

THE ORIGINAL SEQUENCE OF APOCALYPSE 20-22

PAUL GAECHTER, S.J.

Innsbruck, Austria

IN MY second study on the Apocalypse¹ I intended to illustrate the technique of its writer; it has been composed and written by a disciple of St. John, whom we shall call here, with Charles, the editor. True, he worked by the authority of the apostle, but depended entirely on his memory when he did his best to reproduce what he had heard John telling his audience of the visions he had had. This present article deals with the sequence of the parts and verses in the last three chapters of the Apocalypse to try out the theory forwarded in the second article, and to see what their connection is with the rest of the book. If I am not greatly mistaken, by having recourse to the blundering memory of the editor we shall be able to explain not a few of the puzzles of those chapters.

Our route has largely been laid down by the penetrating commentary of R. H. Charles.² Our purpose does not require us to go into all the details of the text, or of Charles's critical comments on it. While many of them admit of exceptions, we shall follow him in his great and most important discovery of a twofold description of the heavenly Jerusalem. In general we shall have to inquire into the literary forms and arrangement of the text, but shall also take a few steps into the field of interpretation where it seems to be advisable to illustrate the sequence of sections which we shall advocate. On principle all arguments will be left out which are based on a pretended steady development of thought in the book, because, as my first article on the Apocalypse may have shown,³ there is no such unbroken line of argument. Similarly we shall not take into account parallel ideas found in the O.T. or non-biblical sources, because you can never trust St. John to endorse them even if he should borrow from their imagery.

¹ "The Role of Memory in the Making of the Apocalypse," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, IX (1948), 419-52.

² R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh, 1920, vols. I and II; here in particular II, pp. 144-226.

³ "Semitic Literary Forms in the Apocalypse and Their Import," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, VIII, (1947), 547-73.

Charles begins his study of Apocalypse 20:4–22:21 by examining its literary nature: “These chapters have hitherto been a constant source of insurmountable difficulty to the exegete. They are full of confusion and contradiction, if the text is honestly dealt with.”⁴ His suppositions are on the one hand the structural unity of the previous sections, on the other the “general linguistic unity”⁵ of chapters 20–22 which is evidence that practically all their parts derive from St. John. This second point no doubt holds good. But as to the former it should be noted that Charles had formed his opinion on the unity of 1:1–20:4 before he had realized the full share which the editor must have had in composing and writing the book.⁶ If he had studied that question again in the light which he afterwards derived from chapters 20–22, he would have discovered more of it also in the previous parts and consequently insisted less on the pretended unity of thought. On our part, therefore, we shall abstain from arguing from former sections of the Apocalypse unless the section or verse we refer to can be proved to be in literary connection with the text we are dealing with. Our last principle will be the reasonableness which is taken for granted in every author modern or ancient, until the contrary is proved, but which in St. John is not. A minor point of disagreement with Charles is this, that in my opinion the climax of confusion does not begin with 20:4, but has already begun in chapter 19, but we shall not enter upon this point.

THE SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 20

Chapter 20 opens with the imprisonment of Satan (20:1–3). He is chained and thrown into the “abyssos,” where he will be held for a

⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 144. Even E.-B. Allo, O. P., who is always inclined to turn literary blunders of the Apocalypse into surprising literary devices is forced to admit imperfections in Ap. 21–22. He says, commenting on 21:24–27: “Il [St. John] traite ses symboles avec quelque laisser-aller,” and notices “l'apparente contradiction.” Again he writes on the epilogue 22:10–21: “L'épilogue présentera le même désordre apparent” [like 1:1–8], but omits to point out the exact extent of this disorder, and how it is to be explained. For we cannot possibly accept as such an explanation what he says about the epilogue: “. . . l'écrivain, arrivé au bout de sa tâche, l'âme plongée dans la sérénité de la Jérusalem céleste, sentira pourtant fléchir en lui l'esprit humain, celui qui ordonne et combine, sous le fardeau surhumain des terreurs et des joies qui l'ont traversé pour se répandre sur l'Eglise.” (*Saint Jean. L'Apocalypse*, Paris, 1921, p. 324 and p. 2.) This is meaningless verbiage.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 147.

⁶ “In the earlier chapters I adopted tentatively and occasionally the hypothesis of an editor.” *Op. cit.*, I, p. L.

thousand years; then, after his last battle, eternal punishment awaits him in "the lake of fire and brimstone." He is chained in order that "he should no more deceive the nations till the thousand years should be fulfilled." At first glance this seems to mean that Satan, for this period, ceases entirely to be a source of danger to the faithful, or to man in general. But there is always the possibility of taking such a sweeping enunciation in a restricted sense as, e.g., that he should no more directly, or by himself, deceive people.

Why Satan's imprisonment should follow after the undoing of the beast and its false prophet, is a problem. Charles and most of the modern authors take the sequence as it stands and are of the opinion that according to the seer a spell of absolute peace of a thousand years is to follow after what is told in chapter 19. Allo, following another school of thought, thinks that this spell of a thousand years is to be taken as simultaneous with the empire of Antichrist and the Roman empire (ch. 13), and that it began in the days of the apostles.⁷ As he argues from various passages in former chapters and on the supposition of a throughgoing unity of thought, to which I take exception, I shall try to make his point clear by a different reasoning, for his hypothesis seems to be correct.

Satan's last onslaught (20:7-10) logically must take place as long as there are to be rallied armies of men hostile to God, "Gog and Magog. . . the number of whom is as the sand of the sea" (20:8). Yet all of them had already perished when the beast and the false prophet led them to war against "the King of Kings and Lord of the Lords" (19:16-21). Seeing that the undoing of the beast and its pseudo-prophet is told along the same lines as that of Satan himself, we should take the two scenes (19:19-21 and 20:7-10) as two literary tableaux which exhibit the same object under different aspects. By so doing we have the advantage of Satan being definitely conquered together with his agents which looks more natural than if these are put out of the way long before Satan himself. Consequently we should not look upon 20:7-10 as the last of a series of events that developed in the way in which they are lined up in the book. This point gained, we are right in putting Satan's chaining not only a thousand years before his unchaining and destruction, but also the same period of time before the

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 299-300.

undoing of his agents; in other words, 20:1-3, in reality, also precedes 19:19-21. The succession of events from 19:19 to 20:10 is a purely literary one, and therefore not to be understood as representing the actual development of historical events.

Satan's chaining (20:1-3), then, takes us back into history which from the point of time of the beast's and Satan's undoing is remote. Why the author chose this arrangement is not difficult to guess. Satan is the arch-enemy of God and man. The seer not only put him first and last in the great chiasmic symmetry of chapters 12-20, but also enhanced his position by combining him in some way with the "woman," the representative of God's church.⁸ His end therefore is more important than the end of any other adversary of God, and for that reason is described by two scenes instead of one only. The first is his chaining; it is a prelude and symbol of his final downfall, which is told in the second scene. There is nothing unnatural, or unusual, in John's procedure, if he for that purpose puts an event of the past (20:1-3) between the two eschatological scenes of the destruction of the beast (19:17-21) and of Satan (20:7-10).

Where in the actual development of history should we put Satan's chaining? Since it is part of the great chiasmic symmetry (cc. 12-20), we do not counter, I think, St. John's thoughts if we combine what we have said about the relation between Satan's chaining (20:1-3) and the beast's undoing (19:17-21) with chapter 12, one of the main figures of which is Satan. Here he is hurled down from heaven upon the earth:

Woe to you, earth and sea,
for the devil is gone down to you with great fury,
knowing that he has but a short time. (12:12)

Being unable to do to the children of the "woman" the evils he craves to inflict upon them (v. 17) he confers his power to the beast which, seemingly by his machination, arises out of the "sea" (13:1-2). Here we see Satan handicapped, but are left to guess what was the reason for it. Only in 20:1-3 do we learn about his being chained, and know that this must have happened "a thousand years" before the end of the beast. Apocalypse 12:17 and 13:1-2 strongly suggest that this chaining took place immediately before the beast began to rave against the

⁸ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, VIII (1947), 556.

saints, and was, in fact, the very reason why Satan contrived to send the beast and its false prophet as his agents into the world.

We gather some more information about this point from the Gospel of St. John. True, there is no literary connection between it and the Apocalypse, but it would be surprising if John, the author of both, had not had a definite idea of the history of Satan from which he drew repeatedly in both works. The identity of the author and the temporal nearness of their composition warrant the inner cohesion of the various remarks on Satan that the two books contain. When Satan was upon the earth among men, he tried to get a hold on Jesus at the beginning of His public ministry, but had to abandon his scheme "until a favorable time" (Lk 4:13). Towards the end of His days Jesus remarked to His disciples: "I shall have no other chance to talk to you: for the prince of the world will come (to fight me): but he will have no hold over me (even if he brings me to death)" (J 14:30). On the contrary, this struggle will end in Satan's defeat and Christ's victory: "Have confidence: I am the conqueror of the world" (J 16:33), which implied that He was to defeat its prince, Satan. He had stated it explicitly, with a direct bearing on our point in question: "Now (the time is come that) the prince of this world is to be cast out" (J 12:31). Jesus does not mention where he is to be cast out from, nor where he is to be cast into. Both questions are answered in Apocalypse 20:1-3: Satan, in virtue of Christ's triumph on the cross, was cast out from among men, that is, from this visible world, and hurled into the abyss to be kept a prisoner for a thousand years.

