

Satisfactory. If ever pub., some details w. require previous exam.
J. A. B.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

By Thomas Polhill Stepford

A Member of the Post-graduate Class of 1893-4.

Louisville, Ky.

April, 30. 1894.

Does the Style of the Apocalypse forbid
Its Unity of Authorship with the Fourth Gospel?

The traditional testimony to the authorship of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John is as early, abundant and trustworthy as we could well expect. Very few points in it have been disturbed by the close criticism of those who maintain a contrary view. It follows, then, that the burden of proof rests upon those who deny the Apostolic authorship on the basis of style. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria in the middle of the third century, is the first person whose criticisms have been preserved that urges that St. John could not have written in the style of the Apocalypse; but he mentions the fact that others were of a like opinion with himself. Since the Reformation the question has been much agitated. Criticism is still in an unsettled state. The question of date, whether the Apocalypse was written before or after the Gospel, affects to an important degree the subject before us. But, since to treat this question in a satisfactory way could not be done in this essay, I have chosen to follow Hengstenberg, Lee, Milligan and others, and place its composition near the close of Domitian's reign, about A.D. 96; making its date some 12 or 15 years later than that of the Fourth Gospel. This is justifiable since many of the difficulties with which we shall be concerned could better be

explained by placing its composition before that of the Gospel, in the reign of Nero.

Since external evidence quite satisfactorily attributes the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, and it is to be received as a work of his unless sufficient proof is advanced by objections to overthrow this position, this discussion will naturally take the form of an apology, an answer of objections.

The first objection, that I consider, is, that the fact that the writer of the Apocalypse gives his name, and the manner in which he speaks of himself and of the twelve Apostles argue that he was not the author of the Fourth Gospel, one of the Twelve, namely, the Apostle John.

In the case of a purely literary work, it need not be considered morally wrong for a writer in that age to have assumed the name of another person; but for an author to have done so, in a writing professedly religious and addressed to Christians for their instruction and edification as a revelation from Jesus Christ, is at once to render belief in it as inspired impossible and to exclude it from the canonical books of Scripture. So many critics, unwilling to believe that the Evangelist John wrote the Apocalypse, but still believing it truly authentic and inspired, conclude that the writer must have been another John, this name being a very common one in the first ages of Christianity. Some do not attempt to say who this person John

was; some identify him with a certain "Presbyter John" mentioned by Papias as a disciple of our Lord.

Since the Apostle John, neither in his Gospel nor in any one of his epistles, speaks of himself by name, it is maintained that he would not do so in this writing. Certainly this is a rigid rule of criticism. Could he not change his way of speaking of himself simply from taste, if for no other reason? He did do so in his other writings. In the Gospel St. John, as all agree, is "that disciple whom Jesus loved"; in the second and third epistles, he is the "Elder". Besides, there are reasons why it is more befitting for him to speak of himself by name than otherwise in a writing of this character. The Gospel gives an account of the earthly life of Christ, his ministry of labor and suffering; it tells of his kindness, his enemies, his friends and his intimate disciples; and one feels that it is perfectly appropriate for the evangelist to refer to himself as he does. But the view we have of Christ in the Apocalypse is quite a different one; he is now in the triumph of victory; the ties of kindness and personal friendship are not recognized at all; he is exalted to his position of lordship and all are to bow in worship to him. It is easy to see that for St. John now to speak of himself as "that disciple whom Jesus loved" would be out of place; and that to call himself a "servant"

of Jesus Christ, which he does in the opening verse and elsewhere, is much better. He does as the prophets of the Old Testament had done before him, by whom the style of the Apocalypse was very much affected, as will be shown hereafter, and gives his name.

But some critics again object that, if this had been the Apostle John, he would have written as an Apostle and would thus have given additional authority to what he says; but on the contrary he rates himself as a "fellow-servant" with those to whom he writes.

This objection would have some weight if the apostleship of St. John had ever been called in question. Paul begins many of his epistles by declaring his apostleship; but he was not every where acknowledged as such and there was occasion for him to assert his rights. St. John seems to have had no need to do so. It is a matter of history that he resided for sometime in western Asia Minor and was well known in that region. Further designation of himself than simply John was not necessary, while any other John would certainly, or very likely, have spoken of himself so as to distinguish himself from the Apostle John. Let it be remembered also that he does not call himself an Apostle in the Gospel and Epistles. That the writer ranks himself as fellow-servant with other Christians is certainly not an objection against the apostolic authorship of the book; for Peter speaks of himself so and Paul does

it repeatedly. But though he does not take to himself the title of an Apostle, he, nevertheless, speaks without reserve of authority. The true of the Apocalypse reveals an author conscious of his authority and his right to speak. No book of the New Testament possesses this character more than does this one. Compare the closing verses of the book and the manner in which the seven Churches are spoken to. It is certainly a false supposition that an Apostle could not have written to his people as a brother and companion with them in afflictions, since this was really the case, without mentioning that he writes with Apostolic authority; nor is it any more reasonable to maintain that St. John would have assumed the same attitude to his readers in the Apocalypse as he did in his First Epistle, since the latter contains loving advice, as from a father to children; while the former is a direct revelation from Jesus Christ. Let us give St. John credit for knowing how to do neither, since a man between these two extremes seems to be just the appropriate thing in this writing.

Akin to the above objections to St. John's authorship is the one that the writer would not have spoken of the twelve apostles, as he does in 21:14, had he been one of them. Compare also 18:20.

Judging from our ways of speech, it might seem inconsistent with humility for me to tell of a position

6

of honor which he in company with a few others is to occupy, or to refer to the responsibilities of distinction of an office which he may occupy; but from a New Testament standard, it is not for the Apostles to do so. Matthew was one of the Twelve and he exalts them to a position of honor greater than does the Apocalypse. See Matt. 19:28. Scholten felt the force of this argument and concluded arbitrarily that this passage in Matt. is spurious. His theory would require him to cut out many other passages also which point in the same direction. For example, Eph. 2:20 and John 20:28. Certainly one should not let his views decide what scripture should be, but let the scripture decide what his views should be.

That the Apostles are spoken of objectively, as Keim observes, is an argument of little weight against the Johannine authorship. The prophets are also so spoken of in 18:20, and surely the writer does not mean to exclude himself from among their number, in as much as the book professes to be a foretelling of future events. John could refer to the Apostles objectively with as much propriety as Paul could (Compare 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 3:5); and, judging from his peculiar way of speaking of himself in the Fourth Gospel, he would be inclined to mention them in the third person rather than the first. Grant it, that the revelation given him made it necessary to speak of the Apostles at all, which was the

fact, then he had to speak of them subjectively or objectively, and he has selected the latter which seems the more modest way. One is surprised and not a little pained to see such superficial objections as these urged by great scholars.

