

A

RELIGIOUS ENCYCLOPÆDIA:

OR

DICTIONARY

OF

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BASED ON THE REAL-ENCYKLOPÄDIE OF HERZOG, PLITT, AND HAUCK.

EDITED BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. SAMUEL M. JACKSON, M.A., AND REV. D. S. SCHAFF.

VOLUME III.

NEW YORK:

FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,

10 AND 12 DEY STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1883, BY FUNK & WAGNALLS.

Electrotyped and printed by Rand, Avery, & Co., Boston.

threatened him with rebellion. The final solution was effected by Franz von Sickingen, who politely advised the Dominicans of Cologne to stop all further proceedings, and pay the fine, or to be prepared for a visit from himself and his friends. The Dominicans chose to pay and be silent.

The sensation caused by the trial of Reuchlin was enormous. All the humanists sided with him; and a party with very outspoken reformatory tendencies, and something of an organization, was formed under the name of Reuchlinists. It must not be understood, however, that Reuchlin himself stood at the head of that party. On the contrary, during the whole course of his trial he did his utmost not to fall out with the church. There was in his nature and character not the least trace of a talent for martyrdom. The last years of his life were much disturbed by war-incidents; and the brilliant engagement he accepted in 1521, as professor in Greek at Tübingen, he was by death prevented from fulfilling. After the appearance of Luther he also became estranged from his grand-nephew, Melancthon, who had previously been his pride. See his biography by MAI, Durlach, 1587 (Latin); MAYERHOFF, Berlin, 1830; LAMEY, Pforzheim, 1855; LUDWIG GEIGER, Leipzig, 1871. KLÜPFEL.

REUTERDAHL, Henrik, b. at Malmö, Sweden, Sept. 10, 1795; d. at Upsala, June 28, 1870. He studied theology at Lund, and was appointed adjunct to the theological faculty in 1824, professor ordinarius in 1844, minister of worship and public education in 1852, bishop of Lund in 1855, and archbishop of Upsala in 1856. His principal work is *Svenska kyrkans historia* (History of the Swedish Church), 1838-63, 5 vols., reaching to the Reformation, — a work based on original and exhaustive researches, but often admitting too much space to secular history. A. MICHELSEN.

REVELATION, Book of, called, also, by adoption, instead of translation of the Greek title, **The Apocalypse**, a term, which, according to its original sense, would denote the future glorious revelation of Christ, and only by a later idiom, the prophecy of it, and which is now commonly used to designate that specific kind of prophecy, of which this book is the most perfect example, which expresses itself in symbolical visions rather than in simple predictive words. According to the usual arrangement, it stands at the end of the New Testament, a position appropriate to its contents, and probably, also, to its date. It is the only prophetic book of the New-Testament canon, and, with the partial exception of Daniel, the only prophetic book of either Testament which is planned and written in the form of a carefully ordered and closely concatenated whole. The boldness of its symbolism makes it the most difficult book of the Bible: it has always been the most variously understood, the most arbitrarily interpreted, the most exegetically tortured.

Any question of its *genuineness, authenticity, or canonicity*, may be considered excluded by the strength of the external evidence. The book asserts itself to be by John in terms which forbid our understanding another than the John of the other New-Testament books (i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8). "An unknown John, whose name has disappeared from history, leaving hardly a trace behind it, can scarcely have given commands in the name

