great miracle of Jerusalem’s deliverance (probably referring to the siege of Sennacherib), he asserts that by God’s mercy its destiny had not become that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. 1:9). But in Isa. 1:10 the pair of cities (Jerusalem and Sodom) is used again, but this time it refers to the gravity of sin. The often repeated references in the prophecy concerning Jerusalem as a former city of righteousness (Isa. 1:21, 26 and 3:9) may also be intended as a contrast with Sodom as ‘a symbol of evil and injustice’ (cf. Frisch, 1994:80-83).} (Rev. 11:8; cf. Isa. 1:10). Following the ascension of the witnesses (Rev.
11:12), John records a great earthquake, and that a tenth of the city fell (Rev. 11:13; Mt. 27:51, for the strong parallels between Rev. 11 and Mt. 27:51-54, see Van der Waal, 1981:224). Preterist interpreters associate this with the fall of Jerusalem. It is not clear, however, whether this passage deals with the final and complete destruction of the city. The time frame of Rev. 11:15 is that of AD 70. Christianity only became a world religion (or kingdom) after it became totally dissociated from Judaism in AD 70. Chilton (1990:287) argues that the kingdom of God, the fifth kingdom prophesied in Da. 2, becomes universalised. The kingdom of Christ now begins the process of encompassing and enveloping all kingdoms of the world. There may be a tendency to read in the expression, “The time has come for judging the dead” (Rev. 11:18), a reference to the final resurrection and judgment of all the dead at the final coming of Christ. This is not necessarily its meaning, however. Chilton (1990:291) affirms that this is not the final judgment, but rather the historical vindication and avenging of the martyred saints, those who had suffered at the hands of ungodly Israel (also see Jordan, 1999:32). A consequence of this judgment upon the earthly temple was that the temple of God was opened in heaven (Rev. 11:19). Commenting on this phrase, Russell (1996:447) writes: no sooner is the first tabernacle swept away than the temple in heaven is opened, and even the ark of the covenant is revealed to the eyes of men. Access into the holiest is no longer forbidden, and the faithful have the boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Christ. For the transitional partial preterists, Rev. 11 ends the first half of Revelation and culminates in the destruction of Jerusalem as the first great persecuting power against the infant church (cf. Clark, 1989:79).

It is now time to introduce the arguments in Revelation 12-13 along the two lines of partial preterism.

2.5. The consistent partial preterism of Revelation 12-13

Consistent partial preterism means that throughout the whole Book of Revelation John persistently manifests God's judgment on Jerusalem. Therefore, there is no room for a thematic transition.
2.5.1. David Chilton

In his commentary, Chilton (1990:295) affirms that Revelation 1-11 deals with the victory of Christ over his enemies, culminating in the glorious establishment of the Church as his holy temple.¹⁵⁸ Chapters 12-22 deal with the victory of the Church over her enemies, ending with her glorious establishment as God’s holy temple.¹⁵⁹ In detail, he has commented on Revelation 12-13 as follows: the woman (Rev. 12:1) is the Church in the form of Old Covenantal Israel that gave birth to the child, Jesus (Chilton, 1990:297). Rev. 12:6 pictures the escape of the Judean Christians from the devastation of Jerusalem, so that the dragon’s wrath is expended upon apostate rather than faithful Israel (Chilton, 1990:309). As the unnamed subject of the verb φέρω, the members of the Gentile churches of the Decapolis were in a position to extend aid to the Christian refugees from Jerusalem (Sowers, 1970:315). The dragon’s descent (Rev. 12:13) to the land of Israel is to wipe out the Jerusalem Church (Chilton, 1990:319). The rest of her seed (Rev. 12:17) is the (predominantly Gentile) Christian Church throughout the Empire and does not exclude the Judean Christian in Palestine (Chilton, 1990:323; cf. Moffatt, 1961:428).

The beast¹⁶⁰ of the sea (Rev. 13:1) is the Roman Empire and the Emperor Nero (Chilton, 1990:326). In Rev. 13:3 the Roman Empire had been fatally wounded by the sword (cf. Rev. 13:14) of the Gospel (also Hislop, 1959:239; Fadeley, 1994:44), thus the Nero Redivivus myth is not relevant here.¹⁶¹ The land (Rev. 13:3) means Israel, the

---

¹⁵⁸ Chilton’s commentary on Revelation contains excellent theological arguments, for example, the OT parallels with Revelation, but is sometimes regarded by non-partial preterists as an eccentric work due to its claim that the gist of Revelation is the destruction of Jerusalem based on the early date (see Du Rand, 1994a:37).
¹⁵⁹ Along with Chilton, Fadeley (1995:43, 53) maintains that Rome is involved in Rev. 13 onward; she is not the main character and is involved only in her relationship to the two kingdoms of God. Both the old covenantal Israel and the Israel of the New Covenant are the two main characters and they are shown in their spiritual relationship with Christ.
¹⁶⁰ Van der Waal (1981:242) sees the sea beast not as Rome but as the devilish power, which tramples down Jerusalem.
¹⁶¹ In the Jewish forms of the Nero Redivivus myth, Nero is seen as the instrument of divine vengeance on Rome. In Rev. 13 it is quite the contrary: the beast’s recovery from its mortal wound is not the overturning but the restoration of the beast’s power. Thus, the chapter is not concerned with the downfall of the Roman Empire, but with its apparent ability to oppose God and to persecute his people with impunity. Moreover, the term Redivivus is misleading, since it
apostatical Israel (Chilton, 1990:331). In Rev. 13:5 its prophetic usage is not primarily literal, although it is interesting that Nero’s persecution of the Church did in fact last a full 42 months (Chilton, 1990:333). In Rev. 13:10 John hammers home the certainty of the coming judgment on the heretical Jews of the first century, those who are in league with the beast in persecuting the saints (cf. Jer. 15:2; 42:11; Chilton, 1990:335). Because the land beast (Rev. 13:11) is the Jewish religious leaders (Mt. 24:5, 11; Acts 6:9-15; Dt. 13:1-5; Chilton, 1990:336), Rev. 13:12 denotes that heretical Judaism became completely subservient to the Roman State (Chilton, 1990:337). As in Rev. 13:13-14, the Book of Acts records several instances of the miracle-working false Jewish prophets who came into conflict with the Church (Acts 8:9-24) and worked under Roman officials (Acts 13:6-11; Chilton, 1990:338). In Rev. 13:15-17 the Jewish synagogues enforce submission to the Emperor instead of to Christ (Chilton, 1990:341). The number 666 (Rev. 13:18) is not Nero but the Roman Empire (Chilton, 1990:345), which is not seen in terms of itself, but solely in terms of (1) the Land (Israel), and (2) the Church (Chilton, 1990:325).

To summarise, Chilton reached the conclusion that the destruction of Jerusalem is the main concern of the whole of Revelation, even if he was careful to point out the role of Rome as intimate cooperator with perverted Judaism in order to persecute the Gentile Christians as the woman’s seed in 12:17 (also see Gentry, 1998:68).

implies a belief that Nero had died and would return from death. Van Henten (2000:17) mentions that it seems inappropriate to speak of Nero Redivivus in the context of the Sibylline Oracles since the oracles do mention Nero’s return, but do not refer to his death in this connection. Furthermore, the text intimates that an outside agent administered the fatal wound to one of the heads, but history records that Nero himself inflicted the wound that resulted in his death (see Bauckham, 1993a:421, 429; Kistemaker, 2001:379; contra Klauck, 2001:691, 698).

162 In contrast to Chilton, Charles (1920:342) commented that the destruction of Jerusalem is referred to in Rev. 13:7, and the massacres that followed in Rev. 13:10.

163 Along with Chilton, Van der Waal (1971:84) has believed that it is still Judaism in Rev. 13:11 and contends that ‘out of the earth’ means out of the land of Palestine (cf. Milligan, 1889:227). Furthermore, because the land beast, i.e. false prophet, derives only from Israel, it is not the propagandistic minister for heathen religions (Mt. 24:24; Acts 13:6; Van der Waal, 1981:247). Barnhouse (1971:242) also shows the characteristics of consistent partial preterism in his commentary on Rev. 13:11: it should be remembered that the earth is a symbol of Israel in certain instances in the Scripture. It might well be, therefore, though we should not press the point, that this anti-spirit would be a Jew, and that he would be used by Satan to deceive Israel if possible. Mt. 24:24 deals with the same epoch which is treated in this portion of Revelation which contains a prophecy of the coming of false chists.
2.5.2. James B. Jordan

According to Jordan (1999:33), the woman (Rev. 12:1) as the bride of Christ, gives birth to the male child (Rev. 12:4), Christ. Rev. 12:6 portrays the flight of the Jerusalem Church (cf. Acts 8; and see Barker, 2000:222). The dragon’s persecution of the woman (Rev. 12:13) symbolises how the faithful Jews, who were converted to Christ, are persecuted (cf. Acts 2-8; Jordan, 1996a:4). Rev. 12:15\(^{164}\) concerns the evil doctrines of the Judaisers (the land), with which Satan sought to corrupt the apostolic Church (Jordan, 1996a:4; cf. Hislop, 1959:247; Sweet, 1990:205; Caird, 1999:159; Johnson, 2001:185). Satan tries to kill off the Church in the entire Empire (οἰκουμενή), by Satanising the Roman beast (Jordan, 1996a:4).

The sand of the seashore (Rev. 13:1) refers to Israel (Jordan, 1996c:1). The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) is imperial Rome (Jordan, 1999:34). The ten horns of the beast (Rev. 13:1) are the ten Roman Emperors who ruled before AD 70 (Jordan, 1996b:1). Rev. 13:3 refers to the killing of the sixth head of the beast, Hellenistic Rome. The land (Rev. 13:3) symbolises the apostate Jewry (Jordan, 1996b:2). Nero’s attack upon the Church and God is represented as a specimen of ‘a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies’ in Rev. 13:5 (Jordan, 1996c:3). The period of forty-two months (Rev. 13:5) indicates Nero’s persecution of the Church from June, AD 64 to July 11, AD 68 (Jordan, 1996c:3). The second beast (Rev. 13:11) is a Jewish beast, the man of lawlessness of 2 Th. 2. The land beast is first of all the Herods\(^{165}\) and also seems to

---

\(^{164}\) Sowers (1970:320) differs from Jordan in that he argues that Rev. 12:15-16 suggests that the water of the Jordan had recently been high, but subsided long enough to enable the fugitive church to make a safe crossing.

\(^{165}\) Unlike Jordan, Barker (2000:230, 232) is of the opinion that the ten horns (Rev. 13:1) are the Herods, and the beast from the sea (Rev. 13:1) represents any evil ruler of Jerusalem who in all details exactly opposes the true ruler, the Messiah. At any rate, it is widely maintained that Israel’s sin and (religious) corruption constituted the most valid explanation for the Jerusalem temple’s destruction in AD 70 (2 Bar. 10:18; T. Judah 23:1-5; T. Levi 14:1-15:3; 16:1-5; 1QpHab. 1:13; 8:8-12; 9:2-7; 11:4; 12:3-5, 8-9; 4QFlor. 1:6; 11QTem.29:8-10; 30:1-4; 1 Enoch 90:28-29; 91:11-13; The Jewish War, 3:8:3). In this connection, perhaps a significant contributing factor to the expectation that the first century Jerusalem temple would inevitably be destroyed was that is was Herodian and not Davidic. The first century temple, built by Herod the Great (see The Jewish War, 1:21:1), was in reality Israel’s third temple. Herein lies the problem. By what scriptural precedent or prophetic expectation could be the Idumean Herod build temple of Jerusalem? According to Nathan’s oracle (2 Sa. 7:12-16) the son of David was
include the high priest, the direct agent of the Herods (Jordan, 1996b:3). In Rev. 13:11, the two horns are the Herods and the High Priests. It is a fact that the Herods were the Semitic (Edomite) servants of Rome in Palestine, and also a fact that the Herods appointed the High Priests (Jordan, 1999:35). Rev. 13:13 expresses the pseudo Pentecostal fire as a counterfeit of the fire that God sent upon the altar when the tabernacle and temple were finished (Lev. 9:24; 2 Ch. 7:1). In other words, Rev. 13:13 illustrates that the Jews hated Rome outwardly but in fact, they worshipped Rome and sought to be like Rome (Jordan, 1996c:5). Thus, Rev. 13:14 indicates the completion of Herod’s temple in AD 64. In Rev. 13:15 it is important to note that though Nero put many Christians to death in Rome and throughout the Empire, the Book of Revelation places most of the blame upon the Jews (Jordan, 1996c:6). In Rev. 13:17, because buying and selling symbolise worship (cf. Rev. 3:18), and only those who cooperate with the Satanic Jews are allowed to worship in the synagogue and temple; otherwise they are expelled (Jordan, 1996d:4). The number 666 (Rev. 13:18) does not have anything to do with Nero Caesar. It is a Jewish number, and refers to the religious leaders, the false Solomon’s, of Jewry (1 Ki. 10:14; Jordan, 1999:36).

In summary, in line with Chilton, Jordan interprets Revelation in terms of the persecution of the Church both by the Jews and by the Roman Empire, but his emphasis on the responsibility of Jews for the persecution and its judgment are stricter than those of Chilton.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁶ After carefully investigating the internal evidence and particularly the way Revelation uses the OT, Beagley (1983:344-345) comes to the same conclusion as Jordan: John is concerned to a great extent with the conflict between the Church and unbelieving Jews and focuses primarily to build the temple. But in later exegesis Nathan’s oracle came to be interpreted eschatologically (Lk. 1:32-33; Acts 2:30; 2 Co. 6:18; Heb. 1:5). Since Nathan’s oracle had come to be interpreted in an eschatological sense, at least in some circles, it is not difficult to see how the Herodian temple could have been viewed as prophetically invalid and therefore probably doomed to destruction. Herod the Great wished to be viewed as Israel’s messianic and Davidic king. At many points the life of this remarkable ruler paralleled that of David (and Solomon). Herod may have portrayed himself as Israel’s redeemer. In this regard, there is evidence that Jesus may have viewed Herod as an usurper and rival, and so incorporated this view into some of Davidic typology (Lk. 13:31-33). It is also said that Jesus was opposed by the Herodians (Mk. 3:1-6; 12:13-17), a group of influential persons, perhaps overlapping with the Sadducees, who supported Herodian and Roman rule. At this stage, as manifested in Revelation, it becomes clear that Herod the Great, the Jewish religious leaders (esp. corrupt non-Zadokite ruling priestly families) and the Roman authority conspired against Jesus and the Church.(see Evans, 1992:134-146).
2.5.3. Milton S. Terry

According to Terry (1999:365), Revelation 1-11 exhibits the terrible vengeance of the Lamb upon his enemies, as if contemplating everything from the idea of the king "who sent forth his armies and destroyed those murderers, and buried their city" (Mt. 22:7). Rev. 12-19 presents a vivid outline of the struggling Church passing her first crisis, and rising through persecution and danger to triumph and glory. The same great struggles and the same fearful catastrophe appear in each part, though under different symbols. Thus, Rev. 12-19 is not a chronological sequel to Rev. 1-11, but travels over the same ground again. The woman (Rev. 12:1) is the apostolic Church. The man-child represents the adherents and faithful devotees of the Gospel. In Rev. 12:6 the flight of the woman into the wilderness was the scattering of the Church because of bitter persecutions (cf. Acts 8:1). Michael and his angels (Rev. 12:7) are but symbolic names of Christ and his apostles.

The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) is the Roman Empire, especially as represented in Nero, under whom the Jewish War began, and by whom the woman’s seed, the saints (cf. Rev. 12:17 and 13:7), were most bitterly persecuted. The land beast (Rev. 13:11) is a proper symbol of the Roman government of Judea by procurators and the two horns are Albinus and Gessius Florus (Terry, 1999:366). In Rev. 13:18 the mystic number of the beast is represented both by the Greek Αχατενος and by the Hebrew קפר; the numerical value of each being 666. For the beast is both the Latin kingdom, and its representative and head, Nero Caesar (Terry, 1999:367).

To sum up, Terry regards 1-11 and 12-19 as the same content in different symbols, and on judgments, which are to come upon the nation of Israel culminating in a description of the fall of Jerusalem under the guise of a gaudily-attired harlot named ‘Babylon’. Even the nation of Israel and Yahweh’s chosen dwelling-place, Jerusalem, are not immune from judgment.

167 Marshall (2001:140) emerges with a similar assessment: Rev. 13 is the second part of John’s parable on Roman religious and cultural domination of the circum-Mediterranean world before and during the Judean War. The fear of religious and cultural oppression during a period described as war (Rev. 13:7) fits well into the situation of Jewish Diaspora communities during the Judean War.

168 Similarly, Frey (1953:134) is of the opinion that 666 signifies both the beast (ἠπίον) and Nero (קפר). Therefore, 666 is the number of the beast and a man.
thus gives priority to the fall of Jerusalem with the implication of that of Rome.

2.5.4. Philip Carrington

According to Carrington (1931:224), the woman (Rev. 12:1) symbolises the primitive church in Jerusalem. The male child (Rev. 12:4) is Jesus. Michael is Jesus because Rev. 12:4 tells us who conquered Satan and how: it was Jesus on the cross (Carrington, 1931:218). Rev. 12:6 does not represent the flight of the Christians to Pella, since the woman’s escape is into a vivid sense of communion with the Almighty. The beast from the sea (Rev. 13:1) is Rome (Carrington, 1931:224). Rev. 12:17 depicts the persecution of Gentile Christians by heathen rulers (Carrington, 1931:226). The mortal wound of one head (Rev. 13:3) represents the death of Nero and the blow it dealt to the whole Empire (also Moffatt, 1961:430; Beckwith, 1967:640; Harrington, 1993:138; Caird, 1999:164; Johnson, 2001:193). But it may have referred to the mad emperor Caligula, who made a marvellous recovery from sickness, and who endeavoured to force the Jews to put up his image in the temple; but if so, it has been practically re-written (Carrington, 1931:231). The land beast (Rev. 13:11) is a priesthood or civil authority that enforces emperor-worship in Asia Minor (Carrington, 1931:232). The mark of the beast (Rev. 13:16) is not to be taken literally. It is identical with worship; worship and the mark are one. It is a stain on the soul (Carrington, 1931:233). The number 666 (Rev. 13:18) signifies Nero.\footnote{The most plausible solution (i.e. 666= Nero), which finds many adherents today, was already proposed in the early nineteenth century by W. Bousset (1906) and taken up in 1883 by F. Engels, the companion of Karl Marx (see Klauck, 2001:692).} It also satisfies a reading found in some Latin authorities, 616; for the Latin way of spelling the name is Nero Caesar (Carrington, 1931:234; Harrington, 1993:144; Brown, 1997:793).

2.5.5. Foy E. Wallace

Wallace (1997:261) comments that the woman (Rev. 12:1) is the church of Jerusalem in trial and persecution. The red dragon (Rev. 12:3) signifies the murderous character of the minions of Satan – the Roman and heathen persecuting powers (Wallace, 1997:264). The child (Rev. 12:4) represents the martyred saints (Wallace, 1997:265). The rod of
iron (Rev. 12:5\textsuperscript{170}) is the symbol of the impact of the gospel on the pagan world through the victory of the church, resulting from their persecutions (Wallace, 1997:267). Rev. 12:6 describes the scattering of the Jerusalem Church to Pella (cf. Mt. 24:34; also see Wagemakers, 2002:98). As the signs of Mt. 24 were fulfilled in that generation of living people, so the symbols of Revelation were fulfilled in the experiences of the existing churches (Wallace, 1997:270). The war in heaven (Rev. 12:7) represents the hostilities which developed with the tributary governments of Rome. The dragon and his angels represent all of the powers of paganism and darkness. Conversely, Michael and his angels are representative of the truth and the light of Christianity\textsuperscript{171} (Wallace, 1997:273). In Rev. 12:12 the word 'earth' is used to denote the land of Palestine – as the reference to the beast of the land designates the Palestinian persecutor. The word sea indicates the regions of the empire beyond the land of Israel (Wallace, 1997:279). In Rev. 12:15 the woman escapes this flood and the horrible onslaught of this war of the Romans against Jerusalem. The earth (Rev. 12:16) means the place of nations, namely the subordinate kingdoms and nations of the empire. Their rebellion detracts Roman authorities from the persecutions (Wallace, 1997:284). The rest of the woman (Rev. 12:17) are those who remained throughout the empire to pass through the tribulation (Wallace, 1997:285).

The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) is the symbol of the great power of Rome (Wallace, 1997:288). The land beast (Rev. 13:11) represents the Palestinian Jewish persecutors, who are subordinate to the Roman emperor. In Rev. 13:3 the wound is caused by the civil wars in the Roman Empire (Wallace, 1997:289). By ‘all the nations’ (Rev. 13:7), John means that after the destruction of Jerusalem the persecution spread over the whole empire (Wallace, 1997:293). The two horns (Rev. 13:12) represent two notorious rulers who were sent by Nero into Palestine, namely Albinus and Gessius Florus (Wallace, 1997:296). It is probable that 666 (Rev. 13:18) is Nero (Wallace, 1997:303).

\textsuperscript{170} Van der Waal (1981:233) sees in Rev. 12:6 the enthronement of Christ in his ascension.

\textsuperscript{171} Hislop's opinion is similar: "As Christianity spread in the Roman Empire, the powers of light and darkness came into collision" (Hislop, 1959:238).
2.5.6. James S. Russell

According to Russell (1996:450), the woman (Rev. 12:1) represents the persecuted church, the apostolic church, and the church of Judea. The child (Rev. 12:4) denotes the faithful disciples of Christ in Judea, or even in Jerusalem itself (Russell, 1996:452). Michael (Rev. 12:6) is Jesus. Rev. 12:9 describes the fact that the progress of Christianity in the land aroused the hostility of Satan and his emissaries, and led to more active persecution of the disciples of Christ (Russell, 1996:456). The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) is Nero (Russell, 1996:460; see also Fadeley, 1994:43). The land beast (Rev. 13:11) is the Roman procurator or governor of Judea under Nero as 666. The two horns are Albinus and Gessius Florus (Russell, 1996:467).

2.5.7. Bob Emery

Emery (1998:90) comments that Rev. 13:3 is about Nero’s death and the revival of the Roman Empire under Vespasian (1998:81). The second beast (Rev. 13:11) comes up out of the land of Israel and regards it as a deceptive religious imposter during the Jewish-Roman war. But, for Emery, the harlot in Rev. 17-18 is not Rome but Jerusalem (see also Wright, 1996:363).

In conclusion, the position of consistent partial preterism is that Revelation is God’s ‘divorce document’ to the nation Israel for her unfaithfulness.172 It, then, would see the OT promises to Israel as finding fulfillment in ‘spiritual Israel’ – the Church (Durand, 2000:3). Yet almost all of the consistent partial preterists have a tendency to include the transitional trend, even though they adhere to the consistent.

172 As Kirschner (1985:34-37) notes, 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra (the end of the first century AD and certainly before the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132-135) insist that God himself decreed and executed the destruction of the temple (2 Bar. 1:4; 4 Ezra 3:27). This unequivocal attribution of divine responsibility does not however imply divine culpability. The fault is Israel’s alone (2 Bar. 79:1-2). By attributing the fault to Israel or to the innate sinfulness of humanity, 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra defend both the omnipotence and the benevolence of God. The destruction of Jerusalem is a divine dispensation to pave the way for the climax of human history. Likewise, in Jer. 33:8, God metaphorically says that He gives the faithless Israel a ‘certificate of divorce’ due to her adulteries.
2.6. The transitional partial preterism of Revelation 12-13

Transitional partial preterism means that John makes a thematic transition in Rev. 12 from God’s judgment on Jerusalem to God’s judgment on Rome.

2.6.1. Jay E. Adams

Adams (1966:46-47) states that Revelation primarily pictures the fall of the renegade Jewish commonwealth and religious system, and the overthrow of the last (i.e. Roman) world-kingdom. Thus, the theme of Revelation is that these two satanically inspired persecutors of the church, debauched Judaism and pagan Rome, will soon be judged by God. The climax of the first prophecy regarding the judgment on the Judaism is found in the transitional chapter 12, where the destruction of Jerusalem is predicted in detail (Adams, 1966:68). The woman (Rev. 12:1) is the OT Church. John’s going back to the very roots of Christianity, and sketching the moment until the present achieve the transition (Adams, 1966:71). The remnant of her seed (Rev. 12:17) is the Gentile church, true Israel (Adams, 1966:72; cf. Emery, 1998:94).

The beast from the sea (Rev. 13:1) is the Roman Empire. The second beast (Rev. 13:11) must be linked with the strictly religious aspect of the problem Christians faced during the Roman persecutions (Adams, 1966:72). The number 666 (Rev. 13:18) stands for Nero (cf. Emery, 1998:83).

To summarise, Adams sees the transition in Revelation 12 and regards the persecution of the seven churches in Asia Minor by Rome as the main focus in chapters 13-19.

2.6.2. Moses Stuart

The first major American commentary on Revelation was published in 1845 by Stuart (1864:615), who insisted that Revelation 1-11 bears the most palpable marks of the same state of things in Judea, the persecution by the Jews and Rome. Rev. 12-19 is still more deeply coloured with the same tint but depicts the persecution by the pagan Rome.
of Christians in foreign countries. In order that the malice and efforts of the grand adversary may be fully displayed, John goes back in Rev. 12 and begins with Jesus' birth, and the efforts of Satan to destroy him at that time; he then touches upon his ascension to heaven and the subsequent persecution of Christians through the satanic influence (Stuart, 1864:618). In Rev. 12:17 Jerusalem and Palestine are no longer the theatre of this vision (Stuart, 1864:629).

In Rev. 13:1 the civil power of Rome is a monster emerging from the sea (Stuart, 1864:634). The whole land or earth (Rev. 13:3) means the great body of the Roman Empire (Stuart, 1864:640; Ferry, 2000:11). Rev. 13:5 represents Nero's persecution lasting 42 months (Stuart, 1864:641). In Rev. 13:6 Nero is deified (Stuart, 1864:642). Here the temple in Jerusalem is no longer the scene and object of the beast's blasphemy (Moffatt, 1961:431). Rev. 13:6 has to do with the martyrdom of Christians by Nero in Rome, in that the word 'tabernacle' here does refer to the temple of the Holy Spirit within the faithful (Ferry, 2000:14). The second beast (Rev. 13:11) is the heathen, idolatrous priesthood, and its coadjutors (Stuart, 1864:644). Thus, εκ τῆς γῆς is applied geographically to Asia Minor (Moffatt, 1961:432).

For Stuart the transition is so lucid that all the content of Revelation 13 onwards should be applied to the seven churches in Asia Minor, not to the Church in Palestine.

2.6.3. Arthur M. Ogden

Ogden (1996:171) separates the heavenly apocalypse (Rev. 4-11) from the earthly apocalypse (Rev. 12-20). In the first section John observes the desolation of Israel and the destruction of Jerusalem as seen from its real source, heaven. In the second section John views the Jerusalem fall from its earthly source. Thus, John discusses the same subject matter from different viewpoints. Although Ogden regards Babylon as Jerusalem and sees the destruction of Jerusalem in Rev. 12-20, his interpretation of Rev.

---

173 In the same way, Wallace (1997:263) points out that in Rev. 12 the names Satan, devil, serpent and dragon are used interchangeably, and evidently personified the persecuting powers hostile to the Church; that is, Nero and his successors, in whom the persecutions and the persecutors are personified.
12-13 can be categorised as the transitional partial preterism (Ogden, 1996:337). The woman (Rev. 12:1) is God's true Israel (Ogden, 1996:268). The great red dragon is the devil, the prince of the world (Ogden, 1996:271). The male child (Rev. 12:4) is Jesus (Ogden, 1996:272). Rev. 12:6 and 12:14 picture the flight of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Judea during the Roman-Jewish War (Ogden, 1996:273, 277). The remnant of her seed (Rev. 12:17) is the church as it continues after the Roman-Jewish War, as Satan proceeds again to fight against God in an effort to gain control of man by continuing his persecution of the church (Ogden, 1996:278). At this point, Ogden clearly shows the characteristics of transitional partial preterism: Rev. 12:17 depicts the persecution that erupted in the second century and continued for several hundred years.

The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) is the Roman Empire (Ogden, 1996:280). Rev. 13:3 describes both the murder of Julius Caesar by the Roman Senators (BC 44) and the restoration of Caesarean power upon the Roman world by Caesar Octavianus (Ogden, 1996:282). The period of forty-two months (Rev. 13:5) is Nero's persecution of the saints (Ogden, 1996:283). The earth beast (Rev. 13:11) symbolises the religions of the Empire, which are used by the Empire to subject the peoples of its domain to Roman rule (Ogden, 1996:284). Nero is 666 (Ogden, 1996:288).

2.6.4. David S. Clark

Clark (1989:81) begins his commentary on Rev. 12 with the significance of the Chapter as a turning point in the Book of Revelation (cf. Hopkins, 1965:43):

We have now come to 'a new section' in the Book of Revelation beginning with chapter 12. The preceding section (Rev. 4-11) is ended. The seven seals are all loosed; the seven trumpets have all sounded, and what they signified has now been disclosed. These all portended the destruction of Jerusalem as the first great persecutor of the Christian church. That climax has been reached. With the ending of the seals and trumpets the first section of Revelation came to a close. The two series are distinct as the two historical situations are distinct, and the line of cleavage is here between the eleventh and twelfth Chapters.

The woman in Rev. 12:1 represents the Church of God. The twelve stars may have reference to the twelve tribes of Israel. The true Israel, the Zion of God, gives birth to

The description of the first beast (Rev. 13:1-2) is the Roman Empire as the civil power in John’s time; the visions of Daniel make the reader familiar with such imagery representing great world power (Clark, 1989:86). The head with the deadly wound (Rev. 13:3) is clearly Julius Caesar the founder of the empire. And the wound of that head, the killing of Julius Caesar, does not kill the beast at all. Though Julius Caesar was killed as a protest against autocracy, it did not destroy it in the least (Clark, 1989:87). The second beast (Rev. 13:11) works to continue and exalt the first beast; no doubt by promoting idolatry, empire-worship, and blasphemy against God. The land beast is the pagan religion of old Rome or pagan priesthood which supported the imperial power (Clark, 1989:89). Rev. 13:16-17 depicts the pressure of economic distress which was to be laid on the seven churches to compel them to conform (Clark, 1989:91). The number 666 (Rev. 13:18) signifies the reigning monarch, Nero (Clark, 1989:91). Thus, chapters 12-19 pertain to the times of the Roman Empire, and not to some future period that has not yet dawned (Clark, 1989:92).

2.6.5. Other transitional partial preterists

In 1791 J.G. Eichhorn saw Revelation as a prophecy of both the destruction of the Jewish state and the fall of the Roman Empire (Eichhorn in Wainwright, 1999:392). In a similar vein, Feuillet (1965:54-62) suggested a two-part structure in which chs. 4-11 deal with God’s judgment on Israel and chs. 12-20 with the church and the world. Agreeing with Feuillet, Hopkins (1965:43) contends that there is ample evidence to show that the burden of chs. 4-11 is to recall the triumph of Christianity over Judaism (already accomplished) as the historical ‘springboard’ from which to launch the assurance that Rome, too, will fail to stamp out the infant Church. In keeping with the oracle-pattern of the major OT prophets, one would expect to find oracles against Israel preceding those against the Gentiles. Rev. 12 is the turning point. Chs. 21-22 transcend the earthly scene, for the emergence of the New Israel from the synagogue has provided John with a springboard from which he is able to see not only beyond the new crisis, but unto the end of the ages (Hopkins, 1965:45-47; see Stefanović, 1996:77).
(2000:2) has a similar opinion: the intense persecution of believers by apostate Judaism, centred in Jerusalem, will be answered with divine retribution as Rome destroys Jerusalem (chs. 4-11). The savage persecution of the church by the Roman Empire will, in turn, meet the same divine vengeance in the overthrow of Rome herself (chs. 13-18). In this regard, in a sense, the Book of Revelation is the most, if not the only, anti-Rome text in the NT (Collins, 1988:68).

By way of summary, the transitional partial preterists see a transition in Rev. 12 and suggest that the intense persecution of believers by apostate Judaism will be answered with divine retribution as Rome destroys Jerusalem (chs. 4-11). The savage persecution of the church by the Roman Empire will, in turn, meet the same divine vengeance in the overthrow of Rome herself (chs. 13-19).

2.7. Evaluation and concluding summary

Even if the number of advocates of consistent partial preterism is greater than those of transitional partial preterism, the mechanical calculation is not decisive here. Although, of course, the detailed arguments are not totally agreed upon by the advocates of the circle, one demerit of consistent partial preterism is that it does not properly suggest direct consolation and a solution for John's persecuted audiences in Asia Minor. Van de Kamp (1990:261) is correct when he criticises Van der Waal, who takes too short a view to recognise the conflict between the church and Rome in Rev. 12-13. However, its merit is that while its focal point is God's judgment on the Jews, it aptly interprets the role of Rome as God's tool in the switchover from the Old Covenant to the New in God's economy (cf. Fadeley, 1995:43). Transitional partial preterism, however, overcomes the above inadequacies of consistent partial preterism, and obviously shows the cooperation between the Diaspora Jews and the pagan Romans against the Christians in Asia Minor. However, its error is in thinking that the conflict with Rome is the sole concern from Rev. 13 on and that the controversy with Judaism now fades from the Book (cf. Beagley, 1983:152).

174 Unlike the transitional partial preterists, Setzer (1994:103) regards the pagan Rome as 'the' prime enemy and locus of evil. For her, therefore, persecution by Jews is not a major theme in Revelation.
Although, some aspects of socio-political context of Revelation have already appeared, the socio-historical context of John and his audiences will be investigated in the next Chapter, not only because it makes clear the socio, political and cultural aspects in Rev. 12-13, but also because it prevents exegetes from anachronistic understanding. And then literary aspects in Rev. 12-13 will be probed to hear the voice of the text itself by paying close attention to it. Both socio-historical context and literary study complement one another.
CHAPTER 3.

SOCIO-HISTORICAL AND LITERARY ASPECTS
IN REVELATION 12-13

The study of socio-historical and textual context\(^ {175} \) of Revelation 12-13 first must be made before its intertextual analysis, because exegetes must attend to the 'inner integrity of logic, syntax, and historical setting' of a particular text, and refrain from reading a text from the gross anachronism represented by the view that the way things came out all together at the end imposes its meaning and character upon the way things turned out, one by one (cf. Charlesworth, 1997:204-205). A text must be seen first and foremost as a distinct (if not necessarily unique) text, with its own unique unity, in order to prevent intertextuality from becoming 'the invitation to chaos'.

3.1. Socio-historical context of Revelation 12-13

Thompson (1990:95-116) has questioned and challenged the traditional depiction (in Thompson's term 'standard sources', including Pliny the Younger,\(^ {176} \) Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Chrysostom [ca. 40-112], Juvenal, Dio Cassius and Philostratus [AD 170-245]) of Domitian as a persecutor of the Christian Church. Thus, savageness, cruelty, barbarity and fury are favourite terms for describing Domitian and his reign. But the standard sources distort virtually every area of Domitian's public and state activity during his emperorship. This standard portrait of Domitian is clearly not drawn by neutral observers. At every opportunity the writers defame Domitian by emphasising his evil actions, by attributing malicious motivation to good deeds, or by omitting favourable

---

\(^ {175} \) Socio-historical context means (1) the general socio-historical circumstances of the author and the audiences in Asia Minor in the first century; (2) the specific circumstances which play a role in the communication of the Book of Revelation.

\(^ {176} \) Downing (1995:248-249) is of the opinion that both Revelation and 1 Peter reflect the same situation in the time of Pliny. Thus, he wrongly not only denies the real and severe persecution/prosecution of Christians under Nero and Domitian but also the evidence of John's exile to Patmos (contra Reddish, 1995:212-213). But when he explains the situation of persecution in Revelation, Downing is correct in insisting that "it is not primarily about the clash of symbols: that only constitutes the symptoms of the real disease. It is about a clash of total cultures, a clash of life-styles."
aspects of his reign. The reason for distortion by the standard sources is that a retrospectively negative presentation of Domitian and his reign serves as a foil in the present praise of Trajan, Domitian’s successor. For Trajan, newness requires a beginning and therefore a break with the ‘past’; such a break is constructed ‘rhetorically’ through binary contrast. Thomson notes that almost all epigraphic, numismatic, prosopographic and biographical data contemporary with Domitian throw this negative characterisation into doubt. First and foremost, he notes that there are no extant inscriptions, coins or medallions from the Domitianic period that refer to Domitian as *dominus et deus noster*. Moreover, he notes that Quintilian, Martial, Statius and Silius Italicus, who wrote during Domitian’s reign, reveal more positive views of Domitian (see Salter, 1999:29). Therefore, it would be a mistake to interpret the Book of Revelation as a response to Domitian’s supposed excessive claims to divinity or to a reign of terror at the end of his rule. Most scholars today not only date Revelation to the early AD 90s, the last years of Domitian’s principate or rule, but also presuppose the severe persecution of Domitian. Therefore, the later date advocates bear the greater burden of proof that there was severe persecution under Domitian. Nonetheless, this does not necessarily mean that there was no real persecution under Domitian.

In spite of the belief that the seven churches were persecuted in a perceived way or that there was no full-scale persecution by the Roman Empire, they were suffering from both inward problems and from at least outwardly intermittent persecution. John explicitly speaks of ᾠδήψις (Rev. 1:9), which means oppression, tribulation or pressure; (NRSV translates it ‘persecution’). Throughout Revelation there are a number of references to coming persecutions and martyrdom, Rev. 6:9-11; 13:5-10, 16-18; 17:6 and 20:4-6 (cf. Gager, 1975:124; Bœ, 2001:38). The emperor worship and its

177 By the first century AD, the time in which the Book of Revelation is written, the term ‘Roman Empire’ was understood to embrace two interrelated dimensions: (1) the right of command within the Roman state, which was affirmed by the gods to a few representatives and officials of the people; and (2) a concrete territorial sense to denote the area or land, people and resources over which Rome extended control. The two meanings are connected in that the right of command usually involved two spheres: legislation and jurisdiction, and warfare (cf. Carter, 2001:9).

178 The roots of the Roman emperor worship go back to the Hellenistic period. Alexander the Great believed in his divinity during his lifetime and regarded Heracles and thus Zeus as his divine ancestors (Cimok, 2002:24).
attendant oppression were of critical importance to John's audiences. Only Jews and Christians opposed the worship of idols disguised by the emperor worship, and formed a distinct minority in the Empire (Rev. 2:10, 13; 6:11; 20:4; see Du Rand, 1989:103-105; 1999:1769). It is interesting that as John constructs his vision, it is the worshipper of idols (or emperors) who is in the minority. All the host of heaven and 'every creature in heaven and on earth and below the earth' knows who is the true object, and thus where worship and adoration are properly directed (cf. DeSilva, 1993:50-51).

Though Esler (1994:145), following L. Thompson, contends that Rome is not, in fact, a source of any great difficulty for the Christian communities of Asia at the end of the first century AD, he admits that both the Neronian persecution and the prevalence of the imperial cult in Asia Minor provided justification for a negative image of Rome. The period of AD 63-69 was in turmoil due to the Jewish-Roman War, the harassment of the Diaspora Jews by Nero, the turbulent situation in the Roman Empire, as well as the internal trauma caused by the false prophets, the spiritual compromise and general sloth of the seven churches. When he explains the socio-historical context of the Matthean community, Sim (1996:219-220) avers that "the events of 66-70 AD contributed to the social setting of John's audiences in an important way. The Jewish war against the Romans must have made the social setting of John bleak, since it caused the Gentiles to have an emotion hatred against the Diaspora in the Roman Empire". As Keresztes (1979:256-257) puts it, the Christians were persecuted under Nero as a result of Jewish intrigues, as undesirable elements of society, and as Christians. In this phase, it is worth mentioning the so-called 'Pella tradition', since it has a close connection with the early date of Revelation. According to Gunther (1973:82), the murder of James (Acts 12:2) must have strengthened the Jerusalem Church's existing expectation of coming divine punishment and diminished the Church's willingness to remain there indefinitely. During (or just before) the Jewish-Roman War, Christians from all over Palestine (from both Galilee and Jerusalem) might have gathered in Pella. The naming of Pella as a major refuge is credible (cf. Marcus, 1992:461; Burkett, 2002:510).

The number of Jews living in the Roman Empire at the time of early Christianity

179 It is important to note that due to the early date of Revelation, as well as the geographical
may be estimated at four and a half million — a half to three quarters of a million of them in Palestine — which amounts to about seven percent of the entire population of the empire. It is to be supposed that the number of Christians in the first century AD would not have been much more than 50,000. These numbers are, of course, only approximate figures, but they may illustrate that the Christian congregations were only very small groups — groups of far less importance than Jewish synagogues which were of much higher relevance and influence in the society. In this regard, Cimok (2002:29) assumes that at the time that John lived in western Anatolia the Christians in any city hardly exceeded one percent of the total population. But despite the small number of members the Christians were convinced that the crucified and resurrected Christ whom they confessed, was the Lord of lords and King of kings (Rev. 17:14; 19:16; Lohse, 1993:108-109).

'The letters to the seven churches' suggest that John is faced not with one set of 'opponents' throughout the province, but with different problems in the various congregations (Boxall, 1998:203). The problems in the seven churches are caused, inwardly, by the teaching of Balaamites ('ruler of the people') in Pergamum, of the Nicolaitans ('conqueror of the laity, the people') in Ephesus and Pergamum, and of Jezebel in Thyatira, and by the spiritual indolence, and, outwardly, by the Roman Empire and by the Jews in Diaspora. According to Coutsoumpos (1997:24-25), the Nicolaitans, Balaam, and Jezebel all fostered accommodation to the surrounding culture. As Balaam misled the Israelites into committing idolatry and immoral practices, so the Nicolaitans misled some members of the community with their false teaching. The Nicolaitans are likened to Balaam in Rev. 2:14, and the use of 'so' or 'likewise' at the beginning of Rev. 2:15 links Balaam's practice with the Nicolaitans' teaching, thereby suggesting that they shared the same immoral practices. The false teachers were

reason, John and Paul must have had something in common. On the basis of the network analysis of the first century Roman Empire, White (1992:34) observes that perhaps the most readily discernible network structures in the Roman world are the familial organisations of the extended household and the operation of patronage. The correlation of internal density with external interlinkages within network clusters may serve as a symptom of cultural assimilation. High internal density with low external interlinkages will tend to produce separation. As in the case of Pauline communities, because the seven churches in Asia Minor might have had a well-organised network and an internal solidarity, their low external interlinkages could have caused their separation (or anti-acculturation) in the Roman world.
probably no more than antinomian libertine groups who opened the door to syncretism and religious compromise as well. In summary, it can be concluded that John and his audiences were suffering from both inner problems and from outward persecution under Nero.

3.2. Literary aspects in Revelation 12-13

At this phase, literary aspects in Rev. 12-13 are probed in terms of (1) Greek text of Rev. 12-13, (2) translation of Rev. 12-13, (3) textual context, (4) discourse (colon) analysis, and (5) surface and deep structure in order to listen to the voice from the text itself by paying close attention to the text.

3.2.1. Text and translation of Revelation 12-13

3.2.1.1. Greek text of Revelation 12-13

12:1a Καὶ σημεῖον μεγά λόφος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,
1b γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τῶν ἡλίου, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα
2a καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἡξούσα,
2b καὶ κράζει ὠδίνουσα
2c καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν.
3a καὶ ὁ λόφος ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,
3b καὶ ὁ δράκων μέγας πυρρός ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἐπτὰ καὶ κέφατα δέκα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπτὰ διαδήματα,
4a καὶ ἡ οὐρά αὐτοῦ σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
4b καὶ ἐβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν.
4c καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν,
4d ἵνα ὅταν τέκνῳ τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς καταφάγῃ.
5a καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν,
5b ὡς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ.
5c καὶ ἥρπασθε τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ.

180 Textual criticism is done and placed in other Chapters in this work.
6a καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἐρημοῦν,
6b ὅπου ἔχει τὸ πόλον ἴτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ,
6c ἵνα ἔκει τρέψωσιν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκουσα
7a Καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.
7b ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆς μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος.
7c καὶ οἱ δράκων ἐπολέμησαν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ,
8a καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν
8b οὐδὲ τόπος εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἐτὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.
9a καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ δῆσ ὁ ἄρχαιος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην διήν.
9b ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν,
9c καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν.
10a καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν,
10b Ἀρτέ ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ,
10c ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ κατηγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός,
11a καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διά τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ διὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν
11b καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἄχρι θανάτου.
12a διὰ τοῦτο εὐφραίνεσθε, [οἱ] οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες.
12b οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν,
12c ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ύμᾶς ἡχὼν θυμὸν μέγαν,
12d εἰδὼς ὅτι ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει.
13a Καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ δράκων
13b ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν,
13c ἐδώξειν τὴν γυναῖκα ἤτις ἐτεκεν τῶν ἄρασεν.
14a καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ αἱ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ ἄετον τοῦ μεγάλου,
14b ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἐρημοῦν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς,
14c ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ήμισόν καιροῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
14d καὶ ἐβάλεν ὁ δῆσ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ψωμιοῦν,
15a καὶ ἐβάλεν ὁ δῆσ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ψωμιοῦν,
15b ἵνα αὐτὴν ψωμιοῦν ψωμιοῦν ποιήσῃ.
Several times in the Septuagint, μαρτυρία stands as a parallel to ἐντολή (e.g. Dt. 6:17; 2 Ki. 23:3; 1 Ch. 29:19; 2 Ch. 34:31; Ps. 118). In these instances, μαρτυρία usually translates τιμω. The sense of μαρτυρία here is of a testimony or proclamation from God of essential information, that is, παρέστασις ('the revelation of divine instruction'). Keeping τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἱησοῦ in Rev. 12:17 implies comporting oneself according to the covenant of allegiance and practise between God and Israel to which Jesus is, for John and his community, a paradigmatic witness (see Marshall, 2001:144-145) For the debate concerning the subjective genitive ('the testimony of Jesus') rather than objective genitive, see Tonstad, 2002:58 (cf. 'by the faithfulness of Jesus' in Rev. 14:12).
-όντας.
7α καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτοὺς,
7β καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φιλὴν καὶ λαὸν καὶ γλώσσαν καὶ ἔθνος.
8α καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες
8β οἱ κατοικούντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
8ε οὐ δὲ γέγραπται τὸ δύναμα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου
8δ τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.
9 Εἰ τις έχει οἷς ἀκουσάτω.
10α εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν,
10β εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει·
10γ εἰ τις ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθήματι
10δ αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθήματι.
10ε θεδέ ἐστιν ἡ ὑπομονή καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων.
11α Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαίνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς,
11β καὶ εἶχεν κέρατα δύο ὁμοία ἁρνίῳ καὶ ἐλάλη ὡς δράκων.
12α καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρῶτου θηρίου πᾶσαν ποιεῖ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ·
12β καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ
12γ ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον;
12δ οὐ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγή τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ·
13α καὶ ποιεῖ σημεῖα μεγάλα,
13β ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνει εἰς τὴν ἡν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
14α καὶ πλανάς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰ σημεῖα
14β ἢ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θηρίου,
14γ λέγων τοὺς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιήσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ,
14δ οὐκ ἐχεῖ τήν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ ἐξησεν.
15α καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεύμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου,
15β ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου
15γ καὶ ποιήσῃ [ἵνα] ὥσπερ εὰν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου ἀποκτανθῶ
16α καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλούσιους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους,
16β ἵνα δῶσιν αὐτοῖς χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν
17a καὶ ἑνα μῆ τις δύνηται ἁγοράσαι ἣ πωλήσαι
17b εἰ μῆ ὁ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ.
18a Ὡδὲ ἡ σοφία ἐστίν.
18b ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου,
18c ἀριθμὸς γάρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν
18d καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἐξακόσια ἐξήκοντα ἐξ.

3.2.1.2. Translation of Revelation 12-13

The following translation is the present researcher’s own translation and all quotations from Rev. 12-13 in this work are taken from this translation.

**Revelation 12**

1 And a great sign was seen in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars;
2 and she was with child; and she cried out, being in travail and in pain to give birth.
3 And another sign was seen in heaven: and behold, a great red dragon having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his heads seven diadems.
4 And his tail swept away a third of the stars of heaven, and threw them to the earth (land). And the dragon stood in front of the woman who was about to give birth, so that when she gave birth he might consume her child.
5 And she gave birth to a son, a male child, who is about to shepherd all the nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up to God and to his throne.
6 And the woman fled into the wilderness where she had a place prepared by God, so that there she might be shepherded for one thousand two hundred and sixty days.
7 And there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels (going forth) to war with the dragon. And the dragon and his angels waged war,
8 and they were not strong enough, and there was no longer a place found for them in heaven.
9 And the great dragon was thrown out, the ancient serpent who is called the devil and Satan, who deceives the whole world (land); he was thrown down to the earth (land),
and his angels were thrown down with him.

10 And I heard a loud voice in heaven, saying, “Now the salvation, and the power, and the kingship of our God and the authority of his Christ has come, for the accuser of our brethren has been thrown down, who accuses them before our God day and night.

11 And they did conquer him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, and they did not love their life even unto death.

12 Therefore rejoice, O heavens and you who tabernacle in them. Woe to the earth (land) and the sea, because the devil has come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he has only a short time”.

13 And when the dragon saw that he was cast down to the earth (land), he persecuted the woman who gave birth to the male child.

14 But the two wings of the great eagle were given to the woman, in order that she might fly into the wilderness to her place, where she was nourished for a time and times and half a time, from the face of the serpent.

15 And the serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman water like a river, so that he might cause her to be swept away with the flood.

16 But the earth (land) helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed up the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth.

17 And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and went off to make war with the rest of her offspring, who keep the authoritative instruction of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus.

Revelation 13

1 And he stood on the sand of the seashore. And I saw a beast rising out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads, and on his horns were ten diadems, and on his heads were blasphemous names.

2 And the beast which I saw was like a leopard, and his feet were like those of a bear, and his mouth like the mouth of a lion. And the dragon gave him his power and his throne and great authority.

3 And I saw one of his heads as if it had been slain, and his fatal wound was healed. And the whole earth was astonished and followed the beast;

4 and they worshiped the dragon, because he gave his authority to the beast; and they
worshiped the beast, saying, "Who is like the beast, and who is able to wage war against him?"

5 And the beast was given a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and he was given authority to act for forty-two months.

6 And he opened his mouth to blaspheme God, and to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, that is, those who tabernacle in heaven.

7 And it was given to him to make war against the saints and to conquer them; and he was given authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation.

8 And all who dwell on the earth (land) will worship him, everyone whose name has not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb who has been slain.

9 If anyone has an ear, let him hear.

10 If anyone is (destined) for captivity, into captivity he goes; if anyone shall kill with the sword, with the sword he must be killed. Here is the perseverance and the faith of the saints.

11 And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth (land); and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spoke as a dragon.

12 And he exercises all the authority of the first beast in his presence. And he makes the earth (land) and those who dwell in it to worship the first beast, whose fatal wound was healed.

13 And he does great signs, so that he even makes fire come down out of heaven to the earth in the sight of men.

14 And he deceives those who dwell on the earth (land) by the signs which he was given to do in the sight of the beast, telling those who dwell on the earth (land) to make an image to the beast who had the wound of the sword and lived.

15 And there was given to him to give breath to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast might even speak and cause as many as should not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

16 And he causes all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free men and the slaves, to be given a mark on their right hand, or on their forehead,

17 and that no one should be able to buy or to sell, except the one who has the mark, the name of the beast or the number of his name.

18 Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding count the number of the beast, for it
is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred and sixty-six.

3.2.2. Textual context\textsuperscript{182} and structure of Revelation 12-13

3.2.2.1. Textual context of Revelation 12-13

It is widely proposed that Revelation 12-13 is the centre of the Book (for the chiastic structure of Revelation, Jordan, 1999:17; see A.Y. Collins, 1976:231; Kistemaker, 2001:352). Because of this, its accurate interpretation is the key to a correct understanding of the whole Book. The subject of the preceding chapter (Rev. 11) is God's judgment upon the temple and the holy city at the hand of the Gentiles. As the postlude to the seven trumpets, Rev. 12-15 not only lays out symbolically the history of the period between Pentecost and the final judgment of the Old Covenant (and Rome), but also displays the spiritual realities and conflicts that operate behind the scenes in Acts and the Epistles, and in what follows after the end of the Book of Acts (Jordan, 1999:33).

The great significance of John's placement of events is clear when he emphasises the greater power of God by placing an appearance of the ark of the covenant (Rev. 11:19) in dramatic precedence over the immediately following actions of the dragon.\textsuperscript{183} The whole narrative of the dragon and the two beasts then unfolds under the shadow of the ark with its immensely powerful connotations.\textsuperscript{184} If this textual context is intended to

\textsuperscript{182} The textual context of Rev. 12-13 refers to the position of Rev. 12-13 within the Book of Revelation in general, and within Rev. 11-14 in particular.

\textsuperscript{183} According to Lee (2000:121), Stephen Langdon, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1207 onward, was the person who divided Rev. 11:19 to 12:2 into its present divisions of chapters and verses. Thus, Lee claims that this new section (Rev. 12) in John's Revelation seems to start at what is now numbered as Rev. 11:19. Unfortunately, Kistemaker (2001:351-352) does not pay proper attention to the thematic continuity between Rev. 11 and Rev. 12 when he insists: "There is no close connection between the content of chapter 11 and that of chapter 12. Here is a new beginning, for Revelation basically has two main parts. These parts are divided into Christ's church persecuted by the world (chapters 1-11) and Christ with the church persecuted by Satan (chapters 12-22)."

\textsuperscript{184} The narrative of the two witnesses (Rev. 11:1-13) can be called the most important part of the Church's agenda. In fact, the Church's conflict with the powers of evil in chapters 12-15 and the final judgment in chapters 15-22, are better understood in the light of the witnessing task of the Church (Du Rand, 1996c:56).
control any sense of the ultimate power of Satan, it is true that Rev. 12-13, placed not accidentally in the centre of the narrative, narrates with almost unbearable ferocity the terrifying powers Satan possesses (Long, 1996:263-264).

The present chapter division has meant that the close relationship between Rev. 12 and Rev. 13 has often been missed. The conjunction Kai ('And') shows that the two are closely connected. Some versions indicate this textual connection by placing the first sentence of Rev. 13 as the concluding verse (v. 17) of Rev. 12 (cf. Allen, 1999:322).

3.2.2.2. Discourse (colon) analysis of Revelation 12-13

Colon analysis (the type of [semantic] discourse analysis developed in South Africa) operates on the text theory that a close link exists between the way a text is structured and its meaning. The basic premise of this method is that meaningful relations not only exist between the words in a sentence, but also between larger parts of a text such as sentences, groups of sentences (clusters) and pericopes. The structuring of phrases or sentences in clusters to form text-units, which in their turn have meaning for the text as a whole, takes place in various ways. Colon analysis inquires about the cohesion of a text in order to demarcate the pericopes in a verifiable manner and to describe the trend of argument (see Snyman, 1991:88-98). This method contributes towards more reliable pericope divisions in cases where major differences of opinion occur. Discourse analysis does not destroy the authority of the Bible. And its text immanent reading, for example, is indispensable for the proper understanding of the Bible. There are few works of discourse analysis on Revelation at present (cf. Vorster, 1977:14, 1979:123).

Despite its prominent merits, attention should be paid to several limitations of discourse analysis: (1) it is not a heuristic method of exegesis, because discourse analysis is a stepping-stone of further exegesis. (2) It is not objective but instinctive. (3) Its philosophical presupposition based on structuralism and phenomenology does not taken into account. Like the 'Back-to-the-Bible' movement of seventeen-century pietism, it does not fully take into account its context (see Jordaan, 1986:415-417).

3.2.2.2.1. Discourse (colon) analysis of Revelation 12-13
A: Introduction of the two visions of the woman and the dragon

1. (12:1) Καὶ ἀπείρω ὁ ἁλός ἐν τῷ ὕφανεν,
2. ὁ ἑῳ τὴν ὕποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν νὰτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπείρω στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα
3. (2) καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχουσα, καὶ κράζει ὠδήνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκείν.
4. (3) καὶ ὁ δράκων μέγας πυρρός ἐχων κεφαλᾶς ἐπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποτελεῖ ἐπτὰ διαδήματα.

B: Jesus' birth and ascension and the woman persecuted by the dragon but protected by God

6. (4) καὶ ἡ οὐρα αὐτοῦ ὑπερὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ ὕφανεν
7. καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοῦς εἰς τὴν γῆν.
8. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐστήκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναίκας τῆς μελλουσις τεκείν, ἐνα δηαν τὴν το τέκνου αὐτῆς καταδάγη.
9. (5) καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν,
10. ὁς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἐθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ.
11. καὶ ἦπατο τὸ τέκνου αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ.
12. (6) καὶ ἡ γυναῖκ ἐφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἑρμον.
13. ὁποῦ ἔχει τὸτον ἡτομασμενὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐνα ἐκεῖ τρέφωσιν ἃπετέραμερας χιλιὰς διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα.

C: Michael's victory over Satan and Satan's expulsion from heaven

14. (7) Καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ ὕφανεν,
15. ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολέμησα μετά τοῦ δράκοντος.
16. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ,
17. (8) καὶ άκ θεσαυρεῖ,
18. οὐδὲ τότοις εὐρήθη αὐτοῦ ἐτι ἐν τῷ ὕφανεν.
19. (9) καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ἄρχων ὁ ἄρχαῖος, ὁ καλομενὸς Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς ὅλην, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν.
20. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν.
D: Victorious doxology of God’s kingship through the blood of the Lamb and the church’s witness

21. (10) καὶ ἡκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν,
   "Ἀρτέ ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόματας καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἁδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ κατηγορών αὐτούς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός.
22. (11) καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀμωμού καὶ διὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν
23. καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἀχρι θανάτου,
24. (12) διὰ τοῦτο εὐφράνεσθε, [οἱ] οὐρανοῖ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες
25. οἷοί τιν πὴ καὶ τὴν θαλάσσαν, ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διαβόλος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων θυ -μόν μέγαν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ὁ λίγον καὶ ροῶν ἔχει.

E: Woman persecuted by the dragon and her flight with God’s help

26. (13) Καὶ ὅτε ἐδείξεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν,
   ἐδιώξαν τὴν γυναίκα ἥτις ἐτεκνὶ τὸν ἄρσενα
27. (14) καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναίκῃ οἱ δύο πέργαμος τοῦ ἀετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου,
   ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς
28. ὅπως τρέφηται ἐκεῖ καὶροῦ καὶ καρυκεύσανται καὶ ἱμάσῃ καιροῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θορηκτοῦ.
29. (15) καὶ ἐβαλεν ὁ δράκων ὡς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῆς γυναίκας ὁδὸν ὑπὸ ποταμοῦ, ἵνα αὐτὸ τοῦ ποταμοφόρου ποίηση.
30. (16) καὶ ἐβοήθησαν ἡ γῆ καὶ ἡ γυναίκα
31. καὶ ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς
32. καὶ κατέπνευσαν τοὺς ποταμοὺς ἐν ἐβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

F: War on earth between the dragon and the woman’s offspring who keep God’s instruction and uphold Jesus’ testimony

33. (17) καὶ ὄργεσθαι ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικείᾳ
34. καὶ ἀπήλθεν ποιησάν πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς τῶν τηρούσαν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔχουσαν τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν.
35. καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμμοῦ τῆς θαλάσσας.
G: The vision of the sea beast as the henchman of the dragon

36. (13:1) καὶ Ἐδοθ έκ τής θελάσσες θηρίων ἀναβαίνον, ἔχουν κεφαλᾶς ἑπτά καὶ κέρατα δέκα καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτῶν διαδηματα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν δύομα βλασφημιάς.

37. (2) καὶ τὸ θηρίον τὸ Ἐδοθ ἦν ὄμοιον παραδέλει καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ὡς ἅρκων καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡς στόμα λέοντος. καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὸ δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην.

H: The deeds of the sea beast for the dragon but God controls

38. (3) καὶ μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ἐσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον.
39. καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανατοῦ αὐτῶν ἐθεραπεύθη.
40. καὶ ἐθαυμάσθη ὡλὴ ἡ γῆ ὑπὸ τοῦ θηρίου.
41. (4) καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ δράκων, ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξοουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ.
42. καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ λέγοντες. Τίς ὄμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ καὶ τίς δύνα -ται πολεμήσαι μετ’ αὐτῶν;
43. (5) Καὶ Ἐσθνη αὐτῷ στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ βλασφημίας
44. καὶ Ἐσθνη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ποιήσαι μήνας τεσσαράκοντα [καὶ] δύο.
45. (6) καὶ ἤνωξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν βλασφημί -ςαι τὸ δύομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ, τοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴραμι σκηνούντς -ας;
46. (7) καὶ Ἐσθνη αὐτῷ ποιήσαι πολέμων μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικήσαι αὐτοὺς
47. καὶ Ἐσθνη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλήν καὶ λαὸν καὶ γλώσσαν καὶ ἕθυν
48. (8) καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῶν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὔ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ δύομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολής κόσμου.

I: The lesson of patience and faith

49. (9) Εἶ τις ἔχει οὕς ἀκουσάτω.
50. (10) εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει.
51. εἰ τις ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθήσεται αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθήσεται.
52. οὔδε ἔστιν ἡ ὑπομονή καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων.
J: The vision of the land beast as a parody of the Lamb

53. (11) Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαίνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς.
54. καὶ εἶχεν κέρατα δύο ὄμοια ἀρνίως καὶ ἐλάλει ως δράκων.

K: The deeds of the land beast for the sea beast

55. (12) καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρῶτου θηρίου πάσαν ποιεῖ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ·
56. καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦσαν εἰς αὐτή Ἰνα προσκυνήσωσιν
-ν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, οὐ ἐθεραπεύθη ἢ πληγή τοῦ βαινάτου αὐτοῦ·
57. (13) καὶ ποιεῖ σχεδία μεγάλα, ἵνα καὶ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θυρανίου καταβα
-άινει εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
58. (14) καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦσαν εἰς τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰ σχεδία αὐτοῦ ποιήσωσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θηρίου, λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν εἰς τῆς γῆς ποιήσωσιν εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου, ὅσ ἔχει τὴν πληγή τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ ἔζησεν.
59. (15) καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, ἵνα καὶ λαλῇ
-σῃ ἥξεις τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ποιήσῃ [Ἰνα] ὁσα ἐὰν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν τῇ
eἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου ἀποκτάνωσιν.
60. (16) καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλο-
-υσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἔλευθερους καὶ τοὺς δουλούς,
-ἵνα δώσων αὐτοῖς χάραγμα εἰς τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιὰς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ
-μέτωπον αὐτῶν (17) καὶ ἵνα μὴ τις δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι εἰ μὴ
-ὁ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα τὸ δύομα τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀρίθμον τοῦ ἀνώματος Θ
-νόσου.

L: The lesson of wisdom in order to identify the beast’s number

61. (18) Ὑδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν.
62. ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφιακά τὸν ἀρίθμον τοῦ θηρίου.
63. ἀρίθμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν
64. καὶ ὁ ἀρίθμος αὐτοῦ ἐξακολούθη ἐξήκοντα ἔξ.

