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DEDICATION.

To his kind correspondent and friend, John Burnham, who, having emancipated himself from superstition, has generously devoted his energies to the good of his fellow-men, helping them to take the same liberal views of religion as have given comfort to himself, the author dedicates this small token of his esteem.
The following pamphlet, or as it may be called little book, owes its origin to Mr. John Burnham, whose inquiring mind is not satisfied with many prevailing views of Holy Scripture. Among other subjects, he has been thinking of the book of Revelation, that marvelous part of the New Testament which has attracted to itself so many readers, not only by its imagery and symbolic pictures, but also by its supposed sketches of the church's future history and the world's relation to that church. Readers have been sorely perplexed by its mysteries, while the volumes of those who have tried to explain the book bear striking testimony to the curiosity and folly of the human mind. Mr. Burnham, supposing that my long study of the Scriptures might enable me to throw some light on the obscure production, asked me for a short sketch of my views; in accordance with which request I have copied from a new edition of my Introduction to the New Testament, not yet published, my latest thoughts on the book.

S. D.
The Publisher of this pamphlet wrote to the Author, in substance, the following letter:

Samuel Davidson, D. D. Halle, LL.D.,
14 Belsize Crescent,

Dear Sir,—Recently, while reading the Apocalypse, my attention was drawn to Rev. ii. 2: "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write: These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. I know thy work and thy labor, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars."

The thought struck me with much force: Who was the man in the early church that the Christians at Ephesus had tried and found him a liar? I knew from reading Paul's Epistle to the Galatians something of the fearful contest Paul had with Peter, James, and John, the leaders of the parent church at Jerusalem, in relation to the ceremonial law, including circumcision, being obligatory upon all Christians, and considered how indignant Paul was when he learned that the Apostles had sent emissaries from the parent church to Paul's Galatian churches to sow dissension among them.

No man in the early church more fully realized than did Paul that, if the Apostles and the Ebionites, or Jewish Christians, beat him in this contest, Christianity never would amount to anything more than an insignificant Jewish sect like the Essenes. This accounts for the earnestness and zeal he manifested, and caused him to write the indignant epistle to the Galatians: "O, foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 9: "As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received let him be accursed."

I verily believe not one in the hundred of thousands of the readers of the New Testament since King James' translation was first published ever dreamed that he held the seven stars in his right hand and walked among the golden candlesticks called the apostle Paul a liar, neither have they realized that Paul in Galatians meant, let Peter, James, and John be accursed; but after long consideration of all the facts in this case, including Paul's public disgracing of Peter at Antioch, charging him and his followers with duplicity or dissimulation, the conviction irresistibly forces itself upon my mind that the above is true. If in error, I wish to be corrected. Hence I am exceedingly anxious that one who has made the Bible a lifelong study, and so wide a reputation for Biblical scholarship, and master of Greek and Hebrew, should throw some light upon this subject.

This commentary on Revelation has been furnished me for the American press, in reply to the above inquiry. No earnest student of the Bible can read the latest thoughts of this ripe scholar but with the deepest interest.
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In a subsequent letter to Dr. Davidson I said to him: "I would venture to say, hardly one in a hundred well-informed, well-read persons could tell me the evidences that caused scholars to agree in their opinion that the Book of Daniel in the Hebrew Bible was not historical, and would feel under many obligations to you, if in a private letter, in condensed form, you would give me some of the reasons or evidences that forced scholars to the above decision."

Below will be found an extract from a private letter of Dr. Davidson's answer to my request.

As to Daniel not being the author of the book that bears his name, the problem has been long settled among scholars. The first thing that strikes the reader is, the position of the book in the Hebrew Bible. It stands in the third part of the Old Testament canon (the Hagiographa), not among the Prophets, where it should naturally be if it had been a proper prophetic book, written by one who lived during the exile at Babylon. Then, it is not mentioned by Jesus Sirach. (Chapter 49.) The Book of Ezekiel speaks of Daniel as a man renowned for wisdom, coupling him with Noah and Job, showing that the original Daniel, whose name the author of the book takes, lived before the exile, not in it. The decrees of the kings mentioned in the book are of the same type as the narrative parts. Half of the book is in Chaldee, not in Hebrew. The language has Persian as well as Greek words. The course of the history delineated in the book is not only defective, but partly inaccurate. The writer inserts the Median monarchy between the Babylonian and the Persian, where there is no room for it. He habitually uses the latter form of Nebuchadrezzar's name, the usage of which by a contemporary is remarkable. No true prophet could have carried down the history till the time of Antiochus or supposed that immediately after his death the sovereignty of Israel should commence. Besides, the miracles of the book are grotesque. Witness the lion's den and Nebuchadrezzar eating grass like cattle for seven years. The author of the book wrote about 165 B.C., shortly before the death of Antiochus. Ever yours,

SAMUEL DAVIDSON.


By noticing the following article, cut from a recent English paper, the "Scotsman," the reader will see in how high esteem Dr. Davidson is held by the noted scholars, divines, and statesmen of England:

"AWARD OF A PENSION TO THE REV. SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D. — Intimation has just been received that the Queen, on the recommendation of Mr. Gladstone, has been pleased to award a pension of £100 a year on the Civil List to Dr. Samuel Davidson, in recognition of his eminent scholarship and his important contribution to theological science. Dr. Davidson, who is now in his eighty-fourth year, has been known for more than half a century as a master of the modern German criticism, especially of the New Testament; and his learned works on Biblical criticism, introduction, and cognates have
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exercised great influence on the development and study of these sciences in all English-speaking countries.

"He is still in full possession of all his intellectual power, and is understood to be busily engaged in prosecuting his literary work.

"A memorial setting forth his great services to the cause of theology was lately forwarded from Edinboro' to the Prime Minister, who gave it prompt and favorable consideration. It was mainly promoted by Dr. Gloag, late minister of Galashiels, now resident in Edinboro', and it was cordially supported by leading theologians and laymen of different churches and schools. Among the signatures were Duke of Argyle, Lords Napier and Ettrick, the Bishop of Durham, Canon Farrar, Dr. Doweth, Professors Sanday, Driver, and Host; Principal Fairbairn, Principal Drummond, Dr. Salmond of Dublinson, Principal Cunningham, Sir W. Muir, Professors Flint, Charteris, Taylor, Calderwood, and Kirkpatrick, Dr. Cameron Lees, Principal Rainy, Dr. Blaikie, Dr. Dods, Dr. A. B. Davidson, Sir Thomas Clark, Sheriff McCray, Mr. Thomas McNie, advocate, and others. The recognition thus bestowed upon the distinguished and venerable scholar has been gratefully acknowledged by him."

John Burnham.

Orange, Cal.
THE REVELATION.

Authorship.

The title "Apocalypse of John the Divine" is not in any old manuscript. The epithet was first given to the apostle during the Arian controversy in the fourth century, when its authority was emphasized in opposition to the Arians who rejected the book. No title proceeded from the author. The uncial MSS. H and C have only "Apocalypse of John"; which is also in the subscription of A.

The common opinion has been that John the apostle and son of Zebedee wrote the book, in favor of which both external and internal arguments are advanced, of which the following is a summary:

1. External.

Hengstenberg begins with Polycarp, the apostle’s disciple, who is supposed to write in an epistle to the Philippians "let us so serve him with fear and all reverence as he himself has commanded, and as the apostles who have preached the gospel unto us, and the prophets who have foretold the coming of our Lord, being zealous of what is good," etc. According to Hengstenberg, the prophets are not personally different from the apostles, John in the Apocalypse being their representative. But the Old Testament prophets are meant in the passage.

The oldest testimony for the Apocalypse’s authenticity comes indirectly. Two Cappadocian bishops, belonging probably to the fifth century, Andrew and Aretas, relate that Papias looked upon the book as inspired and credible, which was tantamount at that time to a belief in its apostolic origin. Papias does not speak of it as the work of John the apostle in express terms; but his regarding it as of divine authority and credible comports with the idea of its being written by none other. It has seemed singular that Eusebius omits the testimony of this early writer. But his silence is capable of an easy explanation. The historian disliked Papias because of his millenarian views. The extravagant expectations of John the presbyter’s hearer and of his day were derived from oral tradition, in the opinion of Eusebius; if they were not, Dionysius of Alexandria had influenced the historian, leading him to doubt the authenticity of the book. One thing is clear, that Eusebius would not have omitted Papias’s testimony about the author of Revelation, had the latter expressed hesitation respecting it, which he probably did not.

The testimony of Melito agrees with that of Papias. Eusebius says that he wrote a book “about the devil and the Apocalypse of John.” The fact that the Bishop of Sardis, one of the cities to which an epistle is addressed in the introductory part of the Revelation, wrote on the book has an apparent weight.

Justin Martyr is the earliest writer who expressly attributes the work to John the apostle at Ephesus. Rettig tries to im-

---

1 οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φίλου καὶ τάσις ἐυλαβείας, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλασεν, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται, οἱ προκρήγιασαν τὴν ἔλεον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: Ζη- λωταί περὶ τὸ καλόν, κ. τ. λ.—Chapter 6.

2 Die Offenbarung des Heiligen Johannes, vol. ii., 2, p. 98

3 ἔσπειρως καὶ ἀξίως.


5 Dialog, c. 81, p. 204, ed. 3. Otto.
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pugn the authenticity of the passage in Justin without effect. Eusebius states that Justin wrote his Dialogue or Disputation with Trypho, in which the passage about the Apocalypse occurs, at Ephesus, the first of the seven cities to which the author addressed an epistle (Rev. i. 11; ii. 1). Justin knew of none other than the apostle as author. We conclude, therefore, that the opinion about John’s authorship had not originated before the middle of the second century. There is no reason for thinking that Justin rested on exegetical grounds rather than on tradition. The earliest Christian period relied on persons more than writings for the support of its faith.

Not long after Justin, Apollonius, a presbyter at Ephesus, drew proofs from the Apocalypse against the Montanists, as Eusebius states. The context of the passage in which the historian speaks of him leaves no room for doubt that Apollonius used the book as the apostle’s.

Irenæus is also a witness for the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, appealing to ancient MSS. for the genuineness of the number 666, as well as to persons who had seen the apostle John. This testimony has some weight, because Irenæus must have heard of the writer in proconsular Asia before he went to Gaul. We do not see that the witness of Irenæus is weakened by the fact that he dated the book at the end of Domitian’s reign; or because he accepted superstitious and absurd accounts of John from the presbyters who professed to have seen him. The superstitious opinions of John received from the elders have nothing to do with the composition of a work like the present.

The epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne given by Eusebius also presupposes the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; so that from Asia Minor to Gaul the book is well attested as John’s in the second century. Tertullian uses it as apostolic, showing that Africa participated in the historical tradition prevailing in other countries. The Muratorian list ascribes the work to John.

The want of one witness at the beginning of the third century is suspicious at first sight, viz., the Peshito, from which the Apocalypse is absent. Nor did this old version admit the book afterwards, though scholars in the Syriac church subsequently put it on a level with the rest of the New Testament. A later Syriac translation of the Apocalypse appeared, which was never thought to be equal in authority to the Peshito. It is true that Hug and others suppose the Peshito to have had the book at first; but this is incorrect. How then is its exclusion from this ancient version to be accounted for? When the Peshito was made, perhaps the Apocalypse had not found its way to Edessa, the birthplace of the version.

It is certain that Theophilus of Antioch (180 A.D.) accepted the book as apostolic. In the same century the Alogi ascribed it to Cerinthus; and Caius of Rome, from opposition to Montanism, ventured to make the same statement, as a fragment of Proclus’s preserved by Eusebius asserts: “But Cerinthus, by means of revelations, as if they were written by a great apostle, falsely introduces wonderful things to us, as shown him by angels,” etc. This passage has given rise to discussion, some affirming that the revelations spoken of do not mean the present Apocalypse, but forged revelations having the authority of a great apostle. There can be little doubt that Caius rejected the Apocalypse from the canon because it contained predictions irreconcilable with the teachings of Christ and Paul. In this respect he showed critical
sagacity, but not in ascribing its authorship to Cerinthus. It is an unlikely conjecture that Caius rejected both a pseudo-Apocalypse written by Cerinthus and the New Testament one, a spurious and the genuine one, through hasty over-zeal.

Marcion and his followers excluded the book from their canon, and therefore rejected its apostolic authorship.

When we pass to the third century the evidence on behalf of the apostolicity of the work is favorable. Clement of Alexandria¹ ascribed it to John, as did Origen,² notwithstanding his opposition to millenarianism. Cyprian, Lactantius, and Methodius were of the same opinion. Hippolytus probably wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse directed against the Montanists, which is inferred from a statement of Ebedjesu respecting him: "St. Hippolytus, martyr and bishop, composed a work concerning the dispensation, . . . and an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John the apostle and evangelist."³

Critical doubts began with Dionysius of Alexandria (about 255 A.D.), owing, as it would seem, to doctrinal disputes with the millenarian adherents of Nepos. This father ascribes the work to John the presbyter, not to the apostle, basing his opinion on internal grounds, and on style, language, and characteristic peculiarities; and arguing from the differences of the fourth Gospel and first Epistle of John, that the same person could not have written the Apocalypse also.⁴ His reasoning is valid, on the assumption that the Gospel and Epistle proceeded from the apostle, but it contradicts ecclesiastical tradition. When Dionysius appeals to some of his predecessors who rejected the book and thought it should be excluded from the canon, he alluded to those who looked upon it as the work of Cerinthus; to Caius, the Alogi, and the antimontanists in general.

In the fourth century Eusebius⁵ seems undecided about retaining or rejecting the Apocalypse. His opposition to millenarianism, not less than Dionysius’s critical doubts, inclined him to the latter step. On the other hand, tradition was arrayed on behalf of its apostolicity. With Dionysius the historian conjectures that the writer may be John the presbyter; but he says he will not refuse to put it among the acknowledged books of the canon if cause for doing so should appear.⁶ This wavering policy tells against the historian’s honesty, since he might have cited older witnesses for the apostolic origin of the book.

It is scarcely necessary to follow the series of external testimonies farther than Eusebius. Later witnesses belong to the history of the canon. Enough has been given to show the prevalence of the opinion that the apostle John was the author. But ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries adopted vaguer traditions without inquiring whether they rested on a good foundation; besides, they were generally incapable of if not disinclined to critical investigation. They followed immediate predecessors contented to glide down the ecclesiastical stream. It is true that there were noble exceptions; and that from the middle of the second century several distinguished fathers connected with the church in Asia Minor received the work as an authentic document of John’s. Clement and Origen, too, whose views did not agree with the book, received it as apostolic. The title “Revelation of John the Divine,” which originated in the fourth century, is derived from the fourth Gospel, whose author was supposed to be the apostle also.

2. Internal.

Does internal evidence coincide with the external as regards authorship? In four places John calls himself the author

¹ Stromata, lib. vi. p. 607; and ii. p. 207.
³ Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. iii. part i. p. 15.
⁴ H. E. vii. 24, 25. ⁵ Ib. iii. 25. ⁶ Εἴης φανετή.
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(i. 1, 4, 9; xxii. 8); sometimes without a predicate; at other times with servant of Jesus Christ; or, your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, in relation to his readers; while in xxii. 9 he is styled by the angel a brother of the prophets. He presents himself in the character of a man well known to the Christian churches of proconsular Asia. Though he does not call himself an apostle, he is commanded to write what he had seen and to send it to the seven churches (i. 11). He is the prophet, not apostle, of the Messiah in this instance.