of Christ and the Spirit to the seven churches;" and it is indubitable that "all this was generally understood in the first two centuries of the apostle John" (Hilgenfeld). Traces of the use of the book are found as early as Barnabas, Ignatius, and the Testt. xii. Patt.; John's pupil, Papias, witnessed to its credibility; Justin (147) declares it an inspired prophecy of the apostle John. No church writer expresses a different opinion (Gaius of Rome has been misunderstood) until Dionysius of the third century, who, on purely internal grounds, denies it to the author of the Gospel, although asserting it to be certain that its author was some holy and inspired John, who saw a revelation, and received knowledge and prophecy. Nor did doubt, when it had thus once entered the church, spread rapidly. The third century closes without giving us the name of another doubter: and although Eusebius himself wavers, and tells us that opinion in his day was much divided, and soon afterwards the Syrian Church rejected it, — not without affecting the judgment of individual writers in Jerusalem, Asia Minor, and Constantinople, — yet Eusebius himself believed it to be inspired and canonical, the doubts were purely of an internal kind, the church at large was never affected by them, and the storm, even in the East, was soon weathered. Objection was renewed in the Reformation era by Erasmus, Carlstadt, Luther, Zwingli: but the churches refused to follow their leading; and, so soon as the subject of controversy changed, the book was used authoritatively by all parties. Modern objection began with W. Mace, 1729, and especially with the party of Semler in Germany. The latest opinion is divided into four classes. The moderate theologians, chiefly of the school of Schleiermacher, just because John wrote the Gospel, deny to him the Apocalypse, which they assign to some other John. The Tübingen school, on the other hand, rightly judging the evidence for the apostolical authorship of the Apocalypse decisive, just on that account deny to him the Gospel. Several extremists wish to pronounce both books forgeries. The church at large, on the other hand, together with the great majority of critics, defends the common apostolical authorship of both books; although some feel compelled to place them as far apart in date as possible, in order to account for their internal unlikeness: so, e.g., Hase, Réville, Weiss (1882), Farrar, Niermeyer. The grounds of modern objection are almost wholly internal, turning on divergences between the Gospel and Apocalypse in doctrinal conception, point of view, style, language. But Gebhardt has shown that no argument against unity of authorship can be drawn from the doctrinal relations of the two books; and every new investigation into the differences of style and language renders it more and more plain that it is consistent with unity of authorship. "The difference in the language can . . . have no decisive weight attached to it" (Reuss).

The *integrity and unity* of the book are not in dispute. Grotius, Vogel, Schleiermacher, Volter, and (at one time) Bleek and De Wette stand almost alone in doubting them. To-day "the assumption of the unity of the Apocalypse forms the uniform basis of all works upon it" (Volter). Its *text*, because of the comparatively few manu-

scripts which contain it, remains in an uncertain state in comparison with the other New-Testament books, though not so in comparison with other ancient works, or to any such degree as to impair our confidence in its use.

Its date has been much disputed; although the testimony of the early church, which is ancient, credible, and uniform, would seem decisive for A.D. 94-95. Irenæus, who was not only brought up in Asia Minor, and there knew several apostolical men, but was also the pupil of John's pupil, Polycarp, explicitly testifies that it was seen towards the close of Domitian's reign; and he is supported in this by Clement of Alexandria, according to Eusebius' understanding of his words, as well as by Victorinus, Jerome, and later writers generally. Eusebius drops no hint that any other opinion was known to him. Even those who denied the book to the apostle, yet assigned it to this time. Not the slightest trace (except, perhaps, an obscure one in Origen) of another opinion is found until the late fourth century (the Muratori canon has been misunderstood), when the notoriously inaccurate Epiphanius, not without self-contradiction, places the banishment and prophecy of John under Claudius (41-51). Some few writers adopt interpretations of special passages which might appear to imply their writing before the destruction of Jerusalem, but this inference is sometimes clearly excluded. No early writer assigns John's banishment, or the composition of the Apocalypse, to the times of Nero or his immediate successors. The earliest direct statement to this effect is found in the Syriac Apocalypse of the sixth century, which declares that John was banished to Patmos by Nero Caesar. (Is this due to a clerical error for Nerva?) This is thought to be supported, (1) by Theophylact (eleventh century), who places the writing of John's Gospel at Patmos thirty-two years after the ascension, but at the same time assigns John's condemnation to Trajan, and (2) by a false reading (Domitiou [understood of Nero] for Domitianou) in one passage of Hippolytus Thebanus (tenth or eleventh century), which is corrected in another. Certainly, if historical testimony is ever decisive, it assigns the Apocalypse to the closing years of the first century. Nor are supporting internal considerations lacking. (1) The natural implication of i. 9 is, that John was banished to Patmos; and this is in accordance with Domitian's, and not with Nero's, known practice. (2) The churches are addressed after a fashion which suggests intimate, perhaps long-standing, personal acquaintance between them and the author; yet it is certain, that, up to A.D. 68, John was not their spiritual head, and was probably unknown to them. Neither in Second Timothy nor in Second Peter (both sent to this region) is there the remotest hint of the relation between John and these churches, which seems to have been of long standing when Rev. ii. and iii. were written. (3) The internal condition of the seven churches appears to be different from that pictured in Ephesians, Colossians, First and Second Timothy, First and Second Peter; and the difference is such as seems to require not only time, but a period of quiet time, succeeded by a persecution, for its development. (4) The ecclesiastical usages of the churches seem to have made an advance.

