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Few Biblical critics have acquired higher reputation than Michaelis. His Introduction to the New Testament is an elaborate performance, extremely useful to the theological student. It is, however, with all its excellences, replete with unwarranted censures upon different parts of the sacred text. The following Dissertation is a seasonable corrective to the objections which he has offered to the authenticity of the Apocalypse, or book of Revelation. "We consider it," say the editors of the Christian Observer," (vol. i. p. 726,) and we heartily concur in opinion with them, "We consider it as important, not only because it rescues from undeserved condemnation a very valuable part of the sacred volume, but more especially because its influence will extend to the whole body of canonical Scripture, and will serve as a check to the temerity of the German professor in other instances. Whatever deference the reader may be disposed to pay to the authority of so profound a scholar, on the very subject of his profession, he will suspect that the evidence upon which other books (of Scripture) are rejected or questioned, has as little foundation as that which has produced the rejection of the Apocalypse."—p. 723.

A Dissertation, in which the evidence for the Authenticity and Divine Inspiration of the Apocalypse is stated, and vindicated from the Objections of the Late Professor J. D. Michaelis; by John Chapel Woodhouse, M. A.

CHAP. I.

OF THE METHOD PURSUED IN THIS INQUIRY.

In the following pages I propose to review the evidence which has been adduced, for the authenticity and divine in-
spiration of the Apocalypse; to add thereto some collections of my own; and occasionally to remark on those observations of Michaelis*, which tend to invalidate it.

This evidence divides itself into external and internal. The external is that which is derived from credible witnesses, from the early writers and fathers of the church. The internal is, that which results from a perusal of the book.

Michaelis appears to me an unfair reporter of the external evidence for the Apocalypse. He seems to have approached it with prejudice; a prejudice occasioned by the opinion which he had previously formed concerning its internal evidence. For, it appears from passages of his chapter on the Apocalypse, that he considered the prophecies of this book, as still remaining dark and unexplained. He professes that he does not understand them; he declares himself dissatisfied with the attempts of other writers to show their meaning and completion; and he esteems the contradictions of these interpreters to be more unfavourable to the pretensions of the Apocalypse, than even those ancient testimonies, that external evidence, to which he attributes no preponderance in its favour. Now, as they who appear to themselves to have discovered, in the completion of the Apocalyptic prophecies, certain proof of its divine origin, (for a series of prophecy, punctually fulfilled, must be divine,) will be disposed to examine the external evidence with a prepossession in its favour; so he, who, by examining the internal evidence, has formed an opinion unfavourable to its pretensions, will enter upon the examination of its external evidence with that kind of prejudice, which is visible in the writings of this learned divine.

But, in our examination of the external evidence, we ought, so far as human infirmity may permit, to be free from any partiality; and to lay aside, for a season, our previous conceptions of the weight of its internal evidence. The two species of evidence, external and internal, should be kept apart; they should not be suffered to incorporate or interfere; each should be considered at first with reference to itself only. After which separate examination, they may usefully and properly be brought together, and be allowed their due influence upon each other.

Such appears the proper method of proceeding in this in-

* In the last chapter of his Introduction of the New Testament, to the pages of which, as published by Mr. Marsh, the figures at the bottom of these pages will be found to refer.
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Enquiry, so as to lead to a fair and just conclusion. This method has not been usually pursued. The writers, who have presented us with the two kinds of evidence, have not kept them apart. When they treat, for instance, of the external evidence adduced by Dionysius of Alexandria; when they state how far it appears, from his writings, that he considered the Apocalypse as an inspired book, delivered down to his time as such by the early Fathers of the Church; they moreover produce, and under the same head, the criticisms of this writer on the style and manner of the book; which consideration belongs to the subject of internal evidence.

In the following pages, it will be my endeavour to keep these two species of evidence apart, until they have been separately considered, and may safely be suffered to unite. This method, so far as it can be followed, will tend to prevent the operation of prejudice, and to facilitate the production of truth.