3.2.2.2. A few notes on the structure of Revelation 12-13 with special reference to
structural markers
3.2.2.2.1. Structural markers occurring throughout Revelation 12-13

σημεῖα: Rev. 12:1, 3; 13:13, 14
δράκων, διάβολος, Σατανᾶς, δῆλος, δὲ πλακών. Rev. 12:3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; 13:2, 5, 7, 11, 17, 18.
γῆ: Rev. 12:4, 9, 12, 13, 16; 13:3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14
θεός: Rev. 12:5, 6, 10, 17: 13:6
οὐρανῷ: Rev. 12:1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12; 13:6, 13
Ἰησοῦς, τέκνον, νῦς, ἄρνιον, ἀῤῥήν, χριστός: Rev. 12:5, 10, 11, 13, 17; 13:8
θρόνος: Rev. 12:5, 13:2
σωτηρία, ἔξουσία, δύναμις: Rev. 12:10; 13:2, 4, 5, 7, 12
θάλασσα: Rev. 12:12, 17; 13:1
ἐθνὸς, οἰκουμένη, πᾶσαν·φιλήν·καὶ·λαὸν·καὶ·γλώσσαν·καὶ·ἐθνὸς: Rev. 12:5, 9; 13:7, 8

From the above markers, it is clear that in Rev. 12-13 the cosmic battle between Christ and Satan is the main focus.

3.2.2.2.2. Structural markers occurring only in specific parts of Revelation 12-13

ἡμιά: Rev. 12:1, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
ἐρημὸς: Rev. 12:6, 14
τόπος: Rev. 12:6, 8, 14
μαρτυρία: Rev. 12:11, 17
θηρίων: Rev. 13:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18
όνομα: Rev. 13:1, 6, 8, 17
χάραγμα: Rev. 13:16, 17
ἐσόθη: Rev. 13:5, 7
ἐλένω: Rev. 13:1, 2, 11
RESSION: Rev. 13:10, 18

The above markers show that on the one hand, in Rev. 12, the woman, her flight to God's prepared place, and the faithful testimony come to the fore, but on the other hand,
in Rev. 13, John's vision of the beast(s) and its name (mark) with the divine passive voice are prominent.

### 3.2.2.2.3. Pericope division in Revelation 12-13 and the relations between the pericopes

It is clear from the above diagram that Rev. 12-13 is divided into cola 1-5; 6-13; 14-20; 21-25; 26-32; 33-35; 36-37; 38-48; 49-52; 53-54; 55-60; and 61-64. The relations between the 12 pericopes may be presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cola</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>12:1-3</td>
<td>John’s introduction of the two visions of the woman and dragon</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Jesus’ redemptive works and the persecution of the woman by the dragon</td>
<td>Content 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Heavenly triumph over Satan and Satan’s expulsion from heaven</td>
<td>Content 2&lt;sup&gt;185&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Heavenly doxology concerning the coming of God’s kingship</td>
<td>Result &amp; explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-32</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>The woman’s persecution by the dragon and her protection by God</td>
<td>Content 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>War on the earth between the dragon and the rest of woman’s offspring</td>
<td>Content 4 &amp; result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>13:1-2</td>
<td>The vision of the sea beast as the henchman of Satan</td>
<td>New introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>185</sup> As a matter of fact, Rev. 12:4-6 and Rev. 12:7-9 are so intertwined that Prigent’s argument is also convincing: Rev. 12:7-9 depicts the operation of cleansing following the death and the resurrection of Christ. The result of the battle (Satan chased away from heaven) is the consequence that God draws from the Easter event. That is why this new scene is not present as a third scene (Prigent, 1988:191).
3.2.2.2.4. Concluding remarks on discourse (colon) analysis

The whole discourse of Rev. 12-13 consists of 12 cola. As a matter of fact, Rev. 12-13 constitutes a very neatly-structured pericope. Cola 1-5 serves as the introduction of the whole pericope. Cola 6-13 must be grouped together due to the intertwined relation among the woman, the male-child, and the dragon. The gist of cola 14-20 is the heavenly battle between Michael and Satan. Cola 21-25 as the core of Rev. 12-13 plays the role of a convergence in that it not only comments on cola 14-20 but also anticipates the following cola. In cola 26-32 the conflict between the dragon and the woman is again focused upon. Cola 33-35 depicts the scene of earthly battle between the dragon and the woman's offspring. Cola 36-37 functions as a hinge between cola 1-35 and cola 38-64. In cola 38-48, the contrast between the sea beast and God in the form of the divine passive is typical. Cola 49-52 is the result of cola 36-48. Cola 53-54 as the continual introduction fulfills the function of a hinge between cola 38-52 and cola 55-64. Cola 55-60 as the last content pictures the deeds of the land beast. Cola 61-64 concludes the whole pericope.

3.2.3. Surface structure of Revelation 12-13

The following table based on the above discourse analysis bears out the integral surface structure which occurs throughout Rev. 12-13 (cf. Bullinger, 1984:420; Humphrey, 1995:101):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cola</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38-48</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Content 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Continual introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>Content 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like Rev. 12:12, the reference to the flight of the woman (Rev. 12:6) is anticipatory of 12:13ff. in that it anticipates the more concrete picture of the struggle between the

---

186 On Rev. 12:7-10, Caird (1999:153-154) is of the opinion that it need hardly be said that this is no premundane battle. When the victory is being won in heaven, Christ is on earth on the cross. Because He is part of the earthly reality, Christ cannot at the same time be part of the heavenly symbolism. Michael's victory is simply the heavenly and symbolic counterpart of the earthly reality of the cross. Michael, in fact, is not the field officer who does the actual fighting, but the staff official in the heavenly control room.

187 Lupieri (1999:202) argues that in Rev. 12:17 καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμύνον τῆς θαλάσσης placed in the middle of the Book of Revelation, constitutes a turning point. It indicates the change of perspective: from the heaven to the earth, from divine to human, and from trans-temporal to history.
woman and the red dragon\textsuperscript{188} (Van de Kamp, 2000:300). The intervening verses (Rev. 12:7-12) show why the dragon is persecuting the woman. The heavenly hymn (D, Rev. 12:10-12) serves as a commentary on the preceding narrative (Harrington, 1993:132). The doxology comes in the central point of the narrative, and has a threefold structure: statement (v. 10: the victory), explanation (v. 11: the means or way whereby the faithful attained victory), and response enjoyed (v. 12: the effects of victory both on heaven and earth). The chiastic structure of the doxology stresses the central position of Rev. 12:11 (Wall, 1991:165):

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{A:} "... For the accuser ... has been thrown down." v. 10
\item \textbf{B:} "They conquered him..." v. 11
\item \textbf{A':} "... the devil has come down to you." v. 12
\end{itemize}

3.2.4. Syntactical analysis of Revelation 12:10-12 as the core of Revelation\textsuperscript{189}

As Jordaan (1986:410) suggests, as an immediate constituent analysis, the syntactical analysis (i.e. thought structure on micro level) can function as a possible device for preventing subjectivity of discourse analysis. The following is the syntactical analysis of Rev. 12:10-12, which will further clarify the significance of the most important verses in Revelation\textsuperscript{190} (for the thought structure analysis on micro level [i.e. syntactical analysis], see De Klerk & Van Rensburg, 1999:5-6; Jordaan, 2002:7):

\textsuperscript{188} The principal objection urged against the unity of Rev. 12 is based on the account of the woman's flight, which is given twice, in Rev. 12:6 and Rev. 12:13-16. Some critics omit v. 6 as an editorial addition. Others make vs. 13-16 an editorial working over of v. 6 (see Aune, 1998:664-665). But the fact that John first alludes to a subject briefly and afterwards takes it up more fully is one of his characteristics (e.g. Rev. 13:1-8 and 17:7-14; 14:8 and 18; 16:19 and 18; 21:1-2 and 21:9-22:5). It is not unnatural that John should have closed the first part (Rev. 12:1-6) with some anticipatory allusion (Rev. 12:6) to its sequel, the flight and safety of the woman. The structure of Rev. 12 is the work of one mind (Beckwith, 1967:632-633).

\textsuperscript{189} According to Allen (1999:300), the central verse of Rev. 4-19 is Rev. 12:12 in which it seems eminently fitting that the key word should be 'woe'. But He appears to ignore the aspect of salvation in Rev. 12:12.

\textsuperscript{190} For Hall (2002:288), Rev. 10:11-11:1 are the most important verses in Revelation due to their interlocking function.
Here, a different explanation can be suggested. The interjection οὐαί governs the accusative nouns τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν as direct objects. Notice that the interjection appears without the definite article, which makes it general, while the three woes feature the article (Rev. 9:12; 11:14; Kistemaker, 2001:366). In other words, instead of the normal dative, the accusative which follows may be accusative of general reference: 'woe to the earth and the sea' (Rogers Jr. & Rogers III, 1998:636).

The construction χρόνον μικρόν (Rev. 6:11; reversed in Rev. 20:3) is translated exactly the same as this entry, namely, 'a short time'. While καιρός means opportunity, season, fixed or favourable time, χρόνος denotes chronological time (Kistemaker, 2001:366).
Du Rand (1993:321-322) shows a succinct analysis of Rev. 12:10b-12 as follows:

## Strophe 1: Acclamation (verse 10b)

| a. Statement | 1.1 "Αρτο έγένετο η σωτηρία καὶ η δύναμις καὶ η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ήμῶν  
| | 1.2 καὶ η ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ |
| b. Cause | 1.3 ὅτι ἔβληθε οἱ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ήμῶν  
| | 1.4 ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ήμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς |

## Strophe 2: Sacred narrative (verse 11)

| a. Statement | 2.1 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἁρυίου  
| | 2.2 καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν |
| b. Cause | 2.3 καὶ οὐκ ἡγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἀχρι θανάτου |

## Strophe 3: Exhortation (verse 12)

| a. Statement | 3.1 διὰ τούτο εὐφραίνεσθε οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες  
| | 3.2 οὐκ σήμερον καὶ σήμερον θάλασσαν |
| b. Cause | 3.3 ὅτι κατῆβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐχθρὸν θυμὸν μέγαν  
| | 3.4 εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅλην καὶ ἐχει |

The hymnic composition is carefully constructed, and is partially based on a parallelism of clauses. It is composed of three strophes of four, three and four lines respectively. There is some rhyming within each strophe: (1) the repetition of ἡμῶν in 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4; (2) ἁρυίου and θανάτου in 2.1 and 2.3; (3) θάλασσαν and μέγαν in 3.2 and 3.3; (4) the correspondence of ὁ κατήγωρ and ὁ κατηγορῶν in 1.3 and 1.4; (5) the parallelism

---

193 The word ὁ κατήγωρ (the accuser) in this exact form occurs only once in the NT, whereas the other spelling ὁ κατηγορῶν is more familiar (Acts 23:30, 35; 24:8; 25:16, 18). The first one is the more original reading and is favoured (Kistemaker, 2001:366).

194 A mimetic relationship is formed between the martyrdom of Jesus and the martyrdom of the saints. Although the paschal lamb motif seems to be implicit in Rev. 12:11, it is not so much that the Lamb's death has a vicarious function for the saints, but that his death is paradigmatic for them (Harris, 1989:158).
of διὰ τὸ αἷμα and διὰ τῶν λόγων in 2.1 and 2.2 and of ἐνίκησαν and ἡγάτησαν in 2.1 and 2.3; (6) the correspondence of ἔχων and ἔχει in 3.3 and 3.4 and the antithetic parallelism of ἐφραίνεσθε and ὤμα in 3.1 and 3.2 and of ὤφανοι and γην in 3.1 and 3.2 (see Collins, 1976:136-137).

The doxology makes sure both of the grounds of the kingship /sovereignty of God on the basis of the Christ event and of the definite frustration of Satan’s power (Frey, 1953:115). Revelation 12:11, then, provides the very heart of the Apocalypse (Beasley-Murray, 1990:203), which is enforced by the two lessons in Chapter 13:10 and 18 (I, G’ & I’) as explanatory and corresponding examples. What the dragon was described as doing in ch. 12 he actually does through his servants portrayed in ch. 13 (Beale, 1999b:681). So Rev. 13 explains in further detail the nature of Satan’s persecution of the seven churches. It is important to note that virtually all the main verbs in F’ G’ H’ I’ are present tense. Hence, John is suggesting that what he saw was in some sense going

---

195 The double use of the preposition διὰ (‘by’) in Rev. 12:11 gives the grounds of their (Christians’) victory, not the means (Allen, 1999:317).
196 The hymns in Revelation always play a hermeneutical role in relation to the account or the text. Being a liturgical hymn, it places exegetes at the heart of the community, at its very core, where the historical consciousness of the Christian community of that time becomes clear. Hence the hymns are by no means decorative, but are of the utmost hermeneutical and theological intensity throughout Revelation (Richard, 1995:105-106).
197 βασιλεία is paired with ‘salvation’ and ‘power’, thus referring to ‘royal rule’. In the same vein, in Rev. 11:15 βασιλεία is best understood in the active sense when it is affirmed that the ‘kingship’ of the world has become the ‘kingship’ of our Lord, since it says, ‘and he shall reign forever and ever’ (Bandstra, 1992:18). Moreover, as Letseli (2001:197) points out in his doctoral dissertation, there is a spiraling thread of the kingship of God whose starting point might be traced back from the pre-historic era and prior to creation – at the very heart of God, entwined in the corridors of the OT salvation-prophetic history, knitted in and through the person and works of Christ; weaving through the witness of the NT church with the aim of bringing every person under God’s kingship through the blood of the Lamb.

198 On Rev. 12:18, Beale (1999b:681) comments that some mss. have ἔσταθην (I - John stood) instead of ἔσταθη (he [the dragon] stood). The latter is the original reading because of its superior ms. support (although majority text supports ἔσταθην and is a better witness in the Apocalypse than elsewhere in the NT, it is outweighed here by p7 X A C 1854 2344 2351). The secondary reading arose either from an auditory error, from a scribe reading the ‘v’ from the following τήν, or from a desire to harmonise the verb with εἶδον in Rev. 13:1 (cf. Metzger, 1971:748). Similarly, Charles (1920:344) commented that the textual evidence in itself is overwhelming on behalf of “ἔσταθη”. The dragon, foiled in his attempt to destroy the Messiah and its community, proceeds to the shore of the sea and summons from it the beast (i.e. the Roman Empire) in order to arm it with his own power. Thus ch. 13 follows naturally after 12. And ἔσταθη preserves the continuity ἀπῆλθεν in Rev. 12:17, and ἔδωκεν in Rev. 13:2. Moreover, nowhere else does John change position without instructions (Sweet, 1990:205).
on in the Roman Empire even as he wrote (Michaels, 1997:163).

As Richard (1995:107) points out, Rev. 13 must be understood in the light of Rev. 12, for in ch. 13 the victory of the holy is already implicit. Likewise, without Rev. 13, ch. 12 could lead readers to an illusory and frustrating.

3.2.5. Deep structure of Revelation 12-13

The following table depicts the deep structure of Revelation 12-13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis of communication</th>
<th>God (sender)</th>
<th>Salvation/Judgment (object)</th>
<th>Church/Jerusalem-Rome (receiver)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axis of volition</td>
<td>The woman/Michael and his angels</td>
<td>Christ (subject)</td>
<td>The two beasts, the dragon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although God, the sender, is never mentioned as a direct actor in the cosmic drama in

199 Structuralism was the first synchronic exegetical method to have an impact on modern biblical scholarship. It dates from France in September 1969. Structuralism attempts to penetrate beyond the literal meaning on the surface to assumed deeper levels. Its key insight is that patterns and structures recur in story-telling across a wide range of cultures and periods of history. Accordingly, structuralists approach the Book of Revelation looking for the so-called 'deep structure', including seeking polar opposites, such as strong and weak, good and evil, life and death. Thus, it has little to do with traditional analysis of the literary structure of a story (see Gulley, 2000:212; Wenham & Walton, 2001:92).

200 Schüssler Fiorenza (2001:12) argues that "the Apocalypse's rhetorical world of vision foregrounds the socio-political symbols of two cities (Jerusalem/Rome) as representing the opposition between two worlds: one constituted by the powers of oppression, the other by those of liberation and well-being. The powers behind these two cities are portrayed in animal figures (Lamb/two beasts). The two contrasting city-symbolisations are in turn figured as female (bride/harlot) so that a contrast between two groups of linked images, Bride-Lamb-New Jerusalem on the one side and harlot-beast-Babylon on the other, is constructed". The above Schüssler Fiorenza's argument is not convincing because it is not Jerusalem-Rome but the New Jerusalem-Rome which are contrasted to one another. John depicts Jerusalem negatively in Rev. 11:18 but describes the New Jerusalem always positively. By picturing Jerusalem as an object of God's judgment, John makes an alternative, namely the New Jerusalem.
Rev. 12-13,\textsuperscript{201} the Lord God Almighty as the hidden actor is in everything (see esp. the use of \textit{passiva divina} in 12:5, 14; 13:5, 7, 14, 15; Boring, 1989:154). As Kempson (1982:158, 222) points out, the theme of power (cf. axis of power) is an important theme of Revelation in general and for Rev. 12-13 in particular. God's redemptive power executed through Christ and the Church overcomes the satanical power performed through the two beasts.\textsuperscript{202} All power actually belongs to God and his Christ. The powerful kingdom of God has been inaugurated through the advent of Christ. The image of Jesus in Rev. 12 is the fullfiller and heir of the OT promise, the overcomer, reignier, the Son of man, the Saviour (Engelbrecht, 1980:426-431). The hermeneutical starting-point of Rev. 12-13 is God's sovereignty executed through Christ and the faithful on earth (Theron, 1996:291). Through John's central vision (chs. 12-13), his audiences glimpse the deep spiritual struggle that lies behind history's surface events, the combat between Christ and Satan.

A similar and corresponding notion of deep structure derives from the anti-language of the Apocalypse. Anti-language is the language of social resistance. It functions to express and maintain the social structure. In other words, its chief function is its group defining capacity: to provide an alternative social and conceptual reality. As formulated below, the anti-language of Revelation 12-13 draws a distinction, at one level, between Jewish/Roman oppressors and the oppressed and, at another level, between those who follow the beast and its regime and those who follow the Lamb with endurance (cf. Hurtgen, 1993:51, 142-143):

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{201} Strikingly (in the light of Revelation's use of the OT), there is no language attributing human characteristics to God (anthropomorphism). Only twice does God speak (Rev. 1:8; 21:6); elsewhere others speak on God's behalf (e.g. Rev. 6:1). But this does not mean God is unconcerned with creation (Marshall, Travis and Paul, 2002:313).

\textsuperscript{202} There is a subtle but important difference in the temporality associated with the figure of the male child (Rev. 12:5) and the cosmic activity of the dragon manifested in the particular actions of the two beasts. The snatching of the child, explained as the victory over the dragon in heaven, has pivotal and cosmic significance (cf. Rev. 12:10), whereas the coming of the beasts appear to be simply particular manifestations of the dragon's cosmic power. This suggests the unrepeatability of the former event and the repeatability of the latter (see Paul, 2001:147).
\end{quote}
Long (1994:14-15) correctly argues that the text of Rev. 12-13 invites the readers to view their historical circumstances in the light of God's great victory, already announced with hymns of thanksgiving, in a world beyond historical time. Likewise, they are invited to see the great victory of God in the light of their pain-filled historical struggle to keep the commandments and bear witness to Christ.

3.3. Concluding summary

From the studies of socio-historical context, textual context, and discourse analysis of Revelation 12-13, which locates the middle of the Book and has an integrated structure, it is manifest that under the persecution of Nero and of the apostate Jews in the AD 60s the seven churches were so convinced, not only that Christ was about to offer them salvation, but also that He would punish their adversaries, that John and his audiences were forced to praise God due to his reign through Christ.

Though textual context proves the central position of Rev. 12-13 in the Book of Revelation, investigation of intratextuality of Rev. 12-13 in the next chapter is to confirm the fact more succinctly.
CHAPTER 4.

INTRATEXTUALITY OF REVELATION 12-13

At this stage intratextuality, namely, the interrelation between the whole Book of Revelation and Rev. 12-13, is probed. Attention to intratextuality is a stage of attention that is prior to any analysis of meanings including intertextual study (cf. Bloomquist, 1999:175). This intratextual investigation manifests the central position of Rev. 12-13 in which all the important and integral themes of the Apocalypse come to the fore.

4.1. Intratextuality of Revelation 12

Shea (1985:49) compares Rev. 12 with Rev. 20:1-10 and finds a parallel literary structure between them in terms of structure, theme and locus (for the detailed parallels between Rev. 12:7-11 and Rev. 20:1-6, see Beale, 1999b:992-995):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Locus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning: (Rev. 12:1-6)</td>
<td>Satan’s initial attack</td>
<td>Earth A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (12:7-12)</td>
<td>Satan’s heavenly defeat</td>
<td>Heaven B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End (12:13-17)</td>
<td>Satan’s final attack</td>
<td>Earth A’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Locus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (Rev. 20:1-3)</td>
<td>Satan’s initial defeat</td>
<td>Earth A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (20:4-6)</td>
<td>Church victorious</td>
<td>Heaven B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End (20:7-10)</td>
<td>Satan’s final defeat</td>
<td>Earth A’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

203 In this dissertation, intratextuality is different from inner-biblical intertextuality that is the interrelationship between two (or more) different biblical books. Inner-biblical intertextuality has been the focus of intensive scholarly investigation since 1934 when A. Robert demonstrated the exegetical interrelationship between Deuteronomy and Proverbs (cf. Hepner, 2001:3).

The events of Rev. 12:7-13:2 are circumstantially linked and therefore congruent with the events of Rev. 20:1-3. Three critical points established that relationship (cf. Johnson, 2001:286): (1) the anticipated interruption of the dragon’s activity as deceiver and warrior (Rev. 12:12; Rev. 20:3); (2) the dragon’s authorisation of the sea and earth beasts (Rev. 13:2, 12) to act on his behalf (cf. Rev. 13:7, 14); and (3) the interruption of the dragon’s activity by his imprisonment (Rev. 20:1-3). Thus, the warring Lamb responding to the dragon’s warfare against his kingdom is also depicted in Rev. 20:1-3. Both Rev. 12 and Rev. 20 portray a defeat of the dragon (Rev. 12:7-9; 20:1-3) and the Messianic kingdom that follows (Rev. 12:10; 20:4, 6). In addition, it can be assumed that the recapitulation theory can play a part in analysing the relationship between Rev. 12 and Rev. 20 (White, 1989:96, 122-123). It seems that Rev. 20 anticipates the final consummation of God’s redemptive plan, which has already appeared in Rev. 12. Thus, as Kuyper (1935:281) argues, what is visualised in Rev. 20 refers back to Rev. 12, joins itself to it, and is the immediate result of it. To put it differently, to interpret Rev. 20 as an extended, metaphorical, end-time story that refers to issues of the first century would remove any need for fruitless apocalyptic speculations (cf. Rainbow, 1996:221).

Van der Waal (1981:7) observes two parallelisms: first, between Rev. 12:1-12 and, second, Rev. 5 and between Rev. 12:13-13:18 and Rev. 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev. 5 Enthronement of the Lamb</th>
<th>Rev. 12:1-12 Enthronement of the Son of Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal liturgy</td>
<td>Royal liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment vision</td>
<td>Enthronement of the beast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal liturgy from his two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, the overcoming of Christ at the cross and his enthronement with the Father, which appears to be the main theme of Rev. 5 (esp. 5:5), are linked by Rev. 12:5205 (cf. 205 John incorporates vaticinium ex eventu ('prophecy after the fact') to some degree, for example in the vision of the male child caught up to heaven in Rev. 12:1-6 (i.e. Jesus' ascent to heaven). In Rev. 12 John gives a review of history down to his own time by vaticinium ex eventu (Burkett, 2002:501).
Van der Waal (1981:79) also finds intratextuality of Rev. 12(-13) with other parts of Revelation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev. 12:5- Rev. 2:27; 19:15 Iron sceptre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 12:5- Rev. 2:27; 3:21; 4:2; 5:1; 6:16; 7:9; 8:3; 14:3; 20:11; 21:3, 5; 22:1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The throne²⁰⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 12:9- Rev. 13:5, 6; Rev. 2:9 Slander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rev. 13:5, 6- Rev. 2:13; 20:2, 7 Satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 13:8- Rev. 3:5 The book of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The symbolism John uses is an important element for the study of intratextuality of Rev. 12(-13). The Book of Revelation makes a positive contribution by using both masculine (e.g. Michael) and feminine (e.g. the bride as New Jerusalem) symbols to describe the heavenly world, God's interaction with the earthly world, and salvation in the new age. With regard to the feminine symbolism in Revelation, the major symbols are Jezebel (Rev. 2:20), mother (Rev. 12:1),²⁰⁷ prostitute (Rev. 17:1)²⁰⁸ and bride (Rev. 21:2).

²⁰⁶ The mention of the male-child's being taken to the throne of God is the reiteration of an event which has already been described in different and more elaborate terms in ch. 5 — the glorious coming into heavenly kingly power of Jesus Christ (cf. Lubbe, 2002:4).

²⁰⁷ The following table shows the intratextual connection between Jezebel (Rev. 2) and mother (unnamed woman of Rev. 12) (see Duff, 2001:93):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jezebel</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother whose children are threatened by the Son of God (Rev. 2:23)</td>
<td>Mother whose children are threatened by Satan (Rev. 12:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to Ps. 2:8 in passage (Rev. 2:27)</td>
<td>Reference to Ps. 2:8 in passage (Rev. 12:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezebel 'leads astray' (Rev. 2:20)</td>
<td>Opponent of woman 'leads astray' (Rev. 12:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Proper sexual activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Dangerous alimentary activity directed against woman and child (Rev. 12:4, 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit sexual activity attributed to 'Jezebel' (Rev. 2:20, 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous alimentary activity practiced by 'Jezebel' and her followers (food sacrificed to idols; Rev. 2:20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁰⁸ The contrast and similarity between the woman clothed with the sun and the harlot Babylon are evident. Although both women appear elsewhere, the similar literary functions of the passages justify their correspondence: (1) both contain elaborate descriptions of the women...
These are all relational terms with the male at the centre. The normative person is male.\textsuperscript{209} The hero is male (Collins, 1993:33). Therefore, the male-centred interpretation is important and necessary. In other words, God-centred and Christ-centred interpretations are required for proper understanding.

Stevenson (1995:257-258, 268) is correct in his observation that many symbols in Revelation have received inadequate attention from the standpoint of the historical and cultural milieu from which they originated. Crown imagery provides one such example. Three types of crowns appear in Revelation: the organic wreath (\textit{στέφανος}, Rev. 2:10; 3:11; 6:2; 12:1), the diadem (\textit{διάδημα}, Rev. 12:3; 13:1; 19:12), and the golden wreath (\textit{στέφανος χρυσός}, Rev. 4:4, 10; 9:7; 14:14). Interpretations of crown imagery in Revelation generally revolve around two concepts, victory and kingship. But the role of crowns in antiquity was so diverse that to confine their meaning to one or two options is inadequate. The wreath is capable of expressing at least four different concepts: victory, royalty, divine glory, and honour (cf. Allen, 1999:304). The dragon and the beast wear various diadems (Rev. 12:3; 13:1; cf. Rev. 19:12), thus attempting to usurp authority from the rightful rulers, namely the one who sits on the throne and the Lamb (see Beale, 1999b:952). When judgment eventually comes upon the usurpers, the wearing of the diadems is taken up by the rightful bearer. The rider on the white horse appears wearing 'many diadems', carrying an iron sceptre with which to rule, and bearing the title 'King of kings and Lord of lords' (Rev. 19:11-16). In short, the parody of the satanic forces with the crown imagery enhances the victory, royalty, divine glory and honour of the Trinity.

John uses the word \textit{κράζει} (Rev. 12:2) only when a special revelation is to occur. Apart

\textsuperscript{209} It is interesting that since the one word \textit{υἱόν} is sufficient to distinguish the sex of the child (Rev. 12:5), the addition of \textit{ὁσαν} ('male') suggests an emphasis on the masculinity of Christ (Allen, 1999:309).

(Rev. 12:1; 17:4). (2) Both women are mothers (Rev. 12:5; 17:5). (3) Both are defined in terms of their relationship to God and his people (Rev. 12:5; 17:6). (4) Both are defined in terms of their relationship to God's enemies (cf. Rev. 17:3). And (5) both are located in the desert (Rev. 12:6; 17:3). The pairing contrasts salvation through the woman's child to persecution and death by the whore. This contrast helps John's audiences to identify themselves as true children of God instead of the offspring of the whore, drawing attention to the heavenly origins of the redeemed community (Lee, 1998:188-189; cf. Duff, 2001:86).
from the woman in Rev. 12, only angels, the elect and seafarers 'cry out' (Rev. 6:10; 7:2, 10; 10:3; 14:15; 18:2, 18, 19). Hence, the woman's cry emphatically signifies God's special revelation – the birth of the Messiah – is about to occur (Selvidge, 1992:162).

John's literary techniques, for instance reiteration and redundancy, also contribute to intratextual investigation in Rev. 12(-13). The introduction of the dragon figure and the unfolding of his actions (Rev. 12:3ff.) are in fact instances of reiteration: the devil and his doings have been mentioned before under different guises in Rev. 2:9, 10, 13, 24; 3:9, and probably in the locust episode in Rev. 9:1, 2, 11. In the first series of texts the dragon (i.e. Satan) was simply referred to without comment. In the second, his devastating influence in the lives of the unbelievers was alluded to. In Rev. 12:3ff., the audiences are taken back to the 'original' enmity between Satan and Christ, and given insight into what lies at the root of the current adverse experiences of the Church referred to in chs. 1-3 and further typified in ch. 11: the menacing activity of this same devil. In the following chapter (Rev. 13) the narrative reveals the way in which the devil wages his war. In brief, the dragon in Rev. 12:5 anticipates the beast in Rev. 13 by sharing similar features (cf. Lubbe, 2002:4-5).

As the dragon attempts to consume (καταφάγη, literally 'eat') the child born to the woman, clothed with the sun, in Rev. 12:4, so Babylon the harlot is accused of consuming (ἐσφάγμενον in Rev. 18:24) the prophets and saints and all people living on the earth. She is nourished by their blood (Selvidge, 1992:166). By this word in the feminine context, John accentuates the furious enmity of the Satan and his followers towards Jesus and the Church.

The Zion-Jerusalem motif contributes to the intratextuality of Rev. 12-13 in the frame of Revelation (see Du Rand, 1996a:57-58). In the OT, the Zion-Jerusalem motif has been developed, emphasising God's kingship and his presence not with a geographical but with a theological and eschatological significance. This motif reappears and is fulfilled in the Book of Revelation as well as and in Revelation 12-13.

The table below demonstrates the intratextuality of the Zion-Jerusalem motif:
If several types of God’s people are included, the above table could be extended (e.g. the survivors in Rev. 11:13; the rest of her offspring in Rev. 12:17). It is interesting that in spite of the fact that the transitional partial preterist emphasises God’s judgment on Rome from Rev. 12, indeed, in Rev. 11-22 the Zion-Jerusalem motif plays the dominant role. This fact can be explained, as Du Rand (1996a:57) argues, in that the New Jerusalem is an alternative city for John’s audiences in that they are already a part of the city and realise the parody of the harlot Babylon. Therefore, the Zion-Jerusalem motif does not exclude the theme of the Roman persecution from Revelation.

The period 1260 days in Rev. 12:6\textsuperscript{210} and 14 as the stereotyped measure of Antichrist’s rule is in exact parallelism with 3½ years in Rev. 11:2-3; 13:5 (Beckwith, 1967:636). In Rev. 11:3 the same period of time and the same story character (the Church) is seen from a different angle and in a different role (cf. Prigent, 1988:191). The sole task of the two witnesses is to prophesy for and about Jesus for the whole period of one thousand two hundred and sixty days. Indeed, a strong emphasis on the prophetic calling of the Church is accentuated. This period, of course, also coincides with that of Rev. 11:2 (i.e. the forty-two months during which the pagans are allowed to trample the holy city) and with that of Rev. 13:5 (i.e. the same number of months during which the beast from the sea receives the authority to exercise its blasphemous and oppressive rule on (Jewish or

\textsuperscript{210} Even the historicist Lee (2000:139) agrees with the many partial preterists that 3.5 years or 42 months or 1260 days in Rev. 12:6-8, 11 elapsed between the beginning of the siege and the later destruction of Jerusalem (in AD 66.5-AD 70).
Roman) earth (Lubbe, 2002:8). In this regard, certain insights of rhetorical and reader-response criticism are helpful for understanding the function of the period. The inverted repetition in which the time measurements (42 months, 1,260 days, 3½ years, ‘a time and times and half a time’) appear — 42 months (Rev. 11:2), then 1,260 days (Rev. 11:3), then 1,260 days (Rev. 12:6), then 42 months (Rev. 13:5) — helps John’s audiences to recognise that the same time period is being symbolised throughout Rev. 11-13. The additional ‘a time and times and half a time’ makes explicit allusion to the period of the saint’s persecution under the fourth beast in Da. 7:25 (see Johnson, 2001:182).

The verb πολεμέω is used to describe demonic activity in Rev. 12:7bc and 17:14. Πολεμέω is used only twice of Christ (Rev. 2:16; 19:11). In addition, the noun πόλεμος with an appropriate verb (prepare, make) occurs three times to describe satanic activity (Rev. 11:7; 12:17; 13:17); four times as neutral (Rev. 12:7; 16:14; 19:19; 20:8; cf. Rev. 9:7 and 9). Therefore, the conflict between Jesus and satanic activity is highlighted in the usage of πολεμέω and πόλεμος. A consistent thematic intratextuality is ‘God’s Holy War’ which pervades the entire Book of Revelation. It seems that John stands in a strong prophetic tradition which looks at the eschatological judgment as a war (Klassen, 1966:305-306; Boe, 2001:292-293).

The verb πλανάω (‘to cause to wander, lead astray’) in Rev. 12:9a describes the characteristic activity of Satan and his agents. It is used 8 times in Revelation (2:20; 12:9a; 13:14; 18:23; 19:20; 20:3, 8, 10). In Revelation deception (πλανάω) is intentional and associated with an evil purpose. Revelation states that a heightened future deception will most assuredly occur during tribulation. Those who will accomplish this deliberate deception are Satan (Rev. 12:9a; 20:2-3, 7-8, 10), the false prophet (Rev. 13:14; 19:20) and Babylon (Rev. 18:23). John describes the extent of the deception by using terms that have worldwide application. John refers to Satan as the

---

211 There is a decisive difference between God’s Holy War in Revelation and the Holy War account in Qumran: in the War Scroll the participation of ‘the sons of light’ in warfare is a major concern; the preparation for and organisation of this war is prescribed throughout the whole work. In contrast, in Revelation the war is fought by Christ, the angels are spectators and the Christian community is called to participate in the war and its consequent victory. Satan’s attack is directed against God’s people, not against God himself. This fact is in line with the strategy announced in Rev. 12:12.
one ‘who deceives the whole world’ (Rev. 12:9) and deceives ‘the nations’ (Rev. 20:3). Only the believing remnant will be devoid of that deception (cf. Mt. 24:4-5; 2 Th. 2:1-2, 5; see Harris, 1999:193-201).

By the first centuries BC and AD, the serpent (dragon) had become linked with the malevolent figure of Satan, the devil, the great dragon. This connection is most comprehensively articulated for the Christian community in Rev. 12:9a and 20:2-9\(^{212}\). The identity of the serpent specifically as a dragon in Revelation may have a relatively simple textual grounding in the LXX. Characteristically, the Greek text renders the wilderness ἄρη as ὄφις (Rev. 20:2; Ex. 4:3), while the water-based γῆ is δράκων (Rev. 12:9a; 20:7, 9; Ex. 7:9). The primordial serpent was re-presented for the seven churches in Asia Minor as a solely malevolent monster (i.e. the ultimate force of evil), due for defeat in the Parousia (Rev. 20:10; also see Ge. 2:25-3:1; Nu. 21:6-9; Dt. 8:15; Job 26:12-13; Pr. 30:19; Apocalypse of Abraham 23; 2 Enoch 31:3-6; Life of Adam and Eve 12-16; Phillips, 2000:238).

In terms of phraseological and thematic aspects, the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (Rev. 12:10\(^{213}\)) is similar to the phrase ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (Rev. 11:15). In Rev. 11:15 the total and cosmic comprehensiveness of the kingdom is emphasised. Here in Rev. 12:10 the sovereignty and power of that kingdom in its completeness comes to the fore. The Lord Jesus partially exercised and displayed some of this authority during his earthly ministry, though not all recognised it (e.g. Mk. 1:27; 2:20; 3:22-27). But now this authority of Christ is seen in all its consummating power, before which no enemy can stand and by which Christ completely exonerates his followers and the faith they have in him (cf. Php. 2:7-11) (Brighton, 1999:337). Besides,

\(^{212}\) In a broader perspective one can observe how Christ’s victory over Satan is presented in three stages (Bœc, 2001:255):

- first, in Rev. 12 Satan is expelled from the heaven, down on earth
- second, in Rev. 19 Satan is thrown out of the earth, into the Abyss
- third, in Rev. 20 Satan is thrown into the lake of fire

\(^{213}\) There is a structural intertextuality in the typical pattern of an audience report (e.g. 6:3-7; 8:13; 9:13; 10:4, 8; 11:12; 12:10; 14:2-3; 16:1-7; 18:4; 19:1, 6; 21:3) in which the following five elements stand out: (1) καὶ ἡκουσα (2) an object, (3) location of the object, (4) a participle form of the verb λέγω and (5) citation of what is heard (see Bœc, 2001:241).
Rev. 11:15 and Rev. 20:4 and 6 also have the expression ὁ χριστός where the emphasis is on the future reign of believers with the Anointed One. The four verses (Rev. 11:15; 12:10; Rev. 20:4, 6) which contain ὁ χριστός play an important part in the Apocalypse, encouraging those who have to suffer under the assault of the dragon and his associates. Interestingly enough, in all these cases ὁ χριστός is used in close connection with ὁ κύριος (used of God) and ὁ θεός. Also, in all these verses the word is used together with the noun βασιλεία and/or the verb βασιλεύω. The Anointed One reigns with God and the faithful reign with him (see De Jonge, 1991:87, 98-99).

Gräbe (2000:235) rightly observes the intratextuality of God’s power in Rev. 12:10 and in several passages in Revelation: “Power is an important category in apocalyptic literature. The theocentric use of δύναμις is important for interpreting this motif in the Book of Revelation”. It is interesting that the absolute power of God (as well as the Lamb) is stressed seven times in Revelation, specifically in the worship context. By doing so, John probably contrasts God’s power with the pseudo-power of Satan, which is personified into the Roman Empire/the false Judaism. Hence, socio-political significance is embedded in the concept of power. The following are the intratextures in which δύναμις is directly related to God:

Rev. 4:11: "Ἄξιος εἶ ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμήν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν...

Rev. 5:12: "Ἄξιον ἐστίν τὸ ἄριστον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν τὴν δύναμιν ...

Rev. 7:12: λέγουτες ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἵσχυς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ...

Rev. 11:17: ὅτι ἐλλήφας τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας.

Rev. 12:10: "Ἀρτι ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ...

Rev. 15:8: καὶ ἐγεμίσθη ὁ ναὸς καπνοῦ ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ ...

Rev. 19:1: ‘Ἀλληλουιά· ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ...

Closely connected with ‘God’s power’ is the reference to Χριστός in Rev. 12:10b. In Revelation the titular meaning of Χριστός is evident in Rev. 11:15, 12:10 and 20:4-6. The emphasis in these verses is on Christ’s sovereignty over his enemies. Thus, it can be
concluded that during the persecution and the distress in the middle of the first century AD, Christians in Asia Minor are still very much aware of the ‘messianic overtones’ in the designation Χριστός which is used for Jesus. As in most instances where messianic connotations are evident in the NT use of the term Χριστός (e.g. Mk. 12:35-37; Ro. 1:3-4), so in the Book of Revelation emphasis on royal elements is highlighted particularly in connection with Christ’s judgment at his parousia (cf. De Jonge, 1999:199).

North (1987:458) notes that two witnesses testify to the validity of what the other person declares (Nu. 35:30). The doctrine of the two witnesses (Rev. 11:3) throws light on the NT doctrine of the rebellious third (Rev. 8:7, 8, 9, 10, 12; 9:15, 21). In Rev. 12:4 a third of the stars of heaven are pulled down by Satan’s tail. Why these divisions into thirds? Because, for every transgressor, there are two righteous witnesses to condemn him. God’s final judgment is assured, for in God’s court, there will always be a sufficient number of witnesses to condemn the ethical rebels. Rev. 12:11 also shows the two elements i.e. (1) the blood of the Lamb and (2) the word of their testimony, which functions in the crucial role of expelling the accuser, Satan.

The doxology in Rev. 12:10-12 is related intratextually to other hymns in Revelation (Rev. 4:8, 11; 5:9-10, 12-13; 7:10, 12; 11:15, 17-18; 15:3-4; 16:5-7; 19:1-2, 5, 6-8) as well as to Rev. 12:7-9. “Hymns and doxologies are among the most attractive features of the Book of Revelation. In fact they often spring up as positive relief in the midst of scenes of terror, cries for vengeance and threats of wrath” (Smith, 1998:500). Grand hymns of victory again and again ring out during the gruesome events on earth — a heavenly liturgy celebrated by the angels and the 24 elders that probably echoes the

---

214 The hymns in Revelation carry the story line (i.e. plot) of the Book, and through them the work gradually moves to a crescendo and reaches a climax, which becomes the proclamation of the establishment of the kingdom of God and the enthronement of the Lamb (Ford, 1998:208; Letseli, 2001:194). From the narrative perspective, the hymns in Revelation not only offer meaningful interpretive commentaries on the visions but also bring about audience-involvement in the narrated world (Du Rand, 1991a:26).

215 Satan is thrown out of heaven because he was defeated by the saints through their martyrdom. This fact is actualised in the text through the battle between Michael and Satan (Rev. 12:7-9). Perhaps the reason the implied author gives so little detail about the battle (Rev. 12:11) is that Michael and his angels are only completing a task which was already accomplished through the deaths of the saints, the task of defeating Satan (Harris, 1989:157).
earthly liturgy of the Christian community. What a difference in comparison to the representations of the Jewish apocalyptic writers, who often give an impression of weakness and dejection. But in Revelation, in the case of John, lives a joyful certainty that the victory has already been purchased by the blood of the Lamb. John’s Apocalypse is not a gloomy Book, but one that is uplifting, calming and gladdening (cf. Schnackenburg, 1966:196-197). According to Ford (1998:222-223), the hymn in Rev. 12:10-12 elaborates the themes of Rev. 11:15b, that the Christ will reign, and of Rev. 11:17-18, the presence of the Christ which brings judgment with it. It may be significant that Rev. 11:15 uses ‘Anointed One’ instead of ‘Lamb’ and states that He will reign. The first indication of this is found in Rev. 12:10, where his authority is realised. The Anointed One is to be identified with the male-warrior child who is snatched up to heaven (Rev. 12:5). Whether He was involved in the overthrow of the dragon is not entirely clear, but his authority is celebrated in connection with this in Rev. 12:10.

Letseli (2001:135) points out that the hymns in Revelation highlight God’s kingship, including the means (the blood of Paschal Lamb, Jesus) of achieving it, and its terrain (heaven and earth) (cf. Du Rand, 1996a:48). Rev. 12:10-12, as well as Rev. 11:17-18, also looks forward to (forthcoming) future events in the plot. Rev. 12:12b is virtually a warning to those who dwell upon the earth about the future activity of Satan, who is coming in full wrath to those upon the earth (Harris, 1989:157).

The frequent connection of μαρτυρία with λόγος θεοῦ in the Book (Rev. 1:2; 6:9; 11:7; 20:4) shows that λόγος here means the word of God (Beckwith, 1967:626-627). In Rev. 2:13 Jesus makes mention of Antipas, Jesus’ faithful witness, who apparently had to give up his life for his faith. Rev. 6:6 reports the opening of the fifth seal, and the appearance under the altar of the souls of those who were slaughtered for the sake of God’s word and of the witness to/testimony of Jesus that they bore (for the same reason John was on Patmos in Rev. 1:9; Lubbe, 2002:6). The word of their testimony is their steadfast adherence to their profession and their confession of that truth Rev. 6:9 called confession unto righteousness with the mouth; that testimony which, despite torments, defeats the devil utterly (Durham, 2000:671). In Rev. 11:7 the audiences are told the

---

216 As Smith (1998:502) states, nowadays most researchers think that John himself authored the hymnic passages in Revelation.
opposite: the two witnesses are vanquished and killed by the beast by his waging war on them (cf. Rev. 13:7). The beast conquers the faithful (Rev. 11:7; 13:7), but at the same time, those who get trampled by the beast conquer the dragon (Rev. 12:11). Thus, the dragon’s victory is only apparent – he loses his brutal war while he has the holy killed. Actually, the faithful win by losing (Lubbe, 2002:5-6). In Rev. 11:3-13, the role of the Church is that of faithful witness, following Jesus Christ the faithful witness (Rev. 1:5). But in chapters 12-14 the Church’s role is portrayed primarily by means of the image of warfare with the forces of their enemies. The theme of witness (Rev. 11:3-13; 12:11), which occurs at the centre of the whole Book and is marked out from the rest of the Book by its form as a prediction, not a vision, contains the central statement of the message of the unsealed scroll: the way the Church’s prophetic witness to the point of death is to lead to the conversion of the nations. In a sense, the rest of Revelation expands on this theme of the Church’s witness, setting it in a broad context and elaborating on its results (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:284-285).

Koester (1989b:123, 131) pays attention to the tabernacle imagery which plays a varied role in Revelation. Rev. 7:15 anticipates the time when God will tabernacle with his people, as promised in Ezk. 37:27 and Lev. 26:11, but before the promise is fulfilled, the forces of Satan must be overcome. The angels and martyrs, who ‘tabernacle’ in heaven, vanquish Satan, but the power of evil appears again in the sea beast, who blasphemes the inhabitants of the heavenly tabernacle who had cast Satan out. The tent of witness in heaven opens and seven angels emerge with bowls full of the seven last plagues (Rev. 15:5). The descent of the tabernacle-city fulfils the vision of Rev. 7:15 and a catena of biblical promises from Leviticus, the Psalms, Ezekiel and Zechariah, indicating that it is a manifestation of God’s faithfulness (Rev. 21:2-3). The tabernacle-city is the church of the New Covenant. The vision of the tabernacle-city was initially addressed to Christians in Asia Minor who considered themselves to be Jews, but who

---

217 Both Rev. 12:12 and 13:6 refer to ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’. According to the context of Rev. 12:7-12 these beings are the angels who cast Satan down from heaven and the glorified martyrs (Rev. 12:11). In Rev. 13:6-7, the expression ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’ stands in apposition to ‘his tabernacle’ and indicates that the blasphemy was directed against the inhabitants of the σκηνή, rather than at the σκηνή (cf. Pss. 96:11; 98:7; Da. 7:20-21, 25; 8:9-10). Therefore the σκηνή probably refers to heaven and ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’ to angels and perhaps to the glorified martyrs as in Rev. 12:12 (Koester, 1989b:118).
opposite: the two witnesses are vanquished and killed by the beast by his waging war on them (cf. Rev. 13:7). The beast conquers the faithful (Rev. 11:7; 13:7), but at the same time, those who get trampled by the beast conquer the dragon (Rev. 12:11). Thus, the dragon’s victory is only apparent – he loses his brutal war while he has the holy killed. Actually, the faithful win by losing (Lubbe, 2002:5-6). In Rev. 11:3-13, the role of the Church is that of faithful witness, following Jesus Christ the faithful witness (Rev. 1:5). But in chapters 12-14 the Church’s role is portrayed primarily by means of the image of warfare with the forces of their enemies. The theme of witness (Rev. 11:3-13; 12:11), which occurs at the centre of the whole Book and is marked out from the rest of the Book by its form as a prediction, not a vision, contains the central statement of the message of the unsealed scroll: the way the Church’s prophetic witness to the point of death is to lead to the conversion of the nations. In a sense, the rest of Revelation expands on this theme of the Church’s witness, setting it in a broad context and elaborating on its results (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:284-285).

Koester (1989b:123, 131) pays attention to the tabernacle imagery which plays a varied role in Revelation. Rev. 7:15 anticipates the time when God will tabernacle with his people, as promised in Ezk. 37:27 and Lev. 26:11, but before the promise is fulfilled, the forces of Satan must be overcome. The angels and martyrs, who ‘tabernacle’ in heaven, vanquish Satan, but the power of evil appears again in the sea beast, who blasphemes the inhabitants of the heavenly tabernacle who had cast Satan out. 217 The tent of witness in heaven opens and seven angels emerge with bowls full of the seven last plagues (Rev. 15:5). The descent of the tabernacle-city fulfils the vision of Rev. 7:15 and a catena of biblical promises from Leviticus, the Psalms, Ezekiel and Zechariah, indicating that it is a manifestation of God’s faithfulness (Rev. 21:2-3). The tabernacle-city is the church of the New Covenant. The vision of the tabernacle-city was initially addressed to Christians in Asia Minor who considered themselves to be Jews, but who

217 Both Rev. 12:12 and 13:6 refer to ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’. According to the context of Rev. 12:7-12 these beings are the angels who cast Satan down from heaven and the glorified martyrs (Rev. 12:11). In Rev. 13:6-7, the expression ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’ stands in apposition to ‘his tabernacle’ and indicates that the blasphemy was directed against the inhabitants of the σατανή, rather than at the σατανή (cf. Pss. 96:11; 98:7; Da. 7:20-21, 25; 8:9-10). Therefore the σατανή probably refers to heaven and ‘those who tabernacle in heaven’ to angels and perhaps to the glorified martyrs as in Rev. 12:12 (Koester, 1989b:118).
were distinguished from non-Christian Jews by their belief in Jesus. John’s use of this imagery would have helped to confirm the identity of his audiences as the true people of God and the heirs to God’s promises. Since the church would be God’s tabernacling place in the New Covenant, John’s audiences had to remain faithful to their convictions despite emerging conflict with the apostate Jews and Roman authorities, while remaining a people set apart from the surrounding Gentile culture and its idolatry.

Strand (1990:250) observes the significance of the macrodynamic theme of ‘overcomer/conqueror’ in Revelation — that is, the Book’s development of themes in a progressive and integrated fashion throughout its entire scope. Revelation contains sixty percent of NT occurrences of the word ‘victory’ (cf. Holden, 1990:39). According to Strand (1990:250-262), the theme is integral to the entire Book (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21; 5:5; 12:11; 17:14; 21:7). John introduces the need for, the means of, and the importance of overcoming, as well as the reward for overcoming. In connection with Rev. 12:11, the theme of victor as applied to God’s saints is not to be separated from that same theme in relationship to Christ as the Victor par excellence. This basic fact is highlighted in Rev. 1:18 — the Lord Jesus victorious in death, in resurrection, and in eternal life. Revelation makes clear that the same series of victories (or overcomings) are what lie ahead for Christ’s faithful followers.

In Rev. 12:11 the saints did conquer Satan by the blood of the Lamb, and by the power of the divine word to which they have borne testimony.\footnote{Throughout Rev. 12, Satan is portrayed as a five-time loser, while Christ and his church are victorious (see vs. 5, 9, 6/14, 15-16, 17; Kistemaker, 2001:353).} If ‘by the blood of the Lamb’ (Rev. 12:11) means ‘by the fact that Jesus died’, the redemptive power of Christ’s death is meant here as in Rev. 1:5, 18; 5:9;\footnote{An intratextuality between Rev. 12:11 and Rev. 5:9 is observed in terms of the Exodus motif. Paulien (1995:259) points out that the song of Rev. 5:9-10 recalls the language of Ex. 19:5-6, which describes the inauguration of Israel as the people of God. According to Ex. 19, the giving of the law on Mount Sinai took place on the fifth day of the third month, the day that was ever after celebrated as the festival of Pentecost. As the New Moses, the Lamb receives, as it were, the new Torah from God in Rev. 5. Christ’s death produced the ‘blood of the covenant’ (Mt. 26:28), an apparent reference to the covenant ratified on Mount Sinai (Ex. 24:8). Rev. 12:11 also shows the inauguration of the New Covenant by the Paschal Lamb, the New Moses, Christ.} 7:14; 11:8 (also Jn. 1:29; 1 Jn. 1:7). In connection with ‘I was dead, and behold I am alive for ever and ever!’ (Rev. 1:18), the
death of Jesus is never forgotten throughout Revelation. In particular, in the context of the Lamb imagery of Rev. 5:7ff., the Lion from Judah has evidently conquered by dying (Rev. 5:5). In Rev. 11:8, the Lord’s crucifixion is used as a reference to identify the place where the two witnesses lie dead after their defeat. It proves to be an interesting association of Jesus’ death with that of his witnesses, as if to say: they share in his fate in every way – they will also share in his victory (Lubbe, 2002:6).

Homcy (1995:193-200) also captures the significance of the intratextual theme of overcoming/victory in the Book of Revelation as a whole when he observes that Rev. 12 provides the key to understanding the conflict of Revelation. The emphatic αὐτὸς (Rev. 12:11a) and the aorist verb ἐνικησαν (Rev. 12:11a) accent the certainty of the believer’s victory: Jesus calls them to overcome, and they will overcome. The chapters contingent to Rev. 12 provide illuminating commentary on the dynamics of the conflict. The greatest cluster of occurrences of the verb ‘to conquer’ – to overcome, to be victorious – is in Rev. 2-3. The present participle of νικάω in Rev. 2-3 (e.g. Rev. 2:7: νικῶντες) provides a dynamic sense of ongoing victory over the forces that oppose God and the seven churches in Asia Minor. In Rev. 5:5-6 John portrays the central theme of NT revelation through the images of the Lion (the Davidic Messiah-King) and of the slaughtered Lamb (the Passover Lamb) – victory through sacrifice. Jesus is the very source of true victory. In consequence, to talk of victory without Christ is to talk nonsense and defeat (Holden, 1990:39). In Rev. 11:11-12 God has the last laugh in the face of the enemy’s pseudo-victory. Rev. 13-14 preaches the same message. The beast’s triumph is no triumph at all, for his supposed victims are safely delivered to their

220 Even a cursory glance through the Book of Revelation shows that ‘the Lamb’ (ὁμνίων) is the dominant title for Jesus. It occurs no fewer than 29 times (Rev. 5:6; 6:16; 7:9-10, 17; 12:11; 14:4, 10; 15:3; 17:14; 19:7; 21:14, 22, 23, 27; 22:1, 3), whereas ‘Jesus Christ’ occurs only seven times and ‘Christ’ four times. Most of the 29 references to the Lamb occur in worship passages, which are highly significant. In other words, at the centre of heavenly worship is the prominent figure of the slain yet triumphant Lamb. Thus, it is clearly not accidental that in this vivid pictorial way the centrality of the cross is so presented. The judgment scenes are also an indispensable part of the account of the Lamb’s victory. Hence, the Lamb as a strong intratextuality of John is important to an understanding of God’s judgment as well as God’s salvation and the resultant response from the faithful throughout Revelation (cf. Guthrie, 1981:64, 69). In addition, John probably avoided ὁμνίων because of its connotation of a sacrificial lamb. In Revelation Christ is more than a sacrificial victim. He is, paradoxically, the powerful, conquering Lamb (ὁμνίων) who leads his army of martyrs to victory (see Reddish, 1995:215).
appointed destination in heaven, having delivered their appointed testimony in the world (Rev. 14:13). Thus, in Rev. 15:2 John sees those who had been victorious over the beast and his image and over the number of his name. The beast had been victorious over the saints from an earthly, temporal perspective, not from God's perspective. In Rev. 19:13 the fact that Jesus' robe is dipped in blood reminds exegetes that this is the consummation of the victory purchased on the cross. The victory of the Lamb is the assured conclusion of the Book. Chapters 19-22 expound the final triumph of the King of kings over all other rulers and peoples. In short, the theme of overcoming/victory is a thoroughly penetrating intratextuality throughout the Book of Revelation. To talk of victory in John's terms is to speak of the victory by Christ and in Christ (Holden, 1990:39).

The blood of the Lamb (Rev. 12:11) is parallel to the blood of the saints, the blood of those who bore testimony to Jesus (Rev. 17:6). The expression 'the earth and the sea' in Rev. 12:12 refers to the sphere of Satan's activity as in Rev. 10:2 (Beckwith, 1967:627). In addition, Hanson (1993:226) captures the significance of the blood (Rev. 12:11; cf. Rev. 7:14; 19:13) in terms of the purity-uncleanness. While Aaronic priesthood who must manipulate animal blood in a sanctuary, the Lamb's blood accomplished redemption for all and created a new community in which all members are symbolically priests (Rev. 5:9-10; 7:14). Instead of polluting, the Lamb's blood becomes a metaphor of purification when the saints and the Word of God wash their robes in it (Rev. 19:13-14; cf. Lev. 6:27; 7:14; 19:13).

Schmidt (1994:235) pays attention to the antithetical (intratextual) parallels between Rev. 12:15 and Rev. 22:1-2: a destructive flood gushed from the mouth of the dragon; a life-giving fountain springs from the throne of the Lamb. The fact that the earth is brought to the aid of the woman intratextually reflects the ideology put forth in the opening hymns in Rev. 4:8-11 concerning the all-powerful nature of God, and the fact that He has ultimate control over the created order (Harris, 1989:159).

The rest of her offspring, who keep the authoritative instruction of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus (τῶν τιμωρῶν τᾶς ἔντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔχοντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ, Rev. 12:17; cf. 1 Enoch 99:10; 2 Clement 4:5), are of the same family as
John on the island of Patmos (because of the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus [διὰ τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ], Rev. 1:9), the martyrs under the altar (because of the Word of God and the testimony they had maintained [διὰ τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡν εἰχὼν], Rev. 6:9), and the victims (because of their testimony for Jesus and because of the Word of God [διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ], Rev. 20:4). They are the Christians whose communion with the crucified Christ urged to confession, to testimony and eventually to suffering (cf. Prigent, 1988:196-197).

4.2. Intratextuality of Revelation 13

The term ‘beast’ (θηρόνος) is used more than 40 times in Revelation and only 4 times in the rest of the NT. Only once in Revelation (6:8) is it used to denote animals as such, all the other references are to one of the two beasts fully introduced in Rev. 13, though referred to already in Rev. 11:7 (Bœc, 2001:252-253). The beast (Rev. 17:3) upon which the woman sits is presumably the same that rose up from the sea (Rev. 13:1). The horns in Rev. 13:1 are the symbol of a number of kings who are to aid Satan’s deputy in Rev. 17:10ff., and crowns are assigned them to designate them specially as kings, as with the 24 elders in Rev. 4:4 (Beckwith, 1967:634).

As argued by Schmidt (1994:244-245), interchangeable terminologies for the sea include the primordial chaos, the abode of the dead, sea monsters, the demonic realm, and human enemies of God and his people. In fact, sea imagery (esp. in the later chapters of Revelation: 12:17-13:1; 17:1, 15; 18:11-21; 19:20; 20:13; 21:1) denotes primarily unredeemed people and not place (contra Du Preez, 2000:10). Schmidt (1994:235) also points out two antithetical intratextualities in Rev. 13 and Rev. 14: there is a clear movement from ‘I saw a beast rising out of the sea’ (Rev. 13:1) and ‘I saw another beast coming up out of the earth’ (Rev. 13:11) to ‘Then I looked, and there was the Lamb, standing on Mount Zion’ (Rev. 14:1). The beast requires a mark to be worn on the right hand or on the forehead (Rev. 13:16-18); the Lamb writes his name on the forehead of the saints (Rev. 14:1).

θρόνος is used only three times (Rev. 2:13; 13:2; 16:10) as seat of power of the devil or...
of the beast from the sea. But the one who occupies the throne, and that in heaven, is God, and this fact is described in ch. 4 and then repeatedly referred to throughout Revelation. In connection with the throne of the devil, however, the audiences may well ask: "Where on earth is this throne? The devil has no place in heaven (Rev. 12:8), and he seems to be roaming around on earth. Where is his throne?" Rev. 2:13 is a symbolic way of describing a religious feature of Pergamum, namely its central position in the Roman emperor cult.\(^{221}\) The narrative keeps silent about the origin or place of the devil’s throne. Nowhere is he depicted as sitting on a throne.

The head itself in Rev. 13:3 is seen as one that has been slain and then restored, precisely as in Rev. 5:6 the Lamb bears the mark of having once been slain. If the beast and the heads are viewed separately, it is evident that the loss of one head did not involve the death of the beast, for he is seen from Rev. 17:10 to have survived the loss of five heads (Beckwith, 1967:635).

As in Rev. 21:27 the book of life belonging to the Lamb appears in Rev. 13:8. The authority of the Lamb over the book is also implied in Rev. 3:5 (Beckwith, 1967:637). ‘All whose names have been written in the book of life’ are the same as those who were sealed in Rev. 7:4 and excepted from the hurt of the fifth trumpet in Rev. 9:4 and the 144,000, who are standing as conquerors over the beast with the Lamb upon Mount Zion in Rev. 14:1 (Durham, 2000:705).

According to Peterson (1988:69-71), the worship of the dragon and the beast and his image (Rev. 13:4, 8, 12, 15) recurs throughout Revelation, because, in a sense, the theme of the Apocalypse is the distinction between true worship (e.g. Rev. 7:11; 11:16; 14:7; 19:10; 22:8f.) and idolatry.\(^{222}\) In Rev. 9:20 a large proportion of humanity is

\(^{221}\) In the same vein, Letseli (2001:116) also argues that the throne of Satan in Rev. 2:13 may contain an allusion to the cult of Aesculapius at Pergamum, or more narrowly to the altar to Zeus in the fortress there. The dragon gives a throne to the beast in Rev. 13:2, and an angel pours out a vial on the throne of the beast in Rev. 16:10. This results in darkness for his kingdom; the throne and dominion are related.

\(^{222}\) Though προσκυνέω in Rev. 13 (vs. 4, 8, 12, 15) is linked with the worship of the beast, the verb is also used for the worship of God throughout the Book (Rev. 4:10; 5:14; 7:11; 11:16; 19:4, 10; 22:8; cf. 3:9). In this regard, bodily postures or gestures are remarkable. Two gestures of worship appear in Revelation without evaluative comments: ‘fell down on their faces’ (Rev.
envisaged as worshiping ‘demons and idols’. And the third angel (Rev. 14:9) brings a proclamation recalling the decree of Rev. 13:15-17, that those who will not worship the beast and his image or receive his mark should be persecuted and killed. Now it is revealed that those who do worship the beast and bear his mark suffer a much worse fate at the hands of God. God’s wrath against the worshippers of the beast is then portrayed in Rev. 16:2 and the punishment of the beast and the false prophet who had persuaded people to worship the beast is recorded in Rev. 19:20.

John calls special attention to his warning by the familiar formula in Rev. 13:9, used in the NT and Rev. 2-3 (Bechwith, 1967:638). Aune (1983a:278) notes that each of the seven proclamations in Rev. 2-3 concludes with the repeated statement: “If anyone has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches” (cf. Mt. 11:15; 13:9, 43; Mk. 4:9, 23; Lk. 8:8; 14:35). The formula also occurs in Rev. 13:9, the only instance (out of fifteen occurrences in the NT) where it is not attributed to the earthly or risen Christ. This short exhortation has been labeled a *Weckruf* or *Weckformel*, i.e. a formula which calls attention to the significance of what has been said. Functionally this exhortation is similar to the proclamation formula (e.g. “Hear the word of Yahweh!”) which often introduces prophetic oracles in the OT, though there are similar examples from non-canonical literature (e.g. Gospel of Thomas 8:21, 24, 63, 65, 96; Acts of Thomas 82; Gospel of Mary 7:9; 8:10-11; Pistis Sophia 1:17, 18, 33, 42, 43; see Aune, 1997:150).

