

## Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 369

Revelation 5

March 28, 2021

**Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)**

**Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)**

### Episode Summary

Many presume the scene in Revelation 5 of the Lamb standing before the throne of God is an enthronement ceremony. The one seated on the throne (God) has a scroll in his right hand, sealed with seven seals. Only the Lamb of God, standing before the throne, who is the risen messiah (Lion of Judah, Root of David) is worthy to open the seals. But if we look closely, we see that the Lamb does not occupy the throne, nor is he later seated on the throne as the seals are opened. This episode considers John's use of the Old Testament in Revelation 5 and some of the incongruities in the way the passage is often understood.

### Transcript

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 369: Revelation 5. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! What's going on?

**MH:** Well, not much. Kind of settled into a routine now, which is nice.

**TS:** Yeah. That's good. So the...

**MH:** We like routine. Although I should mention... My daughter [and her husband] got a puppy, because they're going to be moving out in another month. So they got a puppy. And there's nothing better than a puppy, except maybe two puppies. But this is a little Sheltie. And of course, it manages to fall in the pool. [laughs]

**TS:** Uh oh.

**MH:** But the thing is, it fell in and it just immediately swam well. Like, across the pool and over to my daughter. And I'm thinking, "What's up with the pugs?" [laughs] "Why can't they do that?" So we're still doing the floatie thing when it gets warmer, when we put them in intentionally. Because they either need to learn or confirm our suspicions.

**TS:** Yeah. Well, have you not gotten in there with them yet to give them some lessons?

**MH:** Nah, it's just not warm enough. I mean, we were in the 60s a couple days this week. So it's getting there.

**TS:** Well, it's a good thing we talked pre-show, Mike, because we could've done 30 minutes on talking about your Fantasy Baseball draft coming up, and pro wrestling. [MH laughs] It turns out me and Mike were both fans of wrestling, back in the '70s and '80s (and I'll even admit—the '90s and 2000s).

**MH:** Yeah, I was done in the early '80s.

**TS:** I started fading out in the '90s. But...

**MH:** "When I became a man, I put away childish things." [laughs]

**TS:** Ah. Well, I put down *some*, but not all.

**MH:** I was into it in junior high. Junior high, a little bit in high school. So yeah, that brought back good memories actually. Yeah, the audience is already grateful. [laughs]

**TS:** Yeah. It was good stuff, though. I mean, we went deep into it. So it was good.

**MH:** Yep. Back in the day. Back in the day, who our favorites were, and all that stuff. Yeah. It's what I tell my kids. Because I have these conversations about... (You know, they're 20 or whatever.) "Ah, what am I going to do with my life? I'm behind so-and-so!" Or "I lost a year moving," and blah blah blah. Like, "I'm doomed," or something. It's like, "Look, when I was your age, I was watching The Three Stooges and wrestling. So you're going to be okay." [laughs] "It's really not a crisis."

**TS:** Hm. Not me, Mike. I was already in the corporate world. I was on the airplane four times a week. Pre-911. It was such a joy to travel. Because you could just... I lived in Dallas at the time. And Mike, I lived about 40 minutes from the airport. I woke up late one time, 30 minutes before my flight. I had a 6:30 a.m. flight, so no traffic or anything. Still dark. I told my cab driver, "If you can get me there in 20 minutes, I'll give you \$100." He got me there. I made my flight. So I literally, 40 minutes away from DFW airport, I woke up within 30 minutes of my flight, and I *still* made it. You could not do that after 911.

**MH:** That's unbelievable. Yeah, you can't do that now.

**TS:** No, not at all.

---

**MH:** I'm really paranoid about flying. So I'm the guy that *has* to be there two hours ahead. I'm still traumatized by an experience I had in the Paris airport. [I went to] an International Society of Biblical Literature meeting and I decided to take my daughter and a niece. And it just... Gosh, it was bad. I thought we were going to miss flights in Paris. And nobody speaks French, and they hate the Americans anyway, and all this stuff is flowing through my head. And it was traumatic trying to get through that airport fast. And I thought, "Never again. We are going to be anywhere two hours early." So I get made fun of now. But it's like, "Look, you can relax now."

5:00

**TS:** Yeah, I'm usually the last one on the plane. Because the less I have to sit on the plane, the more comfortable I am. I'm just too big to sit in those things for extended periods of time. Alright, well, switching gears now, I know we've been talking about Revelation 5 over the last three episodes, but now we really are in Revelation 5.

**MH:** Yeah. And for those who might just be tuning into this one, we have mentioned Revelation 4-5 in the last three episodes because the chapters do go together, but episodes have really been only about Revelation 4. But this one (the fourth in a series, technically) is going to be about just Revelation 5. So don't get disoriented by the references to Revelation 5 in this one. And you think, "Well, it was 4 and 5 up until this point. What's this chapter 5 doing?" That's why. So the two chapters go together. Three prior episodes really zeroed in on Revelation 4, and now we're going to mop up with chapter 5. So let's get started.

Revelation 4 is pretty familiar. But I was going to say, this one might even be more familiar to the average Christian, reading through Revelation or hearing preaching about it, especially, because this is the chapter that has the appearance of the Lamb of God standing before the throne. And I think, maybe for good reasons and maybe some contrived reasons, this makes good preaching, so people dip into Revelation. And this tends to be one of the chapters. This one and the Second Coming and maybe the Lake of Fire or something like that. People tend to cherry-pick Revelation. This is going to be one of the more familiar passages. And on the surface, it seems pretty transparent as far as what's going on here. So it's not that long. I'm going to read the whole thing. And I think right away you're going to notice maybe some familiar things or if you're really paying attention, you might be jarred a little bit by what you expect to hear in the passage but actually isn't there. So I'm going to read it first and then we'll jump back into doing a little bit of a backdrop to the chapter. But John writes:

**Then I saw in the right hand of him who was seated on the throne a scroll written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals. <sup>2</sup> And I saw a mighty angel proclaiming with a loud voice, "Who is worthy to open the scroll and**

break its seals?" <sup>3</sup> And no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll or to look into it, <sup>4</sup> and I began to weep loudly because no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it. <sup>5</sup> And one of the elders said to me, "Weep no more; behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals."