I shall proceed, first, to the consideration of the external evidence.

CHAP. II.

OF THE TIME WHEN THE APOCALYPSE APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN WRITTEN AND PUBLISHED.

The external evidence, for the authenticity and divine inspiration of the Apocalypse, is to be collected from the testimonies of those ancient writers, who, living at a period near to its publication, appear, by their quotations or allusions, to have received it as a book of sacred Scripture. This was the test by which the primitive church was accustomed to determine the claims of all writings pretending to divine authority. All such writings were rejected, as appeared not to have been received by the orthodox Christians of the preceding ages*.

But to enable us to judge of the force of this evidence, as affecting any particular book, it is necessary to ascertain the time when the book was written. For if it shall appear to have been written and pub-

* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 3.
lished in the early period of the apostolic age, we may expect to find testimonies concerning it, from apostles, or from apostolical men*. If, on the contrary, it can be proved to have been published only in the latter times of that age, we shall not be entitled to expect this earlier notice of it.

Before, therefore, we proceed to examine the testimony of the writers by whom the Apocalypse is mentioned, it will be useful to ascertain the time in which it was published. For if it were not published before the year 96 or 97, (as some critics have pronounced,) little or no notice could be taken of it by the writers of the first century; and, in such case, a writer in the second century, especially in the former part of it, becomes an evidence of great importance; which importance would be much diminished, by the supposition, that the book had been written in the earliest part of the apostolic age, that is, almost a whole century before the time of that author.

This previous inquiry is the more necessary, since, according to Michaelis, no less than six different opinions have been advanced, concerning the time when the Apocalypse was written; only one of which can be true.

In examining these opinions, I shall endeavour to be concise. I shall freely use the arguments of Michaelis, where I can see reason to agree with him; but, where I am obliged to dissent, it will be necessary to take a larger compass.

I. The earliest date assigned to the Apocalypse is in the reign of the Emperor Claudius. This opinion rests on the single testimony of Epiphanius, a credu-

* Apostolical men, in the acceptation of the Fathers, were those who had been personally instructed by apostles; and the apostolic age is that, which extends from before the middle of the first century, when the Apostles began to write, to the close of that century, when St. John, the last surviving apostle, died.—Irenæus et Clem. Alexand. apud Euseb. H. E. lib. iii. c. 23.
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louis and inaccurate writer*, who lived about three hundred years later than St. John the apostle, to whom he ascribes this prophetical book.

This external evidence, weak in itself, is not only unsupported, but contradicted, by every argument which can be derived from internal evidence†. For, first, it appears from the evidence of the book itself, (chap. 1st, 2d, 3d,) that it was written at a time when the Asiatic Christians had been suffering persecution, even unto death; John himself, the writer, was in banishment, "for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus, in the Isle of Patmos," when he saw the visions‡. But no traces of such persecution can be discovered in the times of Claudius. Nero, says the unanimous voice of history, was the first Emperor who persecuted the Christians, and enacted laws against them§. Claudius, indeed, commanded the Jews to quit Rome, but this command could not affect the Jews in Asia, much less the Christians there.


† The reader may, perhaps, begin to think, that I am already transgressing the rule, so lately proposed, to prevent the intermixture of internal with external evidence. That rule shall be scrupulously observed, when we proceed to examine the evidences for the authenticity of the book. But we are now engaged in a previous question, which must be determined before we can judge of the main object of inquiry. And in determining the several steps of this previous question, it is necessary to adduce both kinds of evidence. Still they shall be kept apart, and each come in its order.

‡ Hence St. John is called a Martyr, by Polycrates—Apud Euseb. E. H. lib. iii. c. 31.

