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Abstract

The dissertation investigates the circulation, reception, and traditional usage of the Apoc in the Ancient Church. It begins with the initial publication of the Seer's book on Patmos AD c. 95, and concludes with Athanasius of Alexandria in the canonical context of his 39th Festal Epistle delivered in AD 367. The fundamental methodology behind the research is the examination of the Apoc's transmission in connection with the criteria of canonicity. Linked to this method (by the present writer), is the canonical criticism approach which considers the function of a sacred book in its reception history and the basis for its commendation by the believing community. This approach, in the framework of Church and/or Canon Consciousness, proved to share common ground with a theology of Canon from the viewpoint of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the context of Holy Tradition. The criteria alone, however, were not sufficient to guarantee the authoritative reception which would be accorded to an "apostolic" document. So began the second major investigation into what other factors could have combined to secure the Apoc's ultimate entry into the NT Canon. One of these factors is the mixed genre of the book with its strategic ambiguity which enabled it to rise above chiliast and post chiliast interpretations. More important is the high ecclesiology of the Seer's work with its emphasis on the community of faith, a theology which could not be ignored by the book's first flesh-and-blood readers. From the start, as the Apoc was transmitted by successive Christian generations, it was one of the most solid contenders for inclusion in the list of the authoritative writings of the NT. It is a principal aim of the thesis to make this early history of transmission clear and to demonstrate conclusively that the popularly held position that the book was initially poorly received (at least in the East), or that it made it into the NT Canon more so by a combination of accidents than by its own critical right to be there, is demonstrably flawed.
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<td>New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPNF</td>
<td>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT</td>
<td>La nouvelle revue théologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODCC</td>
<td>Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Patristic and Byzantine Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Patrologia Graeca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGL</td>
<td>Patristic Greek Lexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Patrologia Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prov.</td>
<td>provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>Princeton Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRev</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResQ</td>
<td>Restoration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevExp</td>
<td>Review and Expositor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RivB</td>
<td>Rivista biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelSR</td>
<td>Religious Studies Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Recherches de science religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTR</td>
<td>Reformed Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>Studies in Biblical Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Sources chrétiennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Semeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRS</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>Saint Mark's Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudP</td>
<td>Studia Patristica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudEv</td>
<td>Studia Evangelica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudT</td>
<td>Studia Theologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVTQ</td>
<td>Saint Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABD</td>
<td>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBT</td>
<td>The Bible Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Theology Digest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNT</td>
<td>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Them</td>
<td>Themelios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThZ</td>
<td>Theologische Zeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNTC</td>
<td>Tyndale New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad</td>
<td>Traditio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrJ</td>
<td>Trinity Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QKHE</td>
<td>ΟΡΗΣΚΕΥΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ HQIKH EGKHKL OP AIDEIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSK</td>
<td>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Theology Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TynB</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZ</td>
<td>Theologische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USQR</td>
<td>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Vigiliae Christianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VoxEv</td>
<td>Vox Evangelica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VetT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>World Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTJ</td>
<td>Westminster Theological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZTK</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The Proposal of the Dissertation

This thesis sets out to examine the canonical history of the Apoc from the period immediately after its date of writing, the last decade of the first century (AD c. 95), to the time of Athanasius of Alexandria (AD c. 296-373) whose faithful witness not only earned him the cognomen of "the Great" but also the high title of "Father of Orthodoxy". In broad terms, borrowing an operative description from James Barr, the study is concerned with the "adventures" of the work of John, the Seer of Patmos. More specifically, with the circulation, reception and traditional usage, that is, the canonical development of the book. This also includes those theological aspects of the work and that historical background which played important roles in the story of the document's history. The justification for this dissertation is established primarily on three critical grounds: first, it has been over seventy years since an investigation of the subject at this level was last undertaken; second, by reason of the universally renewed interest in the Apoc, given the start of a new millennium; and third, the phenomenal crisis of authority evidenced in many quarters of the Church today which can be linked to positions and approaches to exegesis, Tradition and Scripture, and hence to questions on the validity of the Biblical Canon itself. Other major aims will be the introduction of Eastern Orthodox scholarship on the Book of Revelation, which is all but absent from such studies, and the bringing up to date of relevant bibliography.

Some Key Definitions Relating to the Question

- By text or document is meant, pure and simple, the book per se as it moved within the geography and communities of the Ancient Church.

---
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- By *circulation* is meant how quickly and how widely the book spread across the early church communities. Circulation must not be confused with reception. A book may have circulated widely but not have been received enthusiastically.
- Therefore, by *reception* is meant how well the book was received in terms of its influence. But in turn, reception must not be confused with canonicity.
- For *canonicity* is the final step whereby both circulation and reception are taken into account for a book to be accepted as an "authoritative rule of faith and practice". By *Canon*, therefore, are indicated those commended writings which were received as authoritative for both worship and doctrine by the community of the faithful of each succeeding Christian generation.
- All these elements occurred within a particular space, the physical geography, and a particular theological mind-set, the "canon consciousness". It is then, all these elements in *toto*, that go to make up the canonical "adventures" of the Apoc.

The Adventure of the Apoc

The adventure will trace the canonical development and intrigue of the Apoc. Critical questions that need to be addressed are: What determined circulation? What criteria influenced reception? Who or what determined canonicity? And how are all of these factors related? The distinction of 'criteria' and 'factors' must also be considered afresh: are they the same? Another question that needs to be asked is what technical factors may or may not have encouraged the physical circulation of the book. For example, the circulation of letters in the ancient world: traders from Smyrna and Ephesus may from the start have taken the "letter" West rather than East. The Apoc was addressed to the Seven Churches in Asia, in effect, the

---


---
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Ecclesia universalis. The text would seem to have been imbued with a canon consciousness from its inception. But how can we be sure of this?

It is sometimes expressed (to illustratively make the point) that the NT 'did not fall from heaven'. Obviously. But any view which does not assign strong theological constructs, which denies the Ancient Church a dominant and vigorous role in the formation of the Biblical Canon, is not an adequate model or approach for any discussion on Canon generally, or for an individual book specifically. Purely historical perspectives are insufficient, for the texts themselves speak clearly of a theological level of interpretation. As soon as precision is desired, as for example in the historical-critical method or even the new methods of literary analysis, the canonical content has to be detached from the whole and a cluster of evaluations or concepts is created, "the sum of which" as Vladimir Lossky says, "is far from expressing that living reality called the tradition of the church." For this reason this present thesis places equal weight on both approaches, as is seen by the chapters and the section divisions which mark the investigation. Theology and history have to be drawn together, without destroying their dialectical relationship. At the profound theological level one way to do this, as J. D. Zizioulas writes, "...is to find again the lost consciousness of the primitive Church concerning the decisive importance of the eucharist in ecclesiology."

In plain terms this is none other than the unique merging of theology and history in the Incarnation of the Logos. God in the God-Man, Jesus Christ effecting this union through and in His person. For it is "the particularity of the Son", in the whole scheme of providence, to "become history."

Aims and Issues Addressed

It has been over seventy years since Ned Bernard Stonehouse's estimable work, The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church: A Study in the History of the New Testament Canon, (Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929), was first published. It has exerted a good influence on a large number of writers who have dealt with the Apoc, though this reliance is
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5 As Aune also writes noting the evidence of the MF, "[i]n the ancient church, seven churches addressed by John were widely regarded as a symbol of the universal church": David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), (Texas: Word Books, 1997), 130.
6 That is, one of the "functions of biblical literature" is "theological": Tremper Longman III, Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation (Vol. 3), (Leicester: Apollos, 1987), 68f.
9 Ibid., 130.
not always quick to be acknowledged. While the original quality and approach of his study, with its rich historical insight and specialist analysis is to be admired and commended as mandatory reading, it is dated and in areas critically defective. There are places, for instance, where major conclusions, whether correct or not, are based on and drawn from a limited and narrow presentation of the primary sources. Stonehouse is also heavily reliant himself, on the theological and historical scholarship of the Germans, especially on the studies of Harnack and Zahn. The work (given the location and era of its production), has an empirical research bias and so in a number of areas its perspectives relegate the pressing theological intrigue that is, manifestly, behind the formation of the NT Canon.\textsuperscript{10} Of course, since 1929 when Stonehouse completed his work, studies and approaches to the Book of Revelation have gone on many diverse tangents. One of the more influential of these "tangents", which is directly relevant to this thesis, has been the rise and the bringing to the fore of the "problem" of the definition of apocalyptic genre.\textsuperscript{11} Equally important, and this time on the issue of method and form, has been the emergence onto the scene of biblical theology (at least from the early 1970s and onwards), of canonical criticism.\textsuperscript{12} The unearthing of the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi has also shown that the struggle to define the nature of the Gospel was an essential component of the process in which the decisions of the Ancient Church were made regarding canonicity, and that this development did not follow the fixing of the New Testament itself.\textsuperscript{13}

An important matter that will be explored, and not only in Stonehouse's case, but across the secondary literature as well, is the quick dismissal by interpreters to accept possible allusions to the Apoc in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. "Allusion" as proof of reference to the Apoc in Early Church literature must not be judged as critically as one would, for example,

\textsuperscript{10} Though it would be both incorrect and unfair to suggest that N. B. Stonehouse misses entirely the component of theology or the concept of church consciousness (that is critical to this dissertation): Ned Bernard Stonehouse The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church: A Study in the History of the New Testament Canon, (Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929), 5.

\textsuperscript{11} For a critical analysis and assessment of the contribution to the study of apocalyptic genre and apocalypticism of the SBL Apocalypse Group and the contributions from the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, see David E. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre", Sem 36, (1986), 65-96.


\textsuperscript{13} Also related to this question are the insights into the “canonical process” that can be derived from the "reconstructing of the literary history of the Dead Sea Scrolls (particularly to do with the "stabilization process" in the context of canon). For a perspective on this subject from the approach of canonical criticism, see James A. Sanders: Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 12-16.
look for direct citation in later patristic literature when the authority of the Scripture and the
development of the NT Canon were on a more secure path. Citation of NT literature in the
eyearly works of ecclesiastical writers, for reasons that will later be discussed, was loose and
irregular. The author of the Apoc itself, though not precisely quoting the OT, references
according to *The United Bible Societies' Greek NT Text* (2nd ed.) over five hundred OT
passages. Commentators have also been quick to dismiss knowledge of the Apoc if it is not
cited specifically, but the silence of writers does not prove their ignorance of the book. They
may have in general no occasion to quote the work, or simply not wish to if its canonical
status was deemed suspect.

Further Reasons for the Value of the Investigation

The value of this present investigation also extends to its timing, and this, on two fronts. First,
the universal interest in the Apoc as we approached the year 2000 with its "millennial
conjunctures" and "apocalyptic prophecy" and the provocative topics of "Antichrist" and
"666" (Rev 13) which have again been brought to our attention in different ways: by talk of a
*Universal Lifetime Identifier* (ULI), the mass media, religious organisations, fundamentalist
literature, and biblical scholarship. Some commentators of the Apoc are again focussing on
the interpretation of the notorious 666 conundrum and on the *Traditionsgeschichte* of
Antichrist. For some of these commentators it is a reply to the recent outpouring of
sensationalist publications fuelled by this "millennial mania". And this leads us to the other
front, that being the question and nature of the "millennium". Few passages in the whole of
the NT, let alone the Book of Revelation itself, have caused so much intrigue, discussion, and
dissension among Bible-believing Christians and not, than the interpretation of the millennial
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14 The wording of the so-called quotations of the Apostolic Fathers, for they were not direct quotations in the
literal sense, were often, as Gerhardsson has written "reproduced freely or adapted in some way to the context":
Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism

15 For instance, Saint John Chrysostom 'appears' to have nowhere mentioned the Apoc, but it cannot be
seriously suggested that a Patriarch of Constantinople (elected in AD 398) would not know of the book. No
doubt his cautious attitude towards the document was swayed and affected by its previously poor show in Syria.

16 Brian J. L. Berry, "As 2000 Approaches: Millennial Conjunctures and Apocalyptic Prophecy",

17 See for instance the landmark study, *The Person-Number Systems of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and
Israel*, (US Dept. of Health and Human Services, *Series 2* No. 84, 1980); also *Computerization and
Controversy: Value Conflicts and Social Choices*, Rob King (ed.), (San Diego: Academic Press, 1996);

18 For an academic response to this literature, see Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief
in Modern American Culture*, (London: Harvard University Press, 1992). Boyer calls this a "genre of prophecy
interpretation" and an example of a "collective discourse conducted at the mass level": *Preface*, xi.
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reign of Christ, the "thousand years" (Rev 20:4-6). This belief that Christ or a New Age "messiah" will return to earth and inaugurate a thousand-year era of blessedness, a utopia, is one that has often been preached, usually with disastrous consequences.\(^\text{19}\) We are as close to millennial fervour as any generation before us and this is being evidenced by the eschatological discourse which is presently being "conducted at the mass level."\(^\text{20}\) This renewed interest in the Book of Revelation itself has become for many, as J. Ramsey Michaels has well noted, "a port of entry to the study of the whole Bible."\(^\text{21}\) Presently, as I write these lines, some are not only scanning the Apoc for evidence of the Y2K millennium computer "bug", but for evidence of the Balkans War now in its fifth week (further heightening popular foreboding and interest in the prophecies of the Seer).\(^\text{22}\)

Though the above connections with the Apoc and our present times might appear to be obvious, there is another less notable but no less compelling reason why the Apoc has steadily accrued a wider and more disparate an audience - ranging from traditional Christianity, to anti-nuclear demonstrationism, to abstractionism in the arts, etc. - this being the crisis of authority in our western culture and the ever-growing cynicism with corrupted religious and political structures. In the Church itself, liberation theology has become particularly attracted to the Apoc.\(^\text{23}\) The crisis has also found refuge in the scholarly world of biblical studies in the form of a purely textually based framework, where religious modes of interpretation have been displaced onto models of secular literature.\(^\text{24}\) Edward Schillebeeckx is correct when he writes, "whatever one may think of apocalypticism, it is fundamentally an existential, realistic, even modern experience in this nuclear age."\(^\text{25}\) For the apocalyptic genre basically wrestles with

\(^{19}\) For a sorry list of cults that have chosen to respond to the next millennium by committing mass suicides, see Dennis E. Hensley, *Millennium Approaches*, (New York: Avon Books, 1998), 47f.

\(^{20}\) Paul Boyer, *loc. cit*.


\(^{22}\) Even as I revised this chapter we witnessed the tragedy of the September 11th terrorist strikes in New York and in Washington D.C. The attack on the Twin Towers (*World Trade Centre*) sent people to the Book of Revelation looking for lexical matches on search engines to "tower". Of course, other frequently visited internet sites during this time were those connected to "Nostradamus". But this attitude to apocalyptic literature generally, also serves to "display[es] a posteriori functions": Bernard McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-En-Der, Joachim of Fiore, The Franciscan Spirituals, Savonarola*, (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1979), 10.

\(^{23}\) For a good example of liberation hermeneutics dealing with the Apoc, see Pablo Richard, *Apocalypse: A People's Commentary on the Book of Revelation*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1995).

