§ 1.) PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING. [intropucrion.   
   
 among themselves who this emperor was. Some among them (ce.   
 Stuart, and others) taking the natural (and one would think the only   
 possible) view of such an historical indication, begin according to general   
 custom with Julius, and bring the writing under Nero. Ewald and   
 Liicke, on account of the “is not, and shall come” of xvii. 8, which   
 they wish to apply to Nero, desert the usual reckoning of Roman   
 emperors, and begin with Augustus, thus bringing the writing under   
 Galba. Again, Eichhorn and Bleck, wishing to bring the writing under   
 Vespasian, omit Galba, Otho, and Vitcllius, relying on an expressi   
 Suetonius, that their reigns were a mere “rebellion of three pri   
 ‘Thus by changing the usual starting-point, and leaving out of the usual   
 list of the Cwesars any number found convenient, any view we please may   
 be substantiated by this kind of interpretation. ‘Those whose view of   
 the prophecy extends wider, and who attach a larger meaning to the   
 symbols of the beast and his image and his heads, will not be induced by   
 such very uncertain speculations to set aside a primitive and as it appears ©   
 to them thoroughly trustworthy tradition.   
 27. It may be observed that Liicke attempts to give an account of   
 the origin of what he calls the Trenean tradition, freely confessing that   
 his proof (?) of the date is not complete without such an account.   
 The character of the account he gives is well worth observing. When,   
 he says, men found that the apocalyptic prophecies had failed of their   
 accomplishment, they began to give a wider sense to them, and to put   
 them ata later date. And having given this account, he attempts to   
 vindicate it from the charge of overthrowing the authority of Scripture   
 prophecy, and says that though it may not be as convenicnt as the way   
 which modern orthodoxy has struck out, yet it leads more safely to the   
 desired end, and to the permanent enjoyment of true faith.   
 28, With evory disposition to search and prove all things, and ground   
 faith upon things thus proved, I own I am quite unable to come to   
 Liicke’s conclusions, or to those of any of the maintainers of the   
 Neronie or any of the earlier dates. The book itself, it seems to me,   
 refuses the assignment of such times of writing. ‘The evident assump-   
 tion which it makes of long-standing and general persecution (ch. vi. 9)   
 forbids us to place it in the very first persecution, and that only a partial   
 one: the undoubted transference of Jewish temple emblems to a Chris-   
 tian sense (ch. i. 20) of itself makes us suspect those interpreters who   
 maintain the literal sense when the temple and city are mentioned: the   
 analogy of the prophecies of Daniel forbids us to limit to individual   
 kings the interpretation of the symbolic heads of the beast: the whole   
 character and tone of the writing precludes our imagining that its   
 original reference was ever intended to be to mere local matters of   
 secondary import.   
 29, The state of those to whom it was addressed furnishes another   
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