§1] AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [1yrropucrion.   
   
 ments of his expgsitions of the New Test. we have no allusion to it,   
 even when on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. speaks of Antichrist and of the second   
 Advent: nor again in his Commentary on the twelve prophets. Oppo-   
 nent as he was of the allegorical method of interpretation, he may have   
 been withheld from receiving the Apocalypse by conscionsness that no   
 other mode would suit it: or he may have followed the older practice   
 of the Syrian chureh, and the canon of the Laodiecan Synod. Still, he   
 rejected the Epistle of James, which both these recognized: and Liicke   
 thinks he may have rejected the Apocalypse from the decision of his   
 own judgment, helped by his disinclination to the book and the existing   
 doubt about its canonicity : being one of those who, like Luther in later   
 times, sought and found “ the Canon within the Canon.”   
 66. Theodoret (bishop of Cyrus, died 457) alludes two or three times   
 to the book; but on 2 Thess. ii. and on Heb. xii. 22, he leaves it unno-   
 ticed, as also in his Commentary on Daniel. On Ps. Ixxxvi. 2, he scems   
 to aim at describing the heavenly Jerusalem in contrast to the apocalyptic   
 description. In speaking of Cerinthus, and of the Nicolaitans, the   
 Montanists, and even of the Millenarian Nepos and his antagonist   
 Dionysius of Alexandria, he says not a word of the Apocalypse. Only   
 once he names it, and adduces ch. i. 9 with the formula “John says :”   
 but then it is in citing from Athanasins.   
 67. After this, in the sixth century, the Syrian churches were   
 divided on the matter. The Nestorians rejected the” Apocalypse,   
 following Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Peschito: the Monophysites   
 received it, following the Alcxandrians, and Hippolytus, and Ephrem   
 Syrus. Liicke thinks from certain indications that even among them it   
 was not in ecclesiastical, but only in theological use.   
 68. In the Greek church in Asia Minor, we have Andreas, of   
 Cwsarea in Cappadocia, the writer of the first entire and connected   
 Commentary on the Apocalypse. He fully and earnestly recognizes its   
 genuineness and inspiration, and (see above, par. 32) appeals to the   
 testimony of the ancients to bear him out: mentioning by name Papias,   
 Irenzeus, Methodius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Gregory Theologus (of   
 Nazianzum). It is perhaps hardly fair in Liicke to infer that, because   
 he names so few, more might not have been adduced: hardly fair again   
 to conclude that, because he promises to use their writings in his Com-   
 mentary, and has not expressly cited them, he did not so use them, or   
 was himself one of the first who explained the book.   
 69. Arcthas, who followed Andreas in his see, and in his work of   
 commenting on the Apocalypse, repeats in his prologue the scholium of   
 Andreas on the Inspiration of the book, adding the anthority of Basil   
 the Great. But we are now approaching a time when, as Liicke remarks,   
 it is really of small import who used the book and who did not, who   
 regarded it as the work of the Apostle, and who did not. Still, a few   
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