\(^{24}\) For a review and critical discussion on this important issue, see Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Vol. 3), (Leicester: Apollos, 1987). "In short, the literary approach appears to reduce the Bible to something less than it is": *ibid*, 8.

the eternal contradiction of the problem of pain and of divine justice. And as such it has stood as a radical literature, challenging the church leadership and the faithful to redress their roles whenever the definition of Church and State became so blurred as to be difficult to distinguish the one from the other. Might well then, the Seer of Patmos in his book fuse the two "beasts" (Rev 13) so compactly (the political and the prophetic), that the history of their interpretation is strewn with disagreements and flights of fancy.

**Unique Contribution**

One of the great imbalances of western biblical bibliography, which has yet to be felt in its entirety, is the lack of citation or reference to the work of Eastern Orthodox scholarship. In a few words, this cannot be considered anything less than a spectacular inconsistency. This thesis (as did my previous dissertation) will seek to introduce and report the work of leading Orthodox biblical scholars who are largely unknown in English bibliography. This of course is the complete opposite of the work, for example, of the Germans and the French (not least in the field of studies to do with the Apoc). Admittedly, not many recent Orthodox scholars have dealt with the Apoc, but those that have, P. Mpratsiwh" and S. Agouridh" for instance, have written major critical works. G Mauronath" popular but commendable approach is a valuable resource of patristic sources. There is also the fine introductory commentary written by Averky Taushev and Seraphim Rose, and more recently the work by Columba Graham Flegg. Others, such as P. Basileiwh" G Galith", G Gratsew", I. Karabidopoulou", J. Ivliev, V. Mihoc, C. Oikoumou, I. Petrou, L. Filh and S. Sakko",

---


27 For a useful survey of some of these bizarre interpretations, see Paul Boyer, When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief In Modern American Culture, (London: Harvard University Press, 1992), 26ff.

28 For example, when during my previous research I had reason to study a great number of Apoc commentaries (not to mention journal articles), rarely do I recall coming across reference to Eastern Orthodox commentary on the Book of Revelation. This serves to keep 'secret' eastern work which can highlight many useful and sensible positions to the study of the Apoc. As for the problem of the marginalization of languages other than English, German, and French, in biblical studies, Linnemann has astutely said, "[h]istorical-critical theology's search for truth already stumbles at the point of so much linguistically inaccessible literature which it must neglect": Eta Linnemann, Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology, trans. Robert W. Yarbrough, (Michigan: Baker Book House, 1995), 90.


have written high-level papers. To this impressive list we should add Basileio' Stoggiand'' Apokaluyh kai Politikh (Qessalonikh: APQ, 1985). How many western commentators have cited either Bukharev or Soloviev, whose "apocalypticism" as Paul Valliere writes, has "enriched modern Orthodox theology." Not to mention Sergius Bulgakov who has expressed some very profound thoughts on the kerygmatic dimensions of the Apoc from the perspective of amillennial eschatology. Recently, there has also been renewed interest in the Apoc by Greek theologians at doctoral level. It is also a critical oversight that even those Orthodox writers who are more widely known to the West, historians and theologians of the awesome calibre and reputation of Evdokimov, Florovsky, Lossky, Meyendorff, and Schmemann for example (these five are mentioned here for obvious reason), are little used. Their collective insight into the inner workings of History and Church Tradition are invaluable for this present study. This indefensible lack of reference in modern theological literature leads the great bulk of western writers (excluding, for instance, those dealing in Patristics), to refer invariably to conclusions of the Catholic Church or Protestant confessions and rarely, if ever, to the position of the Eastern Orthodox.

Apart from the unique contribution already set-down in the abstract and described in this chapter, I point the reader to the Appendix where a new method of investigation into primary sources has been tested and successfully established using the TLG database. A long catalogue of proofs for the traditional usage of the Book of Revelation is presented for the first time, involving many months of extensive electronic string searches complemented and conjoint to a rigorous manual assessment and further exploration. The List of Tables and Exhibits are very important sources of reference in themselves, but also for use in comparable studies.

34 Paul Valliere, Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov: Orthodox Theology in a New Key, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 223.
36 The doctoral dissertation of Euaggeliva Amoirivdou which investigated the history of the interpretation of the "number of the beast x c² §" in the Greek Church from the second right through to the nineteenth century. The dissertation was presented to the School of Theology of the University of Thessaloniki (1998). At the same time another doctoral dissertation was presented to the same school by John Skiadasresis, "The Hymns of the Apocalypse".
37 For example a research project which applies the rigorous investigative method described in the Appendix, but using the Patrologia Latina Database in place of TLG (this would apply to all the NT books).
A final objective will be to bring up-to-date the bibliography related to the main questions of the thesis. As the research will touch on a number of specialist fields, including those of Theology, Biblical Canon, Patristics, and Early Church History, it is not possible (whether logistically or expertly) to do justice to each. The focus, therefore, will remain on those works dealing with the Apoc or with studies that have touched upon our subject, for example, New Testament Introductions and commentaries of which the Book of Revelation has not lacked, especially in recent years. However, quite a lot of 'satellite' reading is also referenced which helps to highlight and interpret different posers and issues of the subject matter under discussion. Directly connected to this effort will be the correction, citation and presentation of sources (both primary and secondary) which have been, hitherto, simply inferred or mentioned in the secondary literature without appropriate reference (and in some instances incorrectly written or passed on).

Methodology and Approach

The Conceptual Framework

A methodology, pure and simple, is a procedure or a technique to guarantee a certain degree of orderliness. There is no absolutely correct methodology, otherwise we would not be inundated by so many of these approaches. All research, whether it be poor or superior, occurs within a "conceptual framework" which will determine its overall direction. "This conceptual framework", as Eta Linnemann writes, "decides, for example, what gets investigated and what gets neglected by researchers."

Despite the dissenting voices, there exists no conceptual framework, where determinative decisions (distinguished from subjective motives) do not, to a large extent, influence both the methodology or approach of a research project. Therefore, canonical criticism is as legitimate an approach to biblical studies as is the historical-critical approach or the more recent theory of literature approach. The biblical texts are so rich in their variety, both as literature and as history, that no scientific method is entirely adequate for their comprehension and interpretation.

---

38 But as H. Y. Gamble rightly states, increasing disciplinary specialization has led to an unfortunate separation between NT studies and early church history... and so 'symptomatically, many NT 'Introductions' contain no discussion of the formation or significance of the canon" (Harry Y. Gamble, The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 13.


40 Linnemann, op. cit., 69.

41 More recently the widely recognized work of the literary critic R. Alter has made this fact of the literary richness of the biblical texts (the "peculiar literature"), increasingly clear, see especially Robert Alter, The World of Biblical Literature, (London: SPCK, 1992). In one place, Alter characteristically warns, "[t]he one
Apocalypse is the telling example: its fusion of genres has seen the book discussed and taken apart on many levels. The danger, however, which would render this (or any other) investigation untrustworthy and its conclusions highly susceptible, would be for whatever approach is taken on board, to pre-empt its own findings, to be self-contradictory, and to be incognizant of the rules of rational discourse.

For these reasons it should not surprise the student of the Apoc who finds himself or herself deluged by an array of ever-competing methodologies and approaches, each of these emphasizing that part of the text or narrative which it considers to be the more worthy of its attention. And so, for example, despite the many positive contributions of the historical-critical method to biblical studies, it has itself been strongly subject to and limited by the approaches of source criticism and the history of religions. The positives and the negatives of a plethora of approaches are now being intelligently debated as an attempt is being made to redefine (better still rediscover), the common ground of biblical studies. All approaches must be cognizant of the fine line that can separate an ideology from a theory and not hold itself above such distinction. Each interpreter will organize and structure the materials of his/her texts and research in one of many adopted theologies, perspectives, or mind-sets. To begin with, this is obvious from within the Bible itself (as Barr himself will plainly note): Saint Paul's justification by faith, or the 'works' theology of Saint James, or perhaps Deuteronomy as the centre for the theological understanding of the Old Testament. The history of modern theology is replete with such overwhelming biases. Take Rudolf Bultmann, for example, whose entire theological position, as James Barr has well argued, "can be plausibly read as..."

For a comprehensive review of the varying approaches to the Apoc, see M. G. Michael, Thesis: Chapters V-VII.

See S. E. Gillingham's study of the diverse approaches to biblical studies in contemporary scholarship in which the major techniques are very well defined and treated, the scholar rightly concludes that, "[o]ur approach to good reading of the Bible should begin with a recognition that there is something both 'fixed' (the text itself) and yet at the same time 'open' (the many voices which are found in the text)"; Susan E. Gillingham, One Bible, Many Voices: Different Approaches to Biblical Studies, (London: SPCK, 1998): 247. But these approaches, as she makes sure to point out throughout her work, must be judiciously applied, "for the pluralistic nature of these texts also reveals that each of the approaches has its limitations": ibid., 25; see also Postmodern Theologies: The Challenge of Religious Diversity, Terrence W. Tilley (ed.), (New York: Orbis Books, 1996).

For some practical examples of this challenging call to mutual biblical understanding, see The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church, J. L. Houlden (ed.), (London: SCM Press, 1995), 13-97.

Barr, op. cit., 71.
deriving from a profound and extreme application of the Lutheran understanding of justification by faith.\(^{46}\)

**The Canonical Criticism Approach**

The first systematic\(^{47}\) undertaking of a canonical critical\(^{48}\) application to the NT was that by Brevard S. Childs in his book *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* (1984), a work that attracted much attention. Though Childs would no doubt disagree,\(^{49}\) he has sometimes exaggerated the terrain between theological exegesis and historical criticism, which runs the risk of dehistoricizing the Canon in respect not only to the composition of the individual texts themselves- but also to the actual history of the Canon itself. The work is, however, a bold and timely approach (but not as pioneering as most would suggest).\(^{50}\) It was not surprising that it stirred much discussion nor that it continues to bring on responses dealing with canonical function and the hermeneutical importance of the Canon. Childs' work has demonstrated to the contemporary biblical exegete not only the possibilities but also the limitations, as H. Y. Gamble importantly points out, "of making theological exegesis dependent upon the shape of the canon while sharply restricting the significance of historical interpretation."\(^{51}\) At this point I should add, that James A. Sanders\(^{52}\) who has redressed some of the apparent weaknesses in the original formulations of Brevard S. Childs (and which James Barr openly acknowledges),\(^{53}\) is also an influence in my own approach in his

\(^{46}\) ibid., 108.

\(^{47}\) The sub-discipline of "canonical criticism" itself, was first proposed by James A. Sanders in *Torah and Canon* (1972). The "immediate question" of Sanders, as he very generously pointed out to me, was "which canon?" The concern of Brevard S. Childs is largely in "keeping a Protestant (Barthian) Doctrine of the Word alive": Sanders, J. A. <SandersJA@aol.com>. Re: from MGM. Wed, 24 Apr 2002. Michael, M. G. <mgjm@1earth.net>.

\(^{48}\) But note here both B. S. Childs and James A. Sanders strong reservations with "critical": Sanders, Canon and Community, 18.

\(^{49}\) "It is erroneous to infer that the canonical approach which is being outlined is opposed to historical criticism in principle. The issue at stake turns on how it is used": Childs, As Canon, 50.

\(^{50}\) Ideas approaching the principal theology of the method, that is its emphasis on *canon consciousness*, can be found for example in Paul Evdokimov's extended analysis of the Eastern Orthodox *a priori* of the Scripture being read in Christ \[**\text{H ANAGWISH EN CRISTW,}**\] and especially where he speaks of the "*instinct of Orthodoxy*" \[**\text{efstikto th' } Proedoxia*\] which leads to the *consensus patrum et apostolicum* of the Church: Paul 0 (Evdokimov, *H Proedoxia*, (Qessalonikh: Ekdos. Bas. Rhojopoulo o' ), *metaf*. A. T. Mourtzopoulo o' , (1972): 257, 245-261.


\(^{52}\) Sanders, *op. cit.*, 1-20, 21-45.

\(^{53}\) "In a number of aspects", James Barr states, "Sanders's position is closer to that which I have taken": Barr, *op. cit.*, 156. Barr is especially pleased that Sanders "rightly questions the idea that interpretation on the basis of what is claimed to be 'canonical context' really functioned in any community before the Reformation": ibid. But
recognition that "throughout the Church's life, interpretative traditions have parallelled the text in an effort to enable it to speak again."\textsuperscript{54} 

The Canon has given the NT its particular form and this can provide the investigator with a unique insight of the processes and dynamics of the "canonical construal" of the Christian tradition which led to its development. And because this canonical construal took place within an identifiable context, it calls "for an analysis", as Childs himself writes:

which combines both historical and theological description. It seeks to pursue not only the motives for giving the literature its peculiar shape, but also the function which the literature now performs in its special form within the smaller and larger units of that collection.\textsuperscript{55} 

Though this study does not take on board all of the positions or conclusions of B. S. Childs' approach, certainly not the limits placed on the historical and political motivations (that only the \textit{Sitz im Leben des Kanons} is what counts), it does, however, absolutely share in its fundamental and critical conviction of "canon consciousness":

...the issue of canon turns on the authoritative role played by particular traditions for a community of faith and practice... it [canon consciousness] thus arose at the inception of the Christian church and lies deep within the NT literature itself.\textsuperscript{56} 

The canonical criticism approach has effectively brought to attention the fact that from the very start, behind the historical process of the development of the Canon of sacred writings, there was an organic continuity in the historical process of the development and establishment of the NT. Nowhere does the approach suggest that this continuity was not generated out of an ongoing conflict.\textsuperscript{57} The process, through the unique adventures of each text, took hundreds of years to complete; it involved controversy, uncertainty, and a multiplicity of theological possibilities. For the Apoc to have survived its own canonical adventure and to have finally found a secure place in the NT Canon of the Ancient Church, there would have to had been some powerful and influential factors at work. These are the intrinsic inner dynamics of the

\textsuperscript{55} Childs, \textit{As Canon}, 38.  
\textsuperscript{56} ibid., 21.  
\textsuperscript{57} Childs, \textit{As Canon}, 30f.; Sanders, \textit{op. cit.}, 33f.; Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, \textit{op. cit.}, 15-25.
text, often referred to as the "criteria of canonicity". However, even though these criteria will play an essential part during the later stages of this present investigation, they will be primarily used as sign-posts and exploratory tools, not as *faits accomplis* on their own. In speaking of *inner dynamics* we are not limited to the strict adherence of the criteria (the criteria become part of the inner dynamics themselves, i.e. the "referential function") and so our approach becomes more wide-reaching. A new factor may be discovered, or an older one may be seen not to be as effective or as dominant as previously thought.