Do the contents agree with the assumption that the book proceeds from an apostolic man, or do they present phenomena inconsistent with John's known character and the time when he wrote? To answer this question, we must take a general survey of the contents. The idea of their Lord's speedy coming had made a deep impression upon the minds of the apostles. Like the Messiah in Daniel, he was to appear on the clouds of heaven with great power and glory. The near approach of this event was the animating and consolatory motive held forth in the apostolic epistles. It was present to the mind of Paul, who proclaims Maranatha; speaks of the Lord's coming with all his saints; of his descending from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; who believes that the day of the Lord — equivalent to the day of Jesus Christ, that day, the day of redemption — is at hand; and that he should live to see it. The saints should then be judges of the world and even of angels. Nor is such eschatology confined to Paul's epistles. It appears in the letter to the Hebrews; Peter's epistles teach the same thing. The epistles of John express it also. James recommends patience till the coming of the Lord, which he declares to be near. And Jude proves from the existence of mockers that it is the last time. The description of Christ's advent thus expected by the New Testament writers is developed in the 24th chapter of the first Gospel; where the sentiment of retribution appears in the form of a solemn judicial process preceded by great distress; and the Messiah reveals himself in splendor, ushering in a new dispensation in which the faithful should be compensated for their sufferings. Some such ideas are present in the Apocalypse, but there are differences.

In like manner the Christology of the Apocalypse contains various apostolic elements. The idea of Jesus the Messiah is, that he existed before the world. He is termed "the beginning of the creation of God" (iii. 14); and the expression "Son of God" (ii. 18) refers to the divine sovereignty bestowed upon him by the Father. The spiritual and potential perfections he possesses were bestowed upon him as a reward for his faithful and victorious career. He is the organ of communication between God and his people; the "Word of God," not "God the Word," as in John i. 1. The name "Word of God" has not a metaphysical sense as if it expressed the principle constituting the person of Christ; nor does it imply an independent hypostasis proceeding from the substance of the Father like the Word of the fourth Gospel, but rather a being possessing divine power and prerogatives received from the Father. The name is a preparatory step to the proper Logos-doctrine, to which the peculiarities of the Alexandrian Logos, preexistence and creative agency, could be easily attached. When he has accomplished the purposes for which the government of the world was given into his hands, he resigns the power and kingdom to the Father and reigns under Him (xi. 15-17). This agrees to some extent with the Pauline Christology, in which Christ is set forth as the man from heaven, one in whom pneuma was the essential principle, who existed before he was manifested to mankind, the representative of ideal humanity.
The conception of Antichrist also harmonizes with apostolic times. The name of this power does not appear in the book, but the idea is found in a concrete form. The Antichrist of the Revelation is a worldly ruler, in whom the powers of evil are concentrated. Bearing the symbolic name of the beast, he is spoken of as a historical person; and other hostile beast-forms are in him, because he is the representative of heathen opposition to the kingdom of Messiah. In the second Epistle to the Thessalonians the idea of Antichrist appears as the man of sin and the son of perdition; the person or thing referred to being obscure. The Revelation presents the same idea, implying a heathen impersonation of hostility to Christianity. One of the redactors in the canonical Matthew speaks of false Christs or Messianic pretenders arising out of Judaism (chapter xxiv.). The name antichrist occurs in John's first epistle, where a plurality of persons, so called, spring from the bosom of the Christian church. When the proper humanity of Jesus was denied, the hostile element was found in the antichrists of gnosticism. The later New Testament writings find Antichrist not in fals doctrine, not in heathenism as a system, or in Judaism. False teachers or heretics are the antichrists of the Johannine epistles.

Need we add that the pneumatology of the Revelation agrees with that of the apostolic writings, containing no later than Pauline ideas on the subject? The power of the devil in relation to the kingdom of Christ is presented under the same aspect in the Apocalypse and Paul's epistles. Though man's arch-enemy was vanquished by Christ at his first advent, he was not finally subdued; the contest with him continues till the second coming. This prince of darkness has legions of spirits associated with him; and his conqueror, the Messiah, must therefore be the head of all principality and power.

As far as John's individuality is reflected in the New Testament and tradition, it does not disagree with the contents of the Apocalypse. The sons of Zebedee were impetuous spirits whose feelings carried them to excess or revenge. They wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhabitants of a Samaritan village, and begged to have the chief places in the kingdom of heaven. John forbade one who presumed to cast out devils in the name of Jesus. He was a Boanerges, or son of thunder, with a decided individuality and an ardent disposition. As far as he appears in the Acts and Pauline epistles his mind is somewhat narrow, emancipated from national prejudices. The Quartodecimans appealed to his Jewish practice about the passover, while Polycrates of Ephesus states that he was a priest and wore the sacerdotal plate, a fact which is said to agree with priestly particulars in the seven epistles at the beginning of the Apocalypse. If he were of a priestly family, which is not improbable, he might assume the sacerdotal ornaments, representing himself as one initiated into the mysteries of Jesus. Asiatic tradition considered him a mediator between Christ and the church. He had the surname of the virgin (see xiv. 4), and appeared as an ascetic who received divine communications.

After his traditional removal to Asia Minor he is described as contending with false teachers, Jewish and Gentile. Irenaeus states from Polycarp that the apostle going into a bath on a certain occasion discovered Cerinthus there, and leaping out of it hasted away, saying he was afraid of the building falling on him and crushing him along with the heretic. These traits may seem to be reflected in the book before us, which betrays an impassioned spirit full of rage against the despisers of God and his anointed, with images of dragons, fire, murder, and blood,—vessels of wrath. The souls of martyrs invoke vengeance on

their persecutors, and all heaven is summoned to rejoice over Babylon's downfall.

In representing the apostle as retaining his Judaic prepossessions, as one whose Christianity was of the original type, some think they are justified by the Apocalypse itself; especially by the descriptions of the Asiatic churches containing allusions to Pauline libertines. In the letter to the church at Ephesus we read: “Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars” (ii. 2). The address to the church of Pergamos has: “I have a few things against thee because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate” (ii. 14, 15). These Nicolaitanes or Balaamites (for the names are identical) may have been libertines. The first Epistle to the Corinthians shows that Paul allowed the use of meats, offered in sacrifice to idols; and the Acts, that the leading apostles at Jerusalem enjoined Gentile Christians to abstain from such food. But these followers of Paul, if such they were, probably carried his liberalism to excess, for fornication is also specified. They abused the doctrine of their alleged master, who, while he boldly proclaimed “all things are lawful for me,” was careful to enjoin virtuous conduct. In like manner, some find an anti-Pauline tendency in the address to the church of Thyatira, the greater part of whom carried the apostle’s principles to excess, abusing the liberty allowed to Gentile converts.

Besides the supposed anti-Pauline tendency observable in some of the letters to the churches there are allusions to the existence of antichristian principles in the churches of Smyrna, Philadelphia, and Pergamos. Paul is also excluded from the foundation of the church; and the twelve alone honored with the insertion of their names in the foundations of the wall round the holy city (xxi. 14). But the fact of John’s being a Jewish Christian and the inferences drawn from it, in addition to his mental idiosyncrasy, do not account for the peculiarities of the Apocalypse. Other phenomena are needed for a satisfactory explanation. Besides, the polemic allusions in the Epistles do not suit the time of John.

The objections to Johannine authorship are weighty — so weighty that they cannot be answered. How could one who had lived with Jesus on earth, who accompanied him on his journeyings and shared his friendship, one who witnessed his hunger and fatigue, give him attributes approaching those of God himself? Could he assign him a dignity far exceeding that which mortal can claim without presumption? Though he is distinguished from Him that sits on the throne and is called at the same time the lamb (vii. 10), a similar ascription of praise is given to both. In like manner, even the incommunicable name Jehovah is assigned to Jesus in xxii. 13, where we read: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last;” a paraphrase of Jehovah. It is hard to see how the bosom friend of Jesus could put the latter on a level with the supreme God.

Again, in xxi. 14, it is said that the names of the twelve apostles are inscribed on the walls of New Jerusalem. Could John put himself among the apostles who had all departed and were in glory?

In Mark x. 40, Jesus says, “to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give.” Did the apostle’s memory fail to recollect the words when he wrote, “to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne” (iii. 21).

Still farther, according to Acts iv. 13, the apostle belonged to the class of the ignorant and unlearned in a Jewish sense; whereas the Revelation shows the possession of Old Testament and Rabbinical learning on the author’s part.
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John recognized Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles (Galat. ii. 8, 9) which disagrees with Rev. ii. 2.

The primitive Christian idea entertained by Jesus himself was that Jerusalem was doomed to speedy destruction, which should be immediately followed by his second advent. In the Apocalypse that city is not razed to the ground, and the coming of the Messiah to reign a thousand years follows Rome's destruction. The whole texture of the book suggests the idea that it was not written continuously. It is impossible to maintain its unity or the simple progression of the contents; and there is room for the opinion that it is the product of different minds. The parts are loosely joined. The dramatic action does not unfold regularly, but portions expository, contemporaneous, or retrospective are interposed, so that interpreters are perplexed. The scenes shift from heaven to earth and the contrary. The plainest intercalary acts are in chapters xii.-xiv. Others occur in the seventh chapter, and in x. 1-xi. 14. These and the like interruptions are a stumbling-block to the reader who looks for continuous dramatic action, and have suggested the view that the book consists of pieces artificially welded together.

Not only are there intercalations but incongruities and inconsistencies. It is probable that the second and third chapters were inserted at the beginning of the Apocalypse proper by a later writer, since they have no connection with the body of the work. Christ is coming immediately at the beginning of the book; at the end it is still the same. The consumption lies in the descent of the new Jerusalem from heaven without a temple. This latter takes the place of the former Jerusalem. And the city is described as twice descending (xxi. 2, 10), seen, too, from different places, the second time from a great mountain. In xix. 9 and 17 two suppers are mentioned; but their nature is different. One is the marriage supper of the Lamb, a joyful feast prepared for the faithful. The other is one to which all the birds of heaven are invited, their meat being the flesh of the enemies of Messiah, who had fallen in the contest between the saints and the wicked. The expectations of what was about to happen are different.

In vii. 1-8 compared with vii. 9-17 and xiv. 1-5 there is an incongruity which has puzzled interpreters. The sealed ones, the 144,000 from the twelve tribes of Israel, are a select body representing the faithful church of God. On the other hand, an innumerable multitude are distinguished from the former. Why are they mentioned separately from the elect few, since both are admitted into the Messianic kingdom? The description of them hardly implies inferior rank (vii. 9-17). The 144,000 are again presented to view in xiv. 1-5, but they are not the innumerable multitude they were before, if, as is evident, they were Gentiles. The number of select Jews in a former passage is transferred in the latter to the elite of the Gentiles, Christian ascetics. Does this agree with one authorship of the three passages? In xiv. 14 and xix. 11, etc., there are two appearances of Messiah which disagree. Both cannot belong to the same book.

In xxii. 6 an angel is sent by God to show the things which must shortly be done; whereas, in i. 9, etc., the revelation is made by Christ himself. In many passages God is said to be the judge of all, punishing the heathen and rewarding his faithful people (vi. 10, 16); in others Christ is judge, and that chiefly in relation to his own church (xxii. 16). In the second and third chapters, where Christ rather than God is prominent, the judicial position of the former is exemplified.

If such inconsistencies exist in the Apocalypse, how are they to be solved? One author is out of the question. The reader is at once struck with the Jewish character belonging to the greater part. This appears most palpably in the 17th
and 18th chapters, where the picture of Babylon's abominations and downfall breathes the most intense hatred against the Roman empire and its metropolis. Her citizens, whose commerce was wide as the world, are singled out lamenting the loss of their all, and the proud city perishes in flames. How Jewish are the words, xviii. 20: “Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.” Another conspicuous example of the writer's Jewish position is presented in chap. xxi. 1—xxii. 5, where the new Jerusalem is described. Indeed, the body of the book (iv. 1—xxii. 5) manifests itself as a Jewish Apocalypse. At the same time Christian pieces or interpolations are not wanting. The word lamb occurs no less than 28 times. The longest insertions in the apocalyptic groundwork are i. 4–8; vii. 9–17; xiv. 1–5. The preliminary chapters, ii.–iii. 22, and the concluding, xxii. 6–21, are also of Christian origin. In this way we are led to the conclusion that a Christian interpolator manipulated and adapted a Jewish Apocalypse. Why he retained so much of the latter it is impossible to say, unless his nature was conservative, for his insertions are comparatively few, and his alterations fewer.

It is not difficult to separate the Jewish and Christian portions. The larger insertions are more easily discovered than the smaller ones. Thus, v. 9–14 is plain; but the very small interpolations in xix. 11–21, such as “called faithful and true, and” (vers. 11), “and his name is called the Word of God” (vers. 13), are less apparent.

The Jewish Apocalypse must have been written in Aramaean and afterwards translated into Greek. The interpolator was probably the translator who wrote the letters to the seven churches of Asia, and added an appendix to the book. To give his work sanction and authority, he put John's name at the beginning, as if he were the author of the whole. That the Apocalypse was translated from the Aramaean is evident from mistakes committed. In x. 7, where we read “and the mystery of God was finished” (εἰρήνη), there should be a future instead of the aorist. So in v. 5, has prevailed (εἰρήνη), the aorist should be a future. That he also interpolated is evident from such gaps as are left in the context by his insertion of v. 9–14. But though he is conservative, taking comparatively few liberties with the text, his tendency is sufficiently perceptible, especially in the introductory chapters, where he exalts Christ to an equality with God, for grace and peace are invoked from Him who is and who was and who is to come, and from the seven spirits before his throne, and from Jesus Christ the faithful witness and the first begotten of the dead and the prince of the kings of the earth (i. 4, 5). In v. 13 the same worship is offered to Him that sits upon the throne and unto the Lamb. The language of i. 8 is transferred to Christ in ii. 8, and xxii. 13. It must be admitted, however, that the line between the Almighty and the Lamb varies under the hand of the interpolator; and that the sovereignty ascribed to the latter is unsteadily maintained.

After Volter led the way in separating and analyzing the book, great credit is due to Vischer for his discovery of the key which unlocks the door into its proper interpretation. Harnack, Weyland, Pfeiderer, Spitta, X in “Stade's Journal,” and Schmidt followed at once. A Jewish Apocalypse has been translated, adapted, and interpolated to make it acceptable to fellow-Christians in a time of suffering. But some still believe that as the fourth Gospel and Apocalypse were long current under the name of John, they cannot be separated in authorship. These theologians advance arguments which may lead away the superficial. Let us glance at them.

The Christology of the Revelation is apparently in unison with that of the Gospel,
the latter describing Jesus as the incarnate wisdom of God, the former using language of similar import (iii. 14). His preexistence is asserted in the Gospel as it is in the Apocalypse (iii. 14). The appellation *Word* distinctive of personality occurs only in the Gospel, first Epistle of John, and Apocalypse.

Christ or God is often termed the *true*; so in the Gospel Christ is called the *true light*; and God is the *true God* in John’s first Epistle.

In Apocalypse ii. 17 Jesus promises believers the *hidden manna*; in the Gospel he is the *true bread* from heaven (vi. 32).

In our book Christ is often styled a *lamb*; an epithet nowhere applied to him but in the fourth Gospel.

