

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

EDITED BY
THE REV. HENRY BURGESS, LL.D., PH.D.,
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
ALEXANDER HEYLIN, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1855.

—for it was with this title that Darius the Mede became the Sovereign of the exiled Jews; nay it was not until Cyrus became king of Babylon that he issued his decree for the rebuilding of the temple. The unfriendly conduct of his successor, Cambyses, may have well made the new title of king of Persia unpopular. Thus, when “the children of Israel, which were come out again from the captivity,” celebrated the first passover after the completion of the second temple, we might, perhaps, reasonably expect that in praising the Lord for turning the heart of Darius unto them, they should have used the older and more familiar title of king of Babylon, or even that of king of Assyria, rather than the comparatively recent, and perhaps unpopular, designation of “king of Persia.”

THE NERONIC DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

DEAR SIR,—I beg to send you one argument for the Neronic Date of the Apocalypse, drawn from internal evidence, which you will oblige me by inserting in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* :—

Before any argument in favour of the Neronic date of the Apocalypse can have weight, it must be shewn that sufficient ground exists for questioning, or at any rate for receiving with diminished confidence, the common opinion, that the Revelation was seen by St. John in Patmos in the reign of Domitian. This is a point, on which much has been said, and to little purpose. I can bring no new weapons to this warfare; I can no more deny that Irenæus asserts the Domitianic date, than I can deny that the title of the Syriac version claims the Neronic date. I have no means of testing the exact amount of probability which is to be attached to each; all I can do is, to shew that a difference of opinion, with regard to the date, existed at a very early period, and having done this, I shall have prepared the way for the argument which is to follow.

Eusebius (lib. iii., 18), says, “In this persecution, it is handed down by tradition, that the Apostle and Evangelist John, who was yet living, in consequence of his testimony to the Divine Word, was condemned to dwell on the island of Patmos. Irenæus indeed, in his fifth book against the heresies, where he speaks of the calculation formed on the epithet of Antichrist, in the above-mentioned Revelation of John, speaks in the following manner respecting him: “If, however, it were necessary to proclaim his name (*i. e.*, Antichrist) openly at the present time, it would have been declared by him who saw the Revelation, for it is not long since it was seen, but almost in our own times, at the close of Domitian’s reign.”

It will be noticed that Eusebius says, that St. John’s banishment to Patmos in Domitian’s reign, was handed down by tradition, and that he quotes the testimony of Irenæus to confirm this tradition.

It seems evident that such a tradition existed, the question is, was such a tradition believed and universally admitted.

Victorinus adds his testimony in support of the Domitianic date, to that

of Irenæus and Eusebius. But he assigns a later date to the Gospel of St John, than to the Apocalypse. On Chap. iv. 14, Victorinus says, "Nam Evangelium *postea* scripsit; cum essent Valentinus, et Cerinthus, et Ebion et cæteri scholæ Sathanæ diffusi per orbem, convenerunt ad illum de finitimis provinciis omnes et compulerunt ut ipse testimonium con-scriberet."

"For he (John) wrote the Gospel *afterwards*; when Valentinus, and Cerinthus, and Ebion, and others of the school of Satan, were scattered over the world, all from the neighbouring provinces assembled together to him, and compelled him also to write his Gospel."

But Sir Isaac Newton tells us that Cerinthus "lived so early, that he resisted the apostles, at Jerusalem, in or before the first year of Claudius, twenty-six years before the death of Nero, and died before John;" and a fragment of Hippolytus fixes the date of St. John's Gospel, A.D. 61. For my own part, I have not the slightest doubt that the Gospel of St. John, like the rest of the New Testament Scriptures, was written previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. Independently of the incidental allusion to the city of Jerusalem as still existing, "Now, there is at Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, a pool" (John v. 2); independently of the conversation recorded in chapter xxi., where our Lord, after predicting to St. Peter that his decease should precede his coming, intimates, respecting St. John, not that he should not die, as the disciples wrongly understood, but that he should tarry till he came; independently of this, which appears to fix the date of the Gospel previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, it seems incredible that such stupendous prophecies of our Lord should have received their accomplishment, and yet have been passed over in silence by an *inspired* historian. Not so St. Luke, when recording the famine, "which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." Not so St. Barnabas (if the passage in question be not an interpolation), "Ἰδοὺ οἱ καθελόντες τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον αὐτοὶ αὐτὸν ὀικοδομήσουσι. Γίνεται διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθήραθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν." "Behold, they who have destroyed this temple, themselves shall build it up—and so it is—for, through their engaging in war, it hath been destroyed by the enemy" (S. Barnabæ, Epist. xvi.).