One of the positions of canonical criticism (for it is still very much a dialogue in process) with which I am in full accord is that the phenomenon of Canon is understood as providing a basic warrant for inferring that the material of the NT was "shaped toward engendering faith", as Childs persuasively argues, "and did not lie inert as a deposit of uninterpreted data from a past age." In this approach particular consideration can be given to how the material is construed into scripture, so that its witness remains alive and active to successive generations of Christians to whom the ministry of Jesus Christ and of His disciples was not an eye-witness experience. But where canonical criticism would ordinarily stress the structure of a document in this context, it is the genre that will be highlighted in this study. Before there was structure, it is my position, there was genre. The structure of a biblical book is an essential aspect of exegesis, but our first contact is with the genre and it is through this initial meeting that the aims of the structural composition can be more clearly defined and understood. For example, if the Apoc belongs to the prophetic genre, then its prophetic structures can be seen to be precisely that, "real prophecy". If, on the other hand, the work is a drama or a liturgy,

---

59 In using this expression I simply wish to underline the idea of the text's potential in the context of a wider application of "referential function": Tremper Longman III, *op. cit.*, 54f.  
60 *ibid.*  
61 Canonical criticism is a dialogue in process, and from within this approach different positions are highlighted or declined. The focus of the interpreters writing "under the rubric canon criticism" (G. T. Sheppard) is fundamentally on *meaning*. What does Canon mean? And how does it communicate that *meaning*? What does *authority* mean? What is *canonization*? More basically, "[i]f Childs emphasises the canon as a product of the community's faith, Sanders stresses its process": Wall and Lemcio, *op. cit.*, 32.  
62 Childs, *As Canon*, 51; see also Bernhard W. Anderson, "Tradition and Scripture in the Community of Faith", *JBL* 100/1, (1981), 5-21. "Nevertheless, this transhistorical quality of the biblical materials did not eclipse the anchorage of the texts in real life with its concrete particularity and historical referents": *ibid.*, 21.  
63 "Consciously or unconsciously, genre identification triggers what I have earlier called expectations on the part of the reader. Indeed it triggers a whole reading strategy...": Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Vol. 3), (Leicester: Apollos, 1987), 81. [italics added]
then the prophetic structures might be construed as merely dramatic effect or stage directions or, if liturgy, as hymnodic motifs.

Brevard S. Childs does come close to admitting an importance of the historical value of the criteria of canonicity, when in his criticism of H. Diem, who gives them a place, he refers to them as a "one-sided characterization" of the whole process. The overriding concern of Childs, however, is to deflect the assumption that the literature was shaped by historical, literary, sociological, and history-of-religion forces alone, and to stress that the theological struggle of its components with the literature's normative function was not insignificant. There were not only extraneous forces involved in the development of the Canon, but the idea of the Canon itself was central to the transmission and shaping of the specific literature. The canonical process above all had to faithfully safeguard and transmit to the succeeding generations of believers the timeless testimony of Jesus Christ's incarnation and resurrection. As John Meyendorff writes (when considering the criterion of apostolicity), "the Christian kerygma as such." But part of this canonical process, which to my mind Childs has unnecessarily underestimated, was the canonical criteria that the Ancient Church itself developed to test the claims of those documents that would profess to canonicity.

And so, finally, to the all important matter of the definition of Canon itself. I cannot either add or subtract from that denotation which Brevard S. Childs, himself, has so clearly and precisely set down and which encompasses the three major points, (a) the "process" of the formation, (b) the "authoritative tradition" and the collection, and (c) the "function" as Sacred Scripture. An Eastern Orthodox interpreter would sit comfortably with what follows:

For this reason I [B. S. Childs] am using the term canon in a broader sense that is traditionally the practice in order to encompass the entire process by which the formation of the church's sacred writings took place. I am including under the term not only the final stages of setting limits on the scope of the sacred writings- canonization

---

64 Childs, *As Canon*, 31.
65 *ibid.*, 22.
66 *ibid.*, 27-33.
67 See John Meyendorff, *Living Tradition: Orthodox Witness in the Contemporary World*, (New York: SVS Press, 1978), 14f. "Apostolicity thus remained the basic criterion in the history of the formation of the canon because it was also the only true characteristic of the Christian kerygma as such. The Church's intervention and judgement concerned only the limits of true Revelation; and in order to exercise this judgement it needed a criterion external to, but not independent from, Scripture. This criterion is the guidance of the Spirit, through whom the Incarnation was realized and who abides both upon Christ Himself, and upon His Body the Church": *ibid.*
68 Meyendorff, *ibid.*
proper- but also that process by which authoritative tradition was collected, ordered, and transmitted in such a way as to enable it to function as sacred scripture for a community of faith and practice.  

Philosophy of the Approach

Here the words of Kallistos Ware are particularly significant, given that this thesis is being written by an author who admits to the Eastern Orthodox confession:

Christianity, if true, has nothing to fear from honest enquiry. Orthodoxy, while regarding the Church as the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, does not forbid the critical and historical study of the Bible...

At all times the Eastern Orthodox theologian is aware of the essential distinction between the doctrinal deposit of the Church (which is unalterable) and the study of history (which is subject to various perspectives). Admittedly, the Christian Creed itself is intrinsically historic, but the dynamics and forces that necessitated its formulation can be approached and studied from diverse angles and viewpoints (religio-historical, religio-political, socio-economic, socio-linguistic, etc). One of the predicaments of the Christian historian, however, (as one writer put it) is that he/ she is rarely content "with the fragmentary vision."

Some might find this 'confession' amateurish or perhaps even improper. And yet there are scholars who are now recognizing the importance of such disclosure at the level of critical consciousness as one is writing. J. E. Bradley and R. A. Muller point out that the approach to objectivity:

---

69 Childs, As Canon, 25.

70 Kallistos Ware, The Orthodox Church, (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 201.

71 See, for example, Meyendorff, Living Tradition (Historical Relativism and Authority in Christian Dogma, 27-44). For instance, note Meyendorff's reasoned position on the application of Formgeschichte, "F. makes us see the biblical authors as living, historical individuals in their human settings, and familiarizes us with the categories of their minds. It thus helps immensely our understanding of Scripture. However, it totally defeats its purpose when it imposes on us as ultimate the categories of scientific research or of modern existential philosophy, or reduces itself to linguistic analysis, or considers as myth anything which is not physically or historically demonstrable. It then destroys the very content of the biblical message: liberation of man from cosmic determinism, which is witnessed by the empty tomb and the Resurrection": 42; but this is not alone the approach of the Orthodox, consider, for example, a similar phronema and sensitivity in an important monograph for our times by the Anglican bishop, Paul Barnett, Jesus and the Logic of History, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1997): 15-28.

72 This is an essential point arising from a concentrated study of history and one which I did not wish to omit simply on account of no longer being able to trace to its original author. But see Ronald H. Nash, The Meaning of History, (Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1998), 5-11.
...can be enhanced by a candid recognition of the fact that empathy and bias belong to our work, from beginning to end... it is methodologically important that one's empathy or one's bias be registered as an initial issue in method at the very beginning of research, so that the method begins to cancel out its effects...73

James Barr, who, in arguing against Brevard S. Childs method, spends time in his book fighting the idea of a "more theological and more canon-centered approach" and who flags the "non-confessional and religiously neutral" positions, cannot but himself also point to a higher authority of appeal with its own inherent biases and presuppositions. In this instance it is the Society of Biblical Literature in the United States or the Society for Old Testament Study in Great Britain.74 Barr is a superior critical scholar and has arrived at effectual conclusions in many places, yet he has failed to see this vein of contradiction that runs through his own work. When he reckons the whole subject of Canon as bereft of any hermeneutical significance, he has not recognized its actual purpose. That is, "the kerygmatic character of the scriptures in bearing testimony to God's redemption of the world in Christ."75

This tension over confession is occurring in an era when even our philosophers seem to have abandoned all hope of finding any truth whatsoever. This is particularly true of those in the pragmatic tradition, such as Stephen Stich, who argue that truth as such has no cognitive value, and that we should not care whether our beliefs are true or false, but whether they enable us to achieve more substantive goals such as happiness and well-being.76 The Sophists, professional instructors of higher education from the fifth century BC, were arguing much the same in the age of Plato.77 Nowadays schools of theology, some of these prominent, have become so embarrassed of their religious identity that they would consider such identification dispensable.78 At the same time there are professors of theology who now feel the need to 'apologize' publicly for the vitality of their own faith.79

74 Barr, op. cit., 150.
75 Childs, As Canon, 48.
77 ibid., 839-841.
It is important for me to note at this point, that though this work is written by someone professing to the worship and doctrine of the Eastern Orthodox Church, I nowhere claim to represent the official teachings of that Confession. On a number of counts I am not equipped for such a specialist task, and besides this is not a thesis dealing directly with questions to do with apologetics nor with the expounding of a systematic theology. However, I have tried to remain faithful to her "ästäiktō" [instinct] and make a good testimony. Therefore, all I can do is repeat here what I wrote in 1998 and address it to both my Orthodox and non-orthodox brethren: take what is useful and profitable from this work, as for anything else, I sincerely wait correction.

**Canon and Holy Tradition**

Linked to this idea of canon consciousness will be the concern for Holy Tradition, occasionally discussed, but not often given much consideration as it is invariably linked to the criterion of traditional usage. Holy Tradition is more than that: it is an ecclesiastical phronema, a theological consciousness, as Niko" Matsouka" says in a similar context, of the "infallibility of the Church" [tov ajlavor tou' ejkklhsia'']. One major reason for the importance of separating traditional usage from Tradition on a higher level is that ecclesiastical tradition was functioning as an oral witness prior to Scripture itself. There is, as Kallistos Ware writes, "the inner meaning of tradition." This will be explored and then considered as a factor in the canonical adventure of the Apoc.

For the Fathers it is the apostolic testimony or apostolic tradition [traditio apostolica] which is the key to the interpretation of the Scriptures. This tradition the apostles had committed

---

80 I believe that any professed Eastern Orthodox writer, with some notable exceptions, who lives, works, and has (for the better part) been trained in the West, should think long and hard before presenting him/herself défenseur de la foi. And if that temptation should arise, then a careful reading of Crh'stou' Giannara'' most confronting but certainly brave critique, $H Geologia Thn Ellada Stevras, (Aθna: Εκδοτ. Διδασκ., 1979), would not be out of place.

81 Certainly the literature here from the Eastern Orthodox is plentiful, but see a refreshing approach from the perspective of the "infallibility of the Church" [tov ajlavor tou' ejkklhsia''] from Niko Matsouka, Dogmatikhv kaiv Symbolikhv Qeologiva (Qessalonivkh: Pournara', 1985), 428-448.

82 "The Bible", as Bauckham fluently points out, "is not simply the first part of tradition. Of course, historically it is the written deposit of a tradition which continued without a break. But it is also true that, even historically, the church’s recognition of the canon of Scripture created a real break, which gave the origin of the tradition, in this written form, a uniquely normative status in relation to the rest of tradition": Scripture, Tradition, And Reason: A Study in the Criteria of Christian Doctrine, (eds) Richard Bauckham & Benjamin Drewery, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 127.

83 Ware, op. cit., 195.

84 For an introduction to the major principles of early patristic interpretation of the Bible, see Robert M. Grant and David Tracy, A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1996), 39-82;
orally to the Church, where it was handed down from generation to generation. There was then a living tradition that was independent of the written documents, which, for instance, the heresiarchs could distort. And so, Athanasius the Great for example, pointing to the Council of Nicaea could say after considering the Arian statements these "contrary doctrines", that he held "fast the sense of the true faith." Here in the Church, the Scriptures have been properly interpreted and preserved, for the Body of the Lord is the witness of the truth, testes veritatis. Irenaeus captures this powerfully when he speaks of "the truth itself as our rule". It was to this "rule of truth" that the patristic writers turned to when they wrote against the heresiarchs, who would themselves appeal to the Scripture. Holy Tradition, writes George Florovsky following Irenaeus of Lyons, safeguards that the preaching of the Church is "everywhere consistent [constans et aequaliter], and continues in an even course, and receives testimony from the prophets, the apostles, and all the disciples." It is within this theological setting that we can now define Church Consciousness as: the testimony that the Body and Head of the Church as a spiritual organism is Jesus Christ. "It [the Body] has a single spirit, a single common faith, a single and common catholic consciousness, guided by the Holy Spirit." Paul of Eujdokimof has traced this "consciousness" with profound insight to the symbol of the Lamb in the Apocalypse 1 Peter:

\[\text{see also J. Panagopolou, "H Erhmienei Th" Agiar Grafi Sth Ekkhsi Twn Patewn (Akriva": Athens, 1991).}\]

85 cf. 1Cor 15:3 with Saint Basil's De Spiritu Sancto 27.
86 Ad Episcopos Aegypti. 13.
87 "Only the scriptural revelation can be the norm of doctrine, but the teachers and confessions of the church are aids in interpretation insofar as they are witnesses of the truth that manifest its presence and preservation in the life of the church": "testes veritatis" in Richard A. Muller, Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 297.
88 Adv. haer. 2.28.1.
89 Those who appealed to any form of authority outside the Church, did not have "the key of entrance, but a false... a counterfeit key (ajntikle"), by which they do not enter as we enter in, through the tradition of the Lord...": Clement, Strom. 7.17.
91 Michael Pomazansky, Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, (California: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1997), 35; see also the inspiring paper from John A. McGuckin, "Eschaton and Kerygma: The Future of the Past in the Present Kairos: The Concept of Living Tradition in Orthodox Theology", SVTQ 42/3-4, (1998), 225-271. "It is, essentially, this spiritual Sobornost of the encounter of believers with the divine Spirit within the history of the Church, and witnessed in the active Kerygma from age to age, that is the guarantee of the Church's catholicity": ibid., 266.
The proximity of the early Fathers not only to the time of the writing of the NT, but to the early interpretative traditions of the books as well, reserves their exegetical testimony for a unique place. \(^{93}\) J. N. D. Kelly has famously written, "the only way to understand the mind of the early Church is to soak oneself in the patristic writing."\(^{94}\) The insensate misreckoning inherited from sections of the classical tradition to dismiss patristic literature as secondary (or even the product of a decadent age) is still prevalent in parts of biblical studies today.\(^{95}\) The rigid structures of the historical critical method, enmeshed as they have become in theories of subjectivity "where present experience and occurrence become the criteria of probability in the past",\(^{96}\) do not allow nearly enough for the interpretative prowess and dynamics of tradition of the early church communities. J. C. Miller did well to remind us that traditions are not "only conscious historical statements" but that they "remain very stable over time."\(^{97}\) Each party of the tradition is a link in the chain of transmission. In my thinking a notable and serious weakness of recent work on the Apoc is the underestimating of the ability of the Early Church community to pass on these "statements" to the next generation relatively intact. There have been some scholars, however, who have called for a more synthetic approach where tradition, and more specifically "oral tradition as evidence",\(^{98}\) is afforded a more significant role in the quest for interpretation.

\(^{92}\) Eujdokivmof, op. cit., 166.


\(^{94}\) See Eta Linnemann's intelligent and reasoned observations on the historical critical method in Chapter 6 [The Study of Historical-Critical Theology] of her cited work.