<sup>6</sup> And between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders I saw a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, with seven horns and with seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth. <sup>7</sup> And he went and took the scroll from the right hand of him who was seated on the throne. <sup>8</sup> And when he had taken the scroll, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb, each holding a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. <sup>9</sup> And they sang a new song, saying,

"Worthy are you to take the scroll  
and to open its seals,  
for you were slain, and by your blood you ransomed people for God  
from every tribe and language and people and nation,  
<sup>10</sup> and you have made them a kingdom and priests to our God,  
and they shall reign on the earth."

<sup>11</sup> Then I looked, and I heard around the throne and the living creatures and the elders the voice of many angels, numbering myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands, <sup>12</sup> saying with a loud voice,

"Worthy is the Lamb who was slain,  
to receive power and wealth and wisdom and might  
and honor and glory and blessing!"

<sup>13</sup> And I heard every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea, and all that is in them, saying,

"To him who sits on the throne and to the Lamb  
be blessing and honor and glory and might forever and ever!"

**14 And the four living creatures said, “Amen!” and the elders fell down and worshiped.**

10:00 Now the assumption, just the average assumption if you got into a conversation about Revelation 5 and you've ran into somebody who actually remembered parts of it, many people presume it is some sort of enthronement scene or ceremony. The one seated on the throne (God) has a scroll in his right hand sealed with seven seals. And only the Lamb of God standing before the throne who is risen (he is the risen messiah, the Lion of Judah, the Root of David)... Only he is worthy to open the seals. But if we look closely, we see incongruities with that assumption—this idea that it's about the enthronement of the Lamb. It's actually not. The Lamb never occupies the throne, nor is he later in the book seated on the throne as the seals are opened. In fact, only after everything plays out in the apocalypse (in the book of Revelation) do we have a hint that the Lamb is also enthroned. And that's Revelation 22:1. Let me just read it to you.

**Then the angel showed me the river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God and of the Lamb...**

So there you have this shared throne idea. But that's it. I mean, that's the end of the book. The Lamb does not occupy the throne in Revelation 5 or anywhere until you hit the end of the book. So that's one sort of oddity. Further, the authority given to the Lamb is dispensed by the Lamb to believers. That's in Revelation 5:9-10. You may have caught it as I was reading. So “the four living creatures and the 24 elders fell down before the Lamb...”

**9 And they sang a new song, saying,**

**“Worthy are you to take the scroll [MH: really singing to the Lamb] and to open its seals, for you were slain, and by your blood you ransomed people for God from every tribe and language and people and nation, 10 and you have made them [MH: these ransomed people] a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on the earth.”**

So he even hands off or shares the authority that's given to him. So we're therefore confronted with some unexpected elements if we assume outright that Revelation 5 is about the Lamb's enthronement, because that never happens. So

these incongruities have led scholars in different directions as they read the text closely. And Aune in his Revelation commentary (still in the first volume—that’s chapters 1-5) writes this. And he sort of sketches the options:

Rev 5 is often interpreted as depicting the *enthronement* of the Lamb, based on the assumption that the text reflects the pattern of ancient enthronement ritual... Others have argued that Rev 5 is modeled after the tradition of a *commission* in the heavenly court, sometimes combining the two patterns... The view argued in this commentary [MH: this is Aune’s take] . . . is that it is more appropriate to understand Rev 5 as depicting the *investiture* of the Lamb based not on ancient enthronement customs and procedures but rather on the literary adaptation of Dan 7 and Ezek 1–2.

So right away you ask, “Well, what’s the difference? What’s the difference between enthronement or commission...” When you hear “commission,” think Isaiah 6. There’s Isaiah in the Divine Council room—the throne room—and he says, “Here am I; send me.” And they commission him and so on and so forth. So that’s what that’s talking about. So what’s the difference between enthronement, commission, and (Aune’s word) investiture? In most basic terms, “enthronement” speaks of the coronation of a new ruler, “commission” is a term associated with an appointment to a task, and “investiture” describes the establishment of someone in an office that that person already holds informally. The terms are, therefore, synonyms whose meanings have points of overlap, but they also retain some nuancing that distinguishes them.

So what leads scholars to opt for one choice over another? (Again, this is all backdrop to Revelation 5. And we’re going to incorporate it into what we’ve talked about before with Revelation 4 and the Divine Council setting and all that.) Well, there are those who opt for enthronement still, even though the Lamb never occupies the throne. You’re still going to have people that are in this category. Those who opt for enthronement will point to the earlier instance in Revelation 3:21, where the exalted Jesus (who is obviously the Lamb) speaks of having already conquered and taken his seat with God on the ruling throne. We’ve referenced that verse a lot in earlier episodes. They might also appeal to Revelation 7:17 where the Lamb is (this is, I think, pretty ambiguous) said to be “in the midst of the throne.” So that’s going to get interpreted as he’s on the throne or something. Well, it doesn’t actually say on the throne; he says in the midst of the throne. But anyway, that would be part of the appeal.

15:00

The threefold process of Israelite coronation or king-making is also a factor. And this is something we've covered in a previous podcast when we talked about the Old Testament... I believe this is the one: The Old Testament in Luke. But I'm not quite sure. But anyway, how the Gospels present Jesus as king. Well, I think... Let me just go on. Because I'll give you the source for that. If you remember that episode, there were three factors of how an Israelite man became king. First there was the designation of the candidate for kingship. And that's usually something done to that candidate to make him a candidate (like anointing). That's typically the procedure: anointing. Not always, but most of the time. Second, the designated candidate has to prove himself kingly by doing some heroic act. And third, the successful candidate is exalted to the throne.

Now as Shelton has shown (this is an article I used in that earlier episode), all three of these steps play out in the life of Jesus in the gospels. Consequently, enthronement seems to make sense. However, the incongruities mentioned above mar the picture. Well, you know, if Jesus is already enthroned, what does that mean? Because the Lamb is not on the throne in Revelation 5. And there's no clear reference to him being on the throne until Revelation 22. So what about what happens in the Gospels? What about Revelation 3? ("I've conquered. I'm sitting on the throne of my Father." And "to him that overcomes, I will let him also sit on the seat" and all this stuff.) How do we put all this together so that it makes sense? Because it seems inconsistent.

Other scholars view Revelation 5 (as I mentioned) through the lens of other divine council scenes, where a spirit (1 King 22) or a prophet (Isaiah 6) is commissioned for a specific task. The problem with that approach here is fundamentally twofold:

(1) The task of the Lamb is already accomplished. He doesn't need to be appointed to a task. He's already done the task. He has been faithful unto death and is now raised to new life. He's "standing" here. So you have a Lamb that looks like it was slain, but it's standing up. It's a resurrection picture.