Peterson (1988:73) maintains that in connection with Rev. 13:10, following the portrayal of the judgment of God on all idolaters, John’s call is for ‘patient endurance on the part of the saints who obey God’s commandments and remain faithful to Jesus’ (Rev. 14:12). John’s aim is not simply negative: to warn his audiences of the persecution they must endure. John writes positively to encourage his audiences to persevere in their obedience to divine relation, to continue in their reliance on Jesus and his redemptive work, and to hold fast to the testimony of the risen Christ. Consequently, Christian worship involves a life orientation and not just cultic activity. To put it another way,

7:11; 11:16), ‘fell at his feet’ (Rev. 3:9; 19:10; 22:8). It seems that both gestures signify deep reverence and independence. But John does not emphasise the carriage or gestures themselves but the motivated and educative forces to which the outward gestures point (see Du Toit, 1994a:270, 274).
Christian worship is the ongoing expression of Christian faith in each circumstance of life.

According to Duff (2001:114-115), John binds Jezebel (Rev. 2:20) to the beast from the earth (Rev. 13:11) in three specific ways. First, he focuses on the verb πεπνύω (to deceive: Rev. 2:20; 12:9; 13:14), a term he associates with both characters. Second, he emphasises the prophetic abilities of each (Rev. 2:20; 13:15). Third, having connected those figures in these two ways, John reinforces that connection by describing the appearance of the beast in a manner that calls to mind John's rival (Rev. 13:11). As the image of the land beast is a curious amalgam of various beastly components (pseudo image of Christ), so Jezebel looks like Christ (i.e. she is a nominal Christian) but does not sound like Christ.

Fire, πῦρ, is a recurring and intratextual concept in Revelation, particularly in contexts of judgments. It is used 26 times, but some of these references do not refer to destruction. In this connection, a related text of Rev. 13:13 is Rev. 11:5. The two witnesses have the authority of consuming their enemies by fire as a defensive means (Rev. 11:5: καὶ εἰ τις αὐτοῖς θέλει ἀδικήσαι πῦρ, ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ κατεσθίει τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν καὶ εἰ τῇ θελήσῃ αὐτοῖς ἀδικήσαι, οὔ -τως δὲι αὐτῶν ἀποκτανθῆναι). The second beast (Rev. 13:13: καὶ ποιεῖ σημεία μεγάλα, ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιή ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάειν223 εἰς τῇ -ν γῆν ἐνωπίων τῶν ἀνθρώπων), however, performs great signs, e.g. making fire fall from heaven, in order to deceive the inhabitants of the earth into worshipping the image of the first beast. (cf. Bøe, 2001:335).

The formula emphasising universality in Rev. 13:7 and 16 appears in Rev. 5:9, 13, 7:9, 10:11, 11:19; 12:12, 14:6; and 17:15. The table below shows their intratextual

---

223 καταβάειν (come down) is another characteristic intratextual verb in Revelation. A list of the ten references to this verb in Revelation according to the subjects of the 'coming down', shows a great variety: Rev. 3:12: the New Jerusalem (Rev. 3:12); another strong angel (Rev. 10:1); the devil (Rev. 12:12); fire (Rev. 13:13); huge hailstones (Rev. 16:21); another angel (Rev. 18:1); an angel (Rev. 21:1); fire (Rev. 20:9); the holy city, the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:2, 10).
The above intratextual parallelism reinforces the fact that the Book of Revelation develops a cosmic drama of God’s kingdom (or nations’ conversion) through his salvation and punishment (cf. Beckwith, 1967:641; Bauckham, 1993a:326).

Shea (1985:54) points out the recurrence of the evil trinity in Revelation, namely dragon, the sea beast, and the land beast (false prophet):

224 The universal character appears also in the image of the New Jerusalem, the bride of Christ. John does not describe an eternally secure place. He depicts eternally secure peoples. The huge dimensions of the city do not mean that it has to be large to hold all the saints, so much as that all the saints whom the city represents will amount to an astronomically high number. With its twelve thousand stadia, long, wide and high (Rev. 21:16), the city is reminiscent of the twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel, especially since the cubical shape of the city makes twelve edges of twelve thousand stadia each, coming to a total of 144,000, just as in the case of the Israelites. Hence, the New Jerusalem has a rhetorical function in that John aims to lift his suffering saints out of their sense of isolation by pointing to the immense number of the redeemed (Rev. 7:1-8; 14:1-5; cf. Gundry, 1987:260).
Throughout the Book of Revelation, the evil trinity imitates the Trinity, which eventually executes redemptive words through the faithful. Revelation's theme is the transfer of the sovereignty of the whole world from the dragon and the beasts who presently dominate it, to God, whose universal kingdom is to come on earth (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:242).

4.3. Concluding summary

Among John's literary techniques for emphasising his theological points, (lexical, thematic, wording, phraseological, structural\textsuperscript{225}) repetition, reiteration and symbolism contribute to show the fact that John intratextually focuses his gist on Rev. 12-13.\textsuperscript{226}

The following figure illustrates the central position of Rev. 12-13 as the intratextual focus in the whole Book:\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{225} Since structural parallels consist of a number of interlocking verbal and thematic parallels, they normally constitute the strongest evidence for direct intertextuality. Verbal parallels are often the weakest criterion for direct intertextuality (Paulien, 1988a:44).

\textsuperscript{226} If the following chiastic structure of the Book of Revelation is correct, a strong intratextual relationship between Rev. 12-13 and Rev. 14-17 is highlighted (see Lee, 1998:174):

A (Rev. 12:1-6) The woman: salvation through the male child  
B (Rev. 12:7-18) Judgment and defeat of God's enemies: the dragon thrown down to the earth  
C (Rev. 13:1-18) Moment of decision: the beast and its worshippers  
C' (Rev. 14:1-20) Moment of decision: the Lamb and his followers  
B' (Rev. 15:1-16:21) Judgment and defeat of God's enemies: the bowl judgments  
A' (Rev. 17:1-6) The woman: killing of the saints by Babylon

In addition, the above chiastic structure supports the recapitulation theory of Revelation.\textsuperscript{227} A very similar phenomenon in the intratextuality of Rev. 12-13 is Rabbinic Midrash. The closure of the corpus of texts turned intertextuality into the archetypal mode of exegetical work.
From the above figure, it becomes clear that Rev. 12-13 plays the role of a window through which John's (Jewish and Gentile) audiences can view previous parts in retrospect as well as anticipate the following part. The rest of the Book of Revelation (chs. 14-22) expands on Rev. 12-13, setting it in a broad context and elaborating on its results.

As a matter of fact, exploration of socio-historical and literary aspects, and intratextuality of Rev. 12-13 plays the role of a stepping stone for the intertextuality of John and his audiences (cf. Bloomquist, 1999:175). On the basis of the socio-textual context and intratextuality of Rev. 12-13, now it is time to probe the intertextuality of John and his audiences. Rainbow (1996:211) rightly observes abundant intertextuality and intratextuality in the Apocalypse of John: "Not only is the Revelation an intertextual tour de force, it also presents a tight system of cross-references within itself. They are often implicit. A given word-picture will crop up in a number of places in the book. If the author nowhere drops a specific hint as to its meaning, the reader must work that out by following the web of its multiplex links with other symbols".

In rabbinic Judaism. All the analogical procedures of gezerah shawah or heqesh presuppose intertextual links at the verbal, nominal, or thematic level, thus allowing for certain unmarked features of Scripture to be brought to the fore; or all the cases where ostensible contradictions are juxtaposed and resolved in such a way that new meanings are produced and mediated. Intertextual correlation is also a primary feature of midrashic homilies. The basic principle of intertextual correlation lies at the heart of every prooftext cited to reinforce a teaching derived from another text (see Fishbane, 2000:43).
John’s intertextuality of Rev. 12-13 in the light of the OT, the NT, and the non-canonical texts will shed light on the partial preterism in that it will explore the relationship between the destruction of Jerusalem and that of Rome. Moreover, the intertextuality of John’s Jewish and Gentile audiences, too, will show how each group responds differently to John’s message. Intertextuality of Rev. 12-13 therefore will solve the problem caused by the two lines of partial preterism.
CHAPTER 5.

INTERTEXTUALITY OF REVELATION 12-13

In terms of intertextuality, there exist significant differences between the Book of Revelation and apocalyptic literature. In this regard, Schnackenburg (1966:188) remarks that Jewish apocryphal works are only a combining and compiling of older materials from the prophetic books of the OT, adeptly blended, seasoned with interesting questions, and given new interpretation. Exegetes do not deny the religious content of these apocalypses, but they know these do not contain any genuine prophecy. Whoever takes into account the setting of John’s Apocalypse without allowing him/herself to be misled by the peculiarities of the environment, will discern a vast unified view of the true Christian prophecy.

5.1. John’s intertextuality for receptive production

The importance of the author’s intertextuality is disclaimed in the circles of deconstruction and radical reader response criticism. Aichele and Phillips (1995:14-15), for example, argue that intertextuality displaces the reductive binary opposition of exegesis/eisegesis with ‘intergesis’, which is the act of rewriting or inserting texts within some more or less established network. They even go on to insist that meaning does not lie ‘inside’ texts but rather in the space ‘between’ texts. Meaning is not an unchanging ideal essence but rather variable, fluid and contextual, depending upon the systemic forces at work that bind texts to one another. But the precise intertextuality of author based on the intratextuality prevents exegetes from uncontrolled fluidity of meaning in a text. Moreover, the assertion of postmodern advocates, namely, ‘the death of the author’, has resulted in the disappearance of the reader. The renunciation of the authorial subject requires that the reader be regarded impersonally (Rajan, 1991:73).

Concerning John’s literary effort, it is his perception of his audiences’ language style that determines his evaluation of what his own appropriate style should be for the telling of his story. John is undeniably a considerate author, that is, one who is person-centred, reader-focused, rhetorically sensitive (Malina, 1994:169-170).
5.1.1. Who is John?

The answer to the question ‘Who is John?’ is crucial as a preliminary step for the investigation of John’s intertextuality. Carroll (1993:73-74) spells out that “the long occupation with the author of texts in biblical studies, the almost obsessional concern to identify who wrote what and to attribute every fragment of a text to a specific author … … these are concerns that have been in the process of being abandoned in recent decades. An intertextual approach to biblical texts should assist that abandonment further”. However, Carroll’s argument is problematic in that the introductory matter of authorship is still indispensable, at least as far as the intertextual study on the production of a text is concerned.

Three times in chapter 1 (vs. 1, 4, 9) and once in chapter 22 (v. 8), the author identifies himself as John.\(^{228}\) As early as the second century AD, Justin Martyr (ca. AD 140), Irenaeus (ca. AD 180) and Clement of Alexandria (ca. AD 200) identified the author of Revelation as the apostle John. In the third century,\(^{229}\) however, Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, compared the style and themes of Revelation with the Gospel of John and concluded that the two must have had different authors. Modern scholars discern the same differences, and so various hypotheses have arisen to throw doubt on Justin’s and Irenaeus’s testimony (see Poythress, 2000:49). In this regard, Freed (1991:369) correctly notes that many attempts to solve the riddle of the authorship of Revelation both through the reference to John and through external evidence, could be intelligent guesses.

Among conservative scholars, Smalley’s view on the authorship of Revelation is that

\(^{228}\) From the fact that the writer uses the name ‘John’, it can be assumed that John the apostle speaks as a person with unquestionable authority and that he is well-known to all the churches in the province of Asia (western Turkey). By simply calling himself John, without any additional designation, everybody immediately knew just who was meant. Like Paul (Php. 1:1; 1 Th. 1:2; 2 Th. 1:1), John does not need to mention the designation ‘apostle’. In addition, the author of the fourth Gospel and of the three epistles never mentions his own name (cf. Greijdanus, 1955:6-7; Hendriksen, 1975:16-17; Kistemaker, 2001:21).

\(^{229}\) Of course, there were those who advocated John the apostle’s authorship in the third century AD: Tertullian of Carthage (ca. AD 220), Origen of Alexandria (ca. AD 223), and Hippolytus (ca. AD 240) (see Hendriksen, 1975:19).
John the apostle is the beloved disciple, and that he is the inspiration behind the Johannine community, which is in some sense gathered around him, and that he is also behind the Gospel and Letters, which come to birth in the Johannine church itself. He admits that the existence of such a group is speculative. The writer's knowledge of Asia, and his obviously Hebraic-Christian background, evidenced by a profound indebtedness to the Jewish apocalyptic and the world and scriptures of the OT, supports the view that the Apocalypse could have derived from the apostle John (Smalley, 1994:16-17, 39). However, there is little or no evidence in Revelation to determine whether or not it stems from John the apostle. John avoids the self-designation 'apostle'. If the apostle wrote Revelation, it is understandable why, like his brother James, John was called Boanerges, Son of Thunder. In Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Sardis and other cities of Asia Minor John, rather than Peter or Paul, was looked upon as the highest head of the Church (Durant, 1971:592).

It is often argued that John was a very common name and that therefore exegetes have no real reason for ascribing Revelation to the same author as the Gospel of John. In this regards, Du Rand (1993:235-237) observes that Revelation itself neither denies apostolic authorship nor explicitly indicates it, and assumes that John may have been an itinerant Christian apocalyptic prophet casting his ministry in the mould of the classic Jewish prophets. John the Baptist is also nominated as the author by Ford (1982:50-54), who argues that Rev. 4-11 originated among John the Baptist’s followers before they came to know Jesus, and that the chapters were written during ‘the time of the Baptist’ and before the ministry of Jesus. Rev. 12-22 is later, but still came from the Baptist’s disciples. But Ford’s argument is only speculative.

Fekkes (1994:49) is correct when he maintains that although John never explicitly calls himself a prophet, his own prophetic consciousness is clearly attested throughout the

---

230 It can also be assumed that whatever the truth about the use of the name John among the Jews, the fact is that exegetes do not have a great number of Christian Johns to choose from. Exegetes have no certain knowledge of any Christian John of this period other than the apostle and John Mark (Morris, 1990:33).

231 In contrast to Du Rand, Mackenzie (1997:3) mistakenly holds that the author of Revelation was a Gentile-Christian, not a Jewish-Christian.
Book in a variety of ways. This prophetic awareness can be illustrated by means of four lines of evidence: testimony related to the word group "προφητεύειν" (Rev. 1:3; 2:20; 10:11; 11:6; 19:10; 22:7, 9, 10, 18, 19), the significance of John’s prophetic commission (Rev. 1:10-20; 10:8-11), formal elements of prophetic speech (τὸ δὲ λέγειν = thus says; oracles delivered in the first person, and symbolic prophetic action [Rev. 10:8-11]) and the absolute authority of John’s prophecy (Rev. 1:1-2, 10-11; 22:18-19). Fekkes (1994:38) goes on to claim that, as a Jewish-Christian prophet, John’s theological and eschatological concepts are firmly rooted in the OT, which he clearly regards as the prime locus of God’s revelation. Indeed, while the apocalyptic character of Revelation should not be underestimated, it must be kept in mind that John’s use of previous prophetic and apocalyptic tradition is almost exclusively limited to the OT.

Today the consensus on the authorship of Revelation is that only one author wrote the Book, though he certainly alludes to many OT, Jewish and Greco-Roman sources. While John, the beloved disciple, may well have written the Book, another John could also have written it. Regardless of which John wrote it, the author of the Book identifies himself as a prophet (Rev. 1:1-3; 22:6-7). As Beale (1999b:35) points out, it is therefore probable that John should be socially identified with a group of early Christian itinerant prophets (cf. Du Rand, 1999:1768). Whether John is Jesus’ disciple or not, he seems to be well acquainted with the OT and the eschatological discourses of Jesus. Of course, he uses the framework of pagan myths and alters it for his own theological reasons.

As Fekkes (1994:177-178) observes, the major issue of Rev. 12-13 on which commentators differ concerns the sources of John’s imagery and the extent of his own contribution. Two prevailing schools of thought have emerged. Some hold that the basic features of this source are usually identified as belonging to a popular ‘pagan myth’ (Charles, Giblin, A.Y. Collins among others). Other commentators, however, while allowing various degrees of mythological influence, uphold the unity of the chapter and argue that most, if not all, of the imagery and story line can be explained on the basis of ‘OT and NT’ (Kraft, Ford, Sweet, Prigent, Comblin and Feuillet). Both views have a certain amount of support from the evidence. On the one hand, there are striking similarities between the narrative in Revelation 12-13 and pagan myth, a form of which was known in Asia Minor. On the other hand, it would be hard to believe that in these all-important chapters John completely abandons his favourite source (the OT) for an unassimilated pagan model. One solution proposes that John has taken over an earlier Jewish adaptation of the myth, which already contained a Messianic outlook and biblical language. As Beale (1999b:634) asserts, the NT and the OT are the filter/lens through which extra-biblical traditions and myths are subordinated and transformed to biblical thought. Thus, it seems best to conclude that Revelation 12-13 reflects a combination of (canonised) pagan myth, OT prophecy and Christian tradition.
To assert that the author is not the apostle John is not to deny its canonicity. Apostolic authorship may be an indicator of canonicity, but it is not a sine qua non (Gentry, 1989:22; cf. Gaffin, 1988:253). Gaffin (1988:256) summarises this fact succinctly as follows: the NT is not a collection that 'just happened', a kind of brute fact hanging there on the horizon of the past. Rather, it is that historical phenomenon by which God, the sovereign Architect and Lord of history, asserts and maintains himself as canon, that is, by which his supreme authority comes to expression. As a consequence, as Poythress (2000:49) correctly observes, Revelation stresses that its message and content derive ultimately from Jesus Christ and from God the Father (Rev. 1:1, 11; 2:1; 22:16, 20). Thus, it possesses full divine authority (Rev. 22:18-19). Hence, this divine authority, rather than the identity of the human author, remains the most significant foundation for interpretation.

5.1.2. John's NT intertexture (i.e. John's NT inner-biblical intertexture)

The way in which John uses the NT is similar to his use of the OT in that he freely makes use of both Testaments to suit his purposes. Because of its measured unity (see the above-mentioned structure of Rev. 12-13) Revelation 12-13 seems not to invite source criticism. However, John's profusion of quotations and allusions to support his theological aim must be explained (cf. Mazzaferri, 1989:56). It is remarkable that the communication system ('interchurch travel' through 'holy internet', to use Thompson's term) of the first century AD must have contributed to the spread of the NT writings in the Mediterranean world. According to Thompson (1998:58-59), "Especially in the early days, survival of the local body of Christ depended on a network of support. The holy internet hungered for news. Their shared commitment to love and their sense of"

\[233\text{ In church history it is likely that once 'apostolicity' (in the narrower sense of the Twelve Apostles as the foundation of the church and spokesmen and representatives of the Lord in his absence) played the role of 'the criterion' of canonicity, when the old catholic church excommunicated the Montanists during AD 150-180. Confronted by the (chiliastic) Montanist revival of early Christian enthusiasm with its claims that the age of the Paraclete promised by Christ had now been ushered in by the New Prophecy, the leaders of the church for the first time carried through to its logical consequences the idea of a dispensation which came to its close with the death of the Apostles, and accordingly excluded all writings not belonging to this old epoch. Although apostolicity is a very important criterion of canonicity, this absolutised apostolicity is just a temporarily reactional phenomenon against specific heresy in church history (see Stonehouse, 1929:2, 36).}\]
community as God's family naturally led Christians to desire information about how brothers and sisters were faring. Eschatological fervour gave a further urgency to sharing news. In the first century messages were delivered relatively fast. For instance, from Ephesus (as the main destination of Revelation) to other Diaspora areas or Palestine (as destinations of many NT writings) it took less than a month. In brief, interchurch fellowship through the holy internet in the first century could have made John's NT intertextuality more effective.

5.1.2.1. The Olivet Discourse

There are two radically different opinions about the date of the Olivet Discourse. Firstly, a few scholars assume the date of the Olivet Discourse to be during the time of Bar Kochba in AD 132-135, because they conjecture that for the most part, the only genuinely reliable point of reference is the fact that the Synoptic Gospels look back to the destruction of Jerusalem and consequently must have been written after the year 70. Secondly, the date of AD 37-41, the time of the Caligula Crisis, is nominated by G. Hölscher and G. Theissen. Indeed, the Olivet Discourse has parallels (and intertextual relations) with the persecutions in Jewish history in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. There may be some truth behind these theories, but there is no clear evidence to support them. They are matters of speculation (see Detering, 2000:161-162). In connection with John's intertextuality of the Olivet Discourse (Mt. 24; Mk. 13; Lk. 21),234 in the 18th century, Firmin Abauzit (1679-1767) interpreted the Apocalypse of John in terms of its parallelism with Mark 13 and came to the conclusion that the Apocalypse depicts the persecution of Nero (see Böcher, 1980:22).

The textual context of the Olivet Discourse is crucial. Throughout the Gospel according to Matthew both the Jewish leaders and the crowds (Mt. 27:22-23) are portrayed as an evil and wicked generation who have set themselves in constant opposition to God. Clearly Mt. 23 plays an important part in the development of this Matthean leitmotif. The so-called 'lament over Jerusalem', found in Mt. 23:37-39, strongly suggests that

---

234 Within the NT itself in general, there is a strong intertextual factor in the production of the Synoptic Gospels, where the Gospels feed on and off each other. The intertextual nature of the Olivet Discourse, in particular, cannot be gainsaid (Carroll, 1993:59-60).
Matthew is seeking to explain the destruction of Jerusalem. This has happened not because God suddenly changed his mind and decided not to favour Israel after all, but because the Jews have rejected the Christ whom God has sent. Mt. 23:2-31 forms a polemical section which was written against the scribes and Pharisees. Matthew then adds to it (Mt. 23:2-31) the eschatological meaning of Mt. 23:32-39. In so doing Matthew has broadened the whole context of the debate. Indeed, the whole of the Jewish nation is symbolised by Jerusalem itself (see Newport, 1995:74-75). Here, the seven woe oracles (Mt. 23:13-36) are a further noteworth mentioning. Mt. 23:13-36 is not a random selection of complaints, but a structured series of charges aimed at key aspects of the outlook, practices and leadership roles in the Jewish community. The first two woes (Mt. 23:13-15) concern membership in the community. The following three woes (Mt. 23:16-26), concerned with oaths, tithes and purity, attack the legal system (oaths), economy (tithes, taxes) and customs (purity rules) that hold the Jewish community together and give it identity. Finally, the last two woe oracles (Mt. 23:27-31) bring to a climax the attack against the personal ethics and intentions of the leaders with charges of lawlessness and murder. The Matthean community was largely Jewish, and the problems it faced included the crisis of having been recently excluded from the synagogue (Verhey, 2002:423). Accordingly, Matthew seeks to present the current form of Jewish society as misguided and corrupt in its practices and leadership. In short, Matthew envisions an authentically and faithfully reformed Jewish society as the correct response to God's will and contrasts it negatively with the mode of living Judaism found in the Jewish community at large. Because of the conflict and resultant differentiation, the members of Matthew's community, as the true Jews, find their core identity and their master status (denoting a primary trait of a person to which all others

---

235 Despite several dissimilarities in certain verbal forms, the parallels between Mt. 23:32-39 and 1 Th. 2:15-16 are striking. The two passages share several key words such as προφήτας, φονεύω, δίώκω and ἀποκτείνω. Similarly, the central thought behind the two passages is the same: the Jews persecute the Church and in so doing 'fill up' the measure of their fathers. God's wrath has, therefore, come upon them (Newport, 1995:171).

236 In this regard, Luomanen (2002:128-129) regards Matthew's community not as a sect but as a cult movement in that the latter comes into existence when invented 'new' religious ideas gain social acceptance. Although Jesus' role can be partly traced back to Jewish messianic expectations there is so much 'new' to it that it can be regarded as a religious innovation. Regardless of the terms - sect and cult - the works of Jesus depicted in Matthew and the reality of Matthean community transparentised from the Gospel have new elements compared with common Judaism, to use E.P. Sanders's term.
are subordinate) in being believers-in-Jesus.\textsuperscript{237} To be sure, this anti-Jewish description of the Matthean community corresponds to the seven churches in Asia Minor (see Saldarini, 1991:52-57).

There has been much debate about the meaning of the Olivet Discourse in apocalyptic language. It seems that the majority opinion is that Jesus predicts the end of the world and the second coming of Christ. The Olivet Discourse has been one-sidedly understood up to the present time as a futurist interpretation of the Book of Revelation. In other words, scholars pay attention to the aspect of ‘not yet’ in the Olivet Discourse.\textsuperscript{238} Wright (1996:635-639), however, rejects this interpretation, insisting that the Olivet Discourse describes an apocalyptic event in history, and should not be seen as a literal description of the end of history.\textsuperscript{239} Though it is in the nature of apocalyptic language to

\textsuperscript{237} With regard to the ‘identity’ (meaning that which defines the central commitment or investment of members of a community) of the Matthean community, there is a strong intertextual connection between (the Apocalypse of) John and (the Gospel of) Matthew. Their common strategies for reinforcing their group identity are: (1) Naming: Revelation and the Gospel employ various names (e.g. brothers, blessed, \textepsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha, the wise) for its audiences which secure separation from other communities. (2) Vilification of opponents: like John, Matthew vilifies Jesus’ opponents, the religious leaders. He names them as enemy, hypocrite, blind guides, evil, serpent, and brood of vipers (Mt. 12:34; 23:15-16, 24, 27, 33). (3) Apocalyptic eschatology: in spite of realised eschatology in Matthew, generally speaking there are two ages (the present evil age and the future glorious age). There are two cosmic forces: God and Satan. There are two social groups: the righteous and the wicked (Mt. 13:36-43; 25:31-46). And (4) central focus: John and Matthew reinforce commitment to Jesus as the central feature of the community’s identity (Mt. 4:19-22; 23:10) (see Carter, 2000b:8-10; Luomanen, 2002:124 and for John’s strategy to reinforce his audiences’ identity, see the socio-scientific interpretation of Revelation in this work 2.1.11.2.2.).

\textsuperscript{238} As Du Rand (2001:116-117) remarks, it is indeed not always easy to distinguish Jesus’ prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in AD 70 from the coming of the consummated kingdom at the end of history. But in contrast to Du Rand, even Mk. 13:24 and 27 (cf. Lk. 21:25-36) can be regarded as passages which depict, not the consummation of history, but the destruction of Jerusalem in the apocalyptic tone.

\textsuperscript{239} Concerning the relationship between the Olivet Discourse and Revelation, Walker’s (1996:252-253) opinion is interesting. He avers: "John is using the Olivet Discourse as the springboard for a wider application. At first glance the Olivet Discourse deals specifically with Jerusalem; yet it also operates at a second level – the level of Jesus’ Parousia and the judgment of the entire world. John draws out that secondary application. More importantly, if John is aware of this dual purpose within the Olivet Discourse (applying both to Jerusalem and to the End), he may well have been assuming that the fall of Jerusalem acts as a paradigm of that later event. There would then be an inherent inter-connectedness between what happened to Jerusalem and what happened to the world as a whole (which John subsequently terms ‘Babylon’)". Although Walker is on right track when he insists that the destruction of Jerusalem functions as a type, the base-metaphor, and a paradigm for the entire world End, his conclusion can be reverted as follows: the fall of Jerusalem (as a parousia, a base-paradigm and a type) is
have multiple references, Wright believes that the primary reference at least is to the events which are predicted in Mt. 24\(^{240}\) and its parallels: that is, the fate of Jesus and of Jerusalem seen in terms of the ‘coming’ (i.e. the vindication) of the son of man; and that it is closely correlated in turn with the ‘arrival’ and enthronement of the ‘Ancient of days’. Although the idea of Jesus’ return (the so-called ‘Second Coming’) has a place in the Olivet Discourse, it is neither central nor major. The time-lag between the ministry of Jesus and the destruction of Jerusalem will be a period in which, in Jesus’ absence, his followers will be open prey to the deceit of false messiahs and will face a period of great suffering before their vindication dawns (see Moyise, 2001c:27). Indeed, the textual information that precedes Mt. 24, too, reinforces the significance of a parousia/coming, because Mt. 23:34-39 deals with the rejection and judgment of Jerusalem and her leaders and the prediction of the destruction of the temple (contra Vorster, 1991:1102).

In a similar way, Painter (1997:561) accurately contends that the Olivet Discourse (esp. the primary reference both in the Olivet Discourse and in Revelation which alludes to the worldwide final End and the Parousia (esp. Mt. 25). Therefore the same conclusion can be applied to Revelation: the main reference of Babylon is Jerusalem, which alludes to Rome in a negative way as well as to the New Jerusalem in a positive way. In fact, the inter-connectedness of the Jerusalem fall and the end of the world (or the Parousia) should not blur the distinction between the primary reference and its allusions in the Olivet Discourse and in Revelation.

\(^{240}\)Ridderbos (1965:15) believes that the reasons for the fact that the Gospel of Matthew was written before AD 70 are (1) there is no mention on the destruction of Jerusalem in Matthew, (2) the description of Jerusalem’s fall and the coming national disaster of the Jewish people in the Eschatological Discourse of Jesus are depicted as an indissoluble connection with the eschatological events of the great end-time, and (3) Mt. 22:7 regarded as the clue to a writing date of after AD 70 has to be understood in terms of the fact that Jesus said it after AD 70 (contra Horsley, 2001:131). In spite of the writing date of Matthew before AD 70, as White (1991:238-241) assumes, the Gospel of Matthew was composed not only to reinforce longstanding beliefs of an existing Christian community, but also to respond to a crisis that had recently arisen. The identity of the Matthean Christian community comprising the mixed community both as Jew-Gentile population and village-urban society was being threatened by ‘their (Jewish) synagogues’ and the Roman Empire (Mt. 10:17-25; 23:34). The pressures from the external opposition were also producing internal tensions. Accordingly, like the seven churches in Asia Minor, the Matthean community had to redefine its own identity through heightened group boundaries. As for John’s audiences, for the Matthean community faithfulness is the watchword of true discipleship for an embattled (small) group seeking to establish its self-definition on the margins of a Hellenistic Jewish society. These assumptions are pertinent not only to the pre-70 AD date of the Gospel of Matthew but also to the historical situation of the community in the broad region of Galilee and Syrian Diaspora in around AD 66-70 (cf. Carter, 2000b:2).
Mt. 24:16-26) is John’s main source for Revelation 12-13. Schnackenburg (1966:189-190) rightly observes the thematic relevance of Revelation to the Olivet Discourse: a careful study shows that the Apocalypse prophesies nothing essentially new when compared with Jesus’ great discourse on a/the Parousia and his proclaiming of God’s perfect kingdom. In both prophecies, exegetes find predictions of persecutions and seductions of the disciples or believing men, the foretelling of disaster and distress, or cosmic catastrophes, and finally the prediction of Christ’s coming in power and glory. As a result, in a sense, John could have intended Revelation as the extended version of the Olivet Discourse (Sproul, 1998:145).

The following illustrates the details of their parallel:

241 In his recent article, Malina points out another parallel between Rev. 12-13 and Mk. 13, that is the astral image (Rev. 12:1; Mk. 13:24-27). Drawing on the combination between the altered states of consciousness and the final discourse genre (i.e. will) tinged with astral prophecy, Malina (2002:56) claims, “NT (including the Olivet Discourse and Revelation) story-lines focus on what was to happen ‘soon’, ‘next’. This emphasis should generate a first-century theory and a set of terms called proximatology or nextology. Proximatology or nextology better fit the broader assumed devolutionary perspective of antiquity than eschatology or apocalyptic”. Malina also criticises the traditional category of the Olivet Discourse as the apocalyptic-eschatological prophecy, due to the fact that ‘eschatological’ and ‘apocalyptic’ are obviously too anachronistic to be of use to people of the first century whose time concept was remarkably present-oriented. Thus, for Malina, the gist of the Olivet Discourse is not the future end of the world but the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem. In a similar way, Hatina (1996:52, 66) contends that Mk. 13:24-27 metaphorically refers to the destruction of the temple in AD 70: (1) The structure of Mk. 13:5-30(37) is based on the two-part question in v. 4 in the following way (cf. Apo. Peter, 1:2):

- **Part 1:** When will these things be?
  - Answer: vs. 28-30(37)
- **Part 2:** What will be the sign when all these things are going to be fulfilled?
  - Answer: vs. 5-23

(2) Mk. 13:24-27 reflects the genre of parenesis in which the Markan Jesus warns his disciples about the affliction, which they will soon experience. (3) A comparative examination of the cosmic portents in Mk. 13:24-25, derived most likely from Isa. 13:10 and 34:4, demonstrates that this imagery is commonly applied to temporal acts of divine judgment against hostile political/religious entities. (4) ‘The coming of the Son of Man’ in Mk. 13:26, quoted from Da. 7:13, also yields a temporal function when it is compared with its use in Daniel and most significantly Mk. 14:62. (5) When ‘the gathering of the elect’ in Mk. 13:27, derived most likely from Dt. 30:4 and Zec. 2:6, is viewed against the original backdrop, the same notion of temporality appears. The gathering of the righteous in these and other texts is associated with a temporal act of judgment, thus there is no need to interpret them eschatologically if by this term one means a final historical event. In Mk. 13:24-27 God’s visitation is not directed against Edom, Babylon or Egypt, but against the temple and its oppressive hierarchy.
A. Defeat of the dragon in heaven leads to (Rev. 12:1-12)
flight of the woman242 (symbol for the Church) (Rev. 12:13-17)
Flight to the mountains (Mt. 24:16-20)

Because most of the events of Mt. 24:5-14 occurred between AD 30-70, Mt. 24:15 onwards depicts the successive events around the fall of Jerusalem. Thus, Jesus warns his followers to accept the perils of this age realistically and to escape them when possible. Jesus’ words may instruct believers from the Matthean community (implied by the feminine symbol) when they would face peril (cf. Keener, 1999:569, 573; contra Vorster, 1991:1104).

B. Kingdom of beasts on earth (Rev. 13)
Standing of the abomination (Mt. 24:15)

"Οταν óυν ἐδήτη τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ῥήθην διά Δαυὶλ τοῦ προ-φήτου, ἕστος ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίω· ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω·

The kingdom of beasts on earth (Rev. 13) is language taken directly from the LXX of Daniel 12:11 (ἀφ’ οὗ ἀν ἀποσταθῇ ἡ θυσία διὰ παντὸς καὶ ἔτοι μασθῇ δοθῆναι τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἡμέρας χιλιῶν διακοσίων ἐνενή

242 Rev. 12 patently describes historical occurrences (for example, the birth and exaltation of Christ, v. 5, and the persecution of the Church, v. 17) in symbolic terms. In addition, there is considerable evidence that the Pella tradition does recall actual first-century events: first, Eusebius’ Historia Ecclesiastica (3.5.3); second, Epiphanius’ Panarion (29.7.7-8 and 30.2.7); third, the pseudo-Clementine Recognitions (1.37 and 1.39); fourth, Renan’s commentary in 1899 (Koester, 1989a:105; Wilson, 1996:64). Pella (a Decapolis city in the Jordan Valley, modern Tabaqat Fahl) was a staunchly pro-Roman Hellenistic city of the Decapolis. The antipathy of that city toward political revolt against Rome made the city a logical choice for the Jerusalem church, seeking a haven from rebellious territory. Some say that the Jewish Christians may not have fared well shortly after their arrival there, since at the outbreak of the war groups of Jews devastated a number of the cities of the Decapolis, including Pella. The end of the Jewish church in Jerusalem came when Hadrian crushed the Second Jewish Revolt (AD 132-135) and forbade all Jews from entering the city (Sowers, 1970:309; Van Elderen, 1994:211, 217; for the late date [ca. AD 133-134] of the plight in Mt. 24:16, see Detering, 1999:208).
-κοὐντα), where it refers to an image set upon the altar of the temple in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. In Mt. 24:15, Jesus adopts the same language to indicate that a similar desecration of the temple will occur. Matthew’s readers were to know that what Daniel once referred to, fulfilled in the historical events of BC 167, was prophesied again by Jesus (cf. Evans, 1992:110). Initially in view, therefore, is the devastation of Jerusalem and the concomitant setting up of the desolating abomination in the temple that occurred in AD 70. Marcus (1992:447, 454) also avers that the abomination of desolation in Mk. 13:14 has something to do with incidents that occurred in the Jewish temple in Jerusalem during the Great Revolt. In its Markan context the reference to ‘the abomination of desolation standing where he should not’ reflects especially the occupation of the temple by Eleazar (a Zealot leader), son of Simon, in the winter of AD 67-68. Marcus (1992:448) goes on to insist that the war, of course, was known throughout the Roman world. Therefore, it can be assumed that John’s audiences in Asia Minor might have heard of this great event. The fact that Matthew writes about this before AD 70 makes the conclusion that Matthew’s prophecy in Mt. 24:15 is a vaticinium ex eventu difficult (Hagner, 1995:699-701; cf. Keener, 1999:576).

C. Sea beast: war on the saints (Rev. 13:1-10)

The great tribulation (Mt. 24:21-22; cf. Mt. 26:52)

εἶσται γὰρ τότε ἡλικία οἶα οὕ γέγονεν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ’ οὐ μὴ γένηται. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκλεκτοῖς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἐν ἑσόδῃ πᾶσα σάρξ, διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι.

The appropriateness of such hyperbolic language in reference to the final six-months siege of Jerusalem in AD 70 is evident from the historical information provided by Josephus’s The Jewish War, 5:12:3. In addition, it is noteworthy that the repeated expression ‘αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι’ (those days) takes on the significance of a semi-technical phrase referring to a unique period of suffering (also see Mt. 24:19-20; cf. Rev. 243

The use of the conjunction γὰρ in the Gospel of Matthew reveals many interesting features with regard to its narrative function. In Mt. 24:3-28 γὰρ is used no fewer than six times as part of Jesus’ directives to the disciples (vs. 5, 6, 7, 21, 24, 27). All of these γὰρ-clauses substantiate preceding commands. Their effect is that the reader has to be on the alert because a/the parousia will be preceded by horrifying events. Another effect of these clauses is to show the reader that the events referred to are part of the divine plan of God (the only appearance of γὰρ in Rev. 12-13 is Rev. 13:18; see Vorster, 1991:1103).

D. Land beast: deception (Rev. 13:11-18)

False christs and false prophets (Mt. 24:23-26)

Marcus (1992:447) avers that the prophecies of false messiahs, war persecution and betrayal in Mk. 13:6-13 are part of the present experience of Mark’s community around AD 66-67 (cf. Mk. 13:21-22; Apo. Peter, 2:7; see Bauckham, 1994:24). In Rev. 13:3 signs (σημεία) are performed by the second beast who leads astray the inhabitants of the earth. Perhaps the false prophets, who are not clearly distinguished from antichrists, are to be understood as those who proclaim others as the Messiah. The implication of ‘εἰ δυνατόν’, ‘if possible’, is that the elect are in the care of God and that it is therefore not within the power of these enemies to accomplish their purpose. Likewise in Rev. 13:15, the phrase ‘as many as do not worship the image’ implies God’s protection and election too (cf. Hagner, 1995:706).

If the above four parallels are true, John without a doubt intends to depict the Jerusalem fall (and its accompanying events) as a parousia and God’s protection of his people in Revelation 12-13, because the main theme of the Olivet Discourse is Christ’s judgment on the apostate Jews in AD 70, which anticipates the Parousia of the Lord. But,

244 King (1987:366, 377) and Russell (1996:90), as hyper preterists, are of the opinion that according to the Olivet Discourse, the destruction of the temple, the completion of the age, the Parousia of Christ (Mt. 24:1-3), the coming of the end (Mt. 24:14) and the coming of the kingdom of God (Lk. 21:31) are interrelated aspects of one indivisible eschaton. Thus, the AD 70 consummation does not make too little of Christ’s Parousia; it prevents too little being made of Israel’s end time by those who would see it merely as the destruction of an infidelic city at the hands of a heathen army under a pagan general. In a similar way, Wright (1996:341) correctly argues that the meaning of παρουσία is ‘presence’ as opposed to ἄποψις, ‘absence’ (cf. Php. 2:12); hence it denotes the ‘arrival’ of someone not at the moment present; and it is especially used in relation to the visit of a royal or official personage. In this connection, several features of παρουσία were normal or typical: (1) the welcome was commonly bestowed on
although Israel is the main focus of Revelation and the Olivet Discourse, the whole scale of Revelation includes the Roman Empire, so that John writes Revelation to the seven churches in Asia Minor (Gentry, 1998:59). As Holman (1996:143) properly observes, it is interesting that although Revelation does not explicitly make worldwide evangelism a prerequisite for the Parousia (Mt. 24:24; Mk. 13:10), this is nevertheless presupposed in the universal Christian persecution in Rev. 13. In this way, John introduces the inauguration of the New Covenant and the universal salvation in which the demarcation of Jews and Gentiles is demolished (cf. Van de Kamp, 1990:261). At this point, John and Paul (see Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11) share the same intertextuality (for the contrast between ‘the present Jerusalem’ and ‘the Jerusalem above’, see Gal. 4:25-26).

From the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (BC 185) until the fall of Jerusalem, Israel was a backslidden nation, which deserved the wrath of God (Bray, 1996:13). After Antiochus,
the Jewish religion was more and more damaged, not only by foreign enemies, but also by their own priesthood. Nothing remained unpolluted, since their avarice and ambition had reached at such a pitch that they trod under foot the whole glory of God, and the law itself. Thus, no wonder the scathing denunciations of Christ to the Jewish leaders in Mt. 23 are so harsh as He predicts in the following chapter 24 the judgment and wrath that will come upon them (cf. Kinman, 1999:194).

The coming of the kingdom of God in Lk. 21:31 is equated in the mind of John with the coming of the salvation, the power and the Kingdom of God after the dethronement of Satan (Rev. 12:10). So, the fall of Jerusalem is a prominent sign of the coming of God’s kingdom. To put it differently, because the coming of God’s kingdom is consonant with the restoration of Israel (Acts 1:6; 2:29-36), the fall of Jerusalem inaugurates the restoration of God’s New Covenantal partner, the NT Church.245

Peerbolte (1996:50) points out that the situation in Mk. 13:9-13 intimates a persecution by both Jews and Romans. The words παραδώσουσιν εἰς συνεδρια καὶ εἰς συναγω -γας point at persecutions by Jews, whereas the persecution by the ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων must refer to Roman persecutions. He (1996:51) also holds that Mark interpreted the fall of Jerusalem as ‘one’ of the events characteristic of the penultimate period preceding the Parousia of Christ. But Mark refused to regard the fall of Jerusalem as ‘the’ sign of the end.

At this stage, the significant intertextuality between the Olivet Discourse and the Roman Empire should be investigated. As a matter of fact, the dominant paradigm or way of reading the Gospel according to Matthew over last century has been in relation to a synagogue with which Matthew’s community is having or has had a bitter dispute. In his socio-political reading of Matthew on the basis of an audience-oriented approach 245

Van Eck (1995:364) one-sidedly emphasises the positive significance of Jesus’ temple action in Jerusalem in Mark 11:15-19: Jesus’ temple action should be seen as an extension of his brokerage on Galilean soil. The action should therefore not be seen as a symbolic act which was intended to put an end to the temple, but to restore it to that what it was intended to be, namely to broker God’s presence and availability to all. However, the problem of Jesus’ cleansing the temple is not ‘either or’ but ‘both and’, namely, Jesus’ action intends to show God’s judgment on the apostate Judaism symbolised by the temple and to imply God’s universal presence to all.
that attends to the interaction of the final text form and a sociohistorically located audience, Carter (2000b:45-46; 2001:53, 89) challenges this conventional paradigm and emphasises on Matthew’s counter-narratives against Roman imperial ideology, contending that:

Matthew’s Gospel challenges Rome’s empire in two ways. The Gospel presents a social challenge in offering a different vision and experience of human interaction and community. Instead of a hierarchical, exploitative, exclusionary community (Mt. 20:25-26) ... it creates an inclusive, merciful, egalitarian community based on practical, merciful, loving service to others. ... The Gospel also presents a theological challenge. It contests the imperial theology or worldview that claims the world belongs to Jupiter and to Rome and the empire and emperor are Jupiter’s chosen agent. ... The Gospel sets Rome’s claims within the context of God’s greater purposes that declare ... different human allegiances ... In so doing, it relativises Rome’s claims, demystivises them, reveals their shortcomings, and boldly dares to announce Rome’s certain demise in the yet-future establishment of God’s empire at the return of Jesus. God’s empire reconfigures social relationships and will inevitably triumph over all other empires, especially Rome’s. ... But the irony must be noted. This bold vision of the completion of God’s salvation and overthrow of Roman imperial power co-opts and imitates the very imperial worldview that it resists!

In the same vein, according to Batstone (1992:394-395), the intersection of the material and spiritual realities is evident in the cosmologically based apocalyptic discourse, such as Mark 13.

---

246 Of course, Carter (2000b:2) does not ignore the conflict between the Matthean community and the anti-Christian Jewish community.

247 Similarly, Watson (1998:197, 217) insists, “With its claim that the Gospels speak ‘primarily’ of the Christian community and not of Jesus himself, redaction criticism and its successors practise an allegorical interpretation of the Gospels. ... As an expression of Christian faith, Christian theology has a particular interest in interpreting the four Gospels in their literal sense, in opposition to the various allegorical (and historical critical) readings which cannot or will not understand that the primary intention of the Gospels is to narrate the historical life, death, and resurrection of Jesus as the unsubstitutable form of the ultimate and universal significance that Christian faith finds here”. Watson’s insistence is, in principle, correct, nevertheless, exegetes should not ignore the Sitz im Leben of the communities of the four Gospels as well as the compositional intention of Gospel writers.

248 Like Mt. 24, Mk. 13 contains anti-Roman polemics. The community to which Mark wrote has traditionally been identified as the Gentile Church in Rome during Nero’s persecution, a community that confronted Roman claims to sovereignty from a position of apparent powerlessness (Verhey, 2002:420). The historical context of Jesus’ speech in Mk. 13, as of Mark’s story as a whole, was the sharp political-economic-religious conflict prevailing...
world, a syncretistic collage of astrology, temple cults and nature religions, which aimed to consolidate with Roman rule the consent of the gods, the sun, the stars and planets, and every other spiritual power (cf. Mk. 13:7-13, 24-25). In this context, Jesus' apocalyptic sayings indicate a direct challenge to the sacred legitimacy of the present order. The utter chaos in the heavens and the insufferable turmoil on earth proclaim that the divine Spirit of truth has no longer consented to Pax Romana which had been fortified by appeals to the fruitfulness of the earth and the security of its people. It seems that Batstone finds a strong relevance in the Olivet Discourse to God's judgment on the Roman Empire in the light of the form of apocalyptic discourse.

Throughout early Roman times. Thus the numerous movements and conflicts of AD 40s, 50s, and 60s offer other possibilities for the events and figures to which particular motifs in Mk. 13 may be referring. Most, if not all, of the images and motifs used in the narrative parts of the speech - war, kingdom against kingdom, famines, desolating sacrilege, fleeing to the mountains without taking time to get a cloak or provisions, brutal military violence against women and infants, popular messiahs and prophets - pertain to the Roman imperial military practices in the conquest and terrorising intimidation of subject peoples, or the response of the subject peoples in popular resistance and renewal movements. Consequently, Rev. 13 is concerned with the severe repression and suffering of the Judean, Galilean and other peoples under Roman rule that escalated in repeated crises during the middle of the first century (see Horsley, 2001:131-134). But Horsley's (2001:136) conclusion is too one-sided: "But the speech (in Mk. 13) itself pays little attention to Jerusalem or its rulers. Thus, Mark is clearly not proclaiming God's judgment on 'the Jews' and their temple because they had killed Jesus. Jesus' speech in Mark 13 rather focuses on his movement's struggle against the repressive violence of Roman rule". In short, the patience and courage of the Marcan community were tested by the persecutions of Jewish and Roman authorities (Verhey, 2002:422).

Carter (2000b:476-479; 2001:86-87) suggests the strong intertextuality of the Olivet Discourse (Mt. 24) with God's judgment on Rome: (1) the description of Jesus' return in Mt. 24:27-31 'with power and great glory' employs terms that echo imperial rule. (2) Jesus' arrival/parousia/coming (Mt. 24:27) concerns not a representative of an imperial power like Rome, but of God's empire. (3) Lightning (Mt. 24:27) commonly appears on coins to depict Jupiter/Zeus's sovereignty wielded by emperors. (4) Eagles/vultures (Mt. 24:28) denote imperial powers such as Babylon as agents of God's punishment on the people, a role Rome performs in AD 70. Although Mt. 24:28 utilises symbols of Roman power and domination, it does not assert Rome as the victorious eagle or vulture. (5) The scene in Mt. 24:28 depicts destroyed Roman troops ('the corpse') with fallen eagle. Thus, the parousia destroys Rome's power. And (6) the image of the loss of light from the sun and moon in Mt. 24:29 concerns the destruction of imperial powers (cf. Isa. 13:10; 34:4). Hence, Carter concludes that the agent of God's punishment in AD 70 and the agent of Satan (Mt. 4:8) that resists God's ways are judged. Among the above-mentioned six points, only the fifth seems to be unconvincing, because the textual context supports the understanding of Mt. 24:28 presenting Rome as God's agent punishing Jerusalem.

Correspondingly, Bloomquist (1999:204) observes God's judgment on Rome in terms of the ideological texture of Lk. 21: "It seems that Luke understands violence and persecution as the prominent factor not only in the creation of the Jesus movement in Lk. 21 but also in its ongoing growth in the book of Acts. In a brilliant adaptation of the rhetorical elements bequeathed to him, Luke inverts the dynamic of the Augustan imperial rhetoric that sees the empire moving
Consequently, if Batstone’s argument is correct, it is proper to conjecture that John makes use of the Olivet Discourse in order to elucidate the judgment on Rome in Revelation 12-20.

But, if serious attention is given to the concerns of Jewish Christian readers in Mt. 24, it is not God’s judgment on Rome but the destruction of Jerusalem that is the priority for them. The following passages clearly indicate the Jewish Christian character of Mt. 24: an increase in lawlessness is a typical motif in the Jewish-Christian apocalyptic (Mt. 24:12); the OT references to the prophet Daniel (Mt. 24:15), the temple (Mt. 24:25), and the Sabbath (Mt. 24:20) likewise belong in this sphere, as well as the gospel of the kingdom (Mt. 24:14) and the question regarding the sign of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:30). In addition, talk of the (Gentile) peoples’ hatred (Mt. 10:18; 24:9) could indicate a Jewish setting and, in this sense, also the Jewish perspective of the author (see Detering, 2000:166-167).

Interestingly, according to Bray (1996:111), Matthew is the only Gospel writer who uses the word ‘parousia/coming’, so it is unique to him. It is thus evident that Matthew at least connects the ‘Parousia’ with the other events mentioned, i.e. the destruction of the temple and the end of the age. Also interesting is the fact that only Matthew of all the Gospel writers uses the expression ‘end of the age’, which conveys to Matthew’s Jewish readers the idea of the end of their age with the coming of the Messiah. The presence/parousia/arrival of the Messiah occurs at the end of that age.

The period of great tribulation (Mt. 24:21) is not an event which the entire world is yet awaiting, but a past historic event of unparalleled concentrated severity specifically afflicting the Jewish nation in AD 70 (cf. Kimball, 1983:88-89). By judging the temple, Jesus is exalted in that the rejected Christ is vindicated as the ascended Lord and shown out from the centre – Rome – to the limits of empire through the expansion of military and business power and through the resultant restoration of all land to full productive powers by showing how ‘the kingdom of God’ rides the ebb or reflux of the imperial wave. This reflux, which moves from the periphery back toward the centre, from the client temple-state of Jerusalem toward the mainstay of that state, Rome, moves from home to home” (for more verbal links between Lk. 21 and Revelation not shared by the other Gospels, see Shellard, 2002:157).
to possess great power and glory (cf. Gentry, 1999:61).

In short, John’s Apocalypse is genuine Christian prophecy, which only serves to confirm the words and promises of Jesus (Schnackenburg, 1966:192). John’s strong intertextuality with the Olivet Discourse (and the parousia parables) implies that he recognises the paraenetic need of his audience, which requires his message in their new situation (Du Rand, 1998:35). In conclusion, without de-emphasising the significance of God’s judgment on Rome in the Olivet Discourse, the following figure shows the common intertextuality between the Olivet Discourse and Revelation in terms of revelation history, in particular the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ: 251

---

251 As Van Aarde (1998:23-24) notes, the shift between Jesus’ ministry and the disciples’ commission in Matthew (and Revelation) takes place at Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection. It seems that John the seer and Matthew describe both the fall of Jerusalem/the destruction of the temple and the vision of the coming of the Son of Man as having been anticipated in the crucifixion/resurrection of Jesus.

252 Many scholars have argued that the (Jewish) crowds in Matthew are ‘transparent’ for part of Matthew’s community. In other words, the crowds are future church members. It can be inferred with some certainty that the transparent crowds were the object of the church’s ministry and that this ministry was an ongoing one (see Cousland, 2002:270-281).

253 Jesus’ mission functions as a ‘transparency’ for the mission of his disciples. These two missions form two narrative lines, or lines of action in the Matthean narrative. Although the mission of the disciples begins at the conclusion of the mission of Jesus, the former alternates with the latter by means of analogic-symbolic anticipation (Van Aarde, 1994:31-32, 147; cf. Cousland, 2002:270; Shellard, 2002:186).
It seems that during the time of Jesus’ ministry, the conflict between the Church and the anti-Christian Jews is more serious than the collision between the Church and the Roman Empire (see Hurtado, 1999:44-45). But it seems that during the time of the disciple’s ministry (or the post-paschal era), the clash between the Church and the Roman Empire becomes more serious.

5.1.2.2. The Johannine writings

The Gospel of John unambiguously stands in a special relationship to the Letters of John, as well as to the Book of Revelation.254 The similarities and differences between these writings function on the level of authorship, (dualistic) symbolism,255 the role of the OT, eschatology, soteriology,256 history of origination, language,257 and style,

254 If one is committed to the view that the apostle John is the human author of the Gospel, the three letters that bear his name and of the Apocalypse, the four books – the Gospel and the letters – provide the base for a better and clearer understanding of the Apocalypse. There seems to be no good reason to debate the issue for the purpose of this study (cf. Pohlmann, 1997:65).
255 Defining symbolism as figurative language which works on convention, Van der Watt (1998:394) points out that (the Gospel of) John uses well-known expressions which are proper to the convention of his reader’s life (cf. Thiselton, 1992:581). From an intertextual perspective, a well-known symbolic image is used, which is then reused by John and contributes to the semantics of John’s figurative language usage. Hence, to understand symbolism properly, exegetes must be conscious of its conventions. As a matter of fact, the Gospel of John freely uses symbols and symbolism in an endeavour to bring together spiritual and material spheres. Thus, the power and potential multivalency of symbols becomes evident in the Fourth Gospel as in Revelation (see Thiselton, 1992:581). Geographical symbolism, for instance, in John’s Gospel is similar to that of Revelation: Jerusalem symbolises the place of the rejection of Jesus (Rev. 11:8; Du Rand, 1997:35). Another example of intertextual symbolism is the shepherd in John 10:11 (cf. 21:15-19) and Rev. 7:17 (see Van der Watt, 1998:396; Nielsen, 1999:76). In connection with symbolism, σημείον (i.e. sign narrative: Jn. 2:11; 4:48, 54; 6:14, 26; 9:16; 12:18, 37) deserves attention here; σημείον points beyond itself to the deeper reality that can be perceived with the eyes of faith. Hence, it must be understood not as a merely literal event but as a vehicle of transcendent significance. It is interesting that the author of the Gospel of John never uses δώρος, the Synoptists’ favourite word for the miracles, which stresses the element of miraculous power (see Carson, 1991:175). Unlike the signs in Revelation, there is no convincing reason to make the seven sign narratives in the Gospel of John pure metaphors or allegorical images (contra Staten, 1993:38). In short, with situation-directed goal (e.g. Jn. 20:31), the symbols in the Gospel of John and Revelation remain sufficiently multivalent for readers to see their own lives (Thiselton, 1992:582; cf. Nielsen, 1999:66).
256 The reconciliatory (or substitutionary) theme and the glorification theme co-exist in the cross-event of Jesus in the Gospel of John (Jn. 11:50-52; 17:19, 22; 18:14; cf. 1:29; 10:11, 15; 15:13). Both themes, therefore, must not be understood as mutually conflicting traditions (as Bultmann argued from redaction criticism), but as supplementary. An intertextual argument supports this finding further. Apart from the Gospel of John, 1 John and Revelation include both themes apparently without tension. The glorification of Jesus requires his reconciliatory work as
structure and composition and opponents, to mention the most important matters (cf. the precondition in the Johannine writings (e.g. 1 Jn. 4:9-10; Rev. 12:11; see Van der Watt, 1995:150-151).

257 Like the seven churches in Asia Minor, it seems that John's community depicted in the Fourth Gospel is an anti-society because it understands itself as other to the dominant society (i.e. the disciples of Moses) that has made it other. "The concept of common Judaism provides the best starting point for sect analysis after AD 70 as well. Ideologically, temple Judaism seems to play the role of a parent body for rabbinic Judaism and for the mainstream Christianity documented in the NT writings" (Luomanen, 2002:124). The basic elements of John's system of characterisation are represented in the social contrast between the disciples of Moses and the disciples of Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel John anti-structurally derives the key terms of his characterisation of Jesus from the image of Moses adhered to by the disciples of Moses who are persecuting his people. Consequently, John's special language proves to be the anti-langauge of the anti-society comprising the Johannine disciples of Jesus (see Petersen, 1993:89-90, 108). In the same vein, Rensberger (1998:142-145) regards the Gospel of John as a sectarian Gospel. He insists, "The Fourth Gospel represents a heretical offensive against orthodoxy, i.e. the orthodoxy of the synagogue authorities. John makes the typically sectarian claim that an act of God has gone unrecognised outside the sect. ... Whereas established Christianity often claims that the social order with which it is interlocked had its roots in the divinely created order of nature, John puts forward the sectarian claim that the one God, the Creator of all things, is anti-establishment. ... All the massive force of divine authority is brought down not to endorse established religious, social and political forms but to overthrow them". For Rensberger, sect(arianism) does not have negative connotations. He focuses on the sect's relation to a larger society of any kind, rather than on deviation from the Christian church.

258 It is increasingly accepted that the Johannine epistles originated in 'Asia Minor'. Nonetheless, one must be careful with pronouncements about the identity of the adversaries mentioned in the Johannine epistles because it would seem that there is no external evidence for them and because the epistles might be too vague in indicating what or whom exactly they condemn. By comparing 1 and 2 John with 'the apocryphal acts of John' and the Gospel of John, Lalleman (1999:17, 24) concludes that the opponents of the epistles are the advocates of the docetism. Even though docetism can be the common opponent of John's Gospel and the epistles, there is little evidence of docetism as the opponent of John the seer in Revelation. With regard to the opponents of the Gospel of John and Revelation, the unbeliever Jews are distinguished (cf. Williams, 2002:354). Van der Watt (1996:193-194, 204-205) is correct when he comments on the Jews and Judaism in the Gospel of John: John's Gospel apparently contains some of the strongest expressions against the Jews in the NT (Jn. 8:44; Rev. 2:9; 3:9). Albeit there are many positive evaluations of the Jews and the Jewish institutions (Jn. 6:69; 7:31; 8:30-31; 9:38; 10:42; 12:11, 42; 17:8), especially in John 9-12 and 18-19, the Jews in Jerusalem and its vicinity stand against Jesus. Like John the seer, the author of John's Gospel does not criticise the Jewish religious system itself, even though he is aware of its fulfilled meaning in Jesus. From John's ideological viewpoint on the Jews, it is evident that the Jews love praise from men more than praise from God (Jn. 12:43). Why does their religion have no concern with God? Because Jesus has no room for playing the role of hermeneutical key for the Jews to draw meaning from their religion, it is remarkable that the Jews (as the spiritually blind) deny Christ's kingship over them at the most critical moment and shout: "Take him away! Take him away! Crucify him! ... We have no king but Caesar" (Jn. 19:15). In the Gospel of John, in thirty-seven instances of seventy-one occurrences, the word 'the Jews' describes authoritative groups whom 'other Jews' fear (Pilch, 1997:120). As in the case of the Book of Revelation, accordingly, the Jews are the major opponent of the faithful, with the help of the pagan force, the Roman Empire. "Christology was at the centre of the controversies that led to the synagogue expulsion of those who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah" (Williams, 2002:352). Of course, John's Gospel and
Du Rand, 1997:137). As Brown (1997:791) holds, in Rev. 12 there is no reference to Jesus’ physical birth or Jesus as an infant (and then a jump to his ascension to God), but to Jesus’ birth as the Messiah through his death. The birth symbolism for death is found in John. 16:20-22 (esp. Jn. 16:21: ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτη λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἠλθεν ἡ ὁ ᾲρα αὐτῆς ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννηθή ἀνθρώπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον): on the night before He dies, Jesus says that the disciples’ sorrow is like that of a woman about to give birth to a child; but that sorrow will be forgotten for joy once the child is born, i.e. through Jesus’ return from the dead (cf. Acts 2:24; 13:33; Ro. 1:4; Col. 1:18).

Wall (1991:163-164) correctly argues that the forensic overtones of Rev. 12:10 are consistent with Johannine Christianity, where the exaltation of Christ marks a fundamental shift in the weight of evidence from Satan’s accusation to the Paraclete’s witness (cf. Jn. 14:16-17 [κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται ὁ λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐκ οὕτως αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει: ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτὸ, ὅτι παρ’ ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσται], 25-27; 15:26; 16:7-8). Jesus said just before his death and resurrection and ascension, as He looked forward to them, “Now is the time for judgment on this world, now the prince of this world will be driven out (Jn. 12:31 [νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται -ταί ἔξω;] cf. Jn. 14:30; 1 Jn. 3:8). When Jesus arose from the dead and ascended to the throne of God, it was an eviction-notice served on Satan (Clark, 1989:84). In this regard, Beasley-Murray (1987:213-214) is correct when he emphasises:

The twofold νῦν (now; also in Rev. 12:10) must be given its full force; it is the decision of God with reference to humankind, characterised as it is by rebellion against God and readiness to follow the ‘prince of this world’, but specifically with respect to its rejection of the Son of man and its putting him to death. Therefore, the death and exaltation of Christ is that moment. … For the Evangelist, the utterance of Jesus employs a well-understood picture to show the change of situation for the world when Jesus was lifted up to heaven via the cross: Satan was dethroned and the Son of man enthroned over the world for which he died.

John 12:31 presumably refers not to Satan’s being driven out from heaven (but cf. Lk.)

Revelation are not anti-semitic documents.
10:18; Rev. 12:9), but rather to his ejection from his role as ruler of this world, a role Jesus will assume as a result of and by means of his glorification (Witherington, 1995b:224).

