

THE  
WORKS  
OF  
NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE  
CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;  
JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;  
HISTORY OF HERETICS;  
AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS:

WITH  
GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

ANDREW KIPPIS, D.D. F.R.S. AND S.A.

---

VOLUME VI.

---



L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

110. c. 72.

their preaching, which these Christians had heard, or the writings of apostles, which they had read, and had in their hands. Such discourses of St. Paul may be seen recorded in Acts xx. 29, 30. And he writes to the like purpose 1 Tim. iv. 1—5. and 2 Tim. iii. and iv. They who suppose, that St. Jude had seen and read the second epistle of St. Peter, must think, that he refers also to 2 Pet. ch. iii. 1—5.

There are some other expressions in this epistle, which may deserve to be here taken notice of by us. Ver. 3. *It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that you should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.* and ver. 5. *I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this.* These expressions seem to imply, that now some considerable time had passed, since the whole scheme of the christian doctrine had been published to the world, and since the persons, to whom the apostle is writing, were first instructed in it.

Upon the whole, as before said, this epistle might be written in the year of Christ 64, or 65, or 66.

---

## C H A P XXII.

### THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

- I. *Its Genuineness shown from Testimony.* II. *From internal Characters.*  
 III. *Its Time.*

I. WE are now come to the last book of the New Testament, the Revelation: about which there have been different sentiments among Christians, many receiving it as the writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, others ascribing it to John a presbyter, others to Cerinthus, and some rejecting it, without knowing to whom it should be ascribed.

I shall therefore here rehearse the testimony of ancient Christians, as it ariseth in several ages.

It is probable, that Hermas had read the book of the Revelation, and imitated it. He has many things resembling it, vol. II. p. 61—64. It is referred to by the martyrs at Lyons, p. 152. There is reason to think, it was received by Papias, p. 108—114. Justin Martyr, about the year 140,

was acquainted with this book, and received it, as written by the apostle John. For in his dialogue with Trypho he expressly says: 'And a man from among us, by name John, 'one of the apostles of Christ, in the revelation made to him, 'has prophesied, that the believers in our Christ shall live a 'thousand years in Jerusalem, and after that shall be the general, and, in a word, the eternal resurrection and judgment 'of all together,' p. 126. To this very passage we suppose Eusebius to refer in his ecclesiastical history, when giving an account of Justin's works, he observes to this purpose: 'he 'also mentions the Revelation of John, expressly calling it 'the apostle's.' See the same page, note (a). Among the works of Melito, bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches of Asia, about the year 177, Eusebius mentions one, entitled, 'Of the Revelation of John,' p. 147. It is very probable, that Melito ascribed this book to the apostle of that name, and esteemed it a book of canonical authority. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, about 178, who in his younger days was acquainted with Polycarp, often quotes this book, 'as the Revelation of John, the disciple of the Lord,' p. 169. And in one place he says: 'It was seen not long ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.' Ibid. And see p. 155.

Theophilus was bishop of Antioch about 181. Eusebius speaking of a work of his against the heresy of Hermogenes, says, 'he therein made use of testimonies, or quoted passages, from John's Apocalypse,' vol. II. p. 190. The book of the Revelation is several times quoted by Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about 194, and once in this manner: 'Such an 'one, though here on earth he is not honoured with the first 'seat, shall sit upon the four and twenty thrones judging the 'people, as John says in the Revelation,' p. 229. Tertullian, about the year 200, often quotes the Revelation, and supposeth it to have been written by St. John, the same who wrote the first epistle of John, universally received, p. 276, 277. Again; 'the apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a *sharp two-edged sword coming out of the mouth of God,*' p. 277. He also says, 'We have churches, that are disciples of John. For though 'Marcion rejects the Revelation, the succession of bishops, 'traced to the original, will assure us, that John is the author:' *ibid.* by John, undoubtedly, meaning the apostle.