(2) The divine council in Revelation 5 is clearly meeting to dispense judgment, not hand out an assignment.

So the commission view doesn't really work, and frankly, it doesn't have many adherents. Still other scholars (like Aune) see the best option as (his term) investiture. This approach views the incongruities of enthronement in Revelation 5 through the lens of the already accomplished kingly accession in the gospels.

So investiture's actually going to be one of these "already, but not yet" approaches, which to me makes more sense. The crucifixion, the resurrection, and the ascension are acknowledged as the actual transition to rulership of Jesus.

So Jesus has gone through the three step process of kingship. Okay? So the investiture view acknowledges that Jesus is the ruler, while simultaneously acknowledging that the ultimate goal of God is not yet accomplished, and that is the reconciliation of the entire cosmos to himself and the restoration of Eden in consummated form. That hasn't happened yet. And when that happens, you're going to need a king. And that king is going to be Jesus. But that's the "not yet." We have the "already," but the "not yet." Now that final form happens in Revelation 22, where the Lamb *is* described as enthroned (Revelation 22:1). So consequently, scholars like Aune opt for understanding Revelation 5 as investiture, not enthronement. It is the formal transition or display to all the world of what has informally been the case for quite some time, since Jesus rose from the dead and ascended. Investiture thus views enthronement as an "already/not yet" point. This, in turn, doesn't impose a new commissioning on the Lamb (so we don't have the commission problem) and retains the progression of the apocalypse to the end of all things when Eden is restored and God, the Lamb, and the children of God are partnered in rule of that new global Eden. So Aune goes on to describe the idea this way:

The argument that Rev 5 should be construed as the *investiture* of the Lamb is based on an analysis of the text of Rev 5 as an adaptation of Dan 7 and Ezek 1–2... The narrative in Rev 5 centers on the recognition of the Lamb as the only one worthy to open the scroll sealed with seven seals... The investiture scene in Rev 5 appears to have been adapted from Dan 7:9–14...

Let me just stop there. Remember earlier when we talked about Revelation 4, we made the point in the first episode when we jumped into that chapter that there are 14 points of Daniel 7 that Revelation 4 follows, in the same order. So it's very obvious that John is tracking on Daniel 7. So back to Aune:

The investiture scene in Rev 5 appears to have been adapted from Dan 7:9–14... which centers on the *investiture* of "one like a son of man," not his enthronement. Even though enthronement is not mentioned in Dan 7...

20:00

Let me stop there. Did you realize that? I mean, in Daniel 7 the Son of Man is given everlasting kingship, but he never sits down. He's never enthroned.

[laughs] So it's this, "Yes, he has the authority, but he hasn't yet been installed over *the* kingdom." And I say *the* kingdom this way to point to this "not yet" idea of when the whole thing is complete, when God gets what he wants, when we have a new Eden, all this stuff, that's the "not yet" part, which Aune and others are going to argue, "This is why the Lamb isn't described as being on a throne till you hit Revelation 22:1." But anyway, back to Aune. He says,

Even though enthronement is not mentioned in Dan 7, however, scholars frequently assume that it is suggested or implied... The author has applied the language of Dan 7:14, 18 to the redemptive death of Christ, which has "enthroned" Christians as kings and priests. The author has overlaid the existing kingship language in Dan 7:14, 18 with the "kingdom and priests" language from Exod 19:6 (which he has also used [MH: earlier in Revelation] in 1:7; [MH: and he's going to use it later in Revelation] 20:6)... The author of Rev 4–5 has taken the basic framework of Dan 7:9–18 and freely adapted it for a new purpose. The presentation of the "one like a son of man" before the enthroned Ancient of Days in Dan 7:13 results in his investiture. John has grounded that investiture on the sacrificial death of Christ, which now becomes the very basis for investiture. The motif of the sealed scroll does not occur in Dan 7 (there is only the reference to the books being opened; cf. Rev 20:12 [MH: also]) but [MH: this "sealed scroll idea"] is imported from Ezek 2:9–10 to serve as a symbol of investiture.

Let me just reference Ezekiel 2:9-10. Because that's less familiar than Daniel 7. Ezekiel is describing what he sees here:

**<sup>9</sup> And when I looked, behold, a hand was stretched out to me, and behold, a scroll of a book was in it. <sup>10</sup> And he spread it before me. And it had writing on the front and on the back, and there were written on it words of lamentation and mourning and woe.**

So the description of the scroll here is the same that you see in Revelation 5 here with John. That's Aune's point. So John is using that description of the scroll, which is going to have something to do with the doom of Judah in Ezekiel. And he's repurposing it here in an apocalyptic scene that's going to unfold in judgment (not on Judah this time, but on the whole earth—wicked Jew and wicked Gentile, unbelieving Jew and unbelieving Gentile, the whole thing). So John is adapting that image of the scroll and he's also adapting the scene from Daniel 7:9-14 to... And think about what he's already done in Revelation with the Son of Man imagery and the Ancient of Days. He fuses those two things together to identify Jesus with God or as God. That much is clear. But again,

even in Daniel 7, the Son of Man is not on the throne yet. He does inherit rulership. He is the legitimate rightful ruler, and God is giving him this authority. And so the argument is that God gave Jesus this authority when he rose from the dead and ascended to the Father. This is long before Revelation 5 was experienced by John and written down. And in that scene, it's a harkening back to the death and resurrection of the Lamb—of Christ. That's what gave him his authority. That's what gives the Son of Man his authority. But he's not yet seated. The job is not yet complete in terms of everything coming full circle, to a new Eden, God returning to earth among his people, so on and so forth. So it's an "already, but not yet" idea that we're seeing here, again. This is a familiar theme in Scripture ("already, but not yet"). It happens all over the place in different areas of theology.

