

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

No. 18.—April, 1884.

---

I.

REV. DR. JAMES RICHARDS AND HIS THE-  
OLOGY.

OF the one, I shall give only a sketch ; of the other, only some outlines.

Dr. Richards' life of seventy-six years (1767-1843) covered an eventful period in the history of the Church and of the State.

In early boyhood, he heard the mutterings of discontent with English misrule, and the notes of armed resistance to British injustice. In the ninth year of his age, the Declaration of American Independence was published. In his own neighborhood, and everywhere, the people took up arms ; and for seven long years—long for the veteran soldiers, long indeed for such a boy—he heard of the terrors, and trials, and vicissitudes of the strife, which seemed to his boyish impatience as if it would never end. Not until his sixteenth year, came the news of the final victory—too good, almost, to be true ; and, then, the better news of peace, and, still better, of American Independence.

Already he was older in experience than many a man could be after fourscore years of national quiet. But Richards had just begun his great life-experience. Now he witnessed the formative process of constitutional government for a young independent nation—a process slow, difficult, delicate ; the formative process of his own State government, and of other States—sometimes appearing more troublesome, and certainly more intricate and delicate than the difficulties of war.

### III.

## THE UNITY OF THE APOCALYPSE, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO DR. VÖLTER'S STRICTURES.

WHEN Lücke first issued his monumental Introduction to the Apocalypse (1848), he was able to write the following cheering words concerning the theories which assumed the piecemeal origin of that book :

“If I do not err, hypotheses of this kind concerning the origin of the Apocalypse, have a common ground in the tendency,—for a while very widespread,—of the newer criticism in general, to explain such works of antiquity as seem to contain differences difficult of explanation or to suffer in any way from lack of internal connection, by the assumption of gradual origin and diversity of authorship. Since, however, in the most recent time, men have become more cautious and sober in the use of this kind of hypothesis in the sphere of classical literature,—as the investigations concerning Homer especially show,—and, by penetrating ever deeper and deeper into the spirit and connection of ancient compositions, have not seldom found unity and completeness where they were missed before,—they have become in the Biblical sphere also partly more distrustful of it and partly more cautious.”\*

This passage was allowed to stand also in the second edition (1852). But already the critical pendulum had swung back again, as Bleek, in his review of Lücke in 1855, did not fail to point out.† And from that time, critical license again—well, perhaps we ought not to say has “reigned,” since its practical influence has, after all, been small, but, at least, has revelled. To a sober eye, the most recent critical literature appears an apparently tireless and endless Walpurgis-night dance of the most dishevelled hypotheses. “As the investigations concerning Homer especially show,” we might justly add here, too, having in mind that Homeric criticism has culminated within the last twelvemonth in the most extreme hypothesis of the origin of “our Homer” ever proposed,—an hypothesis which makes it the Don Quixote of the age of Pericles, a gigantic farce and satire on the popular literature of the day. We groan inwardly whenever we see the

---

\* “Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung,” etc., ii. p. 868.

† “Studien und Kritiken” for 1855, p. 220.

ominous words, "The Origin of ——" on the title-page of a new book. It is quite a distinction for the Apocalypse that throughout all this turmoil it has been permitted to rest unassailed; whether because it suited the critics to assume its genuineness and integrity so that it might serve them as a lever to pry with at the foundations of other New Testament books, or whether because its defences were too strong to invite assault, it would be hard to say. At last, however, the critical cyclone has seen fit to blow its way; and Dr. D. Völter (1882),\* standing amid the ruins and taking thus an inside view, invites us to come with our baskets to gather up the fragments. We cannot be surprised that the day and the man have at length come; the wonder is that no Œdipus before this has seen in the Apocalypse a riddle preserved by a kind Providence just for his skill.

Dr. Völter's brochure is a phenomenon well worth our attention. Were it only on the score of its novelty, it might fairly ask an hour's consideration from us. The seriousness of the issues involved constitutes, however, a far better reason why we should in gravity rather than curiosity turn our thoughts for a brief space to its examination. The purpose of the present paper is to subject Dr. Völter's arguments against the unity of the Apocalypse to as thorough a sifting as the space at our disposal will allow,—with the end in view of discovering whether in the one prophetic book of the New Testament we have a trustworthy relic of the apostolic age, or only, as he would have us believe, the dregs of a century of controversy. In order at once to acquire a fit starting-point for our inquiry, and to secure greater completeness for our subject, and a higher surety for our results, we shall prefix a

#### HISTORY OF OPINION AS TO THE UNITY OF THE APOCALYPSE.†

The ancient church appears to have never raised the question of the origin, unity, and completeness of the Apocalypse, but to have been content to receive it as it came to them, in its apparent entirety. No doubt applications were often made of isolated passages of it which would logically lead to the denial of the closely-knit and continuous sequence of its thought; but this was the result of license in exposition rather than in criticism. Even the divergent traditions of the date and place of composition of the book rest on a settled conviction of its unity, and oppose rather than supplement one another.

\* "Die Entstehung der Apocalypse; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Urchristenthums," von Dr. phil. Daniel Völter, Repetent am Evangelisch-Theologischen Seminar in Tübingen. Freiburg i. B. und Tübingen, 1882.

† It, of course, goes without saying that this section is greatly indebted to Lücke's sections on the same subject. See his "Einleitung," vol. ii., p. 864 *sq.*

GROTIUS (1583—1645) seems to have been the first to call this settled conviction in question. He has nowhere left a clear or full exposition of his hypothesis, which, moreover, appears to have been never thoroughly worked out or subjected to any sharp testing. As gathered from chance hints in his Commentary,\* its main outlines are as follows: He held that the Apostle John was the seer of the visions, the writer of the parts, and the redactor of the book as a whole, but that the completed book was left in the custody of the Presbyter John, a disciple of the Apostle, whence arose the error of some that it was his work. At xv. 1 the book falls into two parts; the *pars priora* having been written at Patmos in accordance with the tradition preserved by Dorotheus of Tyre,† and the *pars posteriora* at Ephesus, as Eusebius asserts. This division has nothing to do with the subjects treated or the progress of the thought.‡ And only in the broadest sense does the whole of each part belong to one time. Each, rather, consists of several distinct visions seen at different times, and afterward redacted together. All the visions of the *priora pars* belong, however, to the times of Claudius, in accordance with the tradition preserved by Epiphanius, and their own implication that Jerusalem was not yet destroyed when they were written. And all the visions of the *posteriora pars* belong to the times of Vespasian, in accordance with their declaration at xvii. 10. Ten separate visions in all may be counted, beginning at i. 9; iv. 1; xi. 19; xiii. 1; xiv. 1; xv. 1; xvii. 1; xix. 1; xx. 1; and xxi. 1. It is not asserted that they are marked by John as belonging to different times; but only that they are exegetically separable as different visions which the apostle saw at diverse times, and which he afterward collected into one volume,—a phenomenon common enough among the Old Testament prophets, the difference in the time of whose visions is frequently not stated, but “is intended to be understood from what is found in each place.” According to Grotius, therefore, the Apocalypse consists of some ten visions, separately seen, which fall into two groups seen at the same place and at about the same time, and which were afterward redacted into one whole by the prophet himself.

In justifying his hypothesis Grotius makes use of the diversity of the

---

\* We have used it as printed in “*Criticorum Sacrorum, Tomus VII*”; Londini (Flecher), MDCLX. Cf. especially the notes *ad initium*, at iv. 1, at i. 9, at xv. 1, at xi. 19, and at the beginning of the various visions.

† That is, of course, the Pseudo-Dorotheus.

‡ From this point of view Grotius divided the book into *four* parts: (1), The visions containing salutary monitions for the seven bishops and churches, and through them for all bishops and churches (i. 9-iii. 22). (2), Those that pertain to the affairs of the Jews (iv. 1-xi. 19*a*). (3), Those which pertain to the affairs of the Romans (xi. 19*b*-xx. 15). (4), Those which pertain to the final glory of the Church (xxi. 1-xxii. 21). See at iv. 1; xi. 19; xix. 11; xx. 1; and xxi. 1.

traditions concerning the place and date of the origin of the Apocalypse, but this was certainly not the basis of his theory. It could not escape him that each of these traditions contemplates the whole, not a part, of the book; nor that the tradition of its Domitianic origin, which he rejects altogether, comes to us with unspeakably more force of evidence than that which assigns it to Claudius, which he accepts, while no tradition places any part of it under Vespasian. It was hardly worth his while to appeal to tradition even as a support to his hypothesis; for truly primitive tradition exhibits no diversity, and for three centuries the Church knew nothing of any other opinion than that the whole Apocalypse was seen and written during the closing decade of the first century. The real basis of his hypothesis was his persuasion that chapters iv.–xi. presuppose Jerusalem and the Temple as still standing, and xvii. 10 refers to Vespasian. To these was added the analogy of the older Prophets. The analogy is not, however, just; the Apocalypse differs in nothing from the Old Testament Prophets more markedly than just in not indicating the beginning and ending of separate visions. Nor can any other than the most precarious exegesis torture the xi. and xvii. chapters into chronological hints; while the applying of those hints, if real, to the determination of the time when the visions were written, proceeds in utter forgetfulness of the nature of the book, which unrolls before the eyes of the reader a panoramic display of the future, present (i. 19), yea, and even past (xii.; vi. 1, 2), each scene being in turn pictured as present.

It is not strange, therefore, that Grotius' theory met with small acceptance, or even that no one thought it worth while to seriously refute it. LAKEMAKER and HAMMOND\* (1653) alone, appear to have adopted it; and it soon passed into complete oblivion.

\* See "*A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament*," etc. Second edition. London, 1659. "John did first (in the time of *Claudius*) receive some Visions concerning this destruction of the *Jewes*, and the other attendants of it, and afterwards in *Vespasian's* time, while he was in *Judæa*, and *Domitian* reigned at *Rome*" [thus Hammond improves on Grotius, who held that the tradition of the Domitianic origin of the Apocalypse was a simple error], "receive more visions, that particularly of the *number of the beast*. For I suppose the several visions of this book were (as those of *Isaiah* c. i. 1; *Jeremiah* i. 2, 3; *Hosea* i. 1; *Amos* i. 1; *Micah* i. 1; in the reigns of several kings) received at several times, not all at once, or in one day. And accordingly there is no difficulty to conceive that *John*, having just received the vision of the *seven churches*, and according to direction, c. i. 11, speedily sent it to them, did *after that* (as μετὰ ταῦτα, c. iv. 1, literally imports) receive more visions, at several times, and after all, put them together into a book or volume, and dedicate them anew to the *seven churches*, c. i. 3, and this about the forementioned end of *Domitian's* reigning in his father's stead, that is, in *Vespasian's* time, when he was returning from *Judæa* that *John* to resume his power again," p. 858. "At what distance or space from one another, or in what order distinctly they were received, it is uncertain, save only that they were not before *Claudius*, nor after *Domitian*. But for the completion, there is no necessity that that should begin at the end of the completion of the former (as it might be conceived to do if the whole book were but one continued Vision), it being very possible that that which should first come to passe, might by God be chosen to be matter of a second Vision, nay, that the

It was thus reserved to our own century and to VOGEL\* to make the first serious attack on the original unity of the book (1811—1816). Like Grotius, he appeals to the diversity of tradition only as a support for an hypothesis already framed; and he is thus able to reject the strong testimony that the Apocalypse was written in the time of Domitian, in favor of the late Patristic guess that it was written in the time of Nero.† Like Grotius, too, Vogel appeals very strongly to the diversity of chronological indications found in the book itself. He thinks that the sections xii.—xxii. belong certainly to the times of Galba, because of xvii. 10; that i. 9—iii. 22 must belong later than A.D. 68, because Laodicea was destroyed by an earthquake in A.D. 60, and time must be allowed for its rebuilding, and recovery of influence; and that iv.—xi. must have been written before the Neronian persecution, since although the subject of the relations of the Church to the heathen is here freely mentioned (ix. 20; x. 11; xi. 18), yet absolutely no even veiled hint is dropped to imply that there had been a persecution from the heathen. It is from these considerations, apparently, that Vogel's hypothesis took shape. Its chief justification was sought, however, from the exegetical side—in an attempt to point out literary differences between the several parts of such character as would posit not only fragmentary origin, but plural authorship. Here a distinctly new step is taken, and the way is opened for a final discussion of the real problem. As the result of his labors, he asserted that the Apocalypse consisted of four parts. (1) The Apostle John wrote iv.—xi. 19<sup>a</sup> concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, about A.D. 64; (2) The Presbyter John wrote xii.—xxii. 20 concerning the Gentiles, under Galba, A.D. 68; (3) The Apostle wrote i. 9—iii. 21 after A.D. 68; and (4) The Presbyter wrote the rest, including i. 1—8; xxii. 21; xi. 19<sup>b</sup>, after A.D. 68, and compacted the whole into one book, doubtless with the knowledge and approval of the Apostle.

