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 not in the Latin church. Pope Gelasius, in his deeree, concerning   
 “what books were to be received” (500), gives the book its place in   
 the Canon of the Catholie Chureh, between the Epistles of St. Paul and   
 the Catholic Epistles. Primasius and Cassiodorus, in the sixth century,   
 expound it as apostolie and canonical. But Junilius the African, the   
 friend of Primasius, says, that only seventeen books, viz. the Old Test.   
 prophets and the book of Psalms, contain the Scripture propheey : “but,”   
 he continues, “concerning the Apocalypse of John there is much doubt   
 among the Orientals.” This he had learned from Paulus, a Persiau, of   
 the school of Nisibis: and he consequently seems inclined not to place   
 it among the “ books of complete authority.”   
 62. The fourth synod of Toledo (633) in its seventeenth canon,   
 deerees that, seeing the Apocalypse is by many councils and Popes   
 sanctioned as a work of the Apostle John, and as canonical, it should,   
 under pain of excommunication, be preached on in the church between   
 Easter and Pentecost. The Synod speaks of “many who do not receive   
 its authority, and scorn to read it in the church of God.” This, Liicke   
 thinks, points to doubters in the West also. But Isidore of Seville   
 (died 636), having given the generally received canon, speaks of many   
 Latins who doubted of the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews,   
 of the genuineness of 2 Peter, of the Epistle of James, and 2 and   
 3 John; but not a word of any who doubted about the Apocalypse.   
 So that it may be after all that the Synod of Toledo may allude to   
 Orientals only. :   
 63. Ienceforward in the Western chureh, with the sole exception of   
 the Capitulare of Charlemagne, which, following Greek authorities and   
 especially the Synod of Laodicea, excluded the book from public   
 reading, we find universal recognition of the Apocalypse until the   
 Reformation.   
 64. In the Greek church during the last noticed period opinions   
 were much in the same state as in the fourth century. On one side we   
 find rejection of the book, at the least from public ecclesiastical use: on   
 the other, unsuspecting reception of it as a genuine work of the Apostle   
 John. Neither side takes any pains to justify its view critically, but   
 simply conforms to local ecclesiastical usage. Cyril of Alexandria   
 says, “ The wise John, who wrote for us the book of the Apocalypse,   
 which has also been honoured with the approval of the fathers.” The   
 very expression here, it is true, betrays consciousness of the existence of   
 doubts, which however do not affect his confidence, nor that of his   
 contemporaries Nilus and Isidore of Pelusium.   
 65, At Antioch, however, the opinion in cent. v. seems to have been   
 different. Its greatest Father of this period, Theodore of Mopsuestia   
 (died 429), never cites the Apocalypse in his extant writings and frag-   
 ments, even where we might have certainly expected it. In the frag-   
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