

~Here is why I believe...Revelation was written before 70 AD~

By Greg Kiser

Revelation 1:1

The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass

- 1 - The time statements refer to soon events of cataclysmic Jewish importance. If it was written in 96 AD, there are no events soon from that time that could even remotely fit. If, however, it was before 70 AD, then the destruction of Jerusalem rises to the occasion as both Jewish and cataclysmic. The time statements **demand** we look here.
- 2 - The second century Syrian version of the book has the title of "John the Evangelist in the Isle of Patmos, where he was thrown by Nero Caesar." Nero, of course, was dead by 68 AD.
- 3 - Some versions have a few manuscripts that have the number of the beast as 616 instead of the Hebrew 666. (You can find this stated in almost any Study Bible). What is shocking is that, using 'gematria' (*a cabbalistic system of interpretation of the Scriptures by substituting for a particular word another word whose letters give the same numerical sum*), Caesar Nero's name would add up to 616 in those versions, but in Hebrew, 666. This is very strong evidence that Caesar Nero really was the one being referred to as the beast and that the change from 666 to 616 in some manuscripts was intentional for that very reason. It is nearly impossible to find another person's name in that time frame that would do this!
- 4 - According to the epistles to the churches, there were still Judaizers (Revelation 2:9; 3:9) presenting problems in the churches. This, would be ridiculous after 70 AD.
- 5 - The temple and the city were apparently still standing in Revelation 11, because John is sent to measure them. This would not be possible after 70 AD. If John is referring to some rebuilt temple in the far distant future, and he is writing in 96 AD, then his **complete silence about the destruction of the temple in 70 AD is deafening!**
- 6 - There were "other apostles" still around according to Revelation 2:2. Tradition has it that all the apostles were dead before 70 AD and John was the only original surviving past that time.
- 7 - The 6th king in Revelation 17 is the one that persecutes the saints. Roman emperors are:

(1) Julius (2) Augustus (3) Tiberius (4) Caligula (5) Claudius (6) Nero (7) Galba

Nero was the first and only Roman Caesar of the Julian line to persecute Christians. Nero's death ended

the Julian dynasty. The one ruling after him reigned only a little while--Galba, 6 months. If the 6th king is indeed Nero, he would be the one that "now is" according to the prophecy, and this would date the writing before 68 AD when Nero supposedly committed suicide. Nero also persecuted Christians for 42 months (31/2 years) as is stated in the prophecy.

8 - Caesar Nero's name in Hebrew gematria adds up to 666. Since this was written about soon events, no other person can be found within this time scope whose name fits this requirement and description.

Especially none can be found in the soon future of 96 AD.

9 - What purpose would it serve for John to tell the first readers of his prophecy to "calculate" the number of the name of the beast if he was not to be born until 2000 years later? This would be completely ridiculous if the beast wasn't around in those days. This implies that the beast *was* living at the time of this writing, thus proving not necessarily the pre-70 AD writing, but definitely the "at hand" time statements of the book.

10 - The 7th king of Revelation 17 is not yet here. If Nero is the 6th, then the book was written before Galba, i.e. before 70 AD.

11 - In Revelation there seems to be only 7 churches in Asia. Historically, there seems to be many more than that after 70 AD as Christianity began to grow very rapidly.

12 - The incredible parallels of Matthew 24 and Revelation, which Jesus said would happen in "this generation" and "when . . . Jerusalem (is) surrounded with armies". Most of that generation were dead in the time of 96 AD and Jerusalem was surrounded with armies in 70 AD.

Advocates of The Early Date of Revelation

The Early Church

Arethas

(On Revelation 7:4) "When the Evangelist received these oracles, the destruction in which the Jews were involved was not yet inflicted by the Romans." (pre 70AD)

Clement of Alexandria (150-215)

"For the teaching of our Lord at His advent, beginning with Augustus and Tiberius, was completed in the middle of the times of Tiberius. And that of the apostles, embracing the ministry of Paul, end with Nero."

(Miscellanies 7:17.)

Epiphanies (A. D. 315-403)

States Revelation was written under "Claudius [Nero] Caesar." **(Epiphanies, Heresies 51:12,)**

Irenaeus' Quote (Used as Grounds for Late Date Theory)

"We will not, however, incur the risk of pronouncing positively as to the name of Antichrist; for if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in this present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld the Revelation. For 'he' [John?] or 'it' [Revelation?] was seen . . . towards the end of Domitian's reign." **(Irenaeus, Against Heresies 5:30:3)**

Muratorian Canon (A.D. 170)

"the blessed Apostle Paul, following the rule of his predecessor John, writes to no more than seven

churches by name. " "John too, indeed, in the Apocalypse, although he writes to only seven churches, yet addresses all." (ANF 5:603).

Historical Preterists

Jay E. Adams (1966)

"[the temple still standing in Revelation 11:1 is] unmistakable proof that Revelation was written before 70 A.D." (The Time is at Hand, p. 68)."The Revelation was written to a persecuted church about to face the most tremendous onslaught it had ever known. It would be absurd (not to say cruel) for John to write a letter to persons in such circumstances which not only ignores their difficulties, but reveals numerous details about events supposed to transpire hundreds of years in the future during a seven year tribulation period at the end of the church age." (**The Time is at Hand, p. 49**)

"It is to remain unsealed because 'the time is at hand.' That is, its prophecies are about to be fulfilled. The events which it predicts do not pertain to the far distant future, but they are soon to happen. The message is for this generation, not for some future one." (**The Time is at Hand, p. 51**)

Adam Clarke (1837)

(On Revelation 1:7) "By this the Jewish People are most evidently intended, and therefore the whole verse may be understood as predicting the destruction of the Jews; and is a presumptive proof that the Apocalypse was written before the final overthrow of the Jewish state." (**6:971.**)

"Bengel has said much on these points, but to very little purpose; the word in the above place seems to signify delay simply, and probably refers to the long-suffering of God being ended in reference to Jerusalem; for I all along take for probable that this book was written previously to the destruction of that city." (Revelation 10)

Conybeare and Howson (1870)

"Concerning the Book of Revelation I will say nothing, except to invite attention to the arguments by which Doctor MacDonald endeavors to fix its date. The reasoning seems to me to be very well drawn out, which assigns the writing of this part of the Holy Scripture to a time intermediate between the Gospel and the Epistles of St. John." (**Life and Writings of John, p. xxxiii, Introduction**)

F.W. Farrar (1886)