25:00

So Aune draws attention to the fact that the son of man in Daniel 7, of course, is not enthroned in the passage, even though it's clear that he has everlasting kingship and dominion. But again, this is not his rule alone, by his own choice. The kingdom is shared with or given to the holy ones in Daniel 7, and the *people* of the holy ones. Isn't that interesting? Because most commentators are going to say, "Ah, holy ones and people of the holy ones refer to the same thing. It refers to human followers of God"—of the Son of Man or whatever. And I don't agree with that. I'm with those scholars that say these are actual different categories. One is a reference to the holy ones of the Divine Council, the heavenly host that is loyal to God. And the other one are human believers. And they are together. They are fused together. They are given the same authority. The two become one. We've talked before, when we had the cloud of witnesses episode and other things. And in *Unseen Realm*, of course, I talk about this, how believers are going to be the reconstituted council. We are going to replace that which has been lost to rebellion in the council. I mean, Daniel 7 gives you a glimpse of that. And so does Revelation 5. Because the authority is given over to those glorified believers that are in the scene as a kingdom of priests. And I think they're focused on because the rulership is going to be on earth—this new Eden idea, the new glorified global Eden. So Revelation 5:9-10 is the passage that makes this point, when the 24 elders sing that "you" (the Lamb) have made all these ransomed people "from every tribe and language and people and nation..." You've "made them a kingdom and priests to our God." And by the way, there you go again with this one body, one man... The Jew and the Gentile are not distinguished here. There's one kingdom of priests. And it's from (to quote John) every tribe, every language, every people, every nation. And again, this is by design. Because if you go back to Daniel 7... Let's just go there real quickly. Not like a new idea, a new invention here. If you go back to Daniel 7:18...

**18 But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, forever and ever.'**

Then you get to verse 26.

**26 But the court shall sit in judgment,  
and his dominion [MH: the beast]  
shall be taken away,  
to be consumed and destroyed to the end.**

**27 And the kingdom and the dominion  
and the greatness of the kingdoms [MH: kingdoms, plural]  
under the whole heaven  
shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High;  
his kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom,  
and all dominions [MH: dominions, plural]  
shall serve and obey him.'**

So you get this notion, again, that the kingdom is bigger than just Israel. Right? It's the whole earth. You go back up to Daniel 7:14:

**14 And to him [MH: the son of man]  
was given dominion  
and glory and a kingdom,  
that all peoples, nations, and languages  
should serve him;  
his dominion is an everlasting dominion,  
which shall not pass away,  
and his kingdom one  
that shall not be destroyed.**

So what John is saying is he's taking that passage and he's equating that language with the redeemed from every tribe, language, nation, so on and so forth. This is how John views the outcome of Daniel 7. And it's important, because we have to recognize the unity of the people of God. It's not just Israel; it's everybody. This is by design. This was the original intention. Because Eden (which is what we're going back to—this is the way the book of Revelation ends,

with a global Eden) didn't have these distinctions. We didn't have Jews and Gentiles in Eden. We're just people—human believers.

So again, by way of summary, let's just think about what we have in the first five chapters. Let's just expand this theme a little bit. What do we have in Revelation 1-5? Well, we have the Lamb who was slain now standing before the throne of God. He's resurrected. That's chapter 5. The Lamb is Jesus, who is depicted in Revelation 1 as the Ancient of Days and the son of man from Daniel 7, who was described earlier in Revelation 1 as one who was dead, but is now alive. Revelation 3:21 looks forward to both Revelation 5 and Revelation 22. So it's not that Jesus has been installed as king in Revelation 3:21. Basically it's "to the one who overcomes, this is what's going to happen. This is your destiny." "I *will* at some point, when I'm enthroned, I *will* grant to that person to sit with me on my throne and rule the nations" and so on and so forth.

30:00

So Revelation 5 is (to use Aune's term) the investiture of that. It is sort of rolling into, not reality, because Jesus is a real ruler... But Revelation is designed to sort of start the wheels grinding toward the end. It's a description of, "Okay, God is acting now. The end of days is approaching. The wheels are set in motion." And we have here the transition in the book of Revelation. The book of Revelation is supposed to transition our thinking from the "already" to the "not yet." This is the progression. It's going to progress from "already" to "not yet." And this is how things are going to play out. We see the present and the future going on in the book. So this is why scholars can say Revelation 3:21 is looking forward to Revelation 5. And then that's looking forward to Revelation 22. It's just a progression. It's not a moment-in-time observation that's already complete. It's not complete; it's partial. It's "already, but not yet". So in some way, the Lamb's rulership—Jesus' rulership—is a reality, though the Lamb is not pictured yet as being enthroned until the end. And the enthronement there is, "We're done now. I can sit down" (and to borrow Sabbath terminology) "and rest." Okay? [laughs] You know, when the king sits, the job is complete. Kings don't really sit around on their behinds when there's work to be done here. But when the king is enthroned at the end (in Revelation 22), then the job is over and things have come full circle.

So despite not yet being enthroned, the Lamb alone has the status of being worthy to open the scroll that will unleash the apocalypse and start to propel things toward the consummation of his rule, with God as his Father, and with those whose believing loyalty remained true. It's all one picture. In short, through Jesus's faithfulness to his mission, he has already achieved the means by which

God will ultimately get what he has always wanted – to have a human family with whom to share rule of earth.

So that's an overall perspective of what's going on in Revelation 5. I want to drill down on a few things, though, that have specific referent to certain parts of the Old Testament for the rest of the episode. So let's just go back and start at the beginning.

In Revelation 5:1-2 we have a reference to “a scroll written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals.” Now Beale and McDonough... This is in the Beale and Carson big commentary on *The Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Beale and McDonough write the Revelation portion of that. And they write this:

Most interpreters have rightly identified the phrase of 5:1b, “a scroll/book written on the front and back,” as evoking the image of Ezek. 2:9b–10. John's scroll, like Ezekiel's, will contain “lamentations, mourning, and woe” [MH: that was the description in] (Ezek. 2:10) [MH: well, you better believe that this is what you're going to see in Revelation, because it's an apocalypse]. The *biblion* [MH: that's the Greek word translated “book”] is further described by the phrase “having been sealed with seven seals,” which appears to be a merging of Dan. 12:1, 4, 9 with Isa. 29:11.

Let me just look those up, just so that you have those fixed in your head. So in Daniel 12 you get some of this terminology.

**“At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation till that time. But at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone whose name shall be found written in *the book*.**

**<sup>4</sup> But you, Daniel, shut up the words and seal *the book*, until the time of the end.**

**<sup>9</sup> He said, “Go your way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and *sealed* until the time of the end.**

So you have a reference to a book that's sealed, so on and so forth. So Beale and McDonough are saying, “John looks like he's borrowing some of this language from Daniel, again, because Daniel is about a lot of the same stuff. So

35:00 this is the other side of the coin (the book of Revelation).” Isaiah 29:11 is going to be far less familiar.