Now does any insuperable reason exist, because Eusebius and Victorinus, with others of later date and less importance, follow Irenæus much on the same ground as the Chiliasts followed Papias on the subject of the millenium, ("He was the cause that by far the greater number of Church writers after him held the like doctrine pleading *the antiquity of the man*" Eus., lib. iii.), that the opinion of a single father is to be considered conclusive against equally positive opinions of antiquity to the contrary? I do not see why, in the matter of a date, Irenæus should not have been quite as liable to mistake as Lactantius, who considered that the period of the six thousandth year of the world, at the end of which the millenium was to take place, was, *in his day*, within 200 years of its accomplishment, so that he considered the world, in his time at least, 5800 years old (Lactantius, *Sacred Institutes*, lib. vii.)

It will be observable that there is a vagueness and uncertainty respecting dates even in the Scriptures themselves. We need only notice

the looseness of the expression, "In the days of Herod the king there came, &c." And the questions that have agitated the theological world respecting the precise date of the nativity, or the period of our Lord's ministry upon earth, serve to confirm the idea that, in writings of such remote antiquity, the question of dates cannot always be accurately determined.

On the other hand, is there any direct and positive evidence of antiquity confirming the idea that the tradition of the Domitianic date was not universally admitted?

Epiphanius says the Apocalypse was written in the time of Claudius, A.D. 50. The title of the Syriac version declares it to have been written in Patmos, whither John was banished by Nero the Cæsar. Origen expressly, and in a marked manner, affirms that John says in his Revelation that he was banished by the king of the Romans, *without saying who condemned him*. Tertullian conjoins the banishment of John with the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, at Rome, under Nero. "Felix ecclesia Romana, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur; ubi Apostolus Johannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." "Happy Roman Church, where Peter is deemed worthy to share the passion of the Lord, where Paul is crowned by the same death as John (the Baptist), where the Apostle John, after having been plunged in burning oil, escapes unhurt, and is banished."

Andreas, Bishop of Cæsarea, in his comment upon this book (c. vi. 16), says, "John received this revelation under the reign of Vespasian."

Arethas, one of the earliest commentators on the Apocalypse, after mentioning the tradition of Irenæus respecting the Domitianic date (which shews that he considered that tradition unworthy of credit), explains the sixth Seal of the destruction of Jerusalem, and mentions that *former commentators* had explained it of the same event. Numerous false Apocalypses written at a very early period, such as the Apocalypse of Cerinthus, or books of almost an apostolic character, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, evidently an imitation of the Apocalypse, prove that the true Apocalypse must have had a much earlier date than the time of Domitian.

Even supposing that the evidence adduced for the Neronic date is not so conclusive as that for the Domitianic date, (although, if Arethas, the third commentator, whose commentary has descended to us, explains the sixth seal of the destruction of Jerusalem, and, as Sir I. Newton says, declares that former commentators had explained it of the same event, this, to my mind, would outweigh all that Irenæus ever said); yet, still it must be admitted that there is positive external evidence in favour of the Neronic date as well as of the Domitianic date, and all that can be done is to array father against father and testimony against testimony, weighing the probabilities of the truthfulness of each in the balances of our own judgment.

It is plain the question *cannot* be settled by external testimony. What course ought to be taken under such circumstances? what is the fair, and honest, and manly way of bringing this point to a right issue? Let an appeal be made to the *internal evidence* of the book itself. Let the words traced by the Spirit of God teach us that knowledge which we cannot

learn from the surmises of ancient fathers, or from the traditions of the Church. Let the love of "science falsely so called," which would exhaust human wisdom in building up a position drawn from sources from which no solid argument can be drawn, turn from the fables of antiquity to the truth of revelation. This would be, at least, the conduct of men who desired to seek after truth. But I hesitate not to affirm that it is because *some are afraid that the truth might be found*, and that it might militate in some way against previously entertained opinions, that they shrink from the inquiry, and suffer the most glorious disclosure in the whole of the Revealed Word of God to remain as sealed and as unintelligible to them as the Sealed Book of which the Apocalypse treats.