The term "the Lord's Day," for Sunday, is unique in the New Testament; the office of "pastor," found elsewhere clearly marked in the New Testament only in the case of James, is here assumed as universal in Asia Minor, and well settled; the public reading (i. 3) of the Christian writings in the churches is spoken of as a usage of long standing, and a matter of course.

On the other hand, it has of late become the ruling opinion among critics, that the book comes from a time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. The chief arguments which are urged in its support are: (1) The whole tradition of the Domitianic origin of the Apocalypse hangs on Irenæus; and it is quite conceivable that Irenæus has fallen into an error, either as to time alone (e.g., Stuart), or as to matter as well, — the banishment, and hence the time of it, and hence the date of the Apocalypse, all depending on a misunderstanding of Rev. i. 9 (e.g., Dusterdieck). But Rev. i. 9 seems most naturally to imply a banishment. Irenæus does not depend on any inference from the book, but mentions excellent independent sources of information in the matter. It does not follow, because all the evidence of the first three centuries and a half is consentient, that it is dependent on Irenæus. Eusebius, on the contrary, understands Clement to the same effect, and appeals as well to a plurality of sources (*H. E.*, III. 20). (2) There is not even an obscure reference in the book to the destruction of Jerusalem as a past event, — a catastrophe of too great importance in God's dealings with his church to be passed over in silence in a book of this kind. This would probably be a valid argument if the book were thought to be a history or practical treatise written about 70-80; but, if a prophecy written about 95, it is too much to demand that it should contain reference to a catastrophe the lessons of which had been long since learned, and which belonged to a stadium of development as well as date long past. (3) Jerusalem is spoken of in it as still standing, and the temple as still undestroyed (xi. 1, 2, 3 sq., and even i. 7, ii. 9, iii. 9, vi. 12, 16), — a statement which proceeds on a literalistic interpretation confessedly not applicable throughout the book, or in the parallel case of Ezek. xl. sq. (4) The time of writing is exactly fixed by the description of the then reigning emperor in xiii. 13 and xvii. 7-12. Until, however, it be agreed who this emperor is, — whether Nero (Berthold, Bruston), or Galba (Reuss, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt), or Vespasian (Bleek, De Wette, Dusterdieck, Weiss), — this reasoning is not strong; and the interpretation on which it is founded (implying the assumption that the ideal date of any vision can be the actual date of the book itself) is exceedingly unnatural in itself, cannot be made to fit the description, except by extreme pressure of its language, and seems to fasten false expectations on the prophet, if not, indeed, the invention of what is known as the "Nero fable." (5) The chief argument with evangelical men, however, is that derived from the literary differences between the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, which are thought by many to be too great to be explained, except on the supposition that a long period of time intervened between the writing of the two books. The differences in dogmatic conception and point of view will hardly, however,

after Gebhardt's investigations, he asserted to be greater than may be explained by the diverse purposes and forms of the two writings; and it is perfectly vain to contend that the differences in style and language are such as are explicable by lapse of time. The Apocalypse betrays no lack of knowledge of, or command over, Greek syntax or vocabulary: the difference lies, rather, in the manner in which a language well in hand is used, in style, properly so called; and the solution of it must turn on psychological, and not chronological, considerations. Every new investigation diminishes the amount and significance of the difference on the one hand, and on the other renders it more and more clear that its explanation is to be sought in the different requirements of the well-marked types of composition and the divergent mental condition of the writer. The evangelist, dealing freely with his material, takes pains to write better Greek than was customary with him; the seer is overwhelmed with the visions crowding upon him, and finds no other speech fit for their expression than that of the old prophets, and therefore rightly yields himself to a prophetic, antique, Ezekiel-like, Hebraizing form of speech (Ebrard).¹