**<sup>11</sup> And the vision of all this has become to you like the words of a book that is sealed. When men give it to one who can read, saying, “Read this,” he says, “I cannot, for it is sealed.”**

That gives you a certain feel that Beale and McDonough and some others that we’ll look at are going to play off on. Back to the quote:

The phrase “to loose the seals” in 5:2c reveals more inspiration from the “sealing” of Dan. 12 (although cf. Isa. 29). The idea of sealing [MH: here’s the point] and opening books in connection with end-time happenings is unique in the OT to Dan. 12:1–13 [MH: specifically as it’s related to times of the end – that’s Daniel 12]. Daniel 12:8–9 implies the future unsealing of the book in a latter-day period. This is yet another indication that John’s prophecy contains the fulfillment of the latter-days prophecies of Daniel.

So John’s book of Revelation is going to be the fulfillment of these things. Beale adds in another book some other thoughts about the passage:

It should be recalled that 4:1–5:1 follows a structural outline that is identical to that of Dan. 7:9ff. and Ezekiel 1–2... The following analysis of Rev. 5:2–14 [MH: again, this is his commentary] will show that the outline of Daniel 7 continues to be followed [instead of the outline] of Ezekiel 1–2.

So we’re in Daniel 7. John’s going to keep tracking through here. And now he’s going to repurpose some stuff in Daniel 12. So on and so forth. So he wants to just make the point that John is really fixed on Daniel in these chapters.

Further, while allusions to Ezekiel 1–2 do not disappear in 5:2–14, there are more numerous allusions to Daniel 7. The presence of all these OT backgrounds enhances further the notion of judgment with which this vision is saturated.

Now what about the description? We can presume that the scroll is rolled up (that’s typically how we would think about this), though the word is *biblion*. Now the technical term for this idea of a *biblion* (a document rolled up) is “opistograph.” An opistograph is a rolled document... Well, it’s not always a rolled document, but most of the time it’s a rolled document that’s written on both sides. A codex is possible. Remember, a codex is when somebody got the idea, “Instead of using scrolls we’re going to cut the material for a scroll in squares. We

can write on both sides. And then we're going to bind the edge and create a book." Codex. Okay? That's possible, as that form of written material came into use in the late first century. (That's what Aune postulates, anyway.) So he's saying, "Well, maybe it's not... Maybe the *biblion* isn't a scroll. Maybe it's a codex, because you can still write on both sides and these would've come into use probably around when Revelation is written." Again, a scroll is considered more likely, though, by most scholars, perhaps because of iconography. If you look at Greco-Roman iconography of rulers from John's period, they often are holding scrolls. They're not holding codices. Okay? They're holding scrolls in their hand. And often it's the right hand, just like it is here in Revelation 5. So Aune reflects the majority opinion, that it's a scroll. He says:

There are two major arguments for regarding the *biblion* of 5:1 as an *opistograph* [MH: a scroll written on both sides]: (1) the allusion to Ezek 2:9–10 [MH: that certainly predates the codex, and that's where the description's taken from, so it's probably a scroll]... and (2) the original reading "on the inside and on the back," i.e., "on the obverse and the reverse," which is appropriate for describing a closed or rolled up *opistograph*...

So again, there's no reason to depart from the typical understanding here. But I thought you might find it interesting, that some people still want to argue for a codex, but it's more likely a scroll. And I agree because of the allusion to Ezekiel 2. That pretty much seals it for me. (Pardon the pun.) Some scholars have wondered whether the language might point to something else, though. There's a third option, something scholars call a "double written" document. Aune describes this option:

The basic rationale for a "doubly written document" is to provide a sealed document that cannot be altered with an unsealed copy that can be read. It is written "within" and "without" in the sense that it consists of two copies of a legal document, one sealed (i.e., "within") and one unsealed (i.e., "without"). The earliest evidence for a "doubly written document" is [MH: Old Testament] Jer 32:9–15, which describes a sealed deed and an open or unsealed deed, both of which were placed in a clay jar. The procedure was to write two copies of the same legal document separated by a short space; the upper document was rolled together and sealed, while the lower document was simply folded together, but could be read [MH: publicly].

Again, it's kind of interesting. But most people don't find it persuasive because of Ezekiel 2 and all that sort of stuff. It doesn't seem to be the right trajectory since the seals are broken. As Revelation continues, the seals get broken. So it kind of

---

mars the “double written document” idea. But again, as a passing point it’s kind of interesting. Aune doesn’t consider it compelling. I don’t either. I think we’re better off with a rolled scroll.

40:00

Now if it *is* a rolled scroll, it would look cylinder-shaped. We can surmise that the “written within and on back” description means that John can see the exterior script, but not the interior. He can see maybe a few lines or a little portion of it. So he knows it’s written, but he can’t see what’s inside because it’s rolled and sealed. That the scroll is in the right hand of God implies its authority due to the “right hand” motif in the OT that signifies power and authority (Exodus 15:6, Exodus 15:12, and a bunch more references). But again, just the fact of how it’s presented conveys the idea that whatever’s in that scroll is authoritative. In other words, it’s not going to change. [laughs] You know? This is the world’s destiny right here, okay? It ain’t going to change. It has the authority of God, because he’s the one holding it. The content of the scroll is obviously of interest. Again, here’s another thing that you think you know, but you really don’t. But it is never actually revealed in Revelation. We’re never actually told what’s in it. There is no specific reason to assume that Revelation 6-8 is a transcript of the scroll. I mean, there’s no reason to believe that. It’s never presented that way. Aune writes this:

Although there has been a great deal of speculation about the contents of the sealed scroll, the text of Rev 5:1–8:1 (the section dealing explicitly with the sealed scroll and the breaking of its seven seals by the Lamb) contains no explicit indication of the contents of the scroll. If the scroll of Rev 5 is regarded as identical with the open scroll of Rev 10...

Which Aune doesn’t consider likely. But think back to that “double written document” thing. But most scholars just think, “Nah, that’s not what’s going on here. Because the seals are broken in chapters 5-8, whereas the “double written document”... That’s not what you would do with it. But anyway, just something to think about. But he says:

If the scroll of Rev 5 is regarded as identical with the open scroll of Rev 10 (which isn’t likely), more clues to its character are found in that chapter. An important clue for the contents of the scroll is found in Ezek 2:9–10, the model for this passage, in which the contents of the scroll shown to Ezekiel are described as “words of mourning, lamentation, and woe,” i.e., the message of divine judgment that the prophet will announce.

