

until that final phase. His system was flexible to the widely accepted idea that the fatal wound the beast received (Rev 13:3) was the dying out of totalitarianism with the break-up of the Roman Empire, and that the healing of the wound will be the "revived Roman Empire."

I therefore think that Irenaeus cannot be called a "historic premillennialist." He gives no hint of a day/year theory, since he obviously takes the years of Antichrist's reign quite literally and makes no attempt to speculate about the length of the time to the end.

The Augustinian-Tyconian Theory

We turn next to Augustine of Hippo for a view which we shall call the Augustinian-Tyconian "church-historical" theory. This view presents the only logical alternative to the view of Irenaeus. Its crucial point of difference is that the millennium has reference to the present age. Our hypothesis is that the 1,300 years after Tyconius reveal stages in the rejection of Tyconius' view and a return to that of Irenaeus. At particular points in history the date-setting inherent in Tyconius' theory has proved to be delusive.

Augustine was a premillenarian previous to his adoption of Tyconius' theory. I propose here a probable explanation of why Augustine adopted Tyconius' idea of recapitulation. The notion of recapitulation appears to be a form of the principle of interpreting Scripture by Scripture. The principle is necessary and commendable, but when false or unreal parallels are juxtaposed, the result is bizarre. If one assumes that Rev 12 speaks of the ascension of Christ, the three and one-half years, or 1,260 days during which the woman is pursued by the dragon, then become an epitome of the present church age. Froom analyzes Tyconius' exegesis as follows:

By the principle of recapitulation -- the sixth in his series of Rules -- Tyconius ingeniously steps back the thousand years over the entire line of the Christian dispensation, dating it from the time of Christ's first advent. Thus he makes the end the beginning, and the beginning the end. Moreover, this millennial period he shortens from 1,000 to 350 years, because Christ's three and a half days in the tomb were shortened by employing only parts of the first and third days. This is part of his 'Fifth Rule,' which puts the part for the whole. Reviving probably a Jewish conjecture that a 'time' possibly signifies a century. Tyconius assumes each prophetic 'time' to be 100 years, and thus three and a half times would be about 350 years. Beginning with the resurrection of Christ, this period would be about expired. So he makes his own day the terminus of prophetic time.^2

The plausible and operative idea is the assumption that the resurrection or ascension of Christ is portrayed in Rev 12. This led to paralleling the 1,000 years of Rev 20 with the three and one-half years, 1,260 days of Rev 12. However, there is abundant exegetical evidence that the 1,000 years of Rev 20 must follow in close chronological succession after the events of Rev 19. Moreover, the other premise of Tyconius' reasoning, that Christ is the man-child of Rev 12, is answered by (1) holding to a sounder literary analysis of Revelation, and (2) holding that the five occurrences of three and one-half years or the equivalent in Rev 11, 12, and 13, must be closely related to the prediction of Dan 7:25, and clearly places the event of Rev 12 in the middle of Daniel's yet future seventieth