I come now to consider an objection differing somewhat from but yet related to the one above, namely, that the spirit exhibited in the Apocalypse is so much unlike that seen in the Fourth Gospel as to forbid our ascribing the authorship of it to the Evangelist John. In the Gospel and Epistles, it is maintained, reveal an author with a gentle and loving spirit, such as we know the Apostle John possessed, while the spirit of the Apocalypse is harsh and vindictive, such as we cannot conceive at all, or without great difficulty, to be exhibited by St. John.

But does this contrast between the two books give a true representation of the tone of each and would such a conclusion necessarily follow if it did? To conclude that, because one production of an author is characterized by a loving and gentle spirit, he cannot have written another work pervaded by a different tone is not a true principle of criticism. At least, it will not do to apply it without limitation to the writers of the Bible; for it is restricting within too small compass the abilities and minds of men who are taught, and who strive, to sustain an attitude of kindness and sympathy to the upright,

and, at the same time, one of strict justice to evil doers; so that it is possible that the same book may possess both these qualities or that one production of an author may be pervaded by one spirit, while a second is characterized by the other. To read different parts of 1. Cor., and to contrast the severe tone of Paul in various parts of Gal. with the loving spirit that characterizes his letter to the Philippians will be sufficient proof of this statement. Now St. John seems to have in his nature these two qualities strikingly blended. It is quite common to conceive of him as loving and gentle, so much so that he would not be apt to manifest fiery temper or righteous wrath; and this is a very erroneous conception. It is not warranted at all by the knowledge we have of the disposition of St. John, and we know a great deal comparatively about him. John and his brother James were named by our Lord Sons of Thunder. See Mark 3:17. This name was very likely given them because of some quality in their disposition that it describes. James and John are the two disciples of Christ who wanted to call down fire from heaven, as Elijah did, in vengeance upon the inhabitants of a Samarian village that would not receive them. See Lu. 9:54. Yet with all this John was "that disciple whom Jesus loved," which we are sure could not have been the case, had he not possessed also a gentle, noble and lovable spirit. The Evangelist and Apostle not only allows this conception of him to continue

in our minds, but enforce it. The First Epistle is persuaded, as it were, with the tender care of a father for his children; but you realize that the writer is one also whose spirit kindles at a flash against evil. It breaks out in 2:22 and elsewhere: "who is as dear but he that denies that Jesus is the Christ!" In the Third Epistle the references to Diotrephes reveal the same side of his nature. It is difficult to see how language can express severer judgments and sterner rebukes than are frequently found in John's Gospel; for example 3:36 and 8:44. It is interesting to notice in addition that the traditions concerning St. John, recorded by Eusebius in respect of Cerinthus and the young man whom the Apostle reclaimed from his desperate course, enforce this conception of him. With these considerations we shall not now find it difficult to see that the objection that the spirit of the Apocalypse cannot be St. John's, in that it is severe and fiery, is not of great weight, unless it is inconsistent with the spirit of Scripture. This cannot be shown to be the case. The Apocalypse may have more to say concerning retribution and judgments upon the wicked than do St. John's other writings; but no more than do the prophetic books of the Old Testament, by which its style was greatly modified as we shall see; and no more than is found in other places of the New Testament. Read for example Matt. 23:23-36 and Lu. 13:1-5. But we greatly err in our conception of the spirit and temper of the

Apocalypse if we do not often see in it the same tenderness and love that we do in the Fourth Gospel. We can frequently do this in the addresses to the seven churches, just where it is most natural for gentleness and love to be manifested. But other parts have a similar tone. Consider the fact that Christ is repeatedly spoken of as a lamb, and the loving invitation, 22:17. Thus it appears that the author of the Fourth Gospel was one especially fitted to write a book of such tone and spirit as the Apocalypse. Let the consideration be added that the striking expression in 6:16, "the wrath of the lamb," comes from one with such a nature as St. John possessed with unique features.

The main arguments against the unity of authorship of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel are founded upon the differences of language said to be between them.

It must be admitted, right at the outset, that any two writings of an author will possess distinctive characteristics. One will have certain qualities not prominent or not found at all in the other. This is only the statement of a necessary truth. Further, the extent, to which the differences between two productions of a writer exist, may vary indefinitely. There may be such striking resemblances between them that one ^{can} see at a glance that they are from the same pen, or they may bear the very slightest traces of

a common origin. A comparison of Romans with Galatians, and then of either of these with Philippians will help us to see this.

The circumstances under which one writes, his mental condition and the subject that he discusses will all have their influence upon his style, and that too in a great degree. Especially will a great length of time between the dates of two works make it the more difficult for us to trace their identity of authorship. These are principles of criticism that every body must acknowledge to be true. The writers of scripture were influenced by them as other authors are. When all these conditions are at work to modify the style of the Apocalypse and render it unlike the Fourth Gospel, we cannot expect but that we shall see much in one that we cannot find a parallel to in the other. We have already spoken of the difference of dates between the two books; we shall ^{see} that other influences capable of modifying one's style were affecting St. John when he wrote the Apocalypse.

The subject is an extremely complex one; conclusions formed about from the character of the style of a book, as to its authorship, are very precarious, there is no science more uncertain than this one. Hitzig is an example of how far one may go astray in these matters;

tracing resemblances in the language of Mark to that of the Apocalypse, especially in respect of the Hebraistic character of each, he concluded that John Mark wrote the Apocalypse. To speak with ^{an} air of certainty in these matters is therefore out of place; all that can be demanded is strong probability. This is not only a reason why orthodox critics should not state their conclusions with bold confidence, but it is also a rebuke to those who assert that it is "one of the most certain conclusions of critical science that the two books could not have had the same author."

Let us now proceed to an examination of the language in respect of the words, phrases and grammatical constructions. An exhaustive treatment of these points, in a thesis of the length to which this one must be limited, is of course not expected. I shall attempt to discuss the most important questions, paying special attention to those points that are mainly insisted upon as militating against St. John's authorship.

It is maintained that the occurrence of certain words in the Apocalypse that are not found in the other writings of St. John, the absence from it of words that are found in his other writings and the use of the same words in different senses in the two books forbid us to

believe that St. John wrote the Apocalypse. I repeat that this is one of the most precarious of arguments. To conclude that, because some words are common in one production and are not common in another, or are not found there at all, they do not have the same author must be given up as a rule of criticism quite unreliable. It was pointed out years ago that "of about 450 words in Milton's L'Allegre over 300 are not to be found in the longer poem Il Penseroso"; also that "of about 590 words in Pennycuik's Lotos-eaters there are 360 which are not found in the longer poem Ceyx." See Salmon's Introduction to the New Testament, p. 252. Therefore, to treat in minute detail the words of the two books in this respect would not help us perhaps at all. Principles that have been applied to the Apocalypse to prove that it cannot have been written by the fourth Evangelist would also prove that several of the undisputed epistles of Paul were not written by him. Besides, objections of this kind seem not to be urged so extensively now as they were formerly. Still some are insisted upon. Since they have been points of so much controversy, we may expect to find that they present difficulties. But a large majority of the difficulties can be satisfactorily explained and a small number of difficulties, that cannot now be explained, ought not to disturb us.