From Eusebius we learn, that Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists about the year 211, quoted the Revelation,

lation, p. 371. By Caius, about the year 212, it was ascribed to Cerinthus, p. 378, 379. It was received by Hippolytus, about the year 220, p. 412, and by Origen about 230, p. 466—468. It is often quoted by him. He seems not to have had any doubt about its genuineness. In his commentary upon St. John's gospel, he speaks of it in this manner: 'Therefore John, the son of Zebedee, says in the Revelation, p. 483. See also p. 483, 484, and 543.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the year 247, or somewhat later, wrote a book against the Millenarians, in which he allows the Revelation to be written by John, a holy and divinely inspired man. But he says, 'he cannot easily grant him to be the apostle, the son of Zebedee, whose is the gospel according to John, and the catholic epistle,' vol. III. p. 105. He rather thinks it may be the work of John, an elder, who also lived at Ephesus, in Asia, as well as the apostle, p. 107. See likewise p. 128, 129, 131. Moreover, it appears from a conference, which Dionysius had with some Millenarians, that the Revelation was about the year 240, and before, received by Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, and by many others in that country, p. 68, 103, 104, and that it was in great reputation, p. 128, 129. It was received by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about 248, and by the church of Rome in his time, p. 175, 176, and by divers Latin authors, whose history is written in the third volume of this work. As may be seen in the alphabetical Table of principal matters, in the article of the Revelation.

The Revelation was received by Novatus, and his followers, p. 245, 246, and by divers other authors, whose history is written in that volume.

It is also probable, that it was received by the Manichees, p. 507.

It was received by Lactantius, vol. IV. p. 80, and by the Donatists, p. 102, by the latter Arnobius, about 460, p. 24, and by the Arians, p. 117.

In the time of Eusebius, in the former part of the fourth century, it was not received by all. And therefore it is reckoned by him among contradicted books, vol. IV. p. 227. Nevertheless it was generally received, p. 234 and 255. Eusebius himself seems to have hesitated about it. For he says, 'It is likely, that the Revelation was seen by John the elder, if not by John the apostle,' p. 256. It may be reckoned probable, that the critical argument of Dionysius, of

Alexandria, was of great weight with him, and others of that time. See p. 257, 258. The Revelation was received by Athanasius, p. 283—286, and by Epiphanius, p. 313—316. But we also learn from him, that it was not received by all in his time, p. 316, 317. It is not in the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, about 348, and seems, not to have been received by him, p. 300—302. It is also wanting in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, about 363, p. 309. Nevertheless I do not think, it can be thence<sup>d</sup> concluded, that this book was rejected by the bishops of that council. Their design seems to have been to mention by name those books only, which should be publicly read. And they might be of opinion, that upon account of its obscurity, it should not be publicly read, though it was of sacred authority. And some may be of opinion, that this observation should likewise be applied to Cyril's catalogue just taken notice of.

The Revelation is not in Gregory Nazianzen's catalogue, vol. IV. p. 408. Nevertheless it seems to have been received by him, p. 409. It is in the catalogue of Amphilochius. But he says, it was not received by all, p. 414. It is also omitted in Ebedjesu's catalogue of the books of scripture, received by the Syrians, p. 439, 440; nor is it in the ancient Syriac version, p. 441.

It was received by Jerom, vol. V. p. 32, 33, 41, 44. But he says, it was rejected by the Greek Christians, p. 50. It was received by Rufin, p. 76, by the third council of Carthage in 397, p. 79, and by Augustine, p. 86, 104. But it was not received by all in his time, p. 102. It is never quoted by Chrysostom, and, probably, was not received by him, p. 137. It is in the catalogue of Dionysius, called the Areopagite, about 490, p. 247. It is in the Alexandrian manuscript, p. 254—256. It was received by Sulpicius Severus, about 401, p. 164, and by J. Damascenus, p. 316, and by Œcumenius, p. 325, and by many other authors, whose history is written in the fifth volume. Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century, p. 250, and Aſethas, bishop of the same place in the sixth century, wrote commentaries upon it, p. 274. But it was not received by Severian, bishop of Gabala, p. 161; nor, as it seems, by Theodoret, p. 195, 196.

Upon the whole it appears, that this book has been generally received in all ages: though some have doubted of it, or rejected it, particularly, the Syrians, and some other  
Christians

Christians in the east. However, for more particulars, see St. John, and the Revelation, in the alphabetical table, which is in the eleventh volume of this work.

