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 the Romish church, became accustomed to the ideas, that the npocalyptic   
 Babylon was in some sense or other not only Pagan but Papal Rome:   
 and that Antichrist was to sit, whether as an usurper or not, on the   
 throne of the Papacy.   
 8. I pass over less remarkable names, which will be found composing   
 an interesting series in Mr. Elliott’s history, noticing as I pass, that   
 such was the view held by the precursors and upholders of the Refor-   
 mation: by Wicliffe and his followers in England, by Luther in Ger-   
 many, Bullinger in Switzerland, Bishop Bale in Ireland; by Fox the   
 martyrologist, by Brightmann, Pareus, and early Protestant expositors   
 generally.   
 9. As we advance in order of time, the same view holds its ground   
 in the main among the Protestant churches. It is, with more or less   
 individual varieties and divergences, that of Mede (1630), Jurieu (1685),   
 Cressener (1690), Vitringa (1705), Daubuz (1720), Sir Isaac Newton   
 (first published in 1733, after his death ; but belonging to an earlier   
 date), Whiston (1706), and the Commentators further on in that een-   
 tury, Bengel and Bishop Newton.   
 10. Mr. Elliott very naturally makes the great French Revolution a   
 break, and the beginning of a new epoch, in the history of apocalyptic   
 interpretation. From it, the continuous historical view seemed to derive   
 confirmation and consistency, and acquired boldness to enter into new   
 details, and fix its dates with greater precision.   
 11, Some of the more marked upholders of the view since that great   
 Revolution have been divided among themselves as to the question,   
 whether the expected second advent of our Lord is to be regarded as   
 preceding or succeeding the thousand years’ reign, or millennium, The   
 majority both in number, and in learning and research, adopt the pre-   
 millennial advent: following, as it seems to me, the plain and undeniable   
 sense of the sacred text of the book itself.   
 12. It is not the purpose of the present Introduction to open controver-   
 sial dispute with systems or withindividuals. The following Commentary   
 will shew how farour views agree with, how far they differ from, the school   
 of which I am treating. With this caution, I cannot refrain from ex-   
 pressing my admiration of the researchand piety which have characterized   
 some of the principal modern Protestant expositors of this school. Imust   
 pay this tribute more especially to Mr. Elliott, from whose system and   
 conclusions I am compelled so frequently and so widely to diverge’.   
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 © The statement made above in the text will account for my not having noticed in   
 detail, with a view to refutation, Mr. Elliott’s work, “Apocalypsis Alfordiana,” pub-   
 lished since the appearance of this volume of my Greek Testament. A careful perusal   
 of that work has not altered my view on any of the points of interpretation whereon   
 we differ. Its arguments are not formidable, consisting for the most part of confident   
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