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 55. The student will observe how entirely conjectural, and valueless   
 as evidence, is this opinion of Eusebius, Certainly Liicke is wrong in   
 his very strong denunciations of Hengstenberg for describing Eusebius   
 as studiously leaving the question open. For what else is it, when he   
 numbers the book on one side among the undoubted Scriptures with an   
 “if it seem so,” and then on the other among the spurious writings with   
 an “if it seem so” also: while at the very moment of endorsing   
 Dionysius’s conjecture that the second John saw its visions, he interposes   
 “unless any prefer the first?” That a man with the anti-millenarian   
 leanings of Eusebius concedes thus much, makes the balance of his testi-   
 mony incline rather to, than away from, the canonicity of the book. I   
 would not press this, but simply take it as indicating that in Eusebius’s   
 time, as well as in that of Dionysius, there was no ecclesiastical tradition   
 warranting the repudiating it as the work of the Evangelist. Adverse   
 opinion there was, which found its fair and worthier employ in internal   
 criticism, and issued in vague conjecture, resting on the mere fact   
 of two persons named John having existed in Ephesus. Who and   
 what the second John was, whether he had any right to speak of him-   
 self as the writer of the Apocalypse does, or to address with authority   
 the seven churches of Asia,—on these and on all such questions we are   
 wholly in the dark.   
 56. Cyril of Jerusalem (died 386) is a more decided witness for the   
 exclusion of the Apocalypse from the Canon. Having prefaced the   
 account of the twenty-two canonical books of the Old Test. with, ‘Do   
 not have any thing to do with the apocryphal writings,” he enumerates   
 the canonical books of the New Test., the four Gospels, Acts, seven   
 eatholic Epistles, fourteen of St. Paul, and concludes, “ But put all the   
 rest in the second rank, And as many as are not read in the churches,   
 neither do thou read in private, as thou heardest.” And it is to be   
 observed that he appeals for this arrangement to ancient authorities: for   
 he says to his catechumen, in the words alluded to in the last-cited clanse,   
 “These only do thou earnestly study, which we openly read in the   
 churches. The Apostles and the ancient bishops, who presided over the   
 church, and handed down these books, were far wiser and more careful   
 than thou.”   
 57, Cyril nowhere mentions the Apocalypse by name. But he   
 seems to use it, and even where he by inference repudiates it, to adopt   
 its terms unconsciously. An instance of the former is found, where he   
 says to his catechumen, speaking of his baptism, “Thou art planted in   
 the spiritual paradise: thou receivest a new name,” Rev. ii.7,17. Of   
 the latter, where, professing to get his particulars respecting Antichrist   
 from Daniel, and having said, “ After them shall arise another king,   
 who shall surpass in evil deeds all before him,” he proceeds, “and he   
 shall humble three kings, clearly from among the ten former ones, and   
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