Apocalypse 12 does not visualize this event except by implication. The text there goes on to speak of Satan's activity against the "woman" and her offspring even after the Savior had been taken up into heaven. This way of representing things was not wrong, but incomplete, for whatever the beast and its pseudo-prophet were going to do was done in the power and on behalf of Satan; they merely acted as his agents, and he acted through them.

Apart from this slight divergence in Apocalypse 12, all the other points where Satan is mentioned in the fourth gospel and in the Apocalypse are in complete harmony among themselves and can only be understood as derived from one and the same general picture. Satan's chaining is part of it. It is the immediate result of Christ's victory,

practically coinciding with it, and as such is the beginning of Satan's final undoing and guarantees its completion. It was perfectly logical to refer to it in Apocalypse 20:1-3 as the beginning of the end of Satan, even if by this reference the dramatic development marked by the triple judgment on Babylon (ch. 18), on the beast and its prophet (ch. 19) and on Satan (20:7-10) is retarded. Such a procedure is common even in historical books.

The chaining of Satan is followed by the picture of the saints who "lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" (20:4-6). They sit upon thrones of judgment.⁹ Whenever similar thrones are mentioned in the visions they are always in heaven rather than anywhere else;¹⁰ so also judgment always proceeds from the throne of God in heaven. Not a word of this section serves to put that scene upon the earth; on the contrary, that the seer sees "the souls of those who had been beheaded . . . and of those who had not worshipped the beast nor its image" admits of no other place than the upper world, or heaven, as do the other features just mentioned. This should be borne in mind when we come to speak of the second resurrection.

This description of the millennial kingdom, as we shall call 20:4-6 for short, is followed by the unchaining of Satan, his rallying of Gog and Magog for the final assault on the holy city, and his definite undoing (20:7-10). We are, however, ill prepared to find here mentioned "the encampment of the saints and the holy city" (v. 9), which is a point of some importance for determining the sequence of the different parts in chapters 20-22 as John had originally intended.

The next narrative (20:11-15) follows in logical order. After Satan has joined his agents in "the lake of fire and brimstone" (v. 10) and all human enemies of God have been wiped out in battle, nothing remains to make God's victory complete but to deliver them also to "the lake of fire" (v. 15). This takes place in the last judgment, after "earth and heaven have vanished and are found no more" (v. 11). This judgment is as general as that in Our Lord's description (Mt 25:31-46), as is borne out by the sentences: "I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne," and "The books were opened:

⁹ On the construction of these grammatically difficult verses see Charles, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 182-3.

¹⁰ Ap. 3:21; 4:4; 11:16; 12:5.

and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged from the entries in the books according to their works."¹¹ These general features are not undone by the fact that only the negative side of the judgment, the condemnation of the wicked, is described. The setting is that of the last and general judgment and does not allow of excepting from it "those who had part in the first resurrection."¹²

"The first resurrection" (20:5) implies that those who had gone through it, should also undergo a second, as also its counterpart, the first death, is implied in "the second death" (v. 15), both being the lot of the wicked. The earliest Christian faith only knows of one resurrection of the body, which will take place at the general appeal for the last judgment. In keeping herewith the description of the millennial kingdom does not contain any term that would force us to take it also as a bodily resurrection; on the contrary it concerns the "souls" only and belongs entirely to heaven, as we have noticed above. The first resurrection, therefore, is a purely spiritual one, not in the sense rightly rejected by Charles,¹³ but in that it consists in passing over from this life on earth to a life with Christ, which means that these souls are "more truly alive than when they were on earth."¹⁴

Because the last judgment in 20:11-15 is visualized as the last act of God's vengeance, the good are not mentioned explicitly, but only the condemnation of the wicked. They, together with the personified "Death" and "Hades," are cast into the lake of fire: "This is the second death." Now all the enemies of God, Satan, the beast with his pseudo-prophet, death, the nether world and all the wicked men have met their ultimate and everlasting fate after which there is no other for them. Even heaven and earth exist no longer.

THE MILLENNIAL JERUSALEM

The first verses of the following chapter, 21:1-4c make perfect sense after the last judgment (20:11-15). They describe an altogether new state of things: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: the former heaven and the former earth were passed away, nor is there any more sea. And I saw (how) the holy city of Jerusalem came down new out of heaven from God." After the old order had come to an end, there was

¹¹ On the troublesome v. 13 see Charles, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 194-98.

¹² *Op. cit.*, II, p. 193.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 184-85.

¹⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 184.

now room for a new, heavenly order, a state of perfect union of man with God, and of eternal bliss. This new state is to last forever.

Also the subsequent verses (21:4d-7) have a bearing on this new order, but are better dealt with in connection with some other passages of similar structure after we have seen the next section of the text. I should only like to point out here with Charles that 21:8 is signally out of place. How can the author, after 20:11-21:4, write: "But as for the cowardly, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars—their lot is in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death"? Have they not already vanished into the second death, and has not the old world given way to a new and holy one? At any rate, this verse prepares us for what is to be said of the following section.

With 21:9-22:2, one of the major problems of Apocalypse 20-22 turns up. This passage contains another and fuller description of the heavenly Jerusalem which does not tally with the one in 21:1-4c. It is introduced in a manner as if 21:1-4c had not been written where we read it. An angel addresses the seer: "Come, I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb." After the foregoing part St. John might have answered that he had just seen her. And so throughout the description of the heavenly city in 21:9 ff. we notice features which are irreconcilable with the heavenly Jerusalem of the verses 21:1-4.¹⁶ As we go along we shall in the main follow the detailed analysis of Charles¹⁶ without endorsing all he says, and omitting points of minor importance for the present article.

I should not, as Charles does,¹⁷ argue that the scenery described in v. 9 is proof that the city of 21:9 ff. must be considered as coexisting

¹⁶ Allo does not acknowledge a double description of the heavenly Jerusalem. According to him the same name given in both places, 21:2 and 21:10 ("the holy city Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God") proves their full identity. "Jean aurait bien dû, dans ses notes, distinguer par quelque désignation spéciale ces deux Jérusalem futures, et indiquer. . . que la première des deux devait être enlevée de terre, ou détruite, avant le Jugement général." (*Saint Jean. L'Apocalypse*, Paris, 1921, p. 315.) He fails to see that there are contradictory features in the two descriptions, that here and elsewhere in the chapters 20-22 the text is in great disorder, and that there is ample proof that St. John had not left written notes, but put forward his visions by word of mouth only.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 145-153.

¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*, p. 151.

with our present world. In v. 9 the seer stands "on a mountain great and high." But what he was shown was a picture of the future, or might be, so that this setting by itself does not prove anything. That the heavenly Jerusalem here described does indeed coexist with our earth results from other observations.

One of its most striking features is the enormous wall with the twelve gates which surround the city, and on which the seer dwells at great length (vv. 12-21). The city as formerly exhibited has no such walls, and it would be surprising if it had, seeing that all possible enemies have disappeared from the scene for good. This one feature strongly suggests that the city of 21:9 ff. is still to be guarded against inroads of enemies and consequently is coexisting with wicked men on earth.

There is no sanctuary in it, but God himself is its temple (v. 22). This is a symbolic expression which may have several different meanings and might suit either of the two descriptions of the heavenly Jerusalem. Then the text says: "The city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it: for the glory of God illuminates it, and its lamp is the Lamb" (21:23). With sun and moon ruled out, and God being its permanent illumination, there can be no night any more for the city. This is exactly what we read soon afterwards in the actual text: "Night shall be no more, and they shall have no need of light of lamp and of light of sun, for the Lord God shall illuminate them, and they shall reign for ever and ever" (22:5). This verse evidently belongs to the description of the heavenly city of 21:1-4c, as also do the two preceding verses 22:2-3: "There shall be no curses any more. And the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and His servants shall serve Him, and they shall see His face, and His name shall be upon their foreheads." We should, therefore, join 21:1-4c with 22:3-5.¹⁸ Since the present earth and heaven are gone, there is neither sun nor moon; the new order is all supernatural where the light of God replaces all created lights. All this is in accord with the eternal Jerusalem, but would not tally with a Jerusalem that has to be defended by walls against human enemies. I should, therefore, submit that 21:23 is a doublet to 22:5

¹⁸ Charles (*op. cit.*, II, p. 153) points out that 22:3 forms the fourth line of the stanza the first three lines of which are preserved in 21:4a-c. Besides, only in 21:1, 4, and 22:3, 5, and nowhere else in the Apocalypse do we find the phrase *ὅτι ἔσται ἐν*, which is proof that those verses form a unit.

called forth by force of association of ideas and put in the wrong place, one of the many examples of this kind in the Apocalypse.¹⁹ However, the original form of v. 23 must have contained a word about light, because v. 24 refers to it. V. 23, therefore, not only is in the wrong place, but takes the place of some words lost.

What follows after v. 23, again suits the heavenly Jerusalem existing on earth, and would be contradictory to the state of the eternal Jerusalem:

24. And the nations shall walk by its light,
and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory into it:
25. And its gates shall not be shut day or night²⁰
26. and they shall bring the splendor and the wealth of the nations into it.
27. And there shall not enter into it anything profane,
or one who practices abomination and falsehood:
none but those who are recorded in the book of life of the Lamb.