"there can be no reasonable doubt respecting the (early) date of the Apocalypse." (**The Early Days of Christianity; NY, NY: A.L. Burt, 1884; p. 387**)

"We cannot accept a dubious expression of the Bishop of Lyons as adequate to set aside an overwhelming weight of evidence, alike external and internal, in proof of the fact that the Apocalypse was written, at the latest, soon after the death of Nero." (**The Early Days of Christianity; NY, NY: A.L. Burt, 1884; p. 408**)

"The reason why the early date and mainly contemporary explanation of the book is daily winning fresh adherents among unbiased thinkers of every Church and school, is partly because it rests on so simple and secure a basis, and partly because no other can compete with it. It is indeed the only system which is built on the plain and repeated statements and indications of the Seer himself and the corresponding events are so closely accordant with the symbols as to make it certain that this scheme of interpretation is the only one that can survive." (**The Early Days of Christianity; NY, NY: A.L. Burt, 1884; p. 434**)

Rev. Prof. George P. Fisher (1864)

"The mythical theory is inconsistent with a fair view of the temper and character of those immediately concerned in the founding of Christianity. Christ chose twelve disciples to be constantly with him, in order that an authentic impression of his own character, and an authentic representation of his deeds and teaching might go forth to the world. We find them, even in Paul, designated as "the Twelve," and a marked distinction is accorded to them in the early written Apocalypse.* * 1 Cor. xv. 5, Rev. xxi. 14. The Revelation, it is allowed by the Tübingen School, was written about A. D. '70." **(The Conflict with Skepticism and Unbelief. Second Article: The Mythical Theory of Strauss, P. 250)**

John Fiske (1876)

"Applying the imagery of Daniel, it became a logical conclusion that he must have ascended into the sky, whence he might shortly be expected to make his appearance, to enact the scenes foretold in prophecy. That such was the actual process of inference is shown by the legend of the Ascension in the first chapter of the "Acts," and especially by the words, "This Jesus who hath been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same manner in which ye beheld him going into heaven." In the Apocalypse, written A. D. 68, just after the death of Nero, this second coming is described as something immediately to happen, and the colors in which it is depicted show how closely allied were the Johannine notions to those of the Pharisees. The glories of the New Jerusalem are to be reserved for Jews, while for the Roman tyrants of Judæa is reserved a fearful retribution. They are to be trodden underfoot by the Messiah, like grapes in a wine-press, until the gushing blood shall rise to the height of the horse's bridle." **(The Unseen World, 107)**

Ken Gentry (1989)

"My confident conviction is that a solid case for a Neronian date for Revelation can be set forth from the available evidences, both internal and external. In fact, I would lean toward a date after the outbreak of the Neronian persecution in late A.D.64 and before the declaration of the Jewish war in early A.D.67. A date in either A.D.65 or early A.D.66 would seem most suitable." **(Before Jerusalem Fell {Tyler, TX: ICE, 1989}, 336.)**

"John emphasizes his anticipation of the soon occurrences of his prophecy by strategic placement of these time references. He places his boldest time statements in both the introduction and conclusion to Revelation. It is remarkable that so many recent commentators have missed it literally coming and going! The statement of expectancy is found three times in the first chapter - twice in the first three verses: Revelation 1:1,3,19. The same idea is found four times in his concluding remarks: Revelation 22:6,7,12,20. It is as if John carefully bracketed the entire work to avoid any confusion." **(The Beast of Revelation; Tyler, TX; ICE, 1982; p. 21-22).**

"Think of it: If these words in these verses do not indicate that John expected the events to occur soon, what words could John have used to express such? How could he have said it more plainly?" **(The Beast of Revelation; Tyler, TX; ICE, 1982; p. 24).**"It seems indisputably clear that the book of Revelation must be dated in the reign of Nero Caesar, and consequently before his death in June, A.D.68. He is the sixth king; the short-lived rule of the seventh king (Galba) "has not yet come." **(Before Jerusalem Fell (Tyler, TX: ICE, 1989; 158.)**

Steve Gregg (1997)

"Many scholars, including those supportive of a late date, have said that there is no historical proof that there was an empire-wide persecution of Christians even in Domitian's reign." **(Revelation: Four Views, p.16)**

"Since the text is admittedly "uncertain" in many places, and the quotation in question is known only from a Latin translation of the original, we must not place too high a degree of certainty upon our preferred reading of the statement of Irenaeus." (**Revelation: Four Views, p. 18**)

William Hurte (1884)

"That John saw these visions in the reign of Nero, and that they were written by him during his banishment by that emperor, is confirmed by Theophylact, Andreas, Arethas, and others. We judge, therefore, that this book was written about A.D. 68, and this agrees with other facts of history.. There are also several statements in this book which can only be understood on the ground that the judgment upon Jerusalem was then future." (**Catechetical Commentary: Edinburgh, Scotland, 1884**)

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown (1871)

"The following arguments favor an earlier date, namely, under Nero: (1) EUSEBIUS [Demonstration of the Gospel] unites in the same sentence John's banishment with the stoning of James and the beheading of Paul, which were under Nero. (2) CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA'S story of the robber reclaimed by John, after he had pursued, and with difficulty overtaken him, accords better with John then being a younger man than under Domitian, when he was one hundred years old. Arethas, in the sixth century, applies the sixth seal to the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), adding that the Apocalypse was written before that event. So the Syriac version states he was banished by Nero the Cæsar. Laodicea was overthrown by an earthquake (A.D. 60) but was immediately rebuilt, so that its being called "rich and increased with goods" is not incompatible with this book having been written under the Neronian persecution (A.D. 64). But the possible allusions to it in Heb 10:37; **compare** Re 1:4,8 4:8 22:12; Heb 11:10; **compare** Re 21:14; Heb 12:22,23; **compare** Re 14:1; Heb 8:1,2; **compare** Re 11:19 15:5 21:3; Heb 4:12; **compare** Re 1:16 2:12,16 19:13,15; Heb 4:9; **compare** Re 20:1-15; also 1Pe 1:7,13 4:13, with Re 1:1; 1Pe 2:9 with Re 5:10; 2Ti 4:8, with Re 2:26,27 3:21 11:18; Eph 6:12, with Re 12:7-12; Php 4:3, with Re 3:5 13:8,17:8 20:12,15; Col 1:18, with Re 1:5; 1Co 15:52, with Re 10:7 11:15-18, make a date before the destruction of Laodicea possible. Cerinthus is stated to have died before John; as then he borrowed much in his Pseudo-Apocalypse from John's, it is likely the latter was at an earlier date than Domitian's reign. See TILLOCH'S Introduction to Apocalypse. But the Pauline benediction (Re 1:4) implies it was written after Paul's death under Nero." (**introduction to Revelation**)

Arthur Cushman McGiffert (1890)

"Internal evidence has driven most modern scholars to the conclusion that the Apocalypse must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, the banishment therefore taking place under Nero instead of Domitian."