The *plan and structure* of the book, the whole of which seems to have been seen by John in one day (i. 10), are exceedingly artistic, and are based on progressive repetitions of sevenfold visions. It thus advertises to us at once its copious use of numerical symbolism, and the principle underlying its structure. Ewald, Volkmar, Rinck, Weiss, Farrar, have further correctly seen that the whole consists of seven sections, and thus constitutes a sevenfold series of sevens, and symbolizes the perfection and finality of its revelation. Five of these sections are clearly marked: it is more difficult to trace the other two. But, if we follow the indications of the natural division of the matter, we shall find the separating line between them at xix. 11 (so De Wette, Weiss, Godet, Hilgenfeld). The plan of the whole, then, is as follows: Prologue, i. 1-8; (1) The seven churches, i. 9-iii. 22; (2) The seven seals, iv. 1-viii. 1; (3) The seven trumpets, viii. 2-xi. 19; (4) The seven mystic figures, xii. 1-xiv. 20; (5) The seven bowls, xv. 1-xvi. 21; (6) The sevenfold judgment on the whore, xvii. 1-xix. 10; (7) The sevenfold triumph, xix. 11-xxii. 5; Epilogue, xxii. 6-21. The sevenfold subdivision of each section is easy to trace in all cases except in (4), (6), and (7), where it is more difficult to find, and is more doubtful.

Within this elaborate plan is developed the action of a prophetic poem unsurpassed in sacred or profane literature in either the grandeur of its poetic imagery, or the superb sweep of its pro-

phetic vision. It is of the first importance to its correct understanding, that we should grasp the fact that its prime *design* is not chronological, but ethical. It was not intended to write history beforehand, but, by tracing the great outlines of the struggle between Christ and the enemy, to keep steadily before the eye of the believer the issue to which all tends, and thus comfort him in distress, encourage him in depression, and succor him in time of need. It has always been the recourse of a persecuted church. In proportion as a church has waxed cold, and settled upon her lees, in that proportion has she neglected this book; but, whenever earthly help and hope have slipped from her grasp, she has addressed herself to it, and found in it all she could need to comfort, encourage, and enhearten. As Luke adjoined to his Acts of the earthly Christ Acts also of the risen Christ, conquering the world from Jerusalem to Rome, and establishing his church in the face of all opposition, so John, to his Acts of the God become man, adjoins the Acts of the man become God, triumphing not only over one age, but over all ages, not only establishing, but perfecting, his church; and thus he brings to the New Testament and the Bible its capstone and crown. "If the Gospels are principally intended to lay the foundations of faith, and the Epistles to enkindle love, the Apocalypse gives food to hope. Without it, we should perhaps see in the church only a place across which believers pass in order to attain individually to salvation. But by its help we recognize in her a body which develops and which struggles, until, with all its members, it attains the full stature of Christ" (Godet).

It is evident that all attempts at the *interpretation* of such a book are foredoomed to failure, unless they proceed in full recognition of its special peculiarities. Certain guiding principles to its exegesis emerge from a general view of its form and scope. (1) The primarily ethical purpose of the book, which at once determined the choice and treatment of its matter, and which gives it a universal and eternal application and usefulness, forbids us to expect in it, what we might otherwise have looked for, a continuous or detailed account of the events of future ages. All expositions are wrong which read it as a history framed with chronological purpose and detailed minuteness, and seek to apply its main portions to events of local or temporal interest, or to recognize the vast outlines of the future as drawn in it in the minute and recondite details of past or contemporary crises. We might as well see in Michael Angelo's Last Judgment a county assize. This were to make John a pedant, puzzling his readers with his superior knowledge of petty details, instead of a comforter, consoling and strengthening their hearts by revelation of the true relations and final outcome of things. He is dealing with the great conflict of heaven and earth and hell, not with such facts as the exact time when Roman emperors began to wear diadems, or that Turcomans used horse-tail standards, or that the arms of old France were three frogs. (2) Like the other biblical books, the Apocalypse was intended to be, for the purpose it was meant to subserve, a plain book, to be read and understood by plain men. No more than elsewhere are we to find here a hidden and esoteric wisdom,

¹ [The early date is now accepted by perhaps the majority of scholars. In its favor, besides the arguments mentioned by the author of the article, may be urged the allusion to the temple at Jerusalem (xi. 1 sq.), in language which implies that it yet existed, but would speedily be destroyed; and, further, that the nature and object of the Revelation are best suited by the earlier date, while its historical understanding is greatly facilitated. With the great conflagration at Rome, and the Neronian persecution fresh in mind, with the horrors of the Jewish war then going on, and in view of the destruction of Jerusalem as an impending fact, John received the visions of the conflicts and the final victories of the Christian Church. His book came, therefore, as a comforter to hearts distracted by calamities without a parallel in history. Cf. SCHLAFF, *History of the Christian Church*, rev. ed., vol. i. 834-837. — Ed.]