But again, that doesn't give us specifics. It gives us the general character. So there's actually a wide range of options in scholarship as to the content of the scroll. Because it's not explicitly spelled out. People have speculated lots of things. Is the content of the scroll initiated by the breaking of the first seal (Rev 6:1), allowing us to surmise that the series of seals gives us the content, or is the content of the scroll only actually revealed when *all* the seals are broken, and then that's the point? When the last seal is broken, that's the point when the scroll is actually opened? You see the difference there? People assume, if they're assuming that Revelation 6-8 is the contents of the scroll, as each... Think of this in your mind. Think of a rolled document. It's got seven seals on it. We tend to think that when the first seal is broken that, "Oh, well, what happens now is what they're reading in the scroll." But it can't be because it's still sealed six times. I mean, think about that. This is another thing we assume [laughs] that if you actually acted it out... Here's a rolled document that's been sealed seven times. Go ahead and break one. Okay, it's broken. Now read it. Well, I can't because it's still got six on it. Exactly. So Revelation 6-8 can't be the content of the scroll. That's the whole point. So the question is, "Well, when you get to the end, when the last seal is broken, are we getting the content now?" Again, we're never told.

The heavenly books motif is another speculation. Does that have anything to do with what's in the scroll? Now, we've done a whole episode on heavenly books, and I've referenced it a number of times in podcast episodes. That's episode 89. Again, there are whole monographs—scholarly discussions in book form—talking about the heavenly books of both the Old and New Testament and ancient literature. So some have speculated that, "Okay, we've got a scroll here. Is that scroll possibly the Book of Life? Because that's also mentioned too." Hmm. When the last seal is broken, where does that put us in the book? Is it a precursor to opening this and finding out who's in the Book of Life and who isn't? Again, it's an interesting idea. But we're never told.

45:00 So these are just some options that scholars discuss. Like "Can we actually read it after one or two or five?" "Well, no, you can't. You've got to wait till the seventh." "Well then what are the contents of Revelation 6-8? I mean, that can't correspond to the scroll, so what's going on?" There's lots of questions here that the book of Revelation never actually answers for us. And these questions derive from both the nature of the object held and also this ref to heavenly books in the book elsewhere, and even up to this point. But again, we're just not told. The best we've got is Ezekiel 2. Whatever's in the scroll is going to be bad, which isn't terribly satisfying. [laughs] But woe and lamentation and judgment. "Yeah, we get

it.” As we read the book, it’s pretty evident that’s what’s happening here. But that’s about the best you can do for specifics.

So returning to that whole theme, in Ezekiel 2:9-10, the scroll is described as the “words of mourning, lamentation, and woe.” That description doesn’t specifically target Judah or the Gentile nations. I’m talking about Ezekiel now. If this is the model... If John is repurposing Ezekiel 2:9-10, he wants his readers when they hear the description or read the description of the scroll, to think, “Oh, yeah! It’s Ezekiel 2. Yeah, it’s the same description.” If you go back and look at Ezekiel 2, we’ve got, “Oh, man! Words of warning and lamentation and woe.” But guess what? That doesn’t specifically target any one group: Judah or Gentile nations. Which really undermines... I mean, a couple of weeks ago we were talking, I think it was about Chilton, about how the book of Revelation is all about the judgment of Jerusalem. Well, not if you’re paying attention to Ezekiel 2:9-10, which John was. You’re sort of misreading the book. And this one point establishes that it’s a misreading.

But anyway, if you look at Ezekiel’s preaching more widely (the book of Ezekiel), you realize that he does hit both targets in the book. So you have Israel or Judah as the target of judgment in Ezekiel 4-24 (all those chapters). And after chapter 24 it transitions to the nations (Ezekiel 25-32). So in light of the analogy of the scroll in Revelation 5 to that of Ezekiel, it seems reasonable to surmise that the text of the scroll contains detailed judgments on the unrighteous among both Jews and Gentiles of the world in opposition to the Lamb and his followers. Not just one, but both. And again, we’re not doing End Times scheme analysis here in this series. But I’ll tell you what: just that one observation is going to influence how you read the book. I’m just saying. Just that one thing. Let’s go to Isaiah 29:11. We mentioned this briefly, that this is the passage where we get this “sealing” language. I’m going to read it again.

**<sup>11</sup> And the vision of all this has become to you like the words of a book that is sealed. When men give it to one who can read, saying, “Read this,” he says, “I cannot, for it is sealed.”**

“Duh. How am I supposed to read it? It’s sealed up.”

**<sup>12</sup> And when they give the book to one who cannot read, saying, “Read this,” he says, “I cannot read.”**

[laughs] And Isaiah's going to go on and use this metaphor to talk unfavorably (I'm trying to be generous) to those who are the points of reference to the language here.

But if we go back to Isaiah 29:11 with the sealing notion there, it's interesting. The sealed book can be read as a metaphor for spiritual blindness. The person who can read can't read this scroll because it's sealed. Well, again, you don't know. You don't have eyes to see. Remember the recurring phrase in the book of Revelation, "him who has ears to hear?" You also get "eyes to see" and this kind of thing. Well, we can't, because it's sealed. God doesn't want us to know. Maybe we're being punished.

Remember Isaiah 6, which is also a divine council scene, where God judges the wicked? They have ears, but they're not going to be able to hear. They have eyes, but they're not going to be able to see. Some scholars take Isaiah 29:11 as a commentary on why the book is sealed here in Revelation 5. It's obviously a judgment context in one sense, but is God punishing those who are spiritually blind? Can we read that into it? That's an item for discussion. I don't know that it's clear. I think it might be possible. I just don't know that it's clear. On the other hand, the referent may also be to Daniel 12:4 and 9, where a book is deliberately sealed to *prevent* its content from being known. It's not really a commentary on spiritual blindness; it's just preventative. Depending on which trajectory is in view in Revelation 5, the point of the sealed book is either the blind (the wicked) are about to be hit by judgment that they will not see coming, *or* that God has chosen to reveal to the righteous what portends for the future. In other words, the people who are reading the book of Revelation are the righteous, and they will understand. It could be either way. Or maybe both.

50:00

Now a contemporary text, 1 Enoch, is an apocalypse. (That's what 1 Enoch is. The book of Enoch is an apocalypse.) It's designed to inform the righteous that they are about to be vindicated and the wicked judged. And so Aune picks up on this and he writes of one portion in 1 Enoch. He says:

*1 Enoch* 89:71 refers to a book containing the deeds of the "shepherds," written by an archangel scribe covering the first historical period from 89:72–77, which God himself sealed after it was read out to him. The unsealing and reading of this book (89:76–77) involve the punishment of the "shepherds" for what they had destroyed (90:17).