Much is made of the fact that o or o occurs very often

in the Gospel and only 6 times in the Apocalypse. I do not think that this case will give us much trouble when we consider the difference in the character of the two books. The Fourth Gospel contains a great deal of reasoning; it is the most philosophic of the Gospels and is very careful to show the relations to each other of its statements. The Apocalypse on the other hand is not philosophic; it is rather a delineation of events, a straightforward, abrupt narrative of things seen by the writer. John in the Gospel is trying to convince people of the truth of Christianity. Compare *Jos. 20:30-31*. This is not his object in the Apocalypse, but to relate the things that are soon to come to pass. So, in stead of *ōv̄r*, we find *κ̄ᾱι* often used. With this explanation agrees remarkably the fact that these six times, that *ōv̄r* occurs in the Apocalypse, are in the first three chapters, showing that the use of the words is not determined so much by the author as by the subject he treats and the manner in which he treats it. This same thing can be noticed also in the Gospel. In the 15. Chapter *ōv̄r* is found 22 times while in the 3. Chapter it occurs only two times, and in 13:32-16:15 and 16:23-18:2 it does not occur at all. To our surprise it is not found in Westcott and Hort's text of 1. John, as Professor Milligan has observed; and this is quite remarkable in that the close resemblance between St. John's Gospel and his first Epistle can be readily

occur. It is an illustration of the statement made before that the mere presence or absence of words from a production reveals very little as to its authorship. Once more, the two Epistles of Paul to Timothy have $\sigma\bar{\nu}\rho$ eight times, but the one to Titus does not have it once; and in some respects these three books are closely related. Hengstenberg has pointed out as a similar case that $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ occurs in Luke only eight times, while it is in Acts more than 160 times. Besides we shall see how greatly the style of the Apocalypse has been affected by the Old Testament, and in no particular would we see the influence of the Hebrew upon a writing of the New Testament more than in its fondness for $\kappa\alpha\iota$, corresponding to the Hebrew waw that is so common a conjunction. If it is replied that the very grounds on which I explain the presence of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the Apocalypse rather than $\sigma\bar{\nu}\rho$, namely, ^{that} the subject treated and the manner in which it is treated are very different from those of the Gospel, furnish another objection, namely, that it is not possible for an author to vary his style in this way, and as the original objection still remains, I shall have something to say concerning this question further on. But in so far as the objection has to do with the infrequency of $\sigma\bar{\nu}\rho$ in the Apocalypse these considerations are certainly a sufficient answer.

St. John uses $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ commonly in the Gospel, but it is not found at all in the Apocalypse, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ being always used. Since

these words have the same meaning and neither the subject
 discussed, nor the manner of its treatment would influence a
 writer to choose one of them rather than the other, but his
 constant choice of either would result altogether from individual
 taste or habit, this case seems more difficult than the previous
 one. $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ is the word used in the Septuagint, and since, as
 already stated, the style of the Apocalypse was much influenced by
 the Old Testament, we should expect to find this one in the Apocalypse,
 more especially since $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ is the more common word in the New
 Testament and the more classical also, if we may judge from
 St. Luke, for he uses it altogether. It is then only what we would
 expect when we find this word in the Apocalypse and what we do
 not expect when we find $\iota\delta\epsilon$ so frequent in the Gospel. But
 $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ is used three times in the Gospel. Paul uses them inter-
 changeably. Both are in Romans and Galatians but only $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$
 is in 2. Corⁱⁿthians. This is an analogous case. Now the point
 is, may not one change in his use of familiar words in
 the course of several years? The occurrence of $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ in the
 Gospel shows that the evangelist had no aversion to that
 word, but commonly wrote $\iota\delta\epsilon$ from personal choice; while the
 absence of $\iota\delta\epsilon$ from the Apocalypse does not indicate the same,
 because $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ is the more common word. It is not only possible
 but very likely that one would change, in the course of a
 few years, in his use of familiar words like these, when they

have the same meaning; and especially is he apt to drift into the use of the one that is the more common. That men do this frequently is what every student of language has certainly observed. It remains for those who deny St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse to prove that the Apostle could not have undergone such an experience.

I have treated the above examples at length, for they seem to be the most difficult cases of objections founded upon the absence or presence of certain words. There are others that require investigation. Look now at the case of $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\xi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\omicron\rho$. Because Jesus is called $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ twice in the Gospel (1:29 and 36), it is argued that St. John would not have spoken of him in this image and used constantly $\xi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\omicron\rho$ as the Apocalypse does. $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ is applied to our Lord in two other places of the New Testament, Acts, 8:32 and 1.Pet. 1:11. Several attempts have been made to explain why the writer of the Apocalypse has used $\xi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\omicron\rho$ rather than $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. Prof. Davidson thinks that $\xi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\omicron\rho$ was used to make an antithesis to $\delta\upsilon\epsilon\acute{i}\omicron\rho$. This explanation cannot be of value in as much ^{as} $\xi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\omicron\rho$ occurs one chapter (5:6) before $\delta\upsilon\epsilon\acute{i}\omicron\rho$ (6:8) does; and to attribute such concern to an author with respect to his style that he should make choice of a certain word in order to continue the same in antithesis to another word, to be used one chapter ahead for the first time, is straining matters quite unnaturally; especially will it not do to attribute such concern to the writer of the Apoca-

lypece. More likely is the view of Cremer that $\xi\epsilon\rho\iota\omicron\rho$, a diminutive, appears to have been selected at first for the sake of contrast with $\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\rho$ of the previous verse. After it was once used there is no reason why it should be exchanged for $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. Also the consideration may have some weight that when St. John uses $\xi\mu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, as meaning our Lord, he puts the word into the mouth of John the Baptist, though this point cannot be passed. Of more value is the fact that $\xi\epsilon\rho\iota\omicron\rho$ is found outside of the Apocalypse only in the Gospel of John (21:15), though it is not there applied to Christ. But to say, as does Düsterdieck, that, because it is applied there to Christ's people, it is "the more inconceivable" that St. John should have applied it to Christ in the Apocalypse, is not a little absurd.