(**Eusebius, Church History, Book III, ch.5. Eusebius notes, 148, footnote 1.**)

James M. MacDonald (1870)

"The question whether the Apocalypse was written at an early date or in the very closing period of the apostolic ministration has importance as bearing on the interpretation of the book. A true exposition depends, in no small degree, upon a knowledge of the existing condition of things at the time it was written ; i.e., of the true point in history occupied by the writer, and those whom he originally addressed... If the book were an epistle, like that to the Romans or Hebrews, it might be of contemporary little importance, in ascertaining its meaning, to be able to determine whether it was written at the commencement of the apostolic era or at its very close. It is very obvious that if the book itself throws any distinct light on this subject, this internal evidence, especially in the absence of reliable historical testimony, ought to be decisive. Instead of appealing to tradition or to some doubtful passage in an ancient father, we interrogate the book itself, or we listen to what the Spirit says that was in him who testified of these things. It will be found that no book of the New Testament more abounds in passages which clearly

have respect to the time when it was written."

(Life and Writings of John, p. 151-152)

"So clear is the internal evidence in favor of the early date of the Apocalypse. And no evidence can be drawn from any part of the book favoring the later date so commonly assigned to it." **(Life and Writings of John, p. 167)**

"And when we open the book itself, and find inscribed on its very pages evidence that at the time it was written Jewish enemies were still arrogant and active, and the city in which our Lord was crucified, and the temple and the altar in it were still standing, we need no date from early antiquity, not even from the hand of the author himself, to inform us that he wrote before the great historical event and prophetic epoch, the destruction of Jerusalem." **(Life and Writings of John, p. 171-172)**

"There appear to have been but seven church in Asia... when the book was written. It is dedicated to these seven alone by the careful mention of them one by one by name, as if there were no others... The expression 'the seven churches' seems to imply that this constituted the whole number, and hence affords one of the most striking incidental proofs of an early date.. Those who contend for the later date, when there must have been a greater number of churches than the seven in the region designated by the apostle fail to give any sufficient reason for his mentioning no more. That they mystically or symbolically represented others is surely not such a reason." **(ibid., p. 154)**

Francis Nigel Lee

"It is difficult to see why the A.D. 130ff Irenaeus would have referred (as he did) to "ancient copies" (rather than simply to "copies") - the original autograph had itself been written on~ "towards the end of Domitian's rule." . . . For then, the first "ancient copies" would and could only have been made after A.D. 96 — whereas Irenaeus implies that those ancient copies were made before that date! Moreover, even if the copies were made only after A.D. 96 - they could hardly have been called "ancient" by the time of Irenaeus (born 130 A.D.). Still less could such first copies then (at a date only after 96 A. D.) appropriately have been described by Irenaeus as "the most approved and ancient copies." Surely the compilation of many copies would thereafter require even further time. And the further determination of such of those approved and ancient copies as Irenaeus refers to as the "most approved and ancient copies" of the original, would need a further long time to take place." **(Francis Nigel Lee, " Revelation and Jerusalem)"**

Brisbane, Australia by the author, 1985.

"Advocates of the Early-Church-in-general's earlier (Neronic) date for the book of Revelation, include: Epiphanius, Andreas of Caesarea, Arethas of Caesarea, Theophylact, Annius, Caponsacchius, Hentenius, Salmeron, Alcazar, Grotius, Hammond, Wettsteign, Harenberg, Herder, Hartwig, Guerike, Moses Stuart, Adam Clark, Zuellig, Luecke, Bleek, Duesterdieck, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Van Andel, A.D. Barnes, J.M. Ford, C. Vanderwaal, Leon Morris, J. A.T. Robinson, F.N. Lee, K.L. Gentry, Jr., and David Chilton. Significantly, the A.D. 400 Church Father Epiphaneaus gave a very early date to the Book of Revelation based on Mt. 24:7 & Acts 11:28 & 18:2. cs. Rev 6:2-8."

Ovid Need Jr. (2001)

"I will say, in opening, that Revelation chapter eleven almost requires that the date of the book be pre 70 AD, for there the temple and altar are still standing, as well as the city where our Lord was crucified, v. 8." **(International Bible Encyclopedia, s.v. Revelation, book of. 1917.)**

"Admittedly, there are good arguments for both an early and a later date of the Revelation. However, I

believe Biblical evidence requires an early date, before 70AD. As an introductory statement, let me mention that prophecy is from the time it is written, NOT FROM THE TIME IT IS READ. A pre-70 AD date would make the purpose of the Revelation the same as was Isaiah's prophecy -- that is, to see the faithful people of God through the extremely difficult times ahead as their then known world was going to be shaken to its very foundation by the judgment of God against Babylon." **(Revelation: Date, Time and Purpose)**

Ernest Renan

"It may be that, after the crisis of the year 68 (the date of the Apocalypse) and of the year 70 (the destruction of Jerusalem), the old Apostle, with an ardent and plastic spirit, disabused of the belief in a near appearance of the Son of Man in the clouds, may have inclined towards the ideas that he found around him, of which several agreed sufficiently well with certain Christian doctrines. " **(Life of Jesus)**

Philip Schaff (1877)

"On two points I have changed my opinion -- the second Roman captivity of Paul (which I am disposed to admit in the interest of the Pastoral Epistles), and the date of the Apocalypse (which I now assign, with the majority of modern critics, to the year 68 or 69 instead of 95, as before)." **(Vol. I, Preface to the Revised Edition, 1882 The History of the Christian Church, volume 1)**

"The early date [of Revelation] is now accepted by perhaps the majority of scholars." **(Encyclopedia 3:2036.)**

"**Tertullian's** legend of the Roman oil-martyrdom of John seems to point to Nero rather than to any other emperor, and was so understood by **Jerome**" **(Adv. Jovin. 1.26) (History 1:428.)**

"The destruction of Jerusalem would be a worthy theme for the genius of a Christian Homer. It has been called "the most soul-stirring of all ancient history." But there was no Jeremiah to sing the funeral dirge of the city of David and Solomon. The Apocalypse was already written, and had predicted that the heathen "shall tread the holy city under foot forty and two months."
(p. 397-398)