So again, Aune is saying maybe this is how we should look at Revelation. It's the wicked are going to get blindsided (pardon the pun) and the righteous are going to know. They're going to know what's happening—what's coming down the pike. Let's go to Revelation 5:3. It says:

**<sup>3</sup> And no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll or to look into it...**

Did you notice the three-tiered cosmology? It's also in chapter 5:13. Now just listen to this. Three-tiered cosmology is heaven, earth, and under the earth. Those of you who are familiar with my content, this should be old news by now. The three-tiered cosmology of Old and New Testament. And Aune writes:

... the emphasis is on the beings who populate each of these three zones. The comprehensive way of referring to each of the three major zones of the cosmos is a way of saying "nowhere in the entire universe..."

Nowhere in the entire universe could be found one that was able to open the scroll or to look into it. No supernatural being in the heavens, no earthly being on the earth, and no supernatural being or disembodied dead under the earth. Nobody. Now interestingly, Aune writes this as well:

In the *T. Sol.* [MH: *the Testament of Solomon*] 16:3, Beelzeboul is referred to as the ruler of the spirits of the air [MH: which sounds very New Testament] and the earth and beneath the earth."

So Beelzeboul is given credit over the spiritual beings in all three zones who are allied with him. And if that's the case, if that's what John intends the reader to think of, basically he's saying, "None of the spiritual bad guys know what's in this scroll. They're going to get blindsided too. And they are unable to open it and read it. And it's in God's right hand. And only the Lamb can open it." In other words, "We have some interesting things in store. [MH laughs] Your God has some interesting things in store for the powers of darkness, and they don't know." Just an interesting thought. On to Revelation 5:5-6. I'll read it again.

**<sup>5</sup> And one of the elders said to me, "Weep no more; behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals."**

**<sup>6</sup> And between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders I saw a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, with seven horns and with seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth.**

These are clear messianic titles from the Old Testament, and they serve as the means to identify the Lamb in the next verse. Verses 5 and 6 is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, and then we get the Lamb. So they define who the Lamb is. Aune draws attention to the wording “has conquered.” That’s in Revelation 5:5. He writes:

The use of the term *νικᾶν* (*nikan*) for the salvific death of Jesus has partial parallels in Paul’s allusion to Isa 25:8 in 1 Cor 15:54, “Death is swallowed up in victory [MH: *nikos*, which is a related term to *nikan*],” and in John 16:33, where the saying is attributed to Jesus, “I have conquered [*nenikēka*] the world [MH: the root is the same for all three of these (Revelation 5:5, 1 Corinthians 15:54, John 16:33)]... The atoning death of Christ, conceptualized as conflict resulting in victory, reflects the classic idea of the atonement in which Christ fights against and triumphs over all the evil powers in the world, under whom human beings were in bondage and suffering, and decisively triumphs over them, thereby reconciling the world to himself.”

55:00

Now here’s why I think this is important. We’ve gotten Q&A questions about it. “What’s Mike’s view of the atonement? Is it the ransom? Is it Christos Victor?” And my answer’s always the same. I don’t see any reason that the atonement must be understood from only one perspective. Usually people want to argue for other views of the atonement just to get away from substitutionary atonement. That is a mistake. It is a theological mistake and a theological error. How can I say that with confidence here? Because this is the Lamb who was slain and now is standing. It’s resurrection imagery. It’s *death* and resurrection. Death and resurrection are linked to “has conquered.” And “has conquered” is linked to “victory over...” Not only victory over supernatural darkness, but the reconciliation of the cosmos to God. You can’t have that with other views of the atonement. In other words, you can’t exclude the idea of the *death* from the atonement concept. You can’t do it, so why are you trying so desperately to do it? Because it’s culturally offensive or something? Well, sorry, it’s in the text. It’s not just here. It’s in the text in other places.

So again, I think this debate over the atonement is kind of useless. It’s a distraction. We can learn something about the atonement from *all* of the possible perspectives. They all have a contribution to make. That’s all I’m saying. We

don't need to embrace some other one just to get rid of substitutionary atonement. That's deeply flawed thinking.

Why does the imagery of the lamb appear here? (We'll move on to another topic.) The term used here (*arnion*) occurs twenty-nine times in the book of Revelation, all of which are references to Jesus, except for Revelation 13:11. The only other New Testament occurrence is John 21:15. So *arnion* (the word for "lamb" here in Revelation 5) occurs 29 times in the book of Revelation. They all refer to Jesus except the one in Revelation 13:11. That's really about the beast, drawing on Daniel with the ram and all that stuff. The only other occurrence is John 21:15. Now the word used in John 1:29... Because a lot of you are thinking, "What about John 1:29, the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world?" That's a different word. That's *amnos*. It's also John 1:36; Acts 8:32; 1 Peter 1:19. So Aune really gets into this. He devotes seven pages of discussion to the Greek terminology for "lamb" found in the New Testament and the Septuagint, as well as Aramaic equivalents. So I'm not going to go through all that. But just a few of his observations here I think are interesting. He writes:

The term ἀρνίον, "lamb," occurs twenty-nine times in Revelation (only in 13:11 does the term not refer to Jesus; rather it refers there to the Beast from the Land or the False Prophet), with the first occurrence [MH: of *arnion* being] in 5:6. The only other NT occurrence of the term is in John 21:15, where the plural form τὰ ἀρνία is a metaphor referring to the Christian community [MH: lambs]. Many commentators have observed that ἀρνίον is the term preferred in Revelation, while ἀμνός is preferred in John . . . where it occurs just twice (1:29, 36)... There are two primary ways of interpreting the lamb metaphor in Revelation: as a *metaphor for a leader or ruler* and as a *sacrificial metaphor*...

So the lamb terminology can either be metaphorically speaking of a leader or ruler or of a sacrificial victim.

While the designation "Lamb" is in some respects synonymous with the term Messiah *in Revelation*, there is only a single disputed instance in which the figure of the lamb is used of the Messiah in early Jewish literature [MH: *Testament of Joseph*] (*T. Jos.* 9:3; see below).

I would actually disagree with that. But I'm not going to worry about that too much. We may be having an episode of the podcast later on where we get into this issue with the Josephite messiah thing. We may get an opportunity to do that. It would be an interview. But anyway, back to the quote.

