this agreed meaning, there are many different views as to the extent of the reference of the “little book” to that which  
follows, and as to its relation to the seven-sealed book of ch. v. As regards these  
points, we may remark, 1) that the contents of the “little hook” cannot well be  
confined to ch. xi. 1-13, or we should not  
have had so solemn an inauguration of it,  
nor so wide-reaching an announcement of  
the duty of the Apostle consequent on the  
receipt of it: 2) that the oath of the Angel  
must necessarily be connected with his  
bearing of the open book on his hand, and  
if so, makes it necessary to infer that the  
contents of the book are identical with  
the mystery, respecting which he swears:  
3) that the episode which follows, containing the first work of the Apostle under  
that his new prophetic commission, inaugurates an entirely new matter—the things  
which befall the Church of God and the  
holy city, which new character of incidents continues to prevail until the very  
end of the book: 4) that the relation of  
this “little book” to the sealed book of  
ch. v. can hardly be doubtful to the readers  
of this Commentary, seeing that we have  
maintained that book to be the sum of the  
divine purposes, which is not opened at all  
within the limits of the apocalyptic vision,  
bat only prepared to be opened by the  
removal of its seven seals. That this is  
not that complete record of the divine  
purposes, nor, technically speaking, any  
portion of it, must. be evident to us. For  
it forms a small detached roll or volume,  
lying open on the angel’s hand: it is  
destined for the especial individual behoof  
of the Seer, into whom it passes, and becomes assimilated with himself, to be  
given forth as he should be directed to  
utter it. 5) That it contained *more than*  
we possess in the remaining portion of this  
book, is probable. St. John doubtless  
knew more than he has told us. Previously to this, he knew what the seven  
thunders uttered: and subsequently to  
this, we can hardly imagine that he was  
ignorant of the name of the wild-beast,  
whose number he has given us.  
It remains that we say something on  
the circumstances accompanying the Apostle’s reception of the mysterious book.  
Its *sweetness*, when he tasted it, allusive as it is to the same circumstance in  
Ezekiel’s eating the roll which was all  
lamentation, mourning, and woe, doubtless  
represents present satisfaction at being  
informed of, and admitted to know, a  
portion of God’s holy will: of those words  
of which the Psalmist said, Ps. cxix. 103,  
“How sweet are thy words unto my taste,  
yea sweeter than honey to my mouth!”  
But when the roll eame to be not only  
tasted, but digested,—the nature of its  
contents felt within the man,—bitterness  
took the place of sweetness: the persecutions, the apostasies, the judgments, of  
the church and people of the Lord, saddened the spirit of the Seer, and dashed  
his joy at the first reception of the mystery  
of God.

**CH. XI. 1—13.**] *The measurement of  
the temple of God. The two witnesses:  
their testimony, death, resurrection, and  
assumption into heaven: the earthquake,  
and its consequences.*  
This passage may well be called, even  
more than that previous one, ch. x.1 ff.,  
the *crux* of interpreters ; as it is undoubtedly one of the most difficult in the whole  
Apocalypse. Referring to the histories of  
apocalyptic exposition for an account of the  
various interpretations, I will, as I have  
done in similar cases, endeavour to lay  
down a few landmarks, which may serve for  
guidance at least to avoid inconsistency,  
if we cannot do more. And I will remark,  
1) that we are not bound to the hard  
“wooden” literal sense so insisted on in  
our day by some of the modern German  
Expositors. I would strongly recommend  
any one who takes that view, who will  
have Jerusalem mean nothing but Jerusasalem, and confine the two witnesses to two  
persons bodily appearing there, to read  
through the very unsatisfactory and shuffling comment of Düsterdieck here: the  
result of which is, that finding, as he of  
course docs, many discrepancies between  
this and our Lord’s prophecy of the same  
destruction of Jerusalem, he is driven to  
the refuge that while our Lord describes  
matters of fact, St. John *idealizes* the  
catastrophe, setting it forth not as it really  
took place, but according to its inner connexion with the final accomplishment of  
the mystery of God, and correspondingly  
to the hope which God’s Old Testament