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 state: but if the two belong to one and the same writer, we must seek   
 for the cause of their diversity not in chronological but rather in   
 psychological considerations.   
 ~23. Again, it is said that the book furnishes indications of having   
 been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, by the fact of its   
 mentioning the city and the temple, ch. xi. 1 ff., and the twelve tribes as   
 yet existing, ch. vii, 4—8, This argument has been very much insisted   
 on by several of the modern German critics. But we may demur to it   
 at once, as containing an assumption which we are not prepared to   
 grant: viz. that the prophetic passage is to be thus interpreted, or has   
 any thing to do with the literal Jerusalem. Let the canon of interpreta-   
 tion be first substantiated, by which we are to be bound in our under-   
 standing of this passage, and then we can recognize its bearing on the   
 chronological question. Certainly Liicke has not done this, but, as usual   
 with him, has fallen to abusing Hengstenberg, for which he undoubtedly   
 has a strong case, while for his own interpretation he seems to me to   
 make out a very weak one.   
 24, Another such assumption is found in the confident assertion by   
 the same critics, that the passages in ch. xiii. 1 ff., xvii. 10 point out the   
 then reigning Cwsar, and that by the conditions of those passages, such   
 reigning Cwsar must be that one who suits their chronological theory.   
 It is not the place here to discuss principles of interpretation : but we   
 may fairly demur again to the thus assuming a principle irrespective of   
 the requirements of the book, and then judging the book itself by it.   
 This is manifestly done by Liicke. Besides which, the differences   
 among themselves of those who adopt this view are such as to deprive   
 it of all fixity as an historical indication. Are we to reckon our Cxsars   
 forwards (and if so, are we to begin with Julius, or with Augustus ?), or   
 backwards, upon some independent assumption of the time of writing,   
 which the other phenomena must be made to fit? If the reader will   
 consult the notes on ch. xvii. 10, I trust he will see that any snch view of   
 the passages is untenable.   
 25. Upon interpretations like these, insulated, and derived from mere   
 first impressions of the wording of single passages, is the whole fabrie   
 built, which is to supersede the primitive tradition as to the date of the   
 Apocalypse. On this aceount, Ireneus, who had such good and suffi-   
 cient means of knowing, must be supposed to have made a mistake in   
 the date which heassigns : on this account, all those additional testimonies   
 which in any other case would have been adduced as independent and   
 important, are to be assumed to have been mere repetitions of that of   
 Treneus.   
 ~~ 2%. But it is most unfortunate for these erities that, when once so   
 sure a ground is established for them as a direct indication, in the book   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 itself, of the emperor under whom it was written, they cannot agree   
 338