\(^{96}\) ibid., 29.
The patristic hermeneutical tradition has been increasingly marginalised: first, by the historical critical method which came to full force in the nineteenth century; and second, by the rise of postmodernism in Biblical Criticism (particularly evident in the deconstructionism of the scriptural text). Contemporary biblical scholarship is still characterised by its "positivistic approach to exegetical problems", as it was 1972 when Georges Barrois had made this critical observation:

Contemporary Biblical scholarship is characterised by its positivistic approach to exegetical problems. It aims at identifying the sources... [t]his procedure is basically sound but limited: its conclusions which are informative and descriptive by nature remain unavoidably provisional and largely hypothetical... [i]n contradistinction with critical exegesis, traditional hermeneusis sees in the Bible an instrument- the instrument $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\varepsilon\gamma\epsilon\omega\chi\zeta\nu\nu\nu\varsigma\zeta\alpha\omicron\mu\nu\iota\nu\iota\omicron\nu$- through which the Divine $\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\sigma\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\iota\nu$ of human destiny is revealed to us from the early beginnings of mankind (so-called Urgeschichte)... [h]ermeneutics is thus immediately geared to the edification of the faith and the pursuit of Christian living.  

The Importance of Background

Ralph P. Martin does not exaggerate when he writes, "[n]o New Testament book demands more introductory background on the part of its modern readers than this one [the Apoc]." A significant part of this thesis is allotted to precisely this aspect, and to the general theatre of the times. Such examination is considered essential because it is directly related to the investigation of the factors of the development of the NT Canon. At the basic level the Biblical Canon is a theological phenomenon (i.e. confessional and doctrinal decisions); nevertheless its examination has to proceed equally on historical grounds because historical factors also played a key part in the canonical process (i.e. ecclesiastical and political intrigues). Some interpreters, however, have sought to diminish the part of theology in this overall process. This is a serious error for, as H. Y. Gamble has written:

...a historical study of the canon's formation cannot truly be critical without paying due attention to the theological factors in the historical process and the theological implications of the church's decision to have a canon. It is necessary to deal with such issues as the context which the canon provides for interpretation and the question of how the canon can exercise normative authority for Christianity."

---


Qualitative and Quantitative Study

Chapters 7-9

In investigating the canonical adventure of the Apoc (more specifically in this instance traditional usage), a two-pronged approach was used in this dissertation, encompassing both a "qualitative" and "quantitative" study. The qualitative study (historical-comparative research) basically took the form of case studies of ecclesiastical writers and their works. These chapters, for reasons explained in the appropriate places, were divided into three sections: (i) the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers; (ii) from the Muratorian Fragment to Origen of Alexandria; and (iii) from Cyprian of Carthage to Athanasius of Alexandria. Addressed were subjects including: geographic location, issues of circulation, authoritative reception, local church pressures, relationships between the individual writers, the mentality and theology of the individual patristic writer. The quantitative study (content analysis) involved using a search program to query a database of writers and their respective works based on key words and phrases from the Apoc. The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae™ CD database and accompanying electronic search programs allow for the investigator to conduct extensive searches across the literature (I discuss this more completely in the Appendix of the thesis). Both these approaches served to complement each other. The qualitative study followed the approach that was so very successfully employed by N. B. Stonehouse in his own investigation into the traditional usage of the Apoc, and more recently (on a far smaller scale) by J. Christian Wilson in his excellent study of Hermas. The quantitative study, which is not exhaustive and only contains ecclesiastical writings in Greek limited to the digitized texts available on the TLG, appears in the Appendix to offer further support to the evidence presented in the main body of the thesis. It should be stressed, however, that the quantitative study must not be considered complete. It is more of a pilot survey, granting future researchers of the Apoc a way forward with the use of other investigative tools: with the warning that the meta-analysis is very intensive and time-consuming (and not exempt from human error). The method explained in the Appendix can be used as a paradigm for other database searches of this kind, applicable to both OT and NT research. The results collected and tabulated in the Appendix include a combination of direct references from the Apoc and strong allusions.


103 Colin Robson, Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 146-166. [of course, the case study is suitably qualified to the discipline to which it is being applied]

Notes on the Major Texts Employed in the Thesis

Unless otherwise referenced the NT Gk cited is from *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland (1983, 1998). Unless otherwise referenced the Septuagint cited is from *H PALAIA DIAQHKH KATA TOUS OV* Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), (1981). Unless otherwise noted the English text of the NT is from the *Common Bible*, The Revised Standard Version, (1973). Unless otherwise noted the Greek and English text of the Apostolic Fathers is from *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Edited and Revised by Michael W. Holmes, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999). Unless otherwise referenced the English patristic text is cited from *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (First Series), *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Second Series), (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, reprint. 1993). Unless otherwise noted Greek patristic text is taken from *Patrologiae Graeca* (J.P.Migne), and *ELLHNES PATERES THS EKKLHSIAS [EPE] (Paterikaiv Ekdovsei" "Grhgo" o Pal amalv*: Qessalonikh), and *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Similarly with the classics, unless otherwise indicated all quotations are cited from the *Loeb Classical Library*, and the *Penguin Classics*. As for the translation of the *Muratorian Fragment*, unless I say differently, I follow Bruce Metzger (*The Canon*, 305-307). Finally, as with my previous thesis, a problem arose with the use of the *monotonic* and *polytonic* systems when citing Modern Greek writers. As this still remains a sensitive issue, I considered it best to quote the authors as they themselves had chosen to write, (except for some few occasions including the Modern Greek bibliography at the conclusion of the thesis where for the sake of consistency I have used the monotonic throughout).

The Chapters of the Thesis

Immediately after the Introduction follows Chapter 2 which includes the major literature review, it outlines the dominant approaches to the study of the Biblical Canon, and critically discusses the factors and criteria in the development of the NT Canon itself. Chapter 3 investigates the importance of the dating of the Apoc in the setting of its background and in the wider context of the criterion of apostolicity. Chapter 4 examines the central significance of genre as "strategic ambiguity" and its role in the hermeneutical adventure and authoritative reception of the Apoc by the Early Church community. Chapter 5 considers the question and influence of Chiliasm on the first "flesh and blood" readers of the Apoc, its

---

105 This chapter and that immediately following are revised versions of those that originally appeared in my MA(Hons) thesis, "The Number of the Beast, 666 (Revelation 13:16-18): Background, Sources, and Interpretation", submitted to the School of History, Philosophy and Politics at Macquarie University, NSW, (1998). Their inclusion was critical on several fronts. Nevertheless, exclusion of both of these chapters "in whole or in part", would affect neither the integrity of the required length of this dissertation nor its results.

106 See above.
"function" in the canonical process, and its impact on the book's consequent history of reception and interpretation. Chapter 6 analyzes and presents a core component of the overarching ecclesial framework of the Apoc in the context of the "community of believers", and the Seer's high cognizance of the importance of connecting his prophecy to a "church consciousness" theology. Chapter 7 commences the survey into the patristic uses and testimonies of the Book of Revelation starting with the Apostolic Fathers; in this chapter I also identify the main reasons the Apoc circulated very early on after its initial publication. Chapter 8 continues with the qualitative survey into the traditional usage of the Apoc beginning with the Muratorian Fragment and ending with Origen of Alexandria. Chapter 9 begins with Cyprian of Carthage and concludes with our final witness, Athanasius of Alexandria. Chapter 10, the Conclusion of the dissertation; here I gather the results from the preceding chapters, summarise the key arguments, and present the conclusions in an ordered manner arguing for the Apoc's honoured record in the traditional usage and canonical formulations of the Early Church. Then follows the Appendix: it includes a detailed description and analysis of the positives and negatives of the use of the TLG CD-ROM, advances the methodology for the pilot survey together with the research paradigm, and it submits extensive tables and end results as supporting evidence for the findings of this thesis. Finally the Bibliography, here is catalogued a comprehensive list of relevant literature connected to most aspects of the investigation, with a special emphasis on monographs (both books and papers) dealing specifically with the Book of Revelation and the formation of the NT Canon.
CHAPTER 2
Factors in the Development of the NT Canon

History of the NT Canon

It is not my intention in this opening section to review in-depth the history of the investigation of the NT Canon. That task has already been performed admirably by a number of scholars and from varying approaches, some focussing directly on the books themselves, others on the question of hermeneutics and authority, and others on the diverse religio-historical dynamics of the overall formation. Among the more prominent of these works over the past two decades (and this is just a representative collection) are the critical studies and surveys conducted by Walter Brueggemann (1982), W. R. Farmer and D. M. Farkasfalvy (1983), James Barr (1983), David L. Bartlett (1983), Brevard S. Childs (1984), J. A. Sanders (1984), H. Y. Gamble (1985), R. Gnuse (1985), David G. Meade (1986), D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (1986), Bruce M. Metzger (1987), John Barton (1988), F. F. Bruce, (1988), James D. G. Dunn (1990), Georg Strecker (1992), R. W. Wall and E. E. Lemcio (1992), G. M. Hahneman (1992), Rolf Rendtorff (1993), John W. Miller (1994), Lee M. McDonald (1995), John Barton (1997). More recently the investigation has been brought up to date with the fresh insights from a "soteriological rather than an epistemological" way of thinking in the work of William J. Abraham (1998), and in E. E. Ellis' concentrated study The Making of the New Testament Documents (1999), where the argument is made for the "corporate authorship" of the NT by "cooperating apostolic missions sharing common traditions but pursuing different tasks." What follows here, however, is an essential review of the principal

---

1 For an excellent overview on the phenomenon of religious canons and the history of religion, see Canonization & Decanonization [Papers presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions], A. van der Kooij & K. van der Toorn (eds.), (Leiden: Brill, 1998). See esp. "The New Testament Canon As The Embodiment Of Evolving Christian Attitudes Towards Jews", P. J. Tomson, ibid., 107-131. Tomson's conclusion, however, that it was only with the rise of historical criticism that exegetes were enabled to rediscover the proper message of the majority of the NT books is too extreme; for the German bibliography, see I. Baldermann (et al.), "Zum Problem des biblischen Kanons", JBT 3, (1988).

phases and the citing of landmark contributions in the area of Canon investigation, which both influenced and prepared the way for the contributions of the scholars not only cited above, but also of those immediately before them. This earlier group would include such names as Floyd V. Filson, Ernst Käsemann, Kurt Aland, and Willi Marxsen.3

This chapter also aims to consider the concept of Canon in the literature of the Ancient Church, which after all was the initial recipient of a canonical theology. It is, however, the primary goal to introduce the factors in the development of the NT Canon with which the concluding evidence of this thesis will be considered against. At the same time it is an objective to re-introduce the criteria of canonicity not only as a legitimate methodological approach in the study of the process of canonization, but to show how they can best be applied.4 The significance of this also extends to the fact that Brevard S. Childs, himself, has questioned their original application as notae canonicitatis.5

The Background to the Study of the NT Canon

It is acknowledged by most scholars, some preferring to begin with J. D. Michaelis,6 that the study of the biblical canon as a "subject" can be traced to one of the pioneers of biblical

---

3 For their most notable contributions to the canonical discussion, see Lee M. McDonald's select bibliography: op. cit., 321-329.

4 McDonald has compactly addressed the questions that would arise today if the criteria were reapplied "with the help of the modern critical and historical disciplines": Lee Martin McDonald, "The Integrity of the Biblical Canon in Light of Its Historical Development", BBR 6, (1996), 128.

5 B. S. Childs writes for instance, "the later expositions of the criteria of canonicity were, in large part, after-the-fact explanations": Childs, As Canon, 32. But to be just to Childs, he does allow for a fairer application of these criteria than this statement might at first suggest: ibid.

criticism, J. S. Semler (1725-1791), who between the years 1771-1775 published four volumes with the title, *Abhandlung von der freien Untersuchung des Kanons*. Semler's approach sought to "de-canonize" the biblical documents from their dogmatic and apologetic position. Semler was successful in that he influenced a large group of scholars immediately afterwards to move away from understanding the NT Canon as a historical continuity of NT tradition. In response to the radical position of Semler (which in effect questioned the authoritative form of the apostolic writings themselves), there emerged a group of scholars who sought to defend the historical continuity of the NT documents. Within this movement the names of conservative scholars such as J. L. Hug and H. E. F. Guericke played an influential part in the developing dialogue which has not always been properly acknowledged in the literature of the East. This position, closely aligned to the perspective of the Early Church, argued for the process of canonization to have begun as near as possible to the time of the apostles, establishing both the history of the canonization itself and the authenticity of the documents.

So from the late eighteenth century onwards we find the interest in the NT Canon becoming a matter for study and of controversy in biblical circles, for in the final analysis it was a question of *authoritas Scripturae* and so it was a great divide. From this inheritance and from that time onwards, liberals with a rationalist bend to their approach to biblical theology such as J. G. Eichhorn, W. M. L. De Wette, and F. C. Baur, or more conservative scholars

---

7 Trans. *Treatise on the Free Investigation of the Canon*. As Metzger has noted, "the two basic theses that Semler formulates, opening the way for the 'free investigation' of the New Testament, rest on dogmatic and historical presuppositions": Metzger, *The Canon*, 16.

8 But this influence was not uniform and different paths were followed in accordance to which thesis of Semler's "broadside attack" was accepted or rejected. See F. C. Schmid (Leipzig, 1775), H. Corrodi (Halle, 1792), C. F. Weber (1798) in Metzger, *The Canon*, 17.


11 W. G. Kümmel has said of Eichorn's five-volume *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, (Leipzig, 1804-27), that it was the "first really free investigation of the origin of the canonical Scriptures and of the NT text": Kümmel, *op. cit.*, 30.

12 It is telling that De Wette (1780-1849), briefly a colleague of Friedrich Schleiermacher at the theological faculty in Berlin, studied under J. J. Griesbach (1745-1812) who was one of the first to break with the *Textus Receptus* by developing his own critical text.

13 Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) is considered one of the founders of historical theology "through his development and application of principles of historical criticism to the history and theology of the canon": Soulen, *op. cit.*, 28. As Kümmel writes, Baur and his Tübingen School steered the science of introduction into a new direction. Baur defined *introduction" as criticism of the canon, or as scholarly research on the origin and the original character of the canonical Scriptures*: Kümmel, *op. cit.*, 30. His major work in which the evolved positions of his approach and methodology are set out in the context of proposed solutions to the "conceptual conflicts of the apostolic and post-apostolic periods" is *Kirchengeschichte der 3 ersten Jahrhunderte*. (1853):
who held more strongly on to the belief of revelation such as B. F. Westcott and T. Zahn, have gone on to formulate their respective methodologies and critical standards. The position of Zahn, however, whose fundamental thesis was that the NT Canon came into being by the end of the first century, was criticized by Adolf von Harnack in Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200 published in 1889. It was Harnack's conviction that one of the major factors in the formulation of the NT Canon was the post-apostolic liturgical use of the Christian texts to ascribe to them a canonical status and of the Early Church's ongoing clash with gnosticism. It is from within these two traditions, the conservative (arguing for growth) and the more liberal (arguing for selection), that we encounter variation and deviation. The famous professor of theology F. Schleiermacher, who had earlier argued that the authority of a NT document depended not on its authorship but on its content, wanted to distinguish between the collecting process which ultimately shaped the Canon and the original setting of each of the texts

*ibid.* The work was translated and edited some 25 years later for English-speaking scholars by A. Menzies, *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, (London: Williams and Norgate, 1878-89).

14 Brooke Foss Westcott was Professor of Theology at Cambridge (1870-90) and Bishop of Durham (1890-1901). He is especially noted for his collaboration with F. J. A. Hort on their critical edition of the Gk NT (1881).