2dly. There is no appearance or probability that the seven churches, or communities of Christians, addressed by their Saviour in the Apocalypse, had existence so early as in the reign of Claudius; much less that they were in that established and flourishing state, which is described or inferred in this his address to them. For Claudius died in the year 54, some years before the Apostle Paul is supposed, by the best critics, to have written his Epistle to the Ephesians, and his First to Timothy. But, from these Epistles we collect, that the Church of Ephesus was then in an infantine and unsettled state. Bishops were then first appointed there by St. Paul's order*. But at the time when the Apocalypse was written, Ephesus, and her sister churches, appear to have been in a settled, and even flourishing state; which could only be the work of time. There is, in the address of our Lord to them, a reference to their former conduct. Ephesus is represented as having forsaken her former love, or charity; Sardis as having acquired a name, or reputation, which she had also forfeited; Laodicea as become lukewarm, or indifferent. Now, changes of this kind, in a whole body of Christians, must be gradual, and the production of many years†. Colosse and Hierapolis were churches of note in St. Paul's time‡; but they are not mentioned in the Apocalypse, although they were situated in the same region of proconsular Asia, to which it was addressed. They were probably become of less im-

* See this proved by Michaelis, in his observations on the 1st Epistle to Timothy.

† See more on this subject, in Vitringa, in Apoc. 1, 2, and L'Enfant and Beausobre's Preface to the Apoc.; also, Lardner's Supplement to the Cred. Gosp. Hist. ch. xxii. where passages from these books are quoted.

‡ Acts iv. 13.
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All these changes required a lapse of time; and we necessarily infer, that such had taken place between the publication of St. Paul's Epistles, and of the Apocalypse. Add to this, that some expressions, which we meet with in the Apocalypse, are such as seem not to have been used in the early period of the Apostolic times. Sunday is called the Lord's Day*; and we find the same expression used by Ignatius†, and other writers of later date. In the early books of Scripture, it is called the first day of the week, or the first after the ‡ Sabbath, &c. but never the Lord's Day.

This opinion, therefore, that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Claudius, cannot be received. The single testimony of an inaccurate writer of the fourth century, cannot be opposed to such external evidence as we shall produce in examining the remaining opinions; especially when it appears so strongly refuted by internal evidence.§

II. By the second opinion, the Apocalypse is supposed to have been written in the reign of Nero. 1. Let us examine the external evidence by which it is supported; namely, a subscription to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, which mentions that Revelation, as given "by God to John the Evangelist, in the Island of Patmos, whither he was banished by the Emperor Nero." Lardner has observed of this subscription, that it is not only without a name, but without a date. But Michaelis has shown it to be probable, that the version to which it is attached was made in the sixth

* Rev. i. 10.  † Epist. ad Magnes. Sec. 9.
‡ μὴ Σαββατ. Mat. xxviii 1.
§ This first opinion would have deserved little notice, if it had not been maintained by the celebrated Grotius, whose arguments, and the able refutation of them by D. Blondel, may be seen, abstracted by Lardner; Supplement, ch. ix. sect. 3.
century; and he intimates that this subscription *might perhaps* have been annexed to the more ancient Syriac version. It *might perhaps*, also, have been added in later times. For of what authority are some of the subscriptions to other books of the New Testament, even those which are printed with the Greek text? They are anonymous, and without date, and, in some cases, are known to give false information*. What credit, then, can be due to this Syriac subscription, whose highest claim to authority is, that the version to which it is attached, was written in the sixth century? If we could admit the evidence, it would indeed be useful; for it would immediately determine the main object of our inquiry. It would determine "the Revelation to have been made by God to John the Evangelist;" which being determined, no more doubt could remain concerning its authenticity, and divine inspiration. But such external evidence is not equal even to that of Epiphanius, which, as standing alone, and at such a distance of time from the fact, Michaelis has, with great propriety, refused to admit.