I propose to examine only one argument drawn from this internal evidence. Not that the Book itself admits of only one—there is no Book in the Bible more replete with internal evidence of its object and its date than the Apocalypse. I need only mention the speedy coming of Christ everywhere mentioned throughout the Book, which coming was to be the "*συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*," of which Professor Lee says, "The context here makes it quite impossible that the end of the world generally can be meant, unless we suppose it was to end with that generation, which is absurd;" and if that coming took place, as St. Mark tells us, "*Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην*"—"In those days, after that tribulation," nothing more need be said. That coming, connected with the destruction of a particular land and a particular city, when "the wine-press was trodden *without the city*," "the great city," "the holy city," the city put in opposition to the *πόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν*, which had dominion over the kings of the earth, *ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*, which defines it to mean that city only which claimed separation from the cities of the Gentiles.

This city and temple are described as still existing in the days when the Apocalypse was written, and the bodies of Christian witnesses lying in the street of the city "where their Lord was crucified." The circumstances of great tribulation under which the Book was written closely agree with the circumstances of the Church under Nero's persecution. The exhortations to stand fast, and the promises of reward to them that overcame, are continually repeated throughout the Book, corresponding minutely with the great Apostacy which our Lord said should precede His advent, and to which St. Paul alludes (2 Thes. ii. 2), "*Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτὸν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς . . . ὡς ὅτι ἐνεστήκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*,"—i. e., "We beseech you, by the *παρουσία* of the Lord Jesus, and by our glorious hope of *ἐπισυναγωγή* at that *παρουσία* that ye be not shaken easily from your conviction, by being made to believe that the day of Christ is *actually upon you—is now present*," for such is the force of *ἐνεστήκεν*, as may be easily seen by comparing Rom. viii. 39, with 2 Thes. ii. 2: "*μήτις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ὅτι, εἰάν μὴ ἔλθῃ Ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον*." "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come 'The' falling away first;" *The* well-known apostacy respecting which the Lord had forewarned His Church. These, and many such like internal proofs, which are only in-

telligible when referred to the closing scenes of the Jewish dispensation, make it morally certain that the symbols of the Apocalypse can refer to nothing so harmoniously as to the scenes connected with the completion of the Jewish economy and the coming of the Son of Man.

But to get at once to the argument which I propose to examine. The woes of the Apocalypse (and I presume I may take it for granted that the Book, from the opening of the first Seal to the final consummation of the destruction of Babylon, is one unmixed and uninterrupted series of terrible calamity) are said to fall upon the dwellers in a particular land, upon the princes and lords and merchants of a particular land, and upon a particular city.

These are described as "they that dwell on the earth,"^a "οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς." "The kings of the earth," "βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς." "The great men of the earth," "μεγιστᾶνες τῆς γῆς." "The merchants of the earth," "ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς." "The great city which had dominion over the kings of the earth," "ἡ πόλις ἣ μεγάλη ἣ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς."

Let us see first of all whether the woes of the Apocalypse are represented as coming upon "them that dwell on the earth," "τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς."

This position can be confirmed by numerous passages.

"Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth," "Τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς" (Rev. viii. 13). "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea," "Τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θαλάσσαν" (Rev. xii. 12). "And there fell a noisome and a grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and which worshipped his image" (Rev. xvi. 2). Now, the men who had "the mark of the beast and who worshipped his image" are defined as "they that dwell on the earth." "And all that dwell upon the earth, πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, shall worship him,"—i.e., the beast (Rev. xiii. 8). "He . . . causeth the earth and them that dwell therein, τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ, to worship the first beast," (Rev. xiii. 12.) "And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth," "τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς." "Saying to them that dwell on the earth, τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, that they should make an image," κ.τ.λ. (Rev. xiii. 14; compare also, Rev. iii. 10; vi. 10; xvii. 2; xvii. 8). I trust, then, it will be admitted as an irrefragable position that the woes of the Apocalypse were to fall upon a particular people, specially marked out and defined as "They that dwell on the earth."

Now, who are they that dwell on the earth?

The words ἡ γῆ are not unfrequently used in the Apocalypse in connexion with other clauses which qualify their meaning, making it evident that no particular land is pointed out, but the earth generally. I would adduce in support of this such passages as the following:—"And no man

^a "They that dwell on the earth," ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, in every passage this ought to be translated "on the land"—i. e., the land of Judæa (compare Luke xxi. 23). "Ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄργη ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ," where our translators, driven to the right meaning of the words by the qualifying clause, "this people," have translated ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς "in the land."

in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth" (Rev. v. 8). "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea" (Rev. v. 13; so also, Rev. xiv. 7; Rev. xx. 11, &c.). In all which passages it is at once evident from the qualifying adjuncts that no particular land can be intended, but the earth generally, as part of creation.

