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 which Liicke, who makes much of Epiphanius’s testimony as shewing   
 that the tradition, which he calls the Irenwan, was not received by   
 Epiphanius, entirely, and conveniently, omits to notice. The passage   
 evidently.sets the return from exile in the extreme old age of St. John,   
 Now if this is so, seeing that Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A.D.   
 putting the return from exile at the last of these dates, we should   
 have St. John aged ninety in the year 54: in other words, thirty-   
 three years older than our Lord, and sixty-three at least when called   
 to be an Apostle: a result which is at variance with all ancient   
 tradition whatever. Either Epiphanius has fallen into some great   
 mistake, which is not very probable, or he means by Claudius some   
 other Emperor: if Nero, then he would still be wrong as to St. John’s   
 age at or near to his return,   
 15. The testimony of Muratori’s fragment on the Canon bas been   
 cited (by Stuart, p. 218) as testifying to an carly date. But all it says   
 is this: “The blessed Apostle Paul himself, following the order of his   
 predecessor John, writes by name to seven churches in the same order.”   
 And the word predecessor, as has been pointed out by Credner, merely   
 seems to mean that St. John was an apostle before St. Paul (or perhaps   
 only represents the title presbyter or elder), not to imply that he wrote   
 his seven epistles before St. Paul wrote his.   
 16. The preface to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse published   
 by De Dieu, supposed to have been made in the 6th century, says that   
 the visions were seen by St. John in the island of Patmos, to which he   
 had been banished by the Emperor Nero. o   
 17. Theophylact, in his preface to the Gospel of St. John, says that   
 it was written thirty-two years after the Ascension in the island of   
 Patmos: and in so saying, places the exile under Nero. But he clearly   
 is wrong, as Liicke remarks, or his meaning not elearly understood,   
 when he attributes the writing of the Gospel to this time: and more-   
 over he is inconsistent with himself: for in commenting on Matt. xx.   
 22, he remarks that as Herod put to death the Apostle James   
 the greater, so Trajan condemned John as a martyr to the word of   
 truth,   
 18. Jerome determines nothing, only citing Tertullian: “ Tertullian   
 relates that having been put by Nero into a cask of burning oil, he came   
 out clearer and healthier than he went in.” But Tertullian only says,   
 in the place apparently referred to, “ Happy is the (Roman) Chureh   
 +++. Where Peter was equalled to the passion of our Lord, where Paul   
 was crowned with the death of John (i.e. the Baptist), where the   
 Apostle John having been immersed in burning oil and taken no hurt,   
 was banished to an island.” It surely is stretehing a point here to say   
 that he implies all three events to have taken place under Nero.   
 19. The Author of the “ Synopsis of the Life and Death of the Pro-   
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