Biblical commentators can have a tendency to take ancient incidents and predictions and to re-invent them, even in their most literal sense, as, now, C21st AD situations. The question is, should their “Apocalypse Now” really be seen as “Apocalypse Then”? 
Lack of Urgency

Fr. Kramer’s whole argument for a late fulfilment of Revelation amounts to a (no doubt unwitting) denial of the urgency, and the concreteness, of Our Lord’s predictions, and those of His disciples. A re-assessment of Fr. Kramer’s commentary is needed in light of St. John’s own words, and this will be the task undertaken here. The conclusions that will be reached in this article are now given, with comments to them following immediately:

- St. John wrote Revelation, not in 95 AD - as most commentators (Catholic and non Catholic alike) insist - but prior to the destruction of the City of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus in 70 AD;
- St. John likely wrote Revelation (that we now have in Greek) in a Semitic language - either Hebrew or its sister language, Aramaic; this being a further argument in favour of early composition;
- The events described in Revelation were all literally fulfilled by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD (though they have a spiritual significance for all times, including our own).
1. Date of Writing

70 AD or 95 AD

Commentators base their conclusion of late date of authorship on the crucial testimony of St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, who claimed to have known Polycarp, disciple of St. John. The evidence from Irenæus that is deemed so compelling is found in Book 5 of his Against Heresies (at 5:30:3), at the end of a section in which Irenæus is dealing with the identification of “666” in Revelation 13:18 (emphasis added):

>We will not, however, incur the risk of pronouncing positively as to the name of Antichrist; for if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in the present time, it would have been announced by him who had beheld the apocalyptic vision [i.e St. John the Evangelist]. For that was seen no very long time since, but almost in our day, towards the end of Domitian’s reign.

If the conventional date of c. 95 AD for “the end of Domitian’s reign” is correct then it - in conjunction with Irenæus’ testimony - would put paid in one blow to my entire thesis [not however my original idea – see Part One] that Revelation pre-dates the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

In answering this - which answer will necessitate my providing at least an outline for a proposed revision of Roman imperial history - I shall endeavour to show why I think Emperor Domitian is to be dated significantly earlier than 95 AD; a conclusion that would in no way contravene anything that St. Irenæus wrote - for Irenæus never said that the Apocalypse was conceived in 95 AD (a quarter of a century after the destruction of Jerusalem), but merely “towards the end of Domitian’s reign”.

Contemporary chronologists are the ones who have fixed Domitian to that approximate date.

Firstly I list for the reader the early Roman emperors (with their conventional dates) up to the destruction of Jerusalem. Some commence their list with Julius Cæsar (49-44 BC):

1. Augustus (31 BC-AD 14)       6. Galba (AD 68-69)
2. Tiberius (AD 14-37)          7. Otho (AD 69)
3. Gaius, known as Caligula (AD 37-41) 8. Vitellius (AD 69)
5. Nero (AD 54-68)

Conventionally, Domitian would be listed a bit further on, c. 95 AD. But I am now going to propose that Domitian might be the same person as Nero.

Chronological ‘Folding’

I strongly suspect that there has occurred, in the construction of Roman imperial history, the same sort of duplication that revisionists have observed in early Egyptian history. Chronologists, scientists, anthropologists, seem to have a pathological tendency to want
to stretch things out. Procrustes in action with his rack. The so-called Stone Ages they stretch out over several million years, in single file, though there is abundant evidence for overlap. Astronomers keep wanting to expand the size of the universe, galaxy upon galaxy, based on the Doppler Effect (or should that be the Doppelgänger Effect?); and to expand the age of the universe by billions of year (give or take a zero).

The same extending has been done to ancient history. In my MA thesis, *The Sothic Star Theory of the Egyptian Calendar*, deemed in some circles of academia to be "irrefutable", I argued that Egyptian chronology has been artificially stretched on the rack to the tune of 500 years or more. It needs a benign Procrustes to shrink it back to its original size. Dr. D. Courville, in *The Exodus Problem and its Ramifications*, rightly concluded that Egypt’s Old and Middle kingdoms - conventionally separated the one from the other (at their beginnings) by 700 years - were in actual fact contemporaneous, and not successive. Chronological reality is often like that; more of a ‘pond-ripple effect’, spreading outwards, than an ‘Indian file’ successive extension.

In my “Osman’s ‘Osmosis’ of Moses” and “Re-discovering the Egyptianized Moses”, written for *The Glozel Newsletter*, I built upon Courville’s important re-alignment. What conventional history has cleft in two, artificially separating the parts by 500-700 years, needs to be rejoined together.

Pharaoh Khufu (4th dynasty) was, so I reckon, the same as Pharaoh Teti (6th dynasty: 

![Image of Pharaoh Khufu and Pharaoh Teti](image)

That the same sort of folding as with Egypt’s Old and Middle Kingdoms needs to be applied to Roman imperial history - though thankfully not a fold of 700 years, but more like 60 years - will become evident from various testimonies.

*Strange Afterglows*

One frequently encounters in Egyptology queries over whether some artefact, piece of literature, or even a destructive action, ought to be dated to the Old or Middle Kingdom. This very querying is often a tell-tale sign that folding is required (so that chronologists will no longer be forced into a dispute over a range of estimates incorporating many centuries).
Now the same tendency of querying I am finding in historical discussions of Nero and Domitian. Historians puzzle over whether such and such a persecution, or event, occurred during the reign of the one or the other Roman emperor.

* A tell-tale sign?