This portion is not as it was meant to be from the beginning, the chief difficulty being v. 25. But the main thoughts are unmistakably clear. This city is contemporary with nations and kings outside. Its gates are open for them day and night. But whoever wishes to enter, must abandon evil deeds. Those who do them also coexist with this city, but are outside of it. Certainly, this city is not the eternal Jerusalem described in 21:1-4c and 22:3-5.

Its description then continues into chapter 22:1-2. There is "a river of water of life" and "the trees of life."²¹ These metaphors are capable of different applications: the decision on their meaning in their actual place lies with the second half of v. 2:

¹⁹ THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, IX (1948), 432-36.

²⁰ I adopt the correction proposed by Charles (*op. cit.*, II, p. 173). The closing of the gates is done at nightfall; if it is mentioned as not done, the text could not reasonably be this: "The gates are not closed by day," because this is self-evident. The sentence requires a complement: The gates are not closed either by day or by night; only in this standing phrase is the mention of day tolerable. The clause, "For there shall be no night," is, as Charles says with good reason, a doublet to 22:5a where it is in place, whereas in 21:25 this is not the case. Its repetition here is a consequence of the disturbance in v. 23 and intended to forestall a contradiction in describing the city. These wrong insertions show that the editor had no clear notion of the two heavenly cities, or rather their descriptions which John must have received in his visions.

²¹ Literally: "the tree of life," but "tree" is here used in a collective sense. See Zahn, *Allo*, Charles *ad loc.*

They bring forth twelve (manner of) fruits,
 each one yielding its fruit every month,
 and the leaves of the trees are for the healing of the nations.

Evidently the seer has in mind a city that exists along with nations which are sick at heart and stand in need of healing.²² These verses explain why they will come with great joy to that city, as we see from 21:24-27. Charles is certainly right when he ascribes 22:1-2 to the description of 21:9 ff. But it does not extend beyond 22:2, because with v. 3, "No curse shall exist any more," the contradictions to 21:9-22:2 begin; during the existence of that Jerusalem there are people who because of their sinfulness are not allowed to enter the city until they have changed their mind; until then there are "curses."²³

From these observations we infer with Charles that there are two different descriptions of a heavenly Jerusalem, of one that coexists with the present world (21:9-22:2), and of one which is eternal (21:1-4c; 22:3-5). The former cannot last beyond the annihilation of this heaven and earth; it is "renewed or replaced by another,"²⁴ or, better, transformed into another state. For in both descriptions the city is called "the holy city Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God" (21:2, 10), which speaks for their identity. Seeing that the one which is described as everlasting is alone called "new" (21:2), and taking into account that the purpose of the city exhibited in 21:9-22:2 ceases to exist after the last judgment, we are right in regarding the eternal city as the same as the temporal, but in a transformed state.

This being so it is clear that the two descriptions follow one another

²² W. Bousset nicely characterizes the city of 21:9-22:2: In these verses "ist der Standpunkt des Jenseits vollkommen verlassen [which the seer had taken in 21:1-4c]. Da wohnen noch Völker auf der Erde, die nach Jerusalem wallfahrten. Da gibt es noch Unreines und Gemeines, das von seinen Toren ausgeschlossen bleibt. Da müssen die Blätter des Lebensbaumes noch zur Heilung der Heiden dienen." (*Die Offenbarung Johannis. Krit.-exeg. Kommentar über das N. T.*, begr. v. H. A. W. Meyer, 16. Abtg., 6. Aufl., Göttingen, 1906, p. 454.)

²³ I take the liberty of referring to the description of an inner-Asiatic town, which is found in Sven Hedin, *Zu Land nach Indien, durch Persien, Seistan, Belutschistan*, 1910, II, p. 49: "Auf dem Meidan [the central square of the town of Tebbes in Kuhistan] mündet eine unendlich lange, schnurgerade Strasse. An ihren beiden Seiten fließen Kanäle, die mehreren Reihen grüner Maulbeer- und Orangenbäume und Trauerweiden, die aus schützenden Lehmsockeln herauswachsen, die nötige Feuchtigkeit spenden." The analogy to the city described in 22:1-2 is striking.

²⁴ Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 157.

in the wrong order. First should come the one which coexists with the nations on this earth, then should follow that which is eternal and beyond the reach of any enemy. Consequently the order originally intended is the following: the temporal Jerusalem of 21:9–22:2, then the eternal of 21:1–4c with 22:3–5.

Implicitly we have touched on a further problem. Where does the temporal Jerusalem come in as regards the different parts of chapter 20? While it lasts, there must be people who may enter it, and such as may not. This is impossible after Satan's unchaining and last battle, wherefore the latest term to assign to the temporal city from heaven is the place before 20:7–10. If we change the sequence thus, we arrive at a very gratifying result: the description of the heavenly Jerusalem of 21:9–22:2 is exactly what is needed to make the reference to "the encampment of the saints and the beloved city" of 20:9 intelligible, a nice confirmation that our argumentation has gone along the right line.

But here two other problems turn up. What relation is there between the temporal Jerusalem and the millennial kingdom described in 20:4–6? and what is its relation to Satan's chaining in 20:1–3?

To begin with the latter, we have identified Satan's chaining and imprisonment with Christ's victory on the cross: it empowered Him to cast Satan by means of an angel into the abyss. The thousand years during which he will be detained last until his unchaining for the last battle, which practically coincides with his final undoing and Christ's advent for the last judgment (20:7–15). We cannot well proceed without briefly dealing with the meaning of the figure of "a thousand." The identification just mentioned apparently affords all the elements required for it. First, the thousand years are a definite figure, not a vague indication of time like "a long time," or "many years." For that reason I should not take it for "une durée quasi indéfinie,"²⁵ but for the opposite, a well-defined time or epoch. Second, seeing that God's angel carries out the chaining of Satan for a thousand years, it is plain that they are a time limit set by God Himself, which, of course, also applies to the thousand years of Christ's reigning with His saints. Third, neither the one thousand of 20:2–3 and 4–5, nor the figures of

²⁵ Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 284, *ad* 20:2.

three and a half, or 42 months, or 1260 days²⁶ are used as true numbers; they are rather pure symbols of ideas, as will be substantiated by their application to one and the same epoch or period. The idea represented and expressed by one thousand years is not difficult to discover. Both Satan's imprisonment and the knowledge that those believers who have died before the second coming of Christ have not to wait for it in order to enter into eternal happiness, but are reigning with Christ even before the general resurrection, are contributing towards the comfort of the faithful. Certainly, the epoch since Christ's victory and Satan's chaining has been, and always will be, full of trials for them and the Church; of this the Apocalypse leaves no doubt. But what would be the conditions if Satan in person were let loose and himself raving among men? It is comforting to know that by God's providence things are not so bad as they might be. Similarly it was consoling to know that those who had died "in Christ" had not perished nor entered a shadowy existence in the nether world, but were enjoying a new life in intimate union with the victorious Lord. It is common human yearning to have good things last as long as possible. For that reason St. John chose the big figure of one thousand to express the favorable aspects of the period which the thousand years cover.

A comparison with the three and a half years and their equivalents supports our explanation.²⁷ When God's servants, the two prophets, are slain and their bodies lying unburied in the public square for three and a half days, the faithful will be under the impression that God's enemies are completely victorious, which spells grief untold. But the figure of three and a half days indicates that their victory will be short-lived. That is consoling. The same interpretation applies to the term "a time, and times, and half a time," whereby Apocalypse 12:14 clumsily renders Daniel 7:25 and 12:7, and which is repeated under the figure of 1260 days in Apocalypse 12:6. The time indicated, on the one hand, is one of God's special protection over the "woman" which is consoling, and for that reason is expressed by the great number of days; on the other hand it is a time of continuous persecution from the devil which renders that period a time of dread and sufferings, and finds its

²⁶ Ap. 12:14; 11:2, and 13:5; 11:3 and 12:6. Cf. Allo, *op. cit.*, pp. 299-301.

²⁷ Cf. Allo, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-46.

expression in the halved seven, in the figure of three and a half times. It is well known that seven with the Hebrews is the standing symbol of what is perfect, good and divine, whereas its half is the contrary, the expression of what is imperfect, wicked and satanic. But by its smallness the three and a half also in this case conveys the idea that the period, by God's providence, will be comparatively short. Apocalypse 11:3 goes with 12:6. There remains the figure of 42 months = three and a half years, in Apocalypse 11:2 and 13:5. It is the time allotted by God to the gentiles to tread under foot the outer court of the temple, and to the beast to wage war against God and His saints. Apart from the broken seven which these passages have in common with those quoted above, the 42 months seem to indicate that God's enemies will not attain their end.²⁸

It is not surprising, then, that one and the same epoch should be simultaneously marked as three and a half years, and as a thousand years. All these passages cover the time from Satan's chaining to his undoing in the end of time. It is a period both of distress and of comfort, the figure of one thousand symbolizing the positive aspect.