It is said in the Apocalypse, of the Jews who reject Jesus, that they are not *true Jews* (iii. 9); so in the fourth Gospel (viii. 39–40).

In ii. 11 a promise is made to him that *overcometh* that he shall not be hurt by the second death; in the fourth Gospel it is said of him that *keeps Jesus’s word* that he shall never see death (viii. 51).

In xiv. 15 a call is addressed to the angel to thrust in his *sickle* and reap, because reaping-time is come; the harvest of the earth being ripe. In the Gospel Jesus says to his disciples, “Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest” (iv. 35).

The favorite expressions, *to testify* and *testimony*, of the Gospel, in the sense of declaration respecting the Saviour, public profession of belief in him is common in the Apocalypse. (Compare Gospel i. 7, 19; iii. 32, 33; v. 31–36; viii. 13, 14; xvii. 37; xxi. 24; Epistle v. 9, thrice, 10, 11; Rev. i. 2, 9; vi. 9; xii. 11, 17; xix. 10; xx. 4; xxi. 18, 20.)

The use of *to conquer*, in the sense of overcoming the evil opposition and enmity of the world, with the implication of remaining active and faithful in the Christian cause, is peculiar to John and Apocalypse. Gospel xvi. 33; Epistle ii. 13, 14; iv. 4; v. 4, 5; Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21; xii. 11; xiii. 7; xxi. 7.

*Countenance*, in the sense of human visage, is found only in Gospel xi. 44 and Rev. i. 16.

To keep the word* is frequent in John’s Gospel and Epistle; the same occurs in the Apocalypse.

To tabernacle* is used in Gospel i. 14, and in Apoc. vii. 15; xii. 12; xiii. 6; xxi. 3.

To slay* is employed in Epistle iii. 12, twice; also in Rev. v. 6; vi. 4, 9, 12; xiii. 3, 8; xviii. 24. It is found nowhere else.

To have part* is used in Gospel xiii. 8, and in Apoc. xx. 6.

To walk with one.* is Gospel vi. 66; Apoc. iii. 4.

Hereafter* is Gospel i. 52; xiii. 19; xiv. 7; Rev. xiv. 13. Elsewhere only in Matthew.

To labour,* with the idea of fatigue. Rev. ii. 3; Gospel iv. 6.

To speak with one.* is Gospel iv. 27; ix. 37; xiv. 30; Rev. i. 12; iv. 1; x. 8; xvii. 1; xxi. 9, 15. Not elsewhere except once in Mark vi. 50.

Heaven* in the Gospel and Epistle has nearly always the article; less frequently elsewhere. The same remark applies to the word *Christ*.

Lord, thou knowest.* is Gospel xxi. 15–17, thrice; Rev. vii. 14.

He answered, saying.* is Gospel i. 26; x. 33; Rev. vii. 13.

The frequent use of *light*, to enlighten, *glory*, to appear,* and such like words in a tropical sense, shows a similar coloring of style in the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse.

19 ἀγάματος. 20 ἐν ἥρασ. 21 ἀπαντάσ. 22 ἀποφαίνεταιν. 23 ἀποκαλύφθη λόγον. 24 ἀπεκτάσει μετά τινος. 25 κοσμίων. 26 κοιμάσω.
The comparison of Christ with a bridegroom, in the Gospel iii. 29, should be placed by the side of Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2; xxi. 17, chiefly on account of the diction. So of the water of life, Rev. xxi. 6; xxi. 17; Gospel iv. 10; vii. 37; of hungering and thirsting, Rev. vii. 16; Gospel vi. 35. The image of cup for trial or suffering, Gospel xviii. 11, is very common in the Apocalypse. The image of Christ as shepherd, Gospel x. 1, appears in Rev. vii. 17.

After these things, which is usually a mere formula of transition, is a striking feature of resemblance between the Apocalypse and Gospel; as, Gospel iii. 22; v. 1, 14; vii. 1; xii. 7; xix. 38; xxi. 1; Apoc. i. 19; iv. 1; vii. 1, 9; ix. 12; xv. 5; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xx. 3. Luke employs the same formula, but not so frequently.

The Apocalypse has often Hebrew words with a Greek explanation. This is done in the Gospel also. Rev. iii. 14; iv. 1; xii. 9; xx. 2; xxi. 17; Gospel i. 39, 42, 43; ix. 7; xii. 13, 17, and is not so frequent elsewhere.

To write, followed by the preposition to, before a noun signifying the object on which the writing is made, is peculiar to the Apocalypse and Gospel. Apoc. i. 11; Gospel viii. 6, 8.

The doctrine of perseverance is common to the three writings, and is expressed in the same way. Compare Rev. iii. 12; Epistle ii. 19; Gospel vi. 37.

The use of to signify deserves notice. Gospel xii. 33; xviii. 32; xxi. 19; Apoc. i. 1.

The neuter gender is used to express rational beings. Gospel vi. 37, 39; xvii. 2, 10. So creature in Rev. v. 13; every, xxi. 27.

John alone has given an account of piercing Jesus’s side with a spear, to which he applies the prediction in Zechariah xii. 10. Apoc. i. 7 exhibits the same Greek version of the Hebrew. The version being a new one, not that of the Seventy, is said to betray the same hand in both.

In Apoc. vii. 15 he that sits upon the throne is said to dwell among the saints; an idea similar to that in the Gospel xiv. 23, where the Father and Son take up their abode with the believer. The same thought is in Apoc. iii. 20; xxi. 22; xxi. 5.

The manner of writing in the Apocalypse often reminds one of that in the fourth Gospel and first Epistle, where the same idea is expressed positively and negatively, and a certain parallelism, both of thought and expression, appears.

More specimens of resemblance have been collected by Donker-Curtius,7 Dannewarn,8 Kolthoff,9 and Stuart,10 to prove identity of authorship, but the most striking and plausible have been given. Stuart’s list needs sifting, because he does not scruple to use the 21st chapter of the fourth Gospel as if it were a genuine part of the work, though Lücke proves that it is not. It is easy to see the weakness of Stuart’s reasoning when he asserts that John is familiar with the neuter noun lamb; whereas it occurs but once in the Gospel, and that in the 21st chapter. His examples sometimes fail to support his assertion, as under the head of Christ’s omniscience, where certain irrelevant passages are quoted from the Gospel and Apocalypse. After every reasonable deduction, however, enough remains to show that the correspondences are not accidental. They either betray the same author, or suggest the belief that the one was influenced by the ideas and language of the other. The true explanation is, that the later writer knew and used the

7 Wer ist der Verfasser der Offenbarung Johannes? 1841. 8 Apocalypsis Joanni apostolo vindicata, 1834. 9 A Commentary on the Apocalypse, 2 vols. 1845, vol. i. 10 ἀπελος.
earlier work. Some expressions in the Gospel remind the reader at once of similar ones in the Revelation; but these specimens of borrowed accord are not important, and detract little from the fundamental dissimilarity of the two productions. Comparison brings out greater unlikeness than the reverse. Visions and revelations, angels and superhuman figures, dramatic scenes which usher in the dread coming of Messiah to destroy his people’s persecutors and establish the blessedness of the saints, are unlike glimpses of the incarnate Word in his brief sojourn on earth, the world’s hatred of its true light, its one access to God; extremely unlike the theological discourses and sublime prayer of the only-begotten Son.

The greatest apparent coincidence is in the Christology, where two particulars bear considerable resemblance to the fourth Gospel, viz.: Christ’s designation as the beginning of the creation of God,¹ and the appellation, Word of God.² The first implies his preexistence. As it has parallels in the Pauline epistles, we think it hazardous with Zeller to regard the phrase as a mere honorary title rather than a doctrinal predicate. Though it be obscure, it is best to take it in the sense of the first created being or the highest creature. But the fourth Gospel makes the Logos or Word to have formed all things.

The Messiah is called the Word of God in the Apocalypse (xix. 3); in the Gospel he is the Word absolutely. The two phrases are different; the former savoring of Palestinian, the latter of Alexandrian metaphysics. The one is the well-known Memra of Jehovah ³ so frequent in the Targums; the other is Philo’s idea.

Similarity of expression has led some critics to assume greater agreement between the descriptions of Christ in the Gospel and Apocalypse than really exists. The heavenly nature and preexistence of Messiah was a later Jewish doctrine, which was gradually taken into the circle of Christian ideas and developed. This doctrine appears first in the book of Daniel, i.e., between 170–160 B.C. The most striking mutual term is that rendered pierce,⁴ the new representative of a Hebrew verb in Zech. xii. 10, which is applied in both to the piercing of the Saviour, and differs from the Septuagint word. It is a precurious thing to found identity of authorship on the use of a mere term; but its connection is peculiar. We might conjecture with Ewald, that the Septuagint had it at first; but the assumption is hazardous. Nor does it remove the difficulty felt by those who argue against identity of authorship, to say that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translate the Hebrew verb by this very apocalyptic one; or that the evangelist refers to the piercing of Christ’s side with a spear, whereas the apocalyptist alludes to his slaying generally — the extreme manifestation of hostile belief.⁵

On the other hand, the characteristic method in which the writer of the Apocalypse views beings, scenes, and objects, betrays a different person from the evangelist. His intuitions are of another cast. The views of the one are sensuous; of the other, spiritual and mystic. In the apocalyptist, fancy is creative and lively; calmness prevails in the evangelist. The objective predominates in the one; speculation, depth, gracious trust, a loving freedom of spirit, in the other. The one is introspective, looking at spiritual relations with a fine psychological organization; the other is of rougher mould, viewing things in concrete, plastic forms. Quiet contemplation has full scope in the evan-

¹ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ.
² ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.
³ זיו נכרית.
⁴ ἐκανέω.
⁵ Düsterdieck, Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis, p. 110; Field’s note in his Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, vol. ii. pp. 1026, 1027.
gelist; mildness and love find utterance in affectionate discourse. But the spirit of the apocalyptist is stern and vengeful. He issues cutting reproofs; commands and threatens; though there are rich and pregnant promises, suited to the majesty of the book. According to the writer of the fourth Gospel, happiness arises from faith in the Saviour on earth, and therefore blessedness is a present possession; according to the apocalyptist, the righteous pray for vengeance, and are restored to life in the first resurrection, that they may reign a thousand years. The Gospel presents an idealizing tendency, which breaks away from the Judaic basis and sets the Redeemer's person, grace, and truth, over against Moses, proclaiming the former as the life and light of the world. In the Apocalypse Messiah is the Conqueror of his enemies; and his power is exhibited more than his grace. God's appearance to reign outwardly, rather than his spiritual abode in the heart, fills the mind of the seer. Besides, a sharp, definite, decisive tone appears in sentences, short, unconnected, without internal pliancy. The evangelist's mode of writing has a circumstantiality foreign to the apocalyptist. It is difficult to make this argument palpable, because it rests in part on subjective tact and taste, so that its reality can be felt more easily than described. Based on a careful survey of the literature that passes under the name of John, it forces itself on the mind. As soon as one perceives the difference of the spiritual elements in which the evangelist and the apocalyptist move, their characteristic modes of apprehension, and the views they take of religious phenomena, expressed in different styles and diction, he infers that the one cannot be identified with the other. Power and majesty, poetic energy and fancy, are hardly consistent with a philosophic idealism permeated with and occasionally concealed by emotional tenderness. The fervor of the evangelist is not fiery; it is subdued by love. A charm lies in his composition. He has refinement and philosophical culture. A solemn grandeur and sensuous symbolism appear in the Apocalypse. Can any reader doubt that the long series of plagues preceding the coming of the Lord, and introduced by demoniacal beings, such as scorpion-like locusts or lion-headed horses, with fire, smoke, and brimstone issuing out of their mouths, and strange riders upon them, is objective and artificial imagery foreign to the evangelist's idiosyncrasy?

These observations prepare the reader to find the doctrinal type of the book before us unlike that of the fourth Gospel. In eschatology, it has a first and second resurrection, a thing unknown to other parts of the New Testament.1

The doctrine of redemption, as far as allusions to it enable us to judge, is more Jewish than it is in the Gospel. It is represented by the strong Jewish figure of washing in blood; but other terms belonging to it, such as lamb, buy, called, freely,2 resemble Paul. Early Christianity was strongly impregnated with Old Testament ideas of sacrifice and atonement which were more sensuous than spiritual; and time was required for leavening it with purer conceptions. The love of God in sending his Son into the world to be the life and light of men, quickening in them that higher principle which sin debases, gradually broke through the ideas of propitiation inherited from their fathers by the Jewish Christians.

As the apocalyptist wrote in Aramaean, he followed Hebrew sources, especially the later prophets, Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, fourth Esdras, the Ascension of Moses, and perhaps the book of Enoch. He is so thoroughly Judaic that there are examples of what was afterwards developed in a corrupt form under the name of Kabbala in Judaism, as in xiii. 18, where the mysterious number of the beast sounds like Gematria. The sacred number seven, 1 Luke xiv. 14 is no exception. See Meyer. 2 ἀμών, ἀγοράζειν, κλητοί, δωρεάν.
which enters into the plan of the book as well as three, savors of Kabbalism. So does the description of the heavenly Jerusalem in the last two chapters.

The view of angels, demons, and spirits is also Jewish, unlike that of the fourth Gospel. Seven spirits are said to be before the Almighty’s throne (i. 4), meaning the seven highest spirits; an idea taken from the Zoroastrian religion into the Jewish, as we see from Zechariah (iv. 2–10), but modified in Hebrew conception, so that the seven spirits represent the one spirit of God. So intimately are these seven associated with the Supreme that grace and peace are invoked from them. An angel interpreter waits upon John; seven angels sound trumpets, and the same number pour out vials full of the divine wrath; an angel comes down from heaven; an angel stands on the sea; an angel has a book in his hand; an angel takes up a great stone; an angel of the waters appears. It is inappropriate to quote, as Stuart does, the angel at the pool of Bethesda in proof of the Gospel representing angelic control of the material elements, because the passage is spurious. Hengstenberg also adduces the place without the least hint of its interpolation. This angelology, bearing a strong likeness to the apocalyptic Daniel and Enoch, plays an important part in the Revelation. We admit that the envelope of visions in which the author clothes his hopes required some spiritual machinery like that of angels; but they are introduced so frequently as to show another idiosyncrasy than the evangelist’s; especially as the Gospel is almost without them.

The view of demons is also singular. Three unclean spirits issue from the mouths of three confederate beasts; these are termed the spirits of demons seducing the kings of the earth by bringing them to join the antichristian leader. In like manner, Satan is conspicuous in the Apocalypse; he is even chained and loosed; he is the great dragon, the old serpent, the arch-enemy of the faithful, the leader of other spirits, with whom he is cast from heaven to earth, and yet is said to accuse the brethren before God continually. In the Gospel he is called the prince of this world.

The language of the book agrees with the fact that it is translated from the Aramean and interpolated. It departs from the usual Greek of the New Testament, presenting anomalies, incorrectnesses, peculiar constructions, and awkward dispositions of words which have no parallel. These originate in Hebraism, the Greek being so moulded by Hebrew as to follow its constructions.

With respect to cases, the unusual license is taken of discontinuing the genitive for a nominative, as in iii. 12; xiv. 12,1 or the accusative for a nominative, as in xx. 2.2 In vii. 9 the nominative is discontinued for the accusative.3 Greek usage is often violated in gender and number, as in vi. 9, 10; ix. 13, 14.4 Neuters plural take plural verbs, xi. 13, 14. The same nouns are both masculine and feminine in iv. 3; x. 1; xiv. 19.5 In xii. 5 man child6 is an imitation of a Hebrew phrase.