A.H. Strong (1907)

" Elliott's whole scheme [based on his "interpretation of `time and times and half a time' of Dan. 7:25, which according to the year-day theory means 1260 years..." p 1009, ed], however, is vitiated by the fact that he wrongly assumes the book of Revelation to have been written under Domitian (94 or 96), instead of under Nero (67 or 68). His terminus a quo is therefore incorrect, and his interpretation of chapters 5-9 is rendered very precarious. The year 1866, moreover, should have been the time of the end, and so the terminus ad quem seems to be clearly misunderstood--unless indeed the seventy-five supplementary years of Daniel are to be added to 1866. We regard the failure of this most ingenious scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation as a practical demonstration that a clear understanding of the meaning of the Prophecy is, before the event, impossible, and we are confirmed in this view by the utterly untenable nature of the theory of the millennium which is commonly held by so-called Second Adventists, a theory which we now proceed to examine." **(Systematic Theology, A.H. Strong, ©1907, published 1912, The Griffith & Rowland Press, Boston, p 1010.)**

R.C. Sproul (1998)

"If the book of Revelation was written after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, it seems strange that John would be silent about these cataclysmic events. Granted this is an argument from silence, but the silence is deafening. Not only does Revelation not mention the temple's destruction as a past event, it

frequently refers to the temple as still standing. This is seen clearly in Revelation 11 ...Gentry gives impressive evidence to support this conclusion." (**Last Days, pp.147-149**)

Moses Stuart (1845)

"The testimony in respect to the matter before us is evidently successive and dependent, not coetaneous and independent." (**1:282. 81**)

"If now the number of the witnesses were the only thing which should control our judgment in relation to the question proposed, we must, so far as external evidence is concerned, yield the palm to those who fix upon the time of Domitian. But a careful examination of this matter shows, that the whole concatenation of witnesses in favour of this position hangs upon the testimony of Irenaeus, and their evidence is little more than a mere repetition of what he has said. Eusebius and Jerome most plainly depend on him; and others seem to have had in view his authority, or else that of Eusebius." (**Ibid. 2:269..**)

"I say this, with full recognition of the weight and value of Irenaeus's testimony, as to any matters of fact with which he was acquainted, or as to the common tradition of the churches. But in view of what Origen has said. . . , how can we well suppose, that the opinion of Irenaeus, as recorded in Cont. Haeres, V. 30 was formed in any other way, than by his own interpretation of Rev. 1:9." (**1:281**)

"Now it strikes me, that Tertullian plainly means to class Peter, Paul, and John together, as having suffered at nearly the same time and under the same emperor. I concede that this is not a construction absolutely necessary; but I submit it to the candid, whether it is not the most probable." (**1 :284n.**)

"It seems indisputably clear that the book of Revelation must be dated in the reign of Nero Caesar, and consequently before his death in June, A.D. 68. He is the sixth king; the short-lived rule of the seventh king (Galba) "has not yet come." (**2:324**)

"A majority of the older critics have been inclined to adopt the opinion of Irenaeus, viz., that it was written during the reign of Domitian, i.e., during the last part of the first century, or in A.D.95 or 96. Most of the recent commentators and critics have called this opinion in question, and placed the composition of the book at an earlier period, viz., before the destruction of Jerusalem." (**A Commentary on the Apocalypse, 2 vols; Andover, MD: Allen, Morrill, and Wardwell, 1845; p. 1:263**)

"The manner of the declaration here seems to decide, beyond all reasonable appeal, against a later period than about A.D.67 or 68, for the composition of the Apocalypse." (**A Commentary on the Apocalypse, 2 vols; Andover, MD: Allen, Morrill, and Wardwell, 1845; p. 2:326**)

Milton Terry (1898)

"the trend of modern criticism is unmistakably toward the adoption of the early date of the Apocalypse." (p. 241n.)

"It is therefore not to be supposed that the language, or style of thought, or type of doctrine must needs resemble those of other production of the same author .. the difference of language is further accounted for by the supposition that the apocalypse was written by the apostle at an early period of his ministry, and the gospel and epistles some thirty or forty years later." (**Biblical Apocalypics, p. 255**)

"A fair weighing of the arguments thus far adduced shows that they all excepting the statement of Irenaeus, favor the early rather than later date. The facts appealed to indicate the times before rather than after the destruction of Jerusalem." (ibid.,258) Now, there is no contention that Galatians and Hebrews were written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and, to say the least, the most natural explanation of the

allusions referred to is to suppose that the Apocalypse was already written, and that Paul and many others of his day were familiar with its contents. Writers who cite passages from the apostolic fathers to prove the priority of the gospel of John are the last persons in the world who should presume to dispute the obvious priority of the Apocalypse of John to Galatians and Hebrews. For in no case are the alleged quotations of Gospel more notable or striking than these allusions to the Apocalypse in the New Testament epistles." (**ibid.,260**)

"The verb 'was seen' is ambiguous and may be either it, referring to the Apocalypse, or he, referring to John himself." (**Biblical Hermeneutics, p. 238**)

B.F. Westcott (1825-1903)

"The irregularities of style in the Apocalypse appear to be due not so much to ignorance of the language as to a free treatment of it, by one who used it as a foreign dialect. Nor is it difficult to see that in any case intercourse with a Greek-speaking people would in a short time naturally reduce the style of the author of the Apocalypse to that of the author of the Gospel. It is, however, very difficult to suppose that the language of the writer of the Gospel could pass at a later time in a Greek-speaking country into the language of the Apocalypse. . . ."

"Of the two books the Apocalypse is the earlier. It is less developed both in thought and style. The material imagery in which it is composed includes the idea of progress in interpretation. . . ."