2. This opinion, like the first, has no internal evidence, derived from the Apocalypse, in its favour. All that can be said is, that the internal evidence thence arising, is not so decidedly against it, as against the former opinion. The Christians at Rome, and, it may be, in some of the Roman provinces, were persecuted in the reign of Nero. But there is no evidence, that the Christians in Asia suffered at

* In another passage of Michaelis's introduction he has observed, that "no subscription of this kind is entitled to the name of evidence;" Ch. vii. sect. 10. p. 320: which he has again asserted on good grounds; Ch. xi. sect. 1. p. 14. Archdeacon Paley has shown by probable arguments, that the subscriptions to six of St. Paul's Epistles contain false information, contrary to evidence fairly deduced from the Epistles themselves. Horæ Paulinæ, ch. xv.
The Apocalypse vindicated.

this time. And the arguments, used so successfully by Michaelis and others, to show that the Apocalypse was not written in the reign of Claudius, will extend, in some degree, to that of Nero. From the time of Claudius, to the end of Nero’s reign, we count only fourteen years. The date of the First Epistle to Timothy is placed, by Michaelis, about ten years before Nero’s death; by Fabricius, Mill, and other able critics, much later. The Epistle to the Ephesians has certainly a later date. So that, it may still be doubted, whether the changes which appear to have taken place in the churches of Lesser Asia, between the date of these Epistles and that of the Apocalypse, could well be brought about in so short a period of time as must be allotted to them, if we suppose the Apocalypse to be written in the times of Nero. But suppose this argument not to be insisted upon, to what will the concession amount? The question, in favour of the Apocalypse having been written in Nero’s reign, will gain no internal evidence positively in its favour. It will rest on the external evidence above stated, the insufficiency of which must be apparent.

III. A third opinion, (as it is called,) has been produced by those writers, who, having explained some of the Apocalyptical prophecies, as fulfilled in the Jewish wars, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, are interested to make it appear, that these prophecies were written before the commencement of those wars. But to assert the Apocalypse to have been written before the Jewish wars, is the same thing as to attribute the date of it to the reign of Nero; for these wars began in the twelfth year of that Emperor*. The question, therefore, seems decided by the evidence already examined. But since the exa-

mination of this third opinion, by Michaelis, has produced another evidence, and other arguments, it will be proper to notice them.

A certain degree of external evidence is attempted to be derived from Arethas, who, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, has endeavoured to explain some of its prophecies, as fulfilled in the Jewish wars; and he has certainly affirmed, that "destruction was not yet come upon the Jews, by the arms of the Romans, when he, (the writer of the Apocalypse,) received these prophecies." The earliest date assigned to the commentary of Arethas, is in the sixth century; but there seems internal evidence in the work, which will prove it of later date. The empire of the Saracens is mentioned in it, as succeeding in Babylon to that of the Persians*. But the Saracens were not possessed of Babylon till nearly the middle of the seventh century. A writer of so late a date will be entitled to little belief in this question, particularly if his evidence go no further than to discover an opinion of his own, without proof in support of it. But, it is said, there is reason to believe that the opinion is more ancient than the period here referred to; for Andreas Cæsariensis, who wrote about the year 500, though he does not adopt the opinion, mentions it as the opinion of some others. And Michaelis, who favours this third opinion, is disposed to believe it derived from Hippolitus, or Irenæus. But he has produced no evidence of the fact. It is merely a conjecture, resting on this unsure foundation: "Arethas must have received this opinion from some author, who explained the Apocalypse before the times of Andreas Cæsariensis; and who could this be, but Hippolitus, or Irenæus?" Hippolitus would have been a valuable evidence, if any proof could be adduced of his hav-