In some other passages, the obscurity of which does not admit of a positive interpretation, it is possible that the earth generally, or a particular land, may be intended. I allude to such texts as, "The seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth" (Rev. v. 6). "The stars of heaven fell to the earth" (Rev. vi. 13). "And He set His right foot upon the sea and His left foot on the earth" (Rev. x. 2). Although, if we bring our Lord's prophecies and the prevailing opinions of the Jews into the scale, it will seem most probable that a particular land was intended. But the words in question are sometimes found qualified by governing considerations which define and determine their meaning, and *this is always the case* when they are found in connexion with the governing clause *οἱ κατοικοῦντες*. Then they have and can have, only one meaning, then they refer only to one land and to one people; and this land and this people must be the land and people of Judæa.

This will be reduced to demonstration from a consideration of the passages in which these words occur.

They are found put in opposition and contradistinction to "every tongue and kindred, and people, and nation." *Πᾶσα φυλὴ καὶ γλώσση καὶ λαός καὶ ἔθνος*. It is well known that one only land claimed this distinction, one only people asserted this separation from the Gentile world. The Greeks were not more anxious to be held distinct from the Barbarians, than the Jews from the heathen, than the *οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* from the *φυλαὶ καὶ γλώσσαι καὶ λαοὶ καὶ ἔθνη*.

The first passage which I shall bring forward in proof of this is (Rev. vii. 4) where the 144,000 are said to be sealed "of all the tribes of the children of Israel"—*ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ*. By turning to Rev. xiv. 3, it will be found that the same 144,000 are said to be "redeemed from the earth"—*ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*. These are contrasted (Rev. vii. 9), with "a great multitude, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues"—*ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν*. Here it is evident that the 144,000 of all the tribes, defined as the "redeemed from the earth," are put in opposition to "the great multitude—of all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues." The inference is unavoidable, that the writer of the book intended to draw a distinction between Jew and Gentile—between the sealed "of all the tribes of the children of Israel" (and these tribes are enumerated by name, in order to shew that a literal Israel is intended), and the gathered from all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues—and by comparing Rev. vii. 4, with Rev. xiv. 3, it is made matter of positive certainty, that the "redeemed from the earth," *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, are identical with the sealed from "all the tribes of the children of Israel." This at once gives us the position we contend for, that "the earth" is the land of Judæa.

Rev. xi. 9—10. "And they of the people and kindreds and tongues

and nations, shall see, &c.—and they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them.”

Rev. xiii. 7—8. “And power was given unto him over all kindreds and tongues and nations and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him.”

Rev. xiv. 6. “And I saw another angel—having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people.”

Rev. xxi. 26—27. “They shall bring the glory and honor of the nations” *ἔθνη* “into it, and there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth—but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.” They who are *not* written in the Lamb’s book of life, are described as *οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν ὄν γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα*—“they that dwell on the earth whose names were not written” (Rev. xvii. 8).

In all these passages there is a marked antithesis between the Jew and the Gentile—a distinction evident to the simplest comprehension. The Jew is described by that title which belongs to him alone, which he generally occupies in the Apocalypse, and which is never used in this book in any other sense but as defining that peculiar people, who were separate from the Gentile world. The heathen, on the other hand, are appropriately distinguished by the name by which the Jew ever recognized them—the one the *οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, the other—the *ἔθνη καὶ γλώσσαι καὶ λαοὶ καὶ φυλαί*.

The same argument may be drawn from the consideration of those texts in which the expression “the kings of the earth,” *οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς*, occurs in contradistinction to other clauses which serve to define and particularize its meaning. And here again I should wish to take it for granted that the woes of the Apocalypse descend upon the *Βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς*, as well as upon the *οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. This will not require any elaborate proof. Under the sixth seal the kings of the earth, and the great men hide themselves from the approaching vengeance, calling upon the mountains and rocks, almost in the identical language predicted by our Lord, “Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb” (Rev. vi. 16). At the destruction of great Babylon the kings of the earth “bewail and lament for her when they see the smoke of her burning” (Rev. xviii. 9).