The two names of Jerusalem, Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλὴμ . The former occurs 12 times in the Gospel, the latter 3 times in the Apocalypse. The latter is the form always used in the Septuagint and this may very naturally account for its presence in the Apocalypse since it occurs in it only three times. The words are used interchangeably by New Testament writers. Both are found in Matt. and in Lu. If one writer could use them both in one work, certainly he should have the right to use both in two productions. Paul has both forms in Gal. but in Rom. there is only Ἱερουσαλὴμ . The writer of the Apocalypse

thinks and writes $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$; the Evangelist thinks and writes $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\rho$," says Diisterdieck. It is hardly correct to say there is a difference of thought in one word from the other as they are synonyms. It would have strengthened Diisterdieck's argument not to concede this, for then the use of one word rather than the other would be the result of personal choice. As with $\iota\delta\epsilon$ and $\iota\delta\omicron\omicron$, so here; St. John could have changed his taste in respect to the two words. The former word occurs twice in the Gospel, the latter twice in the Apocalypse. Both are found elsewhere in the New Testament. $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ is in the Gospel once, in the Apocalypse 8 times. This is very natural in as much as the Apocalypse is especially concerned, in some parts, with impressing the lesson of holding out in true discipleship through afflictions and trials. Prof. Davidson has observed this same thing with regard to $\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\acute{\eta}$, that occurs in the Apocalypse but not in the Gospel. $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ occurs 11 times in 1. Tim. and not at all in Rom; $\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\acute{\eta}$ occurs 6 times in Rom. and not at all in 1. Cor. $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is in the Apocalypse four times and is not in the Gospel. But it is in 1. John once. $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ is in the Gospel 7 times and in the Apocalypse twice. But it is in 1. John 18 times, and according to the length of 1. John it occurs in it ten times as often as in the Gospel; but it occurs only about $3\frac{1}{2}$ times

as often in the Gospel as in the Apocalypse. This is a stronger argument against St. John's authorship of 1. Jov. than that of the Apocalypse. In 1. Cor. it occurs 13 times but only 3 times in Gal. The words, $\sigma\omega\gamma$, $\varphi\upsilon\sigma$, $\text{\textcircled{2}}\lambda\gamma\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\chi\epsilon\iota\omega$ and $\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega$ were first brought into the controversy by Dionysius. But all of them, except $\text{\textcircled{2}}\lambda\gamma\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, rather favor St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse. $\sigma\omega\gamma$ occurs in the Apocalypse about half as many times as in the Gospel. It is in Rom. 14 times, only once in Gal. $\varphi\upsilon\sigma$ is in the Apocalypse 3 times, in the Gospel 22 times. It is in Eph. 5 times and not in 1. Cor. at all. $\chi\epsilon\iota\omega$ is in the Gospel three times, twice in the Apocalypse. $\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega$ is not a common word with St. John. It is in Matt. oftener than it is in the Fourth Gospel. In the Apocalypse it is found 4 times, in the Gospel 11 times. This fact does not agree very well with the objection that the spirit of the Apocalypse is more severe than that of the Fourth Gospel. The word is in 2. Pet. 4 times but not at all in 1. Pet. $\text{\textcircled{2}}\lambda\gamma\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ occurs some 20 times in the Gospel and is not found in the Apocalypse. But it is found 8 times in Rom. and 8 times in 2. Cor., but not at all in 1. The., and only once in Phil. Still it was quite a common word with Paul. Let this example be considered. All are aware that the doctrine of salvation by grace, as against salvation by means of the law, is a familiar one with St. Paul. So we may expect to find $\rho\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ frequently in his writings, and in Rom. it does occur some 65 times, but it is not found at all in 1. Pet.

and only once in Eph. A number of other words have been advanced, but it is not necessary to consider them as those already discussed are the ones mainly insisted upon, and the others could be disposed of in a similar manner. Besides, this feature of the subject has now received as much attention as it deserves. It seems clear that arguments from the mere frequency or infrequency, or the mere presence or absence, of words cannot be trusted as militating against the Apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse; but in some cases even turn in its favor.

Let us now make examination of certain phrases. It is argued that characteristic expressions of the Fourth Gospel (and 1. Epist.), expressions that reveal the Evangelist's peculiar conceptions of Christianity, do not occur in the Apocalypse, and, accordingly, it cannot be a work of St. John. Düsterdieck gives the following: ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, εἶραι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἡμεῖς ζωοῦμεν, ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ κόσμου, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶραι and γεννηθῆναι, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου. See Myer's Commentary on Rev. p. 68. He thinks that such conceptions as these reveal St. John's fundamental conceptions of Christianity and would appear in the Apocalypse, if it were his composition.

But it seems that he did not investigate them as he should have done. ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν occurs only once in the Gospel and only once in 1. John. Could it then be said to contain a characteristic conception of the Apostle, and

that any writing of length from him must contain it or a similar expression? Certainly not. ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου is in the Gospel three times but not in any other writings of St. John. In these three times, that it is found in the Gospel, it is spoken by the Saviour, and perhaps therefore it should not be strongly maintained that this conception of the devil is peculiar to St. John. I do not think that it would be easy to argue that what the Evangelist puts into the mouth of another, as in this case, is not in a sense his own; but this consideration has some weight, in as much as when one is reporting another's speech, he uses, more or less, that person's language; when, were he speaking the same thoughts from his own mind, he would use different terms. Nevertheless the contrary view cannot be proved. τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ occurs twice in the Gospel and 4 times in the First Epistle. Of the 4 times it is found in 1. John 3 times are in one Chapter. Paul has the phrase 3 times in Rom., 4 times if we count 8:17, but not at all in Gal. and these two epistles are much alike. τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου occurs only once in St. John's writings and that is in 1. John. There is a kindred expression in John 8:44. That this phrase is not in the Apocalypse means no more against it as a work of St. John than that its not being in the Gospel does against it. ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι is in the Gospel twice, in the First Epistle 9 times; ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι is in the Gospel only once,

in 1. John 9 times. the similar expression ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος γεν-
ρηθῆναι is in the Gospel twice, but both times are in one Chapter.
Σὺν ζωῆς occurs 15 times in the Gospel, only twice in 1. John.

Here may be considered the expressions ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ,
πρωτότοκος and ρικζρ. ὁ λόγος, meaning Christ, occurs 3 times
in the Gospel, not being followed by modifying words; and it is said
that it is not likely that St. John, having used it thus, would
have added the τοῦ θεοῦ of the Apocalypse in speaking of Christ.
Düsterdieck says that to him such a thing is inconceivable.