In connection with Jesus' presence amongst his followers in the person of the Holy Spirit, the theme of the tabernacle in Revelation (e.g. Rev. 13:6: τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ) shares a close relation with that of the Fourth Gospel (e.g. Jn. 14:2-3, 16, 23: τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μοναί, τόπου, μονήν). Traditionally, John 14:1-23 is misunderstood in terms of Jesus' Second Coming (cf. Carson, 1991:488). If John 14:2-3 refers to the Parousia and is interpreted in terms of the death of the Christian, exegetes cannot overlook the tension between such a view in John 14:2-3 and the realised eschatology of the rest of the same chapter, for example, the thought in 14:15-17 and 14:23 that Jesus comes back to the believer in and through the Paraclete who dwells in the Christian (Brown, 1972:626; cf. Coloe, 2001:160). As a matter of fact, the textual context of John 14 (cf. Rev. 12-13) indicates the permanent fellowship Jesus' disciples, who will obey Christ's word (Jn. 14:1-23: τὸν λόγον μου παρήσει; cf. Rev. 12:17: τῶν παρουσία τῶν τας ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ), will enjoy with their Lord through the Spirit.259

ἐντολὴ occurs 28 times and ἐντέλλεοθαί three times in the Johannine Gospel and epistles. As Du Rand (1977:436-437) correctly notes, even though the general meaning of ἐντολὴ is a provision of the law, the law as a whole, or a general command, the typical Johannine use of ἐντολὴ indicates an 'instruction' of the Father to the Son and

---

259 Forms of the verb μένω with the sense of 'dwelling' occur primarily in John 14 and 15 (14:10, 17, 23, 25; 15:4 [x 3], 5, 6, 7 [x 2], 9, 10). The mutual abiding of Jesus and the Father (Jn. 14:10; 15:10), and Jesus and his disciples (Jn. 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10), enables John to hold together the apparently contradictory statements of presence with the Father and also with the disciples. The theology of mutual indwelling developed in John 14-15 is introduced in both Chapters with a παροιμία, firstly the house of the Father and its many rooms (μοναί: 14:2), and then the vine and branches (15:1, 5). Against the 'heavenly' dwelling place (Jn. 14:2), it must be noted that the subject of the verb μένω, throughout Jn. 14, is not the believer but God. The action therefore is not the believers coming to dwell in God's heavenly abode, but the Father, the Paraclete and Jesus coming to dwell with the believers. It is a 'descending' movement from the divine realm to the human (cf. Rev. 21:2), not an 'ascending' movement from the human to the divine. Consequently, 'in my Father's house there are many dwellings' means a series of interpersonal relationships made possible because of the indwelling of the Father, Jesus and the Paraclete with a believing community as a living temple (see Coloe, 2001:159-167).
of Jesus (God) to the disciples (believers). The term λόγος (Jn. 14; 1 Jn. 2) and ἀγγελία (1 Jn. 3) figure in the narrative contexts within the same semantic spheres as ἐντολή. Thus, it can be concluded that μαρτυρίαν in Rev. 12:17 is also categorised into the same semantic spheres as ἐντολή, signifying the authoritative instruction of Jesus to the seven churches (cf. Louw & Nida, 1993:426). Therefore, it seems that τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ and τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ are synonyms as far as semantic meaning is concerned. John stresses the fact that the obeying of the ἐντολή and the μαρτυρία is his audience’s reply to the revelation of God and Jesus Christ by faith and loyalty.

The redemptive power of Christ’s death in Rev. 12:11 is consonant with John 1:29 and 1 John 1:7 (ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί, κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ’ ἀλλήλων καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ὑιοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας). And the power here attributed to ‘the word of God’ is the same as in John 8:31f. (‘Ἐλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ ἱουδαίους, Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταί μου ἔστε, and ἀλήθεια in Jn. 8:32), 8:51 (ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν τις τῶν ἐμῶν λόγου τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); 15:3 (ἡδὴ ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἔστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὧν λε -άληκα ὑμῖν) (Beckwith, 1967:626). Moreover, the shepherd image of Christ in the Gospel of John is linked with the blood of Christ in Rev. 12:11 (cf. Rev. 13:8). As Busse (1991:13, 15) correctly maintains, the Johannine Jesus identifies himself exclusively with the role of the caring shepherd (Jn. 10:8). By means of the image of the shepherd, John metaphorically describes the office held by Jesus (Jn. 10; 21). In the shepherd image in the OT it is a sheep that can be sacrificed (Ps. 23; Ezk. 34:23-24; Hos. 6:1; cf. Ex. 22:9-14), whereas in the NT the good shepherd himself becomes the sacrificial lamb. But God is a very special shepherd; He turns himself into a wild beast, a lion, the enemy of the shepherd; He hurts (punishes) his own flock; but He heals (saves) his flock once He has hurt it. Accordingly, the motifs of judgment and salvation are combined in the image of the shepherd (Jn. 10:1-11; see Nielsen, 1992:129-131;

---

260 In a similar way, Busse (1991:14) holds that “the Gospel of John speaks only of ἦν ἐντολή τοῦ θεοῦ when Jesus is in view. It is He who obediently fulfills God’s commission. Therefore the death of Jesus is not just a matter of voluntarily giving himself up (cf. Jn. 10:18 and 13:1) as a result of caring love. It comes to have salvation-historical significance”.
The terminology for 'overcoming' or 'being an overcomer' is especially characteristic of Johannine literature, e.g. John 16:33 (ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐν ἑμοὶ εἰρήνη ἔχητε· ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλύσῃ ἔχετε, ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ νεκρίκω τὸν κόσμον); 1 John 2:13 (γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. γράφω ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι νεκρίκατε τὸν πονηρόν), 2:14; 4:4; 5:4; cf. Rev. 5:5; 12:11; 15:2; 17:14; 21:7 (Strand, 1990:238). With regard to this terminology, Swete (1980:29) appositely states: "The Book of Revelation is a record and a prophecy of victories won by Christ and the Church. The note of victory is dominant in Johannine writings, as that of faith is in St. Paul; or rather, faith presents itself to John in the light of a victory". Van der Watt (2002:8, 18) significantly points out the soteriology of the Gospel of John within the framework of the conflict between Jesus' followers (the family of God) and their opponents (i.e. the disciples of Moses as the family of Satan). According to the Gospel of John the Jews were the most serious opponents because they denied the Messiahschip of Jesus (Jn. 7:25-27; 9:22; 10:24) and also maintained that the Christians blasphemed by saying that Jesus was the Son of God (Jn. 10:36; 19:7; Du Rand, 1997:169). John uses the term 'Jews' predominantly for the opponents of Jesus, although Jesus and his disciples were also 'Jews'. John describes the anti-society of Christians against the disciples of Moses. In the Gospel according to John the Jews, with their synagogues, city Jerusalem, temple, feasts, leaders and Caesar (Jn. 19:15) seem to have a thorough and intact group organisation, which also seems to be socially dominant. However, like the seven churches as anti-society in Asia Minor, the

261 Strand (1990:242-243) and Reddish (1995:222) insist that the theme of conquering occurs repeatedly throughout Revelation, but the term is used explicitly just once in connection with the saints, in this key statement: "And they did conquer him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, and they did not love their life even unto death" (Rev. 12:11). According to Rev. 12:11, martyrdom of the saints is victory. The saints have also overcome through their refusal to be deceived (Rev. 13:3).

262 As in the case of Revelation, the emphasis of the soteriology of John's Gospel falls on the salvation of man as well as of the world: Jesus is the saviour of the world (cf. Jn. 4:42). God takes the initiative for his salvific work (cf. Du Rand, 1997:32).

263 At this point, Halliday's argument is worth mentioning. Halliday (1976:570) argues that an anti-language in which metaphorical modes of expression are the norm serves to create and maintain social structure through conversation. He (1976:582) goes on to say that the speakers of an anti-language are constantly striving to maintain a counter-reality that is under pressure from the established world. In other worlds, the function of alternative language including the
figurative ‘anti-society’ represented by the family of God is equally well organised on a higher level, since it is the family (group) of God. The disciples of Jesus overcome the disciples of Moses not by their (Jewish) biology but by accepting Jesus and remaining part of the family of God (cf. Du Rand, 1997:26).

It is striking that in 1 John 5:4 (ὅτι πάν τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ μίκρὰ τῶν κόσμων καὶ αὐτὴ ἑστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τῶν κόσμων, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν) John says that the victory has overcome (νικήσασα: to defeat) the world (i.e. the value system of the world; Louw & Nida, 1993:501). Perhaps he thinks of the completed victory of Jesus (Jn. 16:33), which repeats itself in the life of his readers (cf. Marshall, 1984:229). This fact is also true in Rev. 12:11 where John affirms that the victory of his audiences derives from the victory of Christ. In all of Johannine literature, Christian faith in the decisive victory of Jesus is not a means of escape from conflict; on the contrary it is indispensable in proclaiming the superior might of Jesus in the face of evil’s display of power.

The floodwaters from the dragon’s mouth (Rev. 12:15) symbolise deceptive teaching that would drown the Church’s faith, destroying its life. Such threats are present in the churches of Asia Minor in the form of the Nicholaitans’ lies and Jezebel’s promise of deep knowledge into secret things (Rev. 2:2, 6, 14-15, 20-24). In 1 John, John called the church to exercise discernment in testing prophetic spirits, since many false prophets, controlled by the spirit of the antichrist and denying the incarnation (e.g. the Christological error of docetism), had gone out into the world (1 Jn. 4:1-6) (Johnson, 2001:185-186). Because the author of 1 John discerns the manifestation of the antichrist in the presence of contemporary ‘antichrists’ (e.g. 1 Jn. 2:18, 22; 4:3), this suggests that he does not concentrate on the appearance of a future antichrist, coinciding with the

anti-language is to create alternative reality. In a sense, this counter-reality is shaped in Revelation by the intertextual (symbolic) world of John (see Petersen, 1993:89).

264 A Jewish (apocalyptic) setting to the figure of an ‘antichrist’ may be discovered in Babylonian, or at least Semitic, nature-myths: for example, the legend of a primeval sea monster who would attempt to raise its power against the God of heaven in a final conflict before the end of all things (cf. Job 26:12-13; Ps. 74:12-14; Rev. 12:7-10; 13:1; 20:2-3, 7-10; Smalley, 1994:98). Even though the writer of 1 John himself may have coined the actual term antichrist, he and John the seer might have drawn on the same background when they depict antichrists and the sea monster (Rev. 13:1) respectively.
final stages of history. In fact, the writer historicises the mythical figure as does John the seer in terms of the Roman Empire and the apostate Judaism in Rev. 13:1-8, 11-18 (cf. 2 Th. 2:1-12; see Smalley, 1984:99-100).

The crucifixion of Christ is seen by the fourth evangelist as the ‘glorification’ of Jesus (Jn. 7:39 [τούτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὁ ἐμελλὼν λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν· οὕτω γὰρ, ἢν πνεῦμα, ὅτι ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅπις ἐν ημῶν ἐδοξάσθη]; Jn. 13:31-32 [Ὁτε οὖν ἔξηλθεν, λέγει ἦν πνεῦμα, Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ο ὁ κός τοῦ άνθρωποι, καὶ ο θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ· εἰ ο θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ο θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτῶν]; 17:1, 5; cf. Louw & Nida, 1993:736). This fact is enforced by the notable absence of the Gethsemane episode and of Jesus’ cry in despair from the cross, as well as by the active role of Jesus himself in his arrest and trial. The Pauline terms such as humiliation (Php. 2:8), weakness (2 Co. 13:4) and curse (Gal. 3:13) also do not appear in John’s Gospel. The term that is related to the idea of glorification is ūφώκο. In three contexts (Jn. 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34) it is said that the Son of Man must be ‘lifted up’, which implies the salvation of the faithful as well as Jesus’ return (i.e. glorification) to the Father (Lalleman, 1999:19; cf. Van der Watt, 1999:188). The Evangelist makes it clear that the greatest moment of displayed glory is based on the shame of the cross (Smalley, 1994:60; cf. Carson, 1991:482). The cross-events, as central to the theology of the Gospel of John, are interpreted as glorification of the Father and the Son, and are necessary to reveal the true identity of Jesus as the Lord and God.265 Since the Father and the Son work together (Jn. 10:30), the Father is glorified when the Son is glorified. Without these cross-events the theology of John is not conceivable (see Van der Watt, 1999:188, 192). In precisely the same way, John the seer is sensitive to the fact that the cross of Jesus involves enthronement (Rev. 12:10-11).

265 In Revelation John does not attempt to work out the relationship between the Lamb and the One on the throne through discussions of ontology or through abstract reasoning. His vision report works through the logic of worship and of apocalyptic symbol (Friesen, 2001:198; cf. Williams, 2002:351). As in Revelation, in the Fourth Gospel the figures of the Father and the Son are not simply fused, but neither are they to be so completely distinguished. It is not that their identities are merged but that the identity of the Father lodges in his relationship to the Son, and the identity of the Son in his relationship to the Father. Through focusing attention on the figure of Jesus as the Revealer and Son of God, the one who brings life from God, the Fourth Gospel always directs its reader’s attention to God. In short, like John the seer, the writer of the Fourth Gospel seems to be the most Christocentric writer in the NT, yet his very Christocentricity is theocentric (cf. Thompson, 2001:239).
“John is a master of paradox. Just as in the Fourth Gospel the humiliation of Jesus on the cross is his ‘glorification’, and in the Apocalypse the Christian martyrs those who have ‘conquered’ the beast (Rev. 12:11; 15:2), so in Rev. 20:4-6 those who have lost all for the Lamb’s sake have actually gained their lives” (Rainbow, 1996:219). To put the matter another way, the end of the descent of Jesus (i.e. his completion of redemptive works) is also the beginning of his ascent (i.e. glorification) (cf. Ridderbos, 1997:474).

According to Smalley (1994:61-62), John the seer uses a different word (ἀρνίου) for Lamb, in distinction from the fourth evangelist’s ἄμνος. ἀρνίου as a title of Jesus Christ occurs only in the Book of Revelation, but it is used there more than twenty times (Louw & Nida, 1993:42). The ἀρνίου is the Lamb made victorious through earthly suffering and his blood (Rev. 7:14; 12:11). The ἄμνος of the Gospel of John is potentially such a figure of victory, and probably not without the apocalyptic and messianic overtones (cf. the word for ‘lamb’ in the LXX of Isa. 53:7 is ἄμνος).266 Historically, at the time of John the Baptist’s cry (Jn. 1:29, 36: Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον, πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ λέγει, Ἡδὲ ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἀρών τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει, Ἡδὲ ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ), the crucifixion and exaltation of Jesus had yet to take place, so that John (the writer of the Fourth Gospel) also thinks theologically in terms of victory through suffering.

The eschatology of Revelation is similar to that found in the Fourth Gospel, with its characteristic tension between salvation in the present and the future; between that in Christ which is ‘already now’, and that which is ‘not yet’ (Smalley, 1994:151; cf. Carson, 1991:97; Du Rand, 1997:26). However, in Revelation this tension is not so apparent. For John, the process of redemption and the exercise of God’s sovereignty on earth and in heaven is seen as a single act, not as a series of unrelated or loosely related events.

---

266 Carson (1991:150) has a similar opinion: When John the Baptist identified Jesus as ‘ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ’, he probably had in mind the apocalyptic lamb, the warrior lamb, found in some Jewish texts (1 Enoch 90:9-12, T. Joseph 19:3; T. Benjamin 3:8) and picked up in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 5:6, 12; 7:17; 12:11; 13:8; 17:14; 19:7, 9; 21:22-23; 22:1-3).
The satanic forces (the dragon and the two beasts) in Revelation counterfeit the Trinity. The dragon gives the sea beast 'his power and his throne and great authority' (Rev. 13:2), just as the Father gives the Son his authority in John 5:22-27. Moreover, worship of the dragon and the beast go together (Rev. 13:4), just as worship of the Father and the Son go together (esp. Jn. 5:23: ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα. ὃ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτὸν) (cf. Poythress, 1997:411).

5.1.2.3. The Book of Acts

As Feuillet (1965:281-282) articulates, even if it is purely hypothetical, there is a certain parallelism between Revelation 12 and Acts 12. Acts 12 tells of the persecution of Herod Agrippa, which led to the death of James and to the imprisonment of Peter. Protected by God, and borne on the two wings of the great eagle, the woman escapes the dragon, just as, long before, the chosen people had escaped the oppression of their Egyptian masters. Likewise, 'during the days of the unleavened bread' (Acts 12:3: ἰδὼν δὲ ὅτι ἄρεστον ἐστιν τοῖς ἱσθαίοις, προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον, ἤσαν δὲ [αὐ] ἡμέραι τῶν ἀχύρων), Peter is delivered miraculously from prison. "The other place" (Acts 12:17: κατασείσας δὲ αὐτοῖς τῇ χειρὶ σιγῶν διηγήσατο [αὐτοῖς] πῶς ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰπέν τε, ὁ Ἀπαγγέλλατο Ἰακώβῳ καὶ τοῖς ἁδελφοῖς ταύτα. καὶ ἤξελθον ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἐτέρου τόπον) corresponds well with "the place" (Rev. 12:14: καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικί αἱ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ ἀετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἐρημὸν εἰς τῶν τόπων αὐτῶν) prepared by God as a refuge for the woman in her flight from the dragon. As the dragon pursues the woman in vain (Rev. 12:15), so Herod sends after Peter in vain (Acts 12:19). The dragon's attempt to sweep the woman away by a flood of water (Rev. 12:16) could have its historical basis in the attempt on the part of the unbelieving Jews in Jerusalem to stamp out the early church (Acts 8:1-3; Mounce, 1998:246).

Furthermore, Garrett (1990:672-677) probes a convincing parallelism between the rescue of Peter in Acts 12:1-24 and the resurrection of Jesus in Lk. 9:31. The rescue of Peter recalls Jesus' resurrection in several ways. According to Garrett, the following are distinguished parallels: (1) Peter's imprisonment and rescue take place at Passover.
during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3-4; cf. Lk. 22:1-2, 7). (2) The angel commands Peter to ‘get up quickly’ (‘Ανάστα ἐν τάχει in Acts 12:7). The word translated as ‘get up’ (ἀνάστησιν) is the word regularly used to designate God’s action of raising Jesus from the dead. (3) The first witness to Peter’s release is a woman (Acts 12:13-14) whose report, like that of the women who went to Jesus’ tomb, is not believed (Acts 12:15; cf. Lk. 24:11). (4) Peter then appears to the gathered community, as Jesus had done (Acts 12:16; cf. Lk. 24:36). (5) Jesus’ death and resurrection, and then disappearance (ascension) gave birth to the mission to Jerusalem (cf. Apo. Peter, 17:2-7). Now parallel to this, Peter’s imprisonment and deliverance give birth to the worldwide mission (Jordan, 1992:2). And (6) as Peter realises that God delivered him from Herod (as a type of Pharaoh) and from the Jews (Acts 12:11), Jesus resurrection is God’s vindication of him against his enemies, namely the Jews and the Romans. It is noteworthy that both Peter and Jesus suffered from the coalition between the Jews and the Gentiles. In short, the Exodus from Egypt is woven into the resurrection of Jesus as background to Peter’s deliverance (Jordan, 1992:2).

From the above shared conceptual framework and in terms of the revelation-historical intertextuality, it can be deduced that the salvation of the woman and the Church in Rev. 12 is seen not only from the event of Acts 12 but also from Jesus’ Exodus (cf. Lk. 9:31: οἱ ὄφεινες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἦν ἡμέλλειν πληροῦν ἐν Ἴρουσαλήμ) in the Exodus motif. Closely related is the worship motif. The fact that Satan’s ultimate goal is worship is made very plain in Rev. 13:4-8, where the blasphemy involved is clearly regarded with horror, and in this context one notices that Luke depicts the awful consequences of such a sin for humans at Acts 12:22-23 (see Shellard, 2002:180-183).

267 With regard to the revelation-historical intertextuality, Rev. 11:8 recalls Acts 12 as well as the Exodus in the OT. The story of Acts 12 actually begins in Antioch (Acts 11:27), where Agabus prophesies a great famine all over the world. This refers back to the famine of Joseph’s day. Barnabas and Saul go to take food to Jerusalem to (Acts 11:30). This is equivalent to the descent of the Hebrews into Egypt. While Barnabas and Saul are in Jerusalem-Egypt, the Herod-Pharaoh kills James and imprisons Peter. Peter is delivered from prison-Egypt. The Jerusalem-Egyptian soldiers are killed, and Herod-Pharaoh is also killed (Acts 12:19-23). At the end of the story Barnabas and Saul leave Jerusalem and go back to Antioch (Acts 12:25) (Jordan, 1992:2).
As the intratextuality of Rev. 13:9 with Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22 implies, those passages, which includes the work of the Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts, are intertexts of Rev. 13:9. It is interesting that unlike Rev. 2:7 par. Rev. 13:9 does not have the reference to the Holy Spirit as a subject. For this reason, one can reason that the subject is whether the Risen Christ or the Holy Spirit, even though the latter seems to be more convincing owing to its intratextuality. In Acts, the close relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus is illustrated by the ongoing involvement of the exalted Jesus in the mission. Events in Acts are not only determined by the action of the Spirit and of the apostles. Jesus as Lord directly influences events, thereby co-operating with the Spirit (Acts 7:56, 59; 9:33). Put it differently, the relationship of the Risen Lord and the Spirit is characterised as active partners in mission. In short, in Acts and Rev. 13:9, the Spirit is more clearly understood within the context of the ongoing works of the Risen Christ (cf. De Villiers, 1993:61-62).

With regard to the land beast (Rev. 13:11-13), the authority of the second beast is similar in significance to the authoritative teaching of Christ’s first apostles. According to the Book of Acts, apostolic authority is justified by three basic credentials, each alluded to in Rev. 13:12-13: (1) the apostles were successors of the Risen Christ in both ministry and authority (cf. Acts 1:1-11; Rev. 13:12a); (2) their preaching had authority in that it was centred on the resurrection of Jesus to which they were witnesses (cf. Acts 2:22-36; Rev. 13:12d); and (3) they performed miraculous signs and wonders as concrete manifestations of God’s reign (cf. Acts 2:14-21; 5:12; 15:4, 12; Rev. 13:13) (Wall, 1991:172). Though many scholars pay proper attention to the fact that the land beast is a parody of the Holy Spirit, here another parody is clear, that is, the lampoon between the apostolic church and the land beast.

In the light of the Jewish persecution of the Church, there is a strong intertextual relation between Rev. 12-13 and the book of Acts. In Acts the harassment of the Christians was not confined to Jerusalem or Judea but was aimed at hindering the missionary work outside Palestine (cf. 1 Th. 2:16). It seems that Acts does not mention the initiatives from Jerusalem. On the contrary, the initiative comes from the side of ‘the Jews from Asia’ (Acts 21:27; 23:12; 24:19; see Bammel, 1995:361). The Jewish persecution of early Jewish Christians seems to have consisted of expulsion from the
synagogue and rock throwing (in the case of those who thought that Jesus' messiahship meant that He was God), and of flogging, harrying from town to town, and rock throwing (in the case of missionaries who espoused the equal admission of Gentiles into Christianity; Acts 7; 9:23-25; 14:19; 18:12). The narrative of the Book of Acts then recounts the progressive expulsion of Christianity from Judaism, which leads the Christian missionaries again and again to seek Gentile converts (Acts 10-11; 13:45-47; 18:6; 28:28). The Jews in the Roman Empire took Paul before the Roman Proconsul, charging that "he persuades people to worship God against the law" (Acts 18:13 [Παρὰ τῶν νόμων ἀναπείθει οὗτος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν]; Sanders, 1996:1952-1956).

As in the case of Lk. 21 par., the significance of the fall of Jerusalem as God's judgment in Acts should be noted. Regarding the reticence of Acts concerning the judgment against Jerusalem, Giblin (1985:108, 111-112) correctly observes its significance as follows:

The fate of the temple figures in one context only: expressly in the charges leveled against Stephen at the instigation of Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem, and perhaps implicitly in Stephen's reply (Acts 7:2-60). ... What Stephen attacks ... is his adversaries' idolatrous, anti-prophetic (and therefore anti-Mosaic) outlook and action. Stephen does not attack the temple but attacks a state of mind according to which that building and institution, divorced from response to God's guidance, stands as a pseudo religious absolute. Equivalently, this attitude constitutes idolatry. Such an attitude may presage national calamity, as it did before the Exile. ... Why Acts says so little about the forthcoming catastrophe for the city and the temple is not difficult to construe. First, Luke's account closes with Paul's preaching in Rome before the actual fall of the city. Notation of its actual destruction would have been grossly anachronistic. Second, it probably suffices for Luke to leave on the Lord's lips the certain prediction of coming events regarding the judgment of Jerusalem.

The fact that the Jews in Pisidian Antioch ὁ τάλασσα ψάλτης (Acts 13:13, 45b:) recalls the same word in Rev. 13:6 when the sea beast 'blasphemies' (blasphemai) God and his people. As in Rev. 13:6, as Witherington (1998:415) comments, the word 'blaspheme' in Acts 13:45 presumably means not that the Jews took God's name in vain but that they denied the truth of Paul's message in strong terms, perhaps with oaths, or that they cursed Jesus. Another intertextuality in terms of thematic parallel is the
‘παρρησιασάμενοι’ (Acts 13:46) and ‘by the word of their testimony ... they did not love their life’ in Rev. 12:11. παρρησιασάμενοι (speaking boldly), as the characteristic of a good and honest orator, must have caused the peril of depriving the lives of Paul and Barnabas as in the case of John’s audience (cf. Witherington, 1998:415).

As a result, both the Jewish rejection of the gospel and the Jewish persecution of the early church in Palestine (as well as the Diaspora) give a boost to the mission of the Gentiles in the Roman Empire. This is evident in Rev. 13 onwards, in that the theme of Rev. 13-20 can be summarised as the expanding kingdom of God in the persecution of the Empire. However, it is incorrect to say that the announcement about turning to the Gentiles means either that the Jews will not be preached to again or that the Gentiles are offered God’s word only because of the rejection by the Jews, as a sort of afterthought or second choice (cf. Lk. 2:30-32; Witherington, 1998:416). Hence, it seems that Rev. 13 onward leaves room for John’s concern about the Jews who had to convert to Christ (cf. Van der Waal, 1981:13).

5.1.2.4. Pauline letters

Due to the early date of Revelation as well as the same geographical reason, John and Paul must have had something in common268 (cf. Boxall, 1998:200). Like John, Paul is also a strong intertextual writer and performs a hermeneutical tour de force.269 The

---

268 While the Tübingen school assumes that Revelation is a Judaistic counterpart to the universalism of Paul and that its theology is deficient when compared to Pauline theology, as to the matter of idol food, Paul and John appear to share a common opinion. While John may not have consciously followed Paul in his condemnation of those who advocate eating idol food, the correspondence between Rev. 2 and 1 Co. 10 probably reflects a common Christian tradition shared by both Paul and John. Revelation gives exegetes no reason to believe that Paul was understood to condone the eating of idol food. If Paul was understood to take a liberal attitude toward idol food, it is strange that the church in Ephesus (where he laboured hard) rejected outright the Nicolaitans and their teaching regarding idol food, while those churches on which he seemed to have less influence took a more tolerant attitude. The possibility of the common ground shared by John and Paul is strengthened by the fact that John might have known and used Paul’s letter (cf. Cheung, 1999:199, 208-209). Of course, there are several differences between John and Paul. Their political viewpoints, for example, are slightly different in that Paul’s seems to be more positive towards the authority of Rome (1 Ti. 2:2; cf. O’Donovan, 1986:79).

269 With regard to Paul’s use of the OT, to say that he regards the OT as a Christian book would be anachronistic. Yet Paul evidently felt peculiarly empowered to apply the OT to Christ and to
vocabulary and cadences of Scripture are imprinted deeply on Paul’s mind, and the
great stories of Israel continue to serve for him as a fund of symbols and metaphors that
condition his perception of the world, of God’s promised deliverance of his people, and
of his own identity and calling. His faith is one whose articulation is inevitably
intertextual in character, and the OT is the determinate subtext that plays a constitutive
role in shaping his literary production. Such an approach to reading Paul in no way
seeks to deny or exclude the presence of non-canonical influences on his discourse.
Paul’s discursive space encompassed countless codes and elements ‘already read’ from
his Hellenistic culture.\textsuperscript{270} In fact, an intertextual analysis is not anachronistic because
within Israel as a reading community, all significant speech is Scriptural or Scripturally-oriented (Hays, 1989:16, 21).

Like John, Paul is sometimes called an apocalyptic\textsuperscript{271} theologian. Here, to speak of

---

the Church (see 1 Co. 9:8-10; 10:11), and he makes this fact quite explicit. Paul’s use of the OT
may be summarised under four headings: First, and most important, there is his general
prophetic and kerygmatic understanding of the OT as the precursor, prefiguration, and promise
of the Gospel (Ro. 1:2; 3:21). A second typically Pauline usage might be called ecclesiastical
parenetic (2 Co. 13:1). A third distinguishable use of the OT is found in Paul’s interpretation of
the historical or historical-eschatological situation in which he finds himself (Ro. 9-11). And
fourth and lastly, Paul uses the OT in order to add force to his various arguments (1 Co. 10:26;

\textsuperscript{270} The texture of Paul’s thought (i.e. how Paul’s complex and flexible thought operates) in
connection with the nature and purpose of his letters is summarised as follows: (1)
Pervasiveness of halakha in Paul’s thought logically implies observance of halakha in his life
(e.g. 1 Co. 7:17-24). (2) The source of his teaching to which Paul would undoubtedly have
given priority is apostolic tradition, including halakha taught by Jesus, as well as the orally
transmitted gospel tradition (e.g. 1 Co.). (3) Apart from the halakhic element, general Jewish
tradition, including midrash (1 Co. 10:1-13), apocalyptic (Ro. 11:25; 1 Co. 15:50),
targum (1 Co. 15:54f.), and berakhot formulae (Ro. 1:25 = Ro. 9:5 = 2 Co. 11:31), is an important source of
Paul’s thought. (4) Of special significance for crucial elements of Paul’s teaching are similarities
with the Hillelite tradition (Acts 5:34; 22:3). A foremost element is the open (or universalistic)
attitude towards Gentiles in contrast to the Shammaites. And (5) Hellenistic elements in Paul’s
thought include his epistolary style and rhetoric, and probably his contemporary (Cynico-Stoic)
philosophical tradition (see Tomson, 1990:264-267). Paul and John might have shared many of
these five elements in that both of them were born in the Jewish world and worked in the
Hellenistic world.

\textsuperscript{271} At this point, Du Rand’s (1993:227-228) distinction of apocalyptic, apocalypticism, and
apocalypses is helpful: ‘apocalyptic’ describes the ideology or mental content or critical
phenomenon which comes into being when a group of people in society is threatened to such an
extent that its existence becomes meaningless and it is replaced by a new ideological system
which has significance for that group. ‘Apocalypticism’ is the socio-historical-religious
movement or system within which the apocalyptic is exercised as mental content. And the term
‘apocalypse’ refers to the genre or type of literature. Only the first one of these (apocalyptic)
apocalyptic is to concentrate not only on the theme of direct communication of heavenly mysteries to a human being but also on the theme of God's own visible eschatological activity, that will constitute the actual revelation (De Boer, 2000:354). Beker (1984:15-16), for example, explains this fact as follows: Paul's coherent centre must be viewed as a symbolic structure in which a primordial experience (Paul's call) is brought into language in a particular way. The symbolic structure comprises the language in which he expresses the Christ event. That language is, for Paul, the apocalyptic language of Judaism, in which he lived and thought. It is a Christian apocalyptic structure of thought that delineates the Christ event in its meaning for the apocalyptic consummation of history, that is, in its meaning for the triumph of God.

While mainstream studies of Paul in the last generation have attempted to read him within his Jewish tradition, a good deal of work has still continued to locate him within the wider Greco-Roman world. By the time of Paul's missionary activity the cult of Caesar had already become not only the dominant cult in a large part of the empire, but also the means whereby the Romans managed to control and govern such huge areas as came under their sway. Like John, Paul opposes both the renegade Judaism and Caesar's empire. The Jewish thinking that formed the centre and driving force of Paul's rejection of Caesar's empire (as the parody of Christ's kingdom) was expressed in terms of Paul's very high Christology (Php. 3:20-21). As in Revelation, Paul's proclamation clearly carries a political message at its heart; therefore, the study of Paul is not confined to what is normally thought of as the history of religion (cf. Wright, 2000:161-163, 181-182).

As far as the hymns in Paul's epistles and the Apocalypse of John are concerned, knowledge of the Jewish, Greek and Roman musical traditions are necessary for a better understanding of passages in which they refer to song and music (e.g. Ro. 15:9-12; 1 Co. 14:15-17, 26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Rev. 12:10-12). In these passages they apparently presuppose knowledge of these traditions from their first audiences. They encourage their audiences in a Hellenistic world, knowledgeable of Greek, Roman and Jewish musical traditions of praising God (cf. Viljoen, 2001:440).
5.1.2.4.1. Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians

Schüssler Fiorenza (1985:115-132) finds parallels between John’s opponents, the Nicolaitans, and Paul’s opponents in Corinth, the enthusiasts (e.g. 1 Co. 14). John and Paul use a similar strategy to combat their opponents with the instrument of apocalyptic theology: they both stress the eschatological dimension of human existence and the future consummation of salvation. Schüssler Fiorenza concludes that John’s theology proves itself to be a Christian theology in its own right and comparable to Paul’s theological accomplishment. She also goes on to note other similarities between John and Paul: the use of the Hellenistic letter form as it was modified by Paul; defense of his authority; few references to the historical life of Jesus of Nazareth; the centre of their theologies in the resurrected and exalted Lord (although Paul uses cosmological and John political terms); and emphasis on the necessity of Christ’s suffering and death.

In 1 Co. 14:6 and 2 Co. 12:1 and 7, by ‘revelation’ (ἀποκάλυψις) Paul means an apocalyptic revelation such as the Book of Revelation. In other words, the Holy Spirit shows Paul the revelation during his stay in Corinth to preach (cf. Grosheide, 1954:170; Witherington, 1995a:282). Unlike John, whose vision is recalled the Merkabah of Ezekiel’s vision, Paul cast 2 Co. 12 (his extraordinary experience of the heavenly vision) in the light of his knowledge not of the Merkabah experiences but of apocalyptic experiences that did not necessarily involve Ezekiel’s throne vision (Witherington, 1995a:461). However, as De Boer (2002:33) maintains, the apocalyptic perspective of Paul cannot be reduced to a totally personal, mythical experience of the heavenly world or to the reception of heavenly secrets (see Dunn, 1988:43). Paul uses ‘apocalyptic language’, that is, the word ἀποκάλυψις and its cognate verb ἀποκαλύπτω, in a number of places to characterise the action of God in Christ (in the past and present as well as in the future) as an intelligible-apocalyptic-eschatological event (cf. De Boer, 2000:350, 357). What happens between Jesus’ resurrection and Parousia can be placed under the rubric of apocalyptic: for instance (1) the proclamation of the gospel (Ro. 1:16-17: οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν πάντων· ἐν τῷ πιστεύων τινί Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ)
\[\text{\textit{apokaluptetai}}^{273} \text{\textit{ek pisteos eis pistin, kathos}
\textit{gegrapta}, 'Ode dikaiosgek pist}-
\textit{-eos zhexetai; cf. Ro. 16:25-26} (2) the working of the Spirit (1 Co. 2:10:
\textit{hmin de apekalupheven o theos dial tou pneimatos}), and (3) the present
\textit{wrath of God against all the godlessness and wickedness of men (Ro. 1:18:
'Apokaluptetai gar orgh theou ap' ouranoi epi pasan asbeian kai dikian}
\textit{anphropewn twi tini alltheian en dikia katechontw). According to Paul, God has
done the redemptive work in the apocalyptic-eschatological event of Christ. In
Revelation John also treats the period between Christ's ascension and the Parousia but
Rev. 12-13 mainly focuses on the death/ascension of Jesus until John's own time.

Grabe (2000:239-240, 266) points out the intertextual theme of God's power in the
Pauline letters and Revelation: "It needs to be emphasised that \[\text{\textit{dynamiz}m}\text{\textit{es}}\]
describes the effect of Paul's message on this world. At the same time this power is
associated with God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, because it is God's power in this world.
Where Paul's message of the cross intersects this world, the message of power in Paul's letters finds
its place. This applies to the soteriological (Ro. 1:16-17; 1 Co. 1:18, 24; 15:55-57) and
the ethical dimensions (1 Co. 1:18, 30; 2 Co. 12:9-10), as well as to the pneumatological
dimension (Ro. 15:13, 19; 1 Co. 2:4-5) of the concept of power". It seems that both Paul
and John understand God's power as the gospel, manifested through the resurrection of
Christ and now evidenced through the presence of the Spirit (e.g. Rev. 4:11; 7:12;
11:17; 12:10; 15:8; 19:1). Unlike John, Paul appears to stress the political meaning of
God's power less clearly.

5.1.2.4.2. Galatians

Martyn (2000:253-255) spells out that in fact, numerous locutions in Galatians show
that apocalyptic motifs thread their way through the whole letter. The motif of
apocalyptic discontinuity between 'the present evil age' (Gal. 1:4: to\[\text{D\textit{on}}tos\]
\[\text{\textit{eauto}}\text{\textit{u}}\]

---

\[273\] Dunn (1988:43) notes that the sense of a disclosure divinely given (divine passive; cf. Rev.
12:14; 13:5) is fundamental to the word \[\text{\textit{apokaluptetai}}\] ("it is being revealed" in Ro. 1:17)
with all its connotations of heavenly authority. \[\text{\textit{apekalupheven}}, the verb, became the technical one
for the 'divine revelation of certain supernatural secrets (e.g. Ps. 98:2; 1 Co. 2:10). This
becomes a clearly developed idea in Jewish and Christian 'apocalyptic' (e.g. Da. 2:22). For Paul
this is the ordinary verb for supernatural revelation of any kind (Fee, 1999:99).
In the context of Galatians, we are told about Christ’s ‘coming’ in 3:19, 23, 25, but only the Christological statement in 4:4-5 tells us more about this coming. … The term γενόμενον ἐκ refers to the birth of a human being ‘out of’ a human mother, while γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου defines the conditions of existence of a human being. … This Christology emphasises Christ’s existence as a human being, in particular his being a Jew. As a parallel to ‘born by a woman’ the phrase ‘put under the law’ must have originally had a positive meaning in contrast to the Pauline context, where it is viewed negatively. … This Christology shows characteristic differences with other Pauline Christological passages, but it is acceptable to Paul.

In a similar way, John also develops this apocalyptic thought on the basis of Christ’s redemptive coming (cf. Rev. 12:3). God sent his Son, Christ, into the old creation (Rev. 12:2; Gal. 1:4; 4:4-5) in the middle of which He accomplished salvation, namely the new creation. Paul views both Judaism and paganism on the same level as a part of the old world. Similarly, according to John, Judaism belongs to the old covenant, which has been fulfilled in Christ on the one hand; Jesus has conquered Roman paganism on the other hand (cf. Betz, 1979:320).

When Rev. 12:1, 2, 17 and Gal. 4:26-27, 29 are juxtaposed, their intertextual relation is clear as the below figure shows:
Rev. 12:1: Καὶ σήμειον μέγα ὡφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἁγνηθεὶς περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἡλίουν, καὶ η ἁσλΗνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα

Rev. 12:2: καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα, καὶ κράζει ὡδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκείν.

Rev. 12:17: καὶ ὁργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγάλματι καὶ ἀπήλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς τῶν πηροῦντων τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ θεοῦ274 καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.

Gal. 4:26: ἡ δὲ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἤτις ἑστὶν μητὴρ ἡμῶν.

Gal. 4:27: γεγραπται γάρ, Εὐφράνθητι, στείρα ἡ οὐ τίκουσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ ὡδίνουσα: ὅτι πολλά τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου275 μᾶλλον ἡ τῆς ἔχουσης τὸν ἄνδρα.

Gal. 4:29: ἀλλ’ ὡσπερ τότε ὃ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεῖς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν.

The overarching hermeneutical issue in Gal. 4:27-29 is how Paul can use the story of Hagar and Sarah to effect an exegetical reversal that ends up identifying Jews under the law as the children of Hagar and Christians under the Spirit as the children of Sarah (cf. Ge. 21; Isa. 54:1). In the intertextual light of Rev. 12 and Gal. 4, it is evident that the number of the (Gentile) Christians as the New Jerusalem will ultimately outnumber Jews, who persecute the Church (cf. Hobes, 1993:300, 304).

Here, attention should be paid to the intertextual relation between Gal. 3:16, 19, and Rev. 12:17 (cf. Gal. 3:29). ἐπαγγελλαὶ-ἐντολάς, Χριστός-Ιησοῦ, and σπέρμα(τι)

274 Both from the intertextual relation between Isa. 54:1 and Gal. 4 and from the historical setting of the OT and the NT, it seems that John’s intention to use ‘God’ (Rev. 12:17) is to contrast God with the local patron deity, which usually is regarded as the husband of the ancient city (as a female personification). In other words, John stresses that it is God who is the covenant Patron (husband) of the above Jerusalem, the Church (cf. Hobes, 1993:308).

275 It is the nexus of Sarah’s story in Genesis (Ge. 11:30; 21), Isaiah’s use of Sarah (Isa. 54:1), and Paul’s (Gal. 4:21-31) further use of Isaiah that forms the intertextual space in which the theme of barrenness is to be understood (Hobes, 1993:306). But in Rev. 12-13 the theme of barrenness is absent. The reason, perhaps, is the fact that the abundant theme of barrenness (or childlessness) in the OT and the NT has been fulfilled in the Book of Revelation (see Isaiah’s prophetic promise concerning Jerusalem’s glorious future in Isa. 54). It can, however, be assumed that the plight of the barren and rejected Jerusalem (‘the present city of Jerusalem’ in Gal. 3:25; cf. Isa. 1:4, 21) is implied in Rev. 12 in that the Jews, the persecuting subject of the Church, are implicitly described as an antithesis of the glorious and rejoicing New Jerusalem (cf. Isa. 1:26).
Gal. 3:16: τῷ δὲ Ἄβραάμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματί αὐτοῦ, οὐ λέγει. Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἐνός. Καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὃς ἐστιν Χριστός.

Gal. 3:19: ἄχρις οὖν ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ὃς ἐπήγγελται

Rev. 12:17: καὶ ὑφήγηθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ ἀπήλθεν ποίησαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λῃστῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς τῶν τηροῦντων τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔχοντω τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ιησοῦ.

In Gal. 3:16 and 19, Paul points out that the singular σπέρμα has reference to Christ as the true recipient of God’s promise to Abraham. Paul, for whom physical descent is no guarantee of spiritual relationship, argues that Christ is the ‘seed’ in view of the Abrahamic covenant, and then goes on in Gal. 3:29 to speak of those ‘in Christ’ (or ‘of Christ’: ἰμεῖς Χριστοῦ) as also being Abraham’s seed (τοῦ Ἄβραάμ σπέρμα) and heirs according to the promise (see Longnecker, 1990:131). Here, the corporate relation between Christ (the fulfiller of God’s covenant) and the people of God (the heirs of God’s covenant, namely ‘the rest of her offspring’ in Rev. 12:17) is evident. To put it differently, since the seed of Abraham is Jesus as well as the saints, the person of Christ has to be understood in terms of his ‘inclusive Church character’. In short, all in Christ are equally the seed of Abraham. This is paralleled with the progress of revelation history in Rev. 12-13 in that, like Paul, John not only accentuates the

276 With regard to the Jesus’ church character depicted by the singular σπέρμα, Sarah’s identity as the barren woman to whom God promises a miraculous birth merges with that of the barren one of Isa. 54:1 at only one point in history – when Jesus, the seed of Abraham (and hence the son of Sarah) arose from the grave to be the firstborn son of the New Jerusalem. In Gal. 3:16 Paul argues that the nation which God promised to bring from Sarah’s dead womb and the population of the New Jerusalem prophesied by Isaiah are those people who are born through the resurrection of Jesus, not those who are circumcised. Thus, the purposefully intertextual combination between the Abrahamic covenant, as represented by Sarah, and the New Covenant established in Christ comes to the fore both in Gal. 3 and Rev. 12 (Hobes, 1993:316). Christology involves the assertion of Jesus’ universal relatedness (i.e. church character). In the history of Christology a variety of concepts have been used to express this: church character, representativeness, substitution, incorporation and participation, universal humanity and others. In his life, death and resurrection, the exalted Christ has established his identity as one of open identification with others, open in principle and potential to all who will identify with him in faith. Until the Parousia his identification with all remains open to all. The Parousia as the completion of his own identity, as revelatory of the final truth of his loving identification with all, will be also the completion of the identity of all others (see Bauckham, 2001:276-277).
transition of the Old Covenant to the New, but also confirms the universal salvation by Jesus' coming on Jerusalem/Rome.

5.1.2.4.3. Ephesians

The intertextuality between Revelation and Ephesians seems to be only indirect. The faith in Christ's blood (Rev. 12:11) repels all the accusations as with a shield in Eph. 6:16 (ἐν πάσιν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως, ἐν ψυχησοςεθε πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ [τὰ] πεπυρμένα ὁβέσαι; cf. 1 Pe. 5:8-9) (Durham, 2000:671). Undoubtedly, faith as a human response could be in view here. But it is worth considering whether πίστις should be interpreted as 'faithfulness', thus denoting Christ's faithfulness on behalf of the believers (Moritz, 1996:203-204). If it is true, in Eph. 6:16 Paul may be thinking of the interplay of God's action in Christ and the Christian response to it. Similarly, in his doxology (Rev. 12:10-12) John ascribes the victory to the blood of Christ and then Christian's testimony. Another means of victory, namely, 'the word of their testimony' (Rev. 12:11) recalls 'the sword of the Spirit' (τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεῦματος),277 which is 'the word of God' (ῥῆμα θεοῦ) (Eph. 6:17). The object (or enemy) of the Christian's spiritual war is the spiritual forces of evil (Eph. 6:12; cf. Rev. 12:7).

5.1.2.4.4. Philippians

To begin with, it must be stressed that, like the Book of Revelation, Philippians is an example of the phenomenon of multiple intertextual echoes. Philippians 2:5-11, for instance, echoes Ge. 1, Ps. 8, Isa. 45:23, Da. 7, Ro. 5:12-21 and 1 Co. 15:20-28 (cf. Wright, 1998:58).

277 The genitive, 'of the Spirit', in this case is either source ('given by the Spirit') or possessive ('belonging to the Spirit'). In 'the Word of God', Paul uses the word ῥῆμα, instead of the more usual word λόγος (e.g. 1 Co. 14:36; 2 Co. 2:17; 4:2; 1 Th. 1:8; 2:13; 2 Th. 3:1; cf. Rev. 12:11). While these words are near synonyms and therefore can often be used interchangeably, ῥῆμα tends to point out the emphasis on that which is spoken at a given point, whereas λόγος frequently emphasises the content of the message. If this distinction holds here, then Paul's emphasis is on the actual 'speaking forth' of the message inspired by the Spirit (Fee, 1999:728-729).
Jesus partially exercised and displayed his authority during his earthly ministry, though not all recognised it (e.g. Mk. 1:27; 2:20; 3:22-27). But in Rev. 12:10 this authority of Christ is seen in all its consummating power, before which no enemy can stand and by which Christ completely exonerates his followers and the faith they have in him. Paul declares the same truth in the so-called Christ-hymn, in which Christ’s humiliation (cf. δοῦλος in Php. 2:7), his death (θανάτου σταυροῦ in Php. 2:8; cf. Eph. 1:20-23) and exaltation (in Php. 2:7-11) are clear (esp. Php. 2:10-11: ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ πάν γόνι κάμψη ἐπουρανίως καὶ ἐπιλείπον καὶ καταχθο -νίων καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσηται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θε -οῦ πατὸς) (cf. Brighton, 1999:337). Christ in his incarnation and death exemplifies the qualities that Paul wishes to see in Philippians (Holloway, 2001:122; contra Martin, 1997:68-74). From the above facts, what might be called an abasement-exaltation pattern is clear. Bloomquist (1993:163, 195) is correct when he notes: “Suffering is not the servant’s final experience. The one assurance the servant has is the triumph of God’s grace, understood in terms of exaltation. Thus, the servant, though despised by humanity, is in fact the one through whom the grace of God is proclaimed and who is vindicated”. In Php. 2:6-11, Paul is assured that his (and the Philippians’) suffering will be vindicated as Christ as servant suffered and was vindicated.

In connection with the exaltation of Christ, Silva (1992:131) correctly avers that the Christ-hymn patently expresses Paul’s own conviction that the worship of Jesus does not compromise Israel’s monotheistic faith. Likewise, when John juxtaposes the authority of God the Father with that of Christ in the doxology in Rev. 12:10, he

278 In the Christ-hymn, the doxological indicative tinged with the soteriological meaning (i.e. Christ’s humiliation and exaltation) gives power to the ethically-oriented imperative meaning (i.e. the Philippian community’s daily life according to its model, Christ). As a result, the ethical and the soteriological explanation of the hymn do not necessarily imply conflict with one another. Put differently, ethic is indebted to soteriology. This is also the case in the hymns of Revelation (see Floor & Viljoen, 2002:100-102).

279 Wright (1998:62), drawing on the Adam-Christology (or Servant-Christology) in Php. 2:5-11, thinks that the weight of Paul’s soteriology here lies neither on incarnation nor on exaltation per se, but on the cross, understood as the climax and completion of the divine plan of salvation. The task marked out for Israel has been accomplished by her representative, i.e. Christ as the last Adam (for the complex parallel and contrast between Adam and Christ, see Wright, 1998:59-62).
respects the Jewish monotheistic worship too.\footnote{A similar opinion is Wright’s (1998:94): “It should be clear that Paul remained a monotheist, and never sold out his position to any sort of Hellenistic ditheism or polytheism. It is also clear that Paul regarded Jesus Christ as still Jesus Christ, not simply absorbed into God the Father, as the last phrase of the hymn indicates: honour to Jesus glorifies the Father (Php. 2:11)”. With regard to Paul’s understanding of monotheism, Fatehi’s (2000:329-330) argument is similar: How could Paul as a Jew understand the Risen Christ in relation to his monotheistic faith? According to Fatehi, scholars are not united in their perception of Jewish monotheism. On the one hand, there are those who seem to have too narrow a view of first century Jewish monotheism. These usually conceive of a divine Christology as a breach of monotheism and thus often cannot see any place for it before Christianity is well rooted in Gentile soil. On the other hand, there are those scholars who even deny that monotheism is an appropriate designation to be used for Judaism of the time. For these, a divine Christ would be just one among many parallel concepts already found in Judaism, concepts which Christians could easily borrow and apply to Jesus. The truth seems to lie somewhere between these two extremes. It seems that there was a novum appearing in Christianity even in the early years of its inception, but this novum was so much wrapped up with and interpreted through a stretching of available Jewish concepts that it could not so easily or so early be recognised as a novum. For Paul, the Risen Christ is an agent of God, a real person who is active through God’s Spirit, and included within God himself.} Bauckham (1993a:139-140) is correct in arguing that John, while holding Christ worthy of worship, remains sensitive to the issue of monotheism in worship. Christ cannot be an alternative object of worship alongside God, but shares in the glory due to God. The singular verb ἐγένετο (‘has come’) in Rev. 12:10 implies an important aspect of John’s theology as in the cases of the singular verb ἐγένετο in Rev. 11:15 and singular pronouns αὐτὸῦ in Rev. 22:3-4. It seems that the singular in these cases refers to God and Christ together ‘as a unity’ because John is very sensitive to the theological implications of language and is even prepared to defy grammar for the sake of theology (cf. Rev. 1:4). John is evidently reluctant to speak of God and Christ together as a plurality. John never makes them the subjects of a plural verb or uses a plural pronoun to refer to them both. The reason is clear: John places Christ on the divine side of the distinction between God and creation, but he wishes to avoid ways of speaking which sound to him polytheistic. The consistency of his usage shows that he has reflected carefully on the relation of Christology to monotheism (cf. Bauckham, 1993a:140).

The universal lordship of the exalted Christ is clear both from ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ ἐπιγείῳ καὶ καταχθονίῳ (i.e. a three-storied universe as the cosmological phraseology of Paul’s day; cf. Rev. 5:13) in Php. 2:10 and ‘you who tabernacle in heaven, the earth and the sea’ in Rev. 12:12 (cf. Silva, 1992:133). As
Martin (1997:256) notes, in Php. 2:10-11, what God had announced as a future promise is now a reality (cf. Isa. 45:23: LXX: ὁτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ἡξωμολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ). Isaiah had expected a turning to Yahweh of all the nations upon earth. Paul not only extends the scope to include all sentient beings throughout the entire cosmos but also applies God's absolute authority to Christ (cf. Floor, 1998:104). Since the object of Christ's universal lordship (or homage) does not exclude the angelic beings (cf. Mt. 7:22; Lk. 9:49; 10:17), Jesus is acknowledged as Lord of all angelic forces, especially malevolent demons (e.g. Rev. 12:10; cf. Martin, 1997:261).

At this stage, then, an important question arises. Are the facts of Christ's present lordship and the church's oppression by the very powers which acknowledge his authority be set side by side, like parallel lines which never meet? The fact that the enthronement scene is pictured (as in Rev. 5:1-14) in a hymn may put exegetes on the track of an answer to this question. Within the structure and setting of the Christological hymn the Church is caught up in the drama of redemption and lifted into the presence of God's heavenly court. However, for the church, which is still on earth, it is a time of conflict and sore trial, cruel harassment and endurance of many enemies. But the Christ-hymn enables the Church to see beyond the present in which the Head of the Church reigns invisibly and powerfully to that full proof of his reign in the heavenly sphere in which all the powers are veritably subject to him and his dominion is manifestly confessed (cf. Martin, 1997:268-270). The same question and answer can be applied to Rev. 12-13. When the seven churches listen to the doxology in Rev. 12:10-12 they are also caught up from earth to heaven, from the scene of conflict and duress into the presence of the all-encompassing Lord, from the harsh realities of what is to the

---

281 Epaphroditus (Php. 2:25; 4:18) tells Paul of a number of problems in the Philippians. One of these is a quarrel between Syntyche and Euodia (Php. 4:2-3); but there is also a more widespread fractiousness in the church (Php. 1:27; 2:1-4, 12-16). In addition, there are certain political 'opponents' at Philippi who are persecuting the church (Php. 1:28-30; see Holloway, 2001:44). Though Paul's enemies in Philippi are both the Judaising heresy and Gentiles, the former seems to be dominant (e.g. Php. 1:15-17, 27-28; 3:2, 18-19; see Silva, 1992:9-10). By keeping in mind these problems and enemies in Philippians, Holloway (2001:55, 74-75) reasons that Paul's primary objective in writing to the Philippians is to 'console' them or to rouse them from their despondency over his bonds. Two important consolatory topoi in Philippians are: (1) Paul's use of χαρά and its cognates (16 times in Philippians: 1:4, 18 [twice], 25; 2:2, 17 [twice], 18 [twice], 28, 29; 3:1; 4:1, 4 [twice], 10). (2) The familiar distinction between things that matter and things that do not (Php. 1:10a: εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα).
glorious prospect and promise of what will be, because it is so already in God's sight.

Boring (1989:7) finds the following similarities between Revelation and Paul: the problem of realised eschatology; love as the supreme expression of the Christian life; the problem of emphasising charismatic endowments at the expense of brotherly love; the assumption that Christians are also sinners; the church as the continuation and fulfillment of God's promise to Israel; the claim to be prophets without claiming to know everything; Christian reigning and judging as part of the eschatological scenario; the paradox of works and grace; vice catalogues; and a liturgical context for the reading of the letter.

5.1.2.4.5. 1 and 2 Thessalonians

To begin with, the comparison between 1 Thessalonians (esp. 1 Th. 4:13-18) and 2 Thessalonians (esp. 2 Th. 2:1-12) is instructive in that both are very similar (and different) in structure and wording. But a striking difference is their concepts related with parousia: (1) in 1 Th. a/the parousia is understood to be imminent, but in 2 Th. it is understood to be delayed; (2) in 1 Th. a/the parousia will come suddenly, without any warning (1 Th. 5:2); in 2 Th., however, any parousia will not come suddenly but will be preceded by a series of public events; (3) in 1 Th. the tone is warning and the emphasis falls upon the salvation of Christians and their eternal fellowship with the Lord. In 2 Th., however, the tone is cold and the emphasis falls upon the eternal

---

282 When he researches the Jesus tradition in 1 Th. 4:13-5:11, Kim (2002:238-241) assumes that the Thessalonians received from Paul Jesus' sayings, such as the interconnected parables of the thief, the watchmen and the steward (Mt. 24:30-31, 43-51; Mk. 13:26-27; Lk. 12:36-48), and understood them one-sidedly as meaning that only the living would be gathered at the Parousia of the Lord. Since those sayings did not have any reference to the resurrection of the dead, they thought that only those who would be present at the coming of the Lord would be gathered by the angels. The Son of Man's future coming described in the parables generally gave the Thessalonians the impression that the Parousia was ‘imminent’, and so made them extremely excited.

283 The purpose of 1 Thessalonians, as a deliberative genre, is to exhort the persecuted Christians. Some of the consolatory topics and patterns in 1 Th and also in Revelation: (1) the inability of Paul to be present at the moment of sorrow is what leads him to write a letter of consolation (1 Th. 2:27-28; Rev. 1:9); (2) once Paul as consoler chooses the letter as a way of consoling, sympathy is usually the first characteristic pattern to be found (1 Th. 2:2; Rev. 1:9); (3) after some words of sympathy Paul offers some considerations about suffering and human
destruction of unbelievers (2 Th. 1:6-9). From these three features in 2 Th., it is explicable that, like John the seer, Paul warns his readers of the fact that God's eschatological destructive action, his wrath, is finally directed towards both the unbelievers and the inimical spiritual forces (sin, death, flesh, Satan) that alienate them from God and life (cf. De Boer, 2000:375-276). With regard to 1 Th. 4:13-18, the provenance of the Parousia, however, is not clear. On the one hand, some hold that Paul's portrayal of the term draws on the depictions of the Hellenistic imperial parousia. According to this model, Paul is here depicting the bringing of the Lord: as the citizens go out of the city to meet the coming dignitary and accompany him into their city, so also the faithful go out (or up) to meet the coming Lord in order to accompany him to their earthly abode. On the other hand, others argue that the source of imagery for Paul is OT and Jewish apocalyptic rather than the Hellenistic imperial parousia. The entire scene of 1 Th. 4:13-18 deals with the bringing of the faithful, not with the bringing of the Lord (esp. v. 14). It appears that Paul draws on the developed imagery of life as a source of consolation to the one in sorrow (1 Th. 3:3-4; Rev. 1:5); (4) the mention of future afflictions (1 Th. 3:3; Rev. 12:12, 17) could also be understood within a consolatory rhetorical framework, since consolatory writings' references to foreseeing possible sorrows are frequently found; (5) the noble way in which the addressee has faced sorrowful circumstances is also characteristic of a consolatory work as a joy for the consoler himself (1 Th. 1:6-10; Rev. 2:2-3, 13, 19; 3:8); (6) consolation by exempla is another commonplace (1 Th. 2:14-15; Rev. 1:5; 11:10-11; 12:17; 13:8, 15); (7) the consoler finishes his consolation with an exhortation to overcome grief and suffering (1 Th. 4-5; Rev. 22:20-21). However, unlike ancient consolatory literature, there is a lack of reference to a sad event at the beginning of the letter. This is the difference in Paul's view on suffering — to hope for eternal life with God. Hence it seems that Paul's exhortation comes from a position that is closer to the role of the OT prophets than to the moral authority of philosophers and moralists who wrote works of consolation. Paul intends to socialise the readers — in other words to teach them and encourage them to accept new roles in society, to change their lives according to God's will and to remain faithful to Christ, regardless of the hardships and opposition that they encounter. Since the socio-historical situation of 1 Th. and that of Revelation are similar, therefore, the authors' exhortative purposes also correspond to one another (cf. Chapa, 1994:156-159; Cornelius, 2001:439, 444; contra Theunissen, 1999:200-201).

Apart from παρουσία, two words (phrases) in 1 Th. 4-5 are remarkable owing to their political implication. (1) ἀντίπαρος (1 Th. 4:17) appears to be employed from the political realm. ἀντίπαρος is a technical term describing the festive and formal meeting of a king or other dignitary who arrives for a visit of a city. It is the crucial term for Paul's description of the festive reception of the Lord at his coming. The united community, those who are alive and those who have died and have been raised, will meet the Lord like a delegation of a city that goes out to meet and greet an emperor when he comes to visit. (2) As a political slogan, εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια (= pax et securitas) in 1 Th. 5:3 is best ascribed to the realm of imperial Roman propaganda. This phrase implies that Paul points to the coming of the day of the Lord as an event that will shatter the false peace and security of the Roman establishment (see Koester, 1997:160-162).
available to him in Jewish-Christian apocalyptic and Hellenistic ideas and that he uses this imagery in a creative fashion (see Plevnik, 1997:89-90).

The image of the woman with child (ὡσπερ ἡ ὄδιν τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχοντη; 1 Th. 5:3; Rev. 12:2) is found frequently in prophetic and Jewish apocalyptic literature, although with somewhat different meanings. In 1 Th. 5:3 it brings out the danger, the intense pain, the inevitability, and the suddenness of the coming of Christ. Although Paul does not use the words 'judgment' and 'to judge' (κρίσις or κρίνω) consistently, he here talks about the judgment (τότε αἰϕυίδιος αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται ὅλεθρος) with the image of a sudden disaster when Jesus is coming (cf. Plevnik, 1997:118, 222). Like Paul, in Rev. 12:2-5 John introduces the purpose of Jesus' birth (coming) to judge Satan.

It is interesting and worth noting that like Rev. 12-13, 2 Th. 2 contains the three traditional approaches, excepting the idealist approach: preterist (world or church)
historical and futurist approach. Morris (1984:220-221) discusses this phenomenon at length in 2 Th. 2:

Who is this Man of Lawlessness? A common identification is with the Roman Emperor, either with an individual, or with the line of emperors (i.e. preterism) ... A variant of this view is that the whole idea is derived from the concept of *Nero Redivivus*. The suggestion is made that the present passage is not due to the Apostle Paul, but to some later writer who has taken up facets of the Nero legend ... From the Reformation onwards there have been many who have identified the papacy with the man of Lawlessness (i.e. historicism) ... (Others) think that the Man of Lawlessness is an eschatological personage (i.e. futurism).

The social context of 2 Thessalonians needs briefly to be investigated. 2 Th. 1:4 says the situation of persecution (cf. the persecution of the Jews in 1 Th. 4:12). In 2 Th. 2:2 and 3:11, the urgent and imminent expectation of the Parousia and its negative effects cause problems in the Thessalonian church. Based upon these verses and 1 Thessalonians, it may be deduced that the Thessalonian church, like the seven churches in Asia Minor, suffered inwardly from persecution and trials (e.g. false teachings) as well as outwardly (e.g. the persecution of the Diaspora Jews and Gentiles). Thus, it can be deduced that in a situation of this kind Paul is less a theologian who tries to come to grips with a theological problem, that is, the delay of the Parousia, than he is a pastor who wants to strengthen his readers in their afflictions (cf. Hartman, 1990:472). Here, it is noteworthy that a paralleling element between John's Gentile audiences and Paul's Gentile converts comes to the fore. Paul's Gentile converts were troubled not by the Diaspora Jews but by unconverted Gentiles, precisely the people who persisted in worshipping the idols from which the Thessalonians had turned (cf. Still, 1999:226).