It is scarcely worth while to point out the fallacies and weaknesses in the general grounds of this theory. The failure of direct mention of heathen persecution in iv.—xi. will not appear strange to the care-

same thing might be severally represented by God, and so made the matter of several Visions," p. 883. For the time of the final redaction of the Visions—"those daies of *Vespasian*, wherein (as farre as concerned the Emperors Edicts), the Church received this great tranquillity, but that not perfected to them till the Jewes were destroyed," see p. 867 on Rev. i. 6. According to its sense, Hammond divides the Apocalypse into a Prologue, i. 1—10; the Visions "about the *seven churches* of Asia," ii. and iii.; other three sections, (1) "The proceedings of God with the Jewes," i.—xii.; (2) "The infancy and growth of the Church of Christ," "till it came through great oppositions to get possession of the *Roman Empire*," xii.—xix.; and (3) "The peaceable, flourishing state of the Church for a thousand years," xx.—xxii. 5. "And from thence to the end of the book, a formal conclusion of the whole matter," p. 860.

\* *Commentt. VII. de Apoc. Joann.* Erlangen, 1811—1816. [Four Programmes.]

† First found in the Syriac Apocalypse (of the sixth century.)

ful expositor, while the very generality of the language used is far from excluding it. If Tacitus (Ann. 14, 27) tells of the destruction of Laodicea, he also tells of its rapid rebuilding—and all such notices, even were they valid, would only serve to set a *terminus a quo* for the book at large, not to introduce schism into it. The finding of Galba in xvii. 10 labors under great exegetical difficulties, and could not be pressed to determine the exact actual date of the book as distinguished from the ideal date of the vision. The exegetical arguments are at once the most strenuously pressed, and the most worth discussion.

Vogel admits that the language and style are essentially the same throughout the book; that there is no essential difference between the parts in the use of the Old Testament; that the same great purpose is traceable in both the main portions; that both have essentially the same contents; that chapters ii. and iii. contain many passages\* which refer to, and are explained in, xii.–xxii., and, on the other hand, xii.–xxii. contain many references to iv.–xi.† But he contends: (1), That a slight difference can be traced, in the ease with which the Greek is handled, between i. 9–iii. 22, on one side, and i. 1–8 and iv.–xi., on the other, such as will suggest that the former passage was written by the same author at a later time; (2), that the influence of the LXX can be faintly though surely traced in xii.–xxii., but not in iv.–xi.; (3), that the very parallelism between iv.–xi. and xii.–xxii. forbids us to assign them to the same hand, since one writer would scarcely put together two series of visions of exactly the same contents; (4), that the references in ii. and iii. to later portions of the book can be accounted for as interpolations by the last redactor, and those of xii.–xxii. to iv.–xi. as intentional imitations; and, (5), above all, that there can be traced between the two main sections perceptible differences in conception, force, and rhetorical character, such as the absence of all expectation of an earthly kingdom of Christ, in i. 9–xi., while it is the ruling idea in xii.–xxii.,—the lofty and true poetic spirit which animates the one in contrast with the jejune style and poverty of thought of the other,—the well-ordered, progressive, and skilful plan of the one in contrast with the superfluity and useless repetition of the other.

The insufficiency of these considerations in the measure in which they could be justified, for the hypothesis founded on them, lay on the face of things. Vogel's admission after a rather thorough examina-

\* *e. g.* ii. 7 (cf. xxii. 2, 14, 19); ii. 11 (cf. xx. 6, 14, and xxi. 18); ii. 17 (cf. xiv. 1, and xix. 12).

† *e. g.*, xiv. 1 (v. 6); xiv. 3, xv. 7 (iv. 6, 4); xv. 2 (iv. 6); xvi. 17 (iv. 2); xvi. 3, 4, 8 (viii. 1, 5, 7); xiv. 6, 5, (x. 1, 5, 7).

tion, of the essential unity of the language, style, purpose, and contents of the book, was fatal to his theory. Nor were men slow in discovering that the measure of divergence he asserted to exist was not traceable apart from the warping influence of the theory. The Greek of one portion was made out to be better than that of another only by explaining away all anomalies in the one portion, and refusing the benefit of that process to the other. The influence of the LXX can, in fact, be about equally traced in both sections. However possible it might be to account for the inter-references between the various portions of the book as interpolations or imitations, every one of them stands as a distinct objection to the theory, which has to be explained away. While it is indubitably true that the prophecy returns upon itself at xii. 1, and begins a new series of development, so far from this being strange, or a mark of a different hand, it is in perfect accord with the general plan of the book, which develops itself through parallel and synchronous, though climactic, series of visions. Finally, the differences in conception and rhetorical taste between the two main sections of the book are purely imaginary. It is, no doubt, true that a progress can be traced in the representations of the future, in the passage from one section to the other, so that much more of the future is revealed in the latter than in the former portion of the book; but this is in accordance with the plan, and was to be expected. The rhetorical character of the writing remains, on the other hand, essentially the same, with only the differences that flow from the climactic progress of thought. Instead of becoming poorer as the work advances, the imagery grows unmistakably richer and grander, and it is remarkable that even the exigencies of a theory could blind so acute a mind as Vogel's to the affluence and beauty of the latter portion of the book. Nor are these images dissimilar from those of the former half: they bear the same grand and unearthly, but clear and attractive, character, and unite with them in placing the volume, as a whole, and in all its parts, at the head of all Apocalyptic compositions, as their glory and crown.

Nevertheless, Vogel's publications did not fail of an immediate and deep influence. BERTHOLDT\* was inclined to accept it in a modified form; and the thinking of BLEEK appears to have been profoundly moved by it. The latter writer reviewed Vogel very thoroughly in the *Berlin Theological Magazine* for 1822,† with the result of utterly

---

\* *Einleitung*. Bd. IV., pp. 1901—1907 (1812—1819).

† *Beitrag zur Kritik und Deutung der Offenbarung Johans. besonders mit Rücksicht auf Heinrich's Commentar und Vogel's Programme über dieselbe*. Printed in the Berlin "*Theolog. Zeitschrift*." Bd. II., s. 240, sg. (1822).

overthrowing, indeed, both the theory which he had put forth and the arguments with which he had supported it; but therewith the birth of a new hypothesis which, if more plausible just because grounded on an exegetical fact, was not a whit more really defensible than the one it supplanted. Bleek made an advance especially in two particulars. Hitherto the authorship or at least the authorization of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John had been assumed; Bleek assigns the whole to the Presbyter,—but thereby vindicates the unity of authorship which Vogel had denied. Hitherto growth by simple accretion had been assumed; Bleek assumed error and correction. The ground of his theory is found solely in the visible lack of immediate connection between chapter xi. and chapter xii., supported by the chronological hints in xi. and xvii. 10. The inevitable recognition of the impossibility of accounting for the references to xii.—xxii. in ii. and iii., as interpolations forced him next to presume that these two chapters were written after xii.—xxii., and inserted at this point on the completion of the book. His argument for his theory runs somewhat as follows: Chapter xi. 19 evidently marks a point at which the flow of thought is suddenly and violently broken off. All things hitherto had been working toward the climax of the destruction of Jerusalem; according to viii. 13, the last three trumpets were to bring in three woes—the first is past at ix. 12, the second at xi. 14, and the third is to come quickly. At xi. 15 the seventh angel sounds, and, instead of the third woe, we read only of a thanksgiving in heaven! Chapter xii. begins a new and parallel series of visions, breaking the connection completely. It not only does not carry on the train of thought, but begins at an earlier point than the Apocalypse had yet touched—for the exalted Christ meets us at chapter iv., but here he is not yet even born. We look in vain for the third woe which was certainly to be the destruction of Jerusalem, and read hereafter only of Rome, as if there were no Jerusalem. Take this in connection now with the chronological hints that proclaim to us that xi. was written while Jerusalem was still standing, and xvii. 10 when Vespasian was on the throne. Clearly i.—xi. (except ii. and iii.) were written before xii.—xxii., and had an appropriate ending, now no longer extant, but the place of which xii.—xxii. has taken. Bleek, therefore, supposes that the Presbyter John, sharing the expectation of the age that Christ was immediately to come, wrote in the times of Nero a book embodying his anticipations; finding what he had written falsified by events, he destroyed the latter portion and added a new section to fit it to the new condition of things in the time of Vespasian.

If the chronological notices which Bleek, in common with most critical commentators, assumed in xi. and xvii. 10, were correctly read by him, and it be further assumed that neither of them can be prophetic, and neither can be retrospective, then, no doubt, chapter xi. and xvii. 10 cannot have been written at the same time; and no place for the division can be found more likely than at the end of the eleventh chapter. But this is all assumption, and assumption the precariousness of which we have already had occasion to indicate. Wholly apart from exegetical arguments as to the impossibility of the theory in itself, then, it is clear that Bleek's hypothesis rests on no securer basis than did Grotius' or Vogel's before him. This is the more apparent when we remember that the break in sense and progress at xi. 19 is by no means strange or even very noteworthy in this book, but is in accordance with its manner and plan. It is paralleled, for example, exactly at viii. 1, and more or less accurately at the beginning of each new parallel series of visions.

All this lay far too much on the surface not to be immediately noted; and the effect of Bleek's criticism of Vogel and erection of a new hypothesis of equal unsteadiness on his ruins, was by no means favorable to the theory of the gradual composition of the Apocalypse. DE WETTE\* was caught for a moment in the toils, but the end was already come. EWALD† published his commentary in 1828, and was found to have devoted a section of the Introduction to the discussion of this burning question, in which strong and solid ground was taken both negatively against both Vogel and Bleek and positively in favor of the unity and completeness of the Apocalypse. He declared that the repeated writing and editing of the book were sufficiently improbable *per se*, and were supported by no sound arguments. On the contrary, no ancient book exhibited itself more clearly as one which might have well sprung from a single author at a single time; and there was no reason apparent for disturbing the beautiful order and admirable connection of its visions. He asserted against Vogel that the diversity of language and imagery which he assumed was purely imaginary, and there existed rather a wonderful community of all parts in such matters;‡ and that the former part of the book (iv.—xi.) could not have been written separately from the latter part, in as much as it was clearly only a preparation for greater things to follow, and no reader would fail to look forward for them,—nor, on the other

\* *Einleitung in d. N. T.* Ed. I., § 188, p. 351. Berlin, 1826.

† *Commentarius in Apoc. Joan.* pp. 32, sq., and 52, sq. 1828. Cf. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829. p. 309, sq.

‡ Cf. ii. 3 (λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα) with xiv. 13; iii. 9 (ἤξοισι καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν) with xv. 4; iii. 18 with xvi. 15; vi. 14 with xvi. 20; v. 14 with xii. 16 and xix. 4.

hand, could iv. 1 be understood without a previous i. 1-20, or xi. 7 be either understood or, indeed, written except xiii.-xix. were in immediate prospect. Equally strongly he urged against Bleek the manifold allusions of ii. and iii. to xx.-xxii. ;\* the relation of xi. 7, an inseparable part of iv.-xi. to xiii.-xix. ; the connection of vii. 1-4 with xiv. 1-5 and the whole last section ; the whole disposition, progress, order, and development of the book ; and the insecurity of the chronological data derived from xi. and xvii. 10.

The effect of this new turn in the posture of affairs was almost magical,—as, indeed, it ought to have been. De Wette immediately changed front.† Bleek, in his next publication on the subject, candidly retracted his theory.‡ The frank recognition of the original unity and completeness of the Apocalypse became at once universal. Only SCHLEIERMACHER, on the publication of his literary remains, was found to have remained unconvinced ;§ and he, led by exegetical difficulties in tracing the progress of thought in a book wholly alien to his type of genius, returned essentially to the stand-point of Grotius and held that the book probably consisted of a series of separate visions which belonged to different times and were called forth by different occasions, though undoubtedly seen, collected and ordered by one hand. He thus casts aside the hypothesis of plural authorship as wholly arbitrary, but eases his exegetical difficulties by cutting every knot that faces him. Schleiermacher did not so much, however, as cause an eddy in the current which now flowed straight from Ewald, and carried with it all critics of all schools. From 1828 to 1882 the agreement is unbroken, and Dr. Völter correctly remarks when he opens the discussion anew that the assumption of the unity of the Apocalypse forms the uniform basis of all work upon it. The recent Commentaries and Introductions either pass by the subject or treat it in a purely antiquarian interest and with half-apologies. ||

#### DR. VÖLTER'S THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE APOCALYPSE.

In such a state of affairs it required some boldness merely to reopen the question. Dr. Völter, however, exhibits no sign of hesita-

\* *e. g.* (from De Wette), ii. 11 (xx. 6, 14, xxi. 8), iii. 12 (xxi. 2, 10), ii. 7 (xxii. 2, 14, 19), iii. 5 (xx. 12, 15).

† *Einleitung*, etc. Ed. 2, and subsequent edd. ; *e. g.*, ed. 4 (1842), p. 349 : " Nevertheless, since the reference of xvii. 10 to Galba's reign is not impossible, and chap. xii. can be placed in a right relation to the foregoing, the unity of the book is not to be doubted."

‡ *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik* (1846), p. 81 ; *Studien und Kritiken*, 1855, p. 220ff ; *Vorlesungen*, etc. (1862).