"The Apocalypse is after the close of St. Paul's work. It shows in its mode of dealing with Old Testament figures a close connexion with the Epistle to the Hebrews (2 Peter, Jude). And on the other hand it is before the destruction of Jerusalem." (**Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids: Baker, [1908] 1980), pp. clxxiv-clxxv.**)

C. Vanderwaal (1989)

"We cannot accept all the arguments of J.A.T. Robinson in his book Redating the New Testament (London, 1976), but we agree with his conclusion that all the books of the New Testament were written before the year A.D.70." (**Cited in James E. Priest, "Contemporary Apocalyptic Scholarship and the Revelation," in Johannie Studies: Essays in Honor of Frank Pack, ed. James E. Priest; Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University Press; p. 199, n. 75**)

"The book of Revelation presents a clear testimony to the churches in the first century. To be more specific, I am convinced that Revelation was written in the seventh decade of the first century - before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70, which Jesus talked about in Matthew 24." (**Hal Lindsey and Bible Prophecy; St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada: Paideia Press, 1978; p. 12**)

Robert Young (1885)

"It was written in Patmos about A.D.68, whither John had been banished by **Domitius Nero**, as state in the title of the Syriac version of the book ; and with this concurs the express statement of Irenaeus in A.D.175, who says it happened in the reign of Domitianou -- ie., Domitius (Nero). Sulpicius, Orosius, etc., stupidly mistaking Domitianou for Domitianikos, supposed Irenaeus to refer to Domitian, A.D. 95, and most succeeding writers have fallen into the same blunder. The internal testimony is wholly in favor of the earlier date." (**Commentary on Revelation - Young's Analytical Concordance**)

Modern Preterists

David Chilton (1982)

"John emphasizes his anticipation of the soon occurrences of his prophecy by strategic placement of these time references. He places his boldest time statements in both the introduction and conclusion to Revelation. It is remarkable that so many recent commentators have missed it literally coming and going! The statement of expectancy is found three times in the first chapter - twice in the first three verses: Revelation 1:1,3,19. The same idea is found four times in his concluding remarks: Revelation 22:6,7,12,20. It is as if John carefully bracketed the entire work to avoid any confusion." (**The Beast of Revelation; Tyler, TX; ICE, 1982; p. 21-22**).

"Think of it: If these words in these verses do not indicate that John expected the events to occur soon, what words could John have used to express such? **How could he have said it more plainly?**" (**The Beast of Revelation; Tyler, TX; ICE, 1982; p. 24**).

By Futurists

David E. Aune (1977)

"The keystone of Robinson's enterprise is an argument from silence: none of the books of the New Testament refers, either implicitly or explicitly, to the catastrophic event of the fall of Jerusalem to the Roman legions under Titus in A.D.70. Had they written after that date, so the argument runs, they would surely have at least alluded to that crucial event." (**Review of Redating the New Testament, by John A.T. Robinson, "When Was the New Testament Written?" Christianity Today 21, April 15, 1977; p. 43**)

"On balance, the virtues far outweigh the faults. The book deserves wide circulation among students of the New Testament, since scholarly opinion (whether conservative or liberal) should regularly examine its assumptions and conclusions. In passing, it is perhaps important to note that Robinson makes elaborate use of the scholarship of Theodore Zahn, perhaps the most brilliant conservative New Testament scholar in the last century.. Let us hope that he will be heard." (**Review of Redating the New Testament, by John A.T. Robinson, "When Was the New Testament Written?" Christianity Today 21, April 15, 1977; p. 45**)

G.R. Beasley-Murray (1983)

"The traditional belief that Revelation was written near the close of the reign of the Emperor Domitian, about A.D.96, is likely to be right, though it is not impossible that it was written in the confused period that immediately followed Nero's death in A.D.68." (**"Preaching the Eschatological Texts," in Biblical Preaching: An Expositor's Treasury, ed.; Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, p. 356**)

James Burton Coffman (1984)

"The epic work of John A.T. Robinson in Redating the New Testament is one of the most significant works this century with regard to the date of the New Testament, all of which he affirms to have been written before A.D.70, a conclusion which we believe to be correct." (**Commentary on John; Abilene, TX: ACU Press; p. 12**)

David Crews (1994)

"The view accepted without much question by many Christians is that the Revelation was written in or around A.D.96, during the reign of the Caesar Domitian. This date of authorship would, of course, prevent the book from referring to the events of the Jewish War.. Simply put, the case for a late Domitian date hangs by a very slender thread. It is determined from a single statement by the Bishop of Lyons, named Irenaeus.. This statement is not an eyewitness testimony from Irenaeus, but is his recollection of

what was said by an ever earlier man, Polycarp, who is supposed to have known John personally." [Prophecy Fulfilled - God's Perfect Church (Austin, TX: New Light Publishing, 1994), pp. 256,257]

Dr. E. Earle Ellis (1980)

"At the same time in some New Testament books the silence about the destruction of Jerusalem is very surprising; that is, in books where Jesus' prophecy of the destruction appears (Matthew, Mark, Luke), where the critique of the temple or its transitory character is a major theme (Acts, Hebrews) and where God's judgments on a disobedient Jewish nation are of particular interest to the writer (Acts, Jude). In these cases the absence of any illusion to the destruction would seem to be a fairly strong argument that such books were written before that event took place. The fall of Jerusalem is important in another respect. It marked not only the catastrophic destruction of a city but also the end of the Jewish world as it had been known." ("**Dating the New Testament**", **New Testament Studies**, 26; p. 488)

Joseph A. Fitzmeyer (1978)

"I must admit that what Robinson writes about the Book of Revelation makes a great deal of sense. Here is a case where I might be inclined in the future to admit a pre-seventy dating." (**Review of Redating the New Testament**, by **John. A.T. Robinson**, "**Two Views of New Testament Interpretation: Popular and Technical**, **Interpretation** 32; 1978, p. 312)

Hank Hanegraaff (2004)

"More and more, people who have embraced the Futurist paradigm, when they recognize.. that the book of Revelation was not written in the mid-nineties, but rather was written in the mid-sixties, ..they have a different view of what the book of Revelation is actually dealing with in terms of substance." (**Voice of Reason**, 11/21)

Tim LaHaye (2002)

Misread Rapture! - The Washington Times (1/24/02) "Mr. LaHaye calls the preterist interpretation "the most ridiculous view of eschatology I've ever heard. ... Historically, the fact is the church has always believed that the book of Revelation was written by the Apostle John in 95 A.D., 25 years after the destruction of Jerusalem. Consequently, **it has to** portray future events."

George E. Ladd (1972)

"The problem with this [Domitian date] theory is that there is no evidence that during the last decade of the first century there occurred any open and systematic persecution of the church ." (**George E. Ladd, A Commentary on Revelation (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), p. 8.**)

Jim McGuiggan

"Suppose Irenaeus said the Revelation was seen toward the end of the reign of Domitian. What is Irenaeus said it - does that make it infallibly correct?" (**The Book of Revelation**, p. 184)

Robert Mounce (1977)

"the Cambridge trio (Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort) were unanimous in assigning the Apocalypse to the reign of Nero or the years immediately following." And "such a threefold cord of scholarly opinion is not quickly broken" but that he (Swete) is "unable to see that the historical situation presupposed by the Apocalypse contradicts the testimony of Irenaeus which assigns the vision to the end of the reign of Domitian." Mounce seem to agree with Swete on this" (**p. 21**).