* Com. in Apocal. cap. xxxvi.
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I. For, under the fourth opinion, we must produce the words of Irenæus, which have been understood, by all the ancients, and by all the modern critics, until these days, to assert plainly and unequivocally, that the visions of the Apocalypse were seen "towards the close of Domitian's reign." If these words had been supposed by ancient writers to have been capable of any other meaning, or of any such meaning as hath lately been attributed to them, the tradition of the church would not have been so uniform. For, as Michaelis observes, "almost all the ecclesiastical writers, who have spoken of the time when the Apocalypse was written, have followed this account," namely, that it was written "toward the close of the reign of Domitian." We have already produced all the evidence which has any tendency to contradict this general testimony of the church, and we have seen to what little it amounts. It is very far from sufficient for the purposes of those, who, wishing to apply certain prophecies of the Apocalypse to the times of Nero and his immediate successors, are driven to the attempt of establishing this necessary postulatum, that "it was written before the times in which, (they say,) these prophecies were fulfilled." This is the true reason, (as Michaelis allows,) why they have recourse to the testimony of Irenæus; the importance of which, to the determination of this question, may be collected from the ardent desire of these writers to make his evidence support their sentiments; but will more fully appear,

*P. 524, 525.
by considering his character and connexions, and the time in which he lived.

Irenæus was born, according to his own account, (as his words have generally been understood,) in the age immediately succeeding that, in which the visions of the Apocalypse were seen*. He was a Greek by birth, as his name and language import, and probably an Asiatic Greek, for he was an auditor of Polycarp†, who was Bishop of Smyrna, one of the seven churches, and who had been the auditor of St. John the apostle, whom Irenæus constantly affirms to be the writer of the Apocalypse‡. And accordingly, when Irenæus speaks upon such subjects as concern the external evidences of the church, he appeals, for a confirmation of the truth of what he has advanced, to Polycarp, and to others, who, he says, had seen the apostle John. He appeals also to the Asiatic churches, in which he appears to have been educated§. When removed from Asia into Gaul, where, upon the martyrdom of Pothinus, he became Bishop of Lyons, he kept up a correspondence with the brethren of the Asiatic churches, from whom he would continue to receive the most genuine information then to be obtained concerning the Apocalypse. He was, in his own character, the most learned, pious, prudent, and venerable prelate of the age in which he lived‖. He wrote largely in defence

* The learned Dodwell has taken pains to show, that Irenæus was born in the year 97, the very year in which the Apocalypse will appear to have been published. But there is reason to suppose that he has fixed the birth of this father about ten years too soon. See Grabe's Proleg. ad Irenæum;
‖ It was principally by the wisdom, authority, and mode-
of the truth; and it has been a prevailing opinion in the church, that he sealed his testimony with his blood.

Here then is a witness, far surpassing, in authority and credibility, any that has hitherto been produced. Accordingly, his evidence has been received by the writers nearest to his time, and, with the very few exceptions which we have now produced, by the universal church. And, until these days, there has not been the least doubt of the import of his evidence; no one has seen occasion to interpret his words, otherwise than according to their obvious and received meaning—"that the visions of the Apocalypse were seen in the times of Domitian*." But since a novel interpretation of these words, has been attempted, in order to press them into the service of a pre-conceived opinion, it will be necessary to produce them.

Irenæus, speaking of the mystical name ascribed to Antichrist, in the xiiith chapter of the Apocalypse, and of the difficulty of its interpretation, adds, "καὶ οὐκ ἀκαθάρτως ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ ἔφησεν αὐτῇ τὸνῷ τῷ διὰ ἑαυτὸν τῷ καὶ τῷ αποκαλυθῷ εἰρήκων. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸς ἀπολύου χρόνου ἐνσέβεσθαι ἀλλὰ σχεδόν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐμετράς γινεῖσθαι, εἰρήκο τῷ τίλῳ τοῦ Δομιτίανου αἰχμῆς:

ration of Irenæus, that the furious Victor, Bishop of Rome, was kept in order, and induced, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης φρονεῖ, to think of the things which make for peace, when a schism was about to take place between the Eastern and Western churches, occasioned by the dispute concerning the time of keeping Easter.—Euseb. H. E. lib. v. 24.

