

Jerusalem, and consequently that event could not be the catastrophe.

That St. John should say any thing concerning Ecclesiastical History, and more especially about Secular History; about Huns and Alens, &c., is much doubted by some. But why so? Did not Daniel say much about Assyrians, Grecians, and Romans? He was shown things which should be hereafter. And why should it not be so in the case of the Revelations to John?

The catastrophe is the destruction of Antichrist. There may, however, be minor catastrophies, such as the melting away of Mohammedanism.

From the time of the recommencement of the vision, historic narrative traces the events predicted, as far as fulfilled; and from thence we may ascertain how far the prophecy has run its course, and what yet remains future, and consequently, to what part of the course of the predicted events the present times are related. It is this which renders the book of Revelation so very interesting a study.

There is a wide diversity in the schemes of interpretation adopted by different classes of Expositors. We may distinctly notice *four* main classes.

#### 1. THE PRETERISTS :

This class makes the prophecy stop short of the grand catastrophe—the overthrow of Antichrist. Some of these consider the catastrophe to be the overthrow of the Jewish nation; others consider it to be the overthrow of Pagan Rome; while others adopt both.