Was the Preterist Interpretation of Revelation Invented by the Jesuits to Divert Attention away from the Reformational Interpretation that the Harlot of Revelation 17 and 18 is the Roman Catholic Church?

By Gary DeMar

One of the arguments used against preterism is that it was developed by Spanish Jesuit Luis De Alcazar (1554–1613) who wrote a commentary titled *Vestigio Arcani Sensus in Apocalypsi* or *Investigation of the Hidden Sense of the Apocalypse* in which “he proposed that all of Revelation applied to the era of pagan Rome and the first six centuries of Christianity.”¹ Here’s a typical example: “The Praeterist School, founded by the Jesuit Alcasar in 1614, explains the Revelation by the Fall of Jerusalem, or by the fall of Pagan Rome in 410 A.D.”²

Futurists use Alcasar (also spelled Alcazar) to poison the well. Since a Catholic proposed the view, so the argument goes, then it must be wrong because Roman Catholicism as a theological system is wrong. Of course, Roman Catholics also adhere to the doctrinal statement that we know as the Apostles’ Creed. So how much of the Apostles’ Creed is wrong? All of it? Some of it?

Poisoning the well is a poor way to argue. We might as well claim that the *Volkswagen* is an evil car because “*Volkswagen* was originally proposed in 1933 by Adolf Hitler.”

---


My first introduction to the topic of Bible prophecy came by way of Hal Lindsey’s *Late Great Planet Earth*. That was in 1973 when I was in my final year at Western Michigan University. Having very little knowledge of the Bible, I was intrigued with the argument and the seemingly incontrovertible evidence that we were living in the last days. The signs, I was told, were all around us. It all seemed to make sense . . . until I read the Bible.

As I began reading the New Testament, I came across numerous passages that did not fit Lindsey’s *Late Great Earth* paradigm. Here are three from the Gospel of Matthew that immediately caught my attention:

- “But whenever they persecute you in one city, flee to the next; for truly I say to you, you will not finish going through the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes” (Matt 10:23).
- “For the Son of Man is going to come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and **WILL THEN REPAY EVERY MAN ACCORDING TO HIS DEEDS**. Truly I say to you, there are some of those who are standing here who will not taste death until they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom” (Matt. 16:28).
- “Truly I say to you, this generation will not pass away until all these things take place” (Matt. 24:34; see 12:39, 41, 42; 23:36).

I was perplexed, so I put the study of eschatology on hold for a time until I got on better scriptural footing. But about a year later, the issue again became a topic of discussion. By then I was a student at Reformed Theological Seminary where I had access to a library. I picked up
William Hendriksen’s commentary on Matthew in his multi-volume New Testament Commentary series. Hendriksen was reliable and Dutch, a good place for me to start since I was being taught by professors with names like DeYoung, Van Groningen, and Kistemaker. (It was Simon Kistemaker who took over the commentary series after Hendriksen’s death.) Hendriksen’s comments on these passages were not much help.

In his more than two pages of explanation as to why “this generation” does not mean the generation of Jesus’ day, he did not reference a single verse in the synoptic gospels where the same phrase is used repeatedly (Matt. 11:16–19, 12:39, 14, 41, 42, 16:4, 17:17, 23:36; Mark 8:12; Luke 7:31, 30, 31, 32, 50, 51; 17:25; 21:32):

By no means has it been established that the term “this generation” must be limited to contemporaries. It can also refer to “this kind of people”; for example, the Jews, at any time or in any age. Worthy of the consideration in this connection are such passages as Deut. 32:5, 20; Ps. 12:7; 78:8; etc., where the LXX uses the same word as is here rendered “generation,” but evidently with a