It is easy to see that, in the one passage of the Gospel when
St. John speaks of Christ as ὁ λόγος, it was not necessary for
him to add modifying words, because he speaks at length of him
there and the sense is plainly understood from the context without
the addition of other words; and that it would not have been natural
for him to speak of Christ so in Rev. 19:13, when there is no dis-
cussion with reference to him and it is intended only to designate
him. We must give St. John credit for knowing how to frame
an expression so that the meaning will be clear to his readers,
readers whom we cannot assume to have been as well acquainted
with the Apostle's doctrine of the Logos as some critics are today-
and it would do no hurt if they had been. — But consider
the expression ὁ λόγος τῶς σωῆς of 1. John 1:1, this means Christ as
the context shows, and, if there is the addition of τῶς σωῆς in
one writing of the Apostle, why could there not be the addition

of τὸν θεόν in another. Certainly there is no force in this objection. the Apocalypse calls Christ ὁ πρῶτότοκος ἐκ τεκῶν, the Gospel προγενῆς πατρὸς πατρῶν (or words equivalent to πατρῶν). Now, I submit it to calm thinking, if it is the least improbable that the same writer should have these two conceptions of Christ? On the contrary is there not a marked similarity between them? ὁ πρῶτότοκος ἐκ τεκῶν besides is not peculiar to St. John. It occurs in Col. and Rom. τικῶν is found several times in 1. John, and always with some object as κόσμος or πατριῶν; it is found in the Gospel once with κόσμος; but it is used frequently in the Apocalypse in the absolute, not followed by either of these words. Let it be noticed, first of all, that the one word τικῶν is used in 1. John or in the Apocalypse much more frequently than in any other book of the New Testament. While τικῶν is not followed by the afore-mentioned ^{words} in the Apocalypse, three times it has other objects. It is manifest that there is no difference of thought when those words do not follow; they are readily supplied in thought. τικῶν in the absolute is the poetical construction, to be sure, but this fact is in good harmony with the character of the Apocalypse. Certainly one will not refuse to admit that the same writer can convey the same thought both in prose language and in poetical. Again I submit it to sober judgment, if it is at all unlikely that a man should write in one place, "who is he that overcomes the

worlds?" and in another place, "He that overcome shall inherit these things"? On the contrary their kinship is apparent and the second follows naturally from the first. These expressions therefore are rather on the side of identity of authorship of the two books.

There are some other phrases that could be examined, but it is not necessary to investigate others, as these are representative examples and those that present the greatest difficulties. Some of the points considered seem rather hard to handle simply because they are said to present difficulties when in fact such difficulties do not exist. It will be seen from the above examination that this manner of criticism, used by those who object to St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse, cannot be applied to other books of the New Testament and therefore ought not to be applied to St. John's writings. It is self-destructive; it would be dangerous to deal with the undisputed books of the Apostle in this way. Take the two phrases, $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\iota$ (and $\gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\eta\delta\eta\rho\epsilon\iota$) and $\sigma\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$; the former is very common in 1. John and is uncommon in the Gospel, the latter is very common in the Gospel and is uncommon in the Epistle. It is wrong to conclude that because an expression is common or even characteristic of one of St. John's works, it is characteristic of St. John and must appear in any production of his of much length. To limit St. John's ^{fundamental} conceptions of Christianity to our conception of his conceptions, as revealed in one of his works, would, from our very premise, exclude a second work

as a production of his. It is the same kind of reasoning to limit his fundamental conceptions to what they appear to be as revealed in two works, and then necessarily exclude a third one from his authorship. But these very two writings of the Apostle show that his mental scope was far from being narrow and that his conceptions of Christianity were very varied. St. John's time was an age of stirring events in respect of Christianity, and he was a live student of God's revelations and providences. It was only natural that he, a man of God, living long and seeing much, should be able to write in varied aspects concerning Christianity.

Let us now look at some words and phrases and similar thoughts of the two books that argue the Apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse. It is easy to point out many resemblances in these respects and betray, by doing so, a feeling that the objections based on the same principle, the absence of resemblances, that are urged against us, are of much weight. I think we have seen that the absence of such resemblances has been exaggerated; and that no conclusion, the least satisfactory, based on those that do exist, can be reached. But likenesses between them will certainly have as much weight for, as dissimilarities do against, their identity of authorship. And should they not have more? Because the lack of

similar qualities in two books does not permit us to affirm that the same man did not write them; while qualities characteristic of both do permit us to assert, with strong probability, that one man wrote them. The one puts us only in a state of doubt as to their authorship, the other affirms their identity of authorship; the one permits us only to say, "I don't know whether or not the same person wrote them"; the other enables us to affirm with practical certainty that he did. These statements do not apply when one book is in actual antagonism to the other; or when one is an imitation, more or less, of the other. The Apocalypse, of course, does not sustain either of these relations to the Fourth Gospel. I shall discuss only such expressions and ideas as are peculiar to the Gospel ^(and 1. Jno.) and the Apocalypse, or such as are quite frequent in them and are very seldom found elsewhere. Some points of likeness between the books have already appeared while we were considering the objections. I need not again point them out. Some few points formerly insisted upon are now set aside, as have also been some few objections, by the improved text of Westcott and Hort; but these are very few and of small importance.

The word $\epsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ is in the Gospel and the Apoc-

alypsee, but is in no other book of the New Test.; $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$ is
 in the Gospel twice and is frequent in the Apocalypse, but is
 not found elsewhere; $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is in the Gospel twice and
 in the Apocalypse twice, but is found nowhere else; $\beta\epsilon\omicron\rho\tau\eta$ is
 in both the Gospel and the Apocalypse, but is found nowhere
 else, except in Mark 3:17, and here it is used in translation
 of the name $\beta\omicron\alpha\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, given by Christ to John and his
 brother James. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon$ is not found in either the Gospel or
 the Apocalypse; and since it appears that the use of this
 expression depends principally upon the individuality of the
 writer; for Matt. has it 9 times, while Paul in all his
 Epistles (Hebrews excepted where it occurs only once) has it only
 once; this case presents a good argument. The conjunctions
 $\delta\iota\omicron$ and $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$ also are absent from these books and St. John's
 Epistles, though found in other books of the New Test. $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\rho$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon$
 is in both the Gospel and the Apocalypse and is found elsewhere
 only in Lu. 11:36. The objection of Lücke, that it is followed in
 one case by $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ and in the other by $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon$, seems trivial
 since, as Prof. Davidson observes, in the one case, Jno. 3:5,
 it is "having part with" a person, Jesus, and in the other,
 Apoc. 21:8, it is "having part in" a place, "the lake". The expres-
 sion then has a kindred use in both places; in the
 former, to express the reward of the believer, in the latter,
 the punishment of the wicked. It has not this use in Lu.

ἑδάτα πολλά. occur only in these two books; εἶδω is found
 often in St. John or the Apocalypse than in any other
 book of the New Test. σκυρόω is found only in the Gospel
 and the Apocalypse; it is used in both in a like sense,
 namely, that of divinity dwelling with man. Compare John
 1:14 and Apocalypse 21:3. δείκνυμι occurs in either of these
 books more than in any other book of the New Test.; δεικ-
 νῶ is in both and occurs elsewhere in the New Test. only
 once, Mat 16:21. ἀληθείας is almost peculiar to St. John's
 writings. It occurs only 5 times elsewhere: once in Lu., once
 in 1. Thes., three times in Heb. It occurs frequently in 1. Jn.
 and is very common in both the Gospel and the Apocalypse.