* Michaelis, in another part of his work, considers the testimony of Irenæus, so far as relates to St. John's writings, as of the highest authority. "Irenæus," says he, "is not only the most ancient writer on this subject, but was a disciple of Polycarp, who was personally acquainted with St. John. Consequently Irenæus had the very best information on this subject." Introd. vol. iii. ch. vii. See also his translator's judicious remarks on the importance of Irenæus's testimony.
which may be thus literally translated:—"But if it had been proper that this name should be openly proclaimed in this present time, it would have been told even by him who saw the revelation. For it was not seen a long time ago, but almost in our own age, (or generation,) toward the end of Domitian's reign."

These words are plain and unequivocal; no variety of interpretation of them arose during sixteen hundred years, in which they were read by the church. And, indeed, the only doubt concerning them now is, "what it is that Irenæus affirms to have been seen in Domitian's reign?" What does the verb seen refer to, and agree with? What is the nominative case to the verb seen? Now, I will venture to affirm, that no Greek scholar, unbiased by any favourite opinion, can possibly suppose that the verb seen, "was seen," can be referred to any other nominative than Ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις, "The Revelation."—But it is not a matter wherein a critical knowledge of the Greek tongue is required, to enable us to decide. Plain common sense is to supply what is wanting. And no person, possessed of that valuable qualification, can read this passage, translated literally into any language, without perceiving that the thing represented to be seen in the latter clause, must be the same which was said to have been seen in the former. The same verb, used so nearly with a relative, must refer to the same noun. Otherwise, there is no dependence on common language: and we must, in all our writings, be driven to use the repetitions which are in usage among the lawyers; and Irenæus, if he were to write in modern times, must be instructed to say, after the word "Revelation," not "It was seen," but the "Aforesaid Revelation" was seen.

But if the discovery of these modern critics had rested upon any solid or probable foundation, they would be agreed among themselves, not only in re-
jecting Αποκάλυψις as the nominative to which the verb is to be referred, but in ascertaining the noun which is to supply its place. They are agreed so far as to perceive the necessity of rejecting the common and obvious interpretation, (because, this being admitted, their explications of the prophecies cannot stand;) but they contend, among each other, about the method of supplying the new interpretation. And, indeed, every proposition made by them, with a view to supply a new nominative to ἰσχυραίωσις is full of difficulty and absurdity. Michaelis seems to pass this sentence upon all of them but one, which refers ἰσχυραίωσις to ἔσχεια, and which, to me, appears as forced and improbable as any of the rest. *What was seen?* answer, *the name was seen!* If Irenæus had intended this meaning, he would not have written ἰσχυραίωσις but ἔσχεια. Michaelis has suggested this; and it is a sufficient answer. Yet this able critic is still inclined to favour this application of the verb, referring ἔσχεια to Titan. But this is to break all bounds of grammatical connexion. And, to suppose, as this forced construction requires, that Irenæus understood the Emperor Domitian to be Titan and Antichrist, is to make Irenæus contradict himself; for this father plainly tells us, that he understood not this prophecy; and that, in his opinion, "it is better to wait the completion of it, than to guess at names, which may seem to fit the mystical figures." Irenæus*, therefore, considered the prophecy as not having been fulfilled in the times before him; nor is there any colour of proof for supposing that he considered Domitian as a type of Antichrist, or that there had been any partial completion of the prophecy. Besides, the context of Irenæus, if examined, will admit none of these novel and forced interpretations. It evidently re-

quires the old and obvious acceptation. The object of Irenæus is to dissuade his readers from a difficult and presumptuous attempt to settle who is Antichrist, by applying, in the manner he had shown, the Greek figures 666. And his argument is to this effect:—

"The mystery was not intended to be cleared up in our times: for if it had, it would have been told by him who saw the vision." This implies that the vision had been seen lately. But, to complete the argument, and to support the last clause of it, which was not perfectly clear, Irenæus adds—"for it was seen at no great distance from our own times."