Acknowledging this socio-historical context of the Thessalonian church, Paul combines apocalyptic with polemic, which are responses of an oppressed minority group to a dominant majority group, to offer a powerful, if hostile, retort to his and his converts' plight (cf. Still, 1999:206). The apocalyptic elements in 2 Thessalonians are strong, e.g. vindication (2 Th. 1:6-9), imminence, and dualism (2 Th. 2:12: the believer vs. the evil before the eschatological judge/saviour of the world. 2 Thessalonians has a strong pessimistic outlook on the world, an outlook which is often, though not always, found in apocalyptic literature (cf. Mt. 24; 2 Pe. 3).
unfaithful). It seems that Paul’s abundant use of apocalyptic images makes the correct understanding of 2 Th. more delicate. The common scholarly claim is that 1 and 2 Thessalonians are among Paul’s most apocalyptically-oriented\textsuperscript{288} epistles (cf. Still, 1999:194). With his ‘Christian’ apocalyptic understanding, Paul overcomes the Jewish apocalypticism in that his Christian ethics, for example, do not concentrate on the acquisition of future salvation but on the preoccupation with it, here and now (cf. Marxsen, 1982:65, 71).

2 Th. 2:3b-12 is best understood as a bifid parallel structure separated by 2 Th. 2:5 into two halves with 2 Th. 2:3b-4 matching 2 Th. 2:6-12. As in Rev. 12-13, since the use of the present tense in 2 Th. 2:5-7 breaks the chronological sequencing of 2 Th. 2:3-12, a conceptual rather than a sequential relationship between the two halves should be understood. The second half answers the rhetorical question of 2 Th. 2:5 and deals with the same material as the first, but amplifies or clarifies it in greater detail.

The figure below shows the parallel structure of 2 Th. 2:3b-12 (cf. Brown, 1993:255-260):

\begin{figure}
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\textsuperscript{288} It seems that Paul is influenced by the Jewish apocalyptic thought where sufferings precede the end of history and are even a sign of its end. Paul sees the sufferings as time-identifying signs that the end of the world and the Parousia of Christ are near. At this point, Paul and John the seer share a common intertext: the decisive factor to Paul and John is to insist that suffering constitutes the Thessalonians and the seven churches in Asia Minor as Christians and thereby as true Jews. If they are Christians they are also exposed to adversities and sufferings when they are persecuted by their compatriots. Paul and John remind their readers that their perseverance has reached a limit (1 Th. 1:10; 4:13, 17; see Willert, 1997:230-231).
Connected with the intertextuality of Rev. 12-13, the man of lawlessness, Nero, in 2 Th. 2 written ca. AD 52 is to be preteristically understood for several reasons (Gentry, 2000:5; cf. Sowers, 1970:317; Mathison, 1999:232):

(1) Since the dragon symbolises the Satan, 'Water like a river' (Rev. 12:15) also symbolises the false teaching, likewise 2 Th. 2:9-11 (cf. Horton, 2001:191).

(2) Obvious parallels with Mt. 24 and Rev. 13 tie it into their era of accomplishment: the late AD 60s up to AD 70.

(3) The reference to the temple as still standing (2 Th. 2:4: ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπερα-ρομενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεόν ἡ σέβασμα, ὅστε αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι ἀποδεικνύοντα ἐαυτὸν ὅτι ἔστιν θεός). The man of the lawlessness, like the sea beast (Rev. 13:6), attempts an assault on the throne of God in his holy temple. As Wanamaker (1990:246) argues, ναὸς is made definite by the article and the possessive genitive τοῦ θεοῦ, indicating that a specific building was intended. Although it is true that in 1 Co. 3:16f. Paul employs ναὸς in a metaphorical sense to refer to the Christian as a temple of God, in the context of 2 Th. 2:4 where no mention is made of the believer and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as in 1 Corinthians, such an interpretation is highly unlikely. Jewish Christian as well as Gentile Christian would undoubtedly have understood it as a reference to the one true temple of God in Jerusalem, especially since the verse contains an allusion to Da. 11:31-35 and the

289 In particular, the parallelism or the intertextual relation between Mt. 24 and 2 Th. 2 is striking: (1) a coming of the Lord (2 Th. 2:1; Mt. 24:27, 30), (2) a gathering together to Jesus (2 Th. 2:1; Mt. 24:31), (3) apostasy (2 Th. 2:3; Mt. 24:5, 10-12), (4) the mystery of lawlessness (2 Th. 2:7; Mt. 24:12), (5) satanic signs and wonders (2 Th. 2:9-10; Mt. 24:24), and (6) a deluding influence on unbelievers (2 Th. 2:11; Mt. 24:5, 24). As a matter of fact, the text of 2 Th. 2:1-12 echoes a number of words and phrases also found in Mt. 24:3-31 and, to a lesser degree, Mk. 13:3-27. These parallels prove a first century fulfillment of 2 Th. 2 (Mathison, 1999:230; cf. Hartman, 1990:480-483; McNicol, 1996:62). In general, according to Barclay (1992:51, 55), the atmosphere created by 1 and 2 Thessalonians is heavy with apocalyptic excitement. If the symbolic world of the Thessalonians is decidedly apocalyptic, its social context is dominated by conflict. The standard dualisms of Jewish apocalyptic – between heaven and earth, the present and the future, the elect and the lost – are all present and given sharp focus through the death and resurrection of Jesus. The more opposition the believers in Thessalonica encounter, the more obviously their opponents are darkened in their understanding, captured by the power of evil forces and justly deserving of the judgment they will shortly face. Then, apocalyptic symbols and social dislocation maintain and reinforce each other. This is, in fact, a classic example of the dialectic between symbolic worlds and social processes in which the symbols suggest a certain interpretation of social events and where that construction of events is embraced as confirmation of the reality one believes in.
desecration of the temple at Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes. It would not have been possible to pronounce a name more hateful to Jewish ears than the name of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was the Nero of his age, the inveterate enemy of Israel, the profaner of the temple, the sanguinary persecutor of the people of God. Indeed, Antiochus IV is seen as the prototype of Nero (Russell, 1996:186-187).

(4) The interpretation of 2 Th. 2 hinges on the identification of the so-called 'restrainer' in vs. 6-7. The present restraining of the man of lawlessness are the imperial law and Claudius Caesar (2 Th. 2:6: καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχων οἴδατε εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἐαυτοῦ καρφί; κατέχων in 2 Th. 2:7).

(5) The contemporary operation of the man of lawlessness in mystery form during Paul’s day (2 Th. 2:7: τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἠδή ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας· μόνον ὅ κατ ἐχὼν ἀρτι ἐως ἐκ μέσου γένηται). In 1 Macc. 2:48 and 62, the name ‘the man the sinner’ (ἀνήρ ἀμαρτωλὸς) is given to Antiochus. And it seems highly probable that the epithet ‘man of sin’ (or lawlessness) was chosen by Paul to designate a person of like character and destined to a similar fate as Antiochus IV. The man of lawlessness is Nero who is an individual – a public person – holding the highest rank in the State; heathen, and not Jewish; a monster of wickedness, trampling upon all law. If this epistle was written in AD 52-53, Nero was not yet manifested; his true character had been not discovered (Russell, 1996:182, 186).

(6) The overall relevant correspondence of the features with the contemporary situation in which the Thessalonians found themselves. While officially sanctioned persecution of the church was rare in the first century, this did not mean that Jews or Christians would not be subject to unofficial acts of hostility and abuse. It is clear from Josephus and Philo that such unorganised persecution could take more violent forms. There seems to be no mention of martyrdom in 1, 2 Thessalonians, so it can be surmised that the persecution was the sort which was normally leveled at people whose lifestyles were considered deviant and a threat to the city’s way of life (DeSilva, 1996:62-63).

290 It seems that Jesus (Mt 24:15-24), Paul (2. Th. 2:1-12) and John (Rev. 13:1) describe the eschatological antichrist in language that had earlier been employed to describe the depredations of Antiochus Epiphanes against the Palestinian Jews of Judea and Jerusalem. Antiochus served as a type of the final persecution of God’s people in some circles of first-century Judaism (Helyer, 2002:144).
Both 2 Th. 2 and Rev. 13 warn of the judgment on the Jews and Nero. Not only was Jerusalem destroyed, but the man of lawlessness, Nero himself, died a violent death in the midst of the Jewish War (June 8, AD 68).

The presence of Christ' is described by both ἐν τῇ ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου Ησοῦ αὐ- π’ οὐρανοῦ μετ’ ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (2 Th. 1:7; cf. 2 Th. 2:3, 6) and τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Th. 2:1, 8, 9).

According to Spicq (1996:53-54), παρουσία means sometimes the presence of persons or things, and sometimes arrival, coming visit. In the Hellenistic period, it refers either to a divine manifestation – often very close to ἐπιφάνεια (2 Th. 2:8; 1 Ti. 6:14; 2 Ti. 4:1, 8; Tit. 2:13) and φανέρωσις, and even ἀποκάλυψις – or the formal visit of a sovereign. But he is wrong in insisting that παρουσία in 2 Th. 2:1 and 8-9 (exclusively) means the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus at the end of time, his Second Coming, because the noun does not always mean the Parousia. For instance, in 2 Th. 2:3, ἀποκάλυψις does mean the appearance of the man of lawlessness as a deceptive parody or anti-parousia of Jesus’ (future) coming (cf. Wanamaker, 1990:245).

In 2 Th. 2:8, the means of Christ’s victory over the lawless one are the breath of his mouth (τῶν πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ) and the splendour of his coming (τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ). Correspondingly, Rev. 12:11 and 17 manifest

291 It has been a general assumption that παρουσία is used as a ‘technical term’ for the eschatological coming of Jesus or the Son of Man. However, there is no evidence in pre-Christian apocalyptic literature for such technical usage. If there is any technical use of παρουσία it appears in the terminology for the arrival of a king or an emperor (Koester, 1997:158). Correspondingly, according to Wanamaker (1990:258) and Bauer (2000:780-781), ἐπιφάνεια and ἐπιφάνεια are both used in the literature of Paul’s time as technical terms for the manifestation of a (hidden) divine figure, either in personal form or through an act of power demonstrating his or her presence. παρουσία became the official term for a visit of a person of high rank, especially of kings and emperors visiting a province. Indeed, Paul uses the word παρουσία more often for his presence/coming (1 Co. 10:10; Php. 1:26; 2:12) or for the arrival of his associates (1 Co. 16:17; 2 Co. 7:6-7) than the Lord’s coming. As Curkpatrick (2002:182) puts it, through letters, Paul seeks to maintain a continuum between absence (ἀπουσία) and presence (παρουσία); he writes of a desire to be present, while the letter or emissary functions as his presence in his absence. Paul’s desire for a parousia to his congregations is an implicit desire to overcome the flaws in the apostolic postal system. It is part of his active vocabulary. Thus, only the particular context determines the meaning of this term (Plevnik, 1997:4-5; see 5.1.2.1.).
the word (testimony) of Jesus, by which John’s audiences overthrow their opponents (cf. Rev. 14:12).

2 Th. 2:9 is an intertext of Rev. 13:1 and 13-14 (cf. Marxsen, 1982:136; Hartman, 1990:480). The coming (παροῦσια) of the lawless one is a parody of the true parousia of Christ. Here, Paul probably has in mind the technical sense of the term for official visitations by the emperor to the provinces. Given the probable historical origin of the material in the crisis associated with Nero’s attempt to persecute the faithful, it is worth noting that the connection of ‘in all kinds of counterfeit miracles, signs and wonders’ with the lawless in 2 Th. 2:9 may owe something to the fact that miracles were said to be performed by and in conjunction with various emperors in general, and with Nero in particular (cf. Wanamaker, 1990:259). Like John, for Paul, the evidence of apostleship (or Christian) lies ultimately not in the miraculous (2 Th. 2:9) — in the sense of signs and wonders, since Satan (and false prophets) can also perform these — but in his own ‘imitation of Christ’ in his sufferings and in the fruit of such imitation (Fee, 1999:77).

Within the context of 2 Thessalonians, Paul’s opponents in 2 Th. 2:10, at the same time the object of God’s judgment, are probably those who refused to accept the gospel when it was preached at Thessalonica and became the persecutors of the Christians, though if the idea were a traditional one it would have originally referred to the Jewish people (Wanamaker, 1990:261). Like those who refuse the gospel, in Rev. 13:8 the beast receives worship from all the earth’s inhabitants except those whose names have been written in the Lamb’s book of life.

In Rev. 13:12-13, the evil man will deceive many people through his ‘signs’; however, in 2 Th. 2:11 it is God who visits a powerful delusion on the opponents of 2 Thessalonians — the heretics whose religious faith is perverse and dangerous. The delusion of believers is a standard apocalyptic topic. But here (2 Th. 2:11) the topic of divine delusion is used in a special way. Here God sends the delusion, but there is a special identification of the deluded people; they are, in fact, the ones who refused to believe the orthodox doctrine and thus took pleasure in heresy, here characterised as ‘the lie’ (Hughes, 1989:61).
2 Th. 2:13 (and 2 Th. 1:12) is an important intertext of Rev. 12:10 (and 13:8) in terms of the benefactor system in the first century Greco-Roman world. In Thessalonica, as elsewhere in the Greco-Roman world, to speak of salvation was simply to recognise a form of benefaction. Like John, Paul assures the congregation of its continued reception of benefaction in Christ despite present and future woes (2 Th. 2:13-3:5). In fact, by contrasting the true benefactor with the anti-benefactor figure (i.e. the pseudo-trinity in Revelation and the man of the lawless one in 2 Th.), both John and Paul underline that salvation already received through Christ is brought into relation with anticipated benefactions when the Lord returns as the avenging judge (cf. Danker & Jewett, 1990:490, 494).

‘Stand firm and hold to the teaching’ in 2 Th. 2:15 recalls Rev. 13:10 ‘the perseverance and the faith of the saints’.

Like the Book of Revelation, the apocalyptic language in 2 Th. 2 has an interesting social function. The language reinforces the Christian identity of the readers and carries an implicit exhortation to remain faithful no matter what ‘miracles and wonders’ might seem to refute their beliefs. Paul warns that such miracles and wonders are deceptions (cf. Rev. 13:14; Wanamaker, 1990:261; see Hartman, 1990:473). Paul’s opponents imitate divine miracles in order to lead people away from the true God. 2 Th. 2:11 makes it clear, however, that even this work of deception is ultimately under the control of God and is used by God to achieve his own purpose. In other words, everything, even the deception, is placed in the hands of the Almighty (cf. the passive form in 2 Th. 2:8a and Rev. 13:5; Hartman, 1990:482; Wanamaker, 1990:259).

In the Pauline epistles, the demonic rulers (διάρκειαςωτός) are not identified as the real power behind the human ones, as they were, for example, in the Qumran Jewish sect’s ideology or in Revelation. The ethos of Pauline Christianity is significantly more open than that, say, of the introverted Johannine groups (Meeks, 1983:106-107).

Hartman (1990:483-484) reasons that when he wrote 2 Th. Paul knew and used a version of the synoptic apocalypse when assessing the eschatological interpretation of the situation of the addressees. Afflictions of such a kind depicted in 2 Th. are nothing
new in Pauline churches. 1 Th. is a witness to that (e.g. 1 Th. 2:14; 3:3-4). During the middle of the 1st century, local harassment was a common experience in several Christian churches. The Gospel of Mark reflects this (Mk. 4:17; 10:30), as do Matthew (Mt. 10:17-19; 24:9), Acts (Acts 14:22), 1 Peter (1 Pe. 4:12-19), and Hebrews (Heb. 10:32-39). In conclusion, Hartman (1990:480) holds that Paul has combined the motifs of the abomination of desolation and those of the sign-working false Christs (cf. Rev. 13:13-14) and prophets and added other features from the Danielic texts of the evil king as well as from a few other OT texts.

5.1.2.5. Hebrews

Relating the identity of the author of Hebrews, many persons, including Paul, have been nominated. The author does not claim to be an apostle, or indeed to have any kind of authority over the people to whom he writes. An open verdict seems to be the safest solution. But it is evident that the author was clearly a master of OT content and interpretation (e.g. gezera shawa [clarification of the meaning of one text through a reference to a second text that shares a common, relevant word with the first text] in Heb. 4:1-11; cf. Ge. 2:2; qal wahomer [if something applies in a lesser case, it will apply in a greater case as well] in Heb. 2:2-4; 9:13-14; 10:28-29; 12:25). The depth and extent of oral-scribal intertexture between Hebrews and the OT is impressive indeed (see Ellingworth, 1993:3-21; DeSilva, 2000:32).

If (1) the majority of the readers had come from Judaism to faith in Christ, and (2) the readers lived in some center such as Rome or Asia Minor,292 where Judaism (but not Christianity) was well established and officially tolerated, there could well have been a constant temptation to de-emphasise, conceal, neglect, abandon, and thus in a crisis reject and deny the distinctively Christian dimension of their faith. The writer meets this

292 Dunnill (1992:22-24) assumes that the readers of Hebrews lived in Western Asia Minor. Hebrews is an encyclical letter addressed to a series of small churches of predominantly Jewish Christians. The presence of overlapping themes between the letters directed to Asia Minor readers (Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Peter, Revelation) and Hebrews – though mixed with sufficient diversity to rule out any simple picture of Asian Christianity, and not denying that those themes could as well be manifested elsewhere – is clear (for the detail of the overlapping intertextual themes among 1 Peter, Revelation 2-3 and Hebrews, see Dunnill, 1992:24).
danger, on the one hand negatively, by the severest warnings of the permanent consequences of such action; and on the other hand positively, by presenting Christ as the essential and inseparable culmination of God’s purpose for his own people, under old and new dispensations alike (Ellingworth, 1993:80).

Mathison (1999:132) points out two crucial elements for an understanding of Hebrews, arguing that first, its original audience consisted of dominantly Jewish Christians who were being tempted to return to the shadows of the OT. Second, it was written before the destruction of the temple in AD 70 (cf. Bruce, 1975:xliii; DeSilva, 2000:20).

Freyne (1989:85-92) argues that Hebrews is shaped by Exodus and cultic texts (e.g. Lev. 16; Ps. 91:11) whereas Revelation draws heavily on prophetic and apocalyptic imagery, mainly from Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. The situation of Hebrews’ recipients is that Christians are in danger of reverting to their Jewish past because of a lack of faith in their Christian initiation to bring them into full union with God. The ‘lack of faith’ to which the danger of apostasy points explains the climactic role that Heb. 11:1-12:17 plays in the total argument. From the outset, the author’s intention was to build up the faith of the hearers/readers that he felt to be wavering in the light of the non-fulfilment of promises. This pastoral situation of extreme urgency is not at all dissimilar to the backsliding and lukewarmness that Revelation seeks to address. Moreover, Hebrews and Revelation share the kerygma concerning the eschatological efficacy of Christ’s life, death and resurrection (Heb. 9:14: πόσιν μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεῦμα-ατος αἷμαν ἐκτὸς προσήνεγκεν ἀμωμὸν τῷ θεῷ, καθαρεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν -ν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζωντι; Rev. 12:5). An unspoken but

293 Drawing upon both sect theory and the sociology of knowledge, DeSilva (2000:4-6) is of the opinion that the use of the OT, for example, does not necessitate or even suggest an audience made up exclusively of Jewish Christians. Gentile Christians – especially those who have been attached to the Christian community for some time, as it seems likely that the readers of Hebrews have – would also be familiar with those texts and keenly interested in their interpretation. Thus, the interest in the levitical cultus in Hebrews would probably not leave Gentile Christians cold. Anyway, it seems that the author provides the Jewish and Gentile readers with salvation-historical perspectives on their minority situation (‘sect’ in DeSilva’s term). The author also satisfies the need of the minority group (his readers) to legitimate its existence by proposing the failings of the present body (here, Judaism) and the ways in which the readers have been given the advantage of ‘true’ knowledge about how to approach God. Therefore, it can be concluded that the ongoing theological (‘ideological’ in DeSilva’s term) warfare of the reader is not confined to Judaism but expanded to paganism at least in part.
presumed supposition of both authors is the belief that the Jerusalem temple’s symbolic representation of God’s presence is an appropriate way of exploring the Christian proclamation about Jesus and his achievements. Both works recognise the role of Christ as victim, yet both see victimhood as a means of triumph. The heavenly Jerusalem of Heb. 12:11 (πάσα δὲ παίδεα πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρόν οὐ δοκεῖ χαράς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπη -ς ὑστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρημικὸν τοῖς δι᾽ αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδιδόμοι δικα -ισούντας) inevitably recalls the concluding chapter of Revelation and invites further investigation as to how considerations of an intertextual kind can operate in a helpful way in highlighting aspects of the symbolic world of both works. Because the New Jerusalem represents perfect Israel restored to its proper essence, the woman and the rest of her offspring in Rev. 12 are naturally connected with the New Jerusalem.

Van der Waal (1971:89, 91) insists that it is noteworthy that in Hebrews the present tense is used when the sacrificial service is described. The present tense in Heb. 8:3, 5; 9:6-10 (esp. 9:6: Τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διὰ παντός εἰσίασιν οἱ ιερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες); 13:11 refers to the period before the year AD 70 (cf. Hughes, 1979:31). At that time the relation between synagogue and ecclesia was not without tension (e.g. 1 Th. 2:14; Rev. 2:9; 3:9). Heb. 10:25 does signify an expectation of the impending parousia of Christ in the destruction of Jerusalem, the religious centre of the Jewish world.294

Now, it is most remarkable that in Heb. 10:30 (οἵ δὲ των εἰσόντα, Ἐμοί ἐκδι- ικηθης, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδόσω. καὶ πάλιν. Κρυπτοῦ πάντων λαον αὐτοῦ, Dt. 32:35 (:μοὶ γὰρ τοιαῦτα ἐκδίκηθης, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδόσω. καὶ σῖτιν. Κρυπτοῦ πάντων λαον αὐτοῦ) is quoted: the Lord will do justice to his people. Like the song of Moses in Dt. 32, Heb. 10:25 (μὴ ἐγκαταλείπουτες τὴν ἐπισωμαγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τίσιν, ἀλλὰ παρακα -λοῦντες, καὶ τοσοῦτον μᾶλλον ὡς βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν) speaks about the same impending revenge of the covenant (cf. Hughes, 1979:30). Thus, Hebrews summons the people of God to live faithfully in solidarity with the church and her members. This means not desertion, ὑποστολή in the direction of the synagogue (10:38-

---

294 The fully realised preterist finds the Parousia in Heb. 10:25 in terms of the fall of Jerusalem and, therefore, makes the future coming of Christ nothing (see Russell, 1996:273).
The war in heaven and its effect on the earth in Rev. 12-7-9 reminds John’s audiences of the apocalyptic thought of Heb. 12:26-28. Like John, the author of Hebrews presents the reality in an apocalyptic and dualistic way in which both the visible and temporal realm of everyday experience (e.g. Heb. 2:3-4; 10:32-34; 13:18-19, 23) and the invisible and unshakable kingdom are distinguishable (cf. DeSilva, 2000:27-32). Both John and the author of Hebrews were accustomed to the apocalyptic worldview on which their strategic arguments were developed. The affairs in heaven are the guarantee of those on earth. Theologically speaking, the redemptive work of Jesus has a universal effect which encompasses the heavenly and futuristic age as well as the earthly and present age. As a result, the authors of Revelation and Hebrews spend much time bringing the addressees back to considering their plight (and victory) in the light of eternity as well as in the light of the history of God’s interaction with humanity through Christ. This apocalyptic or dualistic approach does not remove the typical NT eschatology (‘already but not yet’) from Hebrews, not only because Jesus has been inaugurated eschaton but also because the tension between already and not yet is evident in the epistle. It is the burden of the argument of Hebrews that salvation is present as well as future, ‘the age to come’ is already a reality: the Christians have already tasted ‘the power of the age to come’ (Heb. 6:5); they are entering God’s sabbath rest (Heb. 4:3); they have a high priest of the new order (Heb. 4:14; 8:1; 10:21) (cf. Dunnill, 1992:32).

‘Those who tabernacle in heaven’ (τούς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας) in Rev. 13:6 recalls ‘the heavenly things’ (tà ἐπουράνια) in Heb. 9:23 in terms of the New
Covenant through Christ’s sacrifice.

ἐκ δευτέρου ὄφθησεται ('He will appear a second time') in Heb.9:28 shares a similar idea expressed elsewhere by the nouns παρουσία (e.g. Mt. 24:3; 1 Th. 2:8), ἀποκάλυψις (e.g. 1 Pe. 1:7, 13), and ἐπιφάνεια (e.g. 1 Th. 2:8). Heb. 9:28 re-emphasises and carries forward what was said about Christ’s work in Heb. 9:26b (νῦν δὲ ἄπαξ ἐπὶ συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἁθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται) (Ellingworth, 1993:486). Here, Huge (1979:388-389) tersely explains the analogy between the levitical high priest and Jesus:

The two appearings of Christ (Heb. 9:26, 28) answer to the pattern of the appearings of the levitical high priest on the Day of Atonement. First the high priest appeared for the purpose of offering the atoning sacrifice on the altar which stood in the courtyard outside the sanctuary. Then he passed from sight as he entered the sanctuary with the blood of atonement, there to make intercession on behalf of the people. This done, he came out from the sanctuary and presented himself again to the people, who were assembled in eager expectation of the reappearance of their high priest. So also Christ, the High Priest, who appeared in the precincts of this world in order to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and then passed from sight into the heavenly sanctuary ... will appear a second time to mankind ... to proclaim and to perform the completion of salvation for ‘those who are eagerly waiting for him’.

With the first coming of Christ, the eschaton has been inaugurated. In other words, the Jewish age (i.e. the old covenant) has been fulfilled in the earthly work of Jesus (Heb. 9:26; Rev. 12:5). Heb. 9:26 has a striking instance of the confusion arising from the translation of the two different words κόσμος and αἰών by the same word ‘world’. But NIV, for instance, uses two different words: ‘world’ and ‘ages’. The expression συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων in Heb. 9:26 has precisely the same meaning as συντελεία τοῦ αἰώνος, and refers to the Jewish age which was about to end (Russell, 1996:272). Connected with the first coming of Jesus, the uniqueness of Christ’s sacrifice as an unrepeatable action occurred once (ἀπαξ). Then, is the second appearance of Christ (Heb. 9:28) the Parousia or a parousia? The day295 approaching (βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν: Heb. 10:25) as the author’s urgent encouragement for his readers in the AD 60s, is a clue for determining the meaning of the second

---

295 NIV uses a capital letter for ‘day’ to stress the meaning of the Parousia.
appearance. Traditionally, ‘the day approaching’ or ‘the day drawing near’ has been understood as the Last Day, namely, the ultimate eschatological day (e.g. Hughes, 1979:416). Bruce (1975:256), however, maintains that the author of Hebrews, writing before AD 70, had the impending fall of Jerusalem and dissolution of the old order in mind when he spoke of ‘the day’ as approaching. The words ‘as you see the day approaching’ suggest that signs of the impending catastrophe in Judea were already visible to men and women of discernment; and the fulfillment of that phase of Jesus’ prediction (Mt. 24:3f.) pointed to the fulfillment of the final phase.296 Accordingly, preteristically speaking, it can be suggested that, like the Olivet Discourse and the Book of Revelation, there may be a more proximate reference by the author of Hebrews to the impending destruction of Jerusalem and with it of the old order of things in addition to the eschatological connotation of the term.

Indeed, Jesus’ second appearance (at the Jerusalem fall and at the end of history) will confirm that his sacrifice has been accepted and that He has secured the blessings of salvation for those whom He represented. To put it another way, the second appearance of Christ confirms his redemptive work by the first coming.

5.1.2.6. 1 Peter

Such a clear-cut division of Christians into ‘Petrines’ and ‘Paulines’ done by the hypothesis of the Tübingen school fails to do justice to the evidence for Christianity within the Roman province of Asia in the NT period. Asia was one of the most fertile soils in which earliest Christianity took root, and one which has yielded a rich literary crop. Thus, it is safe to conclude that both Petrine and Pauline streams laid some claim to influence in the seven churches in Asia Minor. To divide all Asian Christians into either ‘Petrines’ or ‘Paulines’, therefore, would appear to underestimate both the range of Christian traditions in that area and the criss-crossing of an interplay between those traditions (cf. Boxall, 1998:200-201).

296 In the following part of his comment on ‘the day approaching’ in Heb. 10:25, Bruce (1975:256) also admits the possibility of the Parousia of Christ.
Due to the early date of Revelation as well as the same geographical reason, John and Peter must have had something in common. Like the Book of Revelation, 1 Peter makes use throughout of the OT, both as linguistic influence and as support for points. It does so for the most part without express quotation. Peter is first and foremost a theologian of Scripture (cf. Goppelt, 1993:35).

As a rule, the authorship and date are closely interrelated and important to determine the situation of the book. If one accepts Peter as the author then a date after Nero is rejected, since it is believed that he died in Nero’s reign around AD 64-68. If 1 Peter was written in AD 63, both the readers of 1 Peter and of Revelation (the majority of whom were Gentile Christians in Asia Minor) suffered from inward and outward difficulties, intermittent persecution by the Jews and pagans (esp. Nero) and were warned about syncretism (cf. Goppelt, 1993:43). The situation in 1 Peter is different from that of the time of Paul. The attacks in the Pauline period were particular, localised occurrences. According to 1 Peter, on the other hand, adversity had become the normal experience for Christians throughout the Empire (1 Pe. 5:9; Goppelt, 1993:42). As in the case of Revelation, Peter’s purpose was to encourage his audiences and for this he employed paranetical material to help them see their suffering in proper perspective, so that they could endure it with fortitude. In short, ‘joy in suffering’ can be the main theme of 1 Peter (cf. De Villiers, 1975:70).

In 1 Peter an ethically mixed audience is presumed, comprising those of both Israelite and pagan origin. The Israelite origin is indicated by the preponderance of concepts, terms, and images drawn from Israel’s Scripture and tradition: the concepts of election (1 Pe. 1:1; 2:4-10; 5:13) and holiness or purity (1 Pe. 1:2, 14-16, 22; 2:5, 9; 3:5); the numerous allusions to the Passover and the Exodus (‘gird loins’, 1 Pe. 1:13; παροικία, 1 Pe. 1:17); the story of Hosea (1 Pe. 2:10); the Israelite use of the terms ‘Diaspora’ (1 Pe. 242

297 To be sure, Rome is for 1 Peter already ‘Babylon’ (1 Pe. 5:13), in spite of the fact that in Jewish literature Babylon was first used as a symbolic name for Rome after AD 70 (ca. AD 80 in the Jewish Sib. Or. 4:143; 5:159 and ca. AD 90 in 2 Bar. 11:1; 67:7 and 2 Esdr. 3:1, 28, 31); the reason was clearly the second destruction of Jerusalem. Thus, the particular focus of the Domitianic situation, especially in Asia Minor, lies quite clearly outside the purview of 1 Peter (Goppelt, 1993:45, 375).

298 It is likely that the word πῦρ καταστροφής (fiery ordeal, 1 Pe. 4:12) refers to the time of Nero, when many Christians were burnt to death (contra De Villiers, 1975:80).
1:1) and ‘Babylon’ (1 Pe. 5:13). At the same time, persons of a pagan origin, perhaps
the majority, are also presumed among the audience. This is indicated by references to
traits more characteristic of former pagans than Israelites: the addressees’ earlier
‘ignorance of God’ (1 Pe. 1:4), their former ‘Gentile’ immoral conduct and associations
(1 Pe. 4:2-4), their ransom from the ‘futile conduct inherited from your ancestors’ (1 Pe.
1:18), their divine call ‘from darkness to light’ (1 Pe. 2:9), and their once being
alienated from god (1 Pe. 2:10, though this could describe former Israelites as well).
Among these persons may have been previous Gentile sympathisers with and proselytes
to Israel299. On the whole, the letter’s content, combination of Israelite and Hellenistic
traditions, and mode of argumentation indicate that Peter reckoned on a mixed audience
(Elliott, 2000:95-96). In addition, the fact that the audience of 1 Peter is made up of
both Jews and Gentiles is more likely to be proper in the cities than in rural areas
(Steenberg, 2000:36).

The ethnic composition of the communities addressed in 1 Peter was mixed, consisting
of both former Jews and non-Jews with a preponderance of the latter, because recruits
from among the Gentiles probably outnumbered their Jewish counterparts. From the
vantage point of the general populace it was the Christians, in fact, who were the
outsiders, strangers both socially and religiously. Although Rome had taken no official
position against these Christians, its execution of their purported Lord in Judea and its
indictment of Christians in Rome on the charge of arson suggested that this sect was
vulnerable to the charge of evil doing and perhaps of even more specific offenses. As
the tradition which is cited in 1 Pe. 2:4, 7-8 affirms, opposition to the sect and rejection
of its Lord first began with the apostate Jews. Non-Jews also opposed the Christians
because of their cultural and religious strangeness and their exclusiveness and
proselytising. Sporadic local outbreaks of slander and abuse had led to the suffering of
these Christians here as elsewhere throughout the Mediterranean world. Suffering and
the opprobrium of strangeness could have been minimised or eliminated through the

299 In 1 Peter the terms παροικός (stranger) and παρεπίδηµος (exiles) belong to the semantic
field of ‘proselyte/proselytism’. Thus, it can be deduced that the central aspects of leaving
polytheism for monotheism, leaving one’s country, family, and kinfolk, becoming enemies of
families and friends at the risk of one’s own life, and entering a community of fictive kinship
and brotherly love were all categories and aspects valuable for illumination the conditions of the
recipients of 1 Peter as perceived by the author (Seland, 2001:268).
simple step of social conformity or assimilation. But this would only have resulted in
the loss of the distinctiveness and exclusiveness to which the sect owed its existence

According to Warden (1991:203), the issues involved in the dating of 1 Peter and
Revelation tend to converge on two considerations: (1) both documents are addressed to
the same general geographical region; (2) the texts of both suggest that the addressees
were experiencing significant conflicts with society and that suffering had resulted for
the believers. Related to both considerations is the noteworthy fact that only these two
NT documents apply the appellation 'Babylon' to Rome (1 Pe. 5:13 ['Ασπάζεται ύμᾶς
ή ἐν Βαβυλώνι συνεκλεκτή καὶ Μάρκος ὦ υἱὸς μου]; Rev. 17:5, 18). The dating of 1
Peter is tied to questions of authorship. If the apostle Peter is the author, it is generally
agreed that the book must be dated by the late 60s. Warden (1991:207-210) goes on to
insist that the emperor cult was indeed strong in Asia, but its strength was due to
continuous tradition and development for centuries before Domitian. Thus, it is entirely
possible that Christian conflict with the emperor cult stands behind some of the distress
reflected in Revelation and 1 Peter, but it is unlikely that the distress had any direct link
with the misguided seeking of divine honour by the emperor in Rome. There is no
indication that Domitian himself affected the practice of ruler worship in Asia to any
significant degree. Moreover, the proconsul in the first century of the Principate was
still very much the independent administrator that he had been in the Republican period.
Consequently, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the policies of Roman
governors in Asia are more relevant to Christian persecution than are capricious acts by
individual emperors in Rome. It is true that the Christians may have perceived all of
their circumstances in heathen atmospheres as threatening, but that is not the same as
saying that a new situation had arisen in the province requiring the spilling of Christian
blood.

Botha (1988:29-30) argues that between AD 60-64 three of the most prominent figures
of earliest Christianity died as martyrs: Paul, Peter and James, the brother of the Lord.
This diminished the very important dynamic character of the church during the first
decades. In various regions the situations in the churches also started to develop
differently, for example, in Palestine-Syria and Western Asia Minor each church
developed its own unique character, influenced by local circumstances. In particular, the destruction of the temple had two direct consequences for the early church: (1) the Jewish Christian church was badly impoverished, hence it lost much of its influence on Hellenistic Christian communities. (2) The influence of Palestinian Judaism was practically obliterated and the influence of Hellenistic Judaism was enhanced. As a result, the relationship between the church and Judaism also changed significantly.

While Botha (1988:37) assumes that “the theme of 1 Peter is ‘Christian responsibility in society’ in contrast to the more familiar practice of taking ‘Christian suffering’ as a theme. Everywhere the circumstances of Christians were characterised by social discrimination, although not full persecution”, these two themes are not contradictory.

Slater (1999:20), following Moule, identifies some helpful parallels between 1 Peter and Revelation. Both books exhort their readers to remain steadfast (e.g. 1 Pe. 2:20 [ποίον γὰρ κλέος εἰ άμαρτάνουτες καὶ κολαφίζομενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἄγαθο -ποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τούτο χάρις παρὰ θεῷ]; Rev. 2:2; 3:10). Both refer to the Christian community as a royal priesthood (1 Pe. 2:9 ['Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτῶν, βασιλείαν ἱεράτευμα, ἐθνὸς ἄγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποί -σιν, ὅπως τὰς ἁρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὕμας καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θα -υμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς]; Rev. 1:6). Both works speak of witnesses who have suffered for the kingdom (1 Pe. 5:1-2 [Πρεσβυτέρους ὦν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακάλω ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνίας· ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνίν τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ ἀν -αγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως]; Rev. 1:9) and promise the faithful a crown (1 Pe. 5:4 [καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἄρχιποίμενος κομμείσθη τῶν ἀμαράντινῳ τῆς δόξης στέφανον]; Rev. 2:10; 3:11). In both books, some have definitely experienced oppression (1 Pe. 4:12-5:11; 300 Rev. 2:13), while others are under threat (1 Pe. 2:11-4:11; Rev. 2:10).

As the basis for the overall schema of his theological statement Peter chooses to emphasise two moments within that Christological progression: suffering/death (1 Pe. 3:30 Like the author of 1 Peter, John explains the persecution of Christians in his day as the work of the Devil. Satan was on the earth seeking someone to devour (1 Pe. 5:8; Burkett, 2002:510).
The themes of suffering/humiliation (cf. ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος in 1 Pe. 1:2; τιμῷ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνὸδ in 1 Pe. 1:19; τὸ αἵμα τοῦ ἁρπίου in Rev. 12:11) and glory/exaltation, representing the contours of the Christ-event, offer the framework for Peter’s understanding of the Christian’s life in their imperiled world. For this reason, it is important to observe the theme of humiliation-exaltation which pervades 1 Peter and provides a foundation for its exhortation and consolation. Throughout the letter the path of humiliation and exaltation is presented as the way both of Christ and of Christians. Indeed, in Peter’s perspective, the eschatological event that has dawned with Christ’s death and resurrection includes the suffering of Christians. The suffering of Christians is thus a participation in the suffering of Christ. Both Christ’s suffering and that of Christians result in exaltation. The framework of humiliation-exaltation is also related to the grounding theme of deferring one’s case to God. Christ, the model sufferer, defers his case ‘to the one who judges justly’ (1 Pe. 2:23; 4:19). The exhortation by Peter (and John) to non-retaliatory conduct is addressed to persecuted Christians, who are alienated from society and probably without legal recourse. The exhortation to non-retaliation is part of John and Peter’s charge that Christian suffering be entirely innocent so that full eschatological blessing will be realised (see Zerbe, 1993:282-283). At this point, Peter and John (esp. Rev. 12) share a common Christological mindset.

The following table indicates this (cf. Richard, 1986:133-135):

![Diagram showing the relationship between Christ's suffering/death and resurrection, Christians in Asia Minor's ransomed suffering, and the resulting glory/victory and new life (new covenant)]

In a sense, one of the main problems of both John’s audiences and Peter’s readers is their identity in the pagan world. Peter replaces the old covenantal identity of his readers, that they appeared to have lost, in several ways: they are the elect of God (1 Pe. 1:1; 5:13; cf. Rev.
The above table succinctly demonstrates that once John and Peter have established the basis for Christian existence, they proceed to develop their major thesis: Jesus is the Christian’s model of suffering and glory, in other words, Christology as the pattern for Christian life (cf. De Klerk & Van Rensburg, 1999:32).

In 1 Peter 4:17 ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει ὁ κόσμος ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ has a possible link to Ezek. 9:6b ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἀρέσατε despite their dissimilarities (cf. Jer. 25:29; Am. 3:2; Acts 2:36; 7:23). The similarity of thought is unmistakable, especially in the light of Peter’s application of his warning to the plural ‘us’ in the next clause (1 Pe. 4:17b; cf. ἁγίων). It seems that ‘the house of God’ is not entirely metaphorical here, but that Peter had in mind the actual situation of Jerusalem and the Jewish temple in his own day. If the temple is destroyed, or if it is in serious danger, Peter may well see its plight as a signal of final judgment (cf. Michaels, 1988:271). A similar opinion is that of Schutter (1989:157-166; contra Elliott, 2000:798) who points out the strong intertextual relation between Ezek. 9:6 and 1 Pe. 4:17: (1) Ezek. 9:6 uses ‘house’ (τὸ σπέρμα, τὸ οἶκον) in its immediate context to designate the Jerusalem temple. The prominence of the Skekina in Ezekiel is due precisely to the central place which is given to the temple in chs. 8-11. The point is the terrible moment when God withdrew his protection of the temple by removing his glory (1 Pe. 4:17; cf. Isa. 10:12; Jer. 25:29; 12:17); they are the living stones (1 Pe. 2:5); they are the holy (1 Pe. 1:15, 16; 2:5, 9; cf. Rev. 13:10); they are the heirs (1 Pe. 1:4; 3:7, 9); they are the children of God (1 Pe. 1:14); they are God’s flock (1 Pe. 5:2-3); and they form a priesthood (1 Pe. 2:5, 9). Although Peter’s readers do not really fit into society anymore, Peter does not want to leave them alien and groupless in a group-oriented society. He replaces their previous group with the creation of a new community (cf. Steenberg, 2000:263-264).

1 Pe. 2:5) is, of course, one of main metaphors in 1 Peter. In the NT, one of the most prominent anti-structures’ (i.e. alternative patterns of social relations and social behaviour) used to demarcate and characterise the emerging community of faith is the concept of the family of God’ (Lategan, 1999:136). The household imagery in 1 Peter suggests the formation of a new family – the Christian family. Martin (1992:167-175) delineates five metaphors connected with οἶκος: the first metaphor arising from the notion of οἶκος is the description of the readers as obedient children in 1 Pe. 1:14. The second metaphor in the οἶκος-cluster describes the readers as children who call God ‘Father’ and who have been redeemed from the vain conduct (1 Pe. 1:17-18). The third metaphor depicts the readers as members of the familia Dei. Through the new birth, they enter into a new brotherhood (1 Pe. 1:22). The fourth metaphor is newborn babies (1 Pe. 2:2). The fifth and last is living stones that are being fashioned into a temple (1 Pe. 2:5). These five metaphors are closely connected semantically and describe the ontological status of the reader” In fact, the marginalisation of Peter’s readers by society contributed to the establishment and strengthening of the house of God (Steenberg, 2000:29; cf. Louw & Nida, 1993:113).
Zec. 13:7-9; Mal. 3:1-6; Lk. 23:21; De Villiers, 1975:81). (2) Ezk. 9 serves the context well in 1 Peter by facilitating the transition at 1 Pe. 5:1f. to the exhortation aimed at the πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι. They appear at the head of the list of those to be killed in Ezk. 9:6, and the axe falls on them first (πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεανίσκον). At the very least, their accountability for their conduct as leaders exposes them to greater risk of judgment. In addition and lastly, on his knowledge of exegetical tradition relative to Ezk. 9-11, in the Antiquities of the Jews, 10:79 Josephus also says the temple's fate during the Revolt (cf. Sib. Or. 4:115-125, 2 Bar. 1:1-5; T. Moses 3:1-3; 6:6-9; T. Benjamin 10:8-9). Josephus understands that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but particularly the latter, predicted a number of events which were literally fulfilled. Chief among these was the defiling carnage within the temple bounds which was the fruit of civil war.

By metaphorical extension, the term παροικός (alien, stranger, foreigner, 1 Pe. 2:11) relates to any condition of alienation and hostility in which God's people (both native and non-native residents) may find themselves, because in the NT the word group of παροικι- occurs six times, four of which quote or allude to the LXX concept of the patriarchal or Israelite existence as παροικός (cf. Acts 7:6, 29; Eph. 2:19; see Ge. 15:13; Ex. 2:15, 22). This fact applies to John's audiences in the hostile atmosphere of Asia Minor (Steenberg, 2000:32; see De Klerk & Van Rensburg, 1999:30-31).

The cumulative weight of some details makes it plain to see that Ezk. 9:6 offered the author of 1 Peter the fact that God's judgment on the Jerusalem temple had started. To put it another way, Peter views a collective assault on the temple-community (1 Pe. 2:9) in terms of Ezk. 9-11 and surmises that the long awaited judgment described by the

303 Sib. Or. IV. 115: “An evil storm of war will also come upon Jerusalem from Italy, and it will sack the great Temple of God, whenever they put their trust in folly and cast off piety and commit repulsive murders in front of the Temple. Then a great king will flee from Italy like a runaway slave”.

304 “Then also all men will rise, some unto glory and some unto shame. And the Lord will judge Israel first for the unrighteousness done to him, because they did not believe that God appeared in the flesh as a deceiver. And then he will judge all the Gentiles as many as did not believe him when he appeared on earth” (Hollander & De Jonge, 1985:437-438). According to T. Benjamin 10:8-9, as in the case of transitional partial preterism, God first makes judgment on Israel and then that the Gentiles (cf. Mt. 19:28; Lk. 22:30).

305 As De Klerk and Van Rensburg (1999:33) assume, by παροικός and παρεπίδημος Peter most probably intends to convey both the literal (political) as well as the figurative (spiritual) meaning.
prophet has begun. Consequently, there might well be reason for Peter to fear that God had withdrawn, or was about to withdraw, his glory from his temple-community, since that is a crucial part of the judgment scenario recounted by Ezekiel. According to Peter, God has not abandoned his temple-community to its fate, but remains pledged to its defense, sending the Spirit to render the kind of aid that Isa. 11:2f. details (cf. 1 Pe. 4:14). Therefore, like John, Peter warns his readers (as the temple of the Spirit) of the fact that the physical Jerusalem temple has no further function in the NT.

5.1.2.7. Jude

According to Bauckham (1983:8-14), the tendency of modern scholars to prefer a date for Jude at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second has resulted not only from the early Catholic reading of Jude 3 and the Gnostic interpretation of the false teachers, but also from the usual interpretation of Jude 17, in which Jude is thought to be looking back on the apostolic age as an era now past. Moreover, the pseudepigraphal hypothesis of the authorship has prevailed in most recent commentaries largely because the arguments for a later date have been made to place the letter outside Jude’s probable lifetime. But none of the three main features of early Catholicism is evident in Jude, namely (1) the fading of the Parousia hope, (2) increasing institutionalisation, and (3) crystallisation of the faith into set forms. Indeed, Jude belongs to the milieu of apocalyptic Jewish Christianity and combats teachers of antinomian libertinism. Jude might very plausibly be dated in the 50s, and nothing requires a later date. That readers of Jude are predominantly, but not exclusively, Jewish Christian communities in a Gentile society seems to account best for what little exegetes can gather about the recipients of this letter. Asia Minor as the destination of Jude is a strong possibility.

The canonical relation between Revelation and Jude has been discussed at length above in Chapter 1 (see canonical approach), but it deserves mention once again here. Wall (1992:279) pays close attention to the canonical relevance of Revelation to Jude:

(1) Both frequently imply the OT (and Jewish apocalypses)\footnote{To say that Jude belongs to apocalyptic Jewish Christianity is not a very precise statement,} – to Jude, the OT
citations demonstrate that the alternative of unbelief is there from the beginning and is nothing new (Jude 5, 7, 9, 11 and 14) (Ὑπομίνῃσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἀπάξ λαοῦκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τους μὴ τι -στείοντας ἀπώλεσεν, ὥς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτῶς πόλεις τοῖς ὁμοίοις τρόποις ἐκπορεύεσσαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρὸ κεισται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι, ὅ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενοι διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἔτολμησαν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκείν ἁλλὰ εἶπεν, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος. οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὕδω τοῦ Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθὸν ἐξεχύθησα ἑν τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρη ἀπώλεσον. Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἐβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνώξ λέγων, ἱδού ἠλθεν κύριος εν ἀγίας μυρίασιν αὐτοῦ; Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13).

(2) The eternal sovereignty of God ruling past, present, and future (Jude 25) (μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα μεγαλωμένη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰώνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰώνας, ἀμήν); Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13).

(3) The universality of their readership (a catholic epistle, Jude 1) (Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοὺς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς); Rev. 1:4).

(4) The eschatological tension between the pure faith and heresy or compromise (Jude 4) (παρεισέδωσαν γὰρ τινες ἀνθρώποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀριστούμενοι); Rev. 2:9, 15; 18:4).

(5) Concerning God’s judgment, Jude 14-16 (Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἐβδομος

but the dominance of the apocalyptic outlook in Jude and his use of the Jewish apocalypses at any rate locates him in circles where apocalyptic was not just one influence, but the dominant vehicle through which faith in Jesus found expression (Bauckham, 1983:10).

307 Bauckham is one of the few to offer a dissenting opinion. Writes Bauckham (1983:3): The content of the work makes it clear that it is not a tract against heresy in general, but a message for a specific situation in which a specific group of false teachers were troubling a specific church or group of churches. Therefore he comes to the conclusion that Jude is not a catholic letter addressed to all Christians, but is a work written with a specific, localised audience in mind. If the readers were a group of churches, as Bauckham himself admits, it could mean the universality of the readership.

308 As in 2 Peter, so Jude has a photograph of the heresiarchs denounced by John ‘the antichrist’ and by Paul ‘the apostasy’. The resemblances cannot be mistaken: (1) they are apostates from the faith (Jude 4) and (2) their error consists in the denial of God and of Christ (Russell, 1996:336).
According to the above, it is clear that Jude, situated just before Revelation, leads the Christian church into the last canonical book in which the wider and deeper scope and meaning of the eschatological coming of God’s kingdom through the Lord’s judgment are accentuated. By playing the role of the conclusion of the Bible, Revelation is the evident manifesto of Christian eschatological hope, of the Triune God’s victory over the Satan, of the church over the false church and all its signs (cf. Clark, 1995:212).

Several recurrent phenomena of apocalyptic depiction of the cosmos are common in the cosmic scene in Rev. 12 (esp. Rev. 12:1-4) and Jude 12-13. For example, (1) the God of Israel has created the solar entities – the sun, moon and stars; (2) God retains power over these; (3) any worship of these bodies becomes idolatry; (4) due to the Divine source of light, judgment of evil takes the form, symbolically, of falling stars; (5) a clear distinction between light and darkness. Rebellion in heaven and warfare, assumed in the background of Jude’s epistle, are cosmic in scope. The association between divine judgment and cosmic changes among the solar phenomena, assumed in the polemic of Jude, is by no means foreign to John the seer. The themes of theophany and judgment, as well as the antithesis of the ungodly and the faithful, constitute a thread running throughout Jewish apocalyptic literature. For the writer of Jude as well as John, the borrowing of these motifs serves a useful function. They remind the audience of the divine ability to preserve: God is committed to keep the faithful in his love while at the same time reserving the ungodly for certain judgment. To sum up, although Jude is not necessarily endorsing the breadth of Jewish apocalyptic theology, his mode is apocalyptic. This method is designed to counter the effects of his opponents as well as to have a strategic impact on his audience for reasons not expressly stated in the epistle.
In connection with the heavenly war in Rev. 12:7 and its resultant effect (the expulsion of Satan, the accuser) in Rev. 12:10, the legal disputation of Jude 9 is its important intertext. Bauckham (1983:64), who is familiar with the probable source of Jude 9, argues that in the T. Moses (dated at the beginning of the first century AD or after AD 44), which Jude and his readers knew, the devil had accused Moses of murder. In other words, Satan blasphemed Moses, claiming his body as that of a murderer (cf. Ex. 2:12; Dt. 34:5-6). The archangel Michael, disputing with the devil as advocate for Moses, knew the accusation to be slander, but did not presume to condemn the devil for his slander. Instead, Michael referred the matter to the divine Judge who alone has the authority to rule out an accusation brought under the Law. Michael's behaviour contrasts with that of the false teachers (the teachers of antinomian libertinism) when they reject the accusations which the angels, as spokesmen for the Law, bring against them. They do so because they claim to be above all such accusations, subject to no moral authority. In short, Jude stresses that if Michael, a mighty archangel (Da. 10:13, 21; 12:1; 1 Th. 4:16), had respect for God, how much more should the mere human false teachers have.

Another more promising interpretation of Jude 9 in terms of Rev. 12:7 and 11 emerges from Leithart's argument. He (1989:3-4) argues that Michael (Jude 9) as the patron angel of Israel is 'Christ', the Patron of the Church (cf. Moffatt, 1961:426). And the body of Moses in Jude 9 may be the Aaronic priesthood and, by implication, the entire Mosaic liturgical and social system. Why would the priesthood be called the body of Moses? Perhaps the priesthood was the body of Moses in the same way that the New Covenant priesthood, the Church, is the body of Christ (compare the language of Heb. 3, 'house of Moses' and 'house of Christ'). It is significant that the Old Covenant community was baptised (i.e. made a nation of priests) into Moses, just as the faithful are baptised into Christ (cf. 1 Co. 10:2). This may seem somewhat far-fetched, but it is no more far-fetched than a dispute between Michael and the devil about where to bury Moses' physical remains. If Leithart's insistence is correct, in Jude, as in Revelation, the transition of the Old Covenant to the New, achieved by Jesus' victory over Satan (cf. Rev. 12:11), is emphasised.
The concluding doxology in Jude 24-25 reminds John's audiences of the doxology in Rev. 12:10-12. Like John, Jude ends his epistle with a liturgical doxology instead of personal greetings or any specifically epistolary conclusion (cf. Rev. 22:20-21). In keeping with monotheistic thought, both authors praise both the powerful salvation and the eternal and glorious kingdom (δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος και ἐξουσία) of the only God through Christ.

5.1.2.8. Other New Testament books

Van der Waal (1981:239) holds that Rev. 12:1 reflects tholedot Jesus, the genesis of Jesus in Mt. 1:1 (Βιβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυιδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ), in which the kingship of Jesus comes to the fore, as in Rev. 12:5 (cf. Ru. 4:18: γίνεται; LXX: αἱ γενέσεις). The intertextuality of Jesus' birth (and its incidental events) in Rev. 12:1-5 and in the infancy narratives of the Synoptic Gospels is displayed as follows (cf. Pohlmann, 1997:160-161):

| 1. Mary and Joseph (Mt. 1:16-17; Lk. 1:27) | A woman (Rev. 12:1) |
| 2. Birth of Jesus (Mt. 1:23; Lk. 2:11) | Birth of Jesus (Rev. 12:2) |
| 3. Herod tries to kill the baby (Mt. 2:16) | Satan influences Rome/Jerusalem to destroy Jesus (Rev. 12:3-4) |
| 4. God influences his people to outwit the devil's schemes (Mt. 2:13-15) | God's fatal blow to Satan is the resurrection and ascension of Jesus (Rev. 12:6) |
| 5. God's protection (Mt. 2:13) | God's protection (Rev. 12:6) |

The diagram above demonstrates the interplay between time and eternity, incidental events in the lives of believers and the influence of God over history, and the ultimate achieving of his purpose.

Furthermore, there seems to be an intertextual relevance between Rev. 12:2 and Mt. 1:1-17 in the light of revelation history. The fact that the woman is in travail with the male child (Rev. 12:2) is linked with the nation Israel in travail, because of the parallelism between the woman and Israel from which Jesus derives. Especially in the time of Exile,
prophets expected the imminent Messianic period by describing Israel in terms of a woman’s travail. In that time, the prosperous days of David were over and Israelites were forced to be carried to Babylon. At this point, there is at least one intertextual connection between Rev. 12:2 and Mt. 1:1-17. The agonising Israel is reflected in the triple division of the genealogy of the Lord in the Gospel of Matthew. According to the genealogy in Mt. 1, the first fourteen generations (Mt. 1:2-6) bring one to the culmination of their national prosperity; the second (Mt. 1:6-11) is a period of decline to the captivity; the third (Mt. 1:12-16) a period of restoration. At last, the restoration of Israel comes after the failure of Israel’s hope as well as after her Exilic travail. Thus, in the government of God Israel has her travail-time before the reign of the Messiah (cf. Grant, 1972:427-428).

The *Nunc Dimittis* (Lk. 2:29-32) is an important intertext of Rev. 12(-13). Bovon (1999:386) contends that “even though He ages physically, Jesus, according to Luke, never loses his relationship to his childhood” (Lk. 2:12, 16; 9:46-48; 10:21; 18:16-17; cf. Rev. 12:1-5). In the *Nunc Dimittis*, when the old prophet Simeon declares that the Lord can dismiss him in peace, for his ‘eyes have seen the salvation’, salvation is here present in the future of a child (νοῦν in Lk. 2:29; cf. Rev. 12:10). In the frequency of Luke’s use of words such as ‘today’ (11 times) and ‘now’ (14 times), he brings out the truth that the salvation has become a present reality with the birth of Jesus. The baby Jesus as the antitype of the temple (Lk. 2:27; cf. Lk. 19:45-46) was praised by Simeon. This foreshadows the Jesus who will be praised eternally by all his people and angels at the new temple (i.e. the New Jerusalem, Rev. 21:2). Furthermore, σημείον in Lk. 2:34 is used as a Christological-soteriological term showing the works and person of Christ (cf. Rev. 12:1). To put it differently, by sending the sign (σημείον), the birth of the Messiah, God gives his people the true Messianic assuagement which has been promised from the OT. It is also noteworthy that in the setting of the *Nunc Dimittis* the man-woman parallelism is accentuated. Both Simeon (Lk. 2:25) and Anna (Lk. 2:37) are significant persons in terms of the revelation history in that both of them lived near the temple and had a great longing for the redemption of Jerusalem, namely the consolation of Israel (cf. the man-woman parallel in Rev. 12:1 and 12:5) (see Song, 1999:80-82).

According to Vos (1965:109), the similarities between Rev. 11:10 and Mt. 26:52
(τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀπόστρεψον τὴν μάχαιράν σου εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς· πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται) are: (1) the common use of the instrumental dative ἐν μαχαίρῃ (cf. Jer. 52:2), (2) the land beast’s resemblance to the Lamb in Rev. 13:11 is reminiscent of Jesus’ warning of the false prophets in Mt 7:15: “They come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves”.

In Rev. 13:11 and Mt. 7:15 (cf. Mt. 24:24), with this apocalyptic depiction of the other beast in Rev. 13:11, John recalls some of the basic elements from our Lord’s picture of the false prophets (Vos, 1965:131, 136).

The specific Christian tradition, especially the sayings of Jesus, plays an important role in the formulation of the thoughts and teachings of the Apocalypse. John’s depiction of the ‘false prophets’ is deeply rooted in and closely connected with the sayings of Jesus as presented in Mt. 7:15 (Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἰνομεῖτε ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἐσωθὲν δὲ εἰσὶν λύκοι ἄρπαγες) and Mt. 24:24 par. Thus, both the existence of and the familiarity with the traditions which contain these teachings of Jesus are substantiated.

In connection with Rev. 12:7-9, as Barker (2000:221) notes, the war in heaven is worked out on earth in Jesus’ ministry of healing and exorcism (Mk. 1:25; Lk. 10:17; 11:20 [εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγώ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἀρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ]). Jesus and his seventy disciples (Lk. 10:17: Ἰπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα [δύο] μετὰ χαρᾶς λεγοῦσας, Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡ μῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου) were Michael and his angels (Rev. 12:7) (cf. Shellard, 2002:185-186). Paul also tells the Christians in Rome that God would ‘crush Satan under their feet’ (Ro. 16:20: ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. ἡχάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μεθ’ ὑμῶν); he writes of Jesus’ triumph over ‘principalities and powers’ (Col. 2:15: ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἁρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ) and of the sons of disobedience who still followed the prince of the power of the air.
The words ἔφυλξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ("he opened his mouth") in Rev. 13:6 reflect an Aramaic idiom. Similarly, "He opened his mouth and said" (Mt. 5:2 KJV) simply means "he said". So here the meaning is that the beast spoke words of blasphemy toward God. His sole purpose of existence is to be in opposition to God and his Christ (Kistemaker, 2001:382).

Εἴ τις ἔχει οὐς ἀκούσατω (Rev. 13:9), as aphorism, has intertextual relevance to the six variants in seven places in the Synoptic Gospels: Mt. 11:15; 13:9, 43; Mk. 4:9, 23; Lk. 8:8; 14:35 (cf. 1 Ki. 22:19; Jer. 29:20; Am. 7:16). The paraenetic interpretation of εἴ τις ἔχει οὐς ἀκούσατω shows that it is a waking-call to the audiences not in order to suggest to them a deep/hidden meaning, but for the sake of their earnest attention. Moreover, this formula emphasises the fact that the risen Lord speaks to his Church through the Spirit (cf. Du Rand, 1998:30).

'Wisdom' in Rev. 13:18 is linked with the body of the epistle of James, which contains the exhortations of wisdom (Jas. 1:5; 3:15, 17). Both for John and James, it is likely that the test of faith, which leads either to life or death, to mercy or judgment, is in reality a test of wisdom (Jas. 1:3). To put it in another way, heavenly wisdom enables the faithful to endure to the end to be saved — similar to Paul’s idea of the Spirit who seals the church for the day of redemption (cf. 2 Co. 1:21-22; Eph. 1:13-14). Wall (1990:16) calls the book of James apocalyptic paraenesis (or apocalyptic preaching) for the persecuted community tinged with apocalyptic eschatology (Jas. 1:2, 3, 12-13). In Matthew’s apocalypse, too, the exhortation to obedience, which follows upon the vision discourse, is centred upon the image of the ‘wise’ and faithful servant (Mt. 24:44). Those who are wise and know how to live life in the last days are prepared for the imminent coming of the judgment and salvation of God (see Wall, 1990:20-21).

5.1.3. John’s OT intertexture (i.e. John’s OT inner-biblical intertexture)

One of the underdeveloped areas in the interpretation of Revelation has been, until recently, the extensive use of the OT in Revelation. One of the reasons is that current scholarly interest focuses on historical, literary, and socio-scientific concerns and is often pursued to the neglect of other areas of equal importance, in particular the impact
of the OT on the thought of John and his audiences (cf. Paulien, 1988b:169). Estimates of the number of allusions to, or echoes of, the OT in the Apocalypse vary astoundingly, from a low total of about 275 to a mind-boggling ceiling of 1,000. Considerable disagreement may continue to exist on how many OT uses there are in Revelation (Luter, 2001:463). While the Apocalypse of John is unique among NT books generally, as well as unique in its appropriation of the OT, in two respects it is strikingly typical. First, the prophetic-eschatological dimension of the OT is dominant in Revelation. However, perhaps Revelation shares with Qumran an emphasis on the (near) future rather than the past or present fulfillment of prophecy, whereas the NT generally places greater weight upon the latter aspect. Second, John expresses himself in a vocabulary and phraseology drawn from the OT. The OT served as a rich mine of theological vocabulary and conceptuality for the early Christian writers (see Smith, 1972:62-63).

With regard to John’s OT use in Revelation, the matter of continuity or discontinuity is a burning issue. By agreeing with and relying on Hirsch and Vanhoozer, Beale (2001:30) is convinced of the continuity and maintains that because of the same divine author of the Scripture the continuity is inevitable. According to them, the OT is the guide for the NT writers. To put it another way, the OT provides John with images to understand Christ. There are, of course, advocates of the discontinuity, who argue that the OT is used as a tool by the NT writers who change the OT for their own various purposes. Indeed, it is difficult to pinpoint the total continuity or discontinuity in

---

309 For Paulien (1988a:40-41), the distinction between ‘allusions’ and ‘echoes’ is very significant for the study of Revelation. On the one hand, all the parallels to previous literature in Revelation may be called allusions, whether or not John is conscious of the parallel. In other words, where John is merely using language that is ‘in the air’, or a ‘stock apocalyptic concept’, exegetes retain the term ‘echo’. Thus, an echo indicates that John picks up an idea that can be found in previous literature, but is probably unaware of the original source. On the other hand, where John is consciously referring to previous literature, exegetes call the (verbal, thematic, and structural) parallel a (direct) allusion. However, in this dissertation, both echo and allusion are included into intertextual parallel.