---

4. “An evil and adulterous generation craves for a sign; and yet no sign will be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet” (Matt. 12:39).
5. “The men of Nineveh shall stand up with this generation at the judgment, and shall condemn it because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, something greater than Jonah is here” (Matt. 12:41; cf. Luke 11:29). Jesus could only have meant that generation since it was the only generation that could be condemned because Jesus is the someone who is “greater than Jonah” who was in their presence similar to the way Jonah was in the presence of the Ninevites.
6. “The Queen of the South shall rise up with this generation at the judgment and shall condemn it” (Matt. 12:42).
7. “An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign; and a sign will not be given it, except the sign of Jonah.” (Matt. 16:4).
8. “And Jesus answered and said, ‘You unbelieving and perverted generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I put up with you? Bring him here to Me’” (Matt. 17:17).
9. “Truly I say to you, all these things will come upon this generation” (Matt. 23:36).
meaning that goes beyond “group of contemporaries.” Thus even in the New Testament (see Acts 2:40; Phil. 2:15; Heb. 3:10), thought he starting point may well be a reference to the people of that particular day, this many not be the entire meaning. So also probably here in Matt. 24:34.

With this interpretation, Hendriksen and others have indicated that “this generation” refers to Jews in any period of history. Consider this from amillennialist Anthony Hoekema:

“By ‘this generation,’ then, Jesus means the rebellious, apostate, unbelieving Jewish people, as they have revealed themselves in the past, are revealing themselves in the present, and will continue to reveal themselves in the future.”

This is an impossible interpretation, both on exegetical and theological grounds. Peter restricts the historical parameters of judgment by reciting the charge (Acts 2:23) and identifying the single generation that was guilty of the charge (2:39–40). The judgment upon Jerusalem and

---

10 I believe Hendriksen is wrong. The Bible is referencing a specific generation, in the case of Deuteronomy 32:5, 20, the generation that was in the wilderness not the Jewish race throughout history or during a distant period of “great tribulation.” The same is true of Psalm 78:8: “And not be like their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation, a generation that did not prepare its heart and whose spirit was not faithful to God.”


12 Anthony Hoekema, _The Bible And The Future_ (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 117.

13 “This [Jesus], delivered over by the predetermined plan and foreknowledge of God, you nailed to a cross by the hands of godless men and put Him to death.”

14 “For the promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off, as many as the Lord our God will call to Himself. And with many other words he solemnly testified and kept on exhorting them, saying, ‘Be saved from this perverse generation!’”
the destruction of the temple was the end point of that generation’s judgment. Notice that there is hope in the midst of judgment as Jesus gave a 40-year warning (Matt. 24:15–20; Acts 2:39–40).

In his attempt to back up his weak exegetical argument, Hendriksen writes: “Jesus does not necessarily mean that his disciples shall see all that has been predicted and is going to take place” even though in Matthew 24:33 Jesus says, “you too, when you see all these things, recognize that He is near, right at the door.”

It seemed to me at the time that if Jesus had had a future generation in view, He would have used the far demonstrative “that” instead of the near demonstrative “this.”

Hendriksen’s comments on Matthew 24:14 were equally weak, never mentioning that Jesus uses the word oikoumenē, the only time the word is found in Matthew’s gospel, and its connection to limited geography in Luke 2:1, Acts 11:28, and other places in the New Testament (Luke 4:5; Acts 17:6, 31; 19:27; Rom. 10:18; Heb. 1:6; 2:5; Rev. 3:10; 16:14).  

---

16 “Greek grammars and lexicons recognize two demonstratives: near and distant. The near demonstrative, as the name denotes, points to someone or something ‘near,’ in close proximity. They appear as the singular word ‘this’ and its plural ‘these.’ The distant demonstratives, as their name suggests, appear as ‘that’ (singular), or ‘those’ (plural).” (Cullen I. K. Story and J. Lyle Story, *Greek To Me: Learning New Testament Greek Through Memory Visualization* [New York: Harper, 1979], 74. “Sometimes it is desired to call attention with special emphasis to a designated object, whether in the physical vicinity or the speaker or the literary context of the writer. For this purpose the demonstrative construction is used. . . . For that which is relatively near in actuality or thought the immediate demonstrative [houtos] is used. . . . For that which is relatively distant in actuality or thought the remote demonstrative [ekeinos] is used.” (H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* [New York; Macmillan, 1957], 127–128, sec. 136). Similarly, “[T]his, referring to something comparatively near at hand, just as ekeinos [that] refers to something comparatively farther away.” (William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 4th ed. [Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1952], 600.)
17 Hendriksen is not the only commentator who fails to make the connection. See James H. Hamilton, *God’s Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: IL: Crossway, 2010), 377: “Jesus explains that there will be birth pains until the gospel has gone through the whole world (24:4–14).” Also, Michael Horton: “Since the gospel was obviously not preached to all the nations by AD 70, it is impossible to conclude with preterists that the ‘end’ to which Jesus refers is a past event.” (*The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011], 937). “How often this passage has been applied to the
More recent commentaries, as well as those with a long history (e.g., Henry Hammond, John Gill, Adam Clarke, Philip Doddridge, John Lightfoot, Thomas Newton, Milton Terry, and Thomas Scott) acknowledge that Jesus’ use of “this generation” refers to His own generation and not an unspecific generation in the future. Here are some examples from contemporary authors who would not describe themselves as preterists:

