plural) [**is**] (the present is best to supply, on account of the verbs following,  
which are in the present, until we come to  
*shall send*: and with which the portion  
relating to the corpses is bound up) **upon  
the open street** (literally, **the wide space**)  
**of the great city** (not Jerusalem [see  
above], which is never called by this  
name: but the *great city* of the succeeding visions, of which this is anticipatory and compendious), **namely, that  
which is called spiritually** (i.e. allegorically; in a sense higher than the literal  
and obvious one. The only other place  
in which we find this usage of the word  
is in 1 Cor. ii. 14, which see, and notes  
there) **Sodom and Egypt** (those Commentators who maintain that the literal  
Jerusalem is here meant, allege Isa. i,  
9 ff, and Ezek. xvi. 48, as places where  
she is called Sodom. But the latter place  
is no example: for there Jerusalem is  
compared, in point of sinfulness, with  
her *sisters*, Samaria and Sodom, and is  
not called Sodom at all. And in Isaiah i.  
9 ff., 1) it is not Jerusalem, but the Jewish people in general [see also Isa.  
iii. 9] that are called by this name: and  
that 2) not so much in respect of depravity, as of the desolation of Judea,  
which [vv.7—9] almost equalled that of  
the devoted cities, And even supposing  
this to be a case in point, no instance can  
be alleged of Jerusalem being called Egypt,  
or any thing bearing such an interpretation.  
Whereas in the subsequent prophecy both  
these comparisons are naturally suggested  
with regard to the great city there mentioned : viz. that of Sodom by ch. xix. 3,  
compared with Gen. xix, 28, and that of  
Egypt, and indeed Sodom also, by ch. xviii  
4 ff.), **where their Lord also** (as well  
as they: not the specific term *crucifixion*,  
but the general fact of death by per-  
secution, underlying it, being in the  
Writer's mind) **was crucified** (these words  
  
have principally led those who hold the  
literal Jerusalem to be meant. But if,  
as I believe I have shewn, such an interpretation is forbidden by the previons  
words, then we must not fall back on  
an erroneous view on account of the apparent requirements of these words, but  
enquire whether by the light of the subsequent prophecy, which is an expansion  
of this, we may find some meaning for  
them in accordance with the preceding  
conditions. And this is surely not difficult to discover. If we compare ch. xviii  
24. with Matt. xxiii. 35, we shall find a wider  
ground than the mere literal Jerusalem on  
which to place the Lord’s own martyrdom  
and that of His saints. It is true, He was  
crucified at Jerusalem : but it is also true  
that He was crucified not in, but outside  
the city, and by the hands, not of Jews,  
but of Romans. The fact is, that the  
literal Jerusalem, in whom was found the  
blood of all the saints who had been slain  
on earth, has been superseded by that  
wider and greater city, of which this prophecy speaks: and as the temple, in prophetic language, has become the church  
of God, so the outer city, in the same language, has become the great city which  
will be the subject of God’s final judgments. For those who consider this, there  
be no hesitation in interpreting even  
local designation also of this great  
city). {9} **And some from among the peoples  
and tribes and languages and nations  
look upon** (the prophetic history is carried on in the present, as in ch. xviii,  
11 compared with ver. 9, and elsewhere)  
**their corpse** (see above) **three days and  
a half** (on this period we may remark,  
that these 3 ½ days are connected by  
analogy with the periods previously mentioned: with the 1260 days and 42  
months = 3 years: and that in each  
case the half of the mystic number 7  
enters. Also, that Elliott’s calculation