It can be (though one can also end up with egg on one’s face when the situation is misread). Some commentators, who cannot make up their mind whether St. John the Evangelist was exiled to the island of Patmos during the reign of Nero, or of Domitian, end up by compromising and suggesting that he may have experienced two exiles.

One of the first things I decided to do, to test if there might be any possibility of folding with *Nero* and *Domitian* was to look at Nero’s other names. Like we, the ancients often had a *set of names*; and this can be the cause of much confusion and duplication.

*So is there the chance that Nero was also called Domitian?*

Even with this new theory in mind, I read over Nero’s four names, without a pause, once I had found them in K. Gentry’s *The Beast of Revelation* (p. 14). Perhaps I was distracted by Nero’s nickname, *Ahenobarbus*; a description of his red facial hair. I was only stopped in my tracks a bit further along when I read that a name of Nero’s father was *Domitius*. I quickly scanned back to Nero’s set of names and saw that, yes, Nero certainly had as one of his names, *Domitius*, the Roman version of Domitian.

He was Lucius *Domitius Ahenobarbus* (Nero Cæsar).

This similarity of names in itself is of course no certain proof of identity between Nero and Domitian. But it, coupled with evidences for an early Apocalypse, and the queries of historians, begins to shape up to some sort of a real picture.

Moreover, the current chronology for the life of St. John the Evangelist would have him ending up as an unrealistically sprightly nonagenarian. St. Irenæus wrote (*op. cit.* that St. John “*continued with the Elders till the times of [the emperor] Trajan*”, who came even after Domitian. According to the reckonings of conventional Roman chronology, St. John would have been in his nineties by the time of his dwelling at Ephesus after his return from exile. Yet the activity that he is then said to have undertaken is that of a younger person. Eusebius wholeheartedly endorsed Clement of Alexandria’s account that John not only travelled about the region of Ephesus appointing bishops and reconciling whole churches, but also that while on horseback he chased with all of his might a young man. Unlikely energy for a person in his nineties.

Here are some further examples of the queries historians make between Nero and Domitian:

- Despite the strong conviction by some that the emperor worship that they detect in Revelation can be found no earlier than Domitian, others insist that Nero practised it. Nero was particularly infatuated with Apollo, and even claimed the title, “*Son of Apollos*”. Seneca, one of young Nero’s tutors,
convinced Nero that he was destined to become the very revelation of Augustus and Apollo.

- Despite unanimity amongst early Fathers that St. John was banished to Patmos in the reign of Domitian, shortly after his being dipped in a cauldron of burning oil, St. Jerome said that this dipping occurred in Nero’s reign (*Against Jovinianum* 11:26). That total picture would be appropriate if Nero were Domitian.

That there is something quite wrong with the conventional chronology, and its application to the Apocalypse, is attested by the evidences in the latter that the Temple of Jerusalem was still standing when St. John wrote his book. I have already discussed this situation in:

**I Am Barabbas**

[https://www.academia.edu/3704873/I_Am_Barabbas](https://www.academia.edu/3704873/I_Am_Barabbas)

But that is not all. The conventional chronology of imperial Rome has also served to throw out of kilter the early history of the Roman Catholic Church that has been chronologically tied to it. Let us take the case of Pope St. Clement I of Rome. Clement, like St. John, is supposed to have written around 90-95 AD, yet he likewise spoke as if the Jerusalem Temple were still standing. Clement’s relevant statement is as follows (*I Clement* 41):

> Not in every place, brethren, are the continual daily sacrifices offered, or the freewill offerings, or the sin offerings and the trespass offerings, but in Jerusalem alone. And even there the offering is not made in every place, but before the sanctuary in the court of the altar; and this too through the high-priest and the aforesaid ministers, after that the victim to be offered hath been inspected for blemishes.

This statement clearly pre-dates 70 AD. Clement as a writer, therefore, needs to be retro-dated by at least 20 years. That similar anomalies occur with the current chronology of Pope Pius I is shown in some detail by Gentry in *Before Jerusalem Fell* (pp. 93ff). Added to all this is another strange afterglow about 60 years after the destruction of Jerusalem, with the Emperor Hadrian (conventionally dated to c. 130 AD), putting down a so-called ‘Second’ Jewish Revolt in the Holy Land, and supposedly removing all the stones of the Temple. This, rather than Titus’ destruction of the city, is considered by some to be the more perfect fulfilment of Jesus Christ’s prophecy that ‘... not a single stone here will be left on another; everything will be destroyed’ (*Matthew* 24:2).

But I ask how could the Jews have rallied so mightily, re-populated the area to such an extent, so soon after 70 AD, when their city had been absolutely burned to the ground, and whatever citizens survived were sold into slavery?

Might not the Emperor Hadrian himself be a duplicate of an earlier emperor?
Interestingly, the so-called ‘Second’ Jewish Revolt lasted as long as the First - the three and a half years of Revelation. Hadrian’s main Jewish opponent was the legendary Simon bar Kochba (son of the Star), thought by the Jews to be the Messiah. Indeed Rabbi Aqiba, intellectual leader of the Jews, proclaimed Simon as such. Had not Our Lord warned that some would rise up claiming to be the Christ, i.e. the Messiah (Matthew 24:24)? And Simon perfectly fits this description. Simon was a guerilla fighter, and is very reminiscent of the terrible Simon Giora of 70 AD, guerilla fighter, who led one of the three factions in Jerusalem, fighting amongst themselves even when the Romans had the city encircled.