1:00:00

Apart from this one text, there is no convincing evidence that the Messiah was symbolized by a lamb in second temple Judaism [MH: again, I would disagree with that, but moving on]... The first mention of the Lamb in Revelation follows his introduction as “the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David” in 5:5, both clearly messianic designations... The Lamb is depicted as a mighty warrior able to conquer those who make war against him (17:14). All who oppose the Lamb, regardless of station, fear his wrath (6:16). The role of the Lamb in judgment is suggested by the mention of the Lamb’s book of life (13:8; 21:27)... It is clear that the sacrificial associations of the lamb (discussed below) have no obvious connection with these more violent and powerful activities of the Lamb. Sheep were used throughout the ancient Near East as ways of depicting the gods [MH: isn’t that interesting?] or as symbols for the gods...

**This is especially true in Egypt. I’m skipping all that stuff. Aune gets into it, but it’s just too long.**

Some of the references to the Lamb in Revelation clearly point to the sacrificial death of Jesus.

**So again, here he’s saying, “Look, sometimes this metaphor in the ancient world refers to deities, conquering heroes, and sometimes it’s very obviously a sacrificial thing—a sacrificial animal.” And he says, “Some of the references *clearly* point to the sacrificial *death* of Jesus in Revelation.”**

The Lamb, who is standing and has seven horns and seven eyes, looks as though it had been slain, ὡς ἐσφαγμένον (5:6, 12). The consequence of the slaughter of the Lamb (doubtless referring to the crucifixion of Jesus) was the redemption by means of his blood, i.e., his death (5:9; 7:14). In 12:11, it is said that the people of God conquered Satan by the blood of the Lamb.

**There we go again with the atonement thing. It is deeply flawed to try to exclude substitutionary atonement from the picture of the atonement (the work of Christ). Every perspective of the atonement has something to contribute. John very obviously has his head in the sacrificial aspect here. But that’s not the only aspect. Again, that’s the point I’m trying to make clear here. Back to Aune:**

Jesus is referred to under the metaphor of a sacrificial sheep or lamb in a number of other NT and early Christian texts. The earliest reference is found in 1 Cor 5:7... In John 1:29 Jesus is referred to as “the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (the phrase “the lamb of God” is applied to Jesus again in John 1:36), a

title taken by most scholars to refer to the paschal [MH: Passover] lamb, even though the expiation of sins was not linked to the Passover sacrifice...

I hope you realize that as well. Passover was not about the forgiveness of sin. It was about saving the Israelites from death, from the Destroyer.

[Other scholars have] observed that the Aramaic term *ṭalyā'* [MH: remember the passage, *talitha, ṭalyā'?*], which could mean “child, servant,” as well as “lamb,” was interpreted in the latter sense in John 1:29, 36, based on Isa 53:7.

Like I said, he goes on for seven pages of this. And I just wanted to give you a little bit of a taste of it. But here's the bottom line. The lamb metaphor can work two ways, not only one way. The sacrificial aspect of the metaphor, which is linked to the atonement, which is linked to victory over Satan in Revelation 12, all these things... That's one side of the metaphor and they cannot be excluded. The other side: there are passages that talk about *ṭalyā'* (servant). When you hear “servant”... And in Aramaic, the word for “lamb” can also mean “servant.” That should make you think of Jesus in yet another way: the servant. The Servant Song was Isaiah. I mean, metaphors are like this. They're multivalent. There's your academic word for the day. “Multivalent” means they could have more than one meaning. Think different aspects to it. And this is a good example of it, this whole lamb thing. It includes sacrifice. It includes servant. It includes even deity, because of the wider ancient Near East, where gods were given this terminology. Rulership. It includes all these things. And John (the suggestion is, by Aune) uses it in more than one way. So we need to be thinking about this when we read through the book.

So I would say in summary here, it is likely secure (at least) to say that the lamb metaphor pointing to rulership *is* in view for John, but that does not exclude the sacrificial, particularly since John portrays the lamb as slain. So he's doing both. We should not, then, think only of a lamb being led to slaughter in its weakness. When you read through the book of Revelation about the Lamb and you get this sort of pathetic description of the Lamb who was slain and all, don't think of it as an object of weakness. Yes, it's a sacrificial victim. But at the same time, it's a conquering ruler. And that is actually bound up in the metaphor, believe it or not. So let's try to not read it one way.

1:05:00

Further, while the Passover lamb reference for Jesus is clear in Paul's letter to the Corinthians, it is not clear in John's writings (at least the specific Passover connection). Lambs were used in a wide range of sacrifices in the Old Testament. It could be some other sacrifice to loop in as far as the meaning of it. Consequently, without a specific reference to Passover by John, the options for why John might be drawing on the language are wide open. The two trajectories merge in the two aspects of Christ's mission: broadly, to bring humanity back into

relationship with God and, more narrowly in prospect, to judge the world. The lamb, as a metaphor, is appropriate for *both* sides of that, is the point. So again, these are just a few things in Revelation 5. Especially the lamb thing. Aune just goes on and on and on and on with illustrations and whatnot. It would be wonderful if we could spend the time going through his examples. They're very interesting. They're very telling. But I think that's enough for the sake of this episode of the podcast.

Again, the goal here was to pick out some of the things in Revelation 5 that have a connection in some way to the Old Testament. It would be nice if we could go through all of the sacrifices in the Old Testament that use a lamb. "Might John be thinking of this?" Maybe, maybe not. He's not specific. But we're not going to do that. We need to move on to chapter 6 next week. But just keep in mind, again, that when John uses this image, he means more than one thing. He's traveling down more than one river. [laughs] He's assuming that readers will know, "Oh! John might want me to think this or that. And maybe both. It just depends." Again, there's a lot of that kind of thing going on in Revelation 5. And of course, as we proceed to Revelation 6 next week, we're going to get into some more of these things as the seals are opened. There's going to be a *lot* more dipping into the Old Testament to provide context for what we're reading.

**TS:** Alright, Mike. I'm excited to open the first seal next week. That'll be good. [MH laughs] We'll see what happens.

**MH:** Hopefully you have a pretty sharp instrument.

**TS:** Hopefully we can find somebody worthy enough to open it. [MH laughs] Do you think we will? Are there spoilers? Do we want to...

**MH:** Is this, like, a promotion? I never know what you're thinking, Trey. [laughter]

**TS:** I don't either, Mike. I don't either. [laughs] I don't know what that means. Alright, sounds good. Well, we'll be looking forward to chapter 6 next week. And with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.