- “[T]he obvious meaning of the words ‘this generation’ is the people contemporary with Jesus. Nothing can be gained by trying to take the word in any sense other than its normal one: in Mark (elsewhere in 8:12, 9:19) the word always has this meaning.”  

- “The significance of the temporal reference has been debated, but in Mark ‘this generation’ clearly designates the contemporaries of Jesus (see on Chs. 8:12, 38; 9:19) and there is no consideration from the context which lends support to any other proposal. Jesus solemnly affirms that the generation contemporary with his disciples will witness the fulfillment of his prophetic word, culminating in the destruction of Jerusalem and the dismantling of the Temple.”  

---


• “[This generation] can only with the greatest difficulty be made to mean anything other than the generation living when Jesus spoke.”

• “Matthew uses genea here for the tenth time. Though his use of the term has a range of emphases, it consistently refers to (the time span of) a single human generation. All the alternative senses proposed here [in 24:34] (the Jewish people; humanity; the generation of the end-time signs; wicked people) are artificial and based on the need to protect Jesus from error. ‘This generation’ is the generation of Jesus’ contemporaries.”

• “The meaning of generation (genea) is crucial to the interpretation of the entire chapter. While Scofield, following Jerome, contended that it meant the Jewish race, there is only one possible case in the New Testament (Luke 16:8) where the lexicon suggests that genea means race. There is a distinction between genos (race) and genea (generation). Others have argued that genea means the final generation; that is, once the signs have

---

20 D.A. Carson, “Matthew” in The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, 12 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1985), 8:507. Compare what Carson writes with the note on Matthew 24:34 found in the NET Bible: “This is one of the hardest verses in the gospels to interpret. Various views exist for what generation means. (1) Some take it as meaning “race” and thus as an assurance that the Jewish race (nation) will not pass away. But it is very questionable that the Greek term γενεὰ (genea) can have this meaning. Two other options are possible. (2) Generation might mean ‘this type of generation’ and refer to the generation of wicked humanity. Then the point is that humanity will not perish, because God will redeem it. Or (3) generation may refer to ‘the generation that sees the signs of the end’ (v. 30), who will also see the end itself. In other words, once the movement to the return of Christ starts, all the events connected with it happen very quickly, in rapid succession.” There is no mention of “this generation” referring to that contemporary generation, the meaning that “this generation” has elsewhere in Matthew’s gospel that obviously refers (e.g., 13:39, 41, 42) as well as in Mark and Luke’s version of the Olivet Discourse.


22 The New American Standard translates genea in Luke 16:8 as “kind,” but “generation” is equally valid. The King James Version, the New King James, and American Standard Version, and Young’s Literal Translation translate genea as “generation.”
started, all these happenings would transpire in one generation (cf. 23:36).

But elsewhere in Matthew *genea* means the people alive at one time and usually at the time of Jesus (1:17; 11:16; 12:39,41,45; 23:36; Mark 8:38; Luke 11:50f.; 17:25), and it doubtlessly means the same here.”

- “‘This generation’ has been used frequently in this gospel for Jesus’ contemporaries, especially in a context of God’s impending judgment; see 11:16; 12:39, 41–42, 45; 16:4; 17:17, and especially 23:36, where God’s judgment on ‘this generation’ leads up to Jesus’ first prediction of the devastation of the temple in 23:38. It may safely be concluded that if it had not been for the embarrassment caused by supposing that Jesus was here talking about his *parousia*, no one would have thought of suggesting any other meaning for ‘this generation,’ such as ‘the Jewish race’ or ‘human beings in general’ or ‘all the generations of Judaism that reject him’ or even ‘this kind’ (meaning scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees).”