310 Beale cites Hirsch’s notion of trans-historical intentions: authors using some genres will extend meaning to analogous and even unforeseeable situations so that their meaning is intended to have presently unknowable, future implications. In this respect, one can speak of open-ended authorial intentions and extended meaning in which an authorial meaning can tolerate some revision in cognitive content yet not be essentially altered. Interpretation should go beyond the author’s letter, but it must never exceed the author’s spirit (Beale, 1999a:163; contra. Moyise, 2002:14).

311 Correspondingly, in his intertextual study on the Gospel of Mark, Vorster (1993:392-393)
connection with John’s intertextual use of the OT in Revelation. Therefore, not surprisingly, many scholars find the above two positions too extreme and seek to do justice to both continuity and discontinuity\(^{312}\) (e.g. Moyise, 2002:1). Instead, the textual context of the specific intertextual passage acts as a decisive criterion for deciding the discontinuity or continuity. Thus, McComiskey (1993:311, 316) correctly spells it out at length as follows:

Alteration has no significance apart from our familiarity with the OT settings of the borrowed imagery. If the OT did not exist, we could not think in terms of alteration. ... Alteration of OT imagery is an interesting NT apocalyptic phenomenon. The process of alteration appears to be one of selection of componential symbols from the OT, not an alteration of symbols for the purpose of depicting continuity and discontinuity in the program of God. Certainly the freedom with which Revelation alters OT symbols reflects an underlying belief system. ... The writer’s faith statements find expression in contexts to which the altered use of symbols contributes cognitive data. Our understanding of Revelation’s contribution to the question of continuity and discontinuity in the program of God should reside in text-intentions (i.e. the main intention of a text), not in their perception of the significance of their altered constituent elements. ... The extent to which we may comprehend a Biblical writer’s intention is determined by the precision and clarity of the writer’s language and mode of expression. Thus the closest we can come to authorial intention is the intention of a text as that intention is embedded in the symbols and structures of language.

John might have changed the OT for his (theological and evocative) purposes, especially in the light of the Christ-event. Thus, the OT is used both as a tool and as a guide in John’s production.

\(^{312}\) Similarly, Lacocque (1981:9-10) also observes this fact: “The change of *Sitz im Leben* entails either the complete relinquishment of a circumstance-bound tradition, or its reincarnation in another form. The latter phenomenon can be observed everywhere in the Hebrew Scriptures for, as P. Ricoeur has shown, the very process of inserting discrete oral or written traditions into overall literary contexts ... uproots them from their original *Sitz im Leben* and provides them with a *Sitz im Wort* whose intertextuality the French critic studies with an ongoing wonder. ... with the apocalyptic, we are in an intermediary situation where re-use of former themes and creation of new ones are blended”.

Bearing in mind the possibility of continuity or discontinuity, exegetes have to take into account the growing use of the concept of intertextuality in the study of the OT in Revelation. Intertextuality suggests that texts are not in a static but always in a dynamic relationship with other texts. It is not about using the various sources and influences, but seeks to describe the complex interactions (or intersection) of textual surfaces rather than a point. The issue raised by intertextuality is whether this interaction results in a stable resolution (a point) or a range of possibilities (surface) (Moyise, 2001c:136-137).

The title of Richard Bauckham's (1993a) book has suggested how important it is to recognise that Revelation presents itself as the climax of prophecy, drawing together images that pervade OT prophetic visions and bringing them to fulfillment. Bauckham (1993a:x-xi) goes as far as to say that Revelation is a book designed to be read in constant intertextual relationship with the OT (cf. Johnson, 2001:12).

There is a unanimous consensus that John uses the OT as his paramount source with a high degree of liberty and creativity. 313 The study of the OT intertextuality in Revelation plays a role of safeguarding against fantastic interpretations (Groenewald, 1986:23). As Beale (1988:321) notes, actual visions would have been experienced in John's own thought forms, so it might be difficult to distinguish a description of a

---

313 According to the margins in Nestle's 26th ed., John alludes to all OT books except Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and Haggai. Similarly, Mazzaferri's (1989:383) conclusion of his source criticism of the genre of Revelation is: "John dips his hand willingly into various diverse sources, but bathes himself in one alone, classical OT prophecy".
visionary experience from that of a retelling of the experience through the (un)conscious appeal to various traditions. The fact that Revelation contains no direct quotations from the OT makes John's intertextuality more delicate.

Scholars of Revelation have long been in disagreement with regard to the language and text tradition of the OT that John utilised. Since the work of Charles, many have felt that the author of the Apocalypse drew directly from the Hebrew text of the OT for his allusions (e.g. Schüessler Fiorenza, 1985:16). Trudinger (1963:76-78, 123-128) argues for an Aramaic antecedent (e.g. Sweet, 1979:40). Other scholars, following the lead of H.B. Swete, seem equally certain that John worked directly from the LXX in his use of the OT (e.g. Pfeiffer, Prigent). Still others argue for a multiplex background (e.g. L.A. Vos, 1965:22; Moyise, 1999:112-113), or hypothesise that John worked from a Greek version with which modern exegetes are not familiar.

In the OT intertextual study LXX is used instead of the MT for two reasons. In the first place, the whole notion of verbal allusion is thrown out when comparing across different languages, i.e. Greek and Hebrew. In order to match words, exegetes would need to correlate terms used in translation. And the only meaningful data for that would be to return to Greek versions of the OT. Secondly, despite some argument that much of Revelation's allusion is to the Hebrew texts, translated by John, there is no clear consensus that this is the case. The situation is complex. There do not appear to be any occasions where a parallel with the OT is seriously missed in Revelation 12-13 by considering the LXX only (cf. Paul, 2000:262-63).

5.1.3.1. Genesis

John steeps Rev. 12 in Ge. 3:15-20, on which the literary integrity of the scenario of Rev. 12 is based (Van de Kamp, 2000:306). Rev. 12:1 reminds John's audiences of

---

314 The NT writers, writing in Greek, could not quote the OT in Hebrew. They had to translate the OT passages right then or, more often, use some existing Greek version. They felt no need to quote the OT verbatim. Their concern for interpretation and application led, through paraphrase, to formal changes (Silva, 1994:148-149). In the same vein, Marcos (2000:322-324) maintains that John intentionally uses the LXX, and that from the distortion of language it cannot be concluded that he knew only Hebrew or Aramaic.
Joseph’s dream in Genesis 37:9. Pirson (2001:565) finds the significance of a period of time in number 13 (the sum of one sun, one moon and 11 stars) and number 22 (two [one sun + one moon] times 11 [stars]) in Genesis 37:9. However, Revelation 12:1 has more convincing numerical symbolism than Genesis 37:9 in that the number 12 in the OT and the NT symbolises 12 tribes of Israel and 12 disciples of Jesus respectively. As Minear (1991:71, 75) remarks, one key to understanding this prophecy is to observe the multiple ways in which God’s curse is executed and finally reversed in John’s vision (Revelations 12:2, 4, 10). Moreover, John’s vision echoes the Cain story (Genesis 4:1-16) in many respects, though in Revelation 12:15-16 the earth plays an opposite role; the earth had been a witness to fratricide in Genesis 4.

Lupieri (1999:201), on the other hand, states that in opposition to the earth of the Flood in Genesis 7 that cannot do anything against God’s will, here the earth is opposed to the action of Satan, and defends the woman.

In addition, as in Genesis 3, a feminine character plays an important role in the conflict in Revelation 12. According to Chevalier (1997:356), Eve and the sunlit woman in Revelation 12 differ in that one falls under the influence of the serpent while the other is

315 In the OT in general and the Book of Genesis in particular, the number 12 as represented in the 12 tribes is meant to express the totality of Israel. Genesis 4, for example, mentions only 12 of Adam’s male descendants, although there were other progeny besides them. Seth and his male descendants were also 12, as Genesis 5 says. Of greater significance in the formation of the Israelite nation is the genealogy of Abraham (Genesis 16:11; 21:3; 25:1). All his descendants, by his wife Sarah and by his concubines Hagar and Keturah, evolved into nations, each based on 6 or 12 tribes. The following is a graphical summation of the offspring of Abraham (Genesis 35):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarah</th>
<th>Hagar</th>
<th>Keturah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Ishmael</td>
<td>6 sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Esau</td>
<td>12 sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 sons</td>
<td>12 sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 6/12 base is maintained in Genesis 46:8-27, specifically: All the persons belonging to Jacob who came into Egypt, who were his own descendants, not including Jacob’s sons’ wives, were sixty-six persons in all (v. 26: ESV). Throughout the biblical period and the following 2,000 years, the 12-tribe system was taken for granted (Joshua 4:4-7; 1 Kings 4:7; 11:30-32; Ezra 8:35). Since it was considered to be the perfect number, the nation, the perfect social and political order that was promised to Abraham, had to be built on the base of 12. In conclusion, an analysis of Genesis leads to the conclusion that the existence of 12 tribes was a pre-condition for the evolvement of all the nations in the early biblical narrative, culminating in the nation of Israel (see Buch, 1999:49-51). If this intertextuality of Revelation 12:1 with Genesis in terms of the number 12 is pertinent, John’s (Jewish) audiences interpreted their identity as the true and perfect Israel.

316 Of the woman (Revelation 12:1ff.), it can be deduced that she is the church represented not as the bride of Christ (Revelations 21:9; 22:17), but as the mother of the Messiah. She represents the people of God in both Testaments because she appears in the vision both before and after the birth of her child (Poellot, 1962:155-156).
freed from satanic persecution because of the pain she endured when giving birth to the Messiah and by giving her son away on the cross. In short, the presence of the common motifs of the woman, her offspring, the serpent, and the importance of obeying the commandments (Rev. 12:17) strongly suggests that Rev. 12 appears to be a dramatisation of the so-called protevangelium of Ge. 3:15 (LXX: καὶ ἔχθραν θῆσαι ἀνὰ μέσου σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσου τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσου τοῦ σπέρματός σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσου τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς αὐτὸς σου τηρήσει κεφαλήν καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτοῦ πτέρναν: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed, he shall watch against thy head, and thou shalt watch against his heel) (cf. Aune, 1998:708).

Sweet (1990:194) argues that in Rev. 12 the dominant imagery is biblical, and the dominant themes (as in chs. 4 and 5) are from Genesis – the serpent’s defeat of the woman reversed (Ge. 3:15-20) – and from Exodus: God’s historical defeat of the dragon Egypt and the rescue of his people.

Steeped in the creation themes, John explains the experience of the new creation of the seven churches on the basis of the victory of Christ and the saints.

5.1.3.2. Exodus

John associates the dragon (Rev. 12:3) with Egypt and Rome, since the OT metaphors of the sea monster predominantly portray Egypt as an opponent of God’s people (Pss. 74:13-14; 89:10; Hab. 3:8-15), and John sees in Rev. 12 a replay of the Exodus pattern (Beale, 1999b:633). Moreover, when John introduces the appearance of the dragon in heaven, he significantly adds the word ‘red’ – it is the only instance in the whole Bible where the dragon is mentioned as red. The red dragon is reminiscent of the Red Sea of the OT, indicating to John’s audiences that, although the dragon is indeed awesome,
God will surely overcome it. Because of the long tradition held by the Jewish people, Jewish audiences would immediately understand God's impending overthrow of the dragon as soon as John mentioned the great red dragon (Kio, 1989:131). The first historical circumstances of Rev. 12:4 to which the idea corresponds, and in which it is realised, may be found in the effort of Pharaoh to destroy the infant Moses (Miligan, 1889:202).

Rev. 12:6 and 13 describe the woman's flight to the wilderness in clear Exodus terms. The desert (Rev. 12:6, 14) is a common symbol in both OT and NT for a place of God's protection while one waits for the fulfillment of promises. Even the eagle's wings (Rev. 12:14) make patent reference to Ex. 19:4 and Dt. 32:10-12 in which the wings of the eagle are a symbol of God's protection and providence (cf. Mazzaferri, 1989:371). In Rev. 12:14 the combination of the Exodus theme and the re-creation theme is emphasised. White (1989:117-118) correctly articulates the point as follows:

John's allusion to especially Dt. 32:10-11 is significant, for in the text Moses compares God's presence with Israel in the wilderness to God's presence at creation in Ge. 1:2. That Moses does in fact make this comparison is signaled by two points. On the one hand, the verb used to describe God's activity in Dt. 32:11 (πρᾶσσει) occurs again in the Pentateuch only when Moses describes the Spirit's activity at creation in Ge. 1:2b (πρᾶσσει, LXX: ἐνεφέρθη). On the other hand, the noun used to describe the wilderness where God accompanied Israel in Dt. 32:10 (ποιμνὶ) occurs again in the Pentateuch only when Moses describes the state of the earth over which the Spirit hovered at creation in Ge. 1:2a (ποιμ; LXX: δόρας). From these lexical parallels it is not difficult to see that in Dt. 32:10-11 and Ex. 19:4 Moses interprets the Exodus event as a redemptive reenactment of creation, indeed as Israel's redemptive re-creation. When John alludes to those texts in Rev. 12:14, it is no more difficult to see that he understands the woman's experiences as her participation in the new Exodus under the Lamb. ... John is also telling us that the woman's participation in the Messianic Exodus entails her redemptive re-creation.

Apart from the purely metaphorical meaning of God's protection, Ex. 19:4 may be political in nature. In Egypt the goddess Nekhbet is the vulture goddess who represented Upper Egypt and served as a protecting deity for Pharaoh and the land. Nekhbet was depicted as particularly maternal and was believed to assist at royal and divine births. Significant building of her temple in el-Kab took place in the Eighteenth Dynasty toward the end of the Israelite stay in Egypt, so that she was a popular goddess at that
time. In Egypt God protected Israel, however. Therefore, Ex. 19:4 and Dt. 32:11 speaks of the Lord’s care and protection of his people using the imagery that was familiar from Egyptian metaphors of care and protection (Walton & Matthews, 1997:106, 267). Embedded in the Exodus motif, John also uses ‘the eagle metaphor’ (Rev. 12:14), which was familiar to his audience in Asia Minor as a symbol of the Roman army, in order to accentuate the fact that it is not Rome but God who protects the seven churches in Asia Minor.

In terms of the Exodus motif the blood (Rev. 12:11) serves as a seal of protection and safety. Blood as a symbol of death binds both God and the people together as one in partnership in the covenant seal (Ex. 19:4-6; 24:3-8; Kio, 1989:134). Although John’s clear intertextuality of Exodus cannot be denied, in his doctoral dissertation White (1987:114) points out the difference between the victory in Rev. 12:11 and the victory during Exodus in the OT: “The great irony of Israel’s victory over the dragon (Egypt) had been that, though they were released from Egypt, they were not released from their sins. Therefore, through the law given to Israel in their continuing bondage to sin, God could accuse them of sins and by his indictments subject them to the curses of defeat and death. The saint’s victory over the dragon is, however, profoundly different. As depicted in Rev. 12:10-11, the holy seed is still accused of sins, but they are accused by the dragon, not God”.

Hanson (1993:226) captures the significance of the blood (Rev. 12:11; cf. Rev. 7:14; 19:13) in terms of the purity-uncleanness social system by comparing Revelation with Leviticus: instead of Aaronic priesthood who must manipulate animal blood in a sanctuary, the Lamb’s blood accomplished redemption for all and created a new community in which all members are symbolically priests (Rev. 5:9-10; 7:14). The image of the blood of the Lamb also reverses the categorisation of blood on garments in Lev. 6:27. Instead of polluting, the Lamb’s blood becomes a metaphor of purification when the saints and the Word of God wash their robes in it (Rev. 19:13-14; cf. Lev. 7:14; 19:13).

---

319 Here, the idea of a lamb offered as a cultic sacrifice certainly contributes to this imagery. One should not too quickly interpret the lamb image as solely, or even primarily, cultic-sacrificial terminology (see Reddish, 1995:215).
Rev. 12:16 may be linked to Ex. 15:12 (LXX: ἔξετενας τὴν δεξιὰν σου κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς γῆ. Thou stretchedst forth thy right hand, the earth swallowed them up), in which 'the earth' drank the enemies who were pursuing the fleeing Israelites (Minear, 1991:76). The earth opening its mouth (Rev. 12:16: καὶ ἤρωσεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς καὶ κατέπιεν) also calls to mind the destruction of Korah in Dt. 11:6 (ἀνοίξασα ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς; cf. Ge. 4:1-16; Nu. 16:30-33). If so, the earth’s protection of the woman in Rev. 12:16 ironically reverses the earth’s endangerment of the remaining Israelites in Nu. 16:34 and Dt. 11:6. Although John freely uses and changes the Exodus, the results of the new Exodus are the same as the old: the mother of the seed, as it were, walks on dry land through the midst of the waters (Ex. 15:19; cf. White, 1989:118).

As Sweet (1990:203) notes, the model for her flight (Rev. 12:14) is the Exodus story. God brought his people on eagle’s wings into the wilderness (Ex. 19:4 [LXX: αὐτοὶ ἐωράκατε ὅσα πεποίηκα τοῖς Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὡσεὶ ἐπὶ πτε-ρόνων ἀετῶν καὶ προσηγαγόμην ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτῶν—eagles’ wings]; Dt. 32:11 [LXX: ὃς ἀετῶς σκεπάσας ... τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτῶν – eagle’s wings like Rev. 12:14], where they were nourished for forty-two years. The river-flood (Rev. 12:15) evokes Pharaoh’s attempt to destroy male Israelites in the river (Ex. 1:22) and his pursuit of Israel between the waters of the Red Sea (Ex. 14:21).

As John records the dragon’s rage over the woman’s escape and his departure from her...
to wage war against the rest of her seed in Rev. 12:17, he offers this characterisation of
the seed whom the dragon would overcome: ‘who keep the authoritative instruction of
God and hold to the testimony of Jesus’ (cf. Rev. 14:12). The phrase ‘obey God’s
commandments’ has a theological intertextuality with Exodus. In the time of the
Exodus, Israel’s obeying of God’s commandments would have constituted her victory
over sin, the sequel to which would have been her re-creation as God’s holy kingdom
(cf. Rev. 1:5-6). The phrase describing the seed’s keeping of God’s authoritative
instruction (i.e. commandments) in Rev. 12:17 signifies the seed’s re-creation as the
kingdom being constituted by the Lamb. In fact, John’s audience’s salvation surpasses
that of Israel: unlike Israel, they have been constituted as God’s kingdom not simply by
divine precept, but by divine power as well (White, 1989:120-121).

It is possible to conjecture that Rev. 13:4 shows a parody of Ex. 15:11 in that the beast’s
victory over death is paralleled with God’s victory over the Egyptians (Kraft, 1974:272).
The dragon’s sending of the two beasts (Rev. 13:1, 11) corresponds with the test at the
hands of Balak and Balaam,323 which Israel encountered upon their entry into the
Promised Land (Sweet, 1990:203). The rhetorical question, “Who is like the beast?” in
Rev. 13:4 is an echo of language frequently used in praising God; e.g. Ex. 15:11: LXX:
τίς ὁμοίος σοι ἐν θεῷ κύριε τίς ὁμοίος σοι δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἀγίοις θαυμαστός
ἐν δόξαις ποιῶν τέρατα;324 Pss. 35:10; 113:5 (Beckwith, 1967:636). Following the

323 In the OT, in only two cases (Ge. 3:1-5; Nu. 22:22-35) are animals endowed with the
capacity to express themselves articulately, and here too the impact of their speech is central to
the understanding of these texts. A number of significant intertextual parallels among Ge. 3:1-5,
Although there are partial parallels, the outstanding parallels are: (1) the ass, the snake, and the
beast use interrogatory statements to persuade the listener, but their questions have different
rhetorical intent (Ge. 3:4-5; Nu. 22:28; cf. Rev. 13:4); (2) the image of an angel armed with a
sword is common to the three stories (Ge. 3:24; Nu. 22:31; cf. Rev. 13:10); (3) the motif of
knowledge/wisdom is also common (Ge. 3:6; Nu. 23:34; Rev. 13:18); (4) obedience to the voice
of the snake and the beast entails the rejection of divine authority; (5) evil is associated with a
foreign ruler in the story of Numbers and Revelation; (6) the animals speak only by divine
initiative (e.g. the divine passive in Rev. 13), and have no special powers of their own; (7) in the
three texts it seems that the animals exhibit a deeper understanding of the relationship between
the human and the divine than their human counterparts; (8) the three animals lead people astray,
the snake and the beast figuratively and the ass literally; and (9) the significance of cursing in
the three texts is noteworthy (Ge. 3:14-19; Nu. 22:17; Rev. 13:6) The intertextual relationship
among the stories of the anomalous animal speech sheds light on larger patterns of inner-biblical
interpretation (see Savran, 1994:34, 55).

324 These hymnodic lines are nominal clauses, with attributive modifiers emphasising the point...
rhetorical question "who is like the beast, and who is able to wage war against him?", a series of three aspects of Yahweh's incomparability is raised in a further rhetorical question: his magnificent holiness, his praiseworthy deeds, and his extraordinary accomplishment. Thus, John reminds his audiences of the strong contrast between the true God and the beast and that they are forced to remain faithful to the incomparable God.

The temple motif is also important for the Exodus theme in Rev. 13:6. The fellowship and residence of God in the tabernacle in the historical Exodus event (Ex. 40:34) foreshadow God's dwelling (τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ) and fellowship in the true temple, believers who experience the New Exodus in Christ (cf. Rev. 21:3). The Exodus by Moses is not only a type of the New Exodus by Christ but is also the archetype of the deliverance from the Exile. So, the Exodus by Jesus is the archetype of the future consummated salvation of God, as well as the antitype of the Exodus by Moses.

The fact that for the word 'slain' John uses the Greek word ἐσφαγμένον in Rev. 13:8 (also Rev. 5:6, 9, 12) shows another Exodus theme. Since σφαξω refers to the violent death of the lamb slaughtered for sacrifice (Ex. 12:6), the image evokes the memory of Israel's Exodus and liberation from Egypt, which was considered in Judaism as a prototype of the final eschatological salvation (Kio, 1989:132-133).

The mark in Rev. 13:17 (cf. Rev. 14:9b) indicating that the people belong to the beast has the same meaning as the sign in Ex. 13:9, 16. Both mean the mark of possession (Kio, 1989:126). In connection with the mark, another feature from Exodus appears: the first plague of the seven bowls in Rev. 16:2 is 'an ugly and painful sore' on those who had the mark of the beast and worshipped his image (cf. Ex. 9:9-11).

Relying on the Exodus-based intertextual theme John is offering an image, to the oppressed Christians in Asia Minor, a symbol derived from the Exodus experience of
deliverance and liberation. In order to accomplish his goal, John used a number of Exodus symbols and images. He did this not for the sake of secrecy but for the sake of impact – they have a great evocative and emotive power (Kio, 1989:131). In particular, John uses the battle between God and the dragon of Egypt to interpret Christ's inaugural victory over the dragon who makes war against the Church. John intends to convince his audiences as the community of the New Exodus of the fact that God's protection leads them to the asylum in Pella via the Jordan River during the Jewish-Roman War (cf. Kraft, 1974:264). The Exodus intertextuality is so closely intertwined with the recreation motif that John clearly accentuates the surpassing status of his audience (as the recreated new Exodus community) to that of the Israel in the OT. If Rev. 12-13 is read from the Exodus intertexts, the Exodus intertextuality functions as a paradigm to describe God's saving of his own people as well as his judgment of the oppressors (cf. Du Rand, 1996c:52-53). The eschatological redemption in terms of the Exodus theme for which Christ has worked is so clear in Rev. 12-13 that God's people in Asia Minor, who have already experienced his/her salvation but still anticipate its consummation, have to praise God with great joy.

5.1.3.3. Psalms

In Rev. 12:5 John returns to Psalm 2:9 (LXX: ἐὰν εὐφραίνῃς αὐτούς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδήρῳ ὑς σκέφῳ κεραμέως συντρίφῃς αὐτούς: Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel), one of his favourite texts, to explain his symbolism in which God's Son defeats all worldly enemies and is then enthroned as ruler over the earth (Chilton, 1990:308). It is only alluded to in one other place in Revelation (2:27), but imagery of divine kingship, similar to the Messianic Psalms (Ps. 2), is present throughout (e.g. Rev. 1:5; 4:2; 6:17; 19:5; Paul, 2000:266). As Bratcher and Reyburn (1991:30) note, the verb (ΨΕΩ) in the Masoretic text of Ps. 2:9 is 'break' or 'smash up', but the same consonants of the Masoretic text, with different vowels, which are given in the margin of the text, mean 'to rule', and this is how the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate (pasces) translate it (also NIV, NAB). And this is also the form in which the text is used in Rev. 12:5 (cf. Rev. 2:27; 19:15). The emphasis on Satan's accusatorial role in Rev. 12:10 recalls Job 1:6-11 and 2:1-6. Rev. 12:10-12 recalls Ps. 96:10-13 (esp. 96:11, LXX:...
Let the heavens rejoice, and the earth exult; let the sea be moved, and the fullness of it) in which the psalmist exults in the fact that the Lord is the King and judges the world and its peoples (Kraft, 1974:263). The destructive waters (Rev. 12:16) suggest the destructive power of chaos, which God had to overcome in creation (Pss. 32:6, LXX: ὑπὲρ ταύτης προσευχήται πᾶς ὅσιος πρὸς σὲ ἐν καιρῷ εὐθεῖα πλην ἐν κατακλυσμῷ ὕδατων πολλῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐγγιοῦσι: Therefore shall every holy one pray to thee in a fit time: only in the deluge of many waters they shall not come nigh to him); 69:1-2; 124:2-5; Na. 1:8). It seems that ‘the mighty waters’ (ὕδατων πολλῶν) in Ps. 32:6 is a poetic figure of speech for dangers and troubles (cf. Bratcher & Reyburn, 1991:307).

The term σκηνοῦντες (Rev. 12:12) may be a translation of ὡς (Ps. 98:7, LXX: οἱ κατοικοῦντες; cf. Ps. 96:11), which in Rev. 12:12 refers to the host of heaven, rather than those who dwell on earth, as in the Psalm.

The Leviathan-like character of the sea beast (Rev. 13:1) calls to mind the theme of ‘the Divine Warrior’, doing battle to establish the created world (Ps. 74:13-17; esp. Ps. 74:13-14: ἦκτερον ἐπὶ ἄνω θάλασσα ἐν θάλασσα ἐν θάλασσα ἐν θάλασσα ἐν θάλασσα; cf. Isa. 51:9; Collins,

325 There are two choices in Ps. 74:13-15: firstly, Ps. 74:13-15 refers to creation, using expressions and figures of popular pagan accounts of how the creator God defeated the primeval monsters of the deep chaos. Secondly, if the Exodus from Egypt is taken as the event being described in these verses, then the dragon and Leviathan are symbols of Egypt (Bratcher & Reyburn, 1991:653). In the OT, Yahweh fights on behalf of his people. In the holy war in the OT the overarching principle is that Yahweh is present in the battle. As exegetes broaden their study to include the development of redemptive history, they will observe that there is a progressive pattern to God’s warring activity. Five distinct phases of divine warfare in the Bible come to the fore. Though not strictly sequential, they do reflect the development of the history of redemption. Phase 1: God’s fight against the flesh-and-blood enemies of Israel (e.g. Ex. 15). Phase 2: God’s fight against Israel (e.g. Dt. 28:25-26). Phase 3: Postexilic anticipation of the divine warrior (e.g. Zec. 14:3). Phase 4: Jesus Christ’s fight against Satan (e.g. Col. 2:15). Phase 5: the eschatological battle of the faith up to the Parousia (cf. Longman III, 1998:78-79).

326 Ps. 74 was most likely composed for performance at services of mourning over the destroyed temple in Jerusalem during the exilic period. Such services appear to have been held recurrently at the ruined sanctuary (Jer. 41:4-5) whose razing is reflected in vs. 3-7. Like John, the psalmist depicts God’s saving deeds in conflating both mythical figures and motifs and history. He draws on a narrative pattern widespread in ancient Near Eastern myth and on Israel’s experiences with the Lord in their early history. The interweaving speaks of the victory over primeval chaos and the establishment of world order and of Israel’s passage through the sea and wilderness in the same breath. (cf. Mays, 1994:244-245).
1988:71). It is significant that seven times in Ps. 74:13-17 the psalmist uses the personal pronoun ‘you’ (παρεκλήσεως) as an emphatic device to assert God’s activities; by implication he is denying that some pagan god, Baal or Marduk, had done these things (cf. Bratcher & Reyburn, 1991:653). According to John, as to the psalmist, it is not pagan gods/Nero but God who defeats the dragon and the two beasts. Indeed, John uses military terms throughout Rev. 12-13.

The references to the heavens, the earth and the sea show a noteworthy intertextuality between Psalms and Revelation. Within the worldview of the ancient Near East (including that of the Psalms), the heavens (Rev. 12:12a) are God’s domain in Ps. 115:16. In other words, the heavens are envisioned as utterly secure. The earth (Rev. 12:12b), on the one hand, receives the light of the heavens, and is consequently a region of life; it ends, on the other hand, in dark, bottomless chaos. First of all, the sea in Revelation should be understood not as a geographical aspect but as a personal dimension, though the former cannot be cast out. The sea (Rev. 12:12b; 13:1), the abyss, and the darkness are the domains of the forces of chaos. Where the demythologisation is far advanced, the sea can be viewed as an integral part of the cosmic whole (see Ps. 89:9). Nevertheless, this process of demythologisation had not reached conclusion even in the last books of the NT (cf. Lk. 21:25; Rev. 13:1; 21:1; cf. Keel, 1997:55-56).

The acclamation of the beast in Rev. 13:4 reminds John’s audiences of Ps. 35:10 (LXX: κύριε τίς δομολογεῖς σοι;). The rhetorical question in Rev. 13:4 and Ps. 35:10 is a way of saying ‘There is no one like you’ (TEV).

Alluding to the Psalms, John emphasises both the rule of Christ as the enthroned King and God’s new creation by conquering the disorder.

5.1.3.4. Isaiah

Reading the OT the Book of Revelation lays emphasis on the prophetic writings, not...
on the Torah. In this regard a characteristic difference is to be seen in comparison to the interpretation of the Scriptures in the Jewish synagogues, which concentrated upon the books of God's law (Lohse, 1993:113).

The highest number of allusions comes from Isaiah, though they have attracted less attention than John's use of Daniel and Ezekiel. This is probably because they are often combined with other texts (cf. Moyise, 2002:10-11).

Taking seriously the rhetorical nature of language, and especially figurative uses of language, Darr properly pays attention to a valuable point in Isaiah, namely 'the metaphors of child and female'. According to Darr (1994:83-86, 122-123), (1) limited knowledge and competence (Isa. 3:12), (2) weakness and vulnerability (Isa. 3:16; 11:8), (3) lovableness (Isa. 49:14-18), (4) familial longevity (Isa. 48:18-19), (5) disrespectful behaviours (Isa. 3:5), and (6) rebelliousness (Isa. 1:2-3; 30:1) are associated with the children imagery in Isaiah. These metaphors function strategically to persuade readers to a perspectival realignment, an assent to the depiction of reality that the text presents: God's relationship with Israel is as enduring, as complex and as powerful as the familial blood bond binding parents and children across generations. Isaiah's vision also abounds with references to women. Isaiah shows numerous and complex associations with women: (1) subordination and dependence, (2) vulnerability (Isa. 13:16), (3) haughtiness (Isa. 2:11-17), (4) submissiveness (Isa. 4-5), (5) limited knowledge and competence (Isa. 27:10-11), (6) familial love (Isa. 49:22), (7) maternal devotion (Isa. 49:15) and (8) compassion (Isa. 66:13). Isaiah employs these female images to convey a sense of the love, passion, jealousy, shame and pride believed to be integral to the relations binding God and Israel. As a matter of fact, like Isaiah, John also makes use of abundant images of child and female throughout the Book of Revelation (esp. Rev. 12) to convey his message to his audience in an effective way.

omens — visual phenomena — on the one hand; and oracles — auditory phenomena — on the other. Without diminishing the positive aspects in the prophetic writings of the OT and Revelation, exegetes find a remarkably consistent and common set of structural and terminological intertextuality in the interpretation of dreams, visions, and oracles in these books (cf. Fishbane, 1985:443).
The labour pains of the woman (Rev. 12:2) is an image of Israel used in (1) Isa. 26:16-19; (2) Isa. 54:1 (with Gal. 4:19-27); (3) Isa. 66:7-9 (cf. Jer. 4:31; Mic. 4:9-10; Rissi, 1966:36; Linton, 1993:93-96):

(1) The image of the people of God in the agonies of labour, and waiting to be delivered by God, seems to become more developed from Isa. 26:17 to Isa. 66:7. This image acquired especial significance during the Maccabaean period, when it came to have specifically Messianic connotations, the suffering of God’s people thus described being the birth pangs of the new Messianic age (also see 1 QH 3:7-12). It seems that Isa. 26:17-27:1 is seminal for Rev. 12. The intervening verses (Isa. 26:20-21) do have thematic parallels with Revelation – their images of judgment recur in Isaiah and also occur thematically in Revelation – but that need not imply that these verses have such critical importance for Rev. 12:1-2 (see Paul, 2000:264). In the context of a textual complex filled with relational metaphors concerning Yahweh and his people it seems reasonable to see Isa. 26:16-19 as a reference to national rebirth/resurrection/restoration after a time of judgment during which the nation sought unsuccessfully to extend itself without God. This national restoration can also be assumed from the combination between and in Isa. 26:19 (cf. Doyle, 2000:304-305).

(2) Rev. 12:2, Gal. 4:19-27 and Isa. 54:1 (LXX: εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσαρή -ξον καὶ βοήσουν ἢ οὐκ ὁδίνουσα δτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τής ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐ -χούσης τὸν ἄνδρα: Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that dost not travail; for more are the children of the desolate than of her that has a husband) are connected intertextually with each other. For Paul Jerusalem above is maternal –

---

328 Mic. 4:10 and 5:2-4 show the theme of Israel as a woman in childbirth, waiting on God to be delivered. Although the verbal parallels are not as close here as in Isa. 7:14, 26:17 and 66:7, there is a double structural parallel between Mic. 5:3-4 and Rev. 12: the child (Messiah) will shepherd his flock (ποιμανεῖ; Mic. 5:4; Rev. 12:5) and be joined to the rest of his brethren (Mic. 5:3; Rev. 12:17; see Paul, 2000:265).

329 Rissi (1966:36-37) deals with the intertextuality between LXX of Isa. 26:17-27:1 and Rev. 12: it is quite conceivable that the bud, which has blossomed in Rev. 12 in astounding multiplicity of detail, is evident, although complete certainty is not attainable. Here two examples are enough: (1) the manifestation of God’s wrath follows after a short time (Isa. 26:20), transferred in Rev. 12:12 to the dragon (also here the short period is emphasised). (2) During the difficult time the Messianic community is hidden (Isa. 26:20), according to Rev. 12:6 it is delivered and protected in the wilderness.
'our mother' (Gal. 4:26). The maternal image involves a shift from Paul's anguished birth pangs of Gal. 4:19 (cf. Rev. 12:2) to joyful hope for many offspring (cf. Rev. 12:17). The basis for his joyful hope for many offspring is Isa. 54:1 — a song of assurance for Jerusalem. Though Paul cites only one verse, the intertextual interplay with the Isaianic context is much more extensive. The agonising mother is an Isaianic figure of the exile (cf. Isa. 52:2). The mother who is abandoned in Isa. 50:1 is sent away because of sin and lawlessness. Furthermore, the daughter Zion is captive (Isa. 52:2). The Jerusalem who is sent away captive in Isaiah corresponds to Hagar in Paul's story of Abraham and Sarah (Gal. 4:24). Jerusalem assumes two identities in Isaiah, a Jerusalem in captivity and a free Jerusalem. The latter is a Jerusalem of hope in a promise. So also Jerusalem assumes two identities in Gal. 4, a Jerusalem in captivity and a free Jerusalem. As Isaiah contrasts captivity and restoration, so Galatians contrasts captivity and freedom. Thus, it can be deduced that with the mother image John also intends to introduce his audiences to the contrast between the Jerusalem in captivity and a free Jerusalem (cf. Brawley, 2002:112-114).

(3) Isa. 66:7 (LXX: πρὶν ἡ τὴν ὀδύνουσαν τεκεῖν πρὶν ἔλθεῖν τὸν πόνον τῶν ὀδύνων ἕξεφυγεν καὶ ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν: Before she that travailed brought forth, before the travail-pain came on, she escaped it and brought forth a male) has multiple verbal parallels to Rev. 12:2, 5 and 6; Zion is a woman in the pains of childbirth and longing to be delivered by God. In some senses Zion/Jerusalem stands for the people who are suffering, but Zion/Jerusalem also ‘gives birth’ to the new people delivered by God. A corporate understanding of the woman in Rev. 12 leads to the same paradox, since she gives birth to the child and ‘the rest of her offspring’ (Rev. 12:17; cf. Ellis, 2001:119). In the MT of Isa. 66:7, the woman is delivered of a son (יוֹלָה, hiphil perfect of יָלָה). But the LXX makes the meaning of יָלָה explicit by translating it with two verbs, ἔξεφυγεν καὶ ἔτεκεν, ‘she fled and bore a son’, and thus the idea of combining Exodus imagery with the Messianic deliverance comes to the fore (see Paul, 2000:264-265).

The language of Rev. 12:1-2 may be partly derived from the typological prophecy of the mother and child in Isa. 7:10-14 (esp. v. 14, LXX: διατότῳ δώσει κύριος αὐτὸς ὑμῖν σημεῖον ἵνα παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ: Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; behold, a virgin...
shall conceive in the womb, and shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel; Fekkes, 1994:179; Beale, 1999b:630). Commenting on Isa. 7:14 as a messianic prophecy embedded with strong Christological significance, Watts (1985:104) is correct in maintaining that the announcement of God's sign to king Ahaz in his hour of despair is a fitting reference to illuminate the birth of Jesus whom God had destined to save the world, not by force of arms but by meek acceptance of humiliation and death. That God chooses to accomplish his primary goals in such ways is the message of Isaiah as it is of the Gospels and of the Book of Revelation.

In connection with the male child (Immanuel) and his ministry, Mt. 1:23 and Isa. 7:14, and Rev. 12:1-2 are linked intertextually. Mt. 1:23 cites Isa. 7:14 (essentially following the LXX). Though Isa. 7:14 has implicit Christological overtones in its original context, the explicit Christological meaning is given to John and his audiences in Rev. 12:1-2 owing to the hermeneutical influence of Mt. 1:23 (cf. Paul, 2000:263). The prophet Isaiah addresses king Ahaz of Judah (cf. Mt. 1:9) under threat from Syrian imperial aggression and Israel (Isa. 7:1-2). Isa. 7:14 evokes themes of resistance and the refusal to trust God's saving work, of imperial power as a means of divine punishment, and of God saving the people from imperial power. Isa. 7-8 provides three perspectives of imperial power. First, God opposes it (Isa. 7:1-9). Second, God uses it to punish his sinful people (Isa. 7:17-25). And third, the punishment does not last forever. While imperial power accomplishes God's purpose, it does not control its own destiny. Without de-emphasising the spiritual (and religious and moral) meaning of Christ's salvation, as with Isaiah's Immanuel, the child Jesus in Mt. 1:23-25 is a sign of resistance to imperial power. The name Immanuel contests imperial claims that an emperor is a deus praesens. The Isaiah text evokes a situation of imperial threat, thereby establishing an analogy with the situations of both the Matthean audience and John's audience living under Roman imperial power, and also promise God's salvation through Immanuel. Speaking analogically and intertextually, because the audiences of the Book of Revelation were also under threat from Rome (as a means of divine judgment like Syria in Isaiah) and from the apostate Jews (like northern Israel in Isaiah), the male child in Rev. 12:2 is intertextually analogous to Immanuel in Isa. 7:14 and Mt. 1:23 (see Carter, 2000a:510-513). The table below shows the above-mentioned intertextuality:
The imperial power (Syria) + Northern Israel vs Judah + the male child (Immanuel) (in the time of Isaiah)

The imperial power (Rome) + The apostate Jews vs The Church + the male child (Jesus) (in the time of Matthew and John)

Rev. 12:5-6 alludes to both Isa. 9:6-7 (esp. 9:6a and 9:7a, LXX: ὁτι παιδίον ἡμῖν υἱός καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν ... μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐστιν ὄριον ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Δαυὶδ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ κατορθώσαι αὐτὴν καὶ ἀντιλαβέσθαι αὐτὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἐν κρίματι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον) and to Isa. 66:7-8 (LXX: πρὶν ἡ τὴν ὁδόνουσαν τεκείν πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὸν πόνον τῶν ὁδίων ἐξέφυγεν καὶ ἐτεκεν ἁροεν. τῆς ἡκουσα τολοῦτο καὶ τῆς ἐώρακεν οὕτως ἦν ὁδίνευ γή ἐν μιᾷ ἡμ. ἐρα ἢ καὶ ἐτέχθη ἐθνος εἰς ἅπαξ ὀτι ὁδίνευ καὶ ἐτεκεν Σιὼν τὰ παιδία αὐτῆς).

In particular, the latter (Isa. 66:7-8) is part of a prophecy figuratively describing Jerusalem as a reborn child when God restores Israel from captivity and brings about a new creation. (cf. Fekkes, 1994:183; Beale, 1999b:641). In Isa. 66:7-8 the suddenness of the events depicted in the imagery of birth and child is portrayed: Before...labour, she gives birth. Jerusalem’s destruction in BC 587 had left marks on the city which were not removed until Nehemiah rebuilt the walls in BC 437. After that long wait of well over a century, it took only two months for Nehemiah to complete the wall (Ne. 6:15). It was an unbelievable feat (Watts, 1987:363). It seems that by using Isa. 9:6-7 and 66:7-8 John introduces his audience to Christ, the restorer of the true Israel, the Church.

Isa. 27:1 (LXX: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς τὴν μάχαιραν τὴν ἁγίαν

---

330 The LXX’s use of παιδίον may reflect an intertextual exegetical link that associates the speakers who announce their report in Isa. 53:1-2 with the awaited child of Isa. 9:6, or more likely with Hezekiah’s future children who will announce the Lord’s righteousness (Isa. 38:19) (see Ekblad, 1999:202).

331 In the metaphorical statement of Isa. 26:21-27:4, the necessary prerequisite for restored ‘marital’ relations between Yahweh and his people is explored. Yahweh must destroy the chaos brought about by Israel’s iniquity (Isa. 26:21-27:1) and restore fecundity (Isa. 27:2ff.). The destruction of the chaos monster (Leviathan) as a figure for the judgment of Israel’s
Of the 52 occurrences of οὐρανός in Revelation, the only plural form ‘οὐρανοί’ in Rev. 276

transgression must be read side by side with God’s salvific act of restoration represented by the figure of fecund earth and fecund people (Isa. 27:2ff.). Thus both are salvific metaphors and both speak of restored relationships. As ever, the negative (i.e. punishment) goes together with the positive (i.e. salvation; see the deep structure of Rev. 12-13). Indeed, what links the two metaphors is the notion that the punishment of iniquity is an act of salvation on God’s part and is thus associated with the broader notion of restored fecundity (cf. Doyle, 2000:330). Likewise, John of the Apocalypse also constantly makes sure the fact that God’s salvation of (the new) Israel is acquired by judging the transgression of his covenantally marital partner.

332 According to Isa. 23:17, after a period of 70 years Tyre (the harlot) will do her best to try to draw the attention of the nations again, as in the past. However, as is clearly implied in Isa. 23:18, this new situation will not be to the benefit of Tyre herself, but actually to the benefit of the temple of the Lord and to the people who live on the temple mount of Jerusalem (presumably priests and Levites). The gain and profit will be ‘a sacred gift’ (δώρα) to be put in the treasuries of the temple of God, because it is regarded to be ‘a tax and as such a memorial before the Lord’. The ending of LXX Isa. 23:18 (εἰς συμβολὴν μνημόσυνον ἐναντίον κυρίου: for a contribution, a memorial before the Lord) reflects an interpretation based on Nu. 31:25ff. (μνημόσυνον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐναντίον κυρίου). Just as part of the war booty of the Midianites is considered a tribute or tax to the Lord (οἴκος), so part of the commercial richness of Tyre is seen that way in Isa. 23:18. The people of the Lord (on the temple mount) will have a good life: they will eat, drink and be filled (with the booty). LXX verses 17-18 clearly reflect a great interest in the important role of the temple of Jerusalem in a world-wide setting (see Van der Kooij, 1998:74-75; 86). This intertextuality suggests that with the defeat of the dragon (Rev. 12:7) John could have reminded his audiences of the fact that God will defeat Rome, which will serve God’s people (as priests) in the whole (world-wide) Diaspora.
12:12 recalls ‘οὐρανοὶ’ in Isa. 44:23 (LXX: εὐφρανθῆτε οὐρανοὶ ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ σαλπίσατε θεμέλια τῆς γῆς βοήσατε ὡς εὐφροσύνη οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ π -άντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἱακωβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ δοξα-θήσεται); 49:13b (Fekkes, 1994:189; Beale, 1999b:666). The context of both Isaiah texts is of celebration at God’s act of redemption, in the forgiveness of sins and the comforting of his suffering people. However, neither Isa. 44:23 nor 49:13 appears to have great structural significance within Rev. 12 (Paul, 2000:268). Alluding to Rev. 13:16, Isa. 44:5 (LXX: οὗτος ἔρει τὸν θεὸν εἰμι καὶ οὗτος βοήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ οἴνῳ -τὶ ἱακωβ καὶ ἔτερος ἐπιγράψει τὸν θεὸν εἰμι ἐπὶ τῷ οἴνῳματι Ἰσραὴλ) says that each person who receives God’s Spirit in the end time “shall write with his hand, I am God’s” (Kraft, 1974:281; Beale, 1999b:716). In short, in Rev. 12-13 the emphasis of the fulfillment of the promises of Isaiah in the person and works of Christ and in the Church comes to the fore.

5.1.3.5. Ezekiel

According to the tables in UBS 3rd edition counting 84 of 138, over half of the allusions to Ezekiel in the NT come from the Book of Revelation. It is the only NT writing that shows a significant interest in this great prophet (Moyise, 2002:5-6). On the basis of Revelation’s close conceptual relationship with the Book of Ezekiel, Strand (1976:75) maintains that there is a conceptual parallel among the Olivet Discourse, Revelation, and Ezekiel. Conspicuous conceptual parallels between the two prophetic Books are remarkable as the following table manifests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ezekiel</th>
<th>Revelation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel in captivity sees a vision of God (ch. 1)</td>
<td>John in captivity sees a vision of Christ (ch. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messages to the Jewish people (chs. 2-24)</td>
<td>Messages to the seven churches (chs. 2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments upon the nations (chs. 25-32)</td>
<td>A series of judgments (chs. 6-19) (introduced by visions of God in chs. 4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Messianic kingdom (chs. 33-37)</td>
<td>The Messianic kingdom (20:1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attack of Gog (chs. 38-39)</td>
<td>The attack of Gog and Magog (20:7-10), followed by the Last Judgment (20:11-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ezekiel follows the typical prophetic oracles as do the other OT prophetic books in that he firstly declares God’s judgment on Israel, and then on pagan nations (cf. La. 1:21; Ob. 11-15; Zep. 1:3-4, 18; 2:3). This procedure appears to be able to be applied to the Book of Revelation. According to the above table, it can be assumed that Rev. 12-13 is about God’s judgment on pagan nations preceded by God’s judgment on Israel.

While Vogelgesang (1985:30) accentuates the fact that the interpretation of Ezekiel in Revelation provides a key to an overall understanding of the Apocalypse, he mentions only one verse (Rev. 13:16: χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς) in Rev. 12-13 which has verbal parallels with Ezk. 9:6 (LXX: πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεανίσκον καὶ παρθένον καὶ νήπια καὶ γυναῖκας ἀποκτείνατε εἰς ἐξάλειψιν ἐπὶ δὲ πάντας ἐφ’ οὐς ἐστιν τὸ σημεῖον μὴ ἑγγίστηκαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἄρδεασθε καὶ ἀρέσατο ἄρδεα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρεσβύτερων οἱ ἤσαν ἐσω ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ; for the significance of the Jerusalem fall in Ezk. 9:6, see John’s intertextuality of 1 Pe. 4:17). God exempts from destruction those who grieve over the apostasy of the nation bearing the mark on their foreheads. More attention should be paid here to the surrender of Jerusalem by Babylon. From Ezekiel’s accusation, ‘the utterly detestable things of Israel will drive God far from his sanctuary’ (Ezk. 8:6), the fall of Jerusalem by Babylon is again inevitable. Israel’s sin is centred in the temple of Jerusalem; the very building that was intended to draw people’s minds to God was in reality turning them away from true divine presence. In Ezk. 9 Ezekiel’s vision moves into a more futurist and active mode, as he envisages the forthcoming destruction of both the city of Jerusalem and its temple. Surprisingly, Ezekiel does not name the Babylonian armies as the attackers of Jerusalem, although that is clearly what is meant. For the prophet, it is God who has become Jerusalem’s enemy, and Babylon is serving as an agent of divine punishment (cf. Clements, 1996:40-41).

Yet the image of a woman used as a symbol for the Jerusalem community (i.e. Israel) can also be found in Ezk. 16:2-8 (esp. v. 7, LXX: καὶ ἐπληθὼντος καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθης καὶ εἰσῆλθες εἰς πόλεις πόλεωνοι μαστοί σου
etvcopOctiOrio -av Kai aou elVeTELXE 6v SE iicrOct yuµvI Kai daxripovoikya:

So thou didst increase and grow, and didst enter into great cities: thy breasts were set, and thy hair grew, whereas thou wast naked and bare) (also see Jer. 3:6-10; Hos. 2:19-20; 4 Ezra 9:38-10:59; Linton, 1993:93-96). The covenantal care and the enduring love of God (as the benefactor, adoptive parent, husband) towards Jerusalem (έν διαθήκη μετὰ σοῦ λέγει κόριος in Ezk. 16:8) make Israel his glorious 'queen' (τικικοτρικοτέρικα, Ezk. 16:13). Likewise, John in Rev. 12:1 describes the pregnant woman (the Church, Christ’s bride) with a heavenly, glorious picture. But in Ezk. 16:15-63 the author abruptly changes his voice, calling Israel prostitute/harlot (πόρνη: Ezk. 16:35; cf. the metaphors of two sister-prostitutes in Ezk. 23, see Jer. 3:6-12) not only due to her apostasy with pagan nations but also due to her discarding of God’s covenant. Understandably, therefore, Clements (1996:69) names Ezk. 16:15ff. ‘the OT parable of the prodigal daughter’. In other words, it is an allegory, set in the guise of the story of a foundling girl. This fact implies that John may intend to bring an accusation against Jerusalem for becoming the harlot in Rev. 17-18.

The fact that Ezk. 16 and 23 provide the adulterous wife of Hosea (Hos. 1:2) and Jeremiah (Jer. 2:20-25; 3:1-13) with a biography indicates nicely the biblical tradition from which Ezekiel borrowed the metaphor of the harlot and, at the same time, suggests the overall rhetorically suasive strategy which shaped Ezk. 16 and 23. Ezekiel expects that the association of the shocking image of a depraved harlot with the covenant people or the holy city will attract attention to the prophetic message, and cause the reader to think more about what is being said than if strictly nonfigurative language were used. One of the most intriguing aspects of the use of the metaphor of the prostitute as a trope shadowing religious faithlessness is the way in which the metaphorical narrative and the referential story frequently tell the same tale. When Ezekiel’s allegories tell of the harlot ‘making patchwork altars’ (Ezk. 16:16) and ‘making for herself male idols and engaging in prostitution with them’ (Ezk. 16:17), it becomes difficult to determine whether the prophet is maintaining metaphorical shadows or allowing the referential religious experiences of Israel to intrude. This closeness between metaphor and referent as a literary technique entices and creates interesting, thought-provoking narrative. The audience must decide whether the text is speaking metaphorically or referentially – or both. It is interesting that when Ezekiel adopts a metaphor, he rarely uses it in only one sentence. Nor does he just develop brief narratives based on the metaphors, as does Jeremiah (see Jer. 3:6-13). Ezekiel adopts the metaphor of the harlot and gives her a deprived childhood, a family, a husband, and numerous lovers. The prophet even explores the possibilities of this metaphor to the extent that the narrator modifies the conventional operations of the harlot so that in the story, she pays her lovers (see Durlesser, 1988:149-156, 357-358).

Allegory and parable are basically extended forms of metaphor that can appear in many guises. Whereas the simple metaphor usually focuses on one feature of similarity, parable and allegory (as means of prophetic address) may explore many similarities and connections. Their purpose is to highlight the features of a thing, or a situation, which may not otherwise be apparent, or even properly understood. The main characteristic of an allegory is that the central actors in the story represent characters in the real world (see Clements, 1996:70).
In Ezk. 32:2-3 (LXX: σὺ ὡς δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ δαλάσσῃ ... τάδε λέγει κύριος καὶ πε -ριβαλω ἐπὶ σὲ δίκτυα λαών πολλῶν καὶ ἀνάξω σὲ ἐν τῷ ἀγκιστρῷ) the dragon (cf. Ezk. 29:3; Rev. 12:3) is applied to the tyrant Pharaoh, whose doom is declared to be as sure as that of the watery Tiamat (Beasley-Murray, 1990:198). Why the prophet finds it important to affirm his conviction of Egypt's coming downfall by Babylon after Jerusalem has fallen (Ezk. 32:1, 11; cf. Ezk. 30:10) can be explained as follows: clearly it was a time when a significant community of Jewish refugees was establishing itself in Egypt and beginning to think of this land as offering a hope for the future rebirth of Jewish life. Ezekiel's prophecies declare a firm no to all such expectations. Egypt's judgment is still to come! (Clements, 1996:140-141).

The throne vision in Rev. 12:5 reminds John and his audiences of the throne chariot (i.e. Merkabah) vision of Ezk. 1 and 10 (esp. 10:2, 6-7) (cf. 4 Q 385:4 [known as Pseudo-Ezekiel]: The peoples of the [earth] shall [...] with a cheerful heart and with [...] let him hide a little while [...] and those breaking into [...] the vision which Ezekiel saw [...] the chariot shone, and the four living beings ...; 4 Q 405:20-22: His glorious chariots [...] holy Cherubim, luminous wheel-beings in the inner[most sanctum] godlike spirits of [...] purity [...] of holiness ...335). Exactly like the Book of Revelation, Merkabah mysticism pictures God as βασιλεύς, that is, King or Emperor (see Brooke, 1998:50-52; Smith, 1998:505).

The fact that Rev. 12:12 bespeaks an imminent eschaton in John's very day (cf. ἐγγύς in Rev. 1:3; 22:10) accords with Ezk. 30:3 (ἔδοξεν τῶν κυρίων ἡμέρα):336 For the day of the Lord is nigh, a day of cloud; it shall be the end of the nations), because it is conceivable that 'ἂν γινομεν καιρόν ἡχει' reflects the prophetic ἔτη ἡμέρα (cf. Ezk. 7:7; Isa. 13:6; Joel 1:15; Mazzaferri, 1989:236-237). Here, as Allen (1990:115) correctly puts it correctly,

335 These translations come from 'A new translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls' by Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996:351, 374). It needs to be stated clearly that no NT work explicitly cites any literary work found in the Qumran caves. Some scriptural passages are indeed found quoted in both corpora, but the literary contexts of each usage are distinct. Nonetheless, there is considerable overlap in shared intertextual exegetical combinations in the text found at Qumran and the NT (Brooke, 1998:55-56).

336 MT adds כוֹלִים 'and the day is near' after Ezk. 30:3a. It is not represented in LXX and is taken by most as a dittography (Allen, 1990:113).
Ezekiel makes use of the concept of the day of Yahweh in Ezk. 7:7, with Israel as its target. Yet what threatened Israel threatens the nations also, according to the prophetic pattern in the OT. As a time of Yahweh's intervention, his day was associated with motifs of theophany, attendant storm and 'cloud' (Ezk. 30:3; cf. Zep. 1:15; Mt. 24:30). Thus, it can be deduced that the imminence of God's judgment on pagan nations in Ezekiel may recall God's judgment on Rome in Revelation 13 onwards.

5.1.3.6. Daniel

As many scholars point out, the prophecies of Daniel play a crucial role in a proper understanding of the Book of Revelation. There are three primary approaches to the Book of Daniel, namely, preterist, futurist and historicist. The preterists maintain that the prophecies of Daniel found their fulfillment in the past during the time of oppression by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (BC 175-164). The futurists project all predictions of Daniel into the future. The proponents of this view, which is sometimes called 'dispensationalist', maintain that a gap of about 20 centuries intervenes between the end of the 69th week at Christ's death and the 70th week at the time of the end. The earliest approach, that of the historicists, insists that the Book of Daniel contains events beginning from the time of Daniel and stretching to the time of judgment or Parousia (cf. Letseli, 2001:63-64). Of course, the viewpoint on Daniel in the present work is the partial present, so to speak; although the prophecy has been fulfilled (mostly in the 2nd century BC and in Christ in particular), its contemporary history should be focused upon.

As a post-millennial preterist, Jordan (1994:5-6) criticises the four camps of the study of the book of Daniel. As the main advocates of 'the anti-papal approach', the Reformers believed that the history of the human race after the cross focused on Europe, and that Daniel and Revelation were concerned with predicting the history of Europe down to their history. Thus, they identified the papacy as everything bad in the Bible;

---

337 According to the indexes in the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament 4th, Daniel is quoted five times (cf. Mt. 24:30; 26:64; Mk. 13:26; 14:62; Lk. 21:27) and alluded to, or echoed, some 130 times. The index in the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece 27th which combines quotations and allusions, lists some 200 references (see Evans, 2001:490).
the little horn of Da. 7, the abomination of desolation, the man of sin, the beast, the
great whore and the antichrist. (2) ‘The antichrist myth approach’ has been supported by
the futurists, who continue to amalgamate all the negative persons (e.g. the little horn of
Da. 7 and the willful king of Da. 11:36ff.) in the Bible into one evil personage just
before Christ returns (which is usually thought to be imminent). (3) ‘The dispensational
approach’ takes the antichrist myth and develops it. And (4) ‘the sceptical approach’ is
based on unbelief and refuses to accept that Daniel was shown visions by God and
wrote down future events in advance, and not after the events had happened. The above-
mentioned first approach, the anti-papal approach, is similar to the church historical
interpretation in the study of the Book of Revelation. The second is paralleled to
dispensational futurism. The third is similar to futurism. And the last reminds one of
radical historical criticism. In addition, as Rowland (2001:463-467) spells out, the
world-historical interpretation of Daniel cannot be neglected in the history of
interpretation of Daniel, as in Revelation. For instance, Thomas Muentzer (ca. 1483-
1525) and Gerrard Winstanley (ca. 1648) used the Danielic images, which offered a
powerful incentive for resistance and change, and a lens through which their own
political contexts could be interpreted and judged. Moreover, by resorting to the Book
of Revelation, Muentzer and Winstanley had a sense of vocation and of prophetic
insight, which enabled them to offer the meaning of contemporary events via the visions
of the beast (Rev. 13) or Babylon (Rev. 17). In short, the setting of their reading was not
primarily the inner life of an individual Christian, but a wider political horizon. At any
rate, it must be remembered that the content of Daniel must have had a direct relevance
to the original reader and been understood preteristically like Revelation.

On the basis of the fact the Aramaic chapters (Da. 2-7) tell six stories that are arranged
chiastically, Da. 1 seems also to be chiastically matched with Da. 8-12. The following
figure shows the whole chiastic structure of Daniel (cf. Jordan, 1994:8-9):
The above figure demonstrates that the judgment and conversion of Gentiles comes to the fore as the main theme of Daniel.

According to Beale, what to some may appear to be John's novel interpretations of the OT are the result of his 'new presuppositional lenses' through which he perceives the OT, among the most significant of which are: (1) Christ corporately represents the true Israel of the OT and NT; (2) history is unified by a wise and sovereign plan, so that the earlier parts of canonical history are designed to correspond typologically and to point to later parts of inscripturated history; (3) the age of end-time fulfillment has been inaugurated with Christ's first coming; and (4) in the light of points 2 and 3, the later parts of biblical history interpret earlier parts, so that Christ as the centre of history is the key to interpreting the earlier portions of the OT. If these presuppositions are hermeneutically fallacious, then his/her interpretation must be seen as alien to the intention of the OT (see Beale, 1998:127-128).

Moyise (2002:15) criticises Beale's arguments, contending that "what is difficult about Beale's position is not John's new presuppositional lenses ... If Beale thinks that John viewed the OT through a set of presuppositional lenses and thus offered 'new understandings' of old texts (which the original authors would have found surprising!), how can he maintain that John has preserved the original authorial meaning of these texts?". Even though Moyise's criticism seems to be sensible, the presuppositional
lenses of John observed by Beale are also legitimate and noteworthy in understanding John’s use of Daniel in Revelation 12-13.

Here, attention should be given to Beale’s argument as to John’s two uses of Daniel338 as his main source in Revelation 12-13. He (1988:331; 1998:122) notes the purpose of John’s inverted use of Da. 7:21 (LXX: καὶ τὸ κέρας ἐκεῖνο ἐποίει πόλεμον μετὰ τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ ἱσχύος πρὸς αὐτοὺς: and that horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them) in Rev. 12:7-8: Da. 7:21 refers to an anti-theocratic ‘horn’ which was waging war with the saints and overpowering them. This is applied in reverse fashion in Rev. 12:7-8 (cf. Da. 10:21):339 LXX: καὶ μὰλα ὑποδειξ ὑπὸ τὰ πρ -ώτα ἐν ἀπογραφῇ ἀλήθειας καὶ οὕθεις ἱν ὅρηθών μετ’ ἐμοῦ ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀλλ’ ἡ Μιχαήλ340 ὁ ἄγγελος; 12:1;341 Beale, 1999b:652).

338 Besides John’s inverted and analogical use of Daniel, Beale (1988:327-328; 1998:263) introduces John’s universalisation of Daniel: the ten days of tribulation experienced by Daniel and his friends (Da. 1:12) and the three-and-a-half years of Israel’s tribulation (Da. 7:25; 12:7) are both extended to the tribulation of the church, the eschatological and true Israel, throughout the world. The primary reason for the extended universal applications is John’s presupposition concerning the cosmic dimensions of Christ’s lordship and death. Beale’s argument is undoubtedly characterised by his eclecticism or a redemptive-historical form of modified idealism (cf. Beale, 1999b:49). For that reason, he fails to explain the concrete historical relevance of Daniel to the time of John in Rev. 12-13, although it is proper in a sense of ‘significance’, not ‘meaning’. In line with Beale, Stuart (1854:630) avers that in Rev. 12-14 Da. 7-9 is the model with regard to the nature of the imagery employed. Most importantly, Daniel is John’s primary source of vivid imagery in his urgent message of imminent persecution and judgment (Mazzafarri, 1989:194).

339 Like other ancient Near Eastern writings, the OT (e.g. Da. 10:21; cf. Rev. 12:7-8) assumes that the results of battles on earth reflect the involvement of heaven. Usually, the picture is of heavenly forces aiding Israel and enabling it to win against otherwise overwhelming earthly forces. Yahweh and his armies fight with Israel’s armies (Goldingay, 1989:291).