As regards the holy city that comes down from heaven and coexists with man on earth there is no direct evidence of its complete coexistence with that period. Yet there is no other way than to take the duration of the heavenly city on earth as identical with the thousand years and the three and a half years; the chiastic symmetry of chapters 12-20 requires it. There is no free space of time left between Christ's victory over Satan and his chaining for a thousand years on the one hand, and Satan's unchaining and undoing and the last judgment on the other. After that man no longer exists so as to enter the heavenly city, while there are unbelievers outside, who might enter if they would; once they are in the lake of fire this chance is gone forever. Consequently the heavenly city must be found on earth during the epoch of Satan's being chained and imprisoned. During this epoch no point of time is thinkable at which the epoch would change its nature essentially by the city descending from heaven upon the earth. Therefore the heavenly city must have come down immediately after Christ had won His victory over Satan, when He founded His church, or, if an exact time is required, at the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Therefore both Satan's imprisonment and the existence of the heavenly city among men are strictly coexisting for their entire duration. And because this epoch is expressed by the figure of one thousand, we may call the temporal Jerusalem "the millennial Jerusalem" and by this term distinguish it from the eternal Jerusalem. So much for the second problem raised above.

We now turn to the first problem, which concerns the originally intended literary relation between the description of the millennial Jerusalem and of the eternal Jerusalem. Charles rightly puts the description of the millennial city before that of the eternal, but for a reason which is not convincing. According to him Christ, for His millennial reign, must have the millennial Jerusalem for His seat. It "had come down from heaven to be the abode of Christ and the glorified martyrs."²⁹ I have already pointed out that the scene of the millennial kingdom (20:4-6) is heaven rather than the earth: Christ in heaven and the souls living with Him do not stand in need of an earthly abode. In fact neither is there any reference in the description of the millennial kingdom to the millennial Jerusalem, nor in the description of the millennial Jerusalem (21:9-22:2) to the millennial kingdom; nothing is said about Christ and His saints as residing in, and judging from, the heavenly city on earth. Inasmuch as Jesus is the millennial king He is called "Christ" and described as, if not called, the Lord; inasmuch as He is present in the millennial Jerusalem, He is the "Lamb" and alluded to as the bridegroom and husband of the "woman" (21:9): He is a sanctuary and a light to the city (vv. 22-23). The difference of nomenclature seems to indicate a difference in functions exercised by Him: in the millennial kingdom He acts as the Lord, to the millennial Jerusalem He is related by a mystical union. These different aspects explain why Christ as the Lord is shown as residing in heaven, not on earth, whereas He abides with His bride mystically, nothing being said about His relation to her inasmuch as He is her Lord.

The reasons for putting the millennial Jerusalem before the eternal, 21:9-22:2 before 21:1-4c and 22:3-5, are these. First, there is room for

²⁹ Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 180. He bases his statements on parallels drawn from the Test. XII Patr., IV Esra and later works. The inference that St. John borrowed from them their conception is wholly unproved, even if he should have taken some of their imagery to express his ideas (*loc. cit.*, pp. 152-53).

inserting the millennial Jerusalem after Satan's chaining (20:2-3) and the millennial kingdom (20:4-6), because there is no formal or literary bond between the two portions of the text except the figure of one thousand which occurs in both, but which does not in itself make them coalesce into a literary unit or subsection within their context. Secondly, there is a positive reason. All three parts, the millennial imprisonment of Satan, the millennial kingdom of Christ and what we styled the millennial Jerusalem are portions of the same cycle of thoughts. From the literary point of view the millennial kingdom 20:4-6 is the last of them, for its closing verse (v. 6) not only serves as a clausula to 20:4-5, but after John's fashion ends a whole section. It is an address to the reader: "Happy and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection. Over these the second death has no power: but they shall be priests of God and of the Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years."³⁰ The verses which we shall recognize as the finishing elements of the description of the millennial Jerusalem, have not quite the same range as this verse. For that reason the millennial kingdom seems to have been destined to be the last portion of that whole section; the millennial Jerusalem, in all likelihood, was intended to come in between Satan's chaining and Christ's reign. Satan's chaining opens the way to the conversion of the nations which the millennial Jerusalem presupposes—"so that he might no longer deceive the nations until the thousand years should be completed" (20:3); rather, "the nations shall walk by its (the city's) light" (21:24). The millennial kingdom opens up a wider view which extends beyond the boundary of this earthly life: we see what happens to those who have died as Christ's followers. Therefore the text, if properly arranged as no doubt originally it was meant to be, forms a triplet:

20:1-3, the chaining of Satan "for a thousand years."

21:9-22:2, the millennial Jerusalem.

20:4-6, Christ and His saints reigning "for a thousand years."

The very position of the phrase "for a thousand years" affords a confirmation of this arrangement. The "thousand years" are mentioned only in the first and last parts, not in the central one. As the figure,

³⁰ Similarly Ap. 13:9-10 is the end of the description of the beast (13:1-8); 13:18 of that of the "other beast" or the pseudo-prophet (13:11-17); 19:9-10 is the literary ending of the destruction of the harlot (18:1-19:8); of 21:5-7 and 22:7 we shall speak later.

though by no means the main thing, is of considerable weight, it forms an *inclusio* after a well-known fashion of Hebrew literature. By that *inclusio* the three parts which are a unit of thought are also joined into a literary unit.

Incidentally, the originally intended arrangement confirms what in my article on the Semitic literary forms I have pointed out regarding the combination of Satan and the "woman."³¹ Satan is the first and the last element of the great chiasmic structure of chapters 12-21. In both places he is by contrast connected with the "woman," but this connection, while it is patent in chapter 12, is less clear at the end in the actual sequence of the portions of chapters 20 and 21. In the restored order, however, the "woman," the millennial Jerusalem, immediately follows after the report about the chaining of Satan, and this again in a perfect unity of contrast as in chapter 12. In chapter 12 the woman is protected against the persecution of Satan, in chapters 20-21 Satan's imprisonment turns to her advantage.

What follows after 20:4-6 is again a triplet of scenes:

20:7-10, Satan's release, last onslaught and final ruin.

20:11-15, the last judgment and the condemnation of the wicked.

21:1-4c; 22:3-5, the eternal Jerusalem.

VERSES 21:4d-8

Having accounted so far for all of chapter 20, and for 21:1-4c and 21:9-22:5, we now turn to the remaining verses of chapter 21, viz. 4d-8. The present text is as follows:

4d. ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον.

5. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ·
ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα.

5c. Καὶ λέγει· Γράψον,
ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι
πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ εἰσιν.

6. Καὶ εἶπέν μοι· Γέγοναν.
Ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ,
ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

³¹ THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, VIII (1947), pp. 556-57

- 6d. Ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς δωρεάν.
7. Ὁ νικῶν κληρονομήσει ταῦτα,
καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεός
καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι υἱός.
8. Τοῖς δὲ δειλοῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις καὶ ἐβδελυγμένοις κτλ.

First we shall have to put 21:4d after v. 5ab. Charles proposes the sequence 5a, 4d, 5b.³² He refers to Isaiah 43:18–19 and 2 Corinthians 5:17, where the elements of 5b and 4d already appear joined together in that sequence. But St. John never made himself the slave of his sources, so that from that sequence little is to be derived for reconstructing the original order in our passage. We satisfy all requirements of the text if we put 4d after 5ab and thus preserve the introductory ὅτι which Charles is forced to drop. That 21:4d should be separated from 4abc necessarily follows from the fact mentioned above that 4abc forms a perfect stanza with 22:3a.³³ By being combined with 21:5ab, v. 4d forms a tristich like the two tristichs in vv. 5c–6. The original sequence, then, seems to have been this:

- 5a. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ.
5b. Ἴδου καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα,
4c. ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον.

In discussing the problem where the whole block of 21:4d–8 belongs, we shall not begin by dealing with one verse after another, but must first bring to the fore a literary principle of a wider range which governs those verses, and which Charles unfortunately has completely overlooked. It will be of great service for other portions of the text also. Charles inserts 5a, 4d, 5b immediately after 20:11–15 (the last judgment) and before 21:1 ff. (the eternal Jerusalem), puts 21:5c after 22:5 by making it the first element of the epilogue, and considers v. 6a an interpolation.³⁴ There is, however, a peculiar feature in those verses which does not admit of separating them in that way.

At first sight 21:5–8 gives the impression of a jumble of disjointed

³² *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 201 f.