The conceptions of Christ as ὁ λόγος τὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ,
 Jn 1:1, and as ὁ πρῶτος, Apoc. 1:7 and other places, and as
 ἡ ἀρχή, Apoc. 21:6 and elsewhere, are similar and are almost
 peculiar to the Apostle John. Consider now the phrase τὸν
 ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς of 1. Jn. 2:13. The Apostle could say his words though
 thinking of Christ in similar aspects. Ἰδῶ is used of
 Christ frequently in both the Gospel and the Apocalypse and
 not with special reference to his resurrection; it is very
 seldom so used if at all elsewhere. The idea of τῆς
 τὰς ἐπιτολὰς (or τὸν λόγον or some similar word) is a very
 prominent one in Jn., 1 Jn., and the Apoc.; and occurs very sel-
 dom elsewhere. It is found 11 times in the Gospel, 6 times

in 1. Jno. and 8 times in the Apoc. the state of being δειλός regarded as a guilty one is a very striking idea. See it expressed in the Apoc. 21:8 and compare a similar idea in 1. Jno. 4:18, the thought of one's bearing testimony to truths of Christianity, testimony concerning what he has seen, especially the thought of the writer himself doing so, is a very prominent one with St. John and peculiar to Jno., 1. Jno. and the Apoc.; at least we can say this is practically so. See Jno. 1:14, 3:11, 19:35 and 1. Jno. 1:1 and 3. The idea is made especially emphatic in 1. Jno., because the Apostle is combating errors of the Gnostic heresy. Now look at the Apocalypse, 1:2 and 11, they sound much like the places in the Gospel. μαρτυρεῖα occurs in Jno. or 1. Jno. or the Apoc. oftener than in any other book of the New Test. It is found outside of St. John's writings only 7 times, and of these only once is it used for testimony in respect of the Gospel, which is its common use in these three books. The verb μαρτυρεῖν also is used frequently in these books for testimony in respect of the Gospel. It occurs frequently in some other books of the New Test. but not frequently in this sense. The conception of Christ as a Shepherd occurs oftener in St. John or the Apocalypse than in any other book of the New Test. ποιμαίνω referring to Christ, occurs in the Gospel 4 times; and in this sense it is found only 4 times elsewhere in all the

New Test. and in two of these it occurs in quotation from prophecy. No other book has it in this use but once. ΠΟΙ-
μαίτω is used of Christ 3 times in the Apocalypse. It is
used of him only once elsewhere and that is in a quotation
from prophecy (Matt. 2:6). The phrase, καταβαίτω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρα-
νοῦ, occurs 9 times in Jno. and 9 times in the Apoc. It occurs
only once elsewhere (Matt. 28:2). In other New Test. writings κατα-
βαίτω occurs frequently, followed by ἀπό always rather than
ἐκ except in the one case of Matt., and this too when τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ follows. This is certainly a strong point. The met-
aphorical use of ῥήματα occurs only in Jno. and the Apoc. Com-
pare the phrases ὁ ἔχων τὴν ῥήματα ῥημάτων ἐστίν (Jno.
3:29) and ἡ ῥήματα ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἀγίου (Apoc. 21:9).

The conception of Christ as the "being"^{one} is common to
the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse and characteristic of these
two books. In Jno. 8:58 our Lord says, περὶ ἄβραάμ γεν-
έσθαι ἐγὼ εἶμι. There is very certainly a reference here
to Exodus 3:14; where Christ, speaking to Moses from the
burning bush, calls himself the "I am". This^{is} one trans-
lation of the Hebrew. Another translation is "the one who is,"
ὁ ὢν, and this is the way the Septuagint has it. Now ὁ ὢν
occurs frequently in the Apocalypse as a designation of the
Deity. Compare Platonic Theology by Dr. Taylor Lewis,^{pp. 180-181;}
and notice that the two passages he cites to show

that Paul had such a conception of Christ, or God, do not show it. Compare also Winer, p. 68. I think this is an especially strong point. The figurative use of ἕδωκε to express spiritual blessing occurs only in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. It is used in this sense four times in the latter, six times in the former. Compare now the phrases, ἔδωκεν ἄρτοις ἕδωκε ψῆμα (Jno 4:10) and ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς (Apoc. 21:6). διψῶ, expressing spiritual thirst, occurs four times in Jno., three times in the Apoc. and nowhere else except Matt. 5:6. So also πεινάω, expressing spiritual hunger, occurs in both the Gospel and the Apocalypse. Compare the phrase, ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε (Jno 6:35) and οὐ πεινάσουσιν ἔτι οὐδὲ διψήσουσιν ἔτι (Apoc. 7:16) and ὁ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω (Apoc 22:17). The metaphorical use of μάρα in the Apocalypse, 2:17, corresponds well with the like use of ἕτος in the sixth chapter of Jno. Notice also that μάρα is used in this same chapter with ἕτος, though not in a figurative sense. That it is used literally in Jno. and figuratively in the Apocalypse does not signify anything, for in the latter case it is modified by τοῦ κεκρυμμένου.

The piercing of the side of Jesus is mentioned

only in the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. The event is recorded in Jno. 19:34 and referred to in 20:25 and 27. From the way St. John speaks (19:35), it seems that the circumstance deeply impressed him. The same appears true of the writer of the Apocalypse, from the way he makes reference to the matter, Apoc. 1:7. It is important to notice that in both Jno. and the Apoc. the verb ἔκκερτέω is used of this event; that this is not the word used in the Septuagint, but is the correct translation of the Hebrew that predicts the event; and that it is not found in the New Test. except in these two books. Finally let us notice what should be regarded as a very strong point. The Fourth Gospel sets forth the relation of Christ's disciples to Christ as one similar to the relation of Christ to God; see Jno. 15:9, 17:18, 20:21. Now this same comparison is made in the Apoc. 3:21. In all the four cases the words are put into the mouth of the Savior. This is a remarkable and significant agreement; for this conception, though presented in one other place in the New Test, Lu. 22:29, must be regarded as characteristically St. John's.

It is hardly necessary to pursue the investigation further along this line. Enough has been said to show that in respect of words, phrases and characteristic ideas the two books agree quite as well as we

could expect — certainly better than one can justly demand — when the subject-matter and purpose of the Apocalypse and the circumstances of its composition are considered. We do certainly see that the statement of Düsterdieck, that "in the entire mode of contemplation and statement the author of the Apocalypse is clearly to be distinguished from the author of the Gospel" (p. 58), ought never to have been made.

An examination of the grammatical structure of the Apocalypse, as it bears on our subject, is now in order. Here we meet, I am free to confess, the most formidable difficulties. Two charges are made, namely, that the Apocalypse contains solecisms, improper or bad grammatical relations, and that it possesses an Old-Testamental Hebraistic tone; such peculiarities not being found in the Fourth Gospel, or ^{being} exhibited in so much greater degree in the Apocalypse as to insure that they were written by different persons. These qualities, in the Apocalypse on the one hand and the purer Greek of the Fourth Gospel on the other, have been, as is natural to expect, much exaggerated. That the Apocalypse contains Hebraisms and exhibits an Old-Testamental tone is clear; but that it has bad grammar, judged from a Bible standpoint and from a standpoint of rhetoric, I am not willing to admit.