It may not be improper for me here to remind my readers of the sentiments of divers learned moderns, concerning this book, which were put together in vol. III. p. 126, 131, after having largely represented the criticisms of Caius, and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century upon the style of this book, and of the other writings ascribed to St. John. Where also is proposed this observation, p. 131: 'It may be questioned, whether their exceptions, founded in the difference of style, and such like things, or any other criticisms whatever, can be sufficient to create a doubt concerning the author of this book: which was owned for a writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, before the times of Dionysius and Caius, and, so far as we know, before the most early of those, who disputed its genuineness.'

II. Having thus represented the external evidence of the genuineness of the book of the Revelation, or of its being written by St. John, I should proceed to consider the internal evidence. But I need not enlarge here, because the objections taken from the style, and some other particulars, were stated, and considered, in the third volume, in the article of Dionysius, above-named, bishop of Alexandria.

I now intend therefore only to take notice of a few things, of principal note, which learned men insist upon, as arguments, that the Revelation has the same author with the gospel, and epistles, that go under the name of the apostle and evangelist John.

1. Ch. i. ver. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things, which must shortly come to pass. And he sent, and signified it by his angel, unto his servant John.*

Hence it is argued, that <sup>a</sup> John styles himself the *servant of Christ*, in a sense not common to all believers, but peculiar to those, who are especially employed by him. So Paul, and

<sup>a</sup> — sed esse se *inter notabiles Christi Jesu ministras*, quos ad Ecclesiam suam docendam, regendam, et curandam adhibebat.—Hoc sensu Moses, David, Jesaias, et Prophe-

tæ omnes sub œconomia veteri, et Paulus, et alii Apostoli sub œconomia nova vocantur servi Dei. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. 1.

other apostles, call themselves *servants of God, and of Christ*. Particularly Rom. i. 1. *Paul a servant of Jesus Christ*. James i. 1. *James a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ*. 2 Pet. i. 1. *Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ*. Jude v. 1. *Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ*. So Moses is called *the servant of God*. Numb. xii. 7. and Heb. iii. 2. And in like manner divers of the prophets. And in this very book, ch. x. 7. is the expression: *as he has declared unto his servants the prophets*.

This observation may be of some weight for showing, that the writer is an apostle. But it is not decisive. And in the same verse, whence this argument is taken, the phrase is used in its general sense. *Which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants*.

2. Ver. 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw*.

Some suppose, the writer herein to refer to the written gospel of St. John, and to say, that he had already borne testimony concerning the word of God, and Jesus Christ. But, as formerly observed, these words may be understood of this very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer says here very properly, at the beginning, and by way of preface, that he had performed his office in this book, having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, which he had received from Jesus Christ.

For certain, if these words did clearly refer to a written gospel, they would be decisive. But they are allowed to be ambiguous, and other senses have been given of them. By some they have been understood to contain a declaration, that the writer had already borne witness to Jesus Christ before magistrates. Moreover, I think, that if St. John had intended to manifest himself in this introduction, he would

<sup>b</sup> See vol. III. p. 118.

<sup>c</sup> Ver. 2. *Qui testatus est sermonem Dei, et testimonium J. C. et quæ vidit.*] Duplici modo hæc accipi possunt, vel Joannem confessionem veritatis solennem coram tribunali Præfecti Asiæ Romani edidisse, ob quam ipse missus fuerit in exilium: vel ipsum Evangelio a se edito solenne de Christo, ejusque dictis et gestis edidisse testimonium. Priore sensu vox μαρτυρεῖν scriptoribus Græcis posterioris temporis recep-

tissima est, et manifeste etiam sumitur a Paulo, 1 Tim. vi. 13—Veni igitur ultro in illam sententiam, quæ hæc Joannis verba refert ad Evangelium non prædicatum tantum a Joanne solenniter, sed et scriptis confirmatum.—Quæ si sane sit hujus loci interpretatio, certò simul testabitur de illius auctore, Joanne Apostolo, ac proinde de libri hujus divinitate, et summa auctoritate. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2.

have more plainly characterized himself in several parts of this book, than he has done.

This observation therefore appears to me to be of small moment for determining, who the writer is.

3. Farther, it is argued, in favour of the genuineness of this book, 'that there are in it many instances of conformity, both of sentiment and expression, between the Revelation and the uncontested writings of St. John.'