In short, all these new interpretations are inconsistent and absurd, and have no support but what is derived from the Latin translation of Irenæus, which is allowed to be very imperfect*; and if it had been of greater authority, could only disclose to us the translator's opinion of the meaning of the passage. But since we possess the original Greek, we must have recourse to the text as it stands there; of which the learned in the present age are at least as good judges as this translator, who, if by using the words "visum est," he intended to refer the verb to any other nominative than "Revelatio," has contradicted all the learned students of Irenæus, from the earliest ages to the time of the present innovators.

Of the observations of Knittel, to which Michaelis refers us for information on this subject, I can say nothing, not having seen them. I have already been too diffuse on this subject. But the authority of Michaelis is deservedly great: and, it is necessary to show at large, why an opinion, to which he inclines, ought not to be adopted. I collect, moreover, that Michaelis had observed no evidence, either external

* Grabe asserts and proves it to be barbarous and defective. Proleg. in Irenæum.
or internal*, of sufficient weight to oblige him to fix the date of the Apocalypse in the days of Nero, or before those of Domitian. Otherwise, he would not, in another passage, have been inclined to pronounce it "a spurious production, introduced probably into the world after the death of St. John†," who lived beyond the reign of Domitian.

The words of Irenæus, of this competent and unexceptionable witness, are therefore to be taken in that obvious sense which has been affixed to them by all the writers before our own times: and, thus taken, they determine the time when the Apocalyptic visions were seen, and published, namely, "toward the end of Domitian's reign." This is confirmed by the evidence of all the ancient writers, who are agreed, (except in the few and unimportant instances which have now been produced to the contrary,) that St. John's banishment to Patmos, where he saw the visions, is of this date. Lampe has asserted, and Lardner confirms the truth of the assertion, "that antiquity is abundantly agreed, that Domitian was the author of John's banishment‡."

Internal evidence likewise supports this conclusion. For, in the three first chapters of the Apocalypse, the churches of Asia are described as being in that advanced and flourishing state of society and

* The German critics, who have endeavoured to point out the accomplishment of the Apocalyptical prophecies in the Jewish wars, and times preceding Domitian, have met with insuperable difficulties, as may be sufficiently seen in Michaelis's account, p. 513—518.
† P. 487.
‡ See Hegesipus apud Euseb. lib. iii. c. 20. 23. Tertullian, Apol. c. v. Hieron. tom. x. p. 100. and other authorities adduced by Lardner, Supplement, ch. ix. sec. 5.; who, with his usual judgment and candour, has most satisfactorily determined this question; and also that the Apocalypse was not written till the end of Domitian's reign.
discipline reasonably to be expected; and to have undergone those changes in their faith and morals, which might have taken place in the time intervening between the publication of St. Paul's Epistles, and the concluding years of Domitian.

Domitian's death is related to have happened in September, A. D. 96. The Christian exiles were then set at liberty; and St. John had permission to return to Ephesus. But the Emperor's death, and the permission to return, could not be known in Asia immediately. Some time must intervene, before St. John could be at liberty either to write the Apocalypse at Ephesus, or to send it by messengers, (now probably for the first time admitted to approach him,) from Patmos*. We shall, therefore, place the date of the Apocalypse, as Mill, Lardner, and other able critics have placed it, in the year 96 or 97: probably, (for reasons now assigned,) at the beginning of the latter. It could not be circulated through the Seven Churches sooner.

V.—VI. I shall pass over the fifth and sixth opinions, mentioned by Michaelis, because they are supported by such slender evidence, that he does but barely notice them himself. And I trust there is less reason to refute them, after this review of the evidence, by which the fourth opinion is established.

* There seems internal evidence in chap. i. 9. that the Apocalypse was written after the writer had left Patmos; he says ἐγὼ μέν ἐγὼ τῷ νησί, I was in the island.

(To be continued.)