340 Rev. 12:7 mentions the figure of Michael as the opponent of the enemies of God and his people, in much the same way as Da. 10:13 and 20. There is no need, however, to suppose a specific allusion to each text mentioning Michael. Note that Rev. 12:17 supplies the only occurrence of τοῦ with the infinitive in Revelation, which strengthens the case for seeing an allusion here. In addition, it is remarkable that many of the intertextual allusions to the OT in Rev. 12-13 function in such a way as to identify the characters, for instance, the woman, the dragon, the male child, the rest of her offspring, Michael, the two beasts (Paul, 2000:266, 269).

341 ‘There will be a time of distress such as has not happened from the beginning of nations until then’ (ἐκεῖνη ἡ ἡμέρα θλίψεως οἳ ὁ ἐγεννήθη ἄφ’ οὐ ἐγεννήθησαν ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνης) in Da. 12:1b recalls the Olivet Discourse in that the latter has a similar expression: ‘those will be days of distress unequalled from the beginning, when God created the world, until now – and never to be equaled again’ (ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψεις οἳ οὐ γέγονεν -ς τοῦ αὐτῆ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτισμοῦ ἡ ἐκτίσεω ὁ θεός ἔως τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται: Mk. 13:19). Thus, both passages stress the utmost significance of the tribulations.
With regard to John’s analogical use of Daniel, Beale (1988:326; 1998:99) insists that John’s theological basis for maintaining continuities between the OT and Revelation lies in his conviction that the OT and NT histories are but the working out of God’s unified design of salvation for his kingdom. The following is a sampling of these analogies with a brief description of the primary point of continuity: (1) judgment and persecution of God’s people (Da. 3:4; 7:25 [LXX: καὶ ῥήματα εἰς τῶν υἱοί του υἱοί και τούς ἀγίους τοῦ υἱοί καταρρίφει καὶ προδέξεται ἀλλοιόωσα και καρυοῦ καὶ νόμον καὶ παραδοθῆσαι πάντα εἰς τὰς χειρας αὐτοῦ ἐως καιροῦ καὶ καιρῶν καὶ ἐως ἡμίσους καιρού]; 8:10; 12:7; Rev. 12:1, 4; 13:5-6, 15); (2) idolatrous teaching (Da. 3:2-3; Rev. 13:3, 15-16; cf. Kraft, 1974:279); (3) divine protection (Da. 3:25; 6:23; Rev. 12:6, 14, 16); (4) victorious battle of God’s people over the enemy (Da. 2:35; 11:32; Rev. 12:7, 12); and (5) apostasy (Da. 3:7 [LXX: καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ὅτε ἡκουσαν πάντα τὰ ἐθνή τῆς παντῆς τῆς σάλπιγγος καὶ παντὸς ἡχοῦ μουσικῶν πίπτοντα πάντα τὰ ἐθνη φυλαὶ καὶ γλώσσαι προσεκύνησαν τῇ εἰκόνῃ τῇ χρυσῇ ἡνέστησε Ναβουχοδονοσόρ κατέναντι τούτου: And it came to pass when the nations heard the sound of the trumpet, and pipe, and harp, and sackbut, and psaltery, and all kinds of music, all the nations, tribes, and languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image which king Nabuchodonosor had set up]; Rev. 13:15).

342 There are strong intertextual relations between the concept of God’s kingdom in Daniel and that of Jesus (as well as of the seer John) in terms of themes and images: these are seen in Jesus’ unvarying proclamation of the kingdom of God (Mk. 1:14-15; Da. 2:37; Rev. 12:10-12), in the kingdom’s imminence (Mk. 1:15; Da. 2:28-29), its mysteriousness (Mk. 4:11; Da. 2:47), its unstoppable crushing power (Mk. 12:10-11; Da. 2:44), and in the hope that what is man-made will be cleared away to make room for a temple ‘not made by the hands’ of humans and to establish a government on whose seats of power Jesus and his disciples will sit (Mk. 14:58; Da. 5:4; cf. Evans, 2001:521). These intertextual relevances of God’s kingdom can also be applied to Rev. 12-13.

343 The fact that even during the pagan’s persecution/rule of God’s people, the theme of God’s election of sovereigns is reinforced by Daniel’s use of ‘divine passive’ (e.g. Belshazzar’s kingdom ‘was given’ [רשות] to the Persians in Da. 5:28; cf. Meadowcroft, 1995:210).

344 With regard to the time expression in Da. 7:25b, Antiochus will be allowed to control events for a period, periods, and half a period (cf. 1260 days in Rev. 12:6 and 42 months in Rev. 13:5). The time from the desecration of the temple on 15 Kislev in the 145th year of the Seleucid, BC 167 to its rededication on 25 Kislev in the 148th year, BC 164 was three years and ten days. The time of oppression is closer to 42 months if it is reckoned to begin with events earlier in the 145th year or if its end is reckoned to involve Antiochus’s death, which took place in the 149th year (see Goldingay, 1989:181).

345 A reasonable explanation of the tail (Rev. 12:4) derives from Da. 8:10 in that both passages manifest the astonishing and supernatural power of the devil (Prigent, 1988:188; cf. Paul, 2000:266).
The slightly unusual phrase οὐ (χ) (ὁ) τόπος εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ (Da. 2:35; Rev. 12:8; cf. Ps. 37:36) occurs only twice in the OT, and τόπος with the passive of εὑρίσκω occurs nowhere else in the NT other than in Rev. 20:11. In Da. 2:38, the context is the divine judgment of the metal and clay figure of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which stood for four kingdoms that would be destroyed by the coming kingdom of God. But in Ps. 37:36, the phrase is used of the wicked man; the psalm is an ethical injunction not to fret because of the wicked, but to continue to trust in God, who is depicted as the judge of his eschatological adversary in 4 Q 171. In Rev. 12:8 the judgment is of the cosmic enemy of God, Satan, and echoes the theme of the eschatological adversary that is found in a number of other places in Revelation (Paul, 2000: 266-267).

It is important to note that the sea beast (Rev. 13:1) has the composite attributes of Daniel's first three beasts in Da. 7, evoking the worst feelings John's audiences would have toward Rome and all oppressive political powers (Keener, 1993:797). Verbal parallels between the sea beast and Daniel's four beasts (Da. 7) include their rising from the sea (ἀναβαίνω, θάλασσα) their appearance (πάρδαλις, ἄρκος, λέων), making war with the saints (πολεμεῖω, ἀγιος) speaking haughty words (στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα) and the time of their reign (variously given as 3½ years, 42 months, or 1260 days). The major difference is that instead of having a succession of

346 In contrast to the dominantly negative opinion on 'the sea' in Revelation, Hailey (1989:283) does not see the sea (Rev. 13:1) as a negative source of the evil/chaos. In Revelation, John refers to the sea: (1) literally, as a part of creation (Rev. 5:13; 10:6; 14:7; cf. 'the great sea' in Da. 7:2 meaning the Mediterranean, Goldingay, 1989:160); (2) to describe the limits of the angel's voice (Rev. 7:1-3); (3) symbolically, indicating God's transcendence (Rev. 4:6; 15:2), and (4) to signify the whole of society known at that time (Rev. 8:8f.; 10:2, 8; 12:12; 13:1; 20:13; 21:1). In the same logic, Du Preez (2000:9-11) insists that the references to the sea (Rev. 12:12, 18 and 13:1) mean the living world of human beings in a positive sense. Both the earth and the sea signify interchangeably the dwelling place of man. Though the arguments of Hailey and of Du Preez are valid, it is nonetheless important to note that like the earth and the New Jerusalem the sea is also a reference to the human being in Revelation.

347 As in Rev. 12, Da. 7 is tinged with the Canaanite mythic pattern, which consists of (1) the revolt of Yamm, sea, who demands the surrender of Baal, and kingship over the gods; (2) the defeat of Yamm by Baal; and (3) the manifestation of Baal's kingship. In Da. 7, the revolt of the sea (1) through the beasts which rise from it and the final kingship of a Baal-like figure (3) are clear. It seems that Daniel modeled on the same mythic pattern as the conflict of Baal and Yamm (Collins, 1977:105). In short, both John and Daniel use the mythic pattern, to which they and their contemporary readers are accustomed, for a more effective communication. But they change the message of the pagan myths for the sake of the emphasis of the Messiah, who is beyond compatibility with the mythic figures.
beasts coming from the sea (lion, bear, leopard, beast with ten horns) which represent a succession of empires, John combines these features into a single beast. It is interesting that this is the opposite of what he did with Ezekiel’s four-faced creatures, which he turned into four separate creatures (Moyise, 2002:8).

Hailey (1989:285) outlines that, in the mighty, worldwide Roman Empire, was combined the tearing power of Chaldea (the lion), the crushing force of Medo-Persia (the bear), and the swift and ferocious character of Macedonia under Alexander (the leopard). This beast symbolised all the anti-God opposition that could ever be brought against the people of God, but to John and his audiences it definitely personified the empire of their day. The sea beast (Rev. 13:1) acts like the ‘little horn’ (Da. 7:8^348) – Antiochus IV who in BC 167 savagely attacked the Jews, their temple and their law, aided by elements from within Judaism itself (Da. 11:30-39). Van der Kooij (1993:499) correctly argues that the LXX of Da. 11:30 (LXX: καὶ ἐπιστρέψεις εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ ἐν χρήματι πολλοῖς καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ άγίου πολήσει καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ) supports the view that the notion of covenant in Daniel is related to the temple (cf. Da. 11:28, LXX: καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ άγίου). The close of Da. 11:30, ‘those who forsake the holy covenant’, then refers to persons who no longer do what they should do in the temple. In Da. 11:32 too, unfaithful, renegade priests are meant. Therefore, it can be concluded that John wants his picture of the sea beast to evoke in the imagination of his audiences images of Rome and her emperors that persecute with the help of profane Judaism.

The vision of the first beast’s veneration (Rev. 13:14-15) recalls through a cluster of allusions the veneration of Nebuchadnezzar’s statue. The allusions to Da. 3 in Rev. 13:14-15 are apparent from a cluster of corresponding phrases and concepts: (1) the combination of προσκυνεῖν and εἰκῶν (Da. 3:5-7, 10, 12, 14-15, 18; Rev. 13:15; cf. 13:4, 8, 12); (2) the death penalty as sanction (Rev. 13:15; Da. 3:5-6, 11, 15); and (3) the first beast’s power over various categories of groups in Rev. 13 and the various groups

---

348 The large LXX plus in Da. 7:8, ‘and it was waging war against the saints’ (καὶ ἐπιστρέψει τόλμη -μον πρὸς τοὺς άγίους), is probably introduced from Da. 7:21 (Meadowcroft, 1995:216).
that have to venerate Nebuchadnezzar's statue (cf. Rev. 13:7; Da. 3:4, 7). The correspondences between Rev. 13 and Da. 3 imply an analogous context. The refusal to bestow divine honours upon the image of the beast or upon Nebuchadnezzar's statue results in the death penalty. The rulers force their subjects to decide between being loyal to them or to the God of Israel, or his Messiah, respectively (cf. Van Henten, 2001:155-156).

As Sweet (1990:209) notes, in Da. 7:2ff. 'a little horn' (Da. 7:8) connotes Antiochus IV (ruler of the Northern part of Alexander's broken empire) who in BC 167 savagely attacked the Jews, their temple and their law with help from within Judaism (Da. 11:30-36; cf. Goldingay, 1989:302). Here, there are several similarities between the terrible works of Typhon-Seth and those of Antiochus Epiphanes in Da. 7: (1) the terrifying appearance, the shameless behaviour and the emphasis on the terrible voice of Typhon and the insolent words of Antiochus IV (Da. 7:8, 25); (2) Typhon fights against the Olympic gods under command of Zeus, and Antiochus IV against the saints of the Most High (Da. 7:21); (3) Typhon's contempt of the laws and the eleventh horn's changing the time and law (Da. 7:25); (4) the fall of Typhon, who is struck by Zeus' lightning and burns to ashes; and the eleventh horn is killed along with the fourth beast and subsequently burned (Da. 7:11, 26); and (5) Typhon as well as the eleventh horn rule during a limited time (Da. 7:12, 25; Van Henten, 1993:230; cf. Collins, 1977:107). John the seer also utilises the Typhon-Seth myth in order to emphasise the sovereignty of Christ over his adversary, and describes God's salvation for the seven churches in a familiar fashion to Asia Minor (Rev. 12:4).

As a consistent partial preterist, Jordan (1994:25, 49-51, 96) opposes identifying the little horn (Da. 7:8; cf. Da. 11:36-45) with Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and instead asserts that the personage of the little horn is Herod the Great, who will arise out of the Roman Empire (the fourth beast, Da. 7:7) and assume three provinces (Da. 7:8b). Herod the Great will be different from the Romans (cf. Da. 2:33), being an Edomite. He will attack the people of God (Da. 7:21) and seek to change the law of God (Da. 7:25). He will be killed (Da. 7:26), and his dominion, maintained by the later Herods, will be removed and annihilated by AD 70, at which point the world will be given to the saints (Da. 7:22). Herod is an extension of Roman Empire and, at the same time, the face (of
Rome) visible in Palestine. The activities of the Herods in the NT parallel exactly the activities of Nero in Rev. 13. It can be deduced metaphorically that Daniel sees that the son of man receives the kingdom, and then the time arrives when the saints also receive it (Da. 7:13, 27); this is the difference between AD 30 and AD 70.

Within the apocalyptic framework of Da. 7, ancient imagery is utilised as the vehicle for articulating a response to the experience of political oppressions in the present. The social function of this mythopoesis is to reassure the readers of the vision that another order of reality exists and that the terrible events of their present and recent past are occurring within a context controlled by heavenly forces who will ultimately restore the fortunes of the holy ones. In Da. 7, in its vision of the fourth beast and its destruction which will inaugurate the transfer of power, honour and sovereignty to God's holy ones, there is an example of the prescriptive use of myth, to speak not of the past as the basis for the way things are, but of the future as the pattern of what they will become (Esler, 1994:109).

With ‘42 months’, John indicates the duration of the persecution of the forces of Evil (Da. 7:25; 12:17; Rev. 12:14). With ‘1260 days’, John indicates the time of God’s protection. The period is the same, and perhaps John chooses the term ‘days’ to indicate God’s protection, in order to show that his providence is extended ‘day after day’ (Lupieri, 1999:207).

Alluding strongly to Daniel, John convinces his audiences that they experience the fulfillment of Daniel in Christ’s incarnation and ascension and that the covenantal God gives them victory over their enemies (the Roman Empire and the apostate Jews) in terms of the Christ event, which implies an eschatological significance. John, like Daniel, criticises the status quo of apostasy, compromise, and syncretism. The world system in which the Christians of Asia Minor live is an antithetical parallelism (i.e. the counterfeit trinity) between the dragon and God, the sea beast and Christ, and the land beast and the Holy Spirit (Beale, 1999b:729). As Horton (2001:201) correctly points

---

349 One of John's aims in his Danielic intertextuality is to develope a Trinitarian account of Empire as idolatry. His enlargement of the Father-Son relation into a Trinitarian one is quite
out, the evil trio is made up of separate beings united only in their devilish plans.

In conclusion, the chiastic structure of Daniel assists God's judgment (and conversion) of Gentiles. But the Danielic intertextuality of John assists God's judgment of both the Gentiles and the Jewish people. In particular, as the attack on the Jews and on the temple by Antiochus IV was possible with the help of the Jews, so was Rome's persecution of the seven churches possible with the assistance of the apostate Jews.

By way of summary: John the seer does not engage in exegesis of the NT and the OT for the sake of interpretive creativity. He reads the seven churches' situation through the lens of the intertexts, because of the exigency of the situation. The authoritative words of the NT and of the OT speak anew in the fresh context of John and his audience. "By using a medley of OT imagery and themes, and particularly those associated with salvation and judgment, John creates the dense and evocative texture of Revelation" (Achtemeier, Green & Thompson, 2001:563). John does not stop with the theology of the OT, but proceeds to what is for him the decisive articulation of God: God's forthcoming salvation and judgment through Christ Jesus. This Christocentric move in John clarifies the difference between the OT intertexts and the Apocalypse. Yet this Christocentric move also reveals the complexity of the intertextuality, because it is the authoritative voice of the OT (and the NT) that makes John's particular Christocentric presentation possible. In consequence, it can be deduced that John's ability to speak of Christ is intertextually dependent on the articulation of God in the OT (O'Day, 1990:266-267). To put it another way, the Book of Revelation is unlike most non-canonical apocalyptic in that it imparts to OT intertextures a dynamic quality in the light of the Christ event (cf. McComiskey, 1993:314).

self-conscious. Although the person of the Holy Spirit is not explicitly mentioned in Revelation proper until almost the last verse, John is continually alluding to the Spirit's role by stressing the place of true prophecy in the seven churches' witness (cf. O'Donovan, 1986:81).

Rev. 12-13 uses the OT as a symbolic resource with which to metaphorise the world of its contemporary audiences. It is less a case of Revelation 'interpreting' the OT than Revelation using OT categories to interpret its own world (cf. Schussler Fiorenza, 1985:135). To see Revelation as using the OT as a hermeneutical resource implies that the meaning of OT texts in Revelation can never be tied rigidly to the meaning of those texts in their original context. But neither does it mean that the texts float free from their OT roots. John, it appears, is finding a correspondence of relationships between the OT and his own world (Paul, 2000:273-274).
John's complex NT and OT intertextuality can be epitomised in the figure below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC 586</th>
<th>AD 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Pagan nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Genesis) (Exodus)</td>
<td>(Prophets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Olivet Discourse, Epistles) (Revelation)</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it becomes evident that since the history of salvation is also the history of destruction, it includes a judgment typology. Eden, Egypt and Jerusalem (in the OT) become types of God's eschatological judgment. The faithless Israelite is a type of the faithless Christian; the enemies of Israel a type of the enemies of the Church; and, perhaps, a type of Antichrist (Ellis, 2001:117). In a strict sense, the progress of revelation history is not linear but spiral in that the latter stage(s) not only retrospect the former stage(s) but also anticipate the following stage(s). Therefore, John's intertextuality is associated with a multiple fulfillment.

5.1.4. John's non-canonical intertexture

Luter (2001:465) criticises Aune's careful probe into the parallels between Revelation and the non-canonical material (see Aune's commentary), and regards him as suffering from 'parallelomania' (i.e. seeing relationship, even dependence, of thought in similar words or ideas where none exists). But Luter does not mention a criterion of parallel between Revelation and extrabiblical materials. Of course, exegetes must avoid the impression that the primary literary background of the NT is pagan or sectarian writings, which the NT writers seldom cite. There is no doubt that John’s noncanonical intertextuality is very helpful for a more proper understanding of the Apocalypse.351

351 Less certain than John's relationship to the OT is the assumption that John was familiar with much of the Jewish apocalyptic literature of his day. Nevertheless, John's non-canonical
However, Osborne's (1991:146) evaluation on the non-canonical material is insightful: “Do not read nonbiblical parallels into the text any further than the data allows. In other words, do not force the data to fit the theory”.

Apart from non-canonical writings including Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, here Vernon K. Robbins's cultural, social and historical intertextures are in accord with John's non-canonical intertexture. Revelation must be understood in the context of the cultural and intellectual forces that were affecting the churches of first-century western Asia Minor: religious institutions, political structures, military conflicts, natural disasters and even, perhaps, the symbolic vocabulary of Jewish apocalyptic literature or pagan myth. God is so much the sovereign of history that He can use every dimension of his people’s experience to communicate his word (Johnson, 2001:21).

Scholars who reject the conclusion that John drew on pagan combat traditions claim that the traditional background of Rev. 12-13 can be perfectly understood on the assumption of the sole utilisation of OT and Jewish traditions, for instance, Daniel, Isaiah and Ezekiel. The intertextual relations of these and other Jewish writings cannot be denied. This does not mean, however, that John could not have used pagan traditions as well. It is not a matter of ‘either … or’ but of ‘both … and’ (cf. Van Henten, 1994:503).

Intertextuality should not be neglected. It would be wise to handle parallels to non-canonical materials, including socio-historical setting, as indirect intertexts ('echoes', to use Paulien's term) – witnesses to the environment in which John lived – but not direct intertexts ('direct allusions', to use Paulien's term) in the sense of intended references to literary works. Direct intertexts to non-canonical literature should be limited to passages which can be dated, with reasonable certainty, prior to the composition of Revelation, and for which there is considerable evidence within Revelation that John was familiar with the book’s contents (cf. Paulien, 1998b:44-45).

Analysis of socio-historical-cultural texture involves an analysis of the common social-historical-cultural topics that every one living in an area knows either consciously or instinctively. Analysis of this web of relationships raises questions about the response to the world, the social-historical-cultural systems and institutions, and the cultural alliances and conflicts evoked by the text (see Robbins, 1996:58-63). In a sense, socio-rhetorical interpretation is perhaps the richest and most fully intradisciplinary strategy for the exegesis of an ancient text (DeSilva, 1999:65).

It is interesting to note the fact that, like the pagan combat myth, some Jewish writings in the intertestamental period include the theme of combat performed by the Divine Warrior. As in the Book of Revelation and the combat myth, for instance, Sirach and 1 Enoch, dated in the first quarter of the second century BC, present the Divine Warrior motif as follows:

| Threat (1 Enoch 91:5-9) | 292 |
Thus, Chevalier (1997:331) avers that while many motifs of Revelation 12 can be understood against an OT background, other important images such as the dragon chasing the woman\textsuperscript{354} and her child betray an effort on the part of John to combine traditional elements from a variety of Near Eastern cultures.\textsuperscript{355} The parallels that can be drawn between John's cosmic vision and the mythologies of the ancient world are many, especially the Babylonian epic of Tiamat and Marduk, the Persian story of Azhi Dahak and Ormuzd, the Greek story of Python and Leto, and the Egyptian story of Isis and Typhon.

As Roloff (1993:142-143) argues, Revelation 12 holds a special place, for it is the only chapter in which myth is employed as a means of depiction. Two very ancient mythological traditions are drawn on here: (1) the astrological myth of the goddess of heaven who gives birth to the sun every day, and of the dragon of darkness who pursues her to devour her. (2) The myth of the battle of the gods in heaven and of the defeat of Satan.\textsuperscript{356} Rev. 12:1 contains astrological images that reflect the signs of the Zodiac (cf. Ge. 37:9; Mt. 24:29-30; Mk. 13:24-25; Lk. 21:15; Roloff, 1993:145). The image of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item Combat-victory over enemies (1 Enoch 1:3-9; 5:5-9; 91:5-9; 99:3-10; 100:1-6; Sirach 35:22-24)
  \item Victory shout (1 Enoch 1:3-9; 10:11-11:2; Sirach 35:25)
  \item Salvation of the nation (1 Enoch 1:3-9; 10:11-11:2; 25:3-6; 99:3-10; 100:1-6; Sirach 35:25-26)
  \item Universal reign (1 Enoch 1:3-9; 10:11-11:2; 91:5-9; 99:3-10; 100:1-6; Sirach 36:1)
  \item Procession to the temple (1 Enoch 10:11-11:2; 25:3-6; Sirach 36:13, 16-19)
  \item Banquet (1 Enoch 25:3-6) (see Argall, 1995:168, 212).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{354} John and his audiences might have been accustomed to the outstanding female imagery in Rev. 12. Presumably, one reason is due to Artemis, who was responsible for the fact that women were given special attention in Ephesus. Artemis has a preference for women in leading positions in her temple. From the time of Nero, several imperial women are given the title \textit{Sebasta} (the venerable ones) in Ephesus already while still alive: Nero's mother, the wife of Domitian, the wife of Trajan, the wife of Hadrian (see Van Tilborg, 1996:155, 187).

\textsuperscript{355} Similarly, Chevalier (1997:333-334) notes that with regard to the combat myth, Rev. 12 brings together ancient Isis imagery and Near Eastern combat mythology, both of which were based on solar symbolism: the dragon of darkness tries to kill the sun god, only to be killed by him when the new day dawns. But Rev. 12 busies itself transforming alien imageries into forces struggling in the train of the true God.

\textsuperscript{356} Correspondingly, Chevalier (1997:348) is of the opinion that signs of lunisolarism, Isis imagery, the Leto-Python combat myth, Apollonianism, emperor-worship modelled on the deification of Augustus, the legend of Nero returning to avenge the East on Rome, all these elements of non-Jewish culture were known throughout the world of John's day, and even more so to Jews of the Diaspora. Motifs of this myth are also found in the OT, characteristically in demythologised, unhistorical form. Arrogance and \textit{the fall of foreign rulers} were glossed in the portrait of the heavenly battle and defeat of the gods in Isa. 14:13-15 and Ezk. 28:11-19 (Roloff, 1993:143). Even if John does not borrow \textit{wholly} and \textit{directly} from any of the above pagan sources, the influence of non-canonical elements cannot be denied (Charles, 1920:313).
dragon (Rev. 12:3) or sea monster (Rev. 13:1) as the opponent of God is an archetypal image found in the OT (Pss. 74:14; 87:4; Isa. 27:1; 30:7; Jer. 51:34; Ezk. 29:3-5; Da. 7:1-7) as well as in ancient mythology (Leviathan, Lotan, Tiamat) and in apocalyptic literature (1 Enoch 60:7-10; 4 Ezra 6:49-52; 2 Bar. 29:4). John could have chosen 'the eagle' (Rev. 12:14) to contrast the Roman power with God's power (2 Esdr. 11-12; cf. Aune, 1998:734). In chapter 13 the imagery of the two beasts reflects the Jewish myth of the two beasts: the female monster Leviathan lived in the sea, and the male monster Behemoth lived on the land (Job 40:15-24; 1 Enoch 60:7-25; Aune, 1998:728). The mark of the beast (Rev. 13:16) is often connected with the image of a Roman ruler found on coins in Asia Minor. The most popular explanation of 666 is that it connotes Nero.

In its independent or separative position, astronomy is so abstract that it is not

357 "And Behemoth will reveal itself from its place, and Leviathan will come from the sea, the two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation and which I shall have kept until that time ..." (2 Bar. 29:4).

358 "On the second night I had a dream, and behold, there came up from the sea an eagle that had twelve featured wings and three heads. And I looked, and behold, he spread his wings over all the earth ..." (2 Esdr. 11:1). There is a strong thematic intertextuality between Revelation and 2 Esdr. As in Revelation, the purpose of the original author of 2 Esdr. was not only to denounce the wickedness of Rome (under the image of 'Babylon') and to lament the sorrows that had befallen Jerusalem, but to wrestle with one of the most perplexing of all religious questions, the problem of theodicy.

359 Bauckham (1993a:391) contends that "We shall appreciate the significance of 666 better if we recognise the relationship between triangular, square and rectangular numbers". Keener (1993:799), however, rightly avers that most ancient readers would not have known this.

360 During the second century BC, astrological ideas were apparently first assimilated into Jewish thought. During the last two centuries BC astrological ideas, symbols and belief permeated much deeper into many sectors of Jewish culture; the infiltration was without and within Palestinian Judaism. While many passages in the Pseudepigrapha, such as Jubilees 12:16-18, continue the OT's disputation against astrology, other passages, notably 1 Enoch 72:1-37 and 2 Enoch 21:6, reveal that astrological ideas, not necessarily beliefs, have influenced Jewish thought. The very early Christians had to bear the charge of Pagans that on account of there being such a resemblance between Christian worship and the worship of the sun, as Tertullian says, they (the Christians) were only looked upon as another sect of sun worshippers, and that the construction of the book, and the symbols employed, are but borrowed ideas from pagan mysteries (Bullinger, 1984:691; cf. Malina & Pilch, 2000:8). By the fourth century AD abundant archaeological evidence in Galilee proves that astrological images, signs and symbols attracted Jews. It is, therefore, a misrepresentation to discard Jewish interest and belief in astrology as un-Jewish or heretical (Charlesworth, 1987:947-948). More important is the fact that as communicator of anti-language, John the seer reads the common constellations against the norm society: Draco is the dragon called Satan and devil, the two beasts are not (the Great and the Little) bears but a sea being and a land being, the woman is the Christian community...
helpful in understating Revelation 12-13. The OT contains no astrological beliefs; but it does preserve polemics against astrology (Isa. 47:13-14 [LXX: κεκοπίακας ἐν ταῖς βουλαίς σου στήτωσαν καὶ σωσάτωσάν σε οἱ ἀστρολόγοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀφότερας ἀναγγελ λάτωσάν σοι τί μέλλει ἐπὶ σε ἐρχεσθαι ἵνα ὑπαντήσης ὑστερά τοῖς φρύγανα ἐπὶ πυρὶ κατακαίσθονται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἔξελωνται την ψυχήν αὐτῶν ἐκ φλογὸς ὅτι ἔχεις ἀνθρακαῖς πυρὸς κάθισαι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς]; Jer. 10:1-3 [LXX: ἀκούσατε τὸν λόγον κυρίου ὃν ἐλάλησεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰσραηλάς τάδε λέγει κύριος κατὰ τὰς ὅδοις τῶν ἔθνων μὴ μαυθάνετε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὅτι φοβοῦνται αὐτὰ ταῖς προσώποις αὐτῶν ὅτι τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἕθεων μάταια ξύλον ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ ἐκ κεκομμένων ἔργων τέκτων καὶ -ι χώνευμα]; cf. Dt. 4:19; Da. 2:27; 4:7). So Kemson (1982:251) argues that the superficial evidence has led some to connect the woman (Rev. 12:1) with the astrological constellations of the ancient world. This sort of identification is interesting but not helpful.

But as Van Henten (1994:501) holds, an important argument is that traditions connected with Seth-Typhon would explain the combination of the astral imagery with the mythological symbols. The dragon and the woman are depicted as heavenly signs (Rev. 12:1, 3). Isis as well as Seth-Typhon has been associated with stars and constellations. Isis was linked to the Dog Star and to Virgo, Seth-Typhon to the polar stars and the Great Bear. John shapes both the astrological and the combat myths in very free fashion, the basic elements of which he knew from popular tradition and whose familiarity among his audiences he could assume (cf. T. Joseph 19:3). John joins them together and reinterprets them for his own theological purpose (i.e. a distinctively contemporary Christian view of history) and in order to communicate their points more giving birth to the Messiah (Hurtgen, 1993:98-99).

361 The moon (Rev. 12:1) is a symbol extensively used for goddesses that were based on fertile woman. The fact that the reproductive functions of women are regulated by the moon is a concept that was upheld in almost all periods of history, in all kinds of places. All primitive creeds connected to the moon are based on the concept that the phases of the moon and changes in the woman’s egg have the same appearance (see Ateś, 2002:151).

362 There are some discrepancies between the combat myths and Rev. 12. The figure of Artemis (Apollo’s sister) and the Pythian games (established by Apollo) have no counterpart in Revelation. And the element of the temporary ruling out of the champion is also missing in the myths concerning Python. The rescue of Leto corresponds only in part to that of the woman with the sun in Rev. 12:1, who is brought into safety with the help of the wings of the great eagle, instead of Poseidon’s help (see Van Henten, 1994:500).
effectively. Because of the fact that many citizens of John's world assume that the combat myth is literally fulfilled by the Caesar, John claims the fulfillment of pagan hope in Christ by using the non-canonical intertextuality (esp. Rev. 12:11; Beasley-Murray, 1990:196). There is no other deliverer but Jesus. The Babylonians' Marduk, the Persians' son of Ormuzd, the Egyptians' Horus and the Greeks' Apollo are all mythical expressions of pagan piety and religious yearning, which Jesus alone can fulfill.

The fantastic beasts of eschatological visions may represent 'political dominions' (e.g. Da. 7:6). In the intertestamental period, dragons symbolised spiritual evils (evil spirits) that incited political unrest (cf. Est. 11:5-6). This use anticipates the dragon in Rev. 12:3, 7, 9, where the ancient serpent is the embodiment of evil, the enemy of God and foe of his angels (Ryken, e.a. 1998:579).

In connection with the dragon and beasts in Rev. 12-13, Ford's (1996) investigation into the physical features of the Antichrist on the basis of the ancient manuals on physiognomy is pertinent. The concept of the Antichrist is vividly expressed in symbolic form, especially in Rev. 12-13, even though in the NT the opponent of God and of Christ receives the label 'Antichrist' only in 1 John 2:18, 22 and 2 John 4:11. As depicted in Rev. 12:3-4 and Rev. 13:1-2, the Antichrist is abnormally tall, indeed massive, and variously described as a hundred cubits and fat, thick and ill-proportioned. The Antichrist falls into the category of wicked giants or nephilim. In other words, the Antichrist is a monster rather than a man. Indeed, he is a gruesome male without honour in an agonistic society. Like the dragon and the two beasts in Rev. 12-13, the physical appearance of the Antichrist in non-canonical writings was a condemnation of his character, and without any moralising comment the reader/hearer would diagnose him as a monster.

363 Unfortunately, taking 'the ancient sky-interpretation' and the altered states of consciousness experience into consideration one-sidedly, Malina and Pilch (2000:167, 175) make Rev. 12-13 irrelevant to John and his audience: what John, as the astral seer, describes in chs. 12-13(16) are scenes of events that began in the period before the completion of creation, and he continues his description with the period before the biblical Flood. Thus, the sea beast, for instance, represents beasts that existed before the Flood.

364 Even in the OT, beasts have political connotations. It is noteworthy that several OT prophets make use of beast images to depict the destruction of Jerusalem as well as God's protection from them. Nebuchadnezzar has consumed Jerusalem with his monstrous appetite (Jer. 51:34). Pharaoh, surrounded by the Nile delta, is the great dragon that lies in the midst of his streams, thrashing futilely against God (Ezk. 29:3; cf. Isa. 30:7; see Ryken, e.a. 1998:579).
as the epitome of vice and malevolence. In rabbinc Judaism the Antichrist symbolises the last enemy, the Roman Empire. The physical features of the Antichrist are comparable to many found in descriptions of the less desirable Roman emperors and this gives the Antichrist a certain political savour. For the early Jews/Christians the external appearance of the Antichrist was important because through it one could recognise the Enemy instantly and unerringly, so that here physiognomy takes on a prophetic aspect. To put it differently, the physical features of the Antichrist allowed the early Christians to know their foe, to avoid his evil eye, to arm themselves against his militancy and to kill him psychologically with their invective. Accordingly, from the physiognomy of the Antichrist described in non-canonical writings, transitional partial preterism is more pertinent from Rev. 12 onwards than consistent partial preterism in that the Roman emperors accord with the undesirable features of beasts (Antichrist) and are ready to be judged by God (see Ford, 1996:24, 41).

Van Henten (1994:509-515) summarises the political applications of the (combat) myths to the Roman imperial cult incisively:

The traditional imagery connected with Seth-Typhon is expanded to the human world, which probably arises from the association of Nero with Typhon. ... This is an interesting parallel to Revelation, where the combat myth is also depicted on the two levels of the heavenly and the human world. ... The incorporation of the pagan traditions of the combat myth would imply that Roman imperial ideology was fake and that the emperor did not play the part of the restorer of order, the model of kingship, the saviour of the world, or the supreme commander of the gods and of mankind, who could be associated with Apollo, Horus and especially with Zeus. The combat myth of Revelation with its association with the human world through the symbols of the first and second beast suggests, from the perspective of the imperial ideology, a reversal of roles. The part of the emperors is that of the dragon, who causes chaos and destruction.

According to Barnett (1995:226-231), John as a polemicist intends to emphasise the parallelism between Roman ritual and Revelation in order to convince his audiences, persecuted under Nero in Asia Minor, of the fact that he urges the true worship of the Triune God not the evil trinity. By depicting the splendid appearance of the woman (Rev. 12:1), John could have intended to contrast the glorious reality of his audiences with the parody of Nero, who described himself as Apollo Helios. As a person living in
Proconsular Asia, John would almost certainly have known of the decree issued in BC 9 by the Koinon Asias, changing the local calendar so that Augustus’ birthday (23 September) became New Year’s day. “Within 20 years after his victory at Actium, the koinon of Asia sought greater means for honouring Augustus. Around BC 9, the members of the provincial council decreed a competition: whoever could suggest the highest honours for Augustus would be awarded a crown by the province Paullus Fabius Maximus argued that the greatest honour Asia could give to Augustus would be to recognise time around the birthday of Augustus” (Friesen, 2001:32-33). In consequence, the birth of Christ in Rev. 12:5 is John’s deliberately made declaration about the nativity of the true God, Jesus the Messiah, in comparison with Augustus as a false and pretentious ruler.

References to Jesus as the baby (or child) appear in the Acts of John (73, 87), the Acts of Peter (17), the Acts of Paul (9:19), the Acts of Thomas (27:3) and the Acts of Philip (6:12). Such a childish (or juvenile) appearance of Jesus Christ is far from limited to the apocryphal literature or early Christian art. It is also present in some of the visions that the martyrs had during their prison stays or during the night preceding their executions. If such a Christology of the child is indeed present in early Christianity one can relate it to the patristic conception of the beast, to the incarnation of evil in the form of a monster or a dragon (cf. Rev. 12:3, 9; 13:1, 11). According to many early Christians, it was not only during his human life, but also on the cross, and particularly in his descensus ad inferos and his resurrection that Jesus overcame the power of the beast (Shepherd of Hermas, 22-24; The Acts of Philip, 11:2). Defeated in heaven, the beast will also later disappear on earth (cf. Rev. 12:8, 12) (see Bovon, 1999:387-391).

In connection with ‘ruling with a rod of iron’ in Rev. 12:4365-5, the similar imagery of smashing a potter’s vessel is found in the coronation ritual in Egypt where the King

365 According to Duff (2001:104), John contrasts the eucharistic language in the Apocalypse with ironic, or anti-eucharistic, language. In Rev. 12:4, the devouring of the body of the child must ironically correspond to the Christian understanding of the eucharist, where the believer consumes the body of Christ. In Rev. 12:5-16, the dragon disgorges water from his mouth to destroy the woman. In other words, the water that should go into the mouth to provide life instead comes out of it in order to cause death. Because of the limited sources concerning early church liturgy, Duff’s argument remains probable but not certain.
proclaims his universal power by symbolically smashing potter’s vessels on which the names of foreign kings are inscribed. In Mesopotamian texts, too, the idea that a regent will smash nations like a potter’s vessel occurs frequently. Thus the imagery of Rev. 12:5 manifests the universal kingship of the Messiah over the nations (cf. Klassen, 1966:307).

The fact that the dragon loses and is thrown down to earth together with his angels (Rev. 12:9) has intertextuality with the description in *Life of Adam and Eve* 15-16 of Satan’s expulsion from heaven when he was thrown onto the earth and with the description in 2 Enoch 29:4-5 of how he was thrown into the air (Talbert, 1994:50).

With the doxology in Rev. 12:10-12, John opposes the imperial panegyric frequently directed at Hellenistic rulers (cf. Barnett, 1995:226). Van Tilborg (1996:201) points out that “Pergamum organised a choir when they erected the first emperor temple. Augustus decreed that these people (singers) would individually receive a sum of money and that the province was responsible for that, not Pergamum by itself. Furthermore, the sons of these people were given a right of succession. Ephesus paid its own people. ... Whenever a new temple is erected a new choir is organised” (cf. Smith, 1998:503). In particular, the praise of the Almighty God and of the Lamb in Rev. 12:10-11 is linked

366 “And the Lord God was angry with me and sent me with my angels out from our glory; and because of you, we were expelled into this world from our dwellings and have been cast onto the earth ...” (*Life of Adam and Eve* 16).
367 “But one from the order of the archangels deviated, together with the division that was under his authority. ... And I hurled him out from the height, together with his angels. And he was flying around in the air, ceaselessly, above the Bottomless ...” (2 Enoch 29:4-5).
368 John’s description of the heavenly ceremonial practised in the throne room of God bears such a striking resemblance to the ceremonial of the imperial court and cult that the latter can only be a parody of the former (Aune, 1983b:5).
369 Every emperor has his own identifying titles. A number of emperors were addressed as θεός. Nero, for example, was called ‘son of God Claudius and descendant of God Caesar Augustus’. The deceased king was God; and then the present king may call himself ‘son of God’. At this point, it is important to have a look at the title of Artemis, the goddess in Ephesus. Artemis plays a role in first century Ephesus which is at least as important as that of the emperors. The emperors link themselves with her; get involved with her; they also serve her. She has various names but also carries various titles which are semantically parallel to the titles which the emperors have appropriated to themselves and which in the Book of Revelation are used for Jesus and God the Father. In a number of texts Artemis is called η θεός, η θεά, κυρία and σώτειρα. Probably John intentionally contrasts the names (titles) of God and Jesus to those of Artemis and emperors in order to emphasise the truly divine and salvific character of God and
with the ancient *argumentum e consensus omnium* (the argument from universal agreement, i.e. the agreement of three powerful groups: the senate, the equestrians and the people), that is, the very serious place given to the governed in the making of emperors and the legitimating of their taking power (Aune, 1983b:18). This may explain the pointedness of the universal, cosmic and eternal acclamation of the Lord God and of Christ. In short, the hymns of Revelation owe their presence to John’s polemical position over against Rome (cf. Barnett, 1995:227; Smith, 1998:504).

Jewish apocalyptic texts predicted a conquering lamb (cf. Rev. 12:11) who will appear in the last days and destroy evil, as T. Joseph 19:3 makes clear:

> And I saw that from Judah a virgin was born, wearing a linen garment; and from her a lamb without spot came forth, and on its left side (it was) as a lion. And all the beasts rushed against it, and the lamb overcame them and destroyed them to be trodden under foot.\(^{370}\)

From Rev. 12:11, it is obvious that even though Revelation is tinged with violent images, it does not allow a call for armed resistance. Likewise, the Essenes\(^{371}\) had a War Scroll but, as Philo reported, they did not manufacture weapons (Goranson, 1997:458).

The earth helped the woman by opening its mouth and swallowing the river (Rev. 12:16): this is a metaphor of divine help based on the Jewish belief that the created order cooperates with God either to punish or to bless his creatures depending on their sin or righteousness, so *Wisdom of Solomon* 16:24: “For the creation, serving thee who hast made it, exerts itself to punish the unrighteous, and in kindness relaxes on behalf of those who trust in thee” (Talbert, 1994:51).

---

\(^{370}\) This translation comes from Hollander and De Jonge (1985:406, 408) who explain that T. Joseph 19:3(-4) is a reference to the coming (incarnation: \(\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\omicomma\omicomma\omicomma\)) of Jesus Christ, his victory on his enemies (the devil and his evil spirits) and the future joy of angels, men and the whole earth (cf. Rev. 12:12a; T. Simeon 6:6).

\(^{371}\) When he stresses the intertextuality between Revelation and Essene, Goranson (1997:453) assumes that “the Apocalypse of John shows influence of Essene thought, including Essene polemic. In other words, John shared much of the Essene worldview and may have been an Essene before he became a Christian”. Nonetheless, the fact that there is a strong intertextual tie between Revelation and Essene does not guarantee the fanciful assumption of John’s earlier identity as an Essene. Moreover, here one of the most important criteria of intertextuality, namely, ‘availability’ (see 1.3.3.) is not fit, unless exegetes accept the early date of Revelation.
Rev. 12:17 affirms both faith in Jesus and observance of God's instruction (cf. T. Joseph 4:5; 11:1; 18:1; 19:6; T. Judah 23:5\textsuperscript{372}). Likewise, the earlier Qumran pesher affirms both faith in a teacher of righteousness and Torah-observance. This becomes evident from the etymology of the Greek forms of the name Essene which derives from Hebrew נֶאֶשֶׁנֶן, so that the Essene name embodies their self-description as doers of Torah unlike hypocritical Pharisees (see Goranson, 1997:454, 458).

The art of the ancient world exhibits a variety of composite creatures with grotesque heads, lions' bodies, eagle's legs, and the talons and tail of snake or scorpion. The combination of lion and adder together symbolises the evil powers that the one who trusts in God will dominate (cf. Ps. 91:13). When he describes the appearance of the sea beast in Rev. 13:2 John assumes his audiences' familiarity with this composite creature (cf. Ryken, e.a. 1998:579).

It seems that by the land beast (Rev. 13:11) John as a true prophet means his audiences to think of the false prophet as the high priest of the province. By doing so John makes clear the fact that it is the high priest of Asia Minor, a local dignitary, who exercises what John portrays in Rev. 13:12-17.\textsuperscript{373} Moreover, John as a true prophet stresses the fact that his assault on the enemies of God in the world of his time resembles the prophets of the OT in their assault on the world of their times (cf. Barnett, 1995:228-231).

In Rev. 13:13-15 John shows that the mechanical manipulation, sophisticated technology, special effects equipment and the simulation of nature might have been employed both in the cultic setting and theatre in the first century. Rev. 13:13-15 should

\textsuperscript{372} "And they shall castrate some of you as eunuchs for their wives, until you return to the Lord in integrity of heart, penitent and living according to all the Lord's commands. Then the Lord will be concerned for you in mercy and will free you from captivity under your enemies" (T. Judah 23:5).

\textsuperscript{373} Esler (1994:145-146) contends that Rome as a sorcerer (Rev. 13:14-15) functions in the cycle of myth created in the work as a scapegoat for problems which are largely internal to the seven congregations. The primary function of portraying Rome as a sorcerer is to clarify and reaffirm the identity of the communities both in relation to the outside world and in response to internal tendencies toward disintegration and ennui. Yet the reason why Esler denies the real persecution by Rome is his late date of Revelation. Therefore, John's sorcery accusation in Rev. 13:14-15 has a historical relevance to John's audiences in the time of Nero.
be accepted as describing a part of the actual practice in the imperial cult (Scherrer, 1984:604, 610).

In short, the polemical displacement by biblical-Christian imagery of figures in a mythological-socio-political framework serves to create a new perception of reality in John’s audiences. In other words, in Rev. 12-13 the social and political realities of the Roman Empire in first century Asia Minor, the non-canonical (esp. the pagan mythological) material and the biblical imagery become fused to create a symbolic reality (cf. Paul, 2000:271-272). In this regard, Koester (2001:117) is also of the opinion that John grapples with the icons of the popular culture of his day in order to unmask them, so that when his audiences see the realities that lie behind the facades, they might better resist compromise and persevere in faith. The result is that the sovereignty of God and the Lamb has been elevated so far above all pretensions and claims of earthly rulers that the latter become only diabolical imitations of God. John’s intertextual world is so vast that its complexities cannot be understood apart from a consideration of the traditions of the Greco-Roman world of which he and his communities were part (Aune, 1983b:22-23). The intertextures of John show that he does not choose OT, NT or non-canonical sources at random but in accord with the main themes of Apocalypse 12-13: the new creation, the new Exodus, God’s judgment of the enemies of the churches, the immanent persecution, and the fulfillment of OT and NT promises in Christ (cf. Beale, 1988:332).

5.2. John’s audiences’ intertextuality for productive reception

As pointed out in Chapter 1 of this work, one of the most outstanding characteristics of intertextuality is that it takes into account the role of the reader (audience) in the process of interpretation. As far as religious texts, including the Book of Revelation, are concerned, it is important to distinguish between at least two situations of reception – the initial event of understanding, resulting in the formation of a (religious) text, and the subsequent event(s) of interpretation, including the reading of the present reader (Lategan, 1995:33). In this section (5.2.), it is the audiences of John in the first century who are the focus, not the present readers. For the intertextuality of John’s audiences,
'audiences criticism' \(^{374}\) is a proper method, instead of postmodern reception theory or ideological criticism. Since the 1970s, audience criticism is concerned with understanding the original historical recipients of biblical texts.\(^{375}\) Audience criticism seeks to characterise the intended historical recipient on the basis of clues within the text itself. As a historical discipline, audience criticism also makes use of any available extratextual evidence in constructing the historical recipient. In brief, audience criticism attends to the interaction of the final text form and a sociohistorically located audience (cf. Carter, 2000b:xx; Soulen & Soulen, 2001:15).

In spite of its importance for a proper understanding of Revelation, the study of John's audience has been relatively neglected by Johannine scholars. One of the reasons seems to be that scholars simply accept and presuppose that John's audiences in Asia Minor consisted mainly of Gentiles. Therefore, both the study of John's audience, in general, and the probe of John's Jewish audience, in particular, need more attention. Furthermore, the study of the intertextualities of both the Gentile and the Jewish audience is necessary, since even though the two groups share a strong common knowledge,\(^{376}\) their different

\(^{374}\) The term 'audience criticism' was first used in a biblical context by Baird in his study on the Corinthian Church (Audience criticism and the historical Jesus, 1969), but as in the case of reader response theory, it is a concept which has its origin in general literary studies and which in essence is a synonym for reader response theory. In the study of biblical literature, a variety of methods, ranging from form criticism to sociological analyses, have been employed to obtain information regarding audiences. The aim has been to obtain reliable data about the real receivers and their circumstances as an aid to a better understanding of the texts. The frequent lack of such data and other methodological problems have led recent researchers to employ reader response theory primarily as a literary technique (see Lategan, 1992a:627-628).

\(^{375}\) Almost 1750 years ago Origen devoted a section of his Commentarius in Matthaeum to a discussion of the different roles played by the disciples and the crowds in the Gospel of Matthew (Origen in Cousland, 2002:3). Nonetheless, in the field of historical Jesus, it was not until 1931 that audience criticism really made its entrance with the work of T.W. Manson – 'The teaching of Jesus'. It seems highly probable that the audience is of great importance to those who recorded books because they believed the message was audience-centred. Jesus, his disciples, and the Gospel writers are all pictured as being conscious of the importance of the audience to which a particular saying was directed. Audience criticism does not replace the more traditional critical disciplines of source, redaction, and form criticism; rather it precedes and informs them. The Book of Revelation is not an exception to which audience criticism can be applied (cf. Baird, 1969:16-18, 134).

\(^{376}\) As in the case of mystical texts, the configuration of the apocalyptic text (i.e. Revelation) is dependent on certain essentials of a true apocalyptic text. One of them is the presentation of the text as an invitation to the community (i.e. John's audience). The communities in Asia Minor, groups of people with common personalities, receive and act upon the text. The first act is to determine the authenticity of the event (of Revelation) and the credibility of the author (Mina,
intertextuality for understanding Revelation cannot be underestimated. In fact, the intricate layers of intertextuality in Revelation cast strong doubt on how well the audience could have understood or even heard the biblical allusions. Revelation does not have any citation formulas or other clues to help its audience to recognise biblical quotations or allusions (Royalty, 1998:125).

In spite of the fact that John’s intertextual audiences, as the implied or ideal audiences, know the OT and all kinds of other sources well and interpret their situation in the light of these sources (cf. Vorster, 1989b:34), a question naturally arises: are John’s real audiences so accustomed to the OT, the NT and the non-canonical intertextures that they can understand Revelation in this light and apply Revelation to their own situation? To answer this question, the following study of the intertextuality of John’s audiences is required.

As Moyise (1995:142) notes, most OT studies by NT scholars fall under the heading of source and redaction criticism. Researchers are interested in how a particular author has used the OT in order to meet the needs of the recipients. However, this emphasis on the ‘author’s intention’ seems to have been replaced in recent studies by a focus either on the text itself or on the role of the reader. By utilising past texts, John has produced a fresh composition which invites the audiences to participate and create meaning. 377 Likewise, Linton (1993:11) holds that the extensive intertextuality and highly symbolic imagery of Revelation combine to create much uncertainty about the meaning of the visions. Revelation allows John’s audiences space in which to produce meaning. Here, Aune’s claim is proper: even if no two early Christian readers understood the Apocalypse in precisely the same way, it is likely that particular congregations of readers would have a relatively homologous understanding of the Apocalypse because of their shared knowledge of antecedent texts (Aune, 1991:142-143; and see Vorster, 1988:119). 378 Thus, instead of Linton’s ‘uncertainty’ of the meaning, ‘multiplicity’ of

---

377 The Gadamerian notion of ‘the horizon of expectations’ that a reader brings to a work, resembles the intertextuality of John’s audiences, because their horizon is constructed by an inherited system of norms and conventions (see Clayton & Rothstein, 1991:26).

378 The fact that the Christian mission to the Gentiles in the first century was luring away those very Gentiles who were Judaism’s patrons, implies that the Gentile Christian audiences of John
meaning seems to be more proper.

Given the fact that language is essentially a form of social interaction, any audience has abundant evidence of what some speaker or writer is going to say both from his/her knowledge of how the language works and from a practised sensibility to what one in fact can say in specific situations (Malina, 1994:168).

Ricoeur (1981:184-193) believes that reading is aimed at application or appropriation. Interpretation means basically that readers read a text with the possibility of applying it to their own situation. Unless it is applied to the reader’s own situation, the text has no meaning for that particular person. When this happens, two worlds confront each other: the world of the text and that of the reader. There is currently a growing appreciation among evangelical scholars of the reader’s role in interpretation. Glodo (2000:163), for instance, maintains: “We should interpret Scripture in light of our own concrete realities. ... Exposition in a postmodern setting should be done in self-conscious reflection upon the connections between Scripture and the concrete experience of listeners”.

Most, if not all, of the seven churches addressed were among those planted during Paul’s evangelistic ministry of AD 52-54. Allowing for the Lucan hyperbole in Acts 19:10, widespread propagation of the gospel apparently occurred about two decades before Revelation was written (Wilson, 1996:26). Apart from these Hellenistic Gentile Christians, a migration of Palestinian Christians took place during the Jewish Revolt (cf. Lohse, 1993:110). As Wilson (1996:32) observes, it seems that the Jewish Christians formed a core of the congregation in each of the seven churches. This core community,

were also acquainted with the OT knowledge (cf. Theissen, 1983:104).

379 In quoting Umberto Eco, Tolmie (1995:189, 192) argues that interpretation is a dialectical process between the *intentio operas* (the intention of the work as a semantic strategy in the text) and the *intentio lectoris* (the intention of the reader). This dialectical relationship is able to generate a number of interpretations. However, the text as a coherent whole should check the intention of reader as well as the intention of text, because the interpreter cannot be content with a mere multiplication of interpretations. It is also necessary to establish the relationships between the various interpretations and, further, to attempt to establish a hierarchy between the various interpretations that correspond to the semiotic structure of the text.

380 Here too, the priority of the Bible is essential. Thus, the reader’s own (historical) setting should not become more important to the interpretative process than the (social) location of the biblical author and text (see Gulley, 2000:219).
because of its morality, literacy and familiarity with the OT, provided spiritual stability for the pagan converts.

The most constructive and informative studies of the social level and status of early Christians have been done on the Pauline letters and churches. The audience of Revelation was probably very much like that of the Pauline Churches. To say that the audience of Revelation was like the Pauline communities is to say that the audience of Revelation was urban and was socially and culturally diverse (cf. Gal. 3:28). John’s audience would have included a wide variety of educational and social levels, a fair cross section of urban society in Asia Minor at the middle of the first century (Royalty, 1998:19; cf. Thompson, 1990:7). Along with Malherbe, Meeks (1983:73) spells out that “the most active and prominent members of Paul’s circle are people of high status inconsistency (low status crystallisation). They are upwardly mobile; their achieved status is higher than their attributed status”.

Ephesus as the centre of Asia Minor was replete with Egyptian, Greek, Roman and indigenous cults which shared devotees. Except for Christianity and Judaism, there were few independent eastern religions present in Roman Ephesus. Artemis, as the patron goddess, was involved in a reciprocal ‘give and take’ with the civic self-image and urban needs of Ephesus. Thus, mistreatment of the devotee is mistreatment of Artemis. Moreover, the relation between Artemis and Ephesus is a covenant bond. But Artemis was much more than a goddess sympathetically attuned to the needs and predicaments of her worshippers. She was also venerated because of her lordship over supernatural powers (see Oster, 1990:1700, 1723-1727; Van Tilborg, 1996:68). In the same way, according to Ramsay (1994:72), many of the residents in Asia Minor had no Greek education, but were sunk in ignorance and the grossest Oriental superstition. Therefore, John’s audiences, especially the Gentiles, should have realised the contrast between Christ and Artemis. They might have overcome their previous syncretism through monotheistic Christology and have believed in Jesus the only Patron carrying out the transition from the Old Covenant to the New.
5.2.1. The Jewish Christians

The Greek of Revelation is a topic in itself, containing more Hebraism than any other NT or Greek-Jewish writing. It seems that John consciously Hebraises in order to give his Greek a 'biblical' sound. Sometimes, the cases where a Greek word can only be understood from the biblical meaning of the Hebrew equivalent are arresting (e.g. to give [nätan] — to place in Rev. 3:8; feet — legs [laglayim] in Rev. 10:1). And Hebrew or Aramaic is John's mother tongue. Revelation is one of the most explicitly Jewish-Christian writings within the NT, as is apparent from the language, the imagery, and the message of the Book, as well as from the many strong correspondences with Jewish writings and traditions of the day (see Tomson, 2001:362-366).

The use of the OT in narrative material, such as the Book of Revelation, points to the importance in the text of the intertextual competence of the (implied) reader (Vorster, 1989b:34). Like this implied reader, who knows about other texts and who can use his/her intertextual competence to interpret the Revelation in the light of a reinterpretation of other texts, the Jewish Christian audiences of John, who came from Palestine in AD 64 and were converted by Paul's mission work in AD 52, appear to possess the same intertextual competence. They are also accustomed to Jesus traditions, which must have had a tremendous impact on Christianity outside Palestine (cf. Perrin & Duling, 1982:88). It appears too much of a coincidence that the major exponents of what have become known as postmodern theories of texts, e.g. Derrida, Bloom, and Barthes, share traditions rooted in Rabbinic thought according to which text is not perceived as a static object but as a process of understanding reality (Nel, 1995:40, 43). The following quotation from Nel (1995:2) makes the intertextual ability of Jews clear:

Even in childhood the Jew is brought up in a context where one text

381 The fact that the Jewish Christian audiences of John might have kept their Jewish religious tradition and heritage is assumed from the following statement: "a distinction must be drawn between Judaism as a ‘religious movement’ and Judaism as a ‘cultural phenomenon’. Hellenisation had very little, if any, influence on the former, perhaps not until after the two Jewish Revolts. On the other hand, Hellenisation certainly affected Palestinian culture and Diaspora" (Van Elderen, 1994:211).
replaces, challenges and imitates other texts. In the synagogue he listens to Torah readings, complemented by passages from the Prophets; to homiletic Aggadaic stories which do not intend to proclaim authentic interpretation, but rather play with the possibilities of the texts, perhaps including the replacement of other texts. In the religious school, again, the objective is not to gain final control over the text but to experience the multitude and richness of life generated by the text.

The author of Revelation, himself a ‘Jewish Christian’, feels great animosity towards those other Jews who do not become Christian, and that the barbs have been flying back and forth, at least in Smyrna and Philadelphia where Christian congregations have already been split off from the synagogues (e.g. Rev. 2:9; 3:9). In John’s opinion, the apostate Jews have refused to conform to true Judaism. At least in the case of Smyrna, the non-Christian Jews have been responsible for some hostilities directed towards the church even though the extent of those hostilities is questionable (maybe blasphemy and affliction). Of course, John considers it appropriate to discuss those hostilities in relation to Smyrna and Philadelphia, but the message is for all seven churches in Asia Minor. Accordingly, Revelation certainly shows that the Jewish Christian audiences of John and the non-Christian Jews in Asia Minor in the middle of the first century were engaged in name calling. Perhaps it also shows that non-Christian Jews in that province were opposing Jewish Christians in some overt way, possible by denouncing them to the authorities on some charges (see Sanders, 1993:171-172). For this reason, the Jewish Christian audiences could have interpreted Revelation 12-13 in terms of the destruction of Jerusalem, as the symbol of the Jewish system, and realised the coming of the New Covenant. At first, this is shock to them.\textsuperscript{382} But they realise the fulfilled meaning of the Judaistic system in Christ (cf. Goodman, 1992:28).

Popular treatments of early Christianity and early Judaism have focused so one-sidedly on Palestine and especially on the failed revolts of 66-70 and 132-135 that exegetes tend to think of Rome as the implacable enemy of the Jews.\textsuperscript{383} Although Roman rule was

\textsuperscript{382} After AD 70 the Jewish Christians (esp. the Pharisaic Hebrew Christians) who survived their nation’s fall could not finally shake themselves free from the particularism of Judaism and commit themselves to the universalism of Christianity, as proclaimed by Paul and others, but instead an insistent nostalgia turned back their gaze to the past and limited their hopes to the re-establishment by God of an idealised Jerusalem (Brandon, 1974:183).

\textsuperscript{383} Pilch (1997:122) points out that in the period of the Second Temple (BC 520-AD 70) the
not always benign\textsuperscript{384}, Jews of the Diaspora cities more often regarded Rome as their protector\textsuperscript{385} (Meeks, 1983:38-39). This becomes clearer from Paul who persecuted the Jewish Christians and was persecuted by the Jews.\textsuperscript{386} Apparently Paul persecuted those 'Jewish Christians' who allowed Gentiles to become Christians without undergoing

country Israel is called Judea and its inhabitants are called 'Judeans'. Thus, Pilch contends that the word 'Jews' is an anachronistic term in the biblical period. Keeping this in mind, in this dissertation, the present writer uses 'Jews' as the synonym of 'Judeans'. It is interesting that not long after the defeat of the Jewish rebels and the destruction of Jerusalem, the Diaspora Jews experienced the subsequent sufferings due to the ambiguity inherent in the Latin name \textit{Iudaeus}, Greek \textit{'Iou\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma}. The emperor Titus's victory had been won over the inhabitants of Judea, whom the Romans naturally termed 'Judeans', but the identical term was used to refer to Jews wherever they lived, however little the contact they maintained with the national homeland (Goodman, 1992:31).

\textsuperscript{384} In this connection, the third book of the Sibylline Oracles, probably written in Asia Minor between BC 80-40, shows that at least some Jews living in Asia Minor sympathised with the Greek inhabitants of the cities and hoped for revenge on Rome. The Jewish author combined his hope for Asia's revenge on Rome with the traditional Jewish expectation of a future divine intervention in world history (see Buitenwerf, 2002:1-15).

\textsuperscript{385} The Jews in Ephesus and throughout the rest of Ionia bear the same name as the indigenous citizens by gift of the Diadochi (Hemer, 2001:38; see \textit{The Antiquities of the Jews}, 14.10.25). A significant discovery in Sardis demonstrates the presence of a considerable Aramaic-speaking population, possibly of Jews, at John's time. From Rev. 3:4 it can be inferred that the majority of the Jews in Sardis had 'soiled their clothes', apparently by some accommodation to their environment. The Jews may have strengthened their position through a long-standing accommodation to surrounding pagan culture (cf. Hemer, 2001:137, 151).

\textsuperscript{386} The pre-Christian Paul himself becomes an important example of devout Jews being outraged by the Christological claims and practices of 'Jewish' Christians (cf. 1 Th. 2:14-16). In measuring the Jewish opposition in the time of Paul, the force of the διιχε\mu\alpha \textquoteleft η\gamma\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma (1 Co. 12:3) should not be minimised. It denotes placing Jesus under divine curse and judgment (see Hurtado, 1999:53-57). In this regard, the Sadducean persecution of the Jewish Christian in Diaspora during AD 58-65 should be paid proper attention. The Sadducean position was one of resistance to social and religious change to popular movements, and generally to the forces eroding their authority. That the Sadducees were likely to have opposed the Christians is not surprising: they were an embattled group in the decade prior to the Jewish Revolt. A mere list of conflicts which concerned them is impressive: (1) Pharisaic opposition to the Sadducean penal code, (2) friction between factions of high priests, (3) conflicts with ordinary priests, (4) conflicts between priests and Levites, and (5) general conflict between rich and poor. For the Sadducees, the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (and the Roman Empire) were a group of an element perceived as dangerous. While information is lacking to do more than hypothesise as to the continued prosecution of Paul in Rome, it seems likely that the high priests would have carried their polemical stance toward Christians to Rome. There they would have influenced the Jewish community. The Christians had remained close to the synagogue in Rome and were vulnerable to the attack. Consequently, the persecution of the Jewish Christians from AD 58-65 was part of the Sadducees' last effort to retain control of their world (see Ensminger, 1988:12-13). Probably, in Smyrna, the unbelieving Jews had become active in instigating persecution of the church or denouncing to the authorities those Jews who were also Christians. There is also the testimony contained in the accounts of the martyrdoms of Polycarp and Pionius to the unusually virulent bitterness of the local Jewish community against the Christians (see Hemer, 2001:66-67).
circumcision (Gal. 5:11; 6:12). Since, as a Jewish-Christian missionary, Paul considered himself to be the apostle to Gentiles, it is highly likely that he suffered persecution from synagogues for the same reason (Sanders, 1996:1939). In the same vein, when he mentions the events of AD 66-73, Collins (2000:138-140) spells out that there was a relatively good relation between the Diaspora (Christian) Jews and the Roman authority.