I give an analysis of what we may term irregularities in constructions;

1. In respect of cases. (1) The Nom. case when we would expect the Gen. (a) Examples of apposition, in 1:5 and 2:13. (b) Examples of modifiers, in 3:12, 7:4, 8:9, and 14:12. (2) The Nom. case when we would expect the Acc. (a) Examples of apposition, in 16:13 and 20:2. (b) Examples of modifiers, in 2:20, 3:12, 14:7, 17:3 and 21:12. (3) The Nom. case when we would expect the Dat. Examples, in 2:26, 3:21 and 9:14. (4) The Acc. case when we would expect the Nom. Examples, in 4:4, 7:9 and 14:14.

2. In respect of Gender. (1) The Mas. form when we would expect the Fem. Examples, in 4:1, 9:14, 11:4, and 11:16. (2) The Mas. form when we would expect the Neut. Examples, in 3:4, 4:7 and 8, 17:3 and 17:16.

3. In respect of the phrase, $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \delta\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \epsilon\chi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$.

4. In respect of the participle, $\pi\epsilon\pi\upsilon\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$, in 1:15, and the infinitive $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$, in 12:7.

5 Hebraistic constructions. (1) A relative clause containing the antecedent of its relative pronoun or adv. Examples, in 7:2, 7:9, 12:6, 12:14, 13:12, 17:9 and 20:8. (2) The article and its participle followed by a pronoun in apposition in meaning, but not agreeing necessarily in case. Examples, in 2:26 and 3:21. (3) The manner of using finite

tenses. Examples, in 4:9-10, 10:7 and 18:14. (4) the manner of using the participle. Examples, in 1:16, 6:5, 10:2 and 14:1. Compare on these two last points, (3) and (4), Prof. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament, Vol 3. p. 563. (5) the manner of writing participles and finite tenses. Examples, in 4:5, 6:2, 7:9-10, 12:2 and 12:3-4. Compare on this point Harper's Elements of Syntax, §§ 24:5, 25:5 and 27:5. (6) several nouns appended in the Gen. case. Examples, in 16:19, 18:14 and 19:15. Compare on this point Prof. Davidson, *ibid.* (7) the use of $\omega\varsigma$ with $\varphi\lambda\iota\epsilon\iota$ in 1:16 to denote a comparison.

Let us now examine more closely these irregularities. Shall we suppose that the author did not know how to put words together in any other way and wrote thus from ignorance? If we are to take this view of it, then, I suppose, we could not hold that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse, abiding by the dates we have adopted. This position however cannot stand. The style of the Apocalypse shows that the writer was far from being a novice in letters. It is a great piece of literature. In various places the rules of grammar are perfectly observed. See as examples 1:9-12 and 7:1. That there are some irregularities, that cannot be paralleled elsewhere, is not remarkable; nor does it militate against the Apostle John's being its author more than does the fact that irregularities

occur in some books of other New Test. writers that cannot be paralleled elsewhere. The fact that a writer takes the liberty to depart from the common rules of grammar rather indicates that he is at home in ^{the} language, if, as said, he does not do it from ignorance. Especially is this true when we can see good reasons for such departure.

Take then the phrase, ἄπὸ ὃ ὠρ καὶ ὃ ἦρ καὶ ὃ ἐεχόμενος. The writer knows, of course, that ἄπὸ is to be followed regularly by the Gen. case, for he uses it so often. But it is clear that it would never do to attempt to put all that follows it here into the Gen. case. ὃ ὠρ κ.τ.λ. may well be treated as an indelible substantive. See Riner, p. 68. Since it corresponds pretty well to the Hebrew name of God, אלהים, and since it occurs 5 times in the Apocalypse, ὃ ὠρ and ὃ ἦρ being transposed once and καὶ ὃ ἐεχόμενος left off twice, this is a perfectly natural way to treat it. ὃ ἦρ, the article with a finite verb, is an irregular construction, but it was absolutely necessary to use it, if the thought in it was to be expressed; for there is no other way to express this thought, since there is no Adv. participle of εἶρα. The article with the finite mood occurs in Hebrew. See Harper's Syntax, § 4:3: f. The fact that the writer used it five times indicates that he did not make the construction.

from ^{carelessness} ignorance. Certainly then the Apostle John could use this phrase as well as any other writer, and we have seen that it has a relation to the εἶπε of Jno. 8:58.

There is much doubt as to the text of πεπερωμένοι. Westcott and Hort put πεπερωμένοι in the margin. This form will take away all difficulty and it has good support. Perhaps Westcott and Hort have followed the common rule, "Choose the harder reading;" to a mistake here. At any rate the case is in too much doubt to affect our argument. I follow Winer and do not attempt an explanation of the infinitive τοῦ ποδεμῆσαι. Prof. Davidson (p. 563) considers it a Hebraistic use, but this is doubtful. Whether it be Hebraistic or not, does it argue that the author of the Apocalypse could not write as good Greek as is found in the Fourth Gospel? A loose use of the infinitive is not rare in the New Test. τοῦ εἶπεν εἶν in Acts 10:25 is equally difficult to explain and is the more remarkable as coming from Luke; but can anyone ^{think} that, because such a use of the infinitive occurs in this book and not in the Third Gospel, he did not write the Acts?

Many of the irregularities can be explained from a Greek standpoint. For example, the Mas. forms λέγων in 4:1 and ἔξιοι in 3:4 are to be understood as construct.

ions ad sensum, which are of frequent occurrence in good Greek. A large number of these result from a variation of the construction or from a blending of two constructions or an case of anacoluthon, phenomena that are common elsewhere in the New Test., but are more common in this writing than in any other. This is the view of Winer, p. 534 f. As a case of faulty grammatical agreement in Jew. see 1:14. When the rhetorical character of the Apocalypse is considered, the frequency of these grammatical irregularities should not greatly surprise us, and the observation of Winer, that they occur "especially in the descriptions of visions", is a point of special force. Düsterdieck admits that "it is going too far when all the syntactical improprieties and grammatical irregularities which at first sight present themselves in the Apocalyptic mode of expression are utilized to show the distinction between the style of the Apostle John and that of the Apocalypse" (p. 66).

The Hebraistic character of the Apocalypse is very plain. In addition to the points just given, some few were mentioned earlier; and its Old-Testamental character is exhibited in still other ways; such as by the quality of its figurative language, its bold imagery and its many quotations from the prophetic books,

though the writer never says that he quotes. Especially does the Apocalypse resemble the prophetic books of the Old Test.

This then is our problem: Can these phenomena be accounted for satisfactorily and permit us to hold in good faith and with good reason to the apostolic authorship? That they seem to present grave difficulties, it is unwise to deny. The view that the Apocalypse was written before the Fourth Gospel and that the better Greek of the latter is a result of improvement on the part of St. John in mastering the Greek language, while it removes to some extent the difficulties of language with which we are here concerned and some others in addition of an internal character, nevertheless it meets difficulties also of an internal character equally great, and must set aside very plain and trustworthy evidence for the later date of the Apocalypse. Besides, the character itself of the book forbids us to hold that its author was a novice in composition and to account for its Hebraisms and grammatical irregularities on the ground that he did not know how to write otherwise. I prefer to adopt the later date, as stated at the beginning, and seek an explanation of these difficulties on other grounds.