§ *Vorlesungen über die Einleitung in d. N. T.* in *Liter. Nachlass*. Bd. 3 (*Sämmtlich. Werke*, Bd. p. 8), p. 462ff.

|| *e. g.* Lücke : *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in d. Off. d. Johannes*. 2d ed., 1852, p. 864-887 ; Düsterdiek : *Comm.* (in Meyer). 3d ed., 1877, p. 25-26 ; Davidson : *Introduction*, ed. 1 (1851), vol. iii., p. 615 (but not in ed. 2 of ed. 2 [sic.], 1882).

tion, in reversing the universal judgment of a not uncritical half century, in a pamphlet of seventy-two pages, which he himself describes as a mere sketch, and the result of a single winter's study. The same apparent contempt for contemporary and past opinion, which is suggested by this hasty action, seems also to show itself in the details of his theory. His predecessors in doubt had felt difficulty in assigning the book to more than one writer; only Vogel could assume two, and he posited an authorization of the whole by the original writer. They had found difficulty in assigning its parts to widely-separated times—from Nero to Vespasian is the widest period assumed by the rashest of them. Völter is embarrassed in neither case. According to him the Apocalypse is the drift that has accumulated through a period of more than a century; five separate strata are plainly observable in it, the work of at least four very different hands. Grotius could find differences only in chronological hints; Bleek's keen eyes could detect only one break in connection; Vogel could only, with much reasoning, persuade himself that literary differences existed between broad sections. All alike were constrained to see that in language, theological conception, manner of representation, and poetical style, the whole book was essentially of a piece, and, sooner or later, all since Grotius and Hammond—with the exception of Schleiermacher—have been compelled to admit the development of the book to be unbroken from beginning to end, and its parts welded together by undetachable bands. Völter, on the other hand, sees broken connection and lack of coherence every few verses,—finds a strange affluence of inconsistent chronological hints,—and remarks, with perfect *sang-froid*, that the dogmatic, and especially the christological, conceptions are so varied that no single type can be obtained from them, but “they represent, rather, numerous stages of development.” It is thus quite in character that he has the hardihood to declare,—in the face of the confessedly unanimous judgment of recent times that the book is a unit,—that any exact examination of it will raise doubts as to its unity which justify themselves as well founded.

The patent phenomena which call forth these doubts, he tells us, are of four kinds. There is a clear lack of connection and continuity between the separate parts. There are manifold needless repetitions which cannot be explained out of the progress of the thought. There are plain references to historical situations and persons which will remove sections to a date far later than A.D. 68-70—which is the time set in x., xi., xvii. There are patent and inexplicable divergences—implying numerous stages of development—in the dogmatic, and

especially the christological, representations. On a careful study of the book with attention to these phenomena, it is found to demand separation into five portions,—portions which have not been laid mechanically alongside of one another, but which interlace and dovetail the one into the other in a way to point to repeated intelligent reworking of the book. These sections, when shaken loose from one another, are as follows :

(1). The original Apocalypse, written by the Presbyter John in A.D. 65 or 66, and consisting of: i. 4-6, 9; iv. 1-v. 10 (except the words in v. 6, *ἔχων κέρατα . . . εἰς πᾶσαν τῆν γῆν*); vi. 1-17 (except the words in verse 16, *καὶ ἀπὸ τ. ὄργ. τ. ἄρνιου*); vii. 1-8; viii., ix., xi. 14-19 (except the words in verse 15, *καὶ τ. χ. αὐτοῦ*, and in verse 18, *τῶν νεκρ. κριθ. καὶ*); xiv. 1-3 (except the words in verse 1, *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ*); xiv. 6, 7; xviii. 1-20; xix. 1-4; xiv. 14-20; xix. 5-10 (except the words *ἡ γὰρ μαρτ. Ἰ. εστ. τ. πνευμ. τ. προφητείας*).

(2). A prophecy by the same author, written in A.D. 68, and consisting of: x., xi. 1-13; xvii., xviii. 21-24; in which instead of the opening words of xvii. 1, *καὶ ἦλθεν . . . φιάλας καὶ*, the following are to be read: *καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος*. To the interpolator who inserted these sections into the book, xiv. 8 also is to be assigned.

(3). A large interpolation, composed in the reign of Antoninus Pius, between A.D. 140 and 150, and consisting of: the words in xi. 15 and 18 excepted from (1) above; xii., xiii., xiv. 9-12; xv., xvi. (except v. 15); the words of xvii. 1 excepted from (2) above; xix. 11-xxi. 8.

(4). A smaller interpolation, also composed under Antoninus Pius about A.D. 150, and consisting of: i. 7, 8; v. 11-14, the words excepted from vi. 16 above under (1); vii. 9-17, the words excepted from xiv. 1 excepted from (1) above; xiv. 4, 5; xxi. 9-xxii. 5; xxii. 6, 8-11, 14, 15.

(5). The last interpolation, made under Marcus Aurelius about A.D. 170, and consisting of: i. 1-3; i. 10-iii. 22, the words excepted from v. 6 above under (1), xiv. 13, xvi. 15, xix. 10 end, xxii. 7, 12, 13, 16-21.

It will be observed that even the original Apocalypse, although assigned to A.D. 65 or 66, is denied to the Apostle John. The reasons assigned are four: the author never calls himself Apostle; the external evidence is not decisive, and apparently never was, since Dionysius of Alexandria and Eusebius both allow internal considerations to sway them; it is doubtful whether the Apostle ever was in Asia Minor; and there are grave doubts whether the "authorship of a book, composed in Greek, planned with great art, and full of marks of theological training," can be allowed to the unlearned fisherman of Galilee. Surely to read these reasons is to refute them. The reader is no doubt, however, eager to see how Dr. Völter pictures before himself the origin of the book in its five stages. The first and original composition, he thinks, was addressed to the churches of Asia (i. 4), with the design of showing that the judgment on Rome, and the world in general, was immediately imminent, and of pointing out how it would be consummated. It does not go beyond the Old Testament representations in its theology; even as regards the person of Christ, its conception is a purely human historical one. Its

date is set by its presupposition of the burning of Rome and the Neronian persecution,—perhaps also of the pest of the autumn of 65 A.D.;—all of which are fresh in the mind of the writer, who predicts the judgment against Rome just in order to avenge God's persecuted people. The events that followed hard upon the publication of this Apocalypse only strengthened the author in his belief that the end was near, and supplied more exact outlines to the picture he had drawn of the final catastrophe. Nero's suicide, which occurred in June, A.D. 68, seemed to threaten more danger to his prophecy; but with the news of it came also the report that he was not dead, but had fled to the Parthians and would return, and this report came to his aid. Seizing upon it, he framed it into harmony with his eschatological ideas by transforming Nero's flight into retirement into the *pit*, whence he should in due time emerge. Nor was it difficult to calculate the time of his return. Galba succeeded Nero, and no one could foresee the long usurpation that was to follow him. Only one more emperor was needed to complete the mystic number seven,—a number all the more appropriate here on account of the seven Roman kings, and the seven hills of the city. This seventh could have only the briefest rule (the seer thought of no particular person), for the end was near when Nero, the Antichrist, should return and the fate of the world be fulfilled. The terrible condition of things in Judea also wrought on the mind of the seer,—the raging war, the imminent siege of Jerusalem. In such state of affairs, he was brought toward the end of 68 A.D. to write a new prophecy—at first as an independent piece, but which was soon incorporated into the original book at what seemed the natural places. Even with this addition and correction, however, the prophecy was soon outrun and falsified by the events, and naturally therefore fell out of use and gradually out of memory. The outbreak of the new Jewish war under Hadrian, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the building of a heathen city on the sacred site; the rise of the false prophet, Alexander of Abonoteichos, and the increasing persecution of Christians; worked together to raise anew among the Christians the expectation of the end. Now the old and forgotten Apocalypse was germane to the feelings of the times again; was sought out; and fitted to the new age by an earnest hand, working in the decade 140–150. These additions never had an independent form, but from the beginning constituted only a carefully framed addition to the original document (as xiv. 9–14 show; cf. also xv. 7). Nor is there any trace of a *correction* of the old at this time; it was only bodily *applied* by additions to the new times. The interpolator began immediately after chapter xi. because he deemed

that the prophecies of x. and xi. were already fulfilled, and he inserts, therefore, at that point what he means to refer to his own age. Thus, however, the seven trumpets were separated from the last judgment, and the interpolator found himself compelled to treat them as introducing only a preliminary stage of the development, and to invent seven other angels (the bowls) to introduce the end. He did his work with skill; but could not prevent his own dogmatic conceptions contrasting sharply with those of the earlier book, and especially his christology, which viewed Christ as a *δευτερος Θεός*, and exalted him to the side of, though not to an equality with, God. The date of his labors is set, on the one side, by the use which the Montanists made from their very first origin of the conception of the New Jerusalem (xxi. 2), and, on the other, by the description (xiii.) of the false prophet, which is clearly meant for Alexander of Abonoteichos, to whom is ascribed an already attained wide influence. Probably the years 145–150 mark the time accurately. The hint of the New Jerusalem, thus thrown out in xxi. 2, fired the imagination of a monarchianistic writer who interpolated the book anew about A.D. 150—a date fixed by external evidence, as these sections were known already to Justin. The object is to describe the glories of the New Jerusalem; but the new dogmatic conception of the author which identified Christ with God, unconsciously shows itself and becomes characteristic of this section. Finally a writer, about A.D. 170, an opponent of Montanism, is led by the pressing needs and dangers of his time—the growth of Montanism and Nicolaitan Gnosticism in Asia Minor, the increasing enmity of the Jews since the last war, and the growing pressure from the side of the heathen—to address to the churches of Asia letters of warning and reminder of the near return of Christ. He interpolates these letters into the Apocalypse,—and further fits the book for his purposes by slight additions here and there—in order to give his words, not apostolic alone, but divine authority, for, according to his peculiar view of prophecy and the Spirit's mode of work, the words of the prophet are the words of God. In addition to this peculiar pneumatology, the christology of these sections—the highest of all, no less than the fully developed Logos-doctrine,—characterizes them. Their author was very familiar with the condition of affairs in Asia Minor, the state of the churches in which section, as depicted by him, sets the date of his labors. That they are quoted by Irenæus, but not by the churches of Lyons and Vienne, assigns them to A.D. 170—and several internal hints support this ascription. “Thus” (Dr. Völter himself sums up his conclusions), so far from being able to find the Apocalypse a consistent and closely concate-

nated composition of a single hand, "a whole series of grounds, partly direct and partly indirect, witness against the unity of the book and for its gradual origin. Not to one and the same pen, not to one and the same time, does it owe its origin, but four, or, if any one wishes it, five hands have worked on it, and a full century separates the first author from the last reworker."

In this way Dr. Völter advertises to us that he has no wish to conceal the extreme radicalness of his theory. It may seem to some—it has seemed to some—that this intensely radical position is its own refutation; and doubtless this is true. Vogel, Bleek, De Wette, Ewald, Lücke, and their host of followers, were much too keen-eyed and worked much too carefully over this field not to leave it in the highest degree improbable that it is seamed and cracked by so many and such terrible *crevasses* as Völter finds to cross it in every direction, and yet that they should remain in ignorance of it. However improbable the new theory may be, nevertheless, it is our duty to subject it to independent and careful testing. To the best of our knowledge it has not been heretofore adequately examined in detail, and although the reviewers\* seem, one and all, to accord with the general results which we reach, it does not seem supererogatory to follow, for once, the argumentation on which Dr. Völter rests his theory into as much detail as our space will allow, before we advance the more general considerations which appear to us to render the theory itself impossible, and to vindicate the unity of the Apocalypse against all theories that assume its gradual origin. Thus, at least, can we make it evident that we rest on a very broad basis of fact when we decline to be persuaded by Dr. Völter, and assert the integrity of the book. We need pause before taking up this task only to say that as yet Dr. Völter appears to have made no converts, although Dr. A. D. LOMAN has reached an apparently similar conclusion to his.† Small comfort can be taken by him, however, in this fact; since under the sharp scourge of Dr. Scholten‡ Loman has felt constrained to publish a retraction.§ We dare not hope that Dr. Völter will follow this good example; but we dare hope that our readers will think he ought to.

\* We have noted the following reviews and notices of Dr. Völter's book: *Harnack* in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1882, 24, 561; *Holtzmann* in *Pünjer's Jahresbericht* for 1882, 1883, s. 90; a sharp but just anonymous review in the *New York Independent* for 1882; *Schaff* in *Hist. of the Christian Church* (1882), i. 411; *Scholten* in "Historisch-critische bijdragen naar aanleiding van de nieuwste hypothese aangaande Jezus en den Paulus der vier hoofdbrieven," Leiden, 1882 (3d section); *Zöckler* in the "Zeitschrift für Kirchl. Wissensch. und K. Leben," 1882, ii. and iii., s. 65; *Rovers* in *Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1882, 617, sq.; *Sieffert* in *Herzog and Plitt*, 2d ed., art. *Nicolaitans* (cf. also *Schaff-Herzog sub voc.*); etc.

† "*Quaestiones Paulinae*," in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1882, p. 470, sq.

‡ As above cited.

§ *Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1883, p. 56.