but must labor to avoid the two opposite errors, — of considering the book an elaborate puzzle, or refusing to find any mystery in it at all. It would be difficult to determine which notion is the more hopelessly wrong, — that which supposes that the original reader readily understood its whole meaning in every particular, and which thus refuses to allow here the brooding shadow which hangs over all unfulfilled prophecy, especially if only broadly outlined; or that which supposes, that, in delineating each prophetic picture, the seer chose emblems appropriate, not to his own age or all ages, but specifically to that in which this special prophecy was to be fulfilled, and which thus condemns him to write in enigmas unintelligible to all ages alike, — a concourse of meaningless symbols enclosing one single spot of lucidity for each era. Both the analogy of other Scripture and the experience of all time have disproved both fancies. Notwithstanding the naturalists, no one has ever understood all the details of these visions unto perfection: notwithstanding the pedants, the unlettered child of God has found them always open to his spiritual sight, and fitted to his spiritual need. (3) The Apocalypse is written in a language of its own, having its own laws, in accordance with which it must be interpreted. There is such a thing as a grammar of apocalyptic symbolism; and what is meant by the various images is no more a matter for the imagination to settle than are points of Greek syntax. This is not the same as calling the book obscure, in any other sense than a writing in a foreign language is obscure to those ignorant of it. "As all language abounds in metaphor and other materials of imagery, imagery itself may form the ground of a descriptive language. The forms of it may become intelligible terms, and the combination of them may be equivalent to a narrative of description" (Davison). The source and explanation of this symbolism are found in the prophets of the Old Testament (especially Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) and our Lord's eschatological discourses, which, moreover, furnish the model on the lines of which the Apocalypse is composed. The study of apocryphal apocalypses has also its uses, since their symbolism is also drawn from the canonical prophets; but it is best to draw water direct from the fountain. (4) The question of the fulfilment of the prophecy is totally distinct from and secondary to that of the sense of the prophecy. Nowhere is it more necessary to carry out the processes of exegesis free from subjective preconceptions, and nowhere is it more difficult. There seems no way, except to jealously keep the exegesis of the prophecy and the inquiry after its fulfilment sharply and thoroughly separated. It is only after we know fully what the book says, that we can with any propriety, ask whether, and how far, these sayings have been fulfilled. (5) As the very structure of the book advises us, and numerous details in it make certain, it is exegetically untenable to regard it as one continuously progressive vision: it is rather a series of seven visions, each reaching to the end, not in mere repetition of each other, but in ever-increasing clearness of development.

Doubtless it is because of failure to note and apply these and like simple principles, that the

actual exegesis of the book has proceeded after such diverse fashions, and reached such entirely contradictory results. No book of the Bible has been so much commented on: the exegesis of no book is in a more unsatisfactory state. It is impossible here to enter upon the *history of its interpretation*: the works of Lücke and Elliott, mentioned below, treat the subject in detail. In general, the schemes of interpretation that have been adopted fall into three roughly drawn classes. (1) *The Preterist*, which holds that all, or nearly all, the prophecies of the book were fulfilled in the early Christian ages, either in the history of the Jewish race up to A.D. 70, or in that of Pagan Rome up to the fourth or fifth century. With Hentensius and Salmeron as forerunners, the Jesuit Alcasar (1614) was the father of this school. To it belong Grotius, Bossuet, Hammond, LeClerc, Wetstein, Eichhorn, Herder, Hartwig, Koppe, Hug, Heinrichs, Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, Reuss, Réville, Renan, Desprez, S. Davidson, Stuart, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Maurice, Farrar, etc. (2) *The Futurist*, which holds that the whole book, or most of it, refers to events yet in the future, to precede, accompany, or follow the second advent. The Jesuit Ribera (1603) was the father of this school. To it belong Lacunza, Tyso, S. R. and C. Maitland, DeBurgh, Todd, Kelly, I. Williams, etc. (3) *The Historical*, which holds that the book contains a prophetic view of the great conflict between Christ and the Enemy from the first to the second advents. It is as old as the twelfth century, when Berengaud, followed by Anselm and the Abbot Joachim, expounded it. It has received in one form or another, often differing extremely among themselves, the suffrages of most students of the book. It is the system of DeLire, Wiclif, the Reformers generally, Fox, Brightman, Pareus, Mede, Vitringa, Sir I. Newton, Flemming, Daubuz, Whiston, Bengel, Gausen, Elliott, Faber, Woodhouse, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Von Hofmann, Auberlen, Alford, W. Lee, etc. The last six of these writers will be found nearest the truth.