In regard to verbs, the Apocalypse uses the future like the Hebrew imperfect, in a frequentative sense, as at iv. 9–11. The participle stands for a finite tense in i. 16; while the present passes into the future in i. 7; or into the past, xii. 2–4. Future and past tenses are strangely mixed in xx. 7–10.

In the syntax of nouns the plural stands regularly for the dual, as in xii. 14.7 The genitive is always put after a noun to explain it, in the manner of an adject-

---

1 τὴν καυχήσεις ἡ εἰρωνείαις, ἢ καταβαίνουσα, κ. τ. λ.—τῶν ἄγγελων οἱ τηροῦντες.
2 τῶν δρακόντων, ὁ δὲ θάρσεως.
3 ἔχλος ... ἵστατε ... περιβεβλημένους.
4 τὰς ψυχὰς ... λέγοντες — φωνὴν ... λέγοντα.
5 Ληστός, Ἰσις.
6 ὦδ ἄρμαν γινὸν γιὰ τῆν ἰδί.
7 βῶ το πηρφαγες.
The Revelation.

tive; and a number of genitives are linked together at xvi. 19. 1

Two nouns coupled by a conjunction have each its own suffix, as in vi. 11; 2 ix. 21.

The repetition of a preposition with each connected genitive often occurs, xvi. 13. 8

The genitive absolute seems wanting, unless there be an example in ix. 9, which is doubtful.

The preposition in 4 is almost always prefixed to the dative of the instrument, as in vi. 8.

The usage of the writer in prepositions and conjunctions is altogether Hebraized. Thus we have the nominative after as, 5 where another case should have stood, iv. 7. 6 This is from a Hebrew prefix. 7

The verb to teach 8 is followed by a dative case, ii. 14, like the Hebrew; 9 to avenge, vi. 10, 10 has a preposition with the genitive equivalent to Hebrew usage; 11 and to follow with (vi. 8 12) is also Hebraic. Greek and Hebrew constructions are strangely intermingled in xvii. 4. 18

The anomalies of language are fewer in the purely Christian parts than in the translated ones; but they are not absent from the former, as the appositions in i. 5, ii. 13, 20; iii. 12, and the form δε in ii. 20 show.

These examples show that the language is so peculiar as to neglect the usual rules of Greek. It is grammatically irregular and syntactically harsh. Yet Winer says, "The irregularities of government and apposition which occur in the Revelation (especially in the descriptions of visions), and which from their number and nature give the style the impress of considerable harshness, are partly intended, and are partly traceable to the writer's negligence. From a Greek point of view they may be explained as instances of anacoluthon, blending of two constructions, constructio ad sensum, variatio structurae. In this light they should have been always considered, instead of being attributed to the ignorance of the writer, or even regarded as Hebræisms; since most of them would be faulty in Hebrew, and in producing many of them, Hebrew could have had but an indirect influence. But with all his simplicity and Oriental tone of diction, the author knows and observes well the rules of Greek syntax; even in imitating Hebrew expressions he proceeds cautiously. Besides, examples analogous to many of these roughnesses occur in the Septuagint, and even in Greek authors, though certainly not in so quick succession as in the Apocalypse." 14 This language is apologetic to incorrectness. The same scholar attempts elsewhere to justify and parallel what cannot be done in the measure he proposes. 15 After all endeavors to find analogies to the linguistic peculiarities and departures from good Greek usage in the book before us, either in the New Testament or classical writers, anomalies of such nature and in such number present themselves as separate the author from the evangelist. Hebrew-Greek like his is unique.

The apologies offered by some critics for the writer's curious Greek are exemplified in Professor Stuart, who often misapprehends the true state of the question. Yet he has to confess the uniqueness of expressions in the work, as in xxii. 2,
where no parallel is forthcoming;¹ and in
ii. 13, where he would drop a word out of
the text.² "Is not the Apocalypse," he
asks, "the production of an excited state
of mind and of the most vivid feeling?
Is it not prophetic poetry?" This reason-
ing applied to the Old Testament prophets
would justify the expectation of frequent
and peculiar Hebrew constructions in
them. Do they not write the same kind
of Hebrew as the historians and poets?
Does any one violate Hebrew construction
extensively because he is in an excited
state of mind? We must not deprive
the apocalyptist of conscious calmness when
he wrote. The very fact, indeed, of his
writing in Greek and following Hebrew
so much is against the peculiarities he
exhibits.

The characteristic differences now stated
between the apocalyptist and evangelist
should be considered in their bearing on
authorship. Perhaps some may still think
them consistent with identity. But the
argument is strong against it. Does not
absence of the evangelist's characteristic
expressions, or of such at least as suit
apocalyptic ideas, betray another writer?
Do not the new form of the evangelist's
terms and their new applications show
diversity? Thus the apocalyptist uses a
noun lamb,⁶ which never occurs in the
Gospel; the latter having the phrase Lamb
of God.⁴ The verb overcome⁶ is common
to the two; but a definite object accom-
panies it in the Gospel, as the world, the
evil one; while the Revelation uses it
absolutely. The Gospel has one word for
liar,⁹ the Apocalypse a kindred but not
identical one.⁷ The latter has the noun
Jerusalem ⁸ singular and indeclinable; the
former has it plural and declined.⁹ Beh-
hold is written differently in the two.¹⁰

The phraseology of the apocalyptist is
characterized by such expressions as ἡ
οἰκουμένη, οἱ κατακομβῖντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἡ
µαρτυρία Ἱησοῦ, ὁ µάρτυς applied to Christ,
ἤ αρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ πρῶτοςκος
tón νεκρῶν, κρατεῖ τὸ ὅμορα, τὴν διάχυραν,
pαντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἀρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς;
all foreign to the evangelist; whereas the
favorite expressions and ideas of the lat-
ter—ἡ ἁλάθεια, ποιεῖ τὴν ἁλάθειαν, εἶναι
ἐκ τῆς ἁλάθειας, ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ὁ κόσμος, ὁ
πονηρός, ὁ ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, τὰ
tέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, σκοτία φως, ὁ ἀρχων
πάλιν καθὼς, δοξάζωσιν καὶ ἐνεπάρτωσι, τα-
ράσσοντες, παρθησία, πιστεῖν—do not ap-
pear in the Apocalypse, or very seldom.

The diversities now given, doctrinal,
thological, and linguistic, are explained
by apologists consistently with one author-
ship. The scholars already mentioned try
to find the same or similar expressions in
both, overlooking those which are charac-
teristic; or discover reasons for the diver-
sities; viz. difference of subject, of age,
and of mental state.

The first of these three reasons has
some weight. The Apocalypse is a pro-
phetic book describing the future in poetic
colors. Yet in the epistles to the seven
churches, which are of the same character
with John's first Epistle, and should be a
fair subject of comparison, diversity is
more prominent than likeness. A differ-
tent tone and style appear. The composi-
tions are characteristically different.

The argument of age urged by Olshau-
sen and Guericke has little force. Writ-
ten as they believe the Revelation to have
been twenty years before the fourth Gospel,
it shows marks of inexperience in composi-
tion as well as of an ardent temperament
and youthful fire. It is like the first essay
of one expressing his ideas in a language
to which he is unaccustomed. But the
author, if he were John, must have been
about sixty years of age when he wrote,
a time when inexperience and youthful

¹ µὴν εἶ ἐκαστὸς
² δι.
³ ἀρχήν.
⁴ ὁ ἄμως τοῦ θεοῦ.
⁵ νικᾶν.
⁶ θεῦτης.
⁷ Ἑρωδία.
⁸ Ιερουσαλήμ.
⁹ Ιερουσάλημ.
¹⁰ Ἰούλ. Ἰω.
The Revelation.

fire are past; and the language of the Apocalypse bears no evidence of a beginner's bungling attempt, but has the marks of a consistent and settled usage—of a definite type hardly consistent with the transformation involved in the linguistic phenomena of the Gospel.\(^1\) Kolthoff's comparison of the earlier and later epistles of Paul shows that time is insufficient to account for the characteristic differences between the evangelist and apocalyptist. Nothing but the hypothesis of more than one person can explain them.

Others find the chief cause of diversity in the phrase I was in the spirit (i. 10). Thus Hengstenberg supposes that John was in an ecstatic state, or at least in a passive or receptive condition of mind. The visions and their coloring were given, says Ebrard; whereas John's own reflectiveness appears in the fourth Gospel. His mind was active in the one, passive in the other. We object to this assumption, because it deprives the author of consciousness, and is contrary to the analogy of prophecy. The Old Testament seers were never without consciousness, even in their highest moments of inspiration. Their own individuality appears, each retaining his characteristic peculiarities of conception and language. Ezekiel and Zechariah had visions; yet their own reflectiveness is manifest. So it was with the author of the Revelation, whom we must not convert into an unconscious machine controlled by the Spirit. Had he written down the visions at the time he received them, the idea that he was overpowered by the substance of the communications might appear more plausible.

We conclude that whatever deductions be made on the ground that the work is prophetic poetry, not prose; that the author was a younger man when he wrote the Apocalypse; that the character of his inspiration was higher, his object different; and that he should not be restricted to the same circle of ideas and language; enough remains to show another than the evangelist. The idiosyncrasies are not neutralized by minor coincidences.

At the time of the Reformation, Erasmus intimated his suspicions, thinking it strange that one writing revelations should repeat his name so carefully, I John, I John, as if he were drawing out a bond, not a book, which is contrary both to the usage of other apostles and his own; for in the Gospel he speaks more modestly, and never gives his name. When Paul is forced to speak of his visions, he explains the thing in the person of another. Erasmus proceeds to say, that in the Greek copies he had seen, the title was of John the divine, not John the evangelist; and that the language is not a little different from that of the Gospel and first Epistle.\(^2\) Luther speaks more decidedly against the apostle's authorship. "More than one thing presents itself in this book as a reason why I hold it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic. First and most of all, that the prophets do not concern themselves with visions, but with prophecy, in clear, plain words, as Peter, Paul, and Christ in the gospel do; for it belongs to the apostolic office, clearly and without image or vision to speak about Christ and his work. Moreover, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, not to speak of the New, who is occupied with visions throughout; so that I almost imagine to myself a fourth book of Esdras before me, and certainly can find no reason for believing that it was set forth by the Holy Spirit. Besides, it seems to me far too arrogant in him to enjoin it upon his readers to regard his own as of more importance than any other sacred book, and to threaten that if any one shall take aught away from it, God will take away from him his part in the book of life. Moreover, even were it a blessed thing to believe what is contained in it, no man knows what that is. The

\(^1\) See Lütcke's Einleitung, p. 664, 2d ed.

\(^2\) Annotationes in Apocalypsin Joannis, Novum Testamentum, ed. 1, p. 625.
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book is believed in (and is really just the same to us) as though we had it not; and many nobler books exist for us to believe in. . . . But let every man think of it as his spirit prompts him. My spirit cannot adapt itself to the production; and this is reason enough for me that I should not highly esteem it, that Christ is neither thought of nor perceived in it; which is the great business of an apostle."

Though he used milder language afterwards, Luther never retracted his doubts. Zwingli would not accept passages in proof from the Apocalypse, “because it is not a biblical book,” i. e., a canonical one. Ecolampadius and Bucer seem to have had the same opinion. Carlstadt shared their doubts. Michaelis assigned reasons for the negative view. Many others have followed in the same path, including Lücke, Ewald, Neander, Bleek, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. De Wette’s axiomatic principle is right, that if the apostle wrote the fourth Gospel, he did not write the Apocalypse. The critical sagacity of those who attribute both to John cannot be applauded.

Credner, Bleek, and Ewald assign the book to John the presbyter, an hypothesis contrary to external and supported by no internal evidence. Little probability belongs to the opinion of Hitzig, that the author is John Mark, from whom the second Gospel proceeded; his arguments being based on analogies of language and construction which are overpowered by weightier phenomena. But Hausrath approves it.

Time and Place.

There is diversity of opinion about the time and place at which the book was written. The prevailing notion has been that it was composed A. D. 95 or 96, under Domitian or Nerva. This agrees with the tradition that John was banished to Patmos towards the close of the former’s reign, where he had the visions described in the book. The fact of his exile is first mentioned by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, then by Eusebius and Jerome. Clement styles the emperor who banished him a tyrant. Epiphanius makes him Claudius, a Syriac version of the Apocalypse published by De Dieu, Nero, with which Theophylact agrees. Origen affirms merely that he was a Roman emperor. The author of the Synopsis concerning the life and death of the prophets, apostles, and disciples of the Lord, said to be Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, calls him Trajan. Hegesippus knew nothing of the apostle’s banishment; neither did Ireneüs; the latter merely saying that John had the visions in Patmos. Subsequent writers deduced from Ireneüs’s statement that Domitian banished the apostle, because he says the Apocalypse was revealed in Patmos in the reign of that emperor. The tradition respecting the exile may have arisen in part from a false interpretation of i. 9, and may be pronounced unhistorical.

In the absence of credible external evidence, internal considerations come to our aid. Jerusalem had not been destroyed; if it had the catastrophe would have been noticed. There are distinct allusions to its impending judgment. We see from xi. 1-14, that the holy city should be occupied by the Gentiles, and only a tenth part of it be destroyed by an earthquake, but the temple is supposed to be still standing. Had both been thrown down the fact would have been noticed. This is confirmed by xvii. 10. “And there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come;” i. e., when the writer lived five emperors had fallen; the sixth was reigning, and the other had not yet come. The series begins with Octavianus, so that Galba is the sixth, “The king that is.” The fallen ones are Octavianus, Tiberius, Caligula,

1 Preface to the Revelation, 1522.

2 Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften, 1843.
Claudius, Nero. Others begin the series with Julius Caesar and make Nero the sixth. Galba is then the seventh, who reigned but seven months. This reckoning is faulty, since Julius Caesar was not an Augustus; nor was it till Octavianus and his successors that the Romans ruled over Jerusalem. Others, beginning with Octavianus, make the sixth Vespasian; Galba, Otho, and Vitellius being passed over. The most probable view is that the original was composed under Galba, after Nero's death; which agrees best with the words "the beast that was and is not, and yet is" (xvii. 8). "He is the eighth, and is of the seven" (xvii. 11) is also a plain reference to the return of one who had been one of the seven (the fifth).

The early date, i.e., that soon after Nero, not the late one in Domitian's reign, is usually allowed at the present time. We fix it between June 9, A. D. 68, when Nero died, and January 15, A. D. 69, when Galba was murdered. Conservative theologians, like Hengstenberg and Hofmann, cling to the Domitianic reign, and most English commentators adopt it, as agreeing better with their interpretation of the book, which makes it a kind of church history.

The chief arguments adduced against an early date are the following:

(a.) Nero's persecution did not extend to the provinces.

Were it necessary to speak of the extent of Nero's persecution, we might refer to Tertullian, who mentions the laws \(^1\) of Nero and Domitian against the Christians; an expression, says Milman, \(^2\) too distinct to pass for rhetoric even in that passionate writer; and to Orosius, who expressly testifies to its extension beyond Rome. \(^3\) But it cannot be maintained that the Neronian persecution was other than partial. The examples of suffering mentioned in the epistles to the seven churches of Asia Minor do not need for their explanation the extension of such persecution to the provinces of the empire. That a martyr called Antipas had suffered at Pergamos even in Nero's reign need not excite surprise; and individual Christians may have suffered in the provinces even before Nero. Heathen magistrates, as well as Jews, were ready to put forth their enmity, even when imperial edicts forbade injury to the persons of believers.