## DR. VÖLTER'S GROUNDS OF DOUBT.

It will be remembered that Dr. Völter points to four classes of phenomena which suggest valid doubts to an exact student of the Apocalypse as to the unity of the book. It will be our task to examine at least characteristic specimens of each of these. First among them stands the asserted lack of connection, consistency, or coherence between various portions of the book,—so broad a statement that we are forced to subdivide it, lest we flounder in a slough of details. We note, then, that Dr. Völter finds that: (1) Some interpretations are pointed out by the break in the structure of the sentence which their presence induces; (2) Others by their inconsistency with statements made elsewhere in the book; (3) Others by their purely isolated and disconnected position in the midst of the book, or their superfluousness for the development of the subject; and (4) Still others by the break which their presence makes in the connection and progress of thought, whether in a narrow context, in which case they interrupt only the local connection, or in the whole book, in which case they interrupt the development of the subject, and are inconsistent with the plan of the work. Let us rapidly run our eye over a few of the most striking examples under each of these classes.

(1). To the first we assign the interpolation that is assumed in vi. 16 of the words, "And from the wrath of the Lamb," on the ground that by their omission "not only is the disturbing repetition of τῆς οργῆς in verses 16 and 17 avoided, but also the plainly older reading αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτῶν in verse 17 appears justified"; as well as that which is assumed in xi. 15 of the words, "and of his Christ," because the following verb βασιλεύσει is in the singular. The actual phenomena, however, in neither of these cases awaken the slightest doubt as to the originality of the words. There is in neither even an exegetical difficulty of any gravity, or any appearance of strangeness, in a book which can give us the singular "body" in such a passage as xi. 8. Were αὐτοῦ really the older reading—which it certainly is not—the two passages would be strictly parallel and equally easily explicable.\* As it is, we are reduced to supposing that the "disturbing" repetition of τῆς οργῆς alone suggest doubt, and will lead us to reject much more than will void the repetition! The elements of the case are only understood, when we observe that the real σκάνδαλον of these passages in their high Christology which must be gotten rid of in this portion of the book; and on account of which other grounds of objection are found—or made. An attempt is indeed made to show that vi. 16 is inconsistent with xiv. 1-3, 14-20, inasmuch as these passages do not associate the Lamb with the Father in the last judgment, while this does,—as if the failure to mention the Lamb's part in the last judgment where that judgment is not the main subject could be a proof that it cannot have been mentioned where it is. Moreover, it is observable that the Lamb is associated with the Father in xiv. 1-3; and Dr. Völter has first to cast him out thence before he can plead even this argument! We register,

\* The same phenomena of a composite subject—God and Christ—followed by a singular predication occur in 1 Thess. iii. 11, and 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. The dogmatic consequence is well expressed by Lünemann and Alford *in locis*. It cannot be held to be more strange in the Apocalypse than in these Epistles; and both linguistically and dogmatically the cases are exactly parallel.

therefore, in passing, the presence in the sections assigned to the original Apocalypse of at least two (or three) Christological passages of advanced type for whose rejection no reason can be given except that their presence spoils Dr. Völter's theory.

(2). Inconsistency of statement. The words in v. 6 which ascribe to the Lamb "seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth," are thought inconsistent with i. 4 and iv. 5, because in these passages the seven spirits are found in the form of seven lamps before God's throne, and stand in no closer relation to the Lamb,—as if the seer must tell everything he knows about each object he mentions, every time he mentions it, for fear of seeming inconsistent. In exactly like manner the description of himself by the angel as a fellow-servant of the prophets at xix. 10 is said to be inconsistent with his statement that he is fellow-servant not only of prophets but also of believers in xxii. 9. Precisely on the ground of that very conjunction of the Father and the Lamb in xiv. 1-3 of which we have already spoken, that passage is declared to be inconsistent with vii. 2, *sq.*, because "it is the seal of the living God" that the angel there bears, and therefore it was with his name only that their foreheads were sealed; hence "the monarchianistic expression" αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα here is to be stricken out.† One can readily see why Dr. Völter would like this to be done; but suppose we rather argue thus: 'vii. 2 is inconsistent with both xiv. 10 and vi. 16, and therefore a clause glorifying Christ must have fallen out of it and ought to be restored,'—would the procedure be less justified?× Another inconsistency is found in xvii. 16-18 as compared with xviii. in as much as the former passage represents the 'destruction of Rome' to have been brought about by God indeed (v. 17), but through the instrumentality of the ten kings (v. 12); whereas the latter represents it as a direct act of God's own whereat these very kings sorrow greatly (v. 9).<sup>2</sup> Dr. Völter appears, however, to have overlooked the fact that if xviii. 9 is inconsistent with xvii. 16-18, so is xvii. 2 no less. Why he should identify "the kings of the earth who committed fornication and lived wantonly" with "Babylon" of xviii. 9 with the "ten kings" "that shall hate the harlot and make her desolate and naked" of xvii. 16 rather than with the "kings of the earth" that "committed fornication" with her of xvii. 2, perhaps only he can fully explain. But certainly with xvii. 2 staring us in the face we cannot see that it is "beyond doubt" that the two chapters cannot come from the same hand.† Finally, that there lies an exegetical problem in the interchange of the speaker from the seer or the angel to Christ himself in xxii. 6-21 is not to be denied; but this is hardly a justification for calling in the theory of an interpolator. The whole epilogue, which begins at verse 6, appears to be spoken, like the whole prologue, in the person of the seer. The angel is, however, specifically quoted in verses 6-7 and 9, 10, *sq.* (=probably 10-16), and twice (v. 7 and v. 12) the angel's words pass into direct words of Christ, either because the one sent is identified with the sender or because the messenger here delivers the message in its exact words. The phenomenon occurs, of course, elsewhere in the book, *e. g.* in the prologue i. 8 and in xi. 3, xvi. 15; wherever it occurs (except xi. 3, which is apparently overlooked), Dr. Völter esteems it an interpolation. It is enough to say here that there is no proof that these passages are interpolated, and that the phenomenon is common to all portions of the book and is hence another mark of unity of authorship.

(3). The words τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι καὶ in xi. 18 are strangely declared superfluous 'in as much as the further statement contains the whole conception which the original Apocalypse had of the last judgment':—a criticism which is plainly a *result* of the theory and which cannot, therefore, be adduced as a *reason* for it. The two verses, i. 7-8, are also declared superfluous; they occupy a wholly isolated position; the introduction has already ended with i. 4-6, and now we expect the beginning of the Revelation itself; instead of which we have an entirely unnecessary second introduction. All of which is true enough, in a sense;—in the same sense in which all ascriptions of praise are superfluous to the flow of thought—in which Paul's habit of turning aside to praise the Lord whenever he mentions his name, leads him into many superfluities,—in which all doxologies break the progress of the subject. No doubt were it excised, the reader would not detect a "fault." But all this *raises* no doubt against the verses; only if they were proved doubtful on other grounds, would these considerations fail to raise an argument for their retention. The real objection to them is their advanced Chris-

tology,—but as we have seen that this is certainly found in the original Apocalypse, this also fails to throw doubt on them. We register, then, another case of its appearance. After the song to God in iv. 11, and the song to the Lamb in v. 9-10, it is said to be surprisingly superfluous to give another song to the Lamb in v. 11, *sq.*—and a song introduced without motive, and presenting points of needless difference from the preceding song, in as much as it contains no trace of the reception of the book out of the hand of God (v. 7, *sq.*), or of the opening of the seals (vi.), and ascribes a praise to the Lamb almost more elevated than that given God himself (iv. 11). Why, however, the *chorus* of verses 12 and 13 is any more surprising or superfluous than the song of the elders and living creatures in 9-10, it requires a special critical insight to see; and why the preliminary statements in verse 8 and the subsequent ones in vi. 1 need be repeated before and after *each* song, or why both should be identically alike, it is equally difficult for ordinary mortals to divine. Dr. Völter preserves his consistency by immediately adding, as another surprising circumstance, that verse 14 *does* repeat part of verse 8! The trouble again is, that these verses contain 'Monarchianism'; and we thus register another case of its occurrence in the original Apocalypse. The conclusion of the book is found at xix. 5-10, on grounds which grow out of, rather than support the theory; whence it easily follows that all subsequent to this point is plainly superfluous. And by quite as easy a method i. 1-3 is disposed of: such a beginning before i. 4 is surprising in and of itself, and it is written with an objectivity wholly strange to the rest of the book, and betrays a later writer wishing to commend this important book as of divine origin. We willingly acknowledge a certain truth in this,—just as the address on the envelope of a modern letter is written with more formality and objectivity than the familiar contents within. It is also in a certain sense by a later hand than the rest of the book; it bears every mark of being written in full knowledge of the contents of the book, and therefore after the Revelation was seen. Is it very uncritical to assume that a seer would not compose such a book piecemeal, but, before writing, would know what he was going to write, or even that he wrote the formal introduction last? By as much as this objectivity and knowledge of what comes only later in the book was *natural* in a formal preface, and by as much as the book sustains the character of a divine revelation here attributed to it; by so much can these peculiarities be not urged in proof of the interpolation of this section. By as much as it constitutes a most appropriate opening for the book, and is bound to it by interlaced allusions,—even with its very ending (cf. v. 3 with xxii. 18, 19); by so much is it proven to be an integral and inseparable portion of the work.

(4). A very favorable example of what Dr. Völter means when he charges a passage with inconsistency with the plan of the book is presented by his strictures on the Epistles to the seven churches i. 10-iii. 22. These he finds to be: (a) Inconsistent in their contents with the declarations in i. 1, iv. 1, xxii. 6, in as much as these passages agree in asserting that the book was to contain *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ* or *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα*, while this section does *not* deal with the future, but with the present, to justify which *ἃ εἰσι καὶ* have been inserted in i. 10. (b) Inconsistent in tone with the rest of the book, since they are composed in familiar Epistolary style in sharp contrast to the prophecy that follows. (c) Inconsistent with the machinery of the book, in as much as from iv. 1, where the heavens open,—which is the prerequisite of even the hearing of the voice,—the seer is continually in the spirit, whereas, here (i. 10) the voice is heard before the heavens open and the seer is already in the spirit,—after which iv. 1, 2 is certainly surprising. (d) Inconsistent in knowledge with their position in the book, since iii. 12 presupposes xxi. 2 as already written, for, of course, the New Jerusalem could not be spoken of before xxi. 2, where the conception is first put forward. There is something so convincing in a good sound assertion, that this argument actually appears at first sight somewhat plausible. It is, nevertheless, clearly specious. For: (a) It is beyond all controversy that in its present shape, the book as a book, is a body of prophecies, and this justifies the announcements in i. 1, iv. 1, xxii. 6, and is not inconsistent with its inclusion of a relatively short historical opening section, especially when that section consists of an account of the call of the prophet, and a practical application of the materials of the following visions to present needs. (b) Once given the propriety and desirability of such an introduction, and it is immediately natural and even inevitable

that its tone should correspond with its contents and purpose, and hence be specifically distinct from the lofty, poetical portions of the book; and that this divergence in the present case does not overstep this inevitable limit is vouched for by the confessed fact that the linguistic style of the whole book is of a piece. (c) So far from i. 10 rendering iv. 1, 2 superfluous, it prepares the way for it and is most plainly presupposed by it. This is apparent in the "after these things,"—the manifest repetition of the words—and especially in the description, *ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἦν ἡκουσα ὡς σάλπιγξος λαλοῦσης μετ' ἐμοῦ*, than which probably no clearer back-reference could be devised. Instead of assuming, therefore, with Völter that i. 10 borrowed words from iv. 1, 2, "but with illogical omissions," would it not be less illogical in us to assume that iv. 1 had logically borrowed from i. 10? So far, again, is the position of the section i. 10–iii. 22 from interfering with the machinery of the book, that it carefully observes it; just because the whole vision is seen through the open door into heaven, is all that is not part of that vision proper placed before iv. 1, 2. What would have been strange would be the placing this section *after* that point. (d) Only a curiously mechanical view of composition, finally (does Dr. Völter so compose?) can plead such foretastes of what was coming as iii. 12 as proof that this section was written after xxi. 2. Did John not know from the beginning what he intended to record? And did he not expect his readers to possess and read it as a single piece? Such references as this, in this portion of the work, wherein the visions are utilized for present warning and comfort, not only are not inconsistent with the unity of the book, but were to be expected and constitute so many firm bands binding its parts indissolubly together.

