

end of the 1,260 years.

However, a series of fiascoes, from William Miller's predictions of the Lord's coming in 1843 to those following Anwar Sadat's historic visit to Israel, have given further proof of the fallacies of date-setting. Even the massive scholarship of Froom and E. B. Elliott has not redeemed a hopeless theory. At the same time, the earnestness with which it has been repeated points to the confidence in Scripture which motivated the application of an unworkable theory. Contributing to the confident attempts to calculate the times lay the cumulative effect of centuries of repetition of the Augustinian theory in its many variations.

Conclusion

With the abandonment of the day/year theory went the last support of the Augustinian consensus. The postmillenarian and premillenarian developments of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had broken the supposed parallel of the 1,000 years with the 1,260 day/years by thrusting the millennium into the future. Now the other means of calculation, the 1,260 day/years, had signally failed again and was attacked by futurism. Futurism proposed the projection of Daniel's seventieth week into the future. related the "week" references in Rev 11, 12, and 13 to Dan 7:25, and took the 1,260 days as real days. The remaining pillar of date-setting was gone. We have returned to Irenaeus' conception of the futurity of Daniel's seventieth week. The whole development is epochal. There ensues a new era in which Bible-believing people in general reject date-setting and point to the William Miller fiasco with aversion. We can rest here, having attempted to draw from history evidence for the thesis that the original Augustinian-Tyconian construction which leads to the calculation of the times is hopelessly wrong since God would have the time of the end to be unknown. The eschatological data of the Bible are so structured that the time between the Advents cannot be calculated.

EXEGETICAL CONFIRMATION OF THE FUTURIST VIEW.

The conclusion of the preceding historical survey that Daniel's seventieth week lies in the future may be confirmed by a discussion of the parallels between the Book of Revelation and the Book of Romans. In order to point out these parallels, I will discuss the outline and literary organization of Revelation, enlarging upon chap. 12 in the light of a consistent futurist view. I will follow a similar procedure in discussing Romans, expanding in detail the exegesis of Rom 11. The natural emergence of parallels between Revelation and Romans is the substance of the present argument. If these parallels hold good, the result should be a confirmation of the proposed futurist interpretation of Revelation.

The Eschatological Headline of Revelation

After his elaborate Trinitarian salutation to the churches of Asia, John