The attitude of Gentiles to Jews and Judaism was in no way uniform. Of course there was anti-semitism, but there also existed a remarkable degree of sympathy for Judaism in the Greco-Roman world. This has been clearly demonstrated by Hvalvik (1996:257-258): “It is sufficient to apply three terms to designate Gentiles who in various ways were involved in Judaism: (1) sympathisers, (2) adherents and (3) converts”. The first term (sympathisers) covers Gentiles who (for various reasons) supported the Jews (politically, financially and/or otherwise), and those who recognised the power of the God of the Jews. Adherents include Gentiles who believed in the God of the Jews and followed parts of the Mosaic law (e.g. Lk. 7:1-10). But an adherent was not necessarily a monotheist. With regard to the third term ‘converts’, after probing inscriptions from Asia Minor containing the epithet ‘Ioudaioi’/’Ioudaia thirteen times, Kraemer (1989:43-46) demonstrates a case of woman’s conversion in Smyrna. Hence, it can be deduced that such Gentiles’ sympathy or affection for John’s Jewish Christian audiences took many forms, from passive admiration to more active involvement.

What was the effect on Diaspora Jewish Christians of the war in Judea begun by Vespasian under Nero, suspended during the civil strife following Nero’s death and during the brief principates of Galba, Otho and Vitellius, begun again under the emperor Vespasian and undertaken directly by his son Titus? In the closing portion of book 2 of *The Jewish War*, Josephus describes conflicts in the Diaspora that resulted from the tensions brought on by war in Judea even though he does not directly mention Asia Minor. According to Marshall (2001:106-111), “it is clear that Jews in Jerusalem hoped for help from the Diaspora, that some Diaspora Jews were sympathy with the participants in the rebellion in Judea, and that the cities of the empire could become quite uncomfortable for Jews if significant elements in the cities embarked on an effort to scapegoat their Jewish neighbours. ... The environment for Jews in Asia Minor during AD 69 was significantly affected by the related events in Judea and Rome”.
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Nonetheless, the Diaspora Jews did not join in the revolt of AD 66-70. Moreover, those who were the more prominent members of the Jewish community, in particular, were more loyal to the Romans than the lower classes, because the upper classes had too much to lose and inevitably incurred the resentment of the revolutionaries in revolts against Rome.

While the struggle between the seven churches, especially the Jewish Christian audiences, and the heretical Jews deserve proper attention, the following fact is noteworthy: John may wish to contrast the status of the exalted Lamb over Michael. This detail of his vision may be included as part of an anti-synagogue polemic. John no doubt recognises Michael’s participation in Rev. 12:7 in terms of rabbinical speculation that gives him elevated importance in mediating God’s covenant with religious Israel. In this way, Michael has come to symbolise a triumphant Judaism for many religious Jews. Such a role, however, has been given to the exalted Christ (cf. 1 Ti. 2:5), who alone champions a true Israel (Wall, 1991:163).

As Scott (1974:224-225) observes, unlike the Pharisaic Hebrew Christians, the moderate Hebrew Christians as the largest group in the Jerusalem church rejected circumcision and the Torah as essential conditions for salvation and continued to worship in the temple, to participate in Jewish rituals, and to observe at least some requirements of the Torah in freedom. To some extent they also participated in the world mission of Christianity. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that they might have had a direct influence on and reflected the thought of John’s Jewish audiences.

Wright (1992:71) correctly argues that the best evidence for sustained and regular

387 In Palestine, indications of a certain (Jewish) Christian zeal for the law are given by Luke in Acts and Paul in his letters with regard to the years in AD 54-66. This was the period when the notorious Hellenism of Nero caused a reaction to Judaism which became more and more violent, and then led to the first Jewish War, AD 66-70. If the Zealot troubles had already imposed severe difficulties upon the Christians of Judea around AD 52 (1 Th. 2:14), they grew into a veritable terror after Nero’s enthronement in AD 54. This terror compelled Jewish Christians to combine their belief with a zeal for the law by a desire to avoid the dangers of the Jewish reaction against Nero, but it cannot be proved that they ever took part in revolution and violence. Christians who did not join the extreme nationalists in Judea were probably exposed to pressure or persecution (see Reicke, 2001:13-15).
attacks on Christians in the first century is the evidence for the attacks carried out by Jews, not least by Jews in, or based in, Jerusalem. Thus the great whore that has become drunk with the blood of the saints (Rev. 17:5-6) is to be identified, not with Rome, but with Jerusalem. On her comment on the harlot in Rev. 17-18 Josephin Massyngberde Ford (1982:283-285) agrees with Wright. She comments:

A study of the metaphorical use of ‘harlot’ in the OT shows a marked tendency to depict faithless Israel (Isa. 1:21; Jer. 2:20; Ezk. 16:35; Hos. 2:5; Mic. 1:7). ... The text that influences the author of Revelation most is Ezk. 16, which is a prophetical attack on Jerusalem. The prophet finds no kind word for her. His description is as graphic as in Rev. 17-18. ... On account of her sins, Ezekiel says that God threatens to gather her lovers against her and uncover her nakedness to them (cf. Rev. 17:16). ... Moreover, the author of Revelation does use dual symbolism, so even if it is correct to identify the harlot with the faithless Jerusalem, this does not preclude her identification also with one particular character or office (the high priesthood) within the city.

From Ford’s argument, John’s Jewish audience might have understood the harlot as Jerusalem (Israel). But it seems also that, because the harlot commits adultery with pagan nations, for the Gentile audience Rome is, at least indirectly connected with the harlot.

Concerning the significance of the fall of Jerusalem, Mauro (1990:xii) has maintained as follows:

It is most needful to apprehend both the destruction of Jerusalem and the attendant break-up of the Jewish nation for a right understanding of Bible prophecy in general and of the Book of Revelation in particular. The failure to recognise the significance of that event, and the vast amount of prophecy which it fulfilled, has been the cause of great confusion, for the necessary consequence of missing the past fulfillment of predicted events is to leave on the hands of exegetes a mass of prophecies for which we must contrive fulfillments in the future.

Treblilco (1991:184-189) is of the opinion that the evidence that in the first century BC Jewish communities in Asia Minor were committed to paying the temple tax shows that Jerusalem and its worship remained the geographical focus of their faith. And according to Acts, Jews were able to influence Gentiles to oppose Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian
Antioch, Iconium and Lystra. This is perhaps a further indication that Jew-Gentile relations were reasonable in these cities in the first century AD. Indeed, Christian communities in Asia Minor were very aware of the presence of Jewish communities, which were attractive and had a significant influence on the churches. This could lead to adoption of Jewish practices by Christians or to anti-Jewish views. Hence, one of John’s urgent tasks is to prevent the Jewish Christians, who converted from Judaism, from the evil influence of the apostate Jews.

The absence of Jewish hostility to Christianity in the five churches in Rev. 2-3, excluding Smyrna and Philadelphia, might be taken to imply that there was no significant presence of Jewish Christianity there, since the opposition of non-Christian Jews to Christianity was primarily directed toward Jewish Christianity, not toward Gentile Christianity (Sanders, 1992:442; contra Goranson, 1997:458).

5.2.2. The Gentile Christians

Even if reluctant to read astrology into Revelation, most exegetes will readily admit that John’s contemporaries were certainly versed in Zodiacal lore and assumed that earthly destinies were determined by, and reflected in, the stars (Chevalier, 1997:335). This astral mythology caught the imagination of the Gentile Christians (and all Semitic people) for a single reason: it tackled basic problems of human existence, such as the fate of vegetation in the land of the scorching sun (Chevalier, 1997:358).

In regard to Rev. 12:7-9, John’s Hellenistic audiences, who are acquainted with the Platonic cosmology, assume that what has transpired in heaven will have its historical duplicate on earth. Thus, if the heavenly and invisible war between God and the Evil One had ended with God’s triumph through the exalted Lamb, then the Evil One will surely be defeated by God in an earthly and visible war (Wall, 1991:162).

Apart from astrology, the pagan myths, including the combat myths, could have played a crucial role as intertextuality when John’s audiences listened to Revelation 12-13. Yarbro Collins (1976:232) provides a thorough study of the parallels here with ‘the combat myth’. She suggests that Revelation 12 most closely resembles the myths of
Seth-Typhon’s attack on Isis and Horus and of Python’s pursuit of Leto in the pattern of threat (vs. 3-4)→ salvation (vs. 5-6)→ combat-victory (vs. 7-9)→ victory shout (vs. 10-12). A.Y. Collins’s conclusion is that Rev. 12 follows the pattern of the Leto myth but that the depiction of the goddess is assimilated in Isis. By interpreting the Apollo myth and related symbolism as depicting the birth of the Messiah and his triumph against the dragon, A. Y. Collins (1976:190) avers that the author of Revelation formulates a further element in the antithesis of Christ and Nero.

As Richard (1995:105-106) maintains, in Rev. 12:10 the terms ‘salvation’, ‘power’, ‘kingdom’ and ‘authority’ are strikingly political. The coming of the kingdom is a social, public and visible event in history. In connection with the doxology in Rev. 10:10-12, John’s strategy is to invite his (Gentile) audiences to listen to heavenly singing in the expectation that they will be drawn to join that cosmic chorus and so strengthen their connection with one another (cf. Thompson, 1990:69-71; Smith, 1998:506). For the Gentile Christians (as well as the Jewish Christians) Revelation is full of socio-political meaning, a counterpart of Rome’s tenets, and with theological meaning. John had to explain why a transcendent God would tolerate an apparently successful, apparently unstoppable superpower (i.e. the pagan Roman Empire) that did not acknowledge the One who sits on the throne. John’s intentions in situating political criticism in Rev. 12-13 should be reflected upon. John recast the present time of his (Gentile) audience not as a period of imperial prosperity but as Satan’s last desperate opportunity to take revenge on those who feared God.\footnote{Roman propagandists and Roman culture itself generated motifs defining the emperor as liberator, as descending from heaven, as redeemer of captives, as restorer to the light of life, as one for whom the gates of rebellious cities opened. In other words, the Roman imperial \textit{adventus} ceremony retains a number of defining characteristics: the arriving emperor exemplifies legitimate authority; he is, by an act of his majesty alone, generous and clement; because his enemies have threatened Roman freedoms, he has come to restore them, and thus liberate those held in slavery; and finally, those enemies will suffer appropriate punishment. By the fourth century AD, each of these qualities has, at some sacrifice of integrity, become exaggerated. The Book of Revelation (and Christian Scriptures), already imbued with soteriological notions of the imminent \textit{adventus Christi}, could easily be accommodated to verify this transformation (see Roddy, 2000:164, 178).}


Satan, the source of chaos, gives power to the beast from the sea (Rev. 13:1) whose
chief characteristic is blasphemy against God. This is for the Gentile Christian a radical inversion of the public discourse concerning the emperor of Rome, who is upheld by the order-maintaining divinities of the Greco-Roman pantheon and whose chief quality is pietas, or proper reverence for the gods and ancient Roman values. In the worldview of John's Gentile audience, the emperor is an agent of chaos and impiety. The second beast (Rev. 13:11) is presented as the organiser of religious cults for the first beast, making the worship of the beast a requirement for continued economic and physical well-being. Again, this is a reversal of the public discourse concerning the imperial cult. In his portrayal of the establishment and workings of the imperial cult, John has revealed that its power is essentially 'manufactured charisma', not a manifestation of truly divine power at work (DeSilva, 1993:52).

To summarise, in Revelation 12-13 the above-mentioned pagan materials are rewritten so as to contradict its current political application and bring back memories of the Messianic struggles of the OT. By casting these materials in a Jewish-Christian mould, John turns paganism into a parody of the divine, an expression of self-adulation and satanic idolatry. Therefore, John’s Gentile Christian audiences naturally connected these two chapters with Christ’s victory over the Roman Empire, by which they were persecuted.

5.3. Concluding summary

Here, Stevenson's (2001:12-13) explanation about the relationship of the symbolic world to the identity in Revelation in terms of the apocalyptic rhetoric is proper:

Apocalyptic rhetoric addresses perceptions of injustice, suffering, incompatibility between one’s desired place in the world and one’s place in the world as determined by social and political institutions and structures, and challenges to self and group identity and survival. The value of apocalyptic lies in its ability to make a holistic argument, precisely because it is tailor-made for addressing both the mind and the heart. Apocalyptic rhetoric involves a mixture of emotional appeal and intellectual argument. Analysis of apocalyptic rhetoric frequently focuses upon one or other of these aspects without fully appreciating the interaction of the two. It is generally recognised that John creates a symbolic world or universe that is set in juxtaposition with the social-political world of the Roman Empire. What needs to be determined is the
literary and social function of this symbolic world.

In fact, the symbolic world in Revelation is closely connected with the intertextual world of John and his audiences.

In the light of the intertextuality of John and his audiences, it is reasonable to conclude that John’s production of the non-canonical intertexts and his audiences’ reception of these reveal not so much consistent partial preterism as transitional partial preterism. This is not only because the pagan intertexts have universalistic characteristics but also because the seven churches are under the direct influence of the persecuting Roman Empire. John’s use and his audiences’ reception of the NT intertexts, however, primarily prop up consistent partial preterism, due to the strong message of God’s judgment on the Jews in the Olivet Discourse. Of course, the NT intertexts do not ignore the transitional partial preterism. The use and reception of the OT intertexts seems to support both consistent and transitional partial preterism in that the emphases of the OT prophets are on God’s judgment on Jerusalem as well as on the Gentile nations.

The intertextuality of John’s receptive production in terms of the NT, the OT and non-canonical intertexts is relevant to God’s judgment of Rome as well as that of Jerusalem. For this reason, the intertextuality of the seven churches’ productive reception plays a crucial role in determining the (partial preterist) meaning of Rev. 12-13 in particular, and of Revelation as a whole. This does not of necessity imply that the locus of meaning is in the audience, but that the communicative interaction among the author, the text and the audience decides the meaning complied with the epistemological model of hermeneutics (see 1.3.2.). The partial preterist meaning of Revelation is not unlimitedly multiple but determinately controlled in that the intertextuality of John and his audience manifests only two choices: God’s judgment on Rome and Jerusalem.

The chart below demonstrates the relationship between the two partial preterisms and the intertextuality of John and his audiences:
The Jewish audiences can interpret the pagan intertexts\textsuperscript{389} in terms of the NT and OT (Beasley-Murray, 1990:193). The fact that the Hellenistic audiences are also equipped with a knowledge of the NT and OT besides the pagan sources is evident from the fact that John uses and alters a lot of (NT and) OT intertextuality. Thus both groups share a

\textsuperscript{389} If some of the Jewish Christian audiences of John came from Palestine to Asia Minor, they must have been equipped with a competence regarding Hellenistic intertexts. At the time of Christ Palestine had been a part of the Hellenistic world for over three centuries and had experienced not only the immigration of many Greek-speaking Gentiles but also the resettlement from the Diaspora of thoroughly Hellenised Jews. Even those Jews who resisted the foreign culture were not exempt from its influence. This is the context of the ministry of Jesus and of the earliest church. This does not, however, mean that Jews in Palestine inculturated Hellenism in the same way that Jews in the Diaspora did nor that all Diaspora communities did so in the same ways or to the same degree (cf. Ellis, 2001:45).
strong common knowledge. Although this is not a matter of ‘either...or’ but ‘both...and’, the matter of priority for each group is significant. For the Jewish audiences, the judgment of Jerusalem is still a matter of priority, but for the Gentile audiences God’s judgment on Rome is a matter of priority.

The whole book of Revelation needs to be interpreted in the light of the conclusion of Chapter 5, in particular by keeping in mind the matter of priority. A proposed partial preterism in Rev. 14-22 is to be done in the following Chapter.
CHAPTER 6.

A PROPOSED PARTIAL PRETERISM AND CONCLUSION

6.1. A proposed partial preterism of Revelation 4-22

At this stage, a detailed interpretation of Rev. 4-11 and 14-22 verse by verse will not be done; instead a broad understanding will be explored in terms of a proposed partial preterism, which intends to overcome the pitfall of the two camps of partial preterism. As noted previously, the partial preterist position is divided between those who see Rev. 14-22 as a continuation of the prophecy of the downfall of Jerusalem (consistent partial preterism), and those who believe that that subject was left behind in Rev. 11. The latter opinion (transitional partial preterism) sees Rev. 14-22 as representing God's judgment upon the Roman Empire. However, the proposed partial preterism differs here from these two partial preterist interpretations. The difference becomes apparent in the following proposed interpretation.

6.1.1. Revelation 4-11

It is very important to note that because of the fact that the three series of seven seals, trumpets, and vials depict the same event from different perspectives, John's two groups of audiences could have understood even Rev. 4-11 differently. This argument differs both from the consistent partial preterism and from transitional partial preterism. Beale (1999b:128-129) correctly notes this fact as follows:

The primary intention of the numbering is to represent the order of John's visions, not necessarily the order of historical events, which would have to

390 For the transitional partial preterists, Rev. 4 terminates with Rev. 11, which reaches the climax at that point with the sounding of the seventh trumpet and the judgment upon the anti-church Jews. The consistent partial preterists, however, carry the seventh trumpet on into the subsequent chapters and make it include the seven vials.

391 Beale (1999b:622) even goes on to insist that Rev. 12-22 tells the same story as Rev. 1-11 but explains in greater detail what chs. 1-11 only introduce and imply. Hence, an appreciation for the technique of recapitulation is particularly important for understanding the presentation that John makes in the body of Revelation from 4:1 to 22:5 (cf. Cassidy, 2001:105).
be only secondary. This is a crucial hermeneutical principle of the book that needs to be kept in mind, since it applies not only to the numbered elements in each series but also to the arrangement of the seals, trumpets, and bowls series and to the unnumbered visions. ... The trumpets and the bowls have both been modeled on the Exodus plagues, not only alluding to the same plagues but also presenting these allusions in roughly the same order as one another. The differences are minor compared to the broader culminative likenesses, are required by the need to describe adequately the varied aspects of the same time period, and are to be expected, rather than any reproduction of parallel visions with photographic precision. ... (T)here is a thematic progressive intensity among the three septets (of seals, trumpets, and vials).

6.1.1.1. Interpretation of Revelation 4-11 by John’s Jewish Christian audiences

The Judge sits on the throne (Rev. 4:2; cf. Apocalypse of Peter, 6:1-2) where He is about to hand down sentence upon the accused. The plaintiffs are the (Jewish Christian) martyrs of Christ, whose complaint against their persecutors is recorded later in the vision (Rev. 6:9). The accused (Jerusalem) is about to be condemned. The scroll with the seven seals (Rev. 5:1) is the sentence handed down by the Judge against Jerusalem (AD 66-70) for its part in shedding ‘all the righteous blood’ of the martyrs (Mt. 23:35). With the breaking of the first seal (Rev. 6:1), the progression of events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem begins. The entire series of the seven trumpets (Rev. 8-9) is concerned with the Jewish War of AD 66-70, the last day of the Jewish commonwealth. The action of eating the little book (Rev. 10:10), and reference to how it affected the mouth and stomach, is an imitation of the identical actions of Ezekiel (see Ezk. 3:1-3, 14). Ezekiel’s prophecy was about the destruction of Jerusalem at the hands of the Babylonians in BC 586. John’s similar action is also connected with his prophesying the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70. The time frame of Rev. 11:15 is that of AD 70. Christianity only became a world religion (or kingdom) after it became totally dissociated from Judaism in AD 70. Rev. 11:18 is about the historical vindication and avenging of the martyrred saints, those who had suffered at the hands of ungodly Israel (cf. Chilton, 1990:291).

6.1.1.2. Interpretation of Revelation 4-11 by John’s Gentile Christian audiences

The Judge sits on the throne (Rev. 4:2) where He is about to hand down sentence upon
the accused. The plaintiffs are the (Gentile Christian) martyrs of Christ, whose complaint against their persecutors is recorded later in the vision (Rev. 6:9). The accused (Rome) is about to be condemned. The scroll with the seven seals (Rev. 5:1) is the sentence handed down by the Judge against Rome for its part in shedding 'all the righteous blood' of the martyrs (Mt. 23:35). With the breaking of the first seal (Rev. 6:1), the progression of events leading to the destruction of Rome begins. If the entire series of the seven trumpets (Rev. 8-9) is concerned with the Jewish War of AD 66-70, the last day of the Jewish commonwealth, the Gentile Christian audiences could have understood trumpets in terms of God's warning of the destruction of Rome for two reasons: (1) because of the complex symbolism in Rev. 8-9; (2) because of the key role of the Roman Empire during the Jewish War. The time frame of Rev. 11:15 is not that of AD 70. Christianity only became a world religion (or kingdom) after the world power Rome turned to Christ. Rev. 11:18 is about the historical vindication and avenging of the martyred saints, those who had suffered at the hands of ungodly pagan Rome.

A central point is that in all the mechanisms of Rome's downfall, the hand of God is in control. In other words, every calamity that befalls Rome is divinely initiated and is in some sense a divine response to the abuses that Rome has perpetrated. It is remarkable that Revelation's predictions of Rome's destruction are not ex eventu. On the contrary, John's predictions concerning the Roman downfall are made at a time when Roman power is at its zenith. A list of the mechanisms for Rome's destruction is as follows: by earthquake (Rev. 6:12; 8:13; 11:13; 16:18); by fire (Rev. 17:16; 18:8); through internal conflict (Rev. 17:16); by pestilence and famine (Rev. 18:8); by massacre (Rev. 14:20); through violence (Rev. 18:21); by Christ at the head of a heavenly army (Rev. 17:14; 19:19-20) (cf. Cassidy, 2001:114-115).

To sum up: Rev. 4-11 combines a great variety of OT imagery with contemporary practices of pagan worship and obeisance to the emperor. In doing this, it is claiming for God alone all expressions of worship, and so offers a powerful critique of the acknowledged sources and structures of power in the first-century world (cf. Marshall, Travis & Paul, 2002:316).

The argument of the traditional two partial preterisms (i.e. the destruction of Jerusalem
is the gist of Rev. 4-11) appears to be convincing. However, if the above arguments (6.1.1.1. and 6.1.1.2.) are true, the gist of a proposed partial preterism in Rev. 4-11 is that on the one hand, John's Jewish Christian audiences might have interpreted Rev. 4-11 in terms of God's judgment on Jerusalem, and on the other hand, the Gentile Christian audiences in the light of the destruction of Rome. Notwithstanding, the matter of this proposed partial preterism is a matter of priority.

### 6.1.2. Revelation 14-16

One should note an important element that ties Rev. 15-22 together as a literary unit. After the seven angels have poured out their chalices of wrath, one of the same seven angels comes to show John 'the judgment of the great harlot' (Rev. 17:1). Later, in the final vision of the Book of Revelation, another of these bowl-angels shows John the harlot's opposite number: 'the bride of the Lamb' (Rev. 21:9). To be sure, the visions relating to both the harlot and the bride are extensions of the seven bowls section to the prophecy. For a proper understanding of Rev. 14-22, Clark's (1989:112) insistence is remarkable: "It must not be assumed that the Bible has only one meaning for a symbol. Leaven generally represents sin, but in the parable of the leaven, it represents the kingdom of God. Again a lion is the symbol used in Scripture to represent such diverse personages as Jesus Christ and the devil". The purpose of the vision and voices from heaven in Rev. 14 is obviously to show that the power of the Lamb and the Church is mightier than that of the three great foes: the dragon and the two beasts in Rev. 12-13. The Lamb standing on Mount Zion with the 144,000 is a symbol of Christ's (and the Church's) victory over all his enemies. While the specific meaning of the 144,000 is the seven churches in Asia Minor, in principle they are applied to the Remnant-Church in her entirety. In Rev. 14:6-7 John is about to make the transition from the trumpet visions (proclamations of judgment) to the chalice visions (executions of judgment). The angel preaches the gospel to those who live on the land. The usual expression for the Israelite apostates is 'those who dwell in the land' (Rev. 3:10; 13:8, 12, 14; 17:2, 8). The angel preaches to the Israelites, and then to 'all nation and tribe and tongue and people' (Rev. 14:6b). Before the end came in AD 70, the gospel was indeed preached to all the world (cf. Ro. 1:8; 10:18; Col. 1:5-6, 23). In spite of the attempts of the dragon and his two beasts to thwart the progress of the kingdom of God, the mission of the apostles of the
early church was successful (cf. Chilton, 1990:353, 362).

Rev. 12-14 envisions the rise of the dragon (Rev. 12), followed by the beast (Rev. 13:1-10), the false prophet (or the second beast in Rev. 13:11-18) and finally Babylon (Rev. 14:6-11). Rev. 16 begins a segment that reverses the order of the careers of these evil protagonists. Babylon is mentioned first in the explanation of their demise (Rev. 16:17-21; cf. Rev. 17-18), followed by the beast and the false prophet (Rev. 19:17-20) and finally the dragon himself (Rev. 20:10). This reversal points further to a lack of concern for chronological sequence in Rev. 4-20 (see Beale, 1999b:812).

6.1.2.1. Interpretation of Revelation 14-16 by John's Jewish Christian audiences

In Rev. 14:8 John's reason for applying the word 'Babylon' to Jerusalem is that Jerusalem has become a Babylon, a replica of the proud, idolatrous, persecuting oppressor of God's people. Though the primary thrust of John's prophecy has been directed against Jerusalem, it has dealt with Rome due to its relation to Israel. In Rev. 14:14-16 the emphasis falls not on judgment but on blessing, the gathering in of the elect. In Rev. 14:17-18 John returns to the theme of judgment, for concomitant with the gathering of the Church is the excommunication of Israel. In Rev. 14:19-20 the repeated references to the land (six times in vs. 15-19), combined with the imagery of the vine of the land, emphasise that this is a judgment on the land of Israel. The distance of 1,600 stadia is slightly more than the length of Palestine. The whole land of Israel is thus represented as overflowing with blood in the coming nationwide judgment (see Chilton, 1990:363-377). In AD 70 the vine of Israel is cut down and trampled in the winepress (cf. Carrington, 1931:262).

According to the consistent partial preterist advocates, the judgments of the seven bowls are largely against Jerusalem, culminating in its fall in AD 70. However, it is very important to realise that they admit that the fifth bowl (Rev. 16:10-11) touches the Roman Empire as well – probably referring to the chaotic state of affairs that prevails after Nero's suicide. For the transitional partial preterist, alternatively, Rev. 14-16 says nothing about the fall of Jerusalem and refers strictly to the judgment of God upon the pagan Rome (cf. Gregg, 1997:309). Possibly the seven trumpets depict preliminary
calamities that fall upon Israel during the Jewish War, while the seven bowls present plagues associated with the final and utter devastation of Jerusalem (cf. Gregg, 1997:360). Malina (2002:55) supports consistent partial preterism: "As Rev. 14:6-20 says, the coming of the sky being does not necessarily signal the end of any cosmic time period, just destruction of a city as commanded by God. After the destruction wrought by one like a Son of man and accompanying angels in Rev. 14:6-20, no New Heaven and New Earth follow. All that is involved is a judgment on the scenario described by Mk. 13".

The imagery in Rev. 15 is taken chiefly from the Exodus event, and proclaims that God’s salvation is his victory in this world over his enemies. From Rev. 16 onward, John abandons the imagery of warning, concentrating wholly on the message of Jerusalem’s impending destruction. In Rev. 16:10-11, although most of the judgments throughout Revelation are aimed specifically at apostate Israel, the heathens who join Israel against the Church come under condemnation as well. It is also likely that this judgment partially corresponds to the wars, revolutions, riots, and worldwide convulsions that racked the Roman Empire after Nero committed suicide in June 68 AD. Armageddon in Rev. 16:16 is for John a symbol of defeat and desolation. John’s image of the city’s division into three parts (Rev. 16:19) refers to the division into three factions. While Titus was besieging it from without, the three leaders of rival factions were fighting fiercely within the city of Jerusalem. A specific historical referent of the hailstorm in Rev. 16:21 may have been recorded by Josephus, in his strange account of the huge stone missiles thrown by the Roman catapults into the city of Jerusalem (The Jewish War, 6:3) (cf. Chilton, 1990:395-416).

6.1.2.2. Interpretation of Revelation 14-16 by John’s Gentile Christian audiences

As Cassidy (2001:107) rightly observes, John, like his Gentile audiences, who was very familiar with the writings of Daniel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, and recognised that Rome had replicated the destruction of the temple that imperial Babylon had accomplished in BC 587 in conjunction with the exile of the Jerusalem populace. In several places John refers to Rome under the symbolic name ‘Babylon the great’. John was influenced in using this term not only because of his knowledge that the
Babylonian Empire had crashed so suddenly and so dramatically; it was even more appropriate since Rome had reenacted the deed for which Babylon was most infamous.

Just as there were seven seals and seven trumpets which were symbols of judgment upon Jerusalem, so now there are seven vials that are symbols of judgment upon Rome (Rev. 15:1). Rev. 15:8 says that no man was able to enter the temple in heaven till the seven plagues were fulfilled. This was no doubt to show that no intercession would now avail for the doomed sinners. Their day of grace is now past.

The fifth angel in Rev. 16:10 poured out his vial on the seat of the beast, which evidently meant the seat of government of this persecuting power, Imperial Rome. Armageddon in Rev. 16:15 gets its name from Mount Megiddo in Palestine. Its use here would indicate a place or scene of great slaughter. It is used here in a symbolic way, but it meant that Rome was coming to her Armageddon where she would go down in battle and slaughter. Therefore, Rev. 16:19 pictures the destruction of Rome, which had many cities (cf. Clark, 1989:96-104).

6.1.3. Revelation 17-19

Rev. 17-22 may be considered a continuation of the seventh vial, or an exposition of its meaning; in any case, the events are clearly governed by the angels of the bowls (Chilton, 1990:381, 418). Correspondingly, Beale (1998:847) notes that Rev. 17:1-19:10 is a large interpretive review of the sixth and seventh bowls, which have foretold the judgment of Babylon. Here again, the question, "Who or what does Babylon represent?" or "When do these events occur?" is crucial for an understanding of Rev. 17 onwards.

6.1.3.1. Interpretation of Revelation 17-19 by John’s Jewish Christian audiences

The image of the great prostitute has its literary root in Jewish prophetic literature. As a

392 In a sense, ‘who’ is more proper in the question, because Babylon denotes primarily people; that is, humanity in rebellion against God (cf. Schmidt, 1994:236).
matter of fact, the metaphor functions in various ways in oracles against Nineveh (Na. 3:4), Tyre (Isa. 23) and even Jerusalem (Ezk. 16). Used against Jerusalem in Ezk. 16, the image of harlot provides the opportunity for accusations of unfaithfulness (see Friesen, 2001:205). If Babylon is Jerusalem, the visions in Rev. 17-19 depict the burning of that city by the Romans (AD 70) and the mixed reactions of the wicked and the righteous (cf. Gregg, 1997:399). The principal objections to identification with Rome would be that Rome did not fall suddenly, nor permanently. The metaphor of harlotry is exclusively used in the OT for a city or nation that has abandoned the covenant and turned toward false gods; the term is always used for faithless Israel. Babylon is the old Jerusalem, who has committed fornication with the kings of the earth (Rev. 17:2). The beast in Rev. 17:3 is the sea beast in Rev. 13:1, because the harlot is seated 'on many waters' and on the scarlet beast as well. Concerning Rev. 17:6-7, while it is true that Rome became a great persecutor of the Church, Jerusalem was the preeminent transgressor in this regard. The Roman persecution came about through the Jews’ instigation, as the book of Acts constantly says (cf. Chilton, 1990:421-431).

In Rev. 17:15-18 Jerusalem could be truly portrayed as seated on many waters (i.e. the nations) because of the great and pervasive influence the Jews had in Diaspora before the destruction of Jerusalem. Jerusalem had committed fornication with the heathen nations, but in AD 70 they turned against her and destroyed her, making her desolate. In his description of the Jewish War of AD 68-70 Josephus employs the term ἐρημώω (‘make a wasteland’ in Rev. 17:16) to lament the horror of destruction of the landscape of Jerusalem and the surrounding countryside by the Roman armies (The Jewish War, 6:6-7). ἐρημώω is widely used by classical and biblical authors to describe the razing and depopulation of conquered landscapes and cities. The verb ἐρημώω could also refer to the plundering of wealth or property, as in the lament of the merchants in Rev. 18:17 (ἠρημώθη). During the Jewish War, Rome’s deforestation of conquered lands was notorious. Josephus uses the adjective γυμνὸς (‘naked’) to describe Rome’s stripping of forests (cf. γυμνὴ in Rev. 17:16). Two items in the cargo list of Rev. 18:12-13 are forest products. Josephus laments the beautiful countryside around Jerusalem that was logged by the Romans to construct massive wooden siegeworks and embankments (The
Jewish War, 5:264;\(^{393}\) Aelius Aristides Orations 26:12; see Rossing, 1998:492-493). With regard to Rev. 17:18, if the city is Jerusalem, how can she be said to wield this kind of worldwide political power? The answer is that Revelation is not a book about politics; it is a book about the covenant (cf. Chilton, 438-443).

Rev. 18:2 implies that Jerusalem's apostasy has become so great that her judgment is permanent and irrevocable. The wealth of Jerusalem in Rev. 18:11-17 is attested to by Josephus in his The Jewish War, 6:5:3: Jerusalem trafficked in many goods from all over the world. In Rev. 18:21 a mighty angel dramatically hurls a stone into the water, signifying in part the scattering of the Jews among the Gentiles. The summary verse 24 explains once again that all this happened because the Husband, God, acted to avenge his murdered bride (Jordan, 1999:46).

The hymns in Rev. 19 celebrate the fall of the apostate Judaism, which is the demonstration of God's judgment and vindication (see Rev. 6:9-11). Rev. 19:6-8 implies an important aspect in the revelation history: Pentecost was the inception of a New Covenant. With the final divorce of the unfaithful wife in AD 70, the marriage of the Church to her Lord was firmly established. Rev. 19:11-21 depicts the victory (i.e. progress) of the gospel for the universal proclamation of the message of salvation regardless of the persecution by the Jews and Rome.

6.1.3.2. Interpretation of Revelation 17-19 by John's Gentile Christian audiences

With regard to the reference to Babylon the harlot, the intertextual influences on this image are many: (1) In Na. 3:4 the image of the prostitute emphasises the ability of the 'Assyrian Empire' to seduce and enslave whole nations. (2) Isa. 23 contains oracles against 'Tyre', one of which likened the city to a prostitute. The theme of seduction occurs in this text as well, but the purpose is not to enslave nations. (3) Ezk. 26-27 also opens with the accusation that 'Tyre' rejoiced over the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, seeing in the tragedy a chance to increase its market share of regional commerce.

\(^{393}\) "So the trees were now cut down immediately, and the suburbs left naked. But now while the timber was carrying to raise the banks, and the whole army was earnestly engaged in their works, the Jews were not, however, quite" (The Jewish War, 7:264).
commerce (Ezk. 26:2). Consequently, Ezk. 26-27 seems to provide economic aspects of John’s critique of Rome. And (4) Jer. 50-51 consists of a long series of oracles directed at the historical imperial city of ‘Babylon’ which is a prostitute offering a golden cup of wine to the inhabitants of earth. From Jer. 50-51 come the elements of the call to flee Babylon (Jer. 51:6; Rev. 18:2-4), the golden cup intoxicating the nations (Jer. 51:7; Rev. 17:2-3; 18:3), and the stone thrown into the waters (Jer. 51:63; Rev. 18:21; see Friesen, 2001:206). Instead of simply quoting the above intertexts, John refashions them for his own times. From the above intertexts, it can be assumed that for John’s Gentile Christian audiences Babylon the harlot is identified with the pagan Roman Empire. If it is the case, Rev. 17-19 describes the downfall of the Roman Empire (AD 476) and especially of the city of Rome, the harlot. In this regard, as Friesen (2001:208) puts it, John is primarily concerned to present the character of his opposition to empire. With the socio-political dimension, John’s main opposition is religious: Rome had claimed a status that belonged only to God. In its arrogance, the imperial city had enslaved the nations through military force and through the seduction of their rulers.

The objections to Jerusalem being Babylon would rest upon the fact that Jerusalem was not as much of a commercial centre as was Rome, nor did the fall of Jerusalem cause an economic crisis for the kings, merchants and shipmasters of the earth. Indeed, the backbone of Rome’s global omnipotence was its maritime trade (see Aelius Aristides Orations 26:13). For John’s Gentile audiences, the connection between the prostitute’s expensive attire of ‘purple and scarlet … gold, precious stones and pearls’ (Rev. 17:4) and the imported cargo items in the merchants’ lament (Rev. 18:12-16) suggests that Revelation’s critique of Babylon’s prostitution is not sexual but is directed metaphorically against Rome’s exploitative trade and economic dominion (cf. Rossing, 394

---

394 The tax on prostitutes instituted by Caligula in AD 40 provides exegetes with abundant evidence on prostitution in the Roman world, especially on its economic importance and the attitude towards it of the imperial administration. The primary motive for introducing and maintaining the tax was the enormous revenue it generated; this return moreover serves as indirect testimony to the wide extent and great profitability of prostitution in the Roman world. Generally, the aim was neither to safeguard morality nor even to encourage commerce through adjustments in the tax system, but simply to exact as much as possible for the state treasury. As long as the tax was collected, prostitution was to some extent legitimised officially. To be sure, John’s (Gentile) audiences became aware of this situation and might have understood ‘prostitute/harlot’ in Revelation in terms of the Roman tax policy for strengthening its immoral Empire (see McGinn, 1989:79, 99).
Some have thought that the words (harlot and fornication) in Rev. 17:1-2 were used only when Israel, God's covenant people, were guilty of defection and fell into idolatry, and therefore they could not be applied to pagan Rome. But these words in the OT are applied to other nations such as Babylon and Nineveh, and may here apply to pagan Rome. The beast in Rev. 17:3 is the same beast in Rev. 13, namely the empire of Rome. The woman is the city of Rome (cf. Clark, 1989:106-107). Rev. 17:16 describes the rebellion of the nations under the Roman Empire against Rome.

Concerning Rev. 18:8-10, Rome was frequently sacked and burned, captured again and again, and in her fall there was the suddenness of calamity, and the gradualness of decline. The enemy of God and the Church received her judgment. Rome as a persecuting power went down, as a judgment for her sins, for it was said in Rev. 18:24, "In her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all who have been killed on the earth" (Clark, 1989:114). In the opening of Rev. 19 the rejoicing of heaven over the judgment of the harlot city is sounding. For this reason, Rev. 19 stands in the closest connection with the chapters preceding it. This is sufficient to show that exegetes are still dealing with the series of events that occupied the Book from the thirteenth chapter onwards. Let it be kept clearly in mind that the theme has not changed thus far, that the events of the story are well knit or closely woven. Consequently, the Parousia is not dealt in Rev. 19. In Rev. 19:9 there is no marriage scene. Instead, the things particularly stressed are the apparel of the bride, and the blessedness of those called. The war in Rev. 19:11-21 is the triumph of the gospel. The world is to be conquered by the gospel. The rider on the white horse (i.e. Christ; Rev. 19:11) is marching still. In other words, the coming of Christ is an eschatological process in between his first coming and his Final Coming (see Clark, 1989:117-124).

Even though, most of partial preterists believe in the physical Parousia of Christ in the future, Chilton (1990:481) insists that Rev. 19:11ff. is not about the Second Coming, but rather Christ's defeat of the nations by his bare Word. Regardless of one's millennial presuppositions, it is possible to see the warfare in Rev. 19:11ff. as the victory of Christ through the Church - though the identification of this vision with the Parousia (Second Coming) is one of the chief reasons for seeing the Millennium of Rev. 20 as occurring after the Parousia of Christ (premillennialism) (see Gregg, 1997:450).
In short, for the Gentile Christian audiences, the symbolic name ‘Babylon’ (Rev. 17-18) links Rome with the ancient enemy of the Jewish people, the world empire that destroyed the Jewish temple and took the Jewish people into exile. Like its ancient namesake, the Rome of John’s day had also destroyed the Jewish temple and now persecuted Christians. Consequently, the overthrow of Roman rule marks the time for God to establish his own rule over the earth in Rev. 19. The visions of Rev. 17-19 aim to persuade John’s Gentile audiences that God — not the emperor — is the true divine ruler; that the Roman Empire is coming to an end; and that any future golden age will be inaugurated not by Augustus’ victory but by the Lamb’s victory (cf. Rossing, 1998:490; Burkett, 2002:513).

6.1.4. Revelation 20

Rev. 20 may be regarded as the beginning of a new section (contra Beale, 1999b:975). This chapter leads exegetes into scenes that are futuristic, here they have vistas that reach forward to the final judgment of the whole world (cf. 4 Ezra 9-10; 2 Bar. 4; Sib. Or. 5:420-427; Tobit 13-14). In particular, Rev. 20:11-15 is the place to put the Second Coming of Christ; when He sits on his throne and summons the whole human race to judgment (cf. Mt. 25:31). All the world falls into two classes; those who are written in the book of life and those who are not (Rev. 20:15) (Clark, 1989:125, 134). John’s two groups of audiences might have interpreted Rev. 20 by keeping in mind different objects of Christ’s judgment. For John’s Gentile Christian audiences, in deliberate contrast to the condemnation of Rome (Rev. 18-19), Rev. 20 depicts the vindication of the faithful (e.g. Rev. 20:9). For John’s Jewish Christian audiences, Rev. 20 is not only about God’s vindication of Jerusalem (as the Church) against the harlot (the apostate Jews), but also about the triumph of the Church. John, however, does not allow his audiences to imagine that the destruction of imperial Rome and the Jewish nation are the final battle with evil. The victory against Rome and Jerusalem brings a respite but not the eschaton itself. The battle with Jerusalem and Rome is separated from the final destruction of evil depicted in Rev. 20-22 (cf. Marshall, 2001:177).

396 Rev. 20:1-10 is not so much futuristic as preteristic in that the millennialism has been inaugurated during the works of Jesus (cf. Beale, 1999b:984).
What is the meaning of the ‘1,000 years’? According to the partial preterist approach, which is in accord with a mixture of postmillennialism and amillennialism, the binding of Satan (Rev. 20:2) represents the victory of Christ over the powers of darkness accomplished at the Cross. The 1,000 years is symbolic of a long, indeterminate period, corresponding to the age of the Church now in which the influence of the gospel will have universal sway.\textsuperscript{397} Satan will be loosed (Rev. 20:3) briefly to wreak havoc and to persecute the Church at the end of the present age. Alternatively, a final attempt on the part of a loosed Satan at the end of the age will get nowhere.

The first resurrection in Rev. 20:5 means a spiritual exaltation and not a bodily resurrection. That is, the word ‘resurrection’ is here used in a figurative sense to denote the spiritual exaltation. The figurative usage of resurrection is a very familiar one in the OT and the NT (Ezk. 37:12; Eph. 2:5-6; 5:14; Col. 3:1) (Clark, 1989:129-130). The fire coming from heaven and consuming the wicked is symbolic of Christ’s Second Coming (Rev. 20:10). A general resurrection and judgment of the evil and the good will occur at Christ’s final coming, followed by the creation of the New Heaven and New Earth (Rev. 20:11-13). Rev. 20:10-15 depicts the Last Judgment of Christ at the end of history.

6.1.5. Revelation 21-22

Will there be a literal New Heaven and New Earth? Who or what is the New Jerusalem? At the beginning of Rev. 21 exegetes arrive at the watershed that divides time and eternity. Because in Rev. 20 the general resurrection and judgment and the final destiny of the wicked are stressed, Rev. 21 follows as a continuation of the story (Clark, 1989:136). Literal interpretation advocates (futurists and especially dispensationalists) take the descriptions in Rev. 21-22 fairly literally, as applied to a brand new planet and universe, which will be created after the close of the Millennium (premillennialists) or else at the Second Coming (some amillennialists and some postmillennialists).

\textsuperscript{397} Rev. 20-22 describes events still present or future. ‘The thousand years’ symbolises either the entire age of the Church between Christ’s ascension and his return or a final phase of the Church age in which the Church will flourish and Christ’s kingdom advance through widespread conversion and cultural reformation (Johnson, 2001:358).
In contrast to literal interpreters, some non-literalist advocates spiritualise the whole vision, applying it to a nonmaterial state of existence in heaven. Others take the ‘New Heaven and the New Earth’ (Rev. 21:1;\textsuperscript{399} cf. 2 Bar. 4:1-7; Apo. Peter, 16:1-6; 1 Enoch 14:8-25; 2 Enoch 65:10; 4 Ezra 10:42-55; Apo. Abraham, 12:10) to represent what Paul called ‘a new creation’ (2 Co. 5:17) – that is, the condition of those who are in covenant with God and Christ through the New Covenant, the ‘old heaven and the old earth’ (meaning the old covenant) having passed away. As Chilton (1990:545) puts it, “The final reality of the eschatological New Creation is also the present reality of the definitive-progressive New Creation”. The Church has, after all, already tasted of the powers of the age to come (Heb. 6:5).

The New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:1) represents the Church itself, represented under the imagery of a new Holy of Holies (Rev. 21:22) – the tabernacle of God with men – in its present earthly existence.\textsuperscript{399} As Du Rand (1988:82-83) rightly observes, it should be kept in mind that the heavenly Jerusalem is presented in the Apocalypse neither as a static end nor as a geographical place. It is the personal bride, prepared for the sacred marriage to the Lamb. The bride is the corporate personality, the true theocratic community (cf. Poythress, 2000:189). The vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem, then may be viewed as the climax of the Apocalypse of John, an image to depict the integrated blessedness of the perfected community between God and his people. ‘It is done’ (Γέγονεν) in Rev. 21:6 means that God has wrought out his purpose in saving his people in terms of consummation. Beyond all the glory of golden streets and jasper walls and foundations garnished with precious stones (Rev. 21:18-21) is the glory of the moral and the spiritual character of the New Jerusalem as the glorified Church (Clark,\textsuperscript{332}

\textsuperscript{399} The eschatological end to the sea (Rev. 21:1) is the sequel to the dramatic pronouncement of judgment on sea trade in the Babylon vision in Rev. 17-19 (cf. Sib. Or. 5:447-449). Hence, John’s Gentile audiences may have interpreted Rev. 21:1 as more economic than mythological, hailing the end of Rome’s cargo ships and trade. Furthermore, it seems that Revelation’s New Jerusalem vision fulfills Greco-Roman utopian hopes about the ideal city, with its majestic processional street and abundant greenspace (cf. Rossing, 1998:495-496).

\textsuperscript{399} The Church being the New Temple makes it possible for her to participate in the heavenly worship in the Heavenly Temple as well as continue to function as the Temple after the descent as shown in Rev. 21-22. This is parallel to the sectarian idea in which the sectarians as a temple regard themselves as being in the Heavenly Temple. Their status as a temple qualifies themselves as worshippers of God with the angelic group in the Heavenly Temple (Rev. 22:9). The function of the community temple will not be suspended even after the rebuilding of the New Temple but continue in the New Temple (Lee, 2001:303).
The symbolic numbers in Rev. 21:17 manifest the majesty, vastness and perfection of the Church as the redeemed. Unlike the hyper preterist, the partial preterist firmly believes in the Parousia and the future New Heaven and New Earth as Rev. 22 depicts these.

The division of chapters 21-22 is rather unconvincing. There is no line of cleavage in the thought at Rev. 22:1. The division should have been made between Rev. 22:5 and Rev. 22:6, since Rev. 22:1-5 goes on to describe the Heavenly Jerusalem. Rev. 22:6-21 is the conclusion of the Book of Revelation, reverting to the historical standpoint at the beginning of the Apocalypse (contra Beale, 1999b:1122). ‘Behold! I am coming soon’ in Rev. 22:7 should not be applied to the Parousia, because Rev. 22 like Rev. 1 has its standpoint among the seven churches in Asia Minor. Hence, in Rev. 22:6 onward the same churches are presupposed as in Rev. 1. ‘Yes. I am coming soon. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus’ in Rev. 22:20 has no reference to the technical Second Coming of Christ (contra Poythress, 2000:198). Instead, ‘coming soon’ evidently refers to events in John’s immediate foreground, and concerns the churches which he addresses. The judgment upon the Jewish and Roman persecutors, and the vindication of the persecuted saints most naturally falls in line with the significance of ‘coming soon’, and with John’s response: ‘Amen. Come, Lord Jesus’ (cf. Clark, 1989:142-147). The verbal and thematic parallelism between Rev. 1 and Rev. 22:6-21 becomes evident as illustrated by the following chiastic structure:

A Rev. 1:1-2 The revelation (Ἀποκάλυψις) of Jesus Christ

B Rev. 1:3 Those who keep what is written in it

C Rev. 1:4-8 ἔρχεται

D Rev. 1:9-18 I fell (ἐπέσα) at his feet as though dead

E Rev. 1:19-20 Write the things that you have seen, those that are and those that are to take place (μελέτῃ γενέσθαι)

E' Rev. 22:6-7 Show what must soon take place (γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει)

Jordan’s (1999:53) opinion is the same: Rev. 22:6-21 is the final reminder. The visions are over. John is reminded to tell the seven churches that these events are shortly coming to pass. The seven churches will be tested and tried, but they can stand firm, knowing that Jesus will shortly vindicate them.

6.2. Concluding remarks

The Book of Revelation is a complex intertextuality, an interweaving of texts, codes, language, and images that exceeds the finitude and coherence of a whole, formal structure. Thus, it is a 'writerly text' (i.e. a text that cannot be read or decoded in terms of well-defined constraints, conventions and codes) and an 'open' text (i.e. open to the effects of past texts and to the contexts of present readers) that calls for the audience's participation in its creation (Linton, 1993:212). The seductive richness of the imagery and the complexity of the vision cycles lead scholars to construct equally rich and complex interpretations (Royalty, 1998:6). Two intertextual tensions (the first is between John and his audiences; the second is between John's Jewish audiences and his Gentile audiences) arise, not only because John does not communicate in steno symbols401 (contra tensive symbols), but also as a consequence of the two types of audiences that he has. These are the conflict between John's intertextuality and that of his audiences' on the one hand, and on the other hand, the different views held by the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians (cf. Boring, 1989:175).

It is important to note that there is abundant evidence in the Gospels (Lk. 23:2, 12; Jn. 11:47-48; 19:12, 15) of the cooperation of the Jews with Rome to persecute Jesus and his church. Similarly, because John's audiences were persecuted both by the Jews and the Romans (see Beagley, 1987:152), John intended to accuse both of them by employing his intentional provocative symbolism.

401 In the same vein as Beale who insists that the authorial intention and the continuity between the OT and Revelation are crucial elements for deciding John's use of the OT, Kaiser (1994:69) goes on to say that nowhere does Scripture support the view that the Bible has a multi-track concept of meanings. Yet, granted John's use of the tensive symbols in Revelation, it is not surprise that exegetes frequently confront multiple meanings in symbolic expressions. Thus, Kaiser's argument does not fit Revelation at least.
What then is the priority between God’s judgment on Jerusalem and that on Rome in the two lines of partial preterism? Function has become an important criterion in the description of the apocalyptic genre (Vorster, 1988:118). From the perspective of the speech act theory, it can be deduced that John’s Jewish and Gentile audiences have the same form of locution and the same type of illocution in Revelation 12-13. But the perlocutionary act (i.e. pragmatic function), by which John achieves certain intended effects in his audiences in addition to those achieved by the illocutionary act, is different in both the Jewish and Gentile audiences (see Botha, 1991:66).

With consistent partial preterism, John provides the Jewish Christians with a direct solution, but with transitional partial preterism, he provides a direct solution for the Gentile Christians. Therefore, both solutions function complementarily and not contradictorily.

It is reasonable to conclude that, on the one hand, the Jewish Christian audiences, who emigrated to Asia Minor in AD 66 and were converted by Paul’s Ephesian mission in AD 52, were persecuted, especially by the heretical Jews. Therefore, using the OT and NT knowledge they might have interpreted Rev. 4-11 and Rev. 14-22 in terms of God’s judgment on the infidelic Jews. The removal of the Jewish temple was absolutely necessary to relieve the stress on the first century Christians from persecution from the Jews. As Russell (1996:163) has contended, the annihilation of the Jewish nationality therefore removed the most formidable antagonist of the gospel and brought rest and relief to suffering Christians.

On the other hand, the Gentile Christian audiences, who were acquainted with the pagan

---

402 Thompson (1990:29-30) notes with regard to the Book of Revelation, a reader may become familiar with the language (and even recognise its illocutionary force) and still not be able to locate the exact occasion in which the seer’s speech acts entered the flow of other social action. It is also difficult to trace out the consequences of speech acts, but acts of speech do have consequences after they enter the flow of social action. In conclusion, the social dimensions of language may be located (1) in the language itself, which includes both what is said and its illocutionary point; (2) in the situation occasioning that language; and (3) in the consequences or effects of the speech activity on further social intercourse.

403 An illocutionary act is the act of producing an utterance with a certain illocutionary force, such as greeting, warning, ordering, requesting and so on. A locutionary act is the act of producing a coherent and acceptable grammatical utterance (see Botha, 1991:65).
sources and daily experienced the Roman persecution, were not severely persecuted by the apostatical Jews and interpreted Rev. 4-22 and Rev. 14-22 in the light of God's judgment on Rome (cf. Gager, 1975:136; Theissen, 1983:104). The God-fearers (i.e. the worshippers of God) were persecuted by the heretical Jews (Acts 18:7, 13), because they did not observe the law strictly. The degree of this persecution, however, is weaker than that of the Jewish Christians, because the predominant relationships between Jews and Gentiles were positive.
WORKS CONSULTED


http://www.cmfnow.com/cgi-bin [Date of access: 25 April 2000]


BARTHES, R. 1981. Theory of the text. (In Young, R., ed. Untying the text: a post-


BLOOMQUIST, L.G. 1999. Rhetorical argumentation and the culture of apocalyptic: a


shepherd discourse of John 10 and its context: studies by members of the
Johannine writings seminar. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 6-
17.)


CALLAHAN, A.D. 1999. Apocalypse as critique of political economy: some notes on

Press. p. 731-761.)

CARRINGTON, P. 1931. The meaning of the Revelation. London : SPCK.

and theory. (In Exum, J.C. & Clines, D.J.A., eds. The new literary criticism
and the Hebrew Bible. Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press. p. 55-78.)


CARTER, W. 2000a. Evoking Isaiah: Matthean soteriology and an intertextual reading


Press International.

CASEY, J. 1987. The exodus theme in the Book of Revelation against the background
T&T Clark. p.34-43.)


http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/documents/s4b/sem09.html [Date of access: 6
August 2002]


CHARLES, J.D. 1993. Literary strategy in the epistle of Jude. Scranton : University of
Scranton Press.


DU RAND, J.A. 1998. Paranetiese deparaboliserings van paroesie-gelykenisse by die


GLODO, M.J. 2000. The Bible in stereo: new opportunities for biblical interpretation in


HISLOP, A. 1959. The two Babylons or the papal worship: proved to be the worship of Nimrod and his wife. New Jersey: Loizeaux Brothers.


JOBES, K.H. 1993. Jerusalem, our mother: metalepsis and intertextuality in Galatians


JORDAN, J.B. 1997. The kings from the east. SRev, 0:12-16.


LANDWEHR, M. 2002. Introduction: literature and the visual arts; questions of


LOHSE, E. 1993. Synagogue of Satan and church of God: Jews and Christians in the


MOLTMANN, J. 1996. The coming of God: Christian eschatology. Minneapolis:


OLYAN, S.M. 1996. Honor, shame, and covenant relations in ancient Israel and its


Peabody : Hendrikson.


REDDISH, M.G. 1995. Martyr Christology in the Apocalypse. (In Porter, S.E. & Evans,


VANHOOZER, K.J. 1998. *Is there a meaning in this text?: the Bible, the reader, and the morality of literary knowledge*. Grand Rapids : Zondervan.


## Intertexts of Revelation 12-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revelation 12-13</th>
<th>Intertexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 12</td>
<td>Ge. 3:15-20; 4:1-16; Ezek. 25-32; Mt. 24:16-20 par.; <em>The Nunc Dimittis</em> in Lk. 2; Acts 12; 1 Co. 14:26; The combat myth; The Jewish War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 1a</td>
<td>Ge. 3:15; Jes. 7:14; 54:6; Mt. 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 1b</td>
<td>Ge. 1:14; 4-5; 16:11; 21:3; 25:1; 35; 37:9; Jos. 4:4-7; 1 Ki. 4:7; 11:30-32; Ezr. 8:35; Pss. 104:2; 8:4; 89:37, 38; Ss.6:10; Jer. 3:6-10; Ezk. 16:8b; Hos. 2:19-20; Mt. 24:29-30; Mk. 13:24-25; Lk. 21:15; 4 Ezra 9:38-10:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2a</td>
<td>Da. 8:10; 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2b</td>
<td>Isa. 7:10, 14; Rev. 6:10; 7:2, 10; 10:3; 14:15; 18:2, 18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2c</td>
<td>Ge. 3:16; Isa. 26:16-27; 54:1; 66:7-9; Jer. 4:31; Mic. 4:9-10; 5:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 3a</td>
<td>Ge. 3:1; Pss. 74:13-14; 89:10; Isa. 17:1; Hab. 3:8-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 3b</td>
<td>Ps. 74:13-14; 87:4; Isa. 27:1; 30:7; Jer. 51:34; Ezek. 29:3; 32:3ff.; Da. 7:7; 1 Enoch 60:7-10; 4 Ezra 6:49-52; 2 Bar. 29:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4a</td>
<td>Da. 8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4c</td>
<td>Ge. 3:15-16; Isa. 7:14; Mic. 5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4d</td>
<td>Ex. 1:22; Isa. 9:5; 1 Pe. 1:2, 18-19; 3:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 5a</td>
<td>Jer. 20:15; 1 Pe. 1:2, 9; The Acts of John 73, 87; The Acts of Peter 17; The Acts of Paul 9:19; The Acts of Thomas 27:3; The...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Acts of Philip 6:12, Ps. 2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Ezek. 1, 10; 1 Pe. 3:18, 22; Rev. 4:2; 4Q 385:4; 4Q 405 20-22; Apo. Peter, 6:1-2; 17:2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Ex. 2:15; 5:1; Dt. 8:2; 1 Ki. 19:4; Ps. 136:16; Isa. 40:3; 35:1; Hos. 2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Dt. 8:3; 1 Ch. 15:1; Ps. 105:40-41; Da. 3:25; 6:23; Rev. 7:16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ps. 37:36; Da. 2:35; Shepherd of Hermas 22-24; The Acts of Philip 11:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Ge. 2:25-3:1, 13; Ex. 7:9; Nu. 21:6-9; Dt. 8:15; Job 1:6; 26:12-13; Pr. 30:19; Isa. 27:1; Zec. 3:1; Mt. 1:25; 24:4-5; Lk. 10:17, 11:20; Ro. 16:20; Col. 2:15; 2 Th. 2:1-2, 5; Rev. 2:20; 13:14; 18:23; 19:20; 20:2-3, 7-10; Apo. Abraham 23; 2 Enoch 31:3-6; Life of Adam and Eve 12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Ge. 3:13; Life of Adam and Eve 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>1 Ch. 29:11, 12; Pss. 37:39; 62:8; 96:10-13; Jer. 3:23; Lk. 2:29; Php. 2:7-11; 1 Pe. 1:6; Rev. 4:11; 5:12; 7:12; 11:15, 17; 15:8; 19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Ex. 22:9-14; Lev. 6:27; 7:14; 19:13; Ps. 23; Ezek. 34:23-24; Jn. 1:29, 36; 10:1-11; 21; Eph. 6:16; 1 Jn. 1:7; Rev. 5:6, 9, 12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12a</td>
<td>Acts 13:46; Ro. 1:16-17; 1 Jn. 2:13, 14; 4:4; 5:4; Rev. 1:2; 19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12c</td>
<td>Rev. 8:13; 18:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12c</td>
<td>Isa. 13:6; Ezek. 30:3; Joel 1:15; Rev. 12:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 13a</td>
<td>Rev. 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 13c</td>
<td>Jer. 20:15; Rev. 12:1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 14</td>
<td>Ex. 19:4; Dt. 32:10-12; Da. 7:25; 12:7; Acts 12:3, 7, 19; 2 Esdr. 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>Ex. 1:22; 14:21; 1 Jn. 4:1-6; Rev. 2:2, 6, 14-15, 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>Ge. 4:1-16; Ex. 15:12; Nu. 16:32; Dt. 11:6; Pss. 32:6; 69:1-2; 124:2-5; Na. 1:8; Act 12:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 17</td>
<td>Ge. 3:15; 1 Enoch 99:10; 2 Clement 4:5; T. Joseph 4:5; 11:1; 18:1; 19:6; T. Judah 23:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev. 13**

<p>| v. 1 | Ezk. 25-32; Da. 7; Mt. 24:15-26 par.; 2 Th. 2 |
| v. 2 | Pss. 74:12-17; 87:4; Isa. 27:1; 30:7; 51:9; Jer. 51:34; Ezk. 29:3-5; Da. 7:1-8; 1 Enoch 66:7-10; 4 Ezra 6:49-52; 2 Bar. 29:4 |
| v. 3 | Rev. 2:13; 16:10 |
| v. 4 | Da. 3:2-3 |
| v. 4 | Ex. 15:11; Pss. 35:10; 113:5; Job 41:33-34 |
| v. 5 | Da. 3:4; 7:25; 8:10; 12:7; Mt. 24:19-20 |
| v. 6 | Rev. 21:3 |
| v. 7 | Da. 3:4, 7; Rev. 5:9, 13; 7:9; 10:11; 11:19; 386 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v.</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8  | 12:12; 14:6; 17:15  
Ex. 12:6; Acts 12:22-23; Rev. 7:11; 11:16;  
13:4, 12, 15; 14:7; 19:10; 21:27; 22:8f.;  
Apo. Peter 17:7 |
| 9  | Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22; Gospel of Thomas 8:21, 24, 63, 65, 96; Acts of Thomas 82; Gospel of Mary 7:9; 8:10-11; Pistis Sophia 1:17, 18, 33, 42, 43 |
| 10 | Job 40:15-24; Jer. 15:2; 43:11; Mt. 7:15; 24:24; Rev. 14:12; 1 Enoch 60:7-25 |
| 11 | Acts 1:1-11; Apo. Peter 2:7; 2 Bar. 10:18;  
1QpHab. 9:2-7; 12:3-5; 4QFlor. 1:6;  
11QTem.29:8-10; 30:1-4 |
| 12a| Acts 2:22-36 |
| 12d| Acts 2:14-21; 5:12; 15:4, 12 |
| 13 | Acts 18:12-13 |
| 14 | Da. 3:2-3, 7 |
| 15 | Ezk. 9:6; Da. 3:7 |
| 16 | Ex. 13:9, 16; Ezk. 9:6 |
| 17 | Ex. 13:9, 16 |
| 18 | Jas. 1:5; 3:15, 17 |