³³ Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 153.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 443, note 3.

verses, and so do the portions 19:9-10 and 22: 6 ff. But at closer inspection they have something else in common. In all three texts there is first a triple introductory formula: "and he said—and he says—and he says," or very similar, after which follows a remark made on behalf of the reader:

- 19:9. *καὶ λέγει μοι . . . καὶ λέγει μοι . . . 10. καὶ λέγει μοι . . .
 Ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας.*
 21:5. *καὶ εἶπεν . . . καὶ λέγει . . . βα. καὶ εἶπέν μοι . . .
 6. Ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω κτλ.*
 22:6. *καὶ εἶπέν μοι . . . 9. καὶ λέγει μοι . . . 10. καὶ λέγει μοι . . .
 11. Ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι κτλ.*

There are doublets in these passages: 19:9 and 21:5 have in common *γράψον* and *οἱ τοὶ λόγοι . . . ἀληθινοὶ εἰσιν*, 19:10 and 22:8-9 are largely identical, and in 19:10 and 22:10 the term *προφητεία* occurs. The third passage, 22:6-11, is considerably longer than the other two. Such differences, however, cannot obliterate the observation that all three texts have been molded after the same form. Moreover, this form is found at the end of the judgment on the beast and its pseudo-prophet (19:9-10), at the end of the description of the eternal Jerusalem as far as it is preserved in the text (22:6-11), and after the end of the description of the millennial Jerusalem, but separated from it by a piece which belongs to that of the eternal city (21:4d-8). It can not safely be contested that what the editor of the Apocalypse had learnt from St. John, in these chapters has turned into *disjecta membra*,³⁵ and it is extremely probable that he has erroneously repeated several phrases and sentences. But that at the time he should have created that fixed form is hard to believe seeing that his work throughout the book was that of preservation, and where this was impossible, of integration. That fixed form was rather one used by the seer, and preserved by his disciple. This remains true even if 22:8-9, which is within the section 22:6-11, is an erroneous duplication of 19:9-10. Even in this case it serves to show that the editor made use of a fixed Johannine form. It must have been a delicate section to handle, so choppy are its contents. That the introductory formulae lack their subject, that this subject seemingly is not the same for each triplet of "and he said,"

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

and that the words so introduced have little or nothing to do with one another, were ever so many causes of confusion. Much as such a form may be against our literary taste, it is in accord with the Semitic training of St. John, and may help us to determine the proper place of each verse.

Judging them by their contents, Charles assigns to the verses 4d-5b a place after the end of the first creation, and before the beginning of the new, after 20:15 and before 21:1, for where they are now, they "do not really belong to what follows nor yet to what precedes in the present text."³⁶ His reasoning, like that on most of the verses with which we have to deal on these and the next pages, might carry weight, if 21:4d-5 were part of a continuous narrative instead of belonging to a fixed literary form that holds them together.

Because of this form we should first look also at the other verses of 21:4d-8 before we try to determine the original place of vv. 4d-5b. V. 5c-e, says Charles, must be the words of an angel, which implies that there is here a "bathos," a sheer drop from the high level to which v. 5ab belongs, "an error in style of which our author is never guilty."³⁷ Wherefore he considers v. 5c as an intrusion. This reasoning is not above criticism. In 10:4, and consequently in 10:8 also, it is probably Christ Himself who forbids John to write what the thunders have said, and who tells him to take the book from the hand of the angel.³⁸ Also 22:6, which is a parallel to 21:5de, is the word of Christ.³⁹ Is it then necessary to attribute 5c-e to an angel, declare it a grave error in style, and remove 5c from its context? I think not. Nor is Charles consistent with himself, if in his translation he joins 5c-e with 6b-8, because thereby he makes it to be the word of God Himself.⁴⁰ So far, then, there is no reason for breaking up 21:4d-8.

In 21:6a Charles sees an interpolation: "The seer does not require such an assurance in confirmation of God's own words. Nothing can intervene between the declaration of God, 'Behold, I make all things new,' and the seer's immediate recognition of their fulfillment: 'And I saw a new heaven.'"⁴¹ This and similar reasons which Charles brings forward apply to v. 6a only in the supposition that it forms part of a continuous narrative which, as has been shown, is not the case. V. 6a

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 217.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 203-4.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 444.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, I, p. 262.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 443, note 3.

rather belongs to a string of detached words which are held together only by an artificial literary form. This form as a whole functions as a conclusion, and in it v. 6a is most impressive, and perfectly in place after the renewal of heaven and earth.

The following verses 21:6b-8, in Charles's opinion, are a declaration of God, as it were "the divine authentication of the Apocalypse as a whole." They are meant for the contemporaries of St. John, "for hope is still held out to the repentant, and the doom of the second death has not yet been pronounced against the finally impenitent."⁴² This last observation is correct, but from what we have said of the fixed concluding form it follows that all of v. 6 should go with vv. 4d-5 so that there is no possibility to begin a new portion with v. 6b. Belonging to that formula as its filling, vv. 4d-6 are a unit which is neatly set off against what precedes and what follows.

That does not mean that no other concluding verses must follow after 21:4d-6. In fact the verses 7 and 8 have both the character of ending verses, and refer to the eternal Jerusalem, whose description, as we shall say presently, is ended by vv. 4d-6. V. 7 is a rhythmic tristich. Its form and contents recall to our mind the $\delta \nu\kappa\omega\nu$ -formula which ends each of the seven letters in chapters 2-3. Consequently it too bears the mark of a concluding element. The word $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ confirms it, because it summarizes a whole section that has preceded. Which section it was, can likewise be gathered from $\delta \nu\kappa\omega\nu$, for it implies that those only who have died can obtain what v. 7 promises. The dead do not belong to the millennial Jerusalem, but either join Christ reigning a thousand years, or at any rate will finally be citizens of the eternal Jerusalem. It is to either of these two sections that we have to attach our verse. Seeing that the expression, "I will be his God, and he shall be my son" (v. 7bc) is but an application of the more general word in 21:3, "He shall dwell with them, and they shall be His people," the proper place of 21:7 is without any doubt after the description of the eternal Jerusalem, to which 21:3 belongs.

V. 8 is plain prose. It has much in common with 21:27. This verse ("There shall never enter it anything profane, or one who practices abomination and falsehood.") marks the end of a subsection of the description of the millennial Jerusalem, for the text then continues

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 212.

with a new formula: "He (the angel) also pointed out to me . . ." (22:1). There is therefore a high probability that 21:8 is also an ending clause.⁴³ In the present text it follows a word on those who will be faithful unto death, so that v. 8 makes a fitting contrast to v. 7, exactly as 21:27 is a contrast to vv. 24-26. The references to "the lake that burns with fire and sulphur" and to "the second death" make it a certainty that v. 8 is to be put after the description of the eternal Jerusalem which immediately follows after the undoing of Satan and the last judgment.

There remains only the question to be answered: Where is the original place of the verses 21:4d-6? In fact that portion is holding it in a sense. The vv. 21:1-4c belong to the eternal Jerusalem, and it is the end of its description to which vv. 4d-6 (with vv. 7 and 8) should be assigned. As it is, there is some disorder here, because, as we have mentioned, 22:3-5 is a genuine part of that description, and actually the continuation of 21:1-4c. This portion, for a reason which we shall mention in the last part of this article, drifted away. But for 22:3-5, the position of 21:4d-8 is the correct one. V. 5ab, "And He who was seated on the throne said: Behold, I make all things new," follows well after the last judgment which is introduced by the words: "Then I saw a great white throne, and the one who sat upon it" (20:11), and after 21:1, where John in his vision saw "a new heaven and a new earth, for the former heaven and the former earth are passed away." This vision, of course, was purely prophetic and of eschatological content. V. 4d simply repeats one part of v. 1, whereas 5b, "Behold, I 'make' all things new," is less obvious. The present tense may be understood as indicating the future, as sometimes happens in St. John's writing.⁴⁴ Or else it may be timeless. If the general trend of v. 5ab and v. 4d places them after 20:11-15 and 21:1-4c, the verb "I make" at least does not stand in the way.

The tristich v. 5c-e suits any conclusion of an important part, consequently also of the description of the eternal Jerusalem. V. 6, by "it is done," recalls the vision as such, that is to say, as the show of a future event, and simply underlines its certainty. The phrase does not

⁴³ Cf. Paul Gaechter, S.J., "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu," *ZkTh*, LVIII (1934), 194-95, on "Abschlussgedanken" (concluding themes).

⁴⁴ Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, I, p. CXXIII.

combine with "I make" of v. 5b, but since each element of 4d-7 is detached from the others, the whole being a string of loose words, the difference of tense is no obstacle to putting v. 6 after 4d-5. Its meaning fits in admirably after the greatest of prophetic visions, as is that of the eternal Jerusalem, the end and climax of all that the Apocalypse contains. V. 6d makes the reader first think of "the river of living water" which flows through the millennial Jerusalem (22:1), so that we should not hesitate to refer it to the end of the description of that city, if it were not for the standard closing form of which v. 6d is the end. Detached as it is from the foregoing verses as to its form and contents, being one of that string of loose verses, and seeing that it is an address to the reader as the ending formula requires, there is, I think, little objection against putting it also after the description of the eternal Jerusalem. We can hold this with all the more confidence, because v. 6d does not speak of the "river," but of the "fountain" of water of life, and because the description of the eternal Jerusalem, as it seems, has been preserved in fragments only.⁴⁵ More likely than not it had originally contained something about the water of life, as does the eschatological description of the blessed in Apocalypse 7:17.⁴⁶ At any rate v. 6d as an encouraging word put in for the reader nicely concludes the formal ending of the vision of the eternal city.

The sequence, then, which St. John had intended, but which his amanuensis had disarranged, seems to have been this: 21:1-4c with 22:3-5 (the description of the eternal Jerusalem), 21:5ab, 4d, 5c-e, 6, 7-8 (the clausulae).

VERSES 22:6-21

These verses are perhaps the most obscure part of the whole book as far as literary criticism is concerned. "Here more than anywhere else in chapters 20-22 have we the *dissecta membra* of the Poet-Seer"; "they have been transmitted in the utmost disorder, and no doubt defectively."⁴⁷ Charles's efforts at restoring the original, or originally intended, order resulted in the following arrangement: after "the declaration of God" comprising 21:6b-8 follows "the testimony of Jesus" with 22:6-7, 18a, 16, 13, 12, 10, (11), (18b-19), "and that of

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 153.