J.W. Roberts (1972)

"According to Robert Feuillet the nearest thing to a consensus that has been reached about the study of

Revelation in this century is that the original author and readers understood the book to be speaking about events connected with and/or in the immediate future of the age in which it was written; i.e., it is to be interpreted from the preterist point of view." (**"The Meaning of the Eschatology in the Book of Revelation," Restoration Quarterly 15: 96**)

J. A. T. Robinson (1976)

"It is indeed generally agreed that this passage must bespeak a pre-70 situation. . . . There seems therefore no reason why the oracle should not have been uttered by a Christian prophet as the doom of the city drew nigh." (**Redating the New Testament pp.. 240-242**).

"It was at this point that I began to ask myself just why any of the books of the New Testament needed to be put after the fall of Jerusalem in 70. As one began to look at them, and in particular the epistle to the Hebrews, Acts and the Apocalypse, was it not strange that this cataclysmic event was never once mentioned or apparently hinted at (as a past fact)?" (**Redating, p. 10**).

"One of the oddest facts about the New Testament is that what on any showing would appear to be the single most datable and climactic event of the period — the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 — is never once mentioned as a past fact. . . . [T]he silence is nevertheless as significant as the silence for Sherlock Holmes of the dog that did not bark". (**Ibid., p. 13**.)

"If the Book of Revelation was written after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, it seems strange that John would be silent about these cataclysmic events. Granted this is an argument from silence, but the silence is deafening." (**The Last Days According to Jesus, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998; p. 147**)

N.I.V. Study Bible (1923)

"Revelation was written when Christians were entering a time of persecution. The two periods most often mentioned are the latter part of Nero's reign (A.D.54-68) and the latter part of Domitian's reign" (81-96).

Albert Schweitzer (1906)

"The apocalyptic discourses in Mark xiii., Matt. xxiv., and Luke xxi. are interpolated. A Jewish-Christian apocalypse of the first century, probably composed before the destruction of Jerusalem, has been interwoven with a short exhortation which Jesus gave on the occasion when He predicted the destruction of the temple.. His construction rests upon two main points of support; upon his view of the sources and his conception of the eschatology of the time of Jesus. In his view the sole source for the Life of Jesus is the Gospel of Mark, which was "probably written exactly in the year 73," five years after the Johannine apocalypse." (**Quest for the Historical Jesus**)

C. C. Torrey (1941)

"There are indeed very obvious reasons why the Apocalypse should now seem to call for drastic alteration, for it cannot be made to fit the present scheme of New Testament dogma. If the Church in its beginnings was mainly Gentile and opposed to Judaism, this Book of Revelation can hardly be understood. It is very plainly a mixture of Jewish and Christian elements, and the hope of effecting a separation of the two naturally suggests itself It is, however, a perfectly futile dream, as the many attempts have abundantly shown. Every chapter in the book is both Jewish and Christian, and only by very arbitrary proceedings can signs of literary composition be formed. The trouble is not with the book, but with the prevailing theory of Christian origins.' (**Documents of the Primitive Church , p. 77**.)

H.A. Whittaker

"In A.D. 66, the well supported early date for the writing of Revelation, Jerusalem also was a city which 'had a kingdom over the kings of the Land.' Indeed, not only was Jerusalem a city with special authority over the various tetrarchies adjoining Judaea, but also the temple had an amazing degree of authority over Jewish communities in all parts of the Roman empire." (**Revelation, page 214**).

Herbert B. Workman (1906)

"St. John's banishment to Patmos was itself a result of the great persecution of Nero. Hard labor for life in the mines and quarries of certain islands, especially Sardinia, formed one of the commonest punishments for Christians. . . . He lived through the horrors of two great persecutions, and died quietly in extreme old age at Ephesus." (**Persecution in the Early Church, pp. 18, 19**).

Listing of Early Advocates

Greg Bahnsen (1984)

"A partial list of scholars who have supported the early date for Revelation, gleaned unsystematically from my reading, would include the following 18th and 19th writers not already mentioned just above: John Lightfoot, Harenbert, Hartwig, Michaelis, Tholuck, Clarke, Bishop Newton, James MacDonald, Gieseler, Tilloch, Bause, Zullig, Swegler, De Wett, Lucke, Bohmer, Hilgenfeld, Mommsen, Ewald, Neander, Volkmar, Renan, Credner, Kernkel, B. Weiss, Reuss, Thiersch, Bunsen, Stier, Auberlen, Maurice, Niermeyer, Desprez, Aube, Keim, De Pressence, Cowles, Scholten, Beck, Dusterdiek, Simcox, S. Davidson, Beyschlag, Salmon, Hausrath. Continuing on into the 20th century we could list Plummer, Selwyn, J.V. Bartlet, C.A. Scott, Erbes, Edmundson, Henderson, and others. If one's reading has been limited pretty much to the present and immediately preceding generations of writers on Revelation, then the foregoing names may be somewhat unfamiliar to him, but they were not unrecognized in previous eras. When we combine these names with the yet outstanding stature of Schaff, Terry, Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort, we can feel the severity of Beckwith's understatement when in 1919 he described the Neronian dating for Revelation as "a view held by many down to recent times." [40] By many indeed! It has been described, as we saw above, as "the ruling view" of critics," by "the majority of modern critics," by "most modern scholars," and by "the whole force of modern criticism." **The weight of scholarship placed behind the Neronian option for the dating of Revelation has been staggering.** In our own day it has gained the support of such worthies as C.C. Torrey, J.A.T. Robinson, and F.F. Bruce and has been popularized by Jay Adams. [41] In 1956 Torrey could write about the number 666, "It is now the accepted conclusion that the beast is the emperor Nero." [42]" (**Historical Setting for the Dating of Revelation**)

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Firmin Abauzit, *Essai sur l'Apocalypse* (Geneva: 1730).

Jay E. Adams, *The Time is at Hand* (Philipsburg NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1966).

Luis de Alcasar, *Vestigatio arcani Sensus in Apocalypsi* (Antwerp: 1614).

B. Aube

Karl August Auberlen, *Daniel and Revelation in Their Mutual Relation* (Andover: 1857).

