fore mentioned : no inference can be drawn  
from this that the Sitter on the cloud  
is a mere angel) **came out of the temple,  
crying out ina loud voice to him that  
sat upon the cloud, Put forth** (literally,  
**send**: and so in Mark in the reff. De  
Wette’s objection, that the sitter on  
the cloud cannot be Christ Himself, because He would not be introduced receiving  
a command from an angel, may be well  
answered, as Düsterdieck, that the angel is  
only the messenger of the will of God.  
And I may add what to me makes this  
reply undoubtedly valid, that the command  
is one regarding the times and seasons,  
which the Father hath kept in his own  
power) **thy sickle** (the whole is a remembrance of our Lord’s own saying in  
Mark iv. 29: see below) **and reap: because  
the time to reap is come, because the  
harvest of the earth is dried** (perfectly:  
ripe, so that the stalk is dry: compare  
Mark iv, 29: also the fields being “*white  
already to harvest*,” John iv. 35: which  
they can only become by losing their  
moisture). {16} **And he that sat upon the  
cloud thrust in his sickle upon** (into,  
from above) **the earth, and the earth  
was reaped** (to what does this harvest  
refer? Is it the ingathering of the wicked,  
or of the saints, or of both together? Each  
of these has examples in Scripture symbolism, The first, in Jer. li, 33, where it  
is said of Babylon, “It is time to thresh her,  
yet a little while and the time of her harvest  
is come:” and as appears, Joel iii. 15,  
though the reference seems rather there to  
be to the vintage: the second, in Matt.ix.39,  
and parallels; Mark iv. 29; John iv. 35;  
the third, in Matt. xiii. 30, 39. The verdict of commentators is very much divided.  
There are circumstances in the context  
which tell both ways. The parallelism with  
the vintage, which follows, seems to favour  
a harvest of the wicked: but then on the  
other hand, if so, what is the distinction between the two ingatherings? and why  
do we read of the casting into the winepress of God’s wrath in the second case,  
and of no corresponding feature in the  
other? Again, why is the agency so different— the Son of man on the white cloud  
with the golden crown in the one case, the  
mere angel in the other? Besides, the  
two gatherings seem quite distinct. ‘The  
former is over before the other begins.  
On the whole then, though I would not  
pronounce decidedly, I much incline to  
think that the harvest is the ingathering  
of the saints, God’s harvest, reaped from  
the earth: described here thus generally,  
before the vintage of wrath which follows.  
And thus we have at least these two visions  
in harmony with the character of this section, which contains the mingled agency  
and fortunes of the Church and of its enemies; thus this harvest answers to the  
great preaching of the everlasting gospel  
above, vv. 6,7, while the following vintage  
fulfils the denunciations of wrath on those  
who worship the image or receive the mark  
of the beast, vv. 8, 11. And thus too we  
bring this description into harmony with  
our Lord’s important parable in Mark  
iv. 29, where the very words are used of  
the agency of Christ Himself when the  
work of grace is ripe, whether in the individual or in the church. But while thus  
inclined, I will not deny that the other  
view, and that which unites both, have  
very much to he said for them).

**17—20**.] *The vintage of wrath***.** {17} **And  
another angel** (**another** may perhaps refer  
to the three angels who have already  
appeared in this vision: or, which is more  
probable, referring to the last-mentioned  
Agent, may be a general term, not necessarily implying that He was a mere angel)  
**came out from the temple which was in  
heaven** (from which come forth God’s  
judgments: see ch. xi. 19), **having himself also** (as well as that other: but the