- “‘[T]his generation’ (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη) in the gospels always means the people of Jesus’ own time (11:16; 12:41–42; 23:36) not, as some have proposed, the generation of the last days in history, the Jewish people, the human race in general, or the sinful people.”

---

The reader will note that in all these examples biblical arguments have been used. Those who claim that a preterist interpretation of the Bible is some grand Jesuit/Roman Catholic plot to steer people away from the traditional Protestant claim that the papacy is the antichrist have to deal with the biblical case that’s being made. In fact, it’s those who hold to the Reformers’ views on Bible prophecy rather than an appeal to the Bible are more like the Roman Catholics in that they have made a tradition more authoritative than the Bible.

**Marcellus Kik’s Matthew 24**

While a student at Reformed Theological Seminary (Jackson, Mississippi), my view on Bible prophecy took a radical turn from the sensationalism of Hal Lindsey’s *Late Great Planet Earth* and my attempts to reconcile certain time texts by reading Hendriksen’s commentary on Matthew’s gospel, when I came across a small book. The RTS librarian put out some books from his personal library to sell. My eyes focused on a faded red hardback with “Matthew XXIV” stamped on the spine. It was J. Marcellus Kik’s brief commentary on Matthew’s version of the Olivet Discourse. In the Preface to the second edition, Kik wrote the following:

> The first edition of this work was published in 1948 and it is indeed gratifying that the demand for it has necessitated a second edition. The particular interpretation represented in this book found slow acceptance but in recent years approval has multiplied, especially with the decline of the dispensational position.\(^{26}\)

In time I learned that Kik’s interpretive model was not new or unique to him. In addition, I found that the preterist interpretation of the Olivet Discourse has a long and distinguished history among Bible commentators from diverse orthodox theological traditions going back centuries. Kik’s little book forever changed the way I studied the Bible because it used the Bible to interpret the Bible, the very methodology I was learning in my hermeneutics classes. Kik expressed in his first edition how I felt after reading his exposition of Matthew 24:

> It is with a thrill that one suddenly discovers the key which unlocks the meaning of a difficult portion of Scripture. Matthew Twenty-four is difficult to understand. It is made more difficult by commentaries which speak of “double meanings,” “prophetic perspectives,” and “partial and complete fulfillments.”

Through a process of discovery, I found that a preterist interpretation of the Olivet Discourse was a common feature in commentaries and in various narrative-style books that described the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 as it is outlined in the synoptic gospels.

For example, Alfred J. Church’s *The Story of the Last Days of Jerusalem* (1902), William Patton’s *The Judgment of Jerusalem Predicted in Scripture, Fulfilled in History* (1876), and George Halford’s *The Destruction of Jerusalem: An Absolute and Irresistible Proof of the Divine Origin of Christianity, etc* (1805), to name just three in my possession. There are also numerous editions

---

27 More about this principle below.

of Alexander Keith’s *Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion Derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy, etc.* in which he includes a chapter on “The Destruction of Jerusalem.” Keith’s apologetic work on prophecy was designed to counter liberal claims that the Bible is merely the work of men. Bible prophecy, Keith maintained, demonstrated that this was an impossible claim that could not be defended in terms of many examples of fulfilled prophecy.

Edward Giddings, in his book *American Christian Rulers*, “relates how Keith’s book was instrumental in persuading Supreme Court chief justice John Marshall of the messianic claims of Jesus Christ in the days before his death on July 6, 1835.” The following is from Giddings:

[Marshall] believed in the truth of the Christian revelation, but not in the divinity of Christ; therefore he could not commune in the Episcopal Church. But, during the last months of his life, he read Keith on Prophecy, where our Saviour’s divinity is incidentally treated, and was convinced by his work, and the fuller investigation to which it led, of the supreme divinity of the Saviour.

**Back to Alcasar**

The 20th century has had its share of prophecy skeptics when it comes to passages that describe a soon coming of Jesus, a coming that would take place in the lifetime of Jesus’ disciples.

---


At the time Alcasar wrote, the Protestant Reformers considered the Papal system of the Roman Catholic Church to be the end-time antichrist. The Reformers were nearly unanimous in identifying the Papacy as the Great Harlot of Revelation 17. “For Martin Luther,” a representative of this view, “the Catholic Church was nothing more or less than Babylon — ‘it would be no wonder,’ he wrote in 1520, ‘if God would rain fire and brimstone from heaven and sink Rome into the abyss, as He did Sodom and Gomorrah of old’ — and the pope the Antichrist. ‘If he is not,’ Luther exclaimed, ‘then somebody tell me who is!’”  

Hundreds of years of Protestant anti-Catholic rhetoric could fill a small library. For centuries the papacy was the unanimous antichrist candidate. The papal system was identified as “both the ‘man of sin’ and the Babylonian whore of which Scripture speaks (2 Thess. 2; Rev. 17–18). In the conviction of the sixteenth-century Protestants, Rome was the great anti-Christ, and so firmly did this belief become established that it was not until the nineteenth century that it was seriously questioned by evangelicals.”  

For example, the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) included the following in Chapter 25 section 6:  

There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof: but is that Antichrist, that man of sin,

---

32 Samuel J. Cassels, *Christ and Antichrist or Jesus of Nazareth Proved to be the Messiah and the Papacy Proved to be the Antichrist* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1846).  
and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ and all
that is called God.34

The antichrist designation was removed in 1789 in the American edition. The revised article
reads, “There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the pope of
Rome, in any sense, be head thereof.” There are groups today that still identify the papacy of
the Roman Catholic Church as the antichrist (the historicist view of Revelation),35 but most
evangelicals no longer hold this position even though they (and I) disagree with many of the
Roman Catholic Church’s doctrinal claims and practices.

Once last point about Alcasar being the founder of the preterist school of interpretation needs
to be pointed out. Frank X. Gumerlock, writing in his book Revelation and the First Century,
states that “Luis Alcasar’s commentary on Revelation, published in 1614, was not the first to
take a preterist approach to the main body of the Apocalypse (Chs. 6–19). [John] Henten wrote
his comments almost a century before the publication of Alcasar’s commentary.”36 In 1545,
Henten made these comments on the date of Revelation:

And first it seems to us that John, this apostle and evangelist who is called the
Theologian, was exiled onto Patmos by Nero at the very same time in which he

minster_conf_of_faith.html
35 See Dave Hunt, A Woman Rides the Beast: The Roman Catholic Church and the Last Days (Eugene, OR:
36 Francis X. Gumerlock, Revelation and the First Century: Preterist Interpretations of the Apocalypse in Early
killed the blessed apostles of Christ Peter and Paul. . . . [and] that the Apocalypse was written on Patmos before the destruction of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{37}

According to Gumerlock, Henten (1499–1566), or Hentenius as he is also known, “held that Chapters 6–11 of Revelation referred to the abrogation of Judaism, and Chapters 12–19 referred to the destruction of Roman paganism.”\textsuperscript{38}

Non-preterist might argue that since Henten was a Roman Catholic, he could have had the same goal in mind that Alcasar had, even though they wrote independent of one another. There aren’t many commentaries on Revelation written in the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century written by non-Catholics, so we don’t have a lot to go on. Neither Luther nor Calvin wrote commentaries on Revelation.

But those who attack preterism because a Roman Catholic originated it with his interpretation of Revelation have a problem of their own if poisoning the well is a legitimate way to argue. Francisco Ribera (1537–1591) was a Jesuit doctor of theology in the Roman Catholic Church who began writing a lengthy (500 pages) commentary in 1585 on the book of Revelation (Apocalypse) titled \textit{In Sacrum Beati Ioannis Apostoli, & Evangelistiae Apocalypsin Commentariij}, and published it about the year 1590.

\textsuperscript{37}Johannes Henten, \textit{Enarrationes vetustissimorum theologorum: in Actaquidem Apostolorvm et in omnes D. Pavli ac Catholicas epistolas ab Oecumenio, in Apocalypsim vero, ab Aretha Caesareae Cappadociae episcopo manga cura collectae} (Antwerp: Johannes Steelsius, 1545). Gumerlock’s translation of \textit{Primumque hoc nobis videtur, Johanne sum hunc Apostolum ac Evangelistam, qui et Theologus cognominatur, a Nerone in Patmos relegatum, eodem omnino tempore ille beatos Christi apostolos Petrum et Paulum interemit . . . quod scripta sit in Patmo Apocalypsis ante Ierosolymorum excidium}.

\textsuperscript{38}Gumerlock, \textit{Revelation and the First Century}, 42.
In order to remove the Catholic Church from consideration as the antichrist power, Ribera proposed that most of Revelation refers to the distant future just prior to the second coming. “He taught that Antichrist would be a single individual, who would rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, abolish the Christian religion, deny Christ, be received by the Jews, pretend to be God, and conquer the world — and all in this brief space of three and one-half years.”

Ribera’s view sounds very similar to modern-day premillennialism.

Let me poison the well a bit more. The Jehovah’s Witnesses follow an end-time scenario that is not much different from the one outlined by dispensationalists. Appeals are made to 2 Timothy 3, sections of Daniel, and, of course, the Olivet Discourse in Matthew 24. Just like the dispensationalists, the JWs point to 2 Peter 3:3–4 to support their claim that those who do not believe we are living in the last days are “scoffers.” As evidence that we are living in the last days, like the dispensationalists, they point to “a tribulation that would be greater than any that had yet occurred.” Then there are the obligatory references to nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, earthquakes, pestilence, and what they believe is a yet future preaching of the gospel into all the world of our day.

You will also find that JWs and dispensationalist share the belief that world wars, terrorism, tsunamis, diseases like malaria, influenza, and AIDS are empirical evidence that the end must be near. There is also the common belief that Armageddon is still in our future. Like the dispensationalists, JWs “are convinced of the reality of these prophecies.”

---

40 Awake! (April 2008), 4.
41 Awake!, 7.
If preterism should be discarded because of its supposed Jesuit beginnings, then futurism should similarly be discarded because of its Jesuit association.

F.W. Farrar writes:

But to me it seems that the founder of the Preterist School is none other than St. John himself. For he records the Christ as saying to him when he was in the Spirit, ‘Write the things which thou sawest, and THE THINGS WHICH ARE, and the things which are about to happen (ha mellei ginesthai [ὅ μέλλει γενέσθαι]) after these things’ [Rev. 1:19]. No language surely could more clearly define the bearing of the Apocalypse. It is meant to describe the contemporary state of things in the Church and the world, and the events which were to follow in immediate sequence. If the Historical School can strain the latter words into an indication that we are (contrary to all analogy) to have a symbolic and unintelligible sketch of many centuries, the Preterist School may at any rate apply these words, ha eisen [ἃ εἰσὶν], ‘THE THINGS WHICH ARE,’ to vindicate the application of a large part of the Apocalypse to events nearly contemporary, while they also give the natural meaning to the subsequent clause by understanding it of events which were then on the horizon. The Seer emphatically says that the future events which he has to foreshadow will occur speedily (en taxei [“at hand”]) and the recurrent burden of his whole book is the nearness of the Advent (ho kairos engus [“the time is near”]). Language is simply
meaningless if it is to be so manipulated by every successive commentator as to make the words “speedily” and “near” imply any number of centuries of delay.\textsuperscript{42}

It is curious to see with what extraordinary ease commentators explain the perfectly simple and [un]ambiguous expression “speedily” \textit{(en taxei)}, to mean any length of time which they may choose to demand. The word “immediately,” in Matt. xxiv. 29, has been subject to similar handling, in which indeed all Scripture exegesis abounds. The failure to see that the Fall of Jerusalem and the end of the Mosaic Dispensation was a “Second Advent” — and the Second Advent contemplated in many of the New Testament prophecies — has led to a multitude of errors.”\textsuperscript{43}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{42}Farrar, \textit{The Early Days of Christianity}, 432-33.
\textsuperscript{43}Farrar, \textit{The Early Days of Christianity}, 432, note 2.
\end{flushright}