Divers such coincidences, or instances of agreement, were taken notice of formerly, and remarks were made upon them, vol. III. p. 121—125. That which is at p. 124, appears to me, as striking, as any. I shall therefore enlarge upon it here. Our Saviour says to his disciples John xvi. 33. *Be of good cheer. I have overcome the world.* Christian firmness under trials is several times represented by *overcoming*, or *overcoming the world*, or *overcoming the wicked one*, in St. John's first epistle, ch. ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. v. 4, 5. And it is language peculiar to St. John, being in no other books of the New Testament. And our Lord says Rev. iii. 21. *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.* Compare ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26. iii. 5, 12, 21, and xxi. 7.

III. Concerning the time of writing this book, I need not now say much, having before shown, in the history of St. John, that it is the general testimony of ancient authors, that St. John was banished into Patmos, in the time of Domitian, in the latter part of his reign, and restored by his successor Nerva. But the book could not be published, till after St. John's release, and return to Ephesus in Asia.

As Domitian died in 96, and his persecution did not commence, till near the end of his reign, the Revelation seems to be fitly dated in the year 95, or 96.

Mill placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96, and the last year of the emperor Domitian. At first, he supposed, that

<sup>d</sup> See before, p. 174—186.

<sup>e</sup> Eodem ordine septem istæ Asiæ civitates enumerantur, quo ex Patmo insulâ adiri debebant. Wetsten. in Apoc. i. 11. tom. II. p. 750.

<sup>f</sup> Paucis post conscriptas has epistolas annis, exorta est Christianorum persecutio sub Domitiano.

---In insulâ vero Patmo, in quam relegatus erat Joannes, Domitiani ultimo, seu anno æræ vulgaris xcvi. —facta est ipsi Revelatio: quam universam postea expresso Christi mandato scriptis consignavit. Scriptamque Domini ejusdem jussu misit ad septem ecclesias Asiæ. Unde manifestum



that the Revelation was written in Patmos. But afterwards he \* altered his mind, and thought, it was not written until after his return to Ephesus from Patmos. He builds upon the words of Rev. i. 9. If so, I apprehend, it might not be published before the year 97, or, at the soonest, near the end of the year 96.

Basnage <sup>a</sup> placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96.

Le Clerc <sup>i</sup> likewise, who readily admits the genuineness of this book, speaks of it at the same year.

Mr. Lowman \* supposes, St. John to have had his visions in the isle of Patmos in the year 95.

But Mr. Wetstein <sup>k</sup> favours the opinion of those, who have argued, that the Revelation was written before the Jewish war. He moreover says, that <sup>l</sup> if the Revelation was written before that war, it is likely, that the events of that

manifestum est, visionem non modo Joanni factam fuisse, sed etiam ab eo literis traditam in insula Patmo.

— Scriptam fuisse ex prædictis constat anno vulgaris æræ xcvi. seu Domitiani xvi. et quidem ad finem ejusdem imperii, inquit Irenæus, seu tempore ætivo æræ vulg. xcvi. Proleg. num. 157.

<sup>m</sup> Subjiciemus hic verba Millii, quæ in emendandis posuerat: *Hic sententiam, inquit, mutavimus. Constat enim ex ipsis Joannis verbis Apoc. i. 9. cum post reditum ad Ephesum hunc librum scripsisse.* Kuster. in notis num. 157. Proleg. p. 19.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. ann. 96. num. xii.

<sup>o</sup> At nemo de auctoritate ejus dubitârat ante Caium, Romanum Presbyterum, qui circa finem ii. seculi vixit. Cum Cataphryges eo libro abuterentur—sæctum hunc esse Apostoli negare, atque a Cerintho, præscripto ejus nomine, editum dicere maluit. At Justinus, et Irenæus, eo antiquiores, et qui cum Joannis discipulis versati erant, Apostolo hoc opus tribuerunt. Similiter, cum medio seculo iii. Nepos in Ægypto Episcopus, Chiliastarum deliria eodem libro tueretur, Dionysius Alexandrinus eadem causa Joanni eum abjudicavit.

aliter senserant, quicumque

Apocalypseos antea mentionem fecerant, excepto Caio, quos sequuti etiam posteri omnes ad unum. —

Multo fide dignior Irenæus, qui passim hunc librum, quasi Joannis Apostoli, ad testimonium vocat, et disertè. lib. v. c. 30. *Neque enim ante multum tempus visa est, sed ferme nostra ætate, sub finem imperii Domitiani.* Quæ ejus verba Græca habet Eusebius. l. 5. c. 8. J. Cleric. H. E. An. 96. num. v.