15 For a list of Theodor Zahn's major studies on the NT, see Childs, *As Canon*, 5. He is, of course, the author of the classic two volume commentary, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, (Leipzig: Deichert, 1924-26).


17 Adolf Karl Gustav von Harnack (1851-1930), who at one time was able to hold the positions of professor of church history at the University of Berlin, member of the Academy of Sciences in Berlin, and director of the Prussian State Library, was a theologian and church historian who exerted a strong influence in the development of modern theological and historical scholarship. He viewed dogma as a disintegrative force and the diverse systems of doctrine (*Lehrbegriffe*) emerging as a result of later speculation. As G. E. Ladd notes, Harnack's *“What Is Christianity”* (Eng. Tr. 1901), "is a classic statement of this liberal view": George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), 5. One of his major challenges came interestingly from the German Jewish Reform rabbi, Leo Baeck, who in 1901 argued against one of Harnack's central positions, that original Christianity was unrelated to the Jewish tradition. For a list and publication dates of Harnack's major works, see Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, (Illinois: IVP, 1970), 999.

18 The succinct and telling distinction of the development of the Canon "as one of selection" or "the idea of growth", is from Metzger, *The Canon*, 24.

19 Friedrich Ernst Daniel Schleiermacher's (1768-1834) contribution to the development of NT criticism and hermeneutics is significant. As Child's informs us, it was in Schleiermacher's posthumously published (lecture notes), *Einleitung ins Neue Testament*, (1845), that the author "brilliantly develops some of the hermeneutical and exegetical issues involved in the critical understanding of the New Testament canon": Childs, *As Canon*, 7. This was, as I have noted above, his discrimination between the collecting process of each of the NT books which would eventually comprise the canon itself, and the original setting of each of these books separately outside this collection process. These ideas are also strongly intimated in his: *Über den sogenannen ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus*, (1807), where he disputed Pauline authorship of First Timothy on the evidence of language and situation.
separately. H. J. Holtzmann, similarly famous for his two source hypothesis of the synoptic Gospels, argued, for example, for the developing Canon as tradition within the history of the Catholic Church. In England an important work was to appear in 1911, J. Moffatt’s An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. The significance of this work, which Raymond E. Brown has called "a scholarly classic", was that it followed the critical position of the Germans and argued for a scientific investigation of the formulation of the NT Canon. About a decade earlier a similar position, which has been prominent ever since, was introduced to the United States by B. W. Bacon. The conclusion of Brevard S. Childs at the end of a section from his magisterial survey is my understanding also of the unfolding events:

As a result of the historical critical study of the New Testament a broad consensus emerged by the end of the nineteenth century which continued into the twentieth century in which the New Testament canon was regarded solely as a post-apostolic development without any real significance for understanding the shaping of the New Testament itself.

Of course, many other names could have been added to this introduction to the early period, including those of R. Simon, Friedrich Lücke, A. H. Charteris, A. Alexander, G. T. Purves, C. A. Credner, Louis Gaussen, Alfred Loisy, J. J. Given, J. Cramer, Franz Overbeck, F. Bleek, J. B. Lightfoot, Adolf Jülicher, and R. Knopf (to name but a few), each one providing new perspectives and in many cases inspiring fresh debate. However, as was mentioned at the outset, the aim of this chapter was to straightforwardly introduce the major approaches and methodologies published before or just after the twentieth century which set the stage for the research into the formation of the NT Canon over the past one hundred years. From that period onwards, as I have already noted, the bibliography and critical analysis of the deviations have been well covered. In the Eastern Orthodox arena two principal reasons did

---

20 Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (1832-1910) was professor in NT both in Heidelberg and Strassburg. His "two source hypothesis" of the synoptic Gospels: Mark and Q [Quelle source] behind Matthew and Luke, has been, as Soulen writes, "the basis of synoptic criticism ever since": Soulen, op. cit., 91. His contribution to the question of canon in his Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament, (Freiburg, 1885) is given, as Metzger says, "extensive consideration": Metzger, The Canon, 23.


24 Childs, As Canon, 11f.

25 For summaries and bibliographical details of these scholars and others works, see Metzger, The Canon, 11-24 and Kümmel, op. cit., 28-34.
not permit any commensurate response. First, given the normative recognition of Scripture and Tradition as two equal rules of authority and revelation, the idea of questioning the Canon would have been considered extravagant; second, Greece was under the yoke of Ottoman rule and the Russians were beset by their own internal problems; and though there were periods of spiritual renewal these were not the ideal conditions for the flowering of critical scholarship.

Fundamental Problems of the Investigation

The complexity and difficulty of the investigation of the history of the NT Canon has not been denied by scholars. The fundamental reasons for this difficulty is that the principal evidence for such studies has to be collected from early Christian literature, which creates the problem of the authenticity and age of many of these writings. This is particularly problematic for the first two generations after the time of the Apostles, the most important period. And even when a consensus on these matters is found, the question arises as to the best way of how the evidence should be interpreted. However, the recent strong interest in canonical studies, inspired especially by Brevard S. Childs and James A. Sanders, has seen good progress and some common ground. At the same time, as I have earlier written, canonical criticism itself is engaged in a lively and productive dialectic. As Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio explain, for B. S. Childs the fundamental claim "is that the canonical text alone is the medium of divine revelation... what matters is a text's Sitz im Leben des Kanons." Sanders, however, as the same two authors continue, sees other paradigms emerging "across five cultures" during the written history of the biblical documents and speaks of the "monotheizing pluralism" of canon. Yet very importantly, the approach to the study of the sacred


27 For a fair and telling description of the "Church under Islam" in which the author takes into account both religious and social issues, see Kallistos (Timothy) Ware, The Orthodox Church, (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 87-101. For the conflicts within Russia, beginning with the "schism of the Old Believers": ibid., 102-125.

28 James Barr who has written against Childs' "constant allegation" that modern biblical theology has neglected the canon of scripture, has still said, that Childs' "literary insights... have deservedly raised considerable interest among biblical scholars": Barr, op. cit., 78, fn. 2; J. A. Sanders, however, has found some support in Barr who agrees on a number of points of Sanders' position, particularly that he "rightly questions the idea that interpretation on the basis of what is claimed to be 'canonical context' really functioned in any community before the Reformation..."; ibid., 156.

29 Wall and Lemcio, op. cit., 31f.

30 ibid.
documents of both Brevard S. Childs and James Sanders "raises common questions, although their answers vary sharply":

To what extent, in what sense and how should the canon be considered as authoritative when Scripture is appealed to in theological and ethical reflection?\(^\text{31}\)

Biblical scholars across the confessional divide, whether from a canonical approach or not, have come closer to collective judgement on a number of issues relating both to the NT Canon and to the interpretation of relevant NT pericopes (i.e. 2Tim 3:15-16; 2Pet 3:15-16). Significantly, even where there still remains a great divide on the question of authoritas Scripturae or Tradition for instance, the dialogue that canonical criticism has inspired within biblical theology has helped to narrow the differences, as is generally accepted nowadays, to the most important questions. At the forefront of this modern-day consensus is the recognition by most of the specialist investigators that the development and general dynamics of the formation of the Canon were much more involved and intricate than was earlier believed. The process to the establishment of the NT Canon as an infallible witness to an authoritative list of divinely inspired books was a gradual, and often contradictory process marked by stages and diverse, sometimes unpredictable, causes.\(^\text{32}\)

**Canon: the Term, the Idea, and the History**

The English word "canon" is a transliteration of the Greek κανών, originally meaning "a rule" or "straight rod" by which a straight line could be drawn.\(^\text{33}\) In a metaphorical sense, it came to mean a "standard" or "norm" by which documents or other things ought to be measured.\(^\text{34}\) Originally, the term appears to have been derived from the Semitic root qâneh, the word for "reed". And though the idea itself is implied, there was no exact equivalent in Jewish literature in respect of the OT. This is demonstrable in the common expression "the

\(^\text{31}\) ibid., 31; Wall and Lemcio, of course, are making their own very significant contribution to the entire discussion with particular emphasis on the canon "as intrabiblical dialogue", as James A. Sanders, himself, points out (in the Foreword to their cited work); ibid., 9.

\(^\text{32}\) See Brevard S. Childs for further discussion on the importance of this "remarkable consensus" for biblical studies and for the principal causes that brought some of these agreements about: Childs, As Canon, 18-33. However, he importantly adds (and with this including his own approach), that "it would be unrealistic and even arrogant for any person to claim that a new understanding of canon could resolve all these genuinely perplexing questions": ibid., 21.

\(^\text{33}\) For a detailed survey of the history of the word κανών and for its collection of uses, see especially H. Oppel, "KANWN. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)", (Philologus Supplement 30, 4; Leipzig, 1937).

"Scriptures" as used by Jews in the NT (Matt 21:42; Jn 5:39; Acts 18:24). In other instances also, where the word "Scripture" is used alone for a specific pericope, it contains the idea since the citation receives its authority from the very fact of it being included in a body of sacred writings (Lk 4:21; Jn 13:18; Acts 8:35). This important clue is not always noted by scholars and should not be underestimated in such a discussion. And when Josephus makes a declaration concerning the OT books and their number, the recognition of a Canon is likewise implied (Ap. 1.8). The concept is also evidenced in the collective words in the Talmud for the Divine Scriptures: (i) 'the holy writings', (ii) the 'reading'. More importantly the canonical formulas in the OT itself (Deut 4:2; 12:32; Jer 26:2; Prov. 30:6; Eccles. 3:14), witness to the beginning of the idea of a Sacred Canon from an earlier period.\(^\text{35}\) The German scholar Rolf Rendtorff, who has written extensively on the OT Canon, has helped to balance Brevard S. Childs position who has, it must be admitted, disengaged a little too much the earlier stages of the history of the OT Canon from independent interpretation.\(^\text{36}\) Rendtorff writes:

> The better way- and, as I believe, the only appropriate way- would be the contrary one: to take the self-understanding of the Old Testament in its canonical form quite seriously, and at the same time to recognize, theologically as well, the historical fact that its influence has two separate strands, one Jewish and one Christian.\(^\text{37}\)

We cannot be absolute as to whether the first use of the word "canon" to indicate the collection of books in the Bible was making reference to that specific list or to the \textit{rule of faith} that was expounded in the documents themselves. Attempts to argue for one view or the other have failed to convince which seems to indicate that both sides have emphasized one strand of the usage whilst overlooking the other. It would appear, as F. V. Filson suggests, "that neither idea could ever have been completely lacking- each was at least implied from the first- but conviction that these books were basic and authoritative appears primary."\(^\text{38}\) However, the first religious texts to acquire 'canonical' status are ancient writings belonging to an age in

\(^{\text{35}}\text{For the importance of the Canon for a theology of the Old Testament and its significance for Christian theology, see Rolf Rendtorff, Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 46-56.}\)

\(^{\text{36}}\text{But Childs (as Rendtorff himself is fair to point out), in his paper "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis", JSS 16 (1971), 137-150, interprets the psalm titles which are connected to stages in the life of David "explicitly as 'exegesis' of the existing text": Rendtorff, \textit{op. cit.}, 51.}\)

\(^{\text{37}}\text{Rendtorff, \textit{op. cit.}, 56.}\)

which the vital proclamation of prophecy was no longer heard. These earlier documents, as I. M. Andreyev says, were "preparatory in the history of the divine structure [of revelation]." Importantly, the reluctant disclosure did not rule out an addition to the number of inspired books at a future time of revelation: to disengage the prophetic office without some inspired qualification would be to publicly acknowledge that God had abandoned His chosen people.

Kanwɔ in the New Testament

The canonical intimation in the NT itself evidences that the concept of a sacred collection of documents for the new community of believers was not foreign: cf. Rom 15:4; Gal 1:11-12; 2Tim 3:16; 2Pet 1:20-21, 3:15-16 and was strongly presented in the Apoc itself: Rev 1:1-3; 22:6-7,18-19. Consider especially Rev 22:18-19 to the "canonization-formula" of Deut. 4:1ff. Robert L. Thomas writes, "this is a canonizing of the book of Revelation parallel to the way the Deuteronomy passage came to apply to the whole OT canon." The underlying element behind these citations is that the author and first cause, causa principalis, is God- whilst the second cause, causa instrumentalis, is man. As for kanwɔ it only appears a total of four times in the NT, on each occasion in the epistles of Paul: 2Cor 10:13 [tou' kanɔvno'], v.15 [tɔn kanɔvna], v.16 [al otr iw kanvni]; Gal 6:16 [tw' kanvni]. These are references to a "rule of conduct" or a "standard for making judgements."

Kanwɔ as a Summary Formulation

Outside this Pauline usage the word itself is met with just once in first-century Christian literature, namely in The Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians (more commonly know as 1Clement). By most accounts the epistle was written in Rome close to the time that the Seer

39 This would have been especially significant of the Judaism of the inter-testamental period at which time the Torah, as Russell writes, "became for the Jews the supreme religious authority and Judaism established itself as a religion of the Book": D. S. Russell, Between the Testaments, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 63.


41 This providence is confirmed across the spectrum of the OT scriptures and is especially notable in Joel's locus classicus promise of the outpouring of the Spirit, (Joel 2:28-29).

42 Note especially 2Pet 1:20-21, which Green says is "perhaps the fullest and most explicit biblical reference to the inspiration of its authors": Michael Green, 2 Peter and Jude, (Leicester: IVP, 1977), 91. But see all of Green's well considered discussion on this verse where the distinction between "interpretation and authentication" is also brought out: ibid., 89-92; see the same again for commentary on 2Pet 3:15-16 for a balanced analysis on Peter's possible meaning of tɔ lɔpα' grafα in connection to the writings of Saint Paul: ibid., 146-149.


44 Paul o Ευδοκιμαφ, Η Dropovios, (Qessal orhα Rhgopou o', 1972), 260.

45 “Kanvɔ” in EDNT (Vol. 2), art., A. Sand, 249.
of Patmos was writing the Book of Revelation.\footnote{See Michael H. W. Holmes (ed), The Apostolic Fathers, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 22-24.} The author refers to "rules" managing moral behaviour and ecclesiastical practice: 1.3 \[
\text{[tw\ kanov\ th' upotagh']}\], 7.2 \[
\text{[th' paradosew' hymn\ kanovn]}\]. This situation, however, will change towards the close of the second century with the term becoming increasingly common. It will appear in summary formulations of the basic principles of Christian faith and practice and chiefly refer to the \textit{norm} or \textit{standard} to which this belief should conform or be measured up against. Model phrases: "the rule of truth" [\text{[kanw\ th' ajhqeiva']/ regula veritatis}]; and "the rule of faith" [\text{[kanw\ th' pistew'/ regula fidei]}; but also "the rule of the Church"; and "the ecclesiastical rule".\footnote{See George Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.), Eastern Orthodoxy: A Contemporary Reader, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995): "The Function of Tradition in the Ancient Church", 97-114.}

\textbf{Kanw as a Sacred Collection for the First Time}

The word "canon" as most of us use it today to apply to a collection of writings that have been set apart,\footnote{See Robert Alter's, Canon and Creativity: Modern Writing and the Authority of Scripture, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 1-20.} was not immediately applied to the Christian scriptures in that strict technical sense until the middle of the fourth century.\footnote{For discussion on the general application of the term "Canon" by the Eastern Orthodox in the history of the reception of the "divinely inspired" books, see Pomazansky, \textit{op. cit.}, 25-29.} The earliest known use of the term in this connection is furnished by Athanasius, in his Decrees of the Council of Nicea, written soon after AD 350.\footnote{Metzger, \textit{The Canon}, 211.} Later in his famous Festal Letter (\textit{Ep. 39}) of AD 367 to the Egyptian Churches, he describes the list of authoritative early Christian writings which were "handed down" [\textit{paradoqevnta}], as "canonical" [\textit{kanonizovmena}].\footnote{Athanasius Theol., \textit{Epistula festalis xxxix}, TLG (2035 014) 76.18- 77.14.} Close to that time the Council of Laodicea AD c. 363 in its 59th and 60th Canons refers to the "uncanonical" [\textit{ajkanovnista bibliv}] and the "canonical" [\textit{ta; kanonikav}] books of the New and Old Testament.\footnote{The Rudder of the Orthodox Catholic Church, (Massachusetts: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957), 575f.} Subsequently it became common to use the term "canon" for the collection of authoritative books. But there is room for some uncertainty about exactly what the word meant when it was used in this way. Some scholars following Theodor Zahn argue that in this connection "canon" had the simple sense of "list" or "catalogue" and did not signify that the writings so designated possessed normative authority. Others have argued the opposite on the
basis of the earlier Christian use of the word, so that these writings are to be understood as containing the "canon of truth", the basic authoritative teachings of Christianity.