LIT. — (1) Introduction. The various introductions to the New Testament, e.g., CREDNER'S, GUERICKE'S, BLEEK'S, HILGENFELD'S, S. DAVIDSON'S; the arts. in the encyclopedias, e.g., KITTO'S (by Davidson), McCLINTOCK and STRONG'S, SMITH'S, HERZOG'S, LICHTENBERGER'S (by A. Sabatier), and ERSCH and GRUBER'S (by Reuss); the prolegomena to the commentaries, e.g., DÜSTERDIECK'S, STUART'S, ALFORD'S, LEE'S (in the *Bible Commentary*), and EBRARD'S; and the section in the church histories, e.g., NEANDER'S *Planting and Training*, and SCHIAFF'S *History of the Apostolic Church* (1853, pp. 418-430 and 603-607) and *History of the Christian Church* (vol. i., 1882, pp. 825-853); also GODET: *Studies on the New Testament*, Eng. trans., pp. 294-398; WEISS'S "Apocalyptische Studien," in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1869 (cf. his *Leben Jesu*, 1882, vol. i. pp. 84-101); RENAN: *L'Antechrist*, 1873; BLEEK'S review of Lücke, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1854, 1855; and, above all, LÜCKE'S great work, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung d. Joannis*, second enlarged ed., 1852. — (2) Commentaries. (a) Preterists: — DE WETTE: *Kurze Erklärung d. O. J.*, 3d ed. (Möller), 1862; BLEEK: *Vorlesungen über d. Ap.* (Horsbach), 1862; EWALD: *Die Johan.*

Schriften, 1862, vol. ii. (cf. his *Commentarius in Ap. J.*, 1828); DÜSTERDIECK: *Kritisch. Ezeget. Handb.* (in Meyer's series), 3d ed., 1877; STUART: *A Commentary on the Apocalypse*, new ed., 1864, 2 vols.; DESPREZ: *The Apoc. Fulfilled*, new ed., 1865; REUSS: *L'Apocalypse*, 1878. (b) Futurists: — TODD: *Six Discourses on the Apocalypse*, 1849; C. MAITLAND: *The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation*, 1849; DEBURGH: *An Exposition to the Book of Revelation*, 1845; B. W. NEWTON: *Thoughts*, etc., 1853; I. WILLIAMS: *Notes*, etc., 1873. (c) Historical: — EBRARD: *Die O. J.* (in Olshausen's series), 1853; AUBERLEN: *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*, Eng. trans., 1856; VON HOFMANN: *Weissag. u. Erfül.*, 1862; FÜLLER: *Erklärung*, etc., 1874; HENGSTENBERG: *Die O. d. h. J.*, Eng. trans., 1852; KLIEFORTH: *Erklärung*, etc., 1874, 3 vols.; ELLIOTT: *Horæ Apocalyptice*, 5th ed., 1862, 4 vols. (cf. also his Warburtonian Lectures for 1849-53, Appendix); WORDSWORTH: *Lectures*, etc., 1849, and *New Testament*, vol. iii., 1860; ALFORD: *Greek Testament*, vol. iv., 1866; LANGE (ed. Craven), Eng. trans., 1874; LEE, in the *Bible Commentary*, vol. iv., 1881. — (3) Special Works. On the seven churches, TRENCH (1861), PLUMPTRE (1877), SVOBODE (1869); *Symbolical Parables* (1877); Theology of the Apocalypse, GEBHARDT (*The Doctrine of the Apocalypse*, Eng. trans., 1878). Practical commentaries, DURHAM, VAUGHAN, FULLER. — (4) Latest Literature. E. HUNTINGFORD: *The Apocalypse, with Commentary and an Introduction*, etc., London, 1881 (cf. also *The Voice of the Last Prophet*, etc., 1858); PEMBER: *The Great Prophecies concerning the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Church of God*, London, 1881; FARRAR: *Early Days of Christianity*, ii. pp. 103-352, New York, 1882; SCHAFF: *History of the Christian Church*, i., rev. ed., N.Y., 1882; MURPHY: *The Book of Revelation*, Belfast, 1882; VÖLTER: *Die Entstehung d. Apoc.*, Freib.-i.-B., 1882; ITTMEIER: *Die Sage von Nero als dem Antichrist*, in *Zeitschrift f. kirchl. Wissenschaft u. k. Leben*, 1882, 1, s. 19-31; MILLIGAN: *Inter-relations of the Seven Epistles of Christ*. (*Expositor*, January, 1882), *Double Pictures in the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse* (*Expositor*, October, November, December, 1882), *Structure of Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse* (*Expositor*, January, 1883), *The Church in the Apocalypse* (*Expositor*, July, August, September, 1883); KREMENTZ: *Die Offenb. J. im Lichte d. Evang. nach J.*, Freib.-in-B., 1883; J. T. BECK: *Erklärung d. Offenb. Johann. cap. i.-zii.*, ed. Lindenmeyer, Gütersloh, 1883; HERMANN: *Die Zahl 666 in der Off. d. Joh. xiii. 18*, u. s. w., Güstrow, 1883; I. H. HALL: *The Syrian Apocalypse*, in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1882, Middletown, Conn., 1883; WALLER: *Apocalyptic Glimpses*, Lond., 1883; MILLIGAN: *Commentary in Schaff's Popular Commentary on the N. T.*, 4th vol., Edinb. and N.Y., 1883. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION. This phrase is ordinarily applied to the spiritual condition of a Christian community, more or less limited in extent, in which a special interest is very generally felt in respect to religious concerns, accompanied with a marked manifestation of divine power and grace in the quickening of believers, the reclaiming of backsliders, and the awakening, conviction, and conversion of the unregenerate.