<sup>p</sup> See the scheme and order of the prophecies in the book of the Revelation, which is prefixed to his paraphrase.

<sup>q</sup> Nos quidem, omnibus expensis, cum iis facimus, qui statuant, Apocalypsin ante bellum Judaicum fuisse scriptum. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 746. m.

<sup>r</sup> Quæstio est non levis momenti, cum vera Apocalypseos interpretatio maximam partem inde pendeat. Si enim scripta est ante bellum Judaicum, et bella civilia in Italia; nullo modo probabile est, tantam rerum conversionem omnino præteriri atque negligi potuisse. Sin autem post illos motus compositos scripta est, probabilior erit eorum sententia, qui eventus in Apocalypsi prædictos in seculorum sequentium historia quærendos existimant. Id. ib.

time should be foretold in it. To which I answer, that <sup>a</sup> though some interpreters have applied some things in this book to those times, I cannot say, whether they have done it rightly, or not, because I do not understand the Revelation. But to me it seems, that though this book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, there was no necessity, that it should be foretold here: because our blessed Lord had in his own preaching at divers times spoken very plainly, and intelligibly, concerning the calamities coming upon the Jewish people in general, and the city and temple of Jerusalem, in particular. And his plain predictions, and symbolical prefigurations of those events, were recorded by no less than three historians and evangelists, before the war in Judea broke out.

Grotius, who, as <sup>a</sup> formerly seen, placeth this book in the reign of Claudius, was of opinion, that <sup>o</sup> the visions of this book were seen at several times, and afterwards joined together in one book: in like manner, as the visions and prophecies of some of the prophets of the Old Testament.

Concerning this opinion it is not proper for me to dispute: though there appears not any foundation for it in the book itself, as <sup>p</sup> Vitringa has observed. But that the book of the Revelation,

<sup>a</sup> Lightfootus in genere censet, Apocalypsin hanc editam esse ante novissimum Hierosolymorum excidium. Et certe si Joannes hanc Revelationem vere a Christo Jesu accepisset sub Claudio, magna cum specie negari non posset doctissimis his viris, quædam *figillarum visa* ad fata judaismi non adeo incommode applicari posse. Sed obstant graves rationes, quæ nos in hanc sententiam ire vetant. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 7. Vid. et in cap. vi. ver. 1, 2. p. 101—105.

<sup>a</sup> See before, p. 176.

<sup>o</sup> *Et mitte septem ecclesiis.* Nempe hujus visi descriptionem. Neque ad cætera hujus libri pertinet. Diversa visa diversis temporibus Joanni obtigere, ut et Prophetis aliis. Grot. ad Apoc. cap. i. 11.

Post absolutum Visum, monita salutaria continens, ad septem episcopos et ecclesias.—Sequuntur Visa alia, quæ diversis temporibus Apostolo obtigere, et postea in unum

volumen redacta sunt: quod et in prophetiis aliis evenit, sæpe etiam non annotato temporis discrimine, sed dato intelligi ex iis quæ loco quoque continentur. Pertinent autem hæc Visa ad res Judæorum usque ad finem capituli undecimi: deinde ad res Romanorum, usque ad finem capituli viceßimi: deinde ad statum florentissimum Ecclesiæ Christianæ ad finem usque, &c. Ejusdem Annot. ad cap. iv. init. Vid. et ejus Commentatio ad loca quæd. N. T. &c. citat. in hujus Supplementi volumine primo, p. 176.

<sup>p</sup> Et vero Grotius et Hammondus ipsi causam suam producat, ubi posteriorem Apocalypseos partem sub Vespasiano Ephesi scriptam concedunt. Quis enim illos docuit, Visa Joannis in Apocalypsi hoc modo distinguere, et diversa illis et tam longe distita assignare tam tempora quam loca? Nullum indicium, nulla significatio illius rei in ipsa

Revelation, in its present form, sent as an epistle to the seven churches of Asia, ch. i. ver. 4. was not composed, and published before the reign of Domitian, appears to me very probable from the general, and almost universally concurring testimony of the ancients, and from some things in the book itself.