Let the problem be diminished as much as is right. There is no quality that will be constantly ex-

hibited by the same writer in various kinds of composition more than simplicity. I have noticed how this characteristic can follow a man through a long life and be a virtue in all his productions. Now there is remarkable simplicity in the Apocalypse and all the writings of St. John in respect of style. A beginner in the study of New Test. Greek will especially notice this. There is a straightforwardness of statement, a simple manner of connecting sentences, an absence of involved constructions, a striking transparency of thought in them all. With all the grammatical irregularities of the Apocalypse the meaning is perfectly clear. Add now to this consideration the fact that the Apostle John was a Hebrew, and that the Fourth Gospel also possesses a Hebraistic character. Kengstenberg has very likely gone too far in tracing analogies in this respect between the two writings. But that this feature is prominent in the Gospel, together with its sententious tone, is quite evident. Westcott, after pointing out such Hebraistic qualities in John — for example that the form of expression ἰσχυρῶς occurs even oftener in John than in Matthew — pronounces it a "Hebrew Epic." See Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 273 and 275. Compare also W. Sanday as quoted by Lee on Revelation, p. 456.

Prof. W. Milligan, who has published two very scholarly works on Revelation, urges strongly that we should explain

a large number of our difficulties on the ground of design on the part of the author, believing that he intended to write as he did, adopting the style of the pseudographical or apocalyptic literature of his age. He seems to carry this theory too far, explaining points of detail by it in a forced manner; but it is worthy of careful consideration. This apocalyptic literature was much concerned about the future. So when the Apostle John undertook to write a prophecy he formed his composition after the character of this literature and the prophetic books of the Old Test. Indeed if one was a close student of the Old Test. as the Fourth Gospel shows that St. John was, would he not naturally have sought to set forth predictions of future events in this style similarly as some thoughts naturally such to be expressed in verse? Before I read Milton's Paradise Lost, I had studied some of the Greek and Latin poets and I was surprised to find that its tone in various places ^{resembles} those ancient productions. It was doubtless natural for Milton, whose mind was familiar with the ancient classics, to express the thoughts of this lofty theme in such a way. But he has left other writings that do not possess this character. Now the Apocalypse is the only prophetic book of the New Test. and it is only natural that its style, necessarily modified by the subject-matter and purpose of the book, should be unique to some extent and unlike any other book of the New Test., whether

the author be St. John or some one else, to what extent this uniqueness may exist is only a matter of opinion and conjecture. This supposition is both possible and perfectly natural; and it is evident that no one, no one of the early disciples at least, was better able to give the Apocalypse its character and style than the Apostle John.

When we combine with this view another, one which, though it conflicts with the above view when carried to an extreme, harmonizes with and confirms it when kept in proper limits, we may believe the more confidently in St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse. The Greek of the Apocalypse corresponds to the kind of Greek that must have been spoken much in Palestine in the first century, the kind that St. John doubtless heard and learned in youth, if not in childhood. Now one, though he, in his mature age, may have the mastery of a language, is apt to, and often does, under emotion, excitement or mental strain, return to the speech of his earlier days. This is a patent fact and is observed too often to need demonstration. The Apocalypse reveals throughout that its author's mind was in great agitation and tension; not to such a degree, I believe, that he was careless about his grammar; but to such a degree that, to speak naturally, grammar must give place to rhetoric. This view is advocated by E. H. Sears and other able critics. The author

says in various places throughout the book, "I was in the spirit." This language must mean at least that he was in an uncommon state or condition. The sights he saw were unmarkable and could not but more mightily upon his mind. See as an example 19:9-10. That St. John did some writing while the visions were taking place seems certain from 10:4; while the use of the past tense of verbs, in this passage and other places, as Edor, frequently throughout the book, seems to make it equally certain that a vision or final writing took place after the visions were over; but still this could have been done immediately after, before his agitated state of mind had subsided. This circumstance places the composition of the Apocalypse in conditions wholly unparalleled. The author of no other book of the Bible wrote under such conditions. John's task is to describe what he has seen and relate what he has heard. Thus the materials of the composition, its imagery and the language, necessarily to some (indefinite) extent, are in no small degree independent of the individuality of the writer. The truth of this principle is admitted even by Düsterdieck (p. 59), though he of course has no use for its application. Is it going too far to say that in some respects the Apocalypse is beyond the range of criticism?

These considerations ought to enable us to remain steadfast in the traditional and most common belief of Christendom,

that the Holy Spirit selected St. John, one of the most prominent of the Apostles and "that disciple whom Jesus loved", to foretell the future conflicts and final triumph of the Church of God, and to close, with a wonderful and magnificent piece of literature, his written revelation to men. If our minds are not fully satisfied we do well to reflect that his providence in the sphere of criticism, as it does in other matters, may have kindly veiled our eyes.

A Commentary on Revelation by F. B. Meyer
 Bible Commentary on Revelation by H. C. G. ...
 J. P. Lange on Revelation
 A Commentary on Revelation
 Commentary on the Apocalypse by J. W. ...
 Exegesis on the Revelation of St. John ...
 The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, on Revelation ...
 Smith's Bible Dictionary
 The Revelation of St. John, with ...
 The Word of Christ by ...
 The Historic Theology by ...
 Inspiration by ...
 Life of ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

Books Used in the Study of this Essay.

Rischendorf's Greek Testament. (Eighth Greater Edition).

the Septuagint — Rischendorf's Text.

Winer's New Testament Grammar.

Harpur's Elements of Hebrew Syntax

On the Canon of the New Testament. By B. F. Westcott.

Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. By B. F. Westcott.

Introduction to the New Testament, 3 Vols. By Prof. S. Davidson.

Introduction to the New Testament. By E. Salmon.

Meyer's Commentary on Revelation. By F. Diüsterdieck.

Bible Commentary on Revelation. By W. Lee.

J. P. Lange on Revelation.

Alford's Commentary on Revelation.

Commentary on the Apocalypse. By J. Glasgow.

Hengstenberg on the Revelation of St. John. Vol. I.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, on Revelation. By W. H. Simcox

Smith's Bible Dictionary.

The Revelation of St. John, and Discussions on the Apocalypse. Both by Prof. W. Milligan.

The Heart of Christ. By E. H. Sears.

The Platonic Theology. By T. Lewis.

Inspiration. By W. Sanday.

Life of Niebuhr. By C. Brunser

Thayer's Lexicon, Cruden's Lexicon and Bond's Greek Concordance.

Prof. Juv. R. Saunpey gave me valuable assistance on some points of Hebraisms.