There is much less even apparent force in the arraignment of several passages for breaking the flow of thought in narrower contexts. For example, the adjunction to the account of the great consummation ending with xxi. 8, of the more detailed description of the glory of the New Jerusalem in xxi. 9–xxii. 5, will seem to most readers not only psychologically inevitable, but even formally necessary to the purpose of the book and the most fitting possible conclusion to its comforting visions. Dr. Völter finds it, however, wholly unnecessary and disturbing. For (he argues) xxi. 5–8 deserts the notion of the New Jerusalem and introduces the conclusion, while xxi. 9 goes back to the hint of v. 2 and develops it at length, thus necessitating a new conclusion. That it can appear strange to a critic (and especially a critic so jealous of the 'train of thought'), however, either on the one hand that the writer avoided breaking into the rapid flow of the narrative at xxi. 2 to insert this description, or, on the other, that he paused at xxi. 8 to adjoin it, raises the suspicion that he has not yet grasped either the purpose or the manner or the general structure of the book. This suspicion is not allayed by the arbitrary dictum that xviii. 21–24 have no right meaning in their present position; and is raised beyond suspicion to certainty by the dealing accorded to other passages. For example, we are told that vii. 9–17 disturbs the flow of thought, because it represents a stage evidently not chronologically one with that of vi. 9 *sq.* or even vii. 3 *sq.* on the one side, and just as evidently far in the future to even xiv. 6, 7 on the other; and (following Bleek) that at xii. 1, the progress of the temporal development suddenly breaks off and an unmistakable step is taken backwards—even to the birth of Christ; and, again, that xv. and xvi. have no meaning after viii.–xi. and xiv. 14–20, since the one of these passages presents us with the progressive stages of the last great *θλίψεις*, and the other with the description of the last general judgment, so that 'here is one and the same process of development described *doubly*—a proof that the two could not have stood originally side by side.' All of which means only that the critic has swallowed up the exegete. The phenomena—real enough and undeniable,—which indicate to us the plan of the author and demonstrate exegetically both the artistic intricacy of that plan and the unity of the book as a symmetrical development of so intricate a scheme; are actually made to do duty as proofs of confusion and division. No doubt, no scheme of interpretation which looks upon the book as a continuous prophecy ordered in one line of development is exegetically tenable; and the attempt to interpret it as such a continuously progressive prophecy can result only in hopeless confusion. The confusion lies, however, in the interpreter, not the book. And we regret to say that Dr. Völter does not make his strictures in ignorance of the very simple key which unlocks his puzzles. He even attempts to throw contempt on that

key in the remarkable words printed in a foot-note near the beginning of his *brochure*: 'Weiss attempts to escape the difficulties of the assumption of the unity of the Apocalypse by denying it to be one progressive vision and separating it into seven successive visions, each reaching to the end and developing it step-like with ever-increasing plainness.' "Weiss" indeed! Does Dr. Völter not know that this 'theory of Weiss' is as old as Augustin and the common property of exegesis,—down to the latest expositor, Dr. Milligan? Had he not been blinded by his critical purpose he would have seen that Weiss not only was stating a common theory, but also obvious truth, apart from the recognition of which the Apocalypse cannot be interpreted, and by the recognition of which a whole class of his objections to its unity is at once voided. What, meanwhile, are we to think of a piece of higher criticism which erects the necessary results of the actual scheme of composition of a book into marks of reworking and interpolation?

But Dr. Völter's inattention to the actual plan and method of the book does not stop even here. This method involved occasional interscenes,—a good example of which may be found in chapter vii., by which the solemnity of the coming seventh seal is intensified, and the mind put on a tension of expectation for it. The first eight verses of chapter vii.—quite enough to establish the method of interscenes,—Dr. Völter freely admits to be part of the oldest and original Apocalypse. The section x. 1-xi. 13 is obviously, formally speaking, the exact analogue to chapter vii. Yet Dr. Völter declares that it breaks the connection, and that, because the angels from the first to the sixth had followed each other uninterruptedly,—the sixth had fully finished his work at ix. 21,—and now we expect the seventh, instead of whom this interrupting vision is inserted! He does, indeed, adduce an additional proof (it surely was needed) that the section is a later interpolation, viz.: that in x. 11 we read: 'Thou must prophesy again,' which remark, we are told, has no meaning in the midst of a connected and single prophecy, but clearly presupposes an older prophecy by the same seer, and indeed one which constituted a complete whole of which the new is independent. The reply is obvious and twofold: to cast out a chapter and a half to get rid of two words is something like cutting off a dog's tail behind his ears; and Dr. Völter has neglected to notice the obvious reference of v. 11 to the command in v. 4 to *seal up* the prophecies given immediately before,—a reference which when once noted reduces his criticism perilously close to the ridiculous.

We feel confident that the reader who has paid us the compliment of reading what we have thrown into small type above—as if to invite him to skip it—will justify us in asserting that Dr. Völter has not made good his assumption of interpolations and reworking of the Apocalypse on any of these four grounds—which have been so framed as to include also the "manifold repetitions" which he asserts to exist and throw doubt on the unity of the book. So far from it, an examination of his method in these cases raises the doubt whether his acuteness has not been permitted by him to run entirely away with his judgment. He apparently does not stop to ask whether an apparent inconsistency which suggests itself to the mind of a rapid reader looking for such phenomena is due to inherent confusion in the book or careless confusion in the reader. We begin to fear that he has set himself to see whether he cannot find indications of lack of unity in the book, and, casting his eye rapidly over its pages, has raked together a series of "examples," without that deep, preliminary exegetical study of the work which could alone enable him to estimate the value of his *collectanea*. Nor will this fear be

allayed by an examination of the inconsistent chronological hints which he finds so thickly strewn over the pages of the Apocalypse.

#### THE ALLEGED INCONSISTENT CHRONOLOGICAL HINTS.

It will not be necessary to delay to discuss the correctness of the interpretations which find an undestroyed Jerusalem in chapter xi. and Galba in xvii. 10—the discussions of which are already legion. We may in passing, however, remark, that even granting these interpretations to be correct (which, in our opinion, neither of them is), it is altogether illicit reasoning to date the time of writing the book or any part of it by these dates, rather than by the ideal time of any other of the visions. By exactly parallel reasoning xii. 1–6 was written immediately after the birth of Christ, or at least his ascension, and each section at a different time, even to the end of the world. In a word, our author is proceeding here again—in however good or great a company—in forgetfulness of the nature and professed manner of the panorama-like book he is criticising.

The same flaw exists in and vitiates the reasoning which dates chapter xviii. immediately after the burning of Rome, or vi. 9–11 soon after the Neronian persecution, or vi. 7, 8 after the pest of A.D. 65, even were we to admit a reference to these events in these passages. If it were asserted only that the manner of description implied an acquaintance with or involved reminiscences of these scenes, the argument would be worth our consideration as proof that the writer wrote some time after them, or even perhaps had witnessed them and been deeply affected by them; but anything beyond this is plainly out of the question. If indeed it were true that the descriptions were clear and detailed up to this point, and then suddenly became vague and indefinite (as the author asserts), this phenomenon would be significant, and might lead to a determination of the date of the book or section. But this is plainly not the fact. Dr. Völter finds equally clear traces of knowledge of Galba's reign, for instance (xvii.), or even that of Antoninus Pius (xiii.). Only if on other grounds the book were already separated into sections of differing ages is there, thus, meaning in his assertion. But this is just the fatal fact which sweeps his whole criticism out of existence; we can say at each step only, 'Very good; provided you have the real proof elsewhere.' Meanwhile, until that real proof is adduced, it is very certain that a reference to the burning of Rome in xvii. (if it be there), or to Nero's persecution in vi. 6–11, will not determine the date of the book for us; even on an entirely rationalistic hypothesis they would only assign the book as a whole to a date subsequent to 65

A.D., and would fail utterly to suggest any separation of the section containing them from any other portions written presumably after that date.

The very rich fruitage borne by Dr. Völter's historical studies cannot be appreciated until we study the thirteenth chapter under his guidance. It might be sufficient here, too, to remark that he has taken the ideal date of the vision (granting that he has interpreted it aright) for the date of its composition, and so close at once the discussion. But it will be too instructive to follow the details of his interpretation itself for us to content ourselves with that answer. We return, however, to small type.

We shall not stop, indeed, to wrangle over the interpretations which find a reference to the wars of Hadrian in xii. 13-17, and a governmental persecution, such as never existed before Trajan, in xiii. 7, *sq.*; but when we hear that Antoninus Pius is found probably, and Alexander of Abonoteichos certainly in this chapter, we feel a certain awe creeping over us, and wonder how it can be said that there is nothing new under the sun. Here, at least, we must, if only in sheer curiosity, follow the interpretation itself. Although probably not without reference to Daniel (we are told), the statement that the first beast (xiii. 1) came from the *sea* is yet probably significant. The Sibyllines (viii. 52) speak of Hadrian as the one "who bears the name of the nearer sea," whence the readers were to guess 'Hadria.' Perhaps here, too, there is a like reference to Hadrian, or, better, to his adopted son and successor, Antoninus Pius, whose imperial name was Titus *Ælius Hadrianus Antoninus*! From which we may at least infer that one of Dr. Völter's qualifications for engaging in the higher criticism is that (such is his sharp-sightedness) he can guess 'Hadria' from an Oriental's use of the simple word 'sea' (here evidently equivalent to 'water' in opposition to 'land') where ordinary mortals would understand the eastern shores of the Mediterranean,—equally easily as from the careful and even anxious description of the Sibyllines. We shall not express surprise that he modestly thinks this identification needs some "surer support"; but we need not withhold it when we become aware that he finds this in a very clear description, under the name of the second beast, of the charlatan Alexander of Abonoteichos. Let us follow the exposition by which this identification is justified. (1) Both the second Beast in the Apocalypse (xvi. 14, xix. 20, xx. 9) and Alexander in Lucian (ed. Lehmann, v. 60, *sq.*), are called the "False Prophet," and this is the more significant because Lucian names the Christians among those who, although of little wit, saw through Alexander, and against whom, therefore, he cherished a great hatred. (2) The Beast came from the inland, and Alexander came from across country on the shores of the Black Sea. (3) The Beast spoke like a dragon, and Alexander's manufactured god was a serpent to which he had fitted a dragon's head. (4) In the Apocalypse power is said to be given to give life to the Beast, so that it should speak (xiii. 15), and Alexander's serpent was not only actually alive, but, by a cunning contrivance, its dragon's head was made to open and close its mouth, dart out its tongue, and even, with the aid of a tube and assistant, to speak, and thus give autophonic oracles, to the surprise of the people and profit of the swindler. (5) Opposition to the Beast was dangerous (xiii. 15), and Lucian gives us to understand how dangerous it was to oppose Alexander.

Surely Dr. Völter belongs to the literal-interpretation school of prophetic students. The words of the seer are, at any rate, but a nose of wax in the hands of this exegesis. The beast came out of the earth, Alexander from the seashore; the beast *spoke* like a dragon, but *was* like to something that had two horns like a lamb; Alexander was like nothing but a man, though he *made* a dragon's head for his serpent which *spoke*, not like a dragon, but like a man; the beast did not make an image at all, but only gave *real* life and speech to the image of the first beast (believed by Dr. Völter to be the image

of the Emperor) which the people made (xiii. 14, 15); Alexander had nothing to do with the Emperor-cult, but made only a poor contrivance of a dragon's head. By such resemblances as these, anything is like anything. Yet such resemblances are not half the matter; a large list of dissimilarities of so pronounced a type that even Dr. Völter recognizes them and tries to explain them away, is in reserve. Thus (1), The Beast has all the authority and power of the first beast (the Emperor), xiii. 12, 15, 16, 17;—which was certainly not true of Alexander. (2) He institutes a general and stringent persecution, xiii. 16 *sq.*;—which Alexander did not. (3) The Beast stamps men with his 'mark' (xiii. 17), which, although perhaps figurative, has nothing to correspond with it in the history of Alexander. Völter remarks that 'perhaps the people did stamp themselves with images of the dragon-god as a magic charm.' But, then, *perhaps* they did not. (4) The Beast called down fire from Heaven (perhaps, again figuratively),—not so, Alexander. (5) 'The dragon-cult of Alexander stood in no close relation to the Emperor-cult,' Völter admits; yet there is no dragon-cult at all in the Apocalypse, but only 'the Emperor-cult.' (6) There was no general coercion to worship Alexander's dragon. And so on. It is competent, indeed, for Dr. Völter to say that all these differences are due to a misunderstanding on the part of the seer as to the nature of the movement which Alexander inaugurated. But this is only a confession that the description in the Apocalypse does not describe Alexander, and hence that no proof can be drawn from it that this portion of that book was not written until after Alexander had lived and lied.

We confess to a hearty shame over the easy victory which we have won over this man of straw which Dr. Völter has dressed up and stood in our path; it had been more dignified to smile and pass on. It is perhaps, however, worth the loss of dignity to give our readers the chance of observing in detail one specimen of the facts which are to force the dismemberment of the Apocalypse.

After such a specimen, proclaimed as "certain," we are at least prepared for what lies still before us. The seer predicts a persecution to the church of Smyrna, carefully explaining that it had not yet come; therefore, says Dr. Völter, he is writing after it had come. Such a martyrdom as that of Antipas, which is admitted to have been committed by the mob, it is asserted could not have occurred before Nerva and Domitian,—a statement which would by no means embarrass us who firmly believe that the Apocalypse in none of its parts was written before that date, but which nevertheless cannot be true if any part of the New Testament, which is full of like instances, is credible. Bishops (*i. e.*, Congregational or Pastoral Bishops), we are told, do not come before us until the middle of the second century, and hence the epistles to the seven churches were not written till then,—and yet Ignatius and Polycarp, writing in the earliest years of that century, speak of them as a well-settled office in these very churches to which the seer is writing, and at least one case of such a bishop appears in the New Testament as early as 58 A.D., or even 40 A.D.\* What remains is even more remarkable. In the light of the

\* James of Jerusalem: cf. Gal. i. 19; Acts ix. 26; xii. 17; xv. 6; Gal. ii. 11, 12; Acts xxi. 18.