Now therefore I shall transcribe <sup>a</sup> a part of Lenfant's and Beaufobre's preface to the Revelation, at the same time referring to Vitringa <sup>r</sup> in the margin, who has many like thoughts.

Having

ipſa Apocalypſi exſtat. Contra dicitur Joannes, quæ vidit, *vidiſſe in infala Patmo.* Vitr. ib. p. 11, 12.

<sup>a</sup> Preface ſur l' Apoc. de S. Jean. p. 613, 614.

<sup>r</sup> Primo dubium non eſt, quin ſi teſtimoniis Veterum res conſicienda ſit: communis antiquæ Eccleſiæ traditio, firmata auctoritate Irenæi, hic multum præponderet teſtimonio Epiphani. Irenæus enim temporibus Joannis Apoſtoli propior fuit, tanquam qui eodem adhuc ſeculo cum Joanne vixerit, et traditionem nobis retulit ſuo ætate communem, et omnibus notiſſimam.

Sed quod plus etiam momenti cauſæ noſtræ addit: non nititur noſtra hæc ſententia de tempore ſcriptæ Apocalypſis ſola traditione Veterum. Poſſe illa ex ipſo hoc libro, etiam abſque ulla traditione veteris Eccleſiæ demonſtrari. Quare ſecundo obſervari velim, ex ipſa Apocalypſi evidentiffimas adduci poſſe probationes, ex quibus evincatur, hunc librum non atique ſub Claudio, ſed omnino poſt Claudii et Neronis tempora, quin imo ſub Domitiano demum in lucem editum eſſe. — Quo tempore ſcripta eſt Apocalypſis, eccleſiæ jam per Aſiam inferiorem in celeberrimis locis non tantum erant fundatæ et conſtabilitæ, ſed jamdudum fundatæ et ſtabilitæ fuiſſe ſupponuntur. Redarguuntur enim pleræque a Domino gravium vitiorum et criminum, quæ tractu longioris temporis eccleſias illas obreperant. Ephreſina

*jam reliquerat primam ſuam charitatem.* Sardiceniſ dicebatur, *nomine vivere, ſed vere mortua eſſe.* Laodicenam *magnus occupaverat tepor, eratque ærumnoſa et miſerabilis.* Hæc vero quam belle conveniunt temporibus Claudii! Ex eccleſiis enim ſeptem, quæ hic memorantur, in Actibus Apoſtolorum, aliarum mentio non eſt, quum Ephreſinæ et Laodicenæ. Ephreſina autem a Paulo Apoſtolo demum fundata eſt, ſecundum Annales Ceſtrienſis, anno Claudii Imperatoris extremo. — Liqueſt ex iſdem epistoſis Joannis, illo tempore, quo edita eſt Apocalypſis, Gnoſticorum hæreſes, quæ dicuntur, in florentiffimis Aſiæ eccleſiis altas jam egiffe radices. Ad illas enim carnalium hominum doctrinas ſub myſticis nominibus Bileamitarum et Nicolaitarum in variis locis alluduntur. Illam hæreſim prævidebat Petrus in Eccleſia brevi exorituram, quando epistolam ſuam ſcribebat poſtერიorem, non longe ante Hieroſolymorum excidium. Judas, qui epistolam ſuam edidit, ut probabilis ratio ſuadet, poſt Hieroſolymorum illud excidium, hoc ſemen in prima vidit herba. Sed quo tempore ſcripta eſt Apocalypſis non nata tantum, ſed confirmata erat hæc hæreſis, et præcipuas Aſiæ eccleſias inquinaverat. Quare ſi Judas Apoſtolus epistolam ſuam ſcripſit ſub Veſpaſiano: quis neget, Apocalypſin editam eſſe ſub Domitiano? In ipſis illis Epistoſis paſſim ſupponuntur afflictiones graviores, quas Eccleſia Chriſti religionis ſuæ