A Closer Inquiry

The Holy Scriptures

Not long after the first church communities were established the Christian believers embraced the Jewish "holy scriptures" \[\text{\textit{grafai'}}\ a\text{\textit{givai'}}\] (Rom 1:2) as their own.\(^{53}\) In the immediate generation, however, the Church would further extend the idea of Scripture to another group of documents which were to be acknowledged alongside those of the OT.\(^{54}\) Sometime around AD 150 Pseudo-Clement of Rome's second epistle,\(^{55}\) or more correctly his sermon on the call to repentence (1.1-8), speaks of "the Books and the Apostles [who] declare" \[\text{\textit{ta; bibli\a kai; oj\ apostol di}}\].\(^{56}\) This distinction was not made haphazardly, but was a conscious operation, for comparative distinctions were sought to acknowledge this second body of writings. Melito, bishop of Sardis (AD c. 170), tells of having "learned accurately the books of the Old Testament" \[\text{\textit{ta; th'\ palaia'\ diaqhkh'}}\ bib\liva\].\(^{57}\) Is Melito, as \textit{Jwavnih Karabidopoul o} asks, possibly distinguishing \[\text{\textit{diakriournav\ ta'}}\] these from the books of the NT?\(^{58}\) Evidence also exists around the end of the same century in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, that the names \textit{palaia; diameter/ novum testamentum}, the terms "that have become the most prevalent of all", had been transferred to the actual writings of the two covenants.\(^{59}\) Tertullian preferred the term \textit{Instrumentum} which had legal associations of documentary record or proof (\textit{Adv. Marc.})

\(^{53}\) This hardly needs to be argued for the proof is more than ample: Matt 1:22-23; Mk 1:2-3, 5:17; Lk 4:16-21; Jn 19:24-25; Acts 8:26-35; Rom 1:2, 15:4; 1Cor 1:19; 2Cor 4:13; Gal 1:11-12; 2Tim 3:15-16; Jas 2:8; 1Pet 2:6; 2Pet 1:20-21. \textit{Rev passim}; see also \textit{Jwavnih Karabidopoul o, Eijsagwghv Sthvn Kainhv Diaghkh, (Qessal onikh Pournara', 1998), 95-97, and Georges A. Barrois, Jesus Christ and The Temple, (New York: SVS Press, 1980).}

\(^{54}\) For the theological dialectics of the connection between the Old and New covenants and the Old and New testaments, it has been especially helpful to read two illuminating works by Rolf Rendtorff, \textit{Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology}, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), & \textit{The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation}, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998).

\(^{55}\) For a summary of the arguments of the occasion and date of this important text, which Holmes says "appears to contain the earliest instance of a New Testament passage being quoted as "Scripture" \[\text{\textit{grafh}}\] (2.4), see Michael W. Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 103f.; see also K. P. Donfried, \textit{The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity}, (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

\(^{56}\) \textit{2Clem} 14.2; the Syriac translation dated 1169-1170 AD, adds "bib\liva\ tw'n profhtw'n".


\(^{58}\) \textit{Jwavnih Karabidopoul o, Eijsagwghv Sthvn Kainhv Diaghkh, (Qessal onikh Pournara', 1998), 104. However, as he correctly adds the latter term (NT), was not standard until the third-century and beyond: \textit{ibid.}}

\(^{59}\) See "Canon" in \textit{A Dictionary of the Bible} (Vol. I), 349.
4.1).\textsuperscript{60} The Latin apologist will often use this term, applying it sometimes to particular books, and sometimes separately to OT and NT, but also to Scripture as a whole.\textsuperscript{61} It should also be noted that from \textit{dabhn} the adj. \textit{ejndabk} was formed; it occurs repeatedly in the writings of Origen and Eusebius, in a sense closely corresponding to 'canonical'.\textsuperscript{62}

\textit{Writings Which Have Been Made Public}\n
With a notable exception of Harry Y. Gamble's Books and Readers in the Early Church, (1995),\textsuperscript{63} scholars have not paid sufficient attention to another description: \textit{dedhmosieumevai grafaiv}[writings which have been made public], used more notably by Origen,\textsuperscript{64} and Eusebius. These writings are contrasted with those that are considered "apocryphal". This description is not uncommon in the early patristic literature of the second and third centuries; however, it does not appear to be used in exactly the same way as we might assume or in the rigid fashion of later times.\textsuperscript{65} But the question becomes more problematic if we are to keep in mind, as Gamble warns, "[t]here is no justification in bibliographic terms, for example, for an a priori discrimination between scriptural and nonscriptural texts."\textsuperscript{66} Here the fundamental understanding of 'apocryphal' in the early Christian community is important to help in the unravelling of the more precise meaning of \textit{dedhmosieumevai grafaiv}. Originally

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{60} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{61} "Tertullian, who uses both for the Scriptures [\textit{Instrumentum} and \textit{Testamentum}], seems to prefer \textit{Instrumentum}": Metzger, The Canon, 159. The four Gospels, as Metzger notes, are the "\textit{Instrumentum evangelicum}": Adv. Marc. 4.2.
\item \textsuperscript{62} See Lee M. McDonald, who translates \textit{ejndabk} in \textit{H.E.} 3.25.6 with "encovenanted" for discussion on this point, and for the specific references: McDonald, \textit{op. cit.}, 15f.
\item \textsuperscript{64} \textit{A Dictionary of the Bible} (Vol. I), 349; the author of this extensive resource in the \textit{ADB}, V. H. Stanton, does not, however, mention the specific references to other writers on this term apart from Origen. In varying usages and contexts I have located the following: Eusebius Scr. Eccl. et Theol., \textit{Historia ecclesiastica}, TLG (2018 002) 2.23.25.5, 3.3.6.7, 3.16.1.4, 3.31.6.5, 9.9.10.8; also in Epiphanius Scr. Eccl., \textit{Panarion}, TLG (2021 002) 3.520.21; Basilius Theol., \textit{Homilia in principium proverbiorum}, TLG (2040 028) 31.388.38; Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl., \textit{In Joannem}, TLG (2062 153) 59.446.41, \textit{Fragmenta in Jeremiam}, TLG (2062 186) 64.892.42; and Origenes Theol., \textit{Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei (lib. 10-11)} TLG (2042 029) 10.18.55, "\textit{dedhmeumevai biblivoi}".
\item \textsuperscript{65} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Gamble, \textit{op. cit.}, 94. One reason is that "the scriptural canon had not yet been determined": ibid.
'apocryphal' signified something that was "withheld from general knowledge." The reasons for these writings being treated differently are not difficult to find. Both the Jewish and Christian communities (particularly in the Church of Alexandria as Griggs describes), valued the collective knowledge or wisdom of their tradition, but nonetheless considered some of this as unsuitable to be communicated to all the faithful. It was material thought to be fit only for the study for the advanced and wise. Or conversely, as Athanasius says in the 39th Festal Epistle, "appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and who wish for instruction in the word of godliness." This position, not so much condescending as it was pastoral, did not take sufficient hold on either of the two communities to create a third class of writings regarded as authoritative, but yet not binding. For the Eastern Orthodox, it would raise the question of the Deutero-Canonical books. The enstiktwn sensibility of the Ancient Church, which for Staniloae "moves inside revelation", would resist such classification. That all writings, however, regarded as inspired were included among the dekhmatiounai, is almost certain. The question that confronts investigators is what exactly was meant by and implied in this 'publication', and importantly: does classification among the dekhmatiounai clearly serve to distinguish these writings as authoritatively distinct from all others? The implication of this for the congergatio sanctorum was of inestimable consequence, for as Michael Pomazansky states, the early Christian Church was in the process of accumulating "the material treasures of the faith."

The principal meaning of "publication" would be to indicate the regular reading of a document in the assembly. Consider for instance St Paul's strict order in 1Thess 5:27 "that

---

67 As Guthrie writes, "[t]he books [the Apocrypha] found their way into the Greek Scriptures, but never received sanction among the Hebrew-speaking Jews. They cannot form a basis for NT interpretation for this reason": Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology, (Leicester: IVP, 1981), 64. [italics added]


69 The position of Clement of Alexandria on this issue is quite fascinating even referring to Orpheus "as the theologian" and of Plato as being "under the inspiration of God": see Metzger, The Canon, 130-135.

70 Fest. Epist. 7.

71 For a review of the conflicting tradition on the authority of the Deutero-Canonical books in the reception history of the Eastern Orthodox Church, see Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, The Orthodox Church, (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 200.

72 Staniloae, op. cit., 58.

73 See the NT canonical lists for instance in Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Lectures 4.33; Athanasius, Festal Letter 39; Epiphanius, Medicine Chest, 76.5; and Jerome, Epistle 53.9.


75 Gamble, Books and Readers, 96.
this letter be read \([\text{ajagwnqa}}\) to all the brethren"; the idea was certainly prominent in the Book of Revelation where not only he who "reads" \([\text{ajagwnkwn}}\], but also those who "hear" \([\text{oiJ ajkouvnt}}\)] the prophecy are "blessed" (Rev 1:3). In due time, this ritual and liturgical practice would come to impress upon the faithful, that there was an extra-ordinary authority (an \(\text{authoritas canonica}\)), attached to those writings that they would hear in such a solemn manner. This collective act energized and confirmed in an atmosphere of worship, served as a powerful symbol of legitimacy for the reception and acknowledgment of the books by the Early Church which had been in the first instance 'informally' convened, and which found expression in the traditions of local practice. There is a discernible and enormously significant movement here, from the \(\text{particularis}\) to the \(\text{catholica}\). Harry Y. Gamble has most importantly considered this whole process in the context of worship, which is, incidentally, one of the most critical foundations of Eastern Orthodox biblical exegesis.\(^76\) "[\text{publication in this case [1Thess 5:27] occurred when Paul's letter was read aloud to the gathered community, presumably in the context of the service of worship.}"

**Public Readings**

Even here, however, this principle cannot be applied universally or unequivocally as some conservative approaches might indicate. That particular books would be read publicly does not necessarily mean that everywhere and at all times they were understood to be Sacred Scripture in themselves. Public reading might not hold the same significance for all the communities and the regulations governing the "publication" could differ. The pluralistic stage on which these important decisions were formulated, given to the miscellany of topical customs or theological disposition or outside threats, would further complicate matters.\(^78\) The problem is that different criteria (\(\text{notae canonicitatis}\)) would lead to a different publication. In great part this was a cause for the non-uniformity of the NT Canon in the generations that would follow. The case in point which would prove these inherent contradictions is the Muratorian Canon (AD c. 200), which excludes books from being "received into the \(\text{catholicam ecclesiam}\)" that are of secondary or uncertain authority.\(^79\) No doubt the connection of the church in Rome played a vital part of the selection of the texts, but we also find here an

\(^{76}\) See John Breck, *The Power of the Word in the Worshiping Church*. (New York: SVS Press, 1986). "It is incumbent upon Orthodoxy to preserve exegesis as a function of the worshiping Church": \textit{ibid.}, 44.

\(^{77}\) Gamble, \textit{loc. cit.}

\(^{78}\) V. H. Stanton's across-the-board analysis of the subject remains a standard reference point for scholars dealing with these questions, unfortunately, his name, as I have elsewhere mentioned, has not always been cited in modern bibliography. See Stanton, \textit{op. cit.}, 348-350.

\(^{79}\) \textit{MF} 65-70.
anxiety against the recent spread of Gnosticism and Montanism and against the literature that these groups had begun to circulate.\textsuperscript{80} Let us consider for instance, the standard example which is customarily forwarded, that of Serapion, bishop of Antioch. At about the same time of the publication of the Muratorian Canon, he at first permits the public reading of the Gospel of Peter within the jurisdiction of his diocese for as he admits: "I had not read the Gospel which they put forward under the name of Peter." Afterwards, when he had become familiar with the work and found it to be "involved in some heresy", he does not hesitate to quickly contradict it.\textsuperscript{81} It is useful here to also note that Cyril of Jerusalem in his famous \textit{catechetical} homilies which he delivered sometime around AD 340, says that the class of books "openly read in the church" is on the same level with those "acknowledged among all" and is the opposite of the "apocryphal".\textsuperscript{82} Cyril does not appear to know of a third division of books, or if he did, he certainly does not wish to publicly acknowledge it. And yet Athanasius, writing not long afterwards and representing the conventions of another jurisdiction, distinguishes between, "the books included in the Canon, and handed down, and accredited as divine" [\textit{ta; kanonizomena kai; paradopovota, pisteupovota te gia ei\'ai bibli\a}], "books that are read", and "apocryphal books".\textsuperscript{83} In this very same \textit{39th Festal Epistle}, Athanasius also speaks of the "divinely inspired Scripture", [\textit{qoepneuvq/ graf h}], and of the books of the Old and New Testament [\textit{pal aia" diaqh\i\a" biblia... th" kainh"}].

**Canon, Canonical or Canonized?**

An important question that remains is which of the three key words, \textit{canon}, \textit{canonical}, \textit{canonized},\textsuperscript{84} was first used in connection to the listed books of the Scripture. The earliest instance which we can point to the use of \textit{kanw\a} or a derivative in the strictest sense of that weighty concept, is in the \textit{39th Festal Epistle} of Athanasius written in AD 367.\textsuperscript{85} The participle \textit{kanonizomena} is there used of the books of the Holy Scriptures. Not long afterwards, the revered bishop of Iconium, Amphilochius (b. c. AD 340), concludes his list of the books in the \textit{Epistula iambica ad Seleucum} with the words "[t]his is perhaps the most

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{ibid.}, 80-85.

\textsuperscript{81} Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 6.12.4-6.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Catech.} 4.

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Fest. Epist.} 39.

