

represented by one sitting there. And a stronger argument in favor of it is the last phrase of v. 10, "and the books were opened." That suggests that they were looking for evidence in order to decide whether the beast needs to be punished. That does not seem reasonable. There is certainly _____ in the passage that fits the judgment of individuals.

So I would feel that the books being opened here is rather a symbolic ~~xxx~~ statement of God's complete knowledge of everything that the beast has done. Seen as happening on earth at the time that is here pictured. But one must say that the phrase does suggest the other. And I believe all recent translators have taken it as the other.

The key phrase to this question is the phrase which the KJV translates "the judgment was set." That translation ~~ix~~ it seems to me would fit with the general tenor of the key verses. Here is the mighty God, the sovereign God there with all these firey flames going out from him; the wheels of burning fire and the thousands of thousands ready to perform His will. And His judgment was set. His judgment against the beast had been determined from long before the time the beast had ever come into existence. It is set, and even though you see the little horn speaking his great boastful words and making war on the saints and seems to win against them, and things look hopeless from a human viewpoint, God's judgment is set and will be carried out in its own time.

Now in favor of that interpretation is the fact that the word "judgment" is a word that does not mean a court; it means a decision. The decision for the judgment was set. All the recent commentaries that take the interpretation that this is a court ~~xxx~~ scene, translate that phrase "the court sat" and the books were opened.

It seems to be quite out of relationship with the general tenor of the two verses. And they say the word "judgment" here means decision or judgment, but they say the abstract is here used for the concrete! That can be done, but I'd like some proof that it is done before I accept it. I'd like some other passage _____

This word din here which means judgment is used in the Medieval Jewish writings-- in the Talmud-- a great deal. And there when they refer to a court, they call it Beth Din i.e. the house of judgment. And if this meant "court" it would seem to me that place of judgment or house of judgment,-- something like that would be more appropriate ~~xxxxxxx~~ than the word which means a "decision" rather than a body to make a decision.

However, the fact remains that it does say it sat, and uses the ordinary word "to sit", and that seems, at least to our modern minds, to fit more with a court than with the fact that the judgment was set, that it was sitting from all eternity. So I would not be dogmatic on this. I would state my opinion about it, but all the recent interpretations that I have seen take it the other way.

A very interesting question was turned in to me right on this point. It says, Is it not possible that== no this is not the one. This is the one: In the French Judicial system the Judge is also Jury