It will then hardly be denied that the woes of the Apocalypse come on princes and lords, who are called kings of the earth, as well as upon the inhabitants of the earth. But who are the kings of the earth? They are not the kings of the Gentile world, or they would be called *οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἔθνων*” (Luke xxii. 25), and not *οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς*.” They are not *οἱ δέκα βασιλεῖς τοῦ θηριοῦ* (Rev. xvii. 12), for these are *not* called *οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς*; nay, it is said of these ten kings that they shall hate the whore *ἣ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*. It would be impossible for them to hate and destroy the whore which reigneth over the kings of the earth, and be themselves the kings of the earth.

Is there then any clue by which we may discover who are meant by the kings of the earth? In Rev. xvi. 12—14, they are mentioned in opposition to the kings of the East, *Βασιλεῖς τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου*,

and the kings of the whole world, *Βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης*. This is a very remarkable distinction. They are the princes of a particular land which maintained a separation from every other country, which held itself aloof from the *οἰκουμένη ὅλη* of imperial Rome—and the *ἀνατολικοὶ τόποι, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἀραβίαν*, (S. Clement, Epist. i. ad Cor. 25) of Eastern nations. This, in the uniform language of history and Scripture, can only be Judæa. We may add to this that Clement, Epist. i., 12, calls the king of Jericho *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς γῆς*—and that Acts iv. 26, the rulers of Judæa are styled “the kings of the earth.”

The same distinction is observable in Rev. xviii. 3. “For all nations, *ἔθνη*, have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth, *τῆς γῆς*, have committed fornication with her.” So also Rev. xxi. 24, “And the nations, *ἔθνη*, of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth, *τῆς γῆς*, do bring their glory and honour into it.”

It is most evident that the writer of the Apocalypse (a book everywhere abounding with the most forcible and magnificent contradistinctions and appositions) intended by these striking points of contrast to define and to determine the princes of that particular land, which ever vaunted its superiority in point of privilege above the heathen world.

The same argument, which however I shall not now pursue, is applicable to the expression, “the merchants of the earth”—*ἐμποροὶ τῆς γῆς*—as contrasted with “all nations” *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* (Rev. xviii. 3, 23).

I may now take it for granted, that the woes of the Apocalypse descend upon a particular city, as well as upon the inhabitants and princes of a particular land.

And now comes the *vezala questio*. What is this great city? If the preceding line of argument be correct, one answer only can be given. It is “that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth,” *ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*. If they that dwell on the earth, as opposed to the heathen, can only be the Jewish people—if the kings of the earth, as distinct from the kings of the East, and of the whole world, can only be the princes of Judæa, then the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth can only be Jerusalem. The limits of this paper will not allow me to explain the apparent difficulty of the seven mountains on which the woman sitteth; that has been elsewhere done. But I revert to the chain of argument hitherto pursued, and maintain that in order to be consistent, no other view can be taken of that great city but the one proposed.

It will be satisfactory to find that the same argument which we have as yet employed, is applicable to our present position, and that the city which is the object of the woes of the Apocalypse, is ever held distinct from the cities of the heathen, Rev. xvi. 19: the city is contrasted with the cities of the nations. “And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations, *ἔθνων*, fell—and great Babylon came in remembrance before God.”

Nothing can be more evident than that a marked contrast is here intended to be kept up between the great city which came in remembrance before God, and the cities of the nations—*ἔθνη*.

Rev. xii. 2. "The Holy city, shall they (the Gentiles ἔθνη) tread under foot." Τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν πατήσουσι—or according to St. Luke xxi. 24. Ἱερουσαλήμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν. The distinction drawn between the Gentiles who should tread down "the holy city," (compare Matt. iv. 5, 27, 53; Josephus, lib. vii., cap. 8), and that city which alone could claim this unique title of separation is so plain, that there hardly seemed a necessity for the author of the Apocalypse to render his meaning still more intelligible by defining that holy city as "the great city where also our Lord was crucified" (Rev. xi. 8).