\textsuperscript{84} See Stanton, \textit{op. cit.}; also refer the same author on “New Testament Canon” in \textit{ADB} (Vol. III), 529-542.

\textsuperscript{85} As Lee M. McDonald has written, "[t]he most famous of the lists of NT canonical scriptures that eventually carried the day is found in Athanasius' \textit{39th Festal Letter} from Alexandria, which corresponds to the twenty-seven books of the NT that are acknowledged in the church today": McDonald, \textit{The Formation}, 220.
Factors in the Development of the NT Canon

reliable canon of the divinely inspired Scriptures." As we have previously noted, however, the word *kανών* (which originally meant a *rod* and a *measure*), had already been applied in the sense of a *rule* or *norm*, both in classical and in ecclesiastical usage. And of course, the phrase *kανών th' αιτήσει* [the rule of truth/ *regula veritatis*] for the Church's creed had been familiar for some time, it was "the favorite phrase of Irenaeus." However, it is quite significant to point out, as George Florovsky explains:

Now this rule was, in fact, nothing else than the witness and preaching of the apostles, their *khvugma* and *praedicatio* (or *praeconium*), which was deposited in the church and entrusted to her by the apostles, and then was faithfully kept and handed down, with complete unanimity in all places, by the succession of accredited pastors, "qui cum episcopatus succedionem charisma veritatis certum acceperunt" ("those who, together with the succession of the episcopacy, have received the firm charisma of truth").

The Rule of Truth is the Divine Scripture

Was the word *kανών* when first employed in the connection to the Scriptures, intended to express the idea that the sacred documents form the rule of faith and life for the Christian or to designate the list of the accepted documents of the Bible? From what we have seen and what the evidence indicates, it would appear that the latter is the correct position, especially so in the early centuries. Particularly, when it would be hard to otherwise explain the use of the verb *kανονίζειν* which is applied both to specific books and to the documents collectively. Later however, the former idea would also be readily suggested to the mind by the associations of the word *kανών*. Isidore of Pelusium, in the earlier half of the fifth century, expressing himself thus, "the Canon of the truth, I mean the Divine Scriptures." The Fundamental Factors Shaping the NT Canon

The factors leading to the development, shape and direction of the NT Canon, composed of exclusively Christian writings, are both intricate and involved. For over two centuries an interplay of diverse factors and dialectics served to shape and form the Canon as we possess it today. However, this does not mean that there can be no methodological approach to the question: it is a matter for historical analysis on the one hand, and theological exegesis on the

---

86 For the complete canon of Amphilochius of Iconium, written for his friend Seleucus, see Metzger, *The Canon*, 314.
87 George Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", *op. cit.*, 102.
88 *ibid.*, [discussing Irenaeus, *Adv. haer. 4.26.2.*]  
89 *Ep. 114.*
other. The factors, which are not to be confused with the criteria proper, are fundamentally three: (I) external (II) internal, and (III) the criteria of canonicity.

(I) The External Factors
The most significant external factor drawing a response from the Early Church to delineate her own unique literature was the theological engagement between the "orthodox" and "non-orthodox" worshipping communities, more particularly: Gnosticism, Marcionism, and Montanism. Each of these non-orthodox movements have been discussed elsewhere in the dissertation (Gnosticism in Chapter 5, Marcionism and Montanism at length in Chapter 8). They have also been expertly addressed elsewhere in studies dealing with the NT Canon. 

Harry Y. Gamble's conclusion, however, is very much indicative of the widespread consensus, it is supported by a heavy show of evidence and it is the one, which I too, am in agreement after my own investigation:

Even though a special and determinative impact on the formation of the NT canon cannot be assigned to any one of these second-century controversies, their collective importance ought not to be underestimated.

(a) Gnosticism
The vast production of Gnostic writings in the second century AD (which included gospels, epistles and apocalypses), made the Church sensitive to competing traditions of religious literature. True gnosis, as the early heresiologists taught, could only be possessed by the Christians of the orthodox communities, so authentic Scripture is solely located in the literary

---


91 Gamble, Making and Meaning, 65.

activity of the Apostles. The threat of Gnosticism, which was not a homogenous movement as is sometimes supposed, was a serious matter and none other than Irenaeus himself takes up the main challenge to detect their "blasphemous" systems and to refute their "doctrines". Clement of Alexandria turns the tables cleverly on the Gnostics themselves by defining the true Gnostic as a man "of understanding and perspicacity". Pheme Perkins has made a most interesting observation, "[s]ome gnostic writings such as Apocryphon of James and Gospel of Mary appear to recognize that the Gospel canon and apostolic authority must be claimed for gnostic exegesis."

(b) Marcionism
Marcion's unqualified disengagement from the Hebrew Scriptures resulted in his two-fold so-called NT Canon (Gospel and Apostle). This contained only revised texts of the Lucan Gospel and the Pauline corpus from which he excised Jewish reference and which he declared the "standard of the Christian faith". Though questions concerning Marcion's role in the formation of the Canon cannot all be answered, two weighty conclusions are often drawn out by most investigators. First, that the texts he included in his canon were in all probability already accepted as authoritative; and second, that given the universal furore that he caused, the texts that he rejected would in all probability have been the documents most highly prized by the early church communities. At the same time the Gospel-Apostolos structure can be traced to a period before Marcion, and certainly the undisputed high position of St Paul's writings was an actuality as early as the Apostolic Fathers.

(c) Montanism
Montanus' ecstatic utterances were written down and cited by his followers as new revelation and authoritative for the Church universal. The great Tertullian himself was the

---

93 See for instance MF 65-85; Iren., Adv. haer. 1.8.1, 3.1-2; Clem., Strom. 7.16.
94 Adv. haer. 4. pref.; Book 1 describes in detail the assorted group of Gnostics and their individual systems. The "error" of these "certain men", Irenaeus writes, "is craftily decked out in an attractive dress": ibid., 1. pref.
95 Strom. 4.22.
97 Our principal source for our knowledge of Marcion's heresy is Tertullian's Adversus Marcionem which consists of five books. Tertullian refers to Marcion as "the heretic of Pontus": Adv. Marc. 1.2.
100 See Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 5.16.1-22.; Epiph., Pan. 48.1.4; 48.4.
The Apocalypse

movement's prized convert and most famous spokesperson. By appealing to the criterion of apostolicity the defenders of orthodoxy claimed chronological parameters for the authoritative texts of the Church, and so not only responded to a prophetic movement active in the middle of the second century in Asia Minor, but also (whether deliberately or not) set the limits for the closure and the fixing of the Canon. These challenges played a part in the inner workings of the Church to begin a process of setting apart a definitive collection of orthodox writings, in part to respond to the threat of a competing textual and oral history. It was also intended, as says, to set certain criteria as standards of authority to which documents could be sized up against, " and the historical articulation which is so necessary in a time of so much textual and oral tradition."\[103\]

(II) The Internal Factors

Biblical scholars from across the academic spectrum generally agree that Christianity in its earliest expression was not a literary religion, even allowing for the fact, as writes, that the authors of the NT "borrowed and adapted a wide range of literary and oral forms." Christianity was centered upon the teachings and person of Jesus Christ. In the first instance the salvific kerygma of the crucified and risen Son of God was preserved in oral tradition, and only later when historical contingencies would demand (as we shall see).

101 For Tertullian's involvement in the movement, which Eusebius refers to as the Phrygian New Prophecy "he [Tertullian] probably never left the Catholic church at all": ; see also Osborn, .

102 , op. cit., 209.

103 , op. cit., 98f.


105 Gillingham’s recent pluralistic reading of the compilation of the Bible is representative of the scholarly consensus, "[i]t is likely that a good deal of oral tradition lies behind the New Testament material": S. E. Gillingham, , (London: SPCK, 1998), 23. The "wide range of literary and oral forms" includes the OT, the Graeco-Roman world, and contemporary Jewish sects (i.e. the communitites of Qumran and Massada): ibid.

106 Evdokimov calls the reading of the scriptures in the Person of Christ the and aptly cites Augustine, " and aptly cites Augustine, " and the Graeco-Roman world, and contemporary Jewish sects (i.e. the communities of Qumran and Massada): ibid.

107 Though this fundamental aspect is discussed later in the chapter, here the point must be made that the deposit of faith in the oral tradition was built around a consensus, and that it was precisely this consensus that was to later collect the books of the NT Canon," [s]acred scripture has come into existence on the basis of a consensus in the believing community recognizing in the texts the expression of revealed faith": J. L. Houlden, (ed.), The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church, (London: SCM Press, 1995), 63. [italics added]
presently note) was it written down. At the same time the earliest Christian communities were very much occupied with eschatological considerations, which was of course connected to the \textit{basil\'eia}, "the Kingdom of God".\textsuperscript{108} Therefore, the need for a documented Christianity was for some decades not a pressing matter, especially when appeal could anywise be made to an existing literary (and authoritative) religious corpus, the OT.\textsuperscript{109} However, as the fledgling Christian community grew and the anticipated parousia was delayed, a number of internal factors (beginning with the OT itself),\textsuperscript{110} demanded that the unique religious expression and faith of the believers be recorded and defended in a distinct collection of authoritative writings.

(a) The OT Reports Only Half of the Story

The Jewish Scriptures, especially the Gk Septuagint,\textsuperscript{111} which, as H. M. Shires writes, "every part of the New Testament shows some knowledge and use of",\textsuperscript{112} though serving the needs of the early Christian community very well (particularly the appeal to fulfilled Messianic prophecy),\textsuperscript{113} reported only a part of the \textit{kho\'ur\'gma}. However, even on more practical grounds,

\textsuperscript{108} On the "Kingdom of God" (Mt 6:33; Mk 4:11; Lk 9:2; Jn 3:3) and its connection to the eschatology of the NT, see G. B. Caird, \textit{New Testament Theology}, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 129-135. Caird unravels much of the complexity in the first instance by explaining that \textit{basil\'eia} [kingdom] "is an ambiguous term which comprehends the three possible senses: sovereignty, reign, and realm" from which the NT writers moved freely from one sense to another. It is this ambiguity, as Caird further explains, that continues "the prolonged debate on the time reference of the phrase 'Kingdom of God', 'thoroughgoing eschatology' maintaining that the Kingdom wholly belongs to the consummation, 'realized eschatology' that it is present in the ministry of Jesus, and 'inaugurated eschatology' that what happened in Jesus was the beginning of a process." Evidence in support for all three is not lacking and only proves to show "that the kingdom is subject to the same three-tense structure... signifying nothing more than that, in the Kingdom of God, God is King": \textit{ibid.}, 129f.

\textsuperscript{109} For a balanced discussion of the use of the OT in the NT in which the author warns of the two extremes, "the first to overplay the continuity... the second extreme is to overplay the discontinuity...": see Gillingham, \textit{op. cit.}, 38-42. See also Georges A. Barrois, \textit{Jesus Christ and the Temple}, (New York: SVS Press, 1980), in which the writer discerns the OT in the New through his study of the pattern of Hebrew worship and the religion of the Temple.

\textsuperscript{110} Almost all previous writers dealing with the subject of the canon have considered the "external" and "internal" factors in the development of the NT Canon. The differential is the weight that is given to each factor as it arises, and the different perspectives brought on by the varying methodological responses to the question. For example, the factors of canonicity (as we have already noted) are only of passing interest to Brevard S. Childs, but are considered far more seriously by Harry Y. Gamble: \textit{Making and Meaning}, 67-72.

\textsuperscript{111} This subject has been extensively treated, see for instance the review by F. F. Bruce, \textit{op. cit.}, 43-54. It is a telling factor, as Bruce himself says, "[that] with few fragmentary exceptions, the Septuagint manuscripts now in existence were produced by Christians": \textit{ibid.}, 45. See also L. M. McDonald, \textit{op. cit.}, 85-92. "One of the most amazing facts about the LXX", as McDonald writes, "was the rapidity of its adoption within the Christian community": \textit{ibid.}, 88.


\textsuperscript{113} A classic example is the interpretation of Isa 7:14, "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." In Isaiah the Heb.
it became insufficient as an instrument for missionary activity, conversion, and catechism. As the Church spread beyond Antioch where "the disciples were for the first time called Christians" (Acts 11:26) and membership of the Gentiles was increased, the need for a unique collection of Christian writings was beginning to be particularly felt. "Newness", John Barton closely observes, "was no longer a sign of inferiority but a mark of authenticity." Christian interpretation of the OT was now also starting to cause concern in the Jewish community itself, and so another authoritative source of appeal was required. This high tension is of course noted early in the Book of Acts and begins especially with Peter's Pentecostal sermon (2:14-36) and is later exemplified in the arrest and martyrdom of Stephen (6:8-15, 7:1-60). And yet, here as well the Jewish collection of sacred writings was of profit, it served as a model of Holy Scripture and demonstrated the need for the existence of an exclusive list of Christian/sacred books.

(b) The Delay of the Parousia Forces the Hand

In the Apocalypse, itself, as Sergius Bulgakov underlines, "these words [ερχόμενον ταυτά] are the main burden of the Revelation, the force of its promise." The delay of the parousia, which was from the start considered to be imminent and which was to bring to a close the present age, would now also force the hand of the Christians to document their testimony.

for young woman is almah which lit. means "an unmarried female" (the Heb. for virgin is bethulah). The Septuagint prefers παρθένος [virgin] for almah; Matthew uses the LXX translation, which he takes as prophetic of Jesus' unique birth (Matt 1:22-23). For an in-depth discussion on the NT use of the OT and of the accuracy of the OT references and the form of the quotation, see G. K. Beale (ed.), Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New: The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1994), 13-51.

Consider, for instance, the early and engaging example of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch by the disciple Philip as recorded in the Book of Acts (8:26-40). The pericope from Isaiah is now to be interpreted by the Church community as a witnessing body spearheaded in its missionary activity by the Holy Spirit. It is by no mere coincidence that Philip asks the Ethiopian eunuch, "Do you understand what you are reading?" Nor can the Ethiopian's wise reply be without instructive consequence, "How can I, unless someone guides me?" F. F. Bruce notes the play on words in the formation of Philip's question (ταύτα γίνεσθαι ἡ αὐτά γίνεσθαι) which he tells us is reproduced in the Latin Vulgate, intellegis quae legis?: F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986), 187.

114 John Barton, op. cit., 67

116 But it was Christ Himself who initiated this "new" hermeneutical approach during the course of His own ministry (Mt chaps 5-7, 26:57-68); for a most valuable discussion on this critical point, see Richard N. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995). Note also the author's selected bibliography on this fundamental question, ibid: 221-230.

117 "This attitude", writes John Barton, "so unusual in the ancient world, presumably has something to do with the early Christian conviction that a new and unprecedented era had arrived with Jesus and the apostolic Church"; Barton, loc. cit.


119 See esp. Mt 3:2, 4:17, 10:7; Mk 1:15, 12:34; Lk 10:9, 17:21, 21:31, with the emphasis on the Kingdom of God being "near" [hγίκεν].
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This was considered necessary for two compelling reasons: (i) to exhort and (ii) to explain. The faithful had to be exhorted (and is some instances admonished) to not lose hope but to remain focussed on their salvation, but there was also a need to explain the delay and to offer an apology to those both inside and outside the Church. Particularly revealing here is Paul's discourse to the Thessalonians on the events preceding the day of the Lord (2Thess 2:1-12) and Peter's concentrated apologia concerning the delay of the second coming of Christ (2Pet 3:1-13).