Greg L. Bahnsen, "The Book of Revelation: Its Setting" (unpublished paper, 1984).

Arthur Stapylton Barnes, *Christianity at Rome in the Apostolic Age* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, [1938] 1971), pp. 159ff.

James Vernon Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, [1899] 1963), Book 2, pp. 388ff. [1]

Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, 3rd ed. (Tubingen: 1863).

- Albert A. Bell, Jr., "The Date of John's Apocalypse. The Evidence of Some Roman Historians Reconsidered," *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978):93-102.
- Leonhard Bertholdt, *Hitorisch-kritische Einleitung in die sammtlichen kanonischen u. apocryphischen Schriften des A. und N. Testaments*, vol. 4 (1812 -1819).
- Willibald Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, trans. Neil Buchanan, 2nd Eng. ed. (Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark, 1896).
- Charles Bigg, *The Origins of Christianity*, ed. by T. B. Strong (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), pp. 30,48.
- Friedrich Bleek, *Vorlesungen und die Apocalypse* (Berlin: 1859); and *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd cd., trans. William Urwick (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870); and *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, ed. Hossbach (1862).
- Alexander Brown (1878)
- Heinrich Bohmer, *Die Offenbarung Johannis* (Breslau: 1866).
- Wilhelm Bousset, *Revelation of John* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck, 1896).
- Brown, *Ordo Saeclorum*, p. 679. 50
- Frederick F. Bruce, *New Testament History* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), p.411.
- Rudolf Bultmann (1976).
- Christian Karl Josias Bunsen. *Cambridge Concise Bible Dictionary*, editor, *The Holy Bible* (Cambridge: University Press, n.d.), p. 127.
- W. Boyd Carpenter, *The Revelation of St. John*, in vol. 8 of Charles Ellicott, cd., *Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, rep. n.d.).
- S. Cheetham, *A History of the Christian Church* (London: Macmillan, 1894) , pp. 24ff.
- David Chilton, *Paradise Restored* (Tyler, TX: Reconstruction Press, 1985); and *The Days of Vengeance* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987).
- Adam Clarke, *Clarke's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, vol. 6 (Nashville: Abingdon, rep. n.d.).
- William Newton Clarke, *An Outline of Christian Theology* (New York: Scribners, 1903).
- Henry Cowles, *The Revelation of St. John* (New York: Appleton, 1871).
- W. Gary Crampton, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (n. p.: by the author, 1986), p. 42.
- Berry Stewart Crebs, *The Seventh Angel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1938).
- Karl August Credner, *Einleitung in da Neuen Testaments* (1836).
- R. W. Dale (1878)
- Samuel Davidson, *The Doctrine af the Last Things* (1882); "The Book of Revelation" in John Kitto, *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature* (New York: Ivison & Phinney, 1855); *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (1851); *Sacred Hermeneutics* (Edinburgh: 1843).
- Edmund De Pressense, *The Early Years of Christianity*, trans. Annie Harwood (New York: Philips and Hunt, 1879), p. 441.
- P. S. Desprez, *The Apocalypse Fulfilled*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1855).
- W. M. L. De Wette, *Kure Erklamng hr Offmbarung* (Leipzig: 1848).
- Friedrich Dusterdieck, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John*, 3rd ed., trans. Henry E. Jacobs (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1886).
- K. A. Eckhardt, *Der Id da Johannes* (Berlin: 1961).
- Alfred Edersheim, *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rep. 1972), pp. 141ff.
- George Edmundson, *The Church in Rome in the First Century* (London: Longman's and Green, 1913).
- Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Commentaries in Apocalypse* (Gottingen: 1791).
- Erbes, *Die Oflenbawzg Os Johannis* (1891).
- G. H. A. Ewald, *Commentaries in Apocalypse* (Gottingen: 1828).
- Frederic W. Farrar, *The Early Days of Christianity* (New York: Cassell, 1884).
- Grenville O. Field, *Opened Seals - Open Gates* (1895).
- George P. Fisher, *The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View to the State of the Roman World at the*

- Birth of Christ (New York: Scribners, 1916), pp. 534ff.
- J. A. Fitzmeyer, "Review of John A. T. Robinson's Redating the New Testament" (1977-78), p. 312. 52
- J. Massyngberde Ford, Revelation. Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975).
- Hermann Gebhardt, The Doctrine of the Apocalypse, trans. John Jefferson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1878).
- J.C.L. Giesler (1820)
- James Glasgow, The Apocalypse Translated and Expounded (Edinburgh: 1872).
- Robert McQueen Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 237.
- James Comper Gray, in Gray and Adams' Bible Commentary, vol. V (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, [1903] rep. n.d.).
- Samuel G. Green, A Handbook of Church History from the Apostolic Era to the Dawn of the Reformation (London: Religious Tract Society, 1904), p. 64.
- Hugo Grotius, Annotations in Apocalypse (Paris: 1644).
- Heinrich Ernst Ferdinand Guenke, Introduction to the New Testament (1843); and Manual of Church History, trans. W. G. T. Shedd (Boston: Halliday, 1874), p. 68.
- Henry Melville Gwatkin, Early Church History to A.D. 313, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan), p. 81.
- Henry Hammond, Paraphrase and Annotation upon the N. T (London: 1653).
- Harbuig (1780).
- Hardouin (1741)
- Harenberg, Erklarung (1759).
- H. G. Hartwig, Apologie Der Apocalypse Wider Falschen Tadel Und Falscha (Frieberg: 1783).
- Karl August von Hase, A History of the Christian Church, 7th ed., trans. Charles E. Blumenthal and Conway P. Wing (New York: Appleton, 1878), p. 33. 54
- Hausrath.
- Bernard W. Henderson, The Life and Prim-pate of the Emperor Nero (London: Methuen, 1903).
- Hentenius. [secondary source]
- Johann Gottfrieded von Herder, Das Buch von der Zukunft des Herrn, des Neuen Testaments Siegal (Rigs: 1779).
- J. S. Herrensneider, Tentamen Apocalypseos illustrandae (Strassburg: 1786).
- Adolf Hilgenfeld, Einleitung in das Neun Testaments (1875).
- David Hill, New Testament Prophecy (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), pp. 218-219.
- Hitzig.
- Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Die Offenbamng des Johannis, in Bunsen's Bibekoerk (Freiburg: 1891).
- F. J. A. Hort, The Apocalypse of St. John: 1-111, (London: Macmillan, 1908); and Judaistic Christianity (London: Macmillan, 1894).
- John Leonhard Hug, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. David Fosdick, Jr. (Andover: Gould and Newman, 1836).
- William Hurte, A Catechetical Commentary on the New Testament (St. Louis: John Burns, 1889), pp. 502ff.55
- A. Immer, Hermeneutics of the New Testament, trans. A. H. Newman (Andover: Draper, 1890).
- Theodor Keim, Rom und das Christenthum.
- Theodor Koppe, History of Jesus of Nazareth, 2nd ed., trans. Arthur Ransom (London: William and Norgate, 1883).
- Max R. King, The Spirit of Prophecy (Warren, OH: by the author, 1971)
- Max Krenkel, Der Apostel Johannes (Leipzig: 1871).
- Johann Heinrich Kurtz, Church History, 9th ed., trans. John McPherson (3 vols. in 1) (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1888), pp. 41ff.
- Victor Lechler, The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times: Their Diversity and Union Ltfe and Doctrine,