(b.) It is also said that the Nicolaitans did not form a sect as early as A. D. 68 or 69.

Irenaeus mentions the Nicolaitans in his time, deriving the name from the Deacon Nicolas (Acts vi.), and referring the allusion in the Apocalypse to them. Other fathers adopt the same view, without troubling themselves about its incredibility. \(^4\) There is some evidence that they were a sect; but none that Nicolas the proselyte of Antioch was its founder. The writer finds a resemblance between them and Balaam, who taught the Israelites to eat things offered to idols and commit adultery. The name Nicolaitans is symbolic, being formed like the word Balaam, \(^5\) and does not refer to the followers of one Nicolas, but to a sect of libertines who indulged their fleshly lusts, believing that the spiritual emancipated them from the material. They belonged to the second century.

(c.) The condition of the seven churches shows that they had been founded a con-

---

1 Commentaries.
2 The History of Christianity, p. 188 note, ed. Murdock, New York.
3 "Romae Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affectit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit." — Adversus Paganos, lib. vii. 7.
4 The notices of Nicolas in Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Clement of Alexandria, are unworthy
5 Awsor from יָבֳרַך to swallow up or destroy the people; Nicolaita from נוֹכָלְתָּא.
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siderable time; which disagrees with an early date of the book. In answer to this argument it has been stated that the Ephesian church may have soon left its first love. It was planted before A.D. 61; and the ardor of converts is liable to cool quickly under trying circumstances. The answer is insufficient. An early date for the composition of the epistles to the seven churches cannot be maintained. They were written later than the body of the work to which they are prefixed by the translator of the latter. We assign them to the reign of Hadrian, because the public appearance of sectaries, according to Hegesippus, did not exist till Trajan's reign. Before, sects had lurked in dark places. The reign of Hadrian is a probable date, i.e., before 130 A.D., when that emperor began to rebuild Jerusalem on the ruins of the old city. The reign of Domitian is too early. The description of the errorists in the epistles is not definite enough for us to identify them with known names. All that can be ascertained is, that dualistic gnosis and gross libertinism had infected some of the churches. Irenæus and those who follow his date have some foundation for their opinion. But a more probable view is that the book did not assume its present form till the reign of Hadrian, which date belongs to the translator and interpolator. The Aramaean Apocalypse, which forms the body of the work, is earlier. Thus different parts of the book justify different dates—a fact that should not be overlooked. This view differs materially from that of Pfeiderer, who, having assumed on precarious grounds that two writers were engaged on the apocalyptic body of the work, with two Christians, an interpolator and final redactor, assigns some parts to the time of Domitian and some to the reign of Hadrian under the hand of the last redactor. The redactor, being conservative, did not adapt the times of the Apocalypse to his own, but allowed them to stand.

About the locality of the authors we are left to conjecture. The apocalyptist may have been in Rome when he wrote, foreboding the future. The translator was probably in Ephesus, for he shows his knowledge of the churches in Asia Minor.

Class of Writings to which the Apocalypse belongs.

Pareus seems to have been the first who thought the book a prophetic drama. A similar opinion was afterwards held by Hartwig, who terms it a symbolical dramatic poem. The genius of Eichhorn elaborated this view with much ability; and the hypothesis of its being a regular dramatic poem is usually associated with his name. He makes the following divisions: The title, i. 1–3; the prologue, i. 4–iv. 22; the drama in three acts preceded by a prelude, iv. 1–xxii. 5. The prelude consists of iv. 1–viii. 5. The first act sets forth, in three scenes, the destruction of Jerusalem, the overturning of Judaism, and the church's weak condition after that catastrophe (viii. 6–xii. 17). The second act represents the downfall of heathenism (xii. 18—xx. 10). The third act describes Jerusalem descending from heaven (xx. 11—xxii. 5). The epilogue contains a threefold address— that of the angel, of Christ, and of John (xxii. 6–11). This ingenious theory needs no refutation. Stuart calls the poem an epopee, a name as objectionable as drama. The body of the work is a Jewish Apocalypse.

The Object for which the Apocalypse was written.

The object of the apocalyptic writer was to set forth the immediate coming of Messiah, in order to support his fellow-believers under calamities already endured and still impending. The world had shown its opposition to the truth, and would exhibit i. pp. 10 et seq.; and Einleit. in das Neue Testament, vol. ii. § 190, pp. 369 et seq.
still greater hostility. Hence believers were encouraged to look for his speedy advent, and to hold fast their profession. By steadfast adherence to the faith, the redeemed should receive their blessed reward in the new kingdom of God. The circumstances seemed sufficiently alarming. The misery of war, the terrors of frequent executions, the perplexities of political affairs, hopes and fears of the future, had produced much excitement among the Jews, who looked for a great revolution, which, beginning with the purification of Jerusalem and the downfall of Rome, should issue in the coming of Messiah, the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world, and the establishment of a spiritual Jerusalem. The heathen seemed to have concentrated their strength against the faithful. Calamities already endured looked as though they were the prelude to greater. The atmosphere was lowering. Well might the Jews tremble. Some had fallen away, needing repentance. Hence it was necessary to reprove as well as console, to censure as well as to encourage. The central idea of the book is Messiah's coming, which constitutes its prophetic character. The time is at hand, and therefore there is no cause for despair. The period of endurance is short. Such is the sum of the seer's writing. Nothing was better fitted to make the readers steadfast in the faith. The great event that formed the consummation of their hopes, the expected redemption to which their weary souls turned for solace, was nigh. The suffering may have sorrowfully thought that they should not be able to stand the shock of their enemies; but the writer points to the triumph of truth and righteousness. Exalted honors, glorious rewards await him who endures to the end. The book arose out of specific circumstances, and was meant to serve a definite object. When the lot of the writer was cast in troubous times, what better theme could he have to strengthen and comfort his fellow-disciples than the speedy appearance of Messiah and the consummation of all?

The kingdom is realized in the new Jerusalem, the conception of which is at once earthly and heavenly. Glorified earth is the heaven of the Apocalypse. The new Jerusalem is a resuscitation of the old, gorgeously renovated and adorned; showing that the seer could not divest himself of sensuous ideas. Heaven, according to him, is not a state beyond the present earthly one, in which complete happiness exists; it is another condition of the earthly. The present and future mingling in a picture painted on material ground. The object of the Christian writer was like that of the apocalyptic. He also lived in distressful times, and wished both to console and strengthen his co-religionists, which he did by announcing Christ's speedy advent to set up a kingdom of peace and happiness, where his victorious followers should be rewarded with a glorious crown.

But what shall be said of the author's prognostications? Were they mistaken? History has proved that they were.

The predictions of the book have been unfulfilled, and their accomplishment cannot be in the future. But unfulfilled predictions need not be a stumbling-block to the reader, since they are not absent from portions both of the Old and New Testaments. As the pictures and ideas of the book proceed for the most part from the authors' imagination, no objective things can put the element of foreknowledge into them. It is vain, therefore, to look for secular history in the Revelation. It contains neither a syllabus of the world's progress nor of that of the Roman empire. Neither is it a compendious history of the church itself. The authors' horizon is dim and limited. Their glances at the immediate past are brief; they do not dwell upon the present, but have respect to the near future, where great phenomena fill the sphere of their vision.

These remarks are sustained by the
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prologue and epilogue, where Christ's second advent is alluded to. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, for the time is at hand."

"The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass." "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus." They also agree with the apocalyptic part.

General Structure.

The work is disposed on a symmetrical plan, a knowledge of which is a guide to a right perception of the vision-drapery. Seven is the leading number throughout. There are seven spirits before the Father's throne, seven epistles to seven churches, seven stars, seven candlesticks, seven seals, seven eyes, seven horns, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven heads on the beast, seven thunders. Subdivisions of this number are three and four. The phases of the future are three,—seals, trumpets, and vials. The first four scenes in each of these are closely connected, being separated from the following by a concluding figure. The seventh trumpet brings the description of three enemies, the dragon, the beast with seven heads and ten horns, and another beast. The number seven is also subdivided into three and a half; or a time, times, and half a time (xii.14). Thus some numbers play an important part in the arrangement, and determine the general method of the work. The interpreter must carefully distinguish between the normal and the subordinate. Stuart has made too much of this principle of numerosity, as he terms it, without a proper discernment of the numbers. Instead of making three the most conspicuous in the author's plan, he should have made seven. Three and four are less prominent, being parts of seven. Ten and twelve do not belong to the general disposition. Zallig is right in ascribing the cardinal number.¹

Analysis of Contents.

The apocalyptic picture consists of visions like those of Daniel. The descriptions, colors, symbols, figures, are taken from the Old Testament prophets, especially Zechariah, Ezekiel, and the book of Daniel. Fourth Esdras and the book of Enoch also supplied ideas. The passages in Enoch which are most like those in the Revelation are given by Huidkoper in his "Judaism at Rome," pp. 487, 488, 3d edition. The apocalyptic author lived in the Old Testament prophecies of a Messianic future, and his originality lies in the combination of scattered views and the artificial construction of his book. He revises apocalyptic elements, expands the great Hebrew theocratic conception, accommodating it to the progress of events, and forms his materials into a sublime picture vitalized by the breath of a fiery genius.

The future is said to be written in a book with seven seals which the Lion of the tribe of Juda alone could open; and the seer is permitted to have a view of its contents. As the seals are successively broken, calamities befall the righteous, putting their fidelity to the test. After the sixth, the believing people are themselves sealed with the name of God, for security against danger. When the seventh is opened, seven angels with trumpets appear, announcing one after another various punishments on the evil world. The seventh trumpet is followed by a description of the hellish powers that oppose Messiah, with the announcement of their destruction. This is succeeded by the final catastrophe, or the outpouring of the vials of divine wrath, and the decisive battle. Rome falls by the returning antichristian emperor, who falls in his turn before the Messiah; the devil is chained for a thousand years, at the end of which he is let loose and besieges the holy city, but is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.

¹ Die Offenbarung Johannis vollstandig erklärt, Einleitung, pp. 120 et seq.
Then come the resurrection, the general judgment, and eternal blessedness in the New Jerusalem. The seals, trumpets, and vials are successive phases in the development of the great drama. Though parallel in their general import, they increase in intensity as they near the final catastrophe.

We need scarcely say that the Jews in Jerusalem were not separated and purified as the seer anticipated. All were destroyed, with the holy sanctuary and the city itself. Antichrist did not return from the East in the person of Nero to devour and lay waste. Paganism indeed fell, but not so soon as represented. The first and second resurrections, with their associated events, did not happen. Nor did Christ come personally. Yet he came again by his spirit. His religion conquered heathenism. Imperial Rome fell. The non-fulfillment of the seer's hopes arose from the fact that they were essentially Jewish. Had they been of a Christian type, they would have presented a different aspect. Without objective sensuousness or close imitation of Daniel's visions, they would have grasped the living power of religion. Above all, the universal love of God, that great motive power which regenerates mankind, would have filled the seer's soul. But in spite of the Judaism that runs through the book, and the forms borrowed from surrounding circumstances, a few great ideas lie at the foundation. Stripping off the temporal and individual characteristics that make up the body of it, we come to the writer's inner conviction, that evil concentrates itself in new forms; that the power of the world however strong cannot reach the heart of religion, though it may damage its outworks; and that good alone, trodden to the ground as it may be, shall finally triumph.

The Jewish Apocalypse may be divided into three parts, viz.: —

1. The vision of the seals, iv. 1—vii. 8.
2. The vision of the trumpets, viii. 1—xi. 19. The Jerusalem fragment, x. 1—xi. 13, is inserted.
3. The Messianic book, xii. 1—xxii. 5, with two insertions, xiv. 6—20, and xvii.—xix. 5.

The introduction consists of i. 1—20 and chapters ii. iii.; the conclusion, of xxii. 6—21.

The prophet paints the overthrow of heathenism identified with the Roman empire. That empire again is symbolized by its head, Nero, who had recently fallen by his own hand. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the East, whence he should return with an army, is here described by the poet. The belief in Nero's survival was widespread among heathens and Jews. Besides Suetonius and Tacitus, it is referred to by Dio Cassius, Zonaras and Dio Chrysostom. The author of the Sibylline Oracle v., or at least the Jewish parts of it, mentions him as returning from beyond the Euphrates, to which he had fled. So, too, the author of the fourth oracle. The belief was prevalent in the latter half of the first century. Nero is Antichrist, Satanic Antichrist opposed to Messiah. This interpretation is as old as Commodian (A.D. 240). The Roman power is personified and embodied in Nero, who should reappear in the character of Antichrist. The great persecutor of the believers at that particular crisis was readily identified with Antichrist, because in effect he elevated himself against Messiah, and struck terror into the pious by his cruelties. Thus the Apocalypse exhibits the triumph of Judaism over paganism. Dramatic scenes precede; and the reader is led on to the final issue. The object of the Apocalypse is not to describe the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem preparatory to its ideal restoration, as Mommsen supposes; but the destruction of the seat and centre of paganism, that is, of Rome. The partial destruction of Jerusalem is only an intercalated fragment in the description leading on to the catastrophe which prepares the way for the consummation of the whole in the New Jerusalem.
A brief survey of some phenomena will throw light on the meaning of the book.

1. The Apocalypse, as has been already remarked, is not a closely coherent work, but a loose compound. The redactor did not make out of the pieces at his disposal a consistent whole. Perhaps the materials he had, created a difficulty, some being only fragments. He did not indeed proceed without a method, but it is artificial and incompact. His arrangement cannot be called good. Imagination may have overpowered the logical sequence of the visions he had to deal with; and as a translator, he must have been occasionally perplexed, not only in harmonizing the symbols, but in discerning the distinctive features of the dramatic scenes that swept past his admiring gaze.

2. The little book mentioned in x. 1 is perhaps the same as the book in v. 1. It contains the fate of Jerusalem, and its contents are concentrated. What had hitherto been idea and vision to the prophet now becomes historical and actual. The scene shifts from heaven to earth. Hence the seer says in xii. 18 (xiii. 1): "I stood upon the sand of the sea;" whereas he had been taken up to heaven at the commencement of the first part (iv. 1). The preparations for the impending event take place in heaven. When it is on the eve of accomplishment, earth is the theatre.

3. The seventh chapter presents a difficulty. In the enumeration of the tribes Dan is omitted, and Manasseh is mentioned separately, though Joseph includes both it and Ephraim. Hence it is counted twice, making the number twelve. Probably Dan is omitted because it was a small and unimportant tribe, while Manasseh is specified to complete the required number.

4. The beast with seven heads and ten horns rising up out of the sea is the Roman power personified, or Anti-christ. The seven heads are identical with the seven kings or emperors; and the ten horns are the ten proconsuls, imperial vicegerents in the thirty provinces. The head, slain as it were, yet having its deadly wound healed, represents Nero. The dragon which gave power to the beast is Satan (xiii. 4). The same beast is depicted in xvii. 3, as scarlet-colored, full of names of blasphemy. The woman on the beast is the great city Babylon, or Rome, the metropolis of spiritual harlotry. The second beast, or the false prophet who helps the first beast, is a personification of heathen prophecy, including magic, astrology, auguries, omens, etc., supporting the idolatry concentrated in Roman imperialism. It is improbable to refer the false prophet to the Emperor Vespasian, as Hildebrandt does; and all but absurd to identify him with Paul because the apostle recommends every soul to be subject to the reigning sovereign Nero, in the Epistle to the Romans (xiii. 1, etc.). Yet Volkmar puts forth the conjecture.

