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 facts stand out from the general mass, which may be useful as indica-   
 tions, or at all events have a claim to our attention.   
 70. Such is the fact of the omission of all reference to the Apocalypse   
 in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes in cent. vi. In his Christian   
 Topography, book vii., he treats of the duration of the heavens according   
 to Scripture, and Liicke thinks must of necessity have cited the book   
 had it been in his Canon. Still, he uses the Festal Epistle of Athana-   
 sius, in which it is expressly included in the Canon.   
 71. The second canon of the Trullian, or Quinisextan council, sanc-   
 tions on the one hand the Canon of the Laodicean council, and that of —   
 the eighty-five apostolic canons, both which omit the Apocalypse, and on \_   
 the other that of the African Synods of the end of the fourth and   
 beginning of the fifth centuries, which include it. Various conjectures   
 have been made as to the account to be given of this. The desire to   
 leave the question open (Liicke) can hardly have been the cause. We   
 may safely leave such evidence to correct itself.   
 72. The list may be closed with one or two notices from later cen-   
 turies, shewing that the doubts were not altogether forgotten, though   
 generally given up.   
 Nicephorus (beginning of cent. ix.) reckons only twenty-six books of   
 the New Test., and does not mention the Apocalypse either in the   
 doubtful or in the apocryphal books.   
 73, A prologue to the book in one of our MSS. (cent. x. or beginning   
 of xi.), after defending its canonicity and apostolic origin, apologizes for   
 the ancient Fathers not mentioning it among the books to be openly   
 read in church “ because they cared more about urgent spiritual matters,   
 and judged it unprofitable for the multitude to search into such deep   
 things.”   
 74. In the preface to the comments of CEcumenius (cent. xi.) the   
 canonicity of the book is strongly asserted, and its being “a genuine   
 production of the beloved Apostle and not spurious, as some erroneously   
 say.” For this, the writer refers to Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Metho-   
 dius, Cyril, and Hippolytus.   
 75. In the Church History of Nicephorus Callistus (cent. xiv.), he   
 treats it as an acknowledged fact that the Apostle John, when in exile in   
 Patmos under Domitian, wrote his Gospel and his holy and inspired   
 Apocalypse. Still, when enumerating the books of the canon in ii. 46,   
 partly from Eusebius, he says summarily of the Apocalypse, that some   
 fancied that it was the work of John the Presbyter.   
 76. It will be well, before passing to an account of modern opinion, to   
 review the course and character of the evidence from antiquity. As we   
 have before noticed, so again we may observe, that throughout, we have   
 results here in marked contrast to those of our enquiry regarding the   
 Epistle to the Hebrews. In that case there was a total lack of any   
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