- 3rd ed., vol. 2, trans. A. J. K.
Davidson, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886), pp. 166ff.
Francis Nigel Lee, Revelation and Jerusalem (Brisbane, Australia, 1985)
John Lightfoot (1658)
Joseph B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays (London: Macmillan, 1893).
Gottfried C. F. Lucke, Versuch einer vollstandigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, 2nd ed.
(Bonn: 1852).
Chnstoph Ernst Luthardt, Die Offenbarung Johannis (Leipzig: 1861).
James M. Macdonald, The Life and Writings of St. John (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1877).
Frederick Denisen Maurice, Lectures on the Apocalypse, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1885).
John David Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. 4; and Sacred Books the New Testament.
Charles Pettit M'Ilvaine, The Evidences of Christianity (Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1861).
A. D. Momigliano, Cambridge Ancient History (1934).
Theodor Mommsen, Roman History, vol. 5.
Charles Herbert Morgan, et. al., Studies in the Apostolic Church (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1902), pp.
210ff.
C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the New Testament, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 174.56
John Augustus Wilhelm Neander, The History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the
Apostles, trans. J. E. Ryland (Philadelphia: James M. Campbell, 1844), pp. 223ff.
Sir Isaac Newton, Observation Upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John (London:
1732).
Bishop Thomas Newton, Dissertation on the Prophecies (London: 1832).
A. Niermeyer, Over de echteid der Johanneisch Schriften (Haag: 1852).
Robert L. Pierce, The Rapture Cult (Signal Mtn., TN: Signal Point Press, 1986)
Alfred Plummer (1891).
Dean Plumptere (1877)
Edward Hayes Plumtree, A Popular Exposition of the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia, 2nd ed.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879).
T. Randell, "Revelation" in H. D. M. Spence & Joseph S. Exell, eds., The Pulpit Commentary, vol. 22
(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rep. 1950).
James J. L. Ratton, The Apocalypse of St. John (London: R. & T. Washbourne, 1912).
Ernest Renan, L' Antechrist (Paris: 1871).
Eduard Wilhelm Eugen Reuss, History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament (Edinburgh: T.
&T. Clark, 1884).
Jean Reville, Reu. d. d. Mondes (Oct., 1863 and Dec., 1873).
J. W. Roberts, The Revelation to John (Austin, TX: Sweet, 1974).
Edward Robinson, Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. 3 (1843), pp. 532ff.
John A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976).
J. Stuart Russell, The Parousia (Grand Rapids: Baker, [1887] 1983).
W. Sanday (1908).
Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 3rd cd., vol. 1: Apostolic Christianity (Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, [1910] 1950), p. 834.
Johann Friedrich Schleusner.
J. H. Scholten, de Apostel Johannis in Klein Azie (Leiden: 1871).
Albert Schweigler, Da Nachapostol Zeitalter (1846).
J. J. Scott, The Apocalypse, or Revelation of S. John the Divine (London: John Murray, 1909).
Edward Condon Selwyn, The Christian Prophets and the Apocalypse (Cambridge: 1900); and The
Authorship of the Apocalypse (1900).
Henry C. Sheldon, The Early Church, vol. 1 of History of the Christian Church (New York: Thomas Y.

- Crowell, 1894), pp. 112ff.
- William Henry Simcox, *The Revelation of St. John Divine. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1893).
- D. Moody Smith, "A Review of John A. T. Robinson's Redating the New Testament," *Duke Divinity School Review* 42 (1977): 193-205.
- Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age* (3rd ed: Oxford and London: 1874), pp. 234ff.
- Ed Stevens, *What Happened in 70 A. D.?* (Ashtabula, Ohio North East Ohio Bible Inst., 1981); J.A. Stephenson (1838)
Rudolf Ewald Stier (1869).
- Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, [1907] 1970, p. 1010).
- Moses Stuart, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (Andover: Allen, Mornll, and Wardwell, 1845). Swegler.
- Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, [n.d.] rep. 1974), p. 467.
Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apostolischm Zeitalter*.
- Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck, *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (1827).
Tillich, *Introduction to the New Testament*.
- Charles Cutler Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, (ch. 5); and *The Apocalypse of John* (New Haven: Yale, 1958).
- Cornelis Vanderwaal, Hal Lindsey and *Biblical Prophecy* (St. Catharine's, Ontario: Paideia, 1978); and *Search the Scriptures*, vol. 10 (St. Cathannes, Ontario: Paideia, 1979).
Gustav Volkmar, *Conmentur zur Ofienbarung* (Zurich: 1862).
- Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *The Book of Revelation* (Nashville: by the author, 1966) .
Israel P Warren (1878)
- Arthur Weigall, *Nero: Emperor of Rome* (London: Thornton Butter-worth, 1930).
- Bernhard Weiss, *A Commentary on the New Testament*, 2nd cd., trans. G. H. Schodde and E. Wilson (NY: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906), vol. 4.
- Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, [1882] 1954).
J. J. Wetstein, *New Testament Graecum*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam: 1752).
- Karl Wieseler, *Zur Auslegung und Kritik der Apok. Literatur* (Gottingen: 1839).
Charles Wordsworth, *The New Testament*, vol. 2 (London: 1864).
- Herbert B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church* (London: Ofiord, [1906] 1980).
- Robert Young, *Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (1885); and *Cotie Critical Comments on the Holy Bible* (London: Pickering & Inglis, n.d.), p. 179.
C. F. J. Zullig, *Die Ofienbamng Johannis erklarten* (Stuttgart: 1852).