Theory of Revivals. — The progress of Chris-

tianity in the world has rarely, for any length of time, been uniform. Its growth in the individual and in the community is characterized by very obvious fluctuations. Like all things temporal, it is subject to constant change, exposed to influences the most varied and antagonistic. Now it makes rapid advances in its conflict with sinful propensities and developments; then it is subjected to obstructions and reverses that effectually check its onward course, and result in spiritual declensions.

The natural is ever at enmity with the spiritual. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." Growth in grace is attainable only by ceaseless vigilance, untiring diligence, unremitting conflict, and a faithful improvement of the opportunities and means of spiritual advancement. Any relaxation in the strife with moral evil tends to spiritual retardation: the evil gets the advantage over the good; the religious fervor abates; the soul becomes lukewarm, cold, dead.

As with the individual believer, so is it with the community. A church, a sisterhood of churches covering a large section of country, by reason of the predominating influence of some worldly interests, — the greed of gain in a season of great commercial prosperity, the strife of party during a highly excited political campaign, the prevalence of a martial spirit in a time of international or civil war, or the lust of pleasure in a time of general worldly gayety and festivity, or any absorbing passion for mere temporal good, — may be so diverted from the direct pursuit of holiness, and the prosecution of the work of advancing the kingdom of Christ, as to lose, to a considerable extent, the power, if not the life, of godliness. The spiritual and eternal become subordinate to the worldly and temporal. The blight of spiritual declension settles down upon them, and attaches itself to them with increasing persistency year by year. Such has been the history of Christian churches everywhere.

The ancient people of God were rebuked with great frequency by their priests and prophets for their proneness to spiritual declension. "My people are bent to backsliding from me." "Why is this people of Jerusalem slidden back by a perpetual backsliding?" This proneness was continually coming to the surface, in the days of Moses and the judges, under the kings, and both before and after the exile. Judges and rulers, priests and prophets, Deborah and Barak, Samuel and David, Elijah and Elisha, Jonah and Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, were raised up to beat back the waves of corruption, to arrest the tide of degeneracy, and to heal the backslidings of the people. The fire was kept burning on the altar only by repeated divine interpositions, resulting successively in a revival of religion.

Similar tendencies have from the beginning been developed in the history of the Christian Church: Ephesus loses her first love, Laodicea becomes lukewarm, Sardis defiles her garments, Philippi and Corinth yield to the blandishments of worldly pleasures. Worldliness and carnality, leanness and spiritual death, succeed, too often, a state of pious fervor, godly zeal, and holy living. The annual narratives of ecclesiastical communi-