⁴⁶ For comparison see J. 4:10, 13-14; 7:38.

⁴⁷ Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 214.

John" in 22:8-9, 20-21.⁴⁸ It is a lucid division, but if one looks closely at the details of the text, it does not impose itself; various literary relations rather make it impossible. In the foregoing discussions we have already had to combine 21:6b-7 with 4d-5, and to place 21:8 with vv. 4d-7 after 22:5, thus disposing of what Charles attributes to the declaration of God.

We also noticed that 22:6-11 is molded on the pattern of 19:9-10 and 21:4d-6, except that it is considerably longer as if interspersed with other matter. If we go to its single elements we discover that it is an odd assembly of doublets, with little to recommend it at all as an originally designed part.

V. 6a-c is a doublet to 21:5c-e and may accordingly be written as a tristich:

Καὶ εἶπέν μοι—
Ὅδοι οἱ λόγοι
πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ

The form is obviously wanting, because without *γράψον* the regular rhythm of 21:5c-e is disturbed. In addition, whereas in 21:5 the speaker is indicated, it is not evident whose word 22:6a-c should be. For these reasons we should consider v. 6a-c as a doublet made by error. V. 6d, which is plain prose, is better dealt with in connection with v. 16a.

V. 7, except the introductory *καί*, in its first part is a doublet to 22:12, in its second part a macarismos like 22:14, both parts with no internal or literary link as far as can be discovered.

The vv. 8-10 are an obvious parallel to 19:9-10. *Τὰυτα* twice put in v. 8 has nothing in the preceding verses 6-7 to which it might refer, so that its position is doubtful. The chief reason that causes suspicion is its repetition of 19:9-10. There are events which do not happen twice, particularly if they are based upon the feeling of surprise or awe; what calls forth these subjective impressions once will not easily cause them a second time. This holds good also in visionary events. Even in his visions the seer would not likely throw himself twice at the feet of an angel thinking he was God or Christ, and receive the same answer. Any repetition, therefore, of this event and its narration seems to be forbidding, unless the same occasion was to be recounted a second time which in 22:8-10 is not the case. It bears all the marks of a secondary, unwarranted duplication of the original scene in 19:9-10.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

On v. 11 Charles justly says: "These words can refer only to the contemporaries of the seer."⁴⁹ In this capacity it is a fit ending of the literary closing form with its triple *καὶ εἶπέν μοι—καὶ λέγει μοι—καὶ λέγει μοί* and the general remark at the end addressed to the reader. But it is so little connected with the preceding verses, apart from that standing form, that it might have been put at the end of any section.

How are we to fit these observations into that other one, that 22:6-11 exhibits the fixed Johannine form of a clausula after a major section? If all the single parts of it are doublets, and to a considerable extent obviously erroneous ones, that form practically remains without its filling. The only way out of this embarrassing situation seems to be this: the editor acting under the impression that a formal concluding part was due in this place in the Apocalypse fell upon one of John's genuine concluding formulae and filled it in as best he knew. Some of the words which he inserted, 6c, 7b, 10, and 11, probably were genuine matter, while the rest are doublets of genuine Johannine verses. As a whole 22:6-11 is no organic part of the book, nor is it likely, as we shall gather from 22:12-20, that it takes the place of a genuine portion of similar structure. In consequence 22:6-11 does not come into consideration for the restoration of the original order of the matter of chapters 20-22.

We now turn to 22:14 and 15. They so obviously refer to the millennial Jerusalem, and are so little in place as closing elements of the whole Apocalypse that they should be regarded as misplaced.

V.14: Happy are they who wash their robes,
so that they may have the right to the tree of life,
and enter in by the gates of the city.

V.15: Outside are the dogs, and the sorcerers,
and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters,
and every one loving and making lie.

Charles joins these verses with 21:9-22:2,⁵⁰ as in fact they have in them all that is required to be clausulae of that particular section, including the mark of being an address to the reader. There is no such question about v. 14 with its "tree of life" and "the gates of the city"; the relations to 22:2 and 21:12-14, 21, 25, 27 are plain.⁵¹ V. 15 on its

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 153.,

⁵¹ Macarisms are concluding elements in Ap. 1:3; 19:9; J. 13:17; 20:29.

part, like 21:8, is a parallel to 21:27, and for that reason should be taken as a concluding verse. Significantly, it does not contain any allusion to the "lake of fire," nor to the "second death," as does 21:8. The absence of such phrases makes it apt to follow after v. 14 at the end of the description of the millennial Jerusalem. Together with 21:8 and 21:27 it illustrates John's liking for concluding thoughts. Our conclusion coincides with Charles's: The description of the millennial Jerusalem (21:9-22:2) originally had as its clausulae 22:14-15.

Considerable difficulties attach to 22:16a: "I, Jesus, have sent my angel to testify these things to you concerning the churches." Three elements in it are embarrassing, the name "Jesus," the address "you," and the mention of the churches at that juncture. In Apocalypse 1:9 "I, John" occurs, but nowhere "I, Jesus," except in our verse. One might argue that after v. 15, which probably is a word of the seer, it was convenient to indicate the change of the person speaking. But chapter 22 affords a number of cases where this change is not expressed, and where it would be much more necessary than here; to omit it would seem to be more in John's way of speaking. It looks therefore as if the name of Jesus were a secondary addition to a form which originally had no name. That the readers are addressed by "you" (six times), is natural in the letters of chapter 2, in 1:4 which verse serves as a protocol to the Apocalypse as an epistle, and where John introduces himself at the opening of the visions (1:9) which also has the character of a part of the epistle. But in 22:16a, "you" is absolutely unwarranted and without parallel in the whole book. The churches are mentioned in the first three chapters and nowhere else in the Apocalypse except in our verse; the context offers no clue as to why the churches should be referred to in v. 16a. To all appearances this verse is a *membrum disjectum*, and we take small risk if we assign it to chapter 1; it may have had its proper place after 1:8. Considering that the book-preface 1:1-3 must have been added after the Apocalypse had been given the form of an epistle, that is, after the writing of 1:4-11, or 1:4-8, we may regard 22:16a, if placed after 1:8, as the source of ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου in 1:1. The context of 22:16a is none the worse for losing that verse.

Moreover, 22:16a also seems to have been the basis for 22:6d: "and the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets, has sent His angel to show to His servants the things that must shortly come to

pass." Charles, much against his wont, leaves the strange phrase ("the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets") without comment.⁵² Apart from 21:22 (ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ where γὰρ accounts for the article before Κύριος) the Apocalypse invariably has Κύριος ὁ Θεός (8 times); ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων and τὰ πνεύματα τῶν προφητῶν occurs nowhere in it, although the phrase τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ⁵³ might easily have led to it. In addition to that, the angel of God in 1:1 is sent to show τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννη what is in store, and throughout the book it is John alone who receives the visions and instructions. However, in 1:1 we also read that God gave to Him (to Jesus) δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει which is exactly what we have in 22:6. (This makes 22:6d a doublet of 22:16a and 1:1.) Taking into account that, as we have already seen, the whole block of 22:6-11 is a string of erroneous doublets and loose fragments, created by the editor and as a whole out of place, v. 6d has no claim whatever to be a genuine word of the seer, nor as replacing a word of similar content which he had meant to put where we read v. 6d.

V. 22:17cd is another source of trouble:

And let him who is athirst come,
and let him who so desires take the water of life freely.

It is somewhat surprising that Charles has nothing to say against the literary unity of v. 17. It begins: "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come [ἔρχου], and let him that hears [this] say, Come [ἔρχου]"; then follow the words quoted with "let him come" (ἐρχέσθω) at the end of the first stichos. Although the verb is identical in both halves of the verse, and used in the imperative form, its sense in 17cd is entirely different from that in 17ab, if not inversed. In 17ab the Spirit and the bride of Christ yearn for the Lord to come to them without delay, whereas v. 17cd invites those of good will to approach the millennial city and thus to come to Christ. The coupling of both ideas in one verse is very hard. Charles tries to avoid the difficulty by declaring the word of the Spirit and the bride to be said to the one who is athirst, not to Christ the bridegroom. But even in that supposition the one who hears this would have to say, "Come," which is hardly tolerable, not to mention that if the bride says a word, it must be directed to her groom unless

⁵² Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 218.

⁵³ Ap. 3:1; 4:5; 5:6.

stated otherwise. Charles interprets the bride as meaning "not the Church before the Advent [of Christ]," but the inhabitants of the millennial kingdom, where Christ in fact, is already present and no more to come.⁵⁴ That this and every other kind of millenarism is ruled out by the text, has been made clear above in this article; Christ is in His Church mystically only, as the Lamb, so that there is ample room for the desire of the bride to be one with Him also socially. That the same verb occurs in both halves of v. 17 in a different sense, makes it a typical example of catchword-composition. If so, v. 17 is no unit, but a composite of heterogeneous parts, which have nothing to do with one another; their coupling is not original; v. 17cd must be explained on its own merits without regard to 17ab.