The argument then resolves itself into this—*Either the woes of the Apocalypse have fallen upon this particular people, princes, and city, or they have yet to fall upon this particular people, princes, and city.*

For it cannot be too strongly stated, that the terrific symbols of the Apocalypse do not fall upon the dwellers on the whole earth, οἰκουμένη—upon the princes and merchants of the Gentiles, ἔθνη, or upon more than one city, and that not a city of the nations, ἔθνη, but a city having dominion over the "kings of the earth," which is continually brought before us throughout the book as the object of God's terrible vengeance, until at last the winepress of the wrath of God is trodden "without the city," and her plagues come in one day, death and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burnt with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." From the beginning to the end of this mysterious volume, one only people are the subjects of vengeance, and no vengeance is denounced on any other. One only city comes into remembrance before God; the princes and merchants of one only land experience the vengeance of the Almighty, and these from first to last are put into distinct contrast with the rest of mankind. Let me then repeat, as it seems to me, the inevitable conclusion to which a candid and critical examination of the subject must lead, *either the woes of the Apocalypse have fallen, or have yet to fall upon this race which asserted separation from the whole world besides.*

It will give me no trouble to shew that they have so fallen. I answer at once in the words of St. Barnabas, Epist. xvi., "Γίνεται." "Καὶ ἐγένετο καθ' ὃ ἐλάλησε Κύριος—"So it is," "and it hath come to pass as the Lord hath spoken." This is so certain, that nothing more need be said. It will not be so easy to shew that the woes of the Apocalypse have yet to fall upon the Jewish people.

According to popular theories, the kings of the East, transformed into the people of the Jews, although the Jews never considered or spoke of themselves as the people of the East, are to be gathered into their own land. Jewish millionaires are to repurchase Palestine. Jerusalem is to be rebuilt with a splendour hitherto unequalled. Christ is to come and reign on an earthly throne—Christianity is to go back into Judaism, instead of Judaism being transfused into Christianity. And the Jews, aided, I suppose, by that Society which espouses the cause of their restoration, are to be the authors of the complete conversion of the human race. All I can say is, if that Society should accomplish its ostensible mission of rebuilding the temple and restoring the Holy City, in defiance of the plain and positive statements of God's Holy Word to the contrary, I should consider it as likely that Exeter Hall would be destroyed by heaven-sent combus-

tion as that fire should have burst from the earth, destroying those who endeavoured to carry Julian's unholy project into execution. But supposing their object gained, and Palestine restored—*what becomes of the woes of the Apocalypse.* In that case, we must suppose that the language of this book, not one word of which was to be taken from, or added to, was ironical. We must reverse the dirge of this book of blood, into the *Te Deum* of thrilling victory—we must say Peace, peace, ppeace, and not “Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth.” True, some commentators would have us shift the burden of these sorrows—would have us believe that volcanic agency exists in the Italian peninsula for the sole purpose of the desolation of the Seven-hilled City. I wonder for what purpose volcanoes exist in Sicily, Hecla, South America, and elsewhere. But unfortunately for their system, not one woe of the Apocalypse is said to descend upon the kindreds and tongues, and people and nations, but only upon them that dwell on the earth, the princes of the earth, and the great city “which reigneth over the kings of the earth,” and the mother of the “abominations of the earth.” It will require the logic of a Whately to shew that Rome is the city distinct from the cities of the Gentiles—or that Roman Catholics, generally, are “they that dwell on the earth,” as contrasted with the rest of mankind.

But not to pursue this chain of thought further, although it opens an almost boundless field for exposing the difficulties which beset modern systems of Apocalyptic interpretation, I sum up in a few words the one argument for the Neronic date, as gathered from the internal evidence of the book itself, which I have endeavoured to establish. I shall hope that it may be considered proved, that the woes of the Apocalypse descend upon a particular people, princes, and city, that this particular people, princes, and city, are contrasted with heathen nations, heathen princes, and heathen cities. That one only people, rulers, and city, claimed this isolated and peculiar position, and this people, dynasty, and city, were the people, dynasty, and city of Judæa.

That the whole argument may fairly be resolved into this—that either the woes of the Apocalypse have fallen, or have yet to fall upon this particular people, princes, and city. That there is evidence, complete and satisfactory, that the woes of the Apocalypse have fallen upon this land, princes, and city—that there is not evidence to justify the expectation that they have yet to fall upon this particular people, princes, and city—inasmuch as the people are no more a people, and the city no more the Holy City of God; and that even on the supposition that the Holy City and people should be once more restored, the whole foundation of such restoration proceeds on the principle, *not* of their being subject to such woes as are predicted in the Apocalypse, but of their being once more the favoured people of God, their city once more the joy of the whole earth. and the Saviour whom they once rejected in their obstinacy, proclaiming from Zion his universal law, and the throne of the new and earthly Jerusalem, filled by him who is “King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.”

Believe me, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

Wolverhampton, Feb. 22.

P. S. D.