people possessed as contrasted with the  
heathen power of this world, which abides  
in “Babylon.” But really, if we have  
come thus far by fighting for the literal  
interpretation, why not a little further?  
Or rather why *so far*? If “Babylon” is  
the abode of the world, why not “Jerusalem” of the church? — If our interpreter,  
maintaining the literal sense, is allowed so  
far to “idealize,” as to exempt the temple  
of God itself [ver. 2] from a destruction  
which we know overtook it, and nine-tenths of the city [ver 13] from an  
overthrow which destroyed it all, surely  
there is an end to the meaning of words.  
If Jerusalem here is simply Jerusalem, and  
the prophecy regards her overthrow by  
the Romans, and especially if this passage  
is to be made such use of as to set aside  
the testimony of Irenaeus as to the date  
of the Apocalypse by the stronger testimony of the Apocalypse itself [so Düsterdieck from Lücke], then must every particular be shewn to tally with known  
history; or if this cannot be done, at least  
it must be shewn that none contradicts it.  
If *this* cannot be done, then we may fairly  
infer that the prophecy has no such reference, or only remotely, here and there,  
and not as its principal subject. 2) Into  
whatever difficulty we may be led by the  
remark, it is no less true, that the “holy  
city” of ver. 2 cannot be the same as the  
“*great city*” of ver. 8. This has been  
felt by the literal interpreters, and they  
have devised ingenious reasons why the  
holy city should afterwards be called the  
great city: so De Wette, “he named  
jerusalem the great city, because he can  
no more call her holy after her desecration” [but he need not therefore call her  
great, by which epithet she is never  
called ],—Düsterdieck, “because it is impossible in one breath to call a city ‘holy,’  
and ‘Sodom and Egypt?’” [most true:  
then must we not look for some other city  
than one which this very prophecy has  
called holy?]. So far Joachim says well,  
“But his saying, ‘*in the streets of the  
great. city*,’ does not seem to favour the  
literal sense. For it [Jerusalem] is never  
called the great city, but rather Nineveh  
and Babylon are ‘thus called: because  
many are called and but few chosen.” His  
other reason see in the interpretation below.  
3) We are compelled, if I am not mistaken, to carry the above considerations somewhat  
further, by the very conditions of the prophecy itself. For it is manifestly and undeniably of an *anticipatory* character. It  
is not, and cannot be, complete in itself.  
The words of ver. 7, “*the wild-beast which  
cometh up out of the abyss*,” bear no meaning where they stand, but require, in order  
to be understood at all, to be carried on  
into the succeeding visions of ch. xiii. ff.  
And if into those visions, then into a period  
when this wild-beast has received power  
from the dragon,—when, as in ch. xiii. 7,  
he makes war with the saints and conquers  
them, and all on earth except the elect are  
worshipping him. 4) Let us observe the  
result as affecting our interpretation. We  
are necessarily carried on by the very terms  
of our present compendious prophecy, into  
the midst of another prophecy, far more  
detailed and full of persons and incidents:  
of one which has its *great city, its temple of  
God, its worshippers in it, its witness of  
Jesus*, and other coincident particulars.  
What inference does a sound principle of  
interpretation force upon us? What, if  
not this—that our present compendious  
prophecy, as in the particular of the beast  
that comes out of the abyss, so in its other  
features, must be understood as giving in  
summary, and introducing, that larger  
one? and consequently, that its terms are  
to be understood by those of that larger  
one, not servilely and literally where they  
stand? And observe, this is deduced from  
the very necessity of the case itself, as  
shewn in ver. 7, not from any system  
throwing its attraction forward and biassing  
our views. *We cannot understand this  
prophecy at all, except in the light of  
those that follow: for it introduces by  
anticipation their dramatis personae.* 5)  
If I mistake not, we thus gain much light  
on the difficulties of this prophecy. If it  
is a compendium of the more detailed prophecies which follow, opening the great  
series regarding God’s church, and reaching forward to the time of the seventh  
trumpet, then its separate parts, so hard  
to assign on any other view, at once fall  
into their places, Then, e.g. we at once  
know what is meant by the temple and its  
worshippers, viz, that these expressions are  
identical in reference with those others in  
the subsequent prophecy which point out  
an elect remnant, a Goshen in Egypt,