(c) The Passing Away of the Apostles

The passing away of the apostles (coupled to the delay of the parousia) was the most crucial factor for the need to preserve and to document the oral traditions. For whilst the disciples were alive the apostolic kerygma was directly accessible for the catechetical and worship needs of the Church and the memory of Christ was ever present. Which, as Alexander Schmemann says, was "made known every time she [the early Church] gathered on the eighth day- the day of the Kyrios." The oral tradition of the Christian community ideally begins with the first great commission of the disciples as recorded in the gospels; however, this initial transmission would have to be faithfully recorded and protected for when the members of this unique group would themselves be gone. Here the eminent Eastern Orthodox theologian Saba Agouridi has made the critically important connection (often overlooked by scholars of the western tradition) of apostolic succession and the fixing of the NT Canon. This would sit very well with Childs, but not at all well with Sanders.

---

120 As Dunn writes, it should come as no surprise then, that given the imminent expectation of the parousia, "that the earliest NT documents, though not apocalypses as such, have characteristic apocalyptic features": James D. G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament, (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 325.

121 Later this 'coincidence view', as Bauckham terms it, would "hold that the content of apostolic tradition coincides with the content of Scripture": Richard Bauckham, Scripture, Tradition and Reason: A Study in the Criteria of Christian Doctrine, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 118; Evdokimov speaks here of the e[nstikto [instinct] of orthodoxy, which would lead its steps in the consensus patrum et apostolicum of the Church: P. Evdokimov, op. cit., 257.


125 Barr, op. cit., 156-157.
(d) The Needs of the Worshipping Community

"A Christian church-community," declares Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "whether a publicly visible congregation or a house-church [Hausgemeinde], is held together by its assembling around the word... the concrete function of the empirical church, therefore, is worship that consists of preaching and celebrating the sacraments."\(^{126}\) This missiological paradigm is not only noticed early with Saint Paul's zeal to establish churches throughout his mission,\(^{127}\) a Christian liturgical setting became increasingly vital with Jewish worship and interpretation of the OT Scriptures no longer fully expressing the practices and faith of the new community now "directly related", as Richard N. Longenecker writes, "to the teaching and example of the historic Jesus."\(^{128}\) But there was also the growing antagonism and distrust between the two communities themselves which made worship in the synagogue for the Christians more difficult as their exegetical position to the OT became more defined.\(^{129}\) Both of these aspects are exposed at the most acute point when the Seer of Patmos, in his message to the church in Philadelphia, writes of "those of the synagogue of Satan [sunagwgh' tou' satana'] who say that they are Jews and are not" (Rev 3:9).\(^{130}\)

(III) On the Criteria of Canonicity

A difficult problem facing the interpreter who sets out to discuss or define the criteria of canonicity (should they be taken on board in the first place), is that this list of checks was not applied with strictness or consistency by early ecclesiastical writers. This makes the actual role of the criteria in the development of the NT Canon a difficult one to assess with any great precision.\(^{131}\) Matters are further complicated, as we have already seen, when there are...


\(^{129}\) ibid., 209-214.

\(^{130}\) "This phrase may reflect", as Aune says, "the beginnings of the separation of the church from the synagogue, for the phrase 'church of Satan' seems impossible to imagine": David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1997), 164.

\(^{131}\) Consider for example the book with which we are directly involved, the Book of Revelation. Early on it was authorship that was dominant (see Justin Martyr, Dial Try. lxxxi; Melito of Sardis, [Euseb.], Hist. Eccl. 4.26.2; Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 4.20.11; Clement of Alexandria, Paed. 2.119; Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 3.14; Origen, In Johann. 5.3; and of course Hippolytus, Antichr. 36.50. At a later stage catholicity was especially prominent (consider for instance three later signposts [the earlier two antagonistic towards the book]), Dionysius of Alexandria who clearly could not accept the traditional ascription of Johannine authorship yet did not deny the book's universal reputation: Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.25; Eusebius himself who begrudgingly considered the Apoc's claim to the list of "recognized" books also placed it easily with the "spurious" leaving the question open to "be
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scholars who would either deny any real importance to the criteria in the development of the Canon or who choose to find any real support for only one or two. Yet few would argue, that though the formation of the NT Canon came about through the interplay of diverse socio-historical causes, it was not simply a process of haphazard chance. Inside the Church herself, over a number of centuries there was a dialectical and interiorized discourse taking place over the evaluation of her literature. John Meyendorff has very well said that the question revolved around the definition of "canon", and not the composition of new 'inspired writings', "because she [the Church] never believed in any 'continuous revelation', but only in the unique historical act of God, accomplished once and for all in Christ."\(^{132}\) And in this process particular documents were especially set apart as authoritative on the grounds of certain criteria. The most fundamental of these being: (a) apostolicity, (b) catholicity, (c) orthodoxy, (d) traditional usage, and (e) inspiration. I must stress, here, that I will not pre-empt the conclusions of Chapters 7-9 by connecting the Apoc to the criteria at this point; however, some critical points will be highlighted. Only after the patristic testimony is carefully evaluated and weighed up will we be in the position to ask: to what extent, whether high or low, did the criteria of canonicity affect the adventure of our book?

(a) Apostolicity

*I John am he who heard and saw these things*, Rev 22:8

To begin with, "[w]e cannot ignore," as James D. G. Dunn states in his comprehensive study, "the overwhelming conclusions of NT scholarship that some at least of the NT writings were not composed by 'apostles' and are second (or even third) generation in their origin."\(^{133}\) Generally when mention is made of the apostolicity of the NT writings, it has been often taken to mean that the document in question was actually written by the apostles themselves. This is a position that some conservative writers still hold on to and will go to great lengths to support,\(^{134}\) but it is demonstrably wrong and is a misleading conception of how this very decided by the testimony of the ancients": *Hist. Eccl.* 3.24.18; and Athanasius whose positive position of the Apoc's authority was crucial for the document's subsequent history was first of all persuaded by those books which were included in the Canon "and handed down, and accredited as Divine": 39th Festal Epistle.


\(^{133}\) James D. G. Dunn, *op. cit.*, 386. Though I cannot accept "or even third."

\(^{134}\) There are numerous examples but they are hardly necessary to prove the point. As a model instance, see Zane C. Hodges in The *Bible Knowledge Commentary*, J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck (eds), (USA: Victor Books, 1983), 777f. Hodges, though conceding Pauline authorship of Hebrews cannot be "proved" any more than it can be "disproved", still argues for "apostolic origin" when he appeals for the possibility of Barnabas having "actually authored" the epistle on the grounds that he [Barnabas] "was called an apostle" (Acts 14:4,14).
important criterion (which was linked to the kerygma) was applied in the early Church.\textsuperscript{135} Even in cases where there was little doubt of genuine apostolic authorship, as Gamble has rightly noted, the Gospel of Matthew or a section of the corpus Paulinum for instance, other criteria were also considered.\textsuperscript{136} There were other writings that were received as authoritative by the early Christian community though recognizing that their connection with the apostles was indirect, the Gospels of Mark and Luke, for instance.\textsuperscript{137} Still other writings that made clear claims to apostolicity either failed in their quest for canonization altogether (The Teaching of the 12 Apostles, Barnabas, the Gospel of Peter), or were acknowledged after long periods and with some reluctance (James, 2Peter, Jude).\textsuperscript{138} In the Apocalypse, itself, on no less than four occasions the Seer of Patmos will mention his name (Rev 1:1, 4, 9, 22:8). On two of these occasions it is preceded by the pronoun \textit{I, "Egw Jwavnnh"} and \textit{"Kajgw; jwavnnh"} (1:9, 22:8).\textsuperscript{139} And on at least another eighty-five occasions he points to himself through the use of this pronoun.\textsuperscript{140} Alone of course, this cannot prove that it was John the Apostle who wrote the Book of Revelation, pseudepigraphy and apocalyptic were a notorious combination.\textsuperscript{141} The appeal to authority, however, of which as A. Wikenhauser says, is "nothing similar in the apocryphal apocalyptic writings of Judaism", cannot be casually dismissed.\textsuperscript{142} Though apostolic authorship could prove decisive and would become a major criterion it: (i) was not the only factor determining the status of a document, and (ii) apostolicity was not limited exclusively to apostolic authorship but was understood as a much broader concept.

\textsuperscript{135} This was not the case of a simple literal application (though of course it could be), but it went beyond the rubric and into the heart of the witness of the early Church, "[a]postolicity" as J. Meyendorff says, "thus remained the basic criterion in the history of the formation of the canon because it was also the only true characterisation of the Christian kerygma as such": John Meyendorff, Living Tradition, 15. The strongest proof of this, that of the four Gospels in the NT only two were considered to have been written by apostles (Matthew and John), the other two (Mark and Luke), by association.

\textsuperscript{136} Gamble, Its Making and Meaning, 68.

\textsuperscript{137} Iren., Adv. haer. 3.10.1-5, 3.14.1-3. Mark, for example, enjoys authority because, according to Irenaeus, he is "the interpreter and follower of Peter".

\textsuperscript{138} Gamble, loc. cit.


\textsuperscript{140} Here I am using The Revised Standard Version (1973).

\textsuperscript{141} Generally on this topic and with connection to canon (with an emphasis on pseudonymity as an expression of tradition), see David G. Meade, Pseudonymity and Canon, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1986). Meade argues that pseudonymity and canon must not necessarily be considered mutually exclusive.

\textsuperscript{142} A. Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, (1958), 545.
(b) Catholicity

John to the seven churches that are in Asia, Rev 1:4

Augustine provides the most precise definition of the criterion of catholicity in a famous deposition on the "sacred writings" in which he advises the reader "in regard to the canonical Scriptures":

[to] follow the judgement of the greater number of catholic churches; and among these, of course, a high place must be given to such as have been thought worthy to be the seat of an apostle and to receive epistles. Accordingly, among the canonical Scriptures he will judge according to the following standard: to prefer those that are received by all the catholic churches to those which some do not receive. Among those, again, which are not received by all, he will prefer such as have the sanction of the greater number and those of greater authority; to such as are held by the smaller number and those of less authority. If, however, he shall find that some books are held by the greater number of churches, and others by the churches of greater authority (though this is not a very likely thing to happen), I think that in such a case the authority of the two sides is to be looked as equal.  

A document, however, would first have been recognized as catholic (and hence authoritative), by virtue of it having been intended by its author to be relevant to the Church universal and not only be of local significance. Here too, we come up with an obvious contradiction, the Pauline corpus which comprises fourteen of the twenty-seven books of the NT. Though Paul's letters were "apostolic", in the sense of his direct association with the disciples (especially Peter and James) and that they were characterized by their Christian kerygma, they would not necessarily pass the test on the grounds of catholicity. The Apostle had not only written to specific communities but to certain individuals as well. There is in Paul's corpus, however, a unifying component that runs throughout most of the documents attributed to him, a practical theology. In most of his letters the Apostle to the Gentiles expounds a theology (both practical and doctrinal) that issues from his responses to questions, problems and protests that

---

143 De Doct. Christ. 2.8.12.

144 There is, however, an apparent inconsistency here which F. F. Bruce has accurately described, "[e]ach individual document that was ultimately acknowledged as canonical started off with local acceptance...": F. F. Bruce, The Canon of Scripture, (Illinois: IVP,1988), 262. Yet the same scholar offers the resolution when he continues a little further down to add, "[b]ut their attainment of canonical status was the result of their gaining more widespread recognition than they initially enjoyed": ibid.

145 Here we include the three so-called Pastoral Epistles 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon which consists of only 25 verses. For insightful discussion on why these epistles would eventually be considered in the wider "ecclesiological context" [βίκτικον πλαίσια], see Karabént, op. cit., 361-368, 381-393.

146 What Murphy-O'Connor says of Paul's brief to the Thessalonians can be applied generally to the Pauline corpus, "[w]hen dealing with the ethical directives which Paul gave the Thessalonians, attention was drawn to his recognition that the witness value of believers depends on freely chosen behaviour": Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, Paul: A Critical Life, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 154.
were brought to his knowledge directly or indirectly from the church communities that he had helped to establish during the course of his missionary activity. And even the briefest of all his epistles, that of Philemon, is considered as "Jwavn" Karabidopoulou" writes, in the wider context of the church community of the Colossians, which is ultimately "related to all of the fullness of the body of Christ" [sev sevsh dhladhv mev o{lo tov sw'ma tou' Cristou'].\(^{147}\) The principal purpose of the Church in putting to practice this criterion as notae canonicitatis was to reject writings which contradicted the commended documents that the ecclesia catholica had hitherto received. As for the Book of Revelation we found in Chapter 6 of this thesis, where the ecclesiology of the book was scrutinized, that the Seer of Patmos made the concept of catholicity (both on the local and universal dimensions) a focal intent of his prophecy. The apocalypticist, himself, with a stroke of singular genius connects apostolicity to catholicity in the one place: Jwavn" tai" epta; ejkklhsivai" tai" ejn th'/ Asia/(Rev 1:4).

(c) Orthodoxy

**These words are trustworthy and true**, Rev 22:6

The criterion of orthodoxy\(^{148}\) was the judgement of whether the document's theology and teachings were in agreement with the "orthodox faith of the church."\(^{149}\) This was a crucial factor, but one that was not so easily applied as might first appear. A particular text could only be judged authoritative if considered against a standard or rule;\(^{150}\) this was of course the orthodoxy and tradition of the Church. Those who go against this, Irenaeus writes, "dismember the truth" [luvonte' ta; mevlh th' ajlhqeiva'].\(^{151}\) Did this mean, however, that the faith of the Church was extrinsic to the writings which she was called upon to judge? The simple and plain answer is no. And I cannot see any good reason why we should complicate

---

\(^{147}\) Karabidopoulou", op. cit., 363. The same scholar does very well in pointing to Paul's frequent use of "en Cristw", "en Kuriw", and "aj' Cristor", as good indicators of the epistle's catholic intentions: ibid.

\(^{148}\) There are several strong references to how 'orthodoxy' came to be understood in the first centuries of the life of the Church. In an epistle of the renowned and learned Antiochean theologian, Theodoretus (AD c. 393-458) bishop of Cyrus, we possess one of the most succinct and accurate accounts. Theodoretus writes to a certain Rufus (possibly the bishop of Thessalonica), "[t]rue religion and the peace of the Church suffer, we think, in no small degree, from the absence of your holiness. Had you been on the spot you might have put a stop to the disturbances which have arisen, and the violence that has been ventured on, and might have fought on our side for the subjection of the heresies introduced into the orthodox Faith, and the doctrine of the apostles and evangelists which, handed down from time to time from father to son, has at length been transmitted to ourselves": Ep. CLXX. [italics added]

\(^{149}\) Socrat., Hist. Eccl. 1.22.

\(^{150}\) For Irenaeus' critical application of this "standard", see Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", op. cit., 99-104.

\(^{151}\) Cited by Florovsky: ibid. Also cited is Irenaeus' useful analogy