Having quoted Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and divers other ancients, placing St. John's banishment in Patmos in the latter part of the reign of Domitian, and saying, that he there saw the Revelation, they say: 'To these uncontestible witnesses it is needless to add a long list of others, of all ages, and of the same sentiment: to whom the authority of Epiphanius is by no means comparable.' And then they go on: 'We must add to so constant a tradition other reasons, which farther show, that the Revelation was not written, till after Claudius, and Nero. It appears from the book itself, that there had been already churches for a considerable space of time in Asia: forasmuch as St. John in the name of Christ reproves faults, that happen not but after a while. The church of Ephesus had left her first love. That of Sardis had a name to live, but was dead. The church of Laodicea was fallen into lukewarmness and indifference. But the church of Ephesus, for instance, was not founded by St. Paul, be-

szæ causa jam sustinebat, et sustinebat: et inter illas supplicium capitale, quo confessores veritatis affliciebantur. Sic Dominus ad Angelum ecclesiæ Ephesinæ: *Novi laborem tuum, και την υπομονην σου, et tolerantiam in afflictionibus.* Ad Angelum Smyrnenis: *Novi opera tua, et την θρησκην, afflictionem, et paupertatem.* Ad Angelum Pergamenæ: *Nec abnegasti fidem meam, ne quidem in diebus, quibus Antipas, testis meus fidelis, απεκτανθη, occisus est.* Supponunt hæc manifeste, tempore editæ Apocalypsis Gentiles jam cœpisse in Christianos sævire, et ipsam etiam mortem pœnæ loco illis quandoque solennibus judiciis irrogasse. Id vero hætenus non liquet factum esse imperante Claudio. Nero, postquam humanitatem exuisset, sanguinem Christianum primus bibit: Romæ tamen, magis quam in provinciis. Post Neronem Domitianus, ultimis imperii sui, idem tentavit. Ad quas postremas Domitiani persecutiones in his locis haud dubie alluditur. Neronis enim illam persecutionem in provinciis Romani Imperii æque ac Romæ arsisse, nec liquet, nec pro-

babile est. Ad Domitiani itaque persecutionem hic manifeste alluditur. Quod argumento est, Apocalypsin hanc sub ipso editam esse. Ejusdem hujus Domitianæ temporis manifestum habemus characterem in Joanne. Dicit enim exerte, *se accepisse hanc revelationem a Domino Jesu, cum ob confessionem veritatis evangelicæ ageret in insula Patmo.* Vocatque se Christianorum, illo tempore afflictorum, socium in afflictione, regno, et patiente expectatione Jesu Christi. Fuit igitur Joannes in exilio, causâ veritatis relegatus in insulam Patmon. Id vero quo modo acciderit sub Claudio? Illum enim in Christianos in provinciis aut exilio aut cæde sævisse, nullibi legitur. — Domitiani igitur hic, et nullius alius Imperatoris character est. Nero enim Christianis capitali supplicio Romæ affecit: sed Domitianus plures exilio, paucos morte punivit, ut certi testes sunt Dio et Eusebius, et pluribus persecutus est Dodwellus. Diff. xi. De Pauc. Mart. § xvii. Quid cessamus itaque tam evidentibus probationibus convicti fidem adhibere traditioni Veterum apud Irenæum? Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 9—11.

‘ fore

fore the last years of Claudius. When in 61, or 62, St. Paul wrote to them from Rome, instead of reproving their want of love, he commends their love and faith, ch. i. 15. 2. It appears from the Revelation, that the Nicolaitans made a sect, when this book was written, since they are expressly named: whereas they were only foretold, and described in general terms by St. Peter in his second epistle, written after the year sixty, and in St. Jude's about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian. 3. It is evident from divers places of the Revelation, that there had been an open persecution in the provinces. St. John himself had been banished into Patmos for the testimony of Jesus. The church of Ephesus, or its bishop, is commended for their *labour and patience*, which seems to imply persecution. This is still more manifest in the words directed to the church of Smyrna, ch. ii. 9. *I know thy works, and tribulation.* For the original word always denotes persecution, in the scriptures of the New Testament: as it is also explained in the following verse. In the thirteenth verse of the same chapter is mention made of a martyr, named Antipas, put to death at Pergamus. Though ancient ecclesiastical history gives us no information concerning this Antipas, it is nevertheless certain, that according to all the rules of language, what is here said, ought to be understood literally.— All that has been now observed concerning the persecution, of which mention is made in the first chapters of the Revelation, cannot relate to the time of Claudius, who did not persecute the Christians, nor to the time of Nero, whose persecution did not reach the provinces. And therefore it must relate to Domitian, according to ecclesiastical tradition.

The visions therefore here recorded, and the publication of them in this book, must be assigned, so far as I can see, to the years of Christ 95, and 96, or 97.