There is a remarkable parallel between 22:17cd and 21:6d:

22:17cd: <i>καὶ ὁ θυψῶν ἐρχέσθω</i> <i>ὁ θέλων λαβέτω</i> <i>ὑδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν.</i>	21:6d: <i>Ἐγὼ τῷ θυψῶντι</i> <i>δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς</i> <i>τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς δωρεάν.</i>
--	--

In Charles's opinion 21:6d "clearly presupposes 22:17 as having preceded it," the reason being that 22:17 has ὑδωρ without the article introducing that term as something new, while the article in 21:6 refers to it as something already known to the reader.⁵⁵ A reference to 7:17 and a glance at the use which St. John makes of the article⁵⁶ offer alternative solutions to the question of how the article in 21:6 is to be explained without recurrence to 22:17. That leaves the field free for explaining the relation between the two verses differently: one of the two passages is an illegitimate duplication of the other. The choice will be in favor of 21:6 which is fully accounted for by the concluding formula whereof it forms part, whereas 22:17cd, resting wholly on a catchword-composition, has nothing in the context to back it. All things considered it should be taken as a secondary formation which got into its present place without St. John's intention.

Of 22:18-19 Charles retains only v. 18a: *Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου*, and makes it a word of

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 179-180.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 212. I fail to see why he asserts that the recurrence of *δωρεάν* in 22:17 does not permit one to explain the article in 21:6 from *ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγῆς ὕδατων* in 7:17.

⁵⁶ "The article introduces conceptions assumed to be familiar in apocalyptic, though mentioned in the text for the first time." Charles, *op. cit.*, I, p. CXIX.

Jesus, whereas vv. 18b-19, in his opinion, are an interpolation.⁵⁷ That the two parts are of different provenance is possible, but that v. 18a is a word of Jesus, and the rest an interpolation is far from being proved. The very wording of v. 18a suggests that it is not a word of Jesus. Every enunciation which Jesus makes about Himself in the Apocalypse begins with *ἐγώ*, with the verb following it; this is also the usage of the fourth gospel,⁵⁸ where we invariably find *ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ*.⁵⁹ V. 18a rather looks like a statement of John himself which was added when the book had been finished by his disciple and editor, and now received his approval. V. 18b can not well have been the original continuation of 18a; otherwise we should have *ἐπ' αὐτούς* (namely *τοὺς λόγους*, etc.) instead of *ἐπ' αὐτά*. Thus far it is an addition of later origin, but not necessarily an interpolation added to the book by a later hand. The hand which so clumsily disposed of the matter thrown together in chapter 22 was quite sufficient to account for placing vv. 18b-19 so oddly. For one is surprised to find it between v. 18a and v. 20 (*Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα. Ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Ἄμην, ἔρχου, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ*). The editor either put vv. 18v-19 between them after he had intended to write them down in the sequence: vv. 18a, 20; or added v. 20 after having written 18b-19, in the fashion of an afterthought to v. 18a. The real difficulty does not lie with vv. 18b-19, but with v. 20. That St. John should have added this interjection at the place where it actually stands is not so surprising. But that it begins with *Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα* forces us to look back to v. 18a, *Μαρτυρῶ ἐγώ*. V. 18a seems to have called forth v. 20; the identical, weighty *μαρτυρῶ ἐγώ—ὁ μαρτυρῶν* combines the two sentences into a catchword-composition. V. 20 may well be an item which had escaped the writer after 17ab, and which he remembered after having written v. 18a with 18b-19. If we are right in attributing its actual position to the workings of *μαρτυρεῖν* as a catchword, it does not occupy its proper place. Presumably it was to form part of the section 22:12-17ab.

Before concluding this chapter we have to go back upon the verses 22:10-11. They are connected with vv. 6 ff. by a fixed literary form which serves as a clausula to important parts of the book. Our verdict

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, II, pp. 218, 223.

⁵⁸ *Ἐγώ* precedes the verb 110 times, the verb precedes *ἐγώ* 10 times, five of which clearly serve to bring out the contrast between *ἐγώ* and *ὁ μείς*, etc. (7:34, 36; 12:26; 14:3; 17:24).

⁵⁹ J. 5:31; 7:7; 8:14; 8:18.

was that it happened to be attached erroneously to the description of the eternal Jerusalem which precedes it, and that it had been filled up for the most part with doublets of a secondary nature. V. 10 contains the third of the required formulae, "And he says to me," while v. 11 serves as the last element of that fixed literary form, being both a general statement and one which was made on behalf of the reader. The question is whether, despite these relations, v. 10 at least might not at the same time be a genuine part of vv. 12 ff. It is not beyond all possibility. Given the erroneous impression that that literary concluding form was due after 22:5, and that somewhere after that verse the text was to continue with v. 10, the editor's mind, working on what he remembered, fitted it into the larger scheme which he had to fill up somehow. This gives us a chance to regard v. 10, although it now belongs to 22:6-11, as the proper introduction to vv. 12 ff.

A final remark concerns 22:7b: "Happy is he who keeps the words of the prophecy of this book." If all the other verses of 22:6-11 were in place, v. 7b, although not connected with any of them, might be regarded as in place also. But its present context being spurious, it either goes with that secondary matter, or, if it is to be kept as a genuine word of John, should be regarded as displaced. It has a parallel in 1:3 which quite obviously is secondary as regards v. 22:7b, because it is worked over and adapted to suit the preface of the book. This is more likely than that 22:7b is but "a short summary of 1:3."⁶⁰ The simple form with the two genitives has a decidedly genuine ring. There is another macarismos in 22:14 which for the reasons indicated above should be put at the end of the description of the millennial Jerusalem. Yet, where 22:14 actually is, a macarismos would suit the context as a middle piece separating two corresponding portions. I venture, therefore, to transfer v. 7b to the place now occupied by v. 14, and vacant if this verse is put where it seems to belong.

After all these considerations we arrive at the following form of 22:6-20: the verses 6, 7a, 8-9, 17cd are erroneous doublets and cannot claim to have been originally intended as parts of the book. Vv. 14-15 belong to the end of the description of the millennial Jerusalem, therefore after 22:2, whereas v. 16a seems to have its proper place in chapter 1, presumably after v. 8. Verse 20 should be combined with v. 17ab, and

⁶⁰ Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 218.

with it v. 21; for v. 21 is the formal salutation of the Apocalypse as an epistle which it received before it was published as a book. This we see clearly from 1:1-3. That part is shaped after several other verses of the Apocalypse and as such of secondary origin. Consequently the verses 22:18-19 which are the end of the Apocalypse as a book must come after everything else, in particular, after 22:21. What remains after the clausulae of the description of the eternal Jerusalem is this:

V. 10. Καὶ λέγει μοι· μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν.

(11. Ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι,
καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι,
καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι.
καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.)

12. Ἴδου ἔρχομαι ταχύ,
καὶ ὁ μισθός μου μετ' ἐμοῦ,
ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ
ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ.

13. Ἐγὼ τὸ ἀλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ,
ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος,
ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

7b. Μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου.

16bc. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ῥίζα
καὶ τὸ γένος Δαβὶδ,
ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός.

17ab. Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν· ἔρχου.
καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω· ἔρχου.

20ab. λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα.
ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ.

20c. Ἀμήν, ἔρχου Κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

(18-19)

The issue of our critical work on 22:10-20 is remarkable enough. At the beginning (v. 10), in the center (v. 7b) and at the end (v. 20c) is a portion in plain prose; the rest is rhythmic prose. With the exception of v. 11, which more likely than not should not occupy its present position, because it has no bearing on the context whatsoever, the whole section is symmetrically composed. The middle portion (v. 7b) is preceded and followed by a tristich beginning with ἐγώ (vv. 13, 16bc), which on their part are preceded and followed by a stanza, or what is almost equal to one; for 17ab is overcharged by one beat, and the unconnected v. 20a, καί before λέγει being missing, does not perfectly merge into one with v. 17ab; καί may have been lost by the wrong arrangement in the present text. Besides, the ἔρχομαι of v. 12a and the triplet ἔρχου—ἔρχου—ἔρχομαι of vv. 17-20ab serve as an *inclusio* after the fashion of Hebrew poetry. All that seems to be typically Johannine.⁶¹ Seeing that this is the result of our criticism, not its starting point, we may not, after all, be far from the original form of that piece. From the contents of vv. 10, 12, 7b, 17ab, and 20, it is plain that John meant 22:10-20 to have its place where we actually find it, at the end of all the visions; vv. 10 and 7b look back upon the whole book without being formal literary conclusions of it. For such the place after v. 20 remains open.

THE TECHNIQUE OF THE EDITOR

The following table is drawn up to show Charles's and our own results concerning the sequence of parts and verses in Apocalypse 20-22.

<i>Charles</i>	I	<i>As here proposed</i>
20:1-3	Satan's chaining	same
21:9-22:2, } 14-15, 17 }	Millennial Jerusalem	21:9-22:2
20:4-6	Millennial Kingdom	22:14-15, clausulae same

⁶¹ For prose parts put at symmetrical places see J. 14:5, 8 in 14:1-11; 6:41-42 and 52 in 6:35-58; a short word in the center with an inclusion in the preceding and following portion: J. 14:18 in 14:15-21; 15:5 in 15:1-8 (*μύειν ἐν ἑμοί* once before, thrice after the centre, as in Ap. 22:10-20). Cf. Paul Gaechter, S.J., "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu," *ZkTh* LVIII (1934), 162-63, 164, 167; "Die Form der eucharistischen Rede Jesu," *ZkTh*, LIX (1935), 422-24.