New Testament, and especially of 1 Corinthians, that false prophets should have shown themselves at Ephesus (Rev. ii. 2),—that at Pergamum there should have been those who defiled themselves with idol sacrifices and an impure life (ii. 14),—that a professed prophetess should have taught such practices at Thyatira (ii. 20), are all in the highest degree natural at any time after, say, A.D. 60. These notices are, nevertheless, declared to be a clear description of the Montanists! If a dull reader objects that the Balaamites and followers of Jezebel are described as the exact antipodes of the ascetic Montanists, he will quickly learn that Dr. Völter does not allow a little thing like that to interfere with his identifications. This description, we are gravely told, was “taken from Balaam [Qy.: at ii. 20, too?], the type of all false prophecy, and applied from this type to the Montanists, although not exactly [*sic!*] fitting them. What is meant, is—and this the very names Balaam and Jezebel show—to point out the unchristian essence of this prophecy, which directly involved a falling away from Christianity to heathendom,—a heathendom whose characteristic was lewdness and idolatry.” Very well indeed; but how then was anybody to know that Montanism was meant? Perhaps Islam or Mormonism will serve better,—or, indeed, almost anything. Even the mention of the Nicolaitans is made a chronological note of a late date, on the ground that the Nicolaitans were a gnostic sect of the middle of the second century. We cannot pause to prove that this is directly in the face of all history regarding them, culminating in Irenæus’ statement that they were *multo prius* than Cerinthus (Haer. III., ii. 1), who himself was John’s contemporary. This will go without saying, and we thus gain space for a fuller discussion of

#### THE ASSERTED IRRECONCILABLE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS.

At the outset of any discussion of this subject, it must be borne in mind that there are two diverse questions here which are frequently confounded. To inquire whether there exist such divergent doctrinal statements in a book as will force us or lead us to assume that it was written piecemeal and by diverse hands, is distinct from inquiring whether the book can be so dissected that each resulting section shall bear a special though perhaps slightly marked dogmatic character. The latter may be done with any book that has been freely written; it can be done successfully with Dr. Hodge’s Theology. Only the answering of the former in the affirmative will avail for Dr. Völter’s purposes, while an affirmative answer to the latter would be of value only as corroborative evidence to justify a separation already performed on other grounds.

Now, it is to be frankly admitted at once that there exists variety in the dogmatic statements of the Apocalypse. No set formula such as "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet" meets us with wearying reiteration as its one dogmatic conception. Christ is sometimes spoken of as a man and with terminology which will not necessitate our assuming more than this; sometimes, on the other hand, as God coequal with the Father; and often in nearly every manner intermediate between the two. It is true, as Dr. Völter asserts, that sometimes God sends the revealing angel (xix. 10a, xxi. 5; xxii. 6),—sometimes Christ sends him (i. 1-3; xxii. 16-21),—while sometimes Christ speaks directly to the seer without the intervention of an angel (xvi. 15; xxii. 7, 12, 13, etc.). It is true that the seven spirits are before God's throne (i. 4; iv. 5), and belong to Christ (v. 6); that God is usually spoken of as the last Judge, but at vi. 16 Christ is associated with him; that the name of God only is mentioned at vii. 2, but Christ's is joined with his at xiv. 1. But it is also true that these phenomena present a knot for exegesis to *unloose*, and it is not sound procedure to *cut* the knot either with Baur by asserting that Divine predicates are assigned to Christ as "names borne outwardly by him and not associated with his person in any unity of nature,"—in other words, that they mean nothing; or with Hoekstra, by saying that in a symbolical book trying to picture the resurrected and exalted Christ, *some* difference had to be made between the state he had thereby attained and that which men in this life could reach to; or with Hilgenfeld, by practically striking an average between the low and high predicates and so finding an Arian christology; or with Völter, by distributing the various statements among several writers,—first classifying them, in a word, and then assuming a writer for each class. These expedients mark the desperation, not so much of the task as of the critics. The problem is simply to find a conception of the person of Christ which will naturally harmonize the various statements; and only on proof of the total impossibility of finding such a conception are other methods to be sought. That such a conception lies ready at hand in the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, or—if we prefer the phraseology—in the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, is too obvious for argument; and it is the less excusable to go beyond that in seeking an account of the phenomenon before us, that it lies openly in the New Testament, and that in a book professing the same author as the Apocalypse, and is indeed taught confessedly in the Apocalypse itself. "Whether according to the categories of the new theology and philosophy, upon whose Procrustean bed the self-styled historical criticism lays the New Tes-

tament writers, there is a discrepancy between the two sides of the Apocalyptic christology, does not trouble us";\* the key to the difficulty lies at the hand of all.

It being thus out of the question to introduce schism into the Apocalypse on account of its varied christological statements, it is worth while next to inquire whether the matter of the book has been so distributed by Dr. Völter as to assign a really special Christology to each section. Dr. Völter does certainly draw out at length the characteristic Christology of 'each hand' and lay stress on it in support of his rearrangement of the matter. But whether such diversity is obtained as in any way to justify this procedure may be easily tested by simply observing 'the characteristic christologies' together. We are told, then, that the Christology of the *first hand* is based throughout on the Old Testament, and the conception of the person of Christ is throughout human and historical (*menschlich-historische*); Christ is called the Son of God, but not in a metaphysical, but only in an ethico-religious sense, in which the Sonship, involving the gift of divine might and glory, is conceived of as a reward given the Messiah for and after his work (i. 5, 6; v. 9, 10; xiv. 3). In the work of the *second hand* (third section), Christ appears as a *δεύτερος Θεός*—at once alongside of and subordinate to God,—who was God from the foundation of the world (xiii. 8). The *third hand* (fourth section) presents a sharply-marked monarchianism,—“God and the Lamb no longer appear as distinguished personally or hypostatically, but only according to name or historically, and the two form essentially one person, one subject” (xxi. 22, 23; xxii. 1, 3, 5). The *fourth hand* (fifth section) advances even on this, representing Christ as “THE” Son of God (ii. 18) in the metaphysical sense, who shares the Father's throne (iii. 21) and his glory (xxii. 16; cf. ii. 28),—the ‘first and the last,’—the *A* and *Ω*,—the ‘beginning and end,’—the mediator of the world-creation (iii. 14),—the WORD OF GOD (xix. 13). It is, however, very plain indeed that here are no inconsistent representations, but only the different sides of one doctrine—the doctrine which has from the beginning until to-day been always held to be truth and scriptural. Any modern or any ancient Trinitarian could adopt every phrase as his own—does use every phrase as his own.† Thus, Dr. Völter only succeeds as proving that the Apocalypse presents an orthodox Nicene Christology. The passages adduced to prove Monarchianism only prove the essential unity of Father and Son; those ad-

\* Gebhardt, *The Doctrine of the Apoc.*, p. 90.

† Harnack (*Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1882) calls attention to the fact that the second ep. of Clement, *e. g.*, presents like phenomena. So does nearly every orthodox writer.

duced to show that the original Apocalypse knew only of a divinity for Christ, received by him as a reward for his work, do not go nearly so far as Phil. ii. 8, *sq.*, and no farther than representations found in the portion of the book assigned to the last hand (iii. 21; i. 18). So that it is pellucidly certain that we have to do here only with a separation of the Apocalypse into sections, each embracing the passages which express one side of the one consistent doctrine of the universal Church; and that the varying representations being thus thoroughly consistent, offer no support whatever to the tearing of the book asunder.

It is even more worth our while, however, to notice that the Apocalypse is rather unexpectedly difficult to separate into even such sections. In its pages the various sides of the Johannean Christology are so interwoven, that even so skilful a dissector as Dr. Völter finds supreme difficulty in running his scalpel between them. Thus, for example, the highest conceptions persist in remaining imbedded in the oldest Apocalypse. In v. 6 the seven spirits of God, that is, the Spirit of God in his totality of Divine perfection, belong to the Lamb. In vi. 16 it is the wrath of the Lamb, equally with that of God, that burns on the great day of wrath. In xi. 15 the kingdom of Christ is identified with that of God. In xiv. 1 the seal of the Living God (vii. 2) bears the name of the Lamb as well as that of the Father. In xiv. 14\* the Redeemer is described as being not only *as* but *like* a man, which beyond question demands that he be recognized as something much more than man.† Of course, our critic does not permit these statements to rest undisturbed in the bosom of this "oldest Apocalypse," but proclaims them all (except the last) interpolations of a deft word or two by later hands. Nevertheless, each interpolation so assumed is a living argument against his dissection of the Apocalypse, and the need of assuming so many proves that so far from the nature and distribution of the christological representations lending support to his theory, they cannot be made consistent with it. When we find him forced further to assign xxii. 6, 8-11 to one hand, and xxii. 7, 12, 13, 16-21 to another and inimical one; and compelled to confess on the one side, that to obtain the characteristic christology of his last hand we must distinguish sharply within the bounds of that section, between what is original with this reworker, and what he adopted from his forerunners, and that even here (as well as in the first section) the conception of re-

\* Which Völter in vain tries to ascribe to an angel; the "another angel" of v. 15, of course, ranges with verses 9, 8, 6, etc.

† Cf. Gebhardt, l. c., p. 78.

ward for work done is found (iii. 21, and i. 18), and there is a certain subordination to the Father (iii. 2, 12; ii. 27), and on the other side that some of the most striking elements of the fifth-hand conception are found only as interpolations into earlier portions (*e. g.* xix. 13);—the demonstration is complete, and the sober student is forced to see that the christological representations of the Apocalypse, so far from being so distributable as to justify Dr. Völter's dissection of the book, actually prove its impossibility.

To other dogmatic conceptions small appeal is made; except that the doctrine of the last reworker as to the Spirit is pronounced diverse, and even opposite to that of the rest of the book. We feel called upon to make only three remarks. The author apparently has fallen into a confusion with regard to what was new in Montanistic Pneumatology: this was not the doctrine of inspiration which compared the prophet to a musical instrument played on by another hand, which was of very early currency, but the doctrine of ecstasy. The fact that the last portion of his Apocalypse consists of the unapocalyptic portions of the book—the historical prologue and epilogue,—which portions are specifically separated from the visions which the angel was sent to show,—at once explains all the real phenomena which Dr. Völter erects into difficulties, and sweeps away his painfully erected fabric. And finally, this assertion also of divergence in doctrine between the parts of the Apocalypse can only be made good by arbitrary criticism; the Spirit is elsewhere as well as here the underlying source of prophecy (iv. 2),—here, too, the angel is declared to be the medium through which Jesus sends the visions (i. 12; xxii. 16)\*,—and finally his criticism cannot stand unless we consent to regard xix. 10*b* and v. 6 as interpolations into the original Apocalypse.

#### GENERAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PARTITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The examination of the details of Dr. Völter's attack on the unity of the Apocalypse suggests certain general arguments for it. For instance, it enables us to say with emphasis that there are no valid considerations as yet before the public against it. Further, in repelling the attack in detail we have reached completer conviction as to the literary consistency of the book, its freedom from inconsistencies in statement or temporal suggestion, its entire dogmatic unity. And each of these facts may be taken out of the category of charac-

\* Völter says these are "adoptions" out of preceding sections.

teristics of the book not disproved by Dr. Völter, and made to carry the war into Africa by being put into the positive shape of valid and weighty arguments against all dissection of such a book. Leaving this task, however, to the reader, we wish to suggest here some other considerations of like character which will lead us independently to a like result, some drawn from the character of Dr. Völter's theory, others from the character of the Apocalypse.

And first, it can scarcely escape any one that Dr. Völter's theory is a much too elaborate, artificial, radical hypothesis to be either natural or likely. It no doubt arranges matters thoroughly; but it arranges them as the old theory of cycles and epicycles arranged matters in the solar system, with a complication and artificiality that are not found in things that *grow*, whether in the heavens or on earth. Dr. Völter asks us to assume so much,—such constant reworking, addition, subtraction, alteration,—by so many hands, in so many interests, extending through so many years,—that even were we disposed toward some theory of gradual origin, we should weary of so complicated and long-drawn an hypothesis as this, and pronounce it *a priori*, if not impossible, yet certainly thoroughly improbable. If the process which he assumes had been really gone through with, either the marks of it would be visible, and the last half century would have recognized it, or they would be too hidden to permit them now to be exhibited with a wave of the hand. Who can believe that so complicated a knot wound together, and compacted by five successive hands, and a century's settling can be so gracefully unravelled? The art of a juggler is suspected, and the reader, in spite of good resolutions of seriousness, greets the operator with a smile, as a literary Heller, rather than with the serious gaze of conviction. And if the strands lie over one another in such obvious and loose folds as to need only the wave of the magic wand to bid them stand apart, what are we to think of the whole line of critics from Vogel and Bleek to our own day?

It may be asserted next, with equal confidence, that Dr. Völter's theory involves not only assumptions which are historically both unproven and exceedingly unlikely, but also assumptions which are historically incredible. It is certainly incredible that a succession of writers capable of sustaining the lofty poetical style, and the combined grandeur, artificiality, and simplicity of this book,—of working with such breadth and freedom within the limits of a plan apparently so artificial, so hedged in by arbitrary though symbolical limitations,—of striking with such apparent ease the highest notes that were ever attained in this special mode of composition,—should be found

among the nameless and unscrupulous heretics and forgers of the first and second centuries, and nowhere else either in that time or any time. The contrast between the Canonical Epistles and those of the successors of the Apostles, or even between the Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels, is no more marked than that between John's Apocalypse, and all Apocryphal writings of the class. Not only is it not approached by any in nobility of poetic imagery, in consistency of symbolism, in sustained grandeur of style; but it alone of all the many Apocalypses of the time attains to clear definition, and avoids the indefiniteness that comes from feeble grasp of the subject, or incomplete mastery of the form; it alone fits to each stage and each scene its appropriate symbolism; it alone avoids the Rabbinical number-jugglery, and in the midst of the most abounding numerical symbolism knows how to be simple in spite of the artificiality of its vehicle; it alone has carried in its bosom a divine message of comfort to all afflicted and persecuted men. Lücke speaks over-soberly even when he says: "There can be no doubt but that no other Apocalyptic production can be compared to John's in richness, and even clearness of thought, or in beauty of form. In every particular, it is the noblest flower of Christian Apocalyptic literature."\* Are we to believe that this book is simply the débris that gathered on the shore of a sea of depraved superstition, heartless imposture, and dishonest forgery? Do men, indeed, gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?

Not less incredible are the more impersonal requirements of such a theory. Dr. Völter's historical imagination is defective, or he could hardly draw so heavily on the credulity of his readers. So far are we from being able to accomplish the feats in supposition that he asks of us that our mental muscles ache at the thought of them. We feel as if we were children again, and some one of our companions were calling on us continually: 'Just let us suppose.' Alas! but we are not children, and wishing-carpets, and Aladdin's lamps, and kindly, flying griffins no longer appear possible to us. But what dream-like contradictions, and what impossible sequences Dr. Völter calls on us to 'just suppose.' We are asked to believe that edition after edition of the Apocalypse was put before the church in quick succession,—no less than three between A.D. 145 and 170,—each differing essentially from its predecessors, and that the docile people received each and all not only as genuine, and John's own writing, but as divinely given for their guidance, and never asked one uncom-

---

\* l. c., p. 416.

fortable question. The second century was, on this view of it, a very heaven for forgers,—if we may not even say a paradise of fools. The Apocalypse which Papias thought worthy of credit\* was not the same that Justin declared inspired. The book that Irenæus knew, and loved, and quoted, when he penned the letter of the Gallican Churches † was an essentially different one, not only in size, contents, and form, but in *doctrinal teaching* from the one which the same Irenæus in his great work on Hæresies tells us was written by John the disciple of the Lord, and—on the authority of those who had seen John,—was composed at the end of Domitian's reign;—but which Dr. Völter tells us was written really by an unknown opponent of Montanism (what one of its known opponents was capable of it?) about 170, when Irenæus was contemplating if he had not already commenced his great work. And Irenæus is but a type of all his contemporaries. Each and all revered in turn two or three totally diverse Apocalypses of John, and as if fairly drunk with Lethean water, preserved no memory of the immediate predecessors of each! No heresy-hunting in that age! Yet this was the age of the Montanists and Gnostics,—of the arch heresy-hunter Irenæus himself. We protest that we have no longer the flexibility of imagination 'to suppose.'

Eyen, however, apart from such broad considerations, what we are bidden to believe about the reworking of the book itself is *per se* sufficiently incredible. Let the reader turn back to the beginning of this discussion, ‡ and read Dr. Völter's story of its growth. Clearly, if the Apocalypse of A.D. 68 had not fallen wholly out of the memory of men, its entire recasting in 145–150 would have been impossible; and so Dr. Völter tells us calmly that the Apocalypse of 68, "not so much because it was unapostolic as rather because it was quickly falsified by the facts, had obtained neither a wide circulation nor great authority, and had soon fallen into oblivion." The truth is simply § that this supposition is necessary for the theory! But if it is improbable in and of itself, how much more so when we remember that there is

\* Dr. Völter no doubt denies (p. 56) that Papias knew the Apocalypse, or if he knew it, yielded it credit, on the ground that if he had spoken of it, he must have spoken of its author too; but that he did not do this the silence of Eusebius sufficiently proves. There is force in this. But the statement of Andreas that Papias deemed the book ἀξιώπιστον backed by his adduction of words from Papias' explanation of Rev. xii. 7, fairly balances it, and cannot be set aside by our failure to find Papias' comment apposite. Arethas quotes Andreas (Cf. Comm. in Apoc. ap. Cramer, Catena, Oxon, 1840, p. 360), thus: τοῦτο καὶ πατέρων παράδοσις καὶ Παπίου διαδόχου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου, οὐ καὶ ἡ προκειμένη ἀνοκάλψις, διαβεβαῖοι Παπίου δὲ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς λέξεως οὕτως φησὶ περὶ τοῦ πολέμου ὅτι "εἰς οὐδὲν συνέβη τελευτήσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν οἰονεὶ τὴν πολεμικὴν ἐγκείρησιν." ἐβλήθη γὰρ ὁ δράκων, ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄψις, ὁ ἀρχαῖος. κ. τ. λ.

† Dr. Völter thinks that this letter was, perhaps, written by Irenæus.

‡ See *ante*.

§ What he has to urge against the knowledge of it by Papias, see *ante*.

as unbroken a line of quotations from the Apocalypse as the Christian remains of the time would lead us to expect, running through this period (culminating with Justin at the end of it, who mentions it by name and as inspired), which prove that it was anything but forgotten.\* And this is not all: this process of forgetfulness, resurrection, and re-issue with improvements was repeated five years later, and again twenty years later still. Dr. Völter does not attempt to explain how these two latest reworkings were 'rendered possible' (although his attempt to explain this for the first, betrayed his sense of the difficulty that meets him here); we admire his wisdom,—but not to explain in such a case is to confess judgment.

After such feats as these, it is scarcely worth while to point out that this new theory does violence to history in such minor matters as the assignment of other than the most probable dates to the origin of parties or to written documents. No doubt there is always some uncertainty in such matters; but it is no commendation to a theory that it is inconsistent with the best probabilities in dates that we can attain to. One instance only need be mentioned as a sample. If Dr. Hort's assignment† of the dates of Justin's works and death which places the dialogue in 146 or 147 and the death in 148 be deemed probable,—then Dr. Völter's theory is thrown into confusion; for it would push back the composition of his fourth section to 137, or earlier, and destroy at once all the elaborated arguments for the dates of both that and the preceding sections. To *probable* arguments of this kind the theory is open in several quarters.

We prefer, however, to deal with what is more certain, and therefore turn now to note some objections to the theory drawn from the character of the Apocalypse. And here, first of all, we would remark that the elaborate, artistic, and even artificial *plan* of the book demonstrates its original unity. The accidents of growth do not produce such symmetrical development: and the latest hand which worked on it could not frame the material lying before him into so artistic a shape without entirely rewriting the book, and so destroying the traces of his predecessors. Just consider for a moment the artificiality of the numerico-symbolical scheme which underlies the whole book;—its seven great divisions, each subdivided into seven subsections; its complications of cæsura-like pauses amid these, separating them into fours and threes; its solemn delays of the end here and there by the insertion of interscenes between the sixth and

\* These are found in Barnabas? (106 ?), Ignatius (117), Testt. xii. Patt. (117 ?), Papias (120 +), Justin (147), Hermas (?), Pseudo-Leucius (130 †).

† Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, iii., 139; but see Holland, *contra*, in Smith & Wace.

seventh sub-sections; its repeated traversal of the same ground in obedience to its system of parallelism, and yet in such a way as not only not to introduce inconsistencies, but even not to fall into repetition, but to mark each successive section as a distinct advance on its predecessor both in matter revealed, clearness of revelation, and grandeur of the poetic imagery and Apocalyptic symbolism clothing the revelation;—consider, we say, all the complications that are involved in the successful carrying out of this scheme, and then ask if such a book could have grown as the mere deposit of the muddy waters of a century's strifes, guesses, and frauds. As well say that a Petrarchan sonnet was found to have formed itself in the waste-box of a printing-office, out of the broken type cast into it, the good type that had accidentally fallen into it, and the stolen type maliciously dumped into it by discontented and rebellious employés. Believe it who can: our fairy-tale age has passed. The Apocalypse is probably the most artistically and elaborately constructed book extant; its every part is bound to each of its fellows and to the whole by innumerable bands of adamant. It is an organism; part answers to part, and the whole is fitly framed and knit together through the mutual interworking of each separate portion in its due measure. When we tear it into pieces, we hold but mutilated limbs up for the world's acceptance as "the original" book,—with the pitiful signs of mutilation painfully evident. We cannot admit that a *torso* is more apt to be the 'original form' than the harmoniously-framed whole. Such a well-compacted frame, we cannot believe, consists of a living heart and artificial limbs.

But, again, we must take note of the fact that this work so artfully framed is, *linguistically* and *rhetorically*, a unit. And this is the more significant in that, in these two particulars, the book is unique. The New Testament furnishes nothing like it; apocryphal apocalyp-tics only faint parallels. How can we suppose that four different writers, scattered over a century of time, and unlike in everything else, yet happened to be precisely alike in this most subtle of all things,—and in such a style;—the essential unity of which unmistakably shines through even the great difference of form between the epistolary introduction and the apocalyptic body of the book. This unity of language and style could be illustrated copiously: it will scarcely be necessary to do so,\* however, after the discussions on the

\* We may note, among the more minor points, *e. g.*, Hebrew pleonasm of pronouns found alike in Völter's §§ I. (vii. 2), III. (xx. 8), IV. (vii. 9), and V. (iii. 8); apposition in different cases in I. (i. 5, iv. 1, ix. 14), II. (xvii. 8), III. (xiv. 12, xvi. 3, xx. 2), IV. (xxi. 1 *sq.*, vii. 9), and V. (ii. 13 and 20, iii. 12); mixed construction in I. (iv. 4, xiv. 14, xviii. 12, 14), and IV. (vii. 9, v. 11); introduction of direct discourse by *ὄτι* in I. (xviii. 7), and V. (iii. 7); participle without verb expressed in I. (iv. 1, 5, 6; v. 6; vi. 2, 5); IV. (v. 13; vii. 9, 10); and V. (i. 16).

subject which Vogel's programmes called out early in the century,—the admissions which Vogel made—and the finding of such a court as sat upon his case, the spokesmen of which were Bleek and Ewald. Dr. Völter does not reopen the question,\* and thus it may be held to be to-day a confessed fact that in language and style the book is all of a piece.

That the various portions of the book are so firmly welded together by allusions from one to the other as to proclaim it a literary whole, is another fact which, after the discussions between Vogel, Bleek, and Ewald, and the consent of all subsequent time, needs no restatement here; † especially since Dr. Völter accords it no special treatment beyond the strange assumption that every reference to another portion of the book is the mark of a later hand—an assumption which would parcel every romance out to a dozen writers and forbid story-tellers to prepare for their *denouements*.

Finally, no sober student can doubt for a moment that the notices of the Apocalypse still extant in the early fathers forbid the assumption of extensive and repeated reworking of the book. Even were we to confine ourselves to the great representative trio of the closing years of the second century, the essential unity of the Apocalypse is historically demonstrated. There is hardly a chapter in the book which Tertullian does not cite or allude to, assigning them all to the Apostle John. He quotes, moreover, from the already current old-Latin version, which—although probably made before Völter's fifth, or fourth, or even third section was composed—nevertheless contained them all,—as is independently rendered probable by the statement in the Claromontanian Stichometry that the North African Revelation contained as many as 1,200 verses. Clement, who was trained by hearers of the apostles and repositories of the “blessed teaching directly from both Peter and James, both John and Paul,” is clear that Dr. Völter's latest sections are the “utterance of the apostolic voice.” And Irenæus, as if he had written for our special behoof, settles the matter beyond appeal. The pupil of John's pupil, Polycarp, and acquainted with others who had seen the apostle, he had exceptional means of knowing the truth. And he took exceptional pains to attain it. He made a point of collecting and examining old copies of the Apocalypse, and tells us that “all the accurate and ancient copies” read 666 at Rev. xiii. 18. Dr. Völter says that passage was not written until 145–150. Irenæus became Bishop in 177; his pre-

\* The one or two cases of divergent usage which he suggests (*e. g.*, *μαρτυρία* I. X., see below) are not sufficient to void this statement.

