§1] AUTIIORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [rxtropucrion.   
   
from these ten humbling the three, he shall reign the cighth;” this   
 last partienlar being from Rev. xvii. 11. And similarly in other   
 places.   
 58. Thus Cyril presents to us remarkable and exceptional phiwno-   
 mena: familiarity with the language of the book, so ag to use it uncon-   
 sciously as that of prophecy, combined with a repudiation of it as   
 canonical, and a prohibition of its study. It would appcar that there   
 had been at some time a deliberate change of opinion, and that we have,   
 in these evident references to the Apocalypse, instances of slips of   
 memory, and retention of phrascology which belonged to his former, not   
 to his subsequent views.   
 59. In the sixtieth eanon of the synod of Laodicea, held between 343   
 and 381, an account of the canonical books of the Old and New Testa-   
 ments is given, in which the Apocalypse is omitted. ‘The genuineness   
 of this canon has been doubted, but apparently without reason: sce   
 Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. pp. 749 ff. We next come to the testi-   
 mony of Gregory of Nazianzen (died 390), who, in his poem, “ concerning   
 the genuine books of the inspired Scriptures,” gives the same canon as   
 Cyril, aud adds, “You have all: if any be beside these, it is not among   
 the genuine books.” But here again, as in Cyril’s caso, we are met by   
 the phenomenon of reference to the book and citation of it as of theolo-   
 gical authority. He says, speaking of the angels presiding over churches,   
 “think that some preside over one church, some over another, as John   
 teaches me in the Apocalypse.”   
 Liicke suggests in explanation of this, that possibly the churches of   
 Asia Minor, especially that of Cappadocia, had excluded the Apocalypse   
 from public reading in the church, on account of the countenance which   
 it had been made to give to the errors of Montanism, and placed it   
 among the apocryphal books. This may have been so: but I cannot   
 think his inference secure, that therefore we may infer the general fact,   
 that the book rested on no secure ecclesiastical tradition.   
 60. In a work printed as Gregory’s, ascribed by some to Gregory   
 himself, but more usually to Amphilochius of Iconium, we have the   
 Apocalypse mentioned by name: “ The Apocalypse of John again some   
 count Scripture, but most reckon it spurions.”   
 But it is to be noticed, that in the scholium of Andreas cited above,   
 par. 32, he enumerates Gregory among those who recognized the   
 canonicity of the Apocalypse.   
 61. After this, it will be sufficient to give a general view of the   
 antagonism to the authority of the book. It was maintained chiefly in   
 the Eastern church ; the Western, after the fifth century, universally   
 recognizing the Apocalypse. It is remarkable that Sulpicius Severus   
 says the Apocalypse is “ by most, either foolishly or impiously,” rejected.   
 But as Liicke observes, he must have found these “ most” in the Greck,   
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