II

20:7-10	Satan unchained	same
20:11-15	Last Judgment	same
21:5a, 4d, 5b, 1-4c } 22:3-5 }	Eternal Jerusalem	{ 21:1-4c 22:3-5 21:5ab, 4d, 5c-6, 7, clausulae
<i>Epilogue</i>		
21:5c, 6b-8 (God's testimony)		<i>Conclusion of the visions</i>
22:6-7, 18a, 16, 13, 12, 10, (Christ's testimony)		22:10-13, 7b, 16b-17b, 20
		<i>Conclusion of Epistle</i>
		22:21
22:8-9, 20, 21 (John's testimony)		<i>Conclusion of Book</i>
		22:18-19

Except for the last portions the divergences from the traditional text are not considerable; but taken together they are significant enough to warrant the inquiries made. The chief difference between Charles and this article is not so much the sequence in itself, as rather the principles on which literary criticism was based. Charles worked exclusively from the content of the text whereas on our part the principle of literary forms has been added. Both arrangements call for a last explanation. How are we to account for the transpositions from what Charles on his part, and we on ours, call the original sequence to the actual arrangement of verses as we have it in the traditional text? Charles is of the opinion "that John died either as a martyr or by a natural death, when he had completed I.-XX.3 of his work, and that the materials for its completion, which were for the most part ready in a series of independent documents, were put together by a faithful but unintelligent disciple in the order which he thought right."⁶² In other words: the transformation from what John had intended to what the editor achieved, was a purely literary process, which was executed without the possibility of having recourse to the apostle. If Charles's restored arrangement is correct, particularly concerning 22:6-21, we have to suppose that the notes left by John each contained often not more than a verse, a supposition which is at the extreme limit of probability. Besides, we do not learn why the editor chose the actual order rather than any other. There is little help in calling him "very unintelligent";⁶³ his ignorance explains at best why he missed the

⁶² *Op. cit.*, I, p. L; II, p. 147.

⁶³ *Loc. cit.*, p. L.

order intended by John, but not why he chose the present order of the text.

It is otherwise, if we apply what I have proposed about the role of memory in the making of the Apocalypse.⁶⁴ There I have come to the same conclusion as Charles, that the editor has worked without consulting his master, and I have put forward reasons which made it intelligible why the editor did not fully grasp the original sequence of all the material he had received from John. But I put the whole relation between John and him into words spoken and words heard; John gave him no written documents, and the editor had to rely wholly on his memory. What with the strangeness of the matter, the breaking up of John's report into several speeches or conferences, and what with the repetition of the same matter, with different applications of the same metaphor, or identical explanations of different images, it was unavoidable that the poor editor should become confused on more than one point, especially as to the sequence of the parts. If I am not greatly mistaken, we can thus explain why many points which belonged to the originally intended order are now missing, and also why the editor chose that particular order which we find in the actual text. For if not in all, at least in a great many cases where the present order is unsatisfactory, the technique of the memory gives the clue. True, it does not completely remove from the editor the slur of being stupid, but it diminishes it to a considerable extent.

First of all memory explains whence the confusion came between the two descriptions of the heavenly Jerusalem. If the editor heard John describing it but missed the point of why this happened twice, confusion was inevitable. Thus we have an obviously wrong arrangement, the millennial Jerusalem following, instead of preceding in the book the eternal Jerusalem (21:1-4c preceding 21:9-22:2); we also notice that a portion of the description of the millennial city, 21:23-27, is influenced by that of the eternal city.

By a sheer blunder of memory one part of the description of the eternal Jerusalem went adrift. When, after 21:4c, a concluding stichos was to follow, the memory supplied it, but a wrong one, which naturally drew material after it which should not have come in there; the proper concluding stichos with what was attached to it became

⁶⁴ See note 19.

a loose section which the editor put into a wrong place. Thus we have to restore the order 21:1-4c, 22:3-5, 21:5ab, 4d, etc.; v. 4d was the wrong concluding stichos.

In two instances we see the editor's memory remembering an expression which was due, but which was prompted in the wrong phrase. We have pointed out that 22:14, *μακάριοι*, etc. should have its place after the description of the millennial Jerusalem, and suggested that 22:7b should take its place, seeing that v. 7b also begins with *μακάριος*. A little further in the same chapter, v. 17b was to be followed by a sentence opening with *μαρτυρεῖν*. This v. 18a actually does, but it is the wrong sentence. In all likelihood v. 20 should have followed after v. 17, with the words: [Καί] λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα.

This phenomenon recalls to our mind the catchword-compositions, which are considered typical for the working of memory. There are several instances of it in chapter 22; one comprises v. 6c (*ἐν τάχει*) and v. 7a (*ταχύ*); another v. 17ab (*ἔρχου*) and v. 17c (*ἐρχέσθω*). Catchword-composition also explains some of the relations between 22:7b and 22:14. Both sentences are macarisms, both are locked in the same associations. For we have *ἔρχομαι* in v. 7a and *μακάριος* in 7b, *ἔρχομαι* in v. 12 and *μακάριοι* in v. 14. Since v. 14 originally was meant to be a conclusion to the picture of the millennial Jerusalem, it was wrongly attracted by this association into its actual place and, being thus fixed in the memory of the editor, expelled the rightful macarismos v. 7b from its place. But the same association (v. 7a and 7b) prevented this second verse from being entirely lost; it was held fast in the secondary concluding form 22:6-11.

An analogous case is 22:6d and its parallel 22:16a. This latter verse is preceded by *Ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ* (v. 13), and followed by *Ἐγὼ εἰμι* (v. 16b). By its content, as we have remarked, it is referred to chapter 1, presumably after v. 8, where both associative elements happen to occur: *ἐγὼ εἰμι—τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ*. After what is now 22:16a, by a mistake of memory, had been separated from its original context at the beginning of the book, the association wherein it had stood there called it forth when at the end of the book the associative terms recurred. Apart from these associations v. 16a also is combined, in a way, with *ἔρχομαι ταχύ* (v. 12), *μακάριοι* (v. 14), and *ἔρχου* (v. 17). These same elements are likewise associated with v. 6d: *ἔρχομαι ταχύ* and *μακάριος*

(in v. 7). It probably was owing to them that the memory of the editor spontaneously, if by error, created v. 6d as a doublet to v. 16a, acting under the influence of the identical association.

Memory also sometimes takes hold of a literary form whose genuine contents are forgotten and replaced at random, or with matter similar to the original one. When our editor had finished writing what he remembered of the description of the eternal city, his memory fell upon a form which in other passages was applied as a formal conclusion of a major section; so in 19:9-10 and 21:4d-6. Consequently it composed 22:6-11, the editor being unaware that John, as a general conclusion to all the visions (the description of the eternal city had already had its proper end in 21:4d-6 which, by his blundering memory, had been anticipated) had put forward another concluding piece, 22:10-20. His memory, after the erroneous conclusion 22:6-11, also reproduced the genuine piece, but blurred it in several points.

That in repetitions by heart memory sometimes causes parts to be dislocated is an experience which everybody has. The innate laws of memory satisfactorily explain how 22:3a, a concluding stichos which should have ended up 21:4a-c, happened to be expelled from its original context by another concluding stichos (21:4d) which memory supplied at an inopportune moment, thereby causing 22:3-5 to be entirely misplaced. Similarly the recollection that a sentence with *μαρτυρεῖν* was due, combined with the proper order forgotten, made the editor put 22:18-19 before 22:20-21.

Finally we notice that the slips of memory, that is, the troublesome verses, turn up in clusters, or at least are numerous in certain parts. This does not apply to 21:4d-7 because these verses have been kept together if in a somewhat disarranged order. But 22:6-11, 22:14-16a, 22:17b-21 are examples of it. They remind us of the weak spots in memorized matter. Once the right sequence was forgotten, there was always a likelihood that loose material would appear, as in those cases obviously happened.

All such cases of a failing memory taken together, we are tempted to pass an unfavorable verdict on the editor. But we should not overlook that we had not to break up completely the series of verses in 22:10-20, as Charles has done. What remained, after we had applied the rules of literary criticism to that portion, evidently showed the

original arrangement of John. This fact illustrates two things, first the endeavor of the editor to retain and to reproduce as faithfully as possible what he had heard John saying, a feature which in fact is attested by every line of the Apocalypse. The other conclusion is that the editor's memory was particularly strong concerning forms and arrangements of given portions, as we also learn from 14:6-20 and 17:7-18.⁶⁵

The consequences of our study are plain. If we hold the memory of the editor responsible for the sequence of the parts and verses, the exegete will not concern himself with the problem of what the intention of the editor for that particular arrangement had been, because following his memory the editor had no intention of his own in that regard. Whenever the sequence is suspect, literary criticism will show in most cases what kind of mistake had been made, and open the way to find out the intention of St. John who was separated from the writing by an intermediary. Where such a solution is not possible, all that remains to do is to interpret the pieces on their own merits.

⁶⁵ THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, IX (1948), 443-51.