† See *ante*.

ceptor was martyred in 155 or 156, at which time he must already have reached manhood. Yet Irenæus, who sought and found old and accurate copies, apparently found none without that passage. Nay, worse than that: he goes on to tell us that those who "had seen John face to face," testified that the apostle wrote 666 and not 616. So that we have contemporary testimonies that the apostle wrote this passage.\* When Dr. Völter has finished reckoning with Irenæus, he may next proceed to the probably earlier document which we call the Muratori Canon, and which in a most provokingly calm fashion speaks of the seven letters of the Apocalypse as a well-known and apparently aboriginal part of the book. Holtzmann thinks this alone destructive of the Völter theory. Still earlier than this Justin declares with perfect innocency—certainly before 161, and probably about 147-9 (just when the passage was getting written!)—that the Apostle John wrote Rev. xx. If it be admitted further that Papias had the Apocalypse (c. 120) and deemed its credibility certain, and found Rev. xiii. 7 (which was not written until 145-150) in it,† it will be seen that the external notices of the book make some difficult work for Dr. Völter. Add, now, that Justin, Melito, and Irenæus are credibly said to have written commentaries‡ on the book,—that it had a place not only in the old Latin, but probably in the old Syrian§ version,—that the Alogi who rejected it as a whole, yet assigned it as a whole to John's day,||—and that there is an unbroken series of silent quotations from it or allusions to it extending back to the earliest times: and it will be seen that the history of the book is plain and its safe transmission to Irenæus certain. It may be worth our while to set down in small print the testimony of the early silent allusions to the various portions of the book as Dr. Völter has divided it, as a kind of *coup de grâce* to his theory, with which we may close.¶

\* Irenæus, *Cont. Haer.*, v. 30, 31.

† See *ante*.

‡ So Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 9 and 24) says; cf. *Eus. H. E.* iv. 18 and iv. 26.

§ Cf. Hilgenfeld's *Einleitung*, etc., pp. 111, 121, etc., for the Syriac version before the Canon, and text as well as Greek text were revised in *sæc.* IV.

|| Epiphanius, "*Haer.*," li. 3.

¶ Dr. Völter's hardihood is shown in nothing so strongly as in his venturing to appeal to external evidence for his theories,—a procedure paralleled only in Loman's appeal to external evidence against Galatians. The anonymous reviewer in the (*N. Y.*) *Independent* thus sharply and justly adverts to the subject:

"These passages Völter dates about the year 170. This date he argues, among other reasons, from the fact that Justin does not quote from these passages *these precise interpolations*, in his dialogue with Trypho of about the year 160, and that the Church of Lyons and Vienne does not quote them in their letter of about the year 177. . . . It is pertinent to remark that this argument from silence in quotations, is about worn out. It was bad enough and groundless enough when applied to the single books of the Bible, each book as a whole; but when Völter reduces it to these alleged interpolations, the senseless reiteration grows monotonous. According to the demands of such scholars, no writer of the early Church could possibly have written ten pages without quoting the New Testament from Matthew to the Apocalypse; and now, according to Völter, they must have quoted solidly. It is true that it is difficult to form a conception of the method by which this

I. The passages which he assigns to about A.D. 170 are quoted in writings earlier than that date, as follows: (1) The *Muratorii Canon* speaks of the seven letters in a way which shows that they had long been known and accepted: (according to Westcott's reading) "Cum ipse beatus Paulus, sequeas predecessoris sui Johannis ordinem, nonnisi nominati septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali . . . et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi, licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit." (2) *Dionysius of Corinth*, who appears to have been bishop from the death of Justin to about 176, or somewhat later, quotes Rev. xxii. 8 (cf. Eus. iv. 23) as authoritative: "These the apostles of the Devil have filled with tares ἃ μὲν ἐξαιρούντες, ἃ δὲ προστίθεντες, οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κέεται." An allusion of the same kind is found in the apparently contemporary anonymous writing against the Montanists (cf. Smith and Wace, vol. iii., pp. 936, 938) as quoted in Eus. v. 16: "fearing lest he should seem to add a new article to the word of the New Covenant of the Gospel,—ὦ μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν δονατόν." Hence it follows: that this passage was a well-known part of the Apocalypse, and was throughout the Church held of authority at this time; that it could hardly have been just foisted in; and that it was already incorporated with the Rev. into a New Testament to which it had been long enough attached to seem to apply to the whole volume. (3) *Hermas* quotes apparently Rev. iii. 5 at Vis. i. 3, 2 (Sin. ix, 24, 3); cf., however, Rev. xiii. 8 and xx. 12, which Völter assigns to 145-150, which may be just in time for Hermaş (yet cf. for date of Hermas, Zahn and Salmon). (4) The *Testt. XII. Patt.*, c. 120, quotes Rev. ii. 7 (yet cf. xxii. 2, 14, belonging according to Völter in 150), at Levi. 18 καὶ γε ἀντὸς [The Messiah] ἀνοιξε τὰς θύρας τοῦ παραδείσου . . . καὶ ὄδωσι τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς. (5) *Polycarp* possibly quotes Rev. iii. 10 at c. 8, μιμηταὶ γενόμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ. (6) *Ignatius* quotes Rev. iii. 12 at Phil. 6: "If both speak not concerning Jesus Christ, they are to me steles and tombs of dead [men] upon which are written only names of men,"—a very clear case of antithetical parallelism (to which Ignatius is somewhat given; cf. the very next chapter Phil. vii. with Jno. iii. 18), as is proved by the likeness of context and especially by the significant μόνον, implying the knowledge of the *opposite* by both reader and writer. Compare for a like phenomenon of *two* antithetical references in a narrow context, Mr. E. Colborne Baber's review of Colquhoun's 'Across Chryse,' in *The Academy* for May 12, 1883, "When at last they neared Bramo, the bourne from which nearly all Chinese travellers return, the author" . . . and "The traveller is made, not born, and the art of serenity has to be acquired." The reference of Ignatius is far plainer than this from Mr. Shedlock: "We may serve two masters: Beethoven's symphonies have not been surpassed by anything that Wagner has written; and sympathy with Wagner does not in the least imply disrespect towards Beethoven." But who will fail to recognize this? We would say that in certainty and strength of allusion it was about equal to this from Mr. James Purves: "And sometimes he cries aloud, but not, like wisdom, in the streets" (*Academy*, Nov. 3, 1883). (7) *Barnabas*, c. 106, quotes apparently Rev. i. 13 (cf., however, i. 7 assigned to 150) at vii. 9: "Since they shall see him in the day, having the scarlet ποδήρη about his flesh and shall say: Is not this he whom we once crucified?" Note here that ποδήρη occurs here only in N. T., and here only in the writers of the sub-apostolic age (except Testt. xii. Patt. Levi 8), and that here only have we authority for the resurrected Christ in such a robe. II. The passages which are assigned to A.D. 150 appear to be quoted earlier than that by: (1) Rev. vii. 14 by *Her-*

should have been effected; but that, of course, cannot hurt the theory. If Völter had lived in the second century, he would simply have written his treatises between the lines in a copy of the New Testament, and have begun somewhat in this way: 'Dearly beloved brethren—quoting, as is my duty, the accompanying Matthew, Mark, Luke, and so forth, I beg leave to offer for your consideration the following interlineations.'

What kind of external evidence could be justly appealed to as proof of the reworking of a book may be seen in the second volume of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, lately published by Messrs. York, Powell, and Vigfusson, where very plausible reasons are given for assuming that the Court poetry of Norway has been reworked by a certain Einar Skulason,—reasons drawn especially from the failure of the numerous quotations from the poets which appear in our editions of the historians to square with the context. It is obvious that Dr. Völter can adduce no evidence of *this* kind beyond what is common to all free adaptation.

*mas*; Vis. ii. 2 7. (2) Rev. xxi. 14 by *Hermas*; Vis. iii. 5. (3) Rev. xxi. 9-xxii. 5 and xxi. 23 by Justin in the Dialogue with Trypho. These passages are admitted by Völter, but assigned to too late a date; this dialogue probably belongs to 147, not 160. III. The passages which are assigned to A.D. 145-150 are quoted as follows by earlier writings: (1) Several passages by *Hermas* (if the late date of *Hermas* be given up as by Salmon and Zahn), *e. g.*, xii. 4 (Vis. iv. 2), xiii. 8, xx. 12 (Vis. i. 3, 2), xix. 1 (Vis. 2, 41), xxi. 2 (iv. 2, 1), xiii. 1 (iv. 1, 10), xii. 11 (iv. 2, 4), etc. (2) Two passages by *Justin's Trypho*, viz., xxi. 2, and 4, which are admitted by Völter. (3) Rev. xx. 2 (cf. xii. 9) by *Justin* in his first apology A.D. 145: ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὄφεις καλεῖται καὶ σατανᾶς καὶ διάβολος. (4) Possibly (but only possibly) Rev. xx. 6 is quoted by *Papias* (Eus. iii. 39). (5) Rev. xii. 7 was known to *Papias* according to Andreas and Arethas (see above). (6) Rev. xxi. 2 is quoted by *Testt. XII. Patt.*, Danl. 5: "The New [νέας] Jerusalem" (c. 120).

Out of the numerous interpolations which Dr. Völter has assumed in the Apocalypse, has he not, then, proved his case with regard to even a single passage? We feel bound to answer with an emphatic negative. Holtzmann, indeed, tells us that "the method and result of the author have generally been objected to, and yet at the same time it has been almost equally generally recognized that some observations of abiding value may lie at the base of his opinions." One would like to agree in this judgment;—it is the judgment one would expect to form of any serious biblical study the general results of which he could not accept. But even at the risk of finding ourselves much in the minority, and of appearing extreme, we cannot accord with it. We have earnestly sought for valuable observations and criticisms of abiding worth in Dr. Völter's pamphlet,—and have not found them. Neither the instances which Holtzmann\* adduces as cases in point, nor the much more wisely and carefully-chosen examples of observations which are "at least weighty," which Harnack† names, commend themselves to our judgment. And we find ourselves compelled to lay aside Dr. Völter's book, with the conviction that its method is so faulty, and the application of that method so overstrained, that it has gone wrong in every instance. It is, nevertheless, as a whole, not

\* *Pünjer's Jahresbericht* for 1882, p. 90. He instances x. 1-xi. 13 as possibly an interpolation (see above); xvi. 15 (see above); xix. 13 (probably on dogmatic grounds, but the rejection of which would be purely arbitrary); and xiv. 4, 5 (probably as implying [Montanistic?] asceticism).

† *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1882, 24, 562. He adduces (1), The double opening and conclusion of the Book. This is, no doubt, curious; but the sections are of a piece with the book (see above); and apparently such a *formal, objective* framing for the book is characteristic of John; cf. the end of the gospel. (2), The diverse usage of the terms ἡ μαρτυρία 'I. X. Probably i. 5 ("who is the faithful witness") gives the key to the sense in which the Apocalypse uses this term; and the genitive is genitive of possession or source,—not, therefore, ever "witness to" or "concerning Jesus," but the "witness which Jesus bears to" or "through his servant." The collocation with "word of God" will indicate this; and the interpretation appears most natural throughout. Cf. Lee *in locis*. Although a slightly divergent or wavering usage—between the subjective and objective genitive—would give no valid grounds to doubt the unity of the book; yet it appears that even that ground is lacking. (3), Changes in the speaker (see above). (4), Very doubtfully, the diversity in christological expressions (see above). Harnack has at least adduced exegetical difficulties.

## THE UNITY OF THE APOCALYPSE.

without its value. It will be instrumental in awaking in students, anew, a settled and well-reasoned conviction of the unity and integrity of the Apocalypse. If the attempt to dismember it can proceed only after such a fashion, its integrity is safe. It has, after study of the question under the instigation of Dr. Völter, become our firm conviction that, on grounds of higher criticism, the entire integrity of the Apocalypse is impregnable. Of course slight textual questions may come up,—awakened by external or internal evidence;—but nothing further. Another, though rather incidental, good may be reaped from Dr. Völter's pamphlet: it seems not impossible that from it may arise an influence, to combine with others now active, in forcing a return to the old and, as it seems to us, the true view of the date of the Apocalypse. Dr. Völter's arguments affect this question in a twofold way,—positively and negatively. On the one side they array side by side with the usual chronological interpretations which are relied on to prove the early date of the book, others of the same kind and equal validity which are plainly out of the question; and thus the arguments which are used by the advocates of the early date are discredited. On the other side, the only valid indications of an origin later than 68 A.D. that are adduced for any portions of the Apocalypse, are just such as the assumption of the later date as witnessed by Irenæus will explain,—such as the martyrdom of Antipas, the existence of Bishops throughout Asia, gnostic elements in the false teachers of Asia, etc. We already see Harnack writing: "Lastly, it should be conceded that many of the characteristic peculiarities of the Apocalypse are difficult to understand on the basis of the hypothesis of its composition under Galba; and that the old tradition of its origin (under Domitian) is perhaps still not to be entirely abandoned." These cautious words are a sign of the times; a retreat is already being sounded from the ruling opinion of the critics of the last few years on this question. The latest two—and they are in some respects also the best two—commentaries on the book, those of Archdeacon Lee and Dr. Wm. Milligan, are found to unite in defending the later date. Dr. Völter will not have written entirely in vain, if his work helps the movement to attain more speedily its inevitable victory. One would naturally prefer, however, to be of use as a guide rather than as a warning.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.