5. The number of the beast is said to be the number of a man, 666 (xiii. 18). This is made up of the numeral letters in Caesar Nero. A shorter form of Nero would make 616, which is a very ancient reading for 666, as we learn from Irenæus. Objection has been made to this explanation, that the author writes in Greek, not Hebrew; but the original was Hebrew. The "Kings of the East," in xvi. 12, are the confederates of the beast, who are about to join him in the final conflict that results in victory.

6. After the fourth angel sounds his trumpet, a threefold woe is announced in viii. 13. In ix. 12, it is said that the first woe, corresponding to the fifth trumpet-sound, is past, and that two more are to come. In xi. 14, the second woe is past,

---

1 ἔστάθη, as Tischendorf rightly reads, not ἔστάθη, which Lachmann has.

2 ρ = 100, ς = 60, ρ = 200; α = 50, διάρρηκτον βασίλευς; ς = 200, α = 6, διάρρηκτον βασίλευς, i.e., νηκτάρ βασίλευς.

3 Instead of ἔσταθη instead of ἔσταθη.
“and behold the third woe cometh quickly.” Yet the third woe is not mentioned afterwards. When or where did it come? Hengstenberg affirms that the third woe and seventh trumpet-sound are in xi. 15–19; and explains the point arbitrarily. With Baur, we find the third woe in xvi. 15, “Behold I come as a thief.”

7. Some have thought that the eleventh chapter describes a catastrophe befalling Jerusalem similar to that which afterwards happened to Rome. In this view, the fall of Judaism and the fall of heathenism are leading phenomena in the book. Accordingly Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and others suppose the general theme to be Christianity triumphant over Judaism as well as paganism. This is incorrect. What happens to Jerusalem is not a final catastrophe or total destruction, but a partial judgment or purifying process which is only a subordinate scene in the drama. Jerusalem is not destroyed, but preserved. The theocratic seed is spared. Believing Judaism is still an object of the divine favor. The author, himself a Jew, supposes that the city and outer court of the temple should be trodden down by the heathen for three years and a half, a number taken from Daniel; but that the temple itself should be spared, with the worshipers in it, during that period. This is different from the fate of Rome, the persecuting and implacable enemy doomed to total destruction. Jerusalem should only suffer in part and for a season. The holy city should be spared, and the faithful inhabitants protected by Jehovah, while the unbelieving should be destroyed. A comparatively small portion of the city falls (the tenth), and only seven thousand of the inhabitants. In vain did the seer measure the temple, the altar, and the worshipers. A Roman soldier snatched a torch and set the holy house on fire so that it soon became a heap of ruins. No sign of the Son of man appeared in heaven. A cloud of smoke hung over the city. The Gentiles trod down more than the outer court, and falsified the writer’s hope of his nation. But prophetic idealism plays its part in the drama, as it did in the old Jewish seers; and one who borrows from them so largely is subject to like limitation.

8. The hope of a happy future, a golden age of the world, has had a place in the mythologies of many nations. The brighter day which was to dawn cheered desponding minds among the Greeks and Romans. The triumph of Ormuzd over Ahriman, tantamount to the disappearance of evil, was looked for by the Persians. The universal yearning of humanity for a blessed era of righteousness, peace, and happiness, is a spiritual instinct that comforts hearts dissatisfied with the present. Such is the millennium of the New Testament, and its continuation in the heavenly abode. There is no trace of millenarianism in the fourth Gospel, where Christ’s judging and condemning are taken spiritually. The chaining and loosing of Satan during and at the end of the period, respectively, together with the attack of the heathen powers on the followers of the Lamb, are also unique, and disagree with Christ’s discourse in the 24th chapter of the first Gospel; nor are they in harmony with Paul’s sentiments (1 Cor. xv. 23–28). The apostolic Christians believed that the Messiah returning to earth would judge all, translating believers freed from sin and stain to a better world, and casting the wicked into a place of punishment. In the Apocalypse a first resurrection, which is peculiar to the New Testament book, appears, having been preceded perhaps by a judgment to determine who is worthy to have part in the millennial kingdom. The resurrection is in the body, and earth continues in its ordinary state, which disagrees with what Christ taught (Matt. xxii. 30), and with 1 Cor. xv. 42, etc. The so-called first resurrection in Daniel xii. 2, etc., includes Jews.
alone; a thousand years' interval before a second resurrection occurs belongs to the Apocalypse. Again, in Paul's doctrine, no definite duration is assigned to the period between the appearing of Christ and the end, when he gives up the sovereignty to God. The time of Christ's visible government of the world until the end of all things is left indeterminate, and is characterized by unceasing war against hostile powers; while the writer in Revelation regards it as the reign of undisturbed blessedness during which the faithful are visibly united, Satan being powerless. The two writers agree in supposing an interval between the second advent and the end of the world; they differ not merely in Paul's silence as to the duration of that interval, but in the way that divine sovereignty is exercised. The Pauline idea is that foes shall war and be overcome; the apocalyptic, that there shall be nothing but uninterrupted happiness. In giving expression to hopes and aspirations, the seer paints a subjective state for which no objective correspondence in the future should be looked for. That it is merely ideal is apparent from certain incongruities, such as the risen saints having their camp beside the earthly Jerusalem, and being attacked by heathen nations; as well as from the existence of heathen enemies, after all the inhabitants of the earth are slain (xix. 21).

The millennium was not unknown to the Jewish Christians, to whom it came from the later Jews, who had speculated about the age of the world and its seven thousand years' duration. The combination of Psalm xc. 4 with the seven days of creation led to the inference of seven thousand. The happy or Messianic thousand of the seven was the last, the period of blissful rest; as God rested from his works on the seventh day. The eschatology of the twentieth chapter is Jewish.\footnote{See Tanchuma, fol. 255.1; Gemara Aboda Sara I. p. 65, ed. Edz.; Sanhedrin, fol. 07.2, 02.1; Pesikta in Yalkut Shimoni II. fol. 56, c. 3, n. 359; Eisenmenger's Entdeckt. Jud. tom. II. pp. 692, 678, etc.} 9. As to the period described in the last two chapters, that of the new heavens and new earth, most interpreters take it to be what is commonly called heaven; while some, as Hammond, Hug, and Bush, think it alludes to a flourishing state of the church on earth. These views are substantially one, since the renewed earth with the happiness of the saints upon it coincides with heaven. The ideas and imagery are taken partly from the Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel, but more perhaps from current Jewish notions; for the descriptions of the three concluding chapters express sentiments occurring in the Talmud. The new heaven and the new earth, the old passing away, Jerusalem and its relation to the heathen nations, the first resurrection or that of the righteous, the casting of the wicked into Gehinnom to be tormented with fire and brimstone, the attack and overthrow of Gog and Magog, which are here two peoples, leading up to the judgment and the end of the world, such a picture of the future Messianic age appears in that book, even with details parallel to those in the Apocalypse. The eschatology of the Jewish work in its unwritten state has been reproduced to a considerable extent by the apocalyptic writer, whose hopes are that heaven and earth should become one in the future kingdom of Messiah. Heaven descends to earth, and earth becomes heaven. The holy church in her triumphant state is the fulfilment of all that was associated with ancient Jerusalem in the Hebrew heart. She is depicted as God's dwelling-place, the sacred city, new Jerusalem, the chaste spouse of Messiah. This is the ultimate aim of all apocalyptic prophecy, the completion of the mystery of God. The picture embodies conceptions of the consummation of the church, or, in other words, the happiness of the righteous. The blessed era is essentially a continuation of
the millennium, with a small interruption occasioned by a gathering of Satanic forces for the overthrow of the saints, followed by universal judgment. To attempt to find particulars corresponding to the figures employed were to convert poetry into prose. The ideas of the seer should be left indefinite, else their beauty vanishes. No mystic meaning lies in the details. Elements expressive of magnificence and splendor are combined to give rhetorical beauty to the composition. A new Jerusalem symbolizes a state of pure happiness, and a Jew cannot separate the glorious future of earth and heaven from the loved metropolis of his sires.

10. The Apocalypse keeps to the Jewish standpoint throughout. Jews and Gentiles are not merged in a common description of the saved; they are distinguished, as in vii. 1–9, etc. Even in the millennium the latter are separate from the Jews; and when the kingdom of God is completed, Gentiles are external (xxi. 24; xxii. 2).

Canonicity and Value.

It is usually thought that the question of authorship affects canonicity and value. But it is not of essential moment that the Revelation should be written by a son of Zebedee. Value does not depend on canonicity, but on contents. Degrees of excellence attach to the canonical writings. We are far from denying that authorship is of consequence; but it is not of the highest. The man who composed the fourth Gospel and he who interpolated a Jewish Apocalypse would necessarily write differently, because their mental development was unequal. Apostles themselves were not gifted alike. The Apocalypse is not of the same authority as if it had been written by a Christian. Its Judaic texture, the story respecting Nero coming back from the East with a Parthian army after he had taken away his own life, and the part which that emperor occupies in the apocalyptic prophecy generally, do not consist with Christian sentiments. The inquirer feels that the more he examines the stronger is his belief that the book breathes another spirit than that of the fourth Gospel. The proper evangelical sentiment which we see in Matt. xxiv. 14, Rom. xi. 25, is wanting; and the general tone clashes with Mark xiii. 32. The apocalypticist's view of the kingdom of God and its realization on earth is neither pure nor original, because unseparated from the features and forms of the old theocracy, and linked to the fortunes of an empire. Instead of the slow development of events requiring patience and faith on the part of the saints, the writer looks for sudden catastrophes, divine judgments upon hostile powers. Yet the book has exerted a great influence upon mankind. A certain moral expression running through its symbolical descriptions tells with power upon the susceptible Christian. In moving and strengthening the soul, in bearing it upward to the throne of God amid suffering, sorrow, and persecution, in attracting its sympathies towards the faithful followers of the Lamb, and in exciting aspirations which can only be realized in the new city so gorgeously painted at the close, its prophetic utterances have a value. The general strain is elevating. Alluring promises console the righteous; awful warnings deter them from unfaithfulness to their vocation; the Almighty's vengeance appalls the wicked. The grandeur of the book urges the spirit forward in the difficult path of duty with the hope of a glorious crown, a golden harp, celestial fruits, refreshing waters of the river of life; the desire of living and reigning with God in perpetual blessedness. The lower place which the work occupies is not seen till its contents are examined in detail. The following are the Christian insertions or additions which the Jewish Apocalypse received: Chapters i. 4–9, 20; ii., iii.; v. 1–vi. 1, 22; vii. 9–17; ix. 11 “in the Hebrew tongue and in the Greek tongue has
the name Apollyon;” xi. 8 “which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt,” etc., 15 “and of his Christ;” xii. 11, 12; xiii. 8-10; xiv. 1-5, 12, 13; xv. 3 “and the song of the lamb;” xvi. 15; xvii. 6 “and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,” 14; xviii. 20 “and ye holy apostles;” xix. 5-10, 13; xx. 5-8, 14, 23 “and the lamb is the light thereof,” 27 “the Lamb’s;” xxii. 1, 3 “and of the lamb,” 6-21.

**Schemes of Interpretation.**

Schemes of interpretation, preterist, continuous, future, and spiritual, adopted by different commentators, must all be rejected, except the first. Expositors of the continuous and futurist class fall into the error of converting apocalyptic poetry into historical prose, and of making all symbols significant. Nor are preterists free from blame. In applying their principle of interpretation they are sure to err, if they try to show that all was fulfilled in the immediate future; or that the seer was infallibly guided in his prognostications and hopes. The so-called spiritual system is a compound of the historical and futurist. Regarding the book as containing warning and consolatory prophecies concerning the great leading forces which make their appearance in the conflict between Christ and the enemy, it spiritualizes certain parts of the Revelation, representing them as describing various conditions of the kingdom of God on earth. Vague, arbitrary, allegorizing as this system is, no sober interpreter can adopt it; though Archdeacon Lee is bold enough to fall in with it; and some others follow.1 The standpoint should be estimated by the mode in which the old prophets depicted the future, not as if they were able to predict events, but as they saw things to which their enraptured spirits were carried forward, and painted them in dim perspec-

tive. Their own sentiments, hopes, desires, and fears are elements in the pictures they draw — pictures whose general outline was real to them, though it is not to us.

Men had long groped in darkness; and foolish books had been written, till Reuss and other scholars at the same time found a key to solve part of the mystery overhanging the interpretation of the Revelation. To the solution of the remaining part Volter led the way by an acute analysis of the contents, though many of his divisions cannot be adopted. He was followed and improved upon by Weizsäcker. Weyland and Vischer arrived independently at similar results, putting the whole subject on a secure foundation, so that Pfleiderer and others found the way easy for their sketch of details.

**Errors into which Expositors have fallen.**

To enumerate all the mistakes committed by interpreters would be impossible. We can only glance at a few.

I. If all historic basis be abandoned, imagination has ample range for extravagance. The author did not forego time and place, elements that cannot safely be neglected. One city is the theatre of sublime and terrible occurrences, Babylon built on seven hills, — Rome, the representative of heathenism or antichristian idolatry. The judgment culminates in the catastrophe of Rome’s downfall, which is succeeded by the new Jerusalem. Historic personages of the time appear. Seven Roman emperors are alluded to; one in particular. Unless the expositor adhere to the historic present and immediate future of the seer, he will lose himself in endless conjecture. Jewish ideas of Messiah’s advent should be known. The prophet stands in the historical circumstances of his own time.

II. It is a fundamental mistake to look for a detailed history of the church, or of leading events in the world’s history that affect Christianity. Some find an epitome

---

1 See some excellent remarks on the subject by Dr. Gloag, *Introduction to the Johannine Writings*, pp. 378, 379.
of the church's history even in the epistles to the seven churches. Others find it in the remainder of the book; others, in both together. Accordingly, particular events are assigned to particular periods; persons are specified, peoples characterized, and definite names assigned. In this fashion the vicissitudes through which the Christian religion has passed in the world are supposed to be sketched. The allegorizing process by which such interpretation is supported cannot be repudiated too strongly. Though it has had advocates, Vitringa, Mede, Faber, Elliot, and others, it is inconsistent with the scope of the Apocalypse.

III. We should not look for a circumstance, event, person, or nation corresponding to the images of the seer. "All the particular traits in this large work," says Hug, "are by no means significant. Many are introduced only to enliven the representation, or are taken from the prophets and sacred books for the purpose of ornament; and no one who has any judgment in such matters will deny that the work is extraordinarily rich and gorgeous for a production of Western origin." This plain principle has been systematically violated by English commentators. Thus, one of them in explaining the language descriptive of the effect of the fifth angel-trumpet (ix. 1, etc.) pronounces the star fallen from heaven, Mohammed. The secret cave of Hera, near Mecca, is the pit of the abyss whence the pestilential fumes and darkness issued. The key of the abyss was given him in contrast to the key of God, in the Koran. The locusts to which the Saracens are compared are peculiarly Arabic, since the very name of the one suggests the other, both being similar in pronunciation and radicals! If the absurdity of this method needs exposure, the reader has only to look farther at the hypotheses respecting the two witnesses in the eleventh chapter, which

---

1 Fosdick's translation, p. 668.

2 עִבְרִית and אָמַרְתָּה אָמְרָם
who take a day for a year cannot establish the truth of their opinion. In prophecy, a day means a day as elsewhere, unless the time be indefinite, as has been proved by Maitland and Stuart. Most numbers in the Revelation should be taken indefinitely, being part of a poetic costume borrowed from the Old Testament.

VI. The twelfth and following chapters refer to the coming Messiah, the offspring of the theocratic church called the woman. The twelfth does not speak of the birth of Jesus, which was a past thing, but conveys the seer's fanciful ideas of the future Messiah. The description disagrees with one who had already come. It is quite Jewish; the Messiah, hitherto concealed with God in heaven, issuing from the church, and left to the protection of the divine throne, while the woman returns to earth to be exposed to Satan's fury.

VII. The peculiar exegesis which refers the book to heretics and sectaries began in the thirteenth century; of which

1 See Lücke, Einleitung, pp. 1005, 1006, 2d ed.
2 The General History of the Christian Church, chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John, pp. 170 et seq. 5th ed., 1812.
MODERN CLAIMS UPON THE PULPIT.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

The Articles of the English Church teach us that great churches have erred, and that councils have erred, and that any particular church may err. A preacher becomes absolutely intolerable—he alienates every instructed mind and every cultivated temperament among his hearers—when, instead of speaking the truth in modesty and love, he teaches what they know to be error with all the airs of sacerdotal pretension and usurped infallibility.

There are two great departments of knowledge which preachers are constantly tempted to invade, with no better equipment than that of a traditional and un instructed opinion, which has remained unchanged in the midst of progress, and which is often rendered still more offensive by being ornamented with a smattering of impossible apologetics. They are the domains of science and of Biblical criticism. In both domains numberless priests, and even whole generations of priests and religious teachers, have maintained and enforced views which are entirely false. The beacon light of progress over every such sunken reef of persecuting ignorance should serve as a warning to the modern teacher to avoid the arrogance of a science which takes itself for knowledge and denounces what it cannot understand.

A wide distinction must be drawn between the teaching of the church and the opinions of even the majority of the churchmen. All the divines and all the preachers of any particular age, and even of many ages in succession, may have held a particular opinion and have been unanimous in its defense, and yet it may in no sense belong to the teaching of the Catholic church. For instance, during nearly a thousand years—roughly speaking, from the days of Origen to the days of St. Anselm—the almost universal opinion in the church of the West was that God had paid to the devil a ransom for man’s salvation. Yet this all but universal inference—which was even enshrined in so famous a text-book as Peter Lombard’s “Sentences”—was no real doctrine of the church. It did indeed survive the days of Anselm, but it gradually crumbled to pieces when the argument of his “Cur Deus Homo” became generally known.

The church in her various creeds and formularies has maintained an absolute silence about many topics which millions of her sons have passed into the forefront of controversy. Martyrs have been burnt for holding truths which the dominant religious teachers of their day, “uniting the profession of priests with the trade and temper of executioners,” have anathematized as deadly heresies. But to attribute these fatal mistakes to popes, and priests, and councils is not to bring them home to the church herself so long as it is impossible to point to a single ecumenical utterance in which she has formally adopted them.

And thus it is perfectly true to say that there is and can be no antagonism between the church and science, while at the same time there is no more deplorable fact than the hostility to science which has been displayed century after century by the immense majority of the church’s repre-
sentatives. Not a few indeed of the martyrs of science have themselves been priests — among them Roger Bacon, one of the greatest of them all; but this has not saved them from years of anguish and persecution, inflicted upon them by their brethren. No one who is acquainted with the history of science, and has sufficient honesty to accept facts, can possibly deny that scarcely a single truth of capital importance in science has ever been enunciated without having to struggle for life against the fury of theological dogmatists. In every instance the dogmatists have been ignominiously defeated. The world moved, as Galileo said it did, in spite of the Inquisition. A great Puritan divine thought that he had checked the progress of astronomical inquiry when he said that he preferred to believe the Holy Ghost rather than Newton; yet Newton was absolutely right and the Puritan divine was hopelessly wrong.

TRUTH OF SCIENCE AND TRUTH OF RELIGION CANNOT COLLIDE.

Thousands of pulpits fulminated anathemas against the early geologists, and one religious controversialist — with the exquisite culture and suavity which marks the ordinary language of self-sufficient bigots — satisfied himself that during the ages which preceded the creation "God had been preparing a hell for the geologists." Yet, before thirty years had elapsed, the rejection of the truths which paleontology had revealed would have been regarded as the mark of an idiot. The men of science quietly advanced in their sacred task of deciphering the letters which God had inscribed upon the rocky tablets of the earth, leaving the theologians to square their Biblical objections with the new revelation as best they could. In our own time, to give but one instance more, we have heard from preachers, and sometimes from men who could barely scrape through the matriculation examination of a tenth-rate college, the most furious denunciations of Darwinism and the doctrine of evolution. Darwin himself opposed to these tirades the silence of a magnanimity too noble even for the indulgence of private disdain. And already not a few leading theologians adopt the theory of evolution as one which can be applied in even wider regions than those of physics. Let the modern preacher learn a little wisdom, a little modesty, a little suspension of judgment, from the disastrous annals of the past. His curses, like chickens, will only come home to roost. No truth of science can collide with any truth of religion. God has revealed himself in nature, of which science is the interpreter, as he has revealed himself in Scripture, of which theology is the exponent. If men of science have often misread for a time the teachings of God’s works, theologians have demonstrably erred — and that far more egregiously, and for ages together, and with far more disastrous consequences — as to the true meaning of God’s word. God speaks in many voices, and has more books than one. Let all religious teachers, above all let ignorant and unscientific teachers, abdicate at once their insolent pretensions to decide ex cathedra on new scientific discoveries and theories. They are wholly incompetent to pronounce any opinion upon them. Let them leave to science the things that belong to science. Science is perfectly able to take care of herself. If her sons are oftentimes hasty in their inductions and generalizations, they have no monopoly of error. The light of God will show what their opinions are worth. If those opinions be erroneous they will be refuted on scientific grounds; and the lesson of historic experience proves that if they be correct, all other weapons, whether they pretend to be sacred or not, will be of no avail against them. When, as is too often the case, a preacher poses as “Sir Oracle” against some scientific theory, while he is as conspicuously ignorant of science as he is of most other subjects, he presents a spectacle
which is ridiculous alike to gods and men.

Again, there has been an undoubted advance in the domain of Biblical knowledge. A preacher who relies only on our authorized version will preach on scores of texts which an instructed hearer knows to be mistranslated or to have a meaning quite other than the one attached to them. What must an educated listener think of a man who insists on the miracle of the angel troubling the water; or defends the doctrine of the Trinity by the text about the three heavenly witnesses; or who rests the whole strength of the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh on the well-known passage of Job, without showing any consciousness of the real meaning of those passages as developed by criticism? There is something almost appalling in the extent to which doctrines have been made to depend on "proof texts" which the context shows to be entirely irrelevant, and which sometimes imply almost the reverse of what they have been quoted to support. The old schoolmarm says: "Turpe est id in quo quotidie versamur ignorare." They who listen, Sunday after Sunday, in the hope of gaining some instruction in things divine, have a right to expect that their teachers shall take some pains to ascertain the real sense and right rendering of the passages from which their texts are taken.

Further than this, an immense and silent revolution has taken place in the whole mode of regarding scripture. The old dogma of verbal dictation has become too baseless an absurdity for any well-instructed and unbiased intelligence to maintain. Men have been learning more and more fully the significance of the wise rabbinic saying, "The law speaks in the tongue of the sons of men;" in other words, that the limitation of human language and the disabilities of human infirmity were not miraculously removed from those who were chosen as the channels of divine revelation. It has been seen that different parts of the Bible are of different value, and that much of the moral teaching of the Old Testament represents an inferior phase of enlightenment and stands far below that of the New. This indeed was no more than what was taught by Christ himself when he spoke of the polygamy which is sanctioned in the books of Moses as a thing inherently objectionable, and only permitted to the Jews because of the hardness of their hearts.

The elaborate details of the ceremonial law, which are still sometimes appealed to as though they were all delivered among the thunders of Sinai and contained in them something essentially divine, were rudely swept aside by St. Paul as "weak and beggarly elements," and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as a decaying system which was ready to vanish away—as things shaken and removed, weak and unprofitable, carnal and incapable of making anything perfect; as mere carnal ordinances relating only to meats and drinks and only imposed till the time of reformation. Moreover, modern criticism has made it at least doubtful whether much of this ritual, which is being made an excuse for modern innovations, was Mosaic at all. The Old Testament can no longer be quoted and appealed to in the uncritical, unhistoric, and indiscriminate way to which we have been so long accustomed.

PREACHING DOES N'T SETTLE EVERYTHING.

Mankind has been slow to learn the lesson; but the preacher who in these days thinks it necessary—as was done by a recent commentator—to institute a parallel between Jael and the Virgin Mary to defend the human sacrifice offered by Jephthah, to treat slavery as a divine institution, to refer acts of atrocious cruelty to the direct command of the All Merciful, and to maintain the righteousness of wars which ended in the wholesale and cold-blooded massacre of innocent women and
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children — such a preacher may revel in the admiration of young ladies and religious cliques, but he puts himself out of court when he claims to impose his crude ignorance and shifting morality upon the consciences of wise and thoughtful men. Again, the science of Biblical criticism has made an immense advance in the last fifty years. The fact that a man is a clergyman gives him no right whatever to pronounce an opinion on such questions as the dates of various Psalms, or the authenticity of Daniel, or the time at which this or that prophet wrote, or whether the whole books of Isaiah and Zechariah were written by single authors, or the Mosaic origin of the book of Deuteronomy, or the genuineness of the Second Epistle of St. Peter or of the last twelve verses of St. Mark. If he has well-matured opinions on these subjects, based upon thorough inquiry and not upon the supposed sacredness of a tradition which in hundreds of instances has been proved to be not only fallible but even absurd, by all means let him say his say. But even then he is bound to do so with modesty, and with the frank admission that many who know ten times more of the subject than himself have come to conclusions different from his own.

The tone adopted by some preachers — who would fain usurp the title of orthodox — upon these points of dispute is thoroughly reprehensible. They assume that the results of the newer criticism are the consequence of something which they call "unbelief;" and they stigmatize them, not as the result of intellectual mistake but as the fruit of moral perversity. The unbelief and the moral perversity rest rather with themselves when they substitute idle denunciation for serious argument, and think that anathemas will serve for refutations. He is an unbeliever, he is morally perverse, who refuses to recognize the truths revealed to us by the widening light of knowledge, and who turns the Bible into a sort of fetich or teraph, whose utterances — picked out here and there to support his own views, and interpreted exclusively in the one sense which he chooses to put upon them — he substitutes for the witness of the Spirit and the voice of God. A preacher is not bound to adopt the conclusions of modern critics, whether German or English; but what he is bound to do is to abstain from denouncing them until he has fully and fairly studied the grounds on which they rest, to abstain from confounding questions of criticism with questions of religion, and above all to abstain from the uncharitable folly of casting insinuations upon the good faith of those who hold them, and who can advance strong arguments from history and philology in favor of their views.

Nor is it less necessary for a modern preacher to observe that, though the few great fundamental truths of Christianity remain unchanged, there are multitudes of religious opinions which in no sense belong to the essential gospel, but are unauthorized accretions to it. A man may, as we have seen, have particular opinions about the inspiration of Scripture; but, seeing that the church has never attempted to define either the nature or limits of inspiration, he has no right to excommunicate those who do not share his private interpretation.

So, too, all Christians alike believe in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ; but as to the method and philosophy of the atonement, and the manner in which the sacrifice of Christ affects the mind of God, there have in all ages been the widest differences. The forensic theory, the doctrine of satisfaction, the doctrine of vicarious punishment, the doctrine of exact substitution, and many others have been defended in huge volumes of theological subtlety. A preacher can preach these theories if he holds them, and many preachers have preached them in such a way as to alienate the hearts of thousands. They have insisted on errors so revolting, as a representation of God the
Father as remorseless and God the Son as pitiful. They have portrayed a Deity who is not to be appeased except by the anguish of the innocent, or one whose attributes are in a condition of chronic antagonism to each other. But no preacher has any warrant to impose his special theology upon his hearers as though its rejection involved the crime of apostasy from revealed truth.

Christ revealed to us the blessings of his life and death in their effects on the souls of man; he did not reveal them—it would probably have been beyond our capacity to grasp them—from the point of view of their relation to the divine will. All that we are told is only sufficient to exclude the false and revolting deductions in which systematic theology has often revealed. Nothing is more plainly taught us than that the incarnation and the entire redemptive work of Christ were due to the love of the Father no less than to that of the Son. Many views of the atonement which were once accepted are now seen to be incompatible with that which God himself has made known to us; and preachers should learn, as educated hearers have long learned, to discriminate between the wheat of divine revelation and the immeasurable chaff of human theories and systems.
EXPLANATORY LETTER.

Batavia, Ill., Dec. 10, 1889.

Mr. Editor: Inclosed herewith please find an article under the heading “The New Testament as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Old,” by Samuel Davidson, D. D., LL. D., of London, England. I wish to state to you how I came to have this article entrusted with me for the American press. Some years since a Chicago correspondent published one of Prof. Davidson’s letters in the daily press of that city. I read the letter with interest, especially the closing sentence, in which the writer expressed his gratitude to God, that his life had been spared to finish his Second Edition of “The Introduction to the New Testament.”

In an editorial the statement was added that Samuel Davidson, D. D., LL. D., 14 Belsize Crescent, Hampstead, London, England, had a wide reputation for being in the front ranks of the foremost scholars of the Protestant world; that he was a graduate of Halle, and had been for a long time Professor of Hebrew at the Independent College in Manchester, England, and was near 80 years old. This statement caused me to desire the books alluded to, which led to a correspondence that has been kept up for some years. I was much interested in his “Introduction to the New Testament” that I asked him to have his publishers send me by express all of his theological works published up to that time. When they arrived I was not a little surprised to find that they comprised six thousand pages. About one year ago there appeared in consecutive numbers of the Old Testament Student, published by Professor Harper, of Yale University, three articles under the heading, “The New Testament as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Old.” I mailed them to Professor Davidson, expressing a desire that in private letters he should give his views of the three articles. In his reply he said that the article by Prof. Toy, of Harvard, was in accordance with the surest results of modern criticism, but that the articles by Prof. Stevens, of Yale, and by Prof. Hovey, of Newton, he could not commend.

I then wrote him that I should be glad to see an article under the same heading written by himself for the American press. He replied saying he had decided to write such an article for an autobiographical work, and would copy it and mail it to me, to do with it as I wished. This is how I came to have it for publication. Doubtless it would be interesting to some of your readers to read a long correspondence which I have had with the editor of an orthodox magazine in relation to publishing this article, and why he has declined to publish it; but for reasons I will omit this.

A Subscriber.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A GUIDE TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D.

Having explained in my “Introduction to the New Testament” several quotations which the writers of the Christian Canon took from the Old Testament, and regarding the subject as one that has been already examined by competent scholars, I think it unnecessary to go over the same ground, though requested to do so by a highly valued correspondent. But as every writer has his own way of discussing a topic, I conceive it possible that I may touch upon some point which has not been brought into prominence before.

Any careful perusal of the New Testament shows that the early Christian authors usually cited the Old Testament from the Septuagint translation, adopting the latter in some instances where it is an incorrect representative of the original Hebrew. I do not believe that they always quoted from memory. The conclusion that they did not scruple in many cases to accommodate the words of the Old Testament to another purpose than that which the original authors intended, has been sufficiently established. They employed the Jewish Scriptures in the way of midrash; they allegorized, changed, distorted...
them, arguing in consequence on a false basis. Of such procedure many examples occur. I cannot accept the New Testament writers as infallible interpreters of Hebrew Scriptures without applying to them the principles of exegesis which regulate the interpretation of other books. When each passage is examined in the light which hermeneutics supply, the logical result undoubtedly follows that the authors in question dealt freely with the language of the Old Testament. The correctness of this statement will be shown by a few examples:

"Out of Egypt have I called my son" (Matthew ii., 15). This citation is applied to the return of Joseph and Mary with the young child from Egypt; whereas the original in Hosea xi., 1, refers to the love which Jehovah had to his people in bringing them out of the land of bondage. Matthew introduces the quotation as the fulfilment of a prophecy, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet"; but no good expositor can accept the statement.

"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirtypieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me." (Matthew xxvii., 9, 10). This quotation is from Zechariah xi., 12, 13, where the prophet, in the attitude of a shepherd, gives up his office and breaks his staff as a sign of abdication. The people rewarded him with thirty pieces of silver—a paltry sum which Jehovah looked upon as a depreciation of himself in his representative, and therefore it was not taken but thrown into the treasury. The original which is not in Jeremiah but in Zechariah, is handled by the Christian author in a very free way, his language agreeing neither with the Septuagint nor the original. "The price of him that was valued" is an inexact representation of the Hebrew "a goodly price that I was prized at of them." In the original properly understood, the prophet took the money and cast it into the treasury; but the evangelist makes the children of Israel give the money for a potter's field. How can it be thought that the prophetic transaction described in Zechariah was fulfilled by what the chief priests and Judas did? The evangelist applies the passage to the case of the traitor in an unnatural way.

"In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted because they are not" (Matthew ii., 18). These words are from Jeremiah xxxi., 15. The original alludes to Rachel, mother of the tribe of Benjamin, weeping for her children who had been carried captive to Babylon. The evangelist considers Herod's massacre of the children in Bethlehem as a fulfilment of Jeremiah's language, Rachel having been buried at Rama not far from Bethlehem, though the latter place belonged to a different tribe. The original was not meant to refer to the event narrated by the evangelist, though he adds it as a prophecy, "then was fulfilled."

"To this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, etc." (Acts xv., 16, 17). This passage from Amos ix., 11, 12, is singularly diverted from its original, being freely cited from the Greek version. The prophets speak of God's judgments upon Israel, contemporaneously with which it is stated that he would receive Judah into favor. The Davidic Kingdom should be restored in its former extent and splendor, embracing Edom with all the heathen once subject to David. Instead of "they may possess the remnant of Edom," the Greek in the Acts has "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord," which departs widely from the Hebrew words. The application of the original by James who speaks in the Acts, disagrees with the sense conveyed by the prophet.
"The just shall live by faith" (Romans i., 17) is cited from Habakkuk ii., 4. The apostle Paul applies to his doctrine of justification by faith words of the Old Testament which do not suit it. The Hebrew term translated faith means fidelity, faithfulness; and the prophet is speaking in general terms of the Chaldeans as well as his own people. Such treatment of the Old Testament was usual in the apostolic time. The same quotation appears in Galatians iii., 11; as also in Hebrews x., 38, where faith means trust in the divine promise. The Septuagint version has "the just one shall live by faith in me," which departs a little from the original Hebrew, "The just shall live by his faithfulness." In using the original, Paul has given another meaning to the word faith, and has also connected it with the adjective just (the just by faith shall live); whereas it is joined to the verb live both in the Hebrew, and in the Greek version.

"And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands, etc." (Hebrews i., 10). This passage (from the 102d psalm, 25th verse, etc.), in which Jehovah is addressed, is referred to the Son by the writer of the epistle, with the same name too (Jehovah), which is a misapplication, since the Jews as well as the apostles never looked upon Messiah as Jehovah. If the later Jews regarded him as superhuman, as he appears for the first time in the book of Daniel, he is still inferior to God. Besides, the psalm is not Messianic.

"Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious; and he that believes on him shall not be confounded" (I. Peter ii., 6). The original is Isaiah xxviii., 16, which is quoted and abridged from the Septuagint. The words of the prophet put into the mouth of Jehovah are meant to give confidence to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, assuring them that the city and its temple should stand secure against the Assyrians, since they had King Hezekiah in whom all trust might be placed without fear. He is the corner-stone of the kingdom. Though some Jews adopted a Messianic reference of the words as the writer of the epistle has done, the original is a stranger to that meaning and represents the stone as already laid, "I have laid in Zion." In Romans ix., 33, the same citation is given somewhat differently.

It is a curious thing that even words in the Septuagint are quoted as proof, which do not belong to the original Hebrew but are a spurious addition, as in Hebrews i., 6, "And let all the angels of God worship him," from Deuteronomy xxxii., 43. The and shows this to be their source, not psalm xcvii., 7.

Enough examples have been presented to establish the proposition that the New Testament authors cannot be taken as correct interpreters of the Old. Influenced by the hermeneutics of the Jews, or led by the Greek version, or following an exegesis of their own, they often turned aside from the right sense of the original.

What now can be said of the statements made by Jesus himself respecting books or parts of the Old Testament? Does not his testimony stand on another level than that of the apostles, evangelists, or historians to whom we owe the New Testament? It is natural to separate him from his followers because of the reverence we justly attach to his person. There are two principles by which a correct decision must be formed regarding his estimation of the Old Testament. In the first place, he did not come into the world to teach biblical criticism, or to meddle with cognate questions. That department of knowledge was outside the sphere of his work. His mission was essentially spiritual. He came to show man the way of salvation more clearly than it had been known before; to reveal the love of his heavenly Father to his children on earth; to reform existing abuses in the religious world; and to inculcate the brotherhood of man. His mission was to put religion on its proper basis, divested of the alloy with which it had been overlaid; to bring forth into full view what God requires
of his servants, and to correct Jewish notions of the Messiah's person. The simplicity and purity of the religion he enunciates, and his self-sacrificing love, are the highest pattern to all his followers. In saying that he had the spirit of God above measure, the sacred writer puts his spiritual nature, his will, the emotional part of his mental constitution, in harmony with the will of God as nearly perhaps as humanity can reach. In the second place, with respect to the intellectual side of his nature, limitation must be allowed. He did not know many things lying outside the mission he undertook; and he himself confesses ignorance of a future event (Mark xiii.,32). I shrink, however, from presumptuously inquiring into the mind of the sinless one, to grope for the extent of its knowledge. Suffice it to say, that in all probability his attention had not been directed to critical questions in the Old Testament, such as the authorship of books, the authority of writers, the authenticity of parts and paragraphs. In all such matters he acquiesced in current opinions, which had no necessary bearing on the chief doctrines he taught, whether to promote or elucidate them.

I am ready to admit that the allusions made by Jesus to the Old Testament, and the authority attaching to them, are of a higher order than those of his followers; and that he could not have sanctioned such perverted exposition as theirs sometimes was; but scientific exegesis was not his object.

These observations lead up to the conclusion that the New Testament is not a correct guide in relation to literary and exegetical questions even where Christ speaks; for his knowledge of certain subjects, such as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the Davidic origin of the 110th psalm, was that of the time. The passage in Matthew xxii.,41—46, commonly adduced to prove the superior authority of Jesus in the critical department of the Old Testament, states that David in spirit calls Christ Lord; and importance is attached to the expression; but Luke has instead, "David says in the book of Psalms," alluding to the superscription; and that cannot be relied on. The psalm is neither David's nor Messianic; for the Old Testament never presents the Messiah as a priest, and the King spoken of is a priestly one. Besides, the ruler celebrated is not one who is future, but present. I have seen it asserted that Christian scholars are well agreed that the psalm is Messianic; but this is incorrect, since the great masters of Hebrew literature, Ewald, Hupfeld, Hitzig, DeWette, Olshausen reject its Messianic character. I have said elsewhere ("The Canon of the Bible," pp. 43, 44, third edition) that the psalm probably belongs to Maccabean times. Though the scribes believed that it was written by David, it does not follow from the words of Jesus that he had the same view; since he seems to argue with his opponents on their own ground, his purpose being directed against the Davidic sonship of Messiah.

In John v.,46, Jesus says, "Moses wrote of me." Though the discourse containing the words is substantially authentic, it is not free from Johannine colors. The passage probably meant is Deuteronomy xviii., 18, 19, which, though unmessianic in the mind of the Deuteronomist, was afterwards understood in another way, and was so interpreted in the time of Christ, as appears from Acts iii.,22. In John vii.,40, the prophet is a different person from Messiah. The entire Pentateuch has no passage which any writer used in a Messianic sense; and it may be safely asserted that the leading purpose of Jesus's earthly life was unaffected by acquiescence in the common view of Old Testament books with regard to authorship.

There is no difficulty in Luke xxiv.,44, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me," if it be borne in mind that the chapter in which the words occur is unhistorical. The contradiction between it and the forty days prior to the ascension which the Acts assume, is patent to all readers.

It is almost superfluous to notice the
method in which passages quoted in the New Testament, especially prophetic ones, are often explained by the help of a double sense, one primary, the other secondary; one historical, the other spiritual; the New Testament presenting the latter and completing the full meaning originally intended. Lord Bacon's "germinant" sense of prophecy leading up to its final sense, amounts to the same thing. When a New Testament writer uses the words "that it might be fulfilled," "then was fulfilled," no more is implied than likeness. "Who," says Moses Stuart, "that has ever studied the New Testament references to the ancient scriptures does not know that the words fulfilment and fulfil have a wide latitude of meaning? Anything which happened or was done in ancient times, and which for substance is repeated or takes place again under the new dispensation; anything later which presents a lively resemblance to another and earlier thing; may be, and often is, spoken of as a 'plenosis' of that earlier thing." All this is mere assumption, dissipating the true sense of the Greek verb rendered to fulfil.

There is more in it than mere resemblance. The sacred author adapts the sense implied in fulfilment to an earlier statement by diverting the latter from its genuine import and substituting an arbitrary one. Had he thought of nothing but a later occurrence like to an earlier, he would have employed a different phraseology.

Still more important are Dr. Davidson's two large "Introductions" to the Old Testament and the New. These works stand at the head of the literature which we have in English on the authorship, date, historical value and general contents of the Bible. We are indebted for the article which we print this month from Dr. Davidson to one of our western subscribers, who has been for some years past a correspondent of the English scholar, and has at different times secured from him valuable articles for publication in periodicals on this side of the ocean.

The following is a part of a letter from Dr. Davidson to the gentleman referred to. It will interest our readers as giving a summary of the views of the Bible and of Christian doctrine which its distinguished author has reached as the result of a long life of biblical study. Dr. Davidson writes: "Inspiration properly belongs to persons, not to books. The authors of the different works contained in the collection called the Bible—of most of whom we know little or nothing, sometimes not even the name—were men of various intelligence and endowments. Possessing unequal gifts, their productions are of unequal value. As infallibility belongs to God alone, none of them was infallible in what he said or wrote. Each wrote according to his light and the purpose he had in view. Contradictions, inconsistencies, errors both intellectual and moral, are observable in their writings. Some were far ahead of their time, as the old Hebrew prophets; others were but little or not at all in advance. The sacred books proceeded from spiritual men living in different ages and amid different surroundings. Perhaps it is scarcely correct to call them all spiritual men; for he to whom we owe the book of Esther, which is little else than a romance, never mentions God, while the author of Ecclesiastes, an old bachelor with a skeptical turn of mind and a tinge of Epicureanism besides, had very little spirituality. The conclusion of his treatise, which was appended to it by others, saved the whole from being ex-

DR. SAMUEL DAVIDSON.

Our readers will be interested in the reminder that Dr. Davidson, whose paper on "The New Testament as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Old" we publish on this and preceding pages, is the author of the article on the "Canon" in the last edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, an article which had to be cut down so much in order to give it room in the Encyclopedia that he published it entire as a volume, under the title "The Canon of the Bible." It is the best work we have on that subject.
eluded from the canon. But I must refer to my work on the canon for these and other details.

"There is no warrant in the Bible itself for calling it 'the word of God.' The word of God is in the Bible, but the Bible is not the word of God. And, as the word of God comes through human instruments, it cannot be perfectly pure. Its purity is conditioned and modified by the earthen vessels it is lodged in.

"The diversities of doctrine contained in the New Testament are pointed out pretty fully in my 'Introduction to the New Testament.' The religion of Christ should always be separated from the Christian religion, as the teaching of Christ differs from that of St. Paul. What is wanted at the present day is to bring men back to the ethical and parabolic teaching of him who was preeminently the Son of God; i.e., to the Sermon on the Mount and the parables. It is very difficult to get at what Christ really said, but I think his most authentic teaching is embodied in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables. The difficulty arises from the fact that the reporters were dependent on written and on oral tradition, both of which had been incrusted with legendary and mythical matter. As the Gospels passed through processes of redaction, with the exception of the fourth, and did not appear in their present state till the second century, there was plenty of time to surround parts of the biography with a mythical haze. The view which the first believers in Christ took of his person was what is called the Ebionite—Unitarian—one. This, however, was soon lifted up to a higher stage, not only by the Apocalypse—A. D. 68 or beginning of 69—but by St. Paul's epistles and the fourth Gospel. The apostle of the Gentile held the Arian view of Christ, so far as he speaks of him as the man from heaven or the heavenly man, implying his pre-existence. But he never notices the miraculous conception. The fourth Gospel by introducing ideas from Alexandrian Platonism carried the view of Christ's person even higher than Paul—higher even than the post-Pauline epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians—see my 'Introduction to the New Testament.' The doctrine of the Trinity is a post-apostolic development.

"I have explained at some length my views of man's future in the book whose title I have already given. I believe that man is created immortal, that the punishment of the wicked hereafter will be remedial, and that all will be finally happy. The fatherhood of God involves the idea of perfect felicity to his children. If a Being of infinite goodness and love controls the boundless universe, we cannot but cherish the hope that such goodness and love will overcome evil. All rational creatures will be happy forever in the enjoyment of their Father's love. . . . One who purified and exalted the Messianic idea, who taught the fatherhood of God, who was without sin, who exemplified the divine in humanity as it never had been and probably never will be, who was the image of the unseen One, and inaugurated a religion which has all the essentials of universality, cannot have inculcated the fearful doctrine of endless torture in the next world. . . . I had intended to speak of what is called original sin and the atonement, but must conclude. The former was rightly termed by Adam Clarke 'original nonsense'; the latter must be resolved into self-sacrifice. The moral and spiritual influence of Christ's self-sacrificing love upon sinful man is the reconciliation to God which is effected by the Gospel."
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A fresh and timely discussion of the present position and the probable future of Socialism and social reform in the United States; it may be called the American answer to Socialism. 1 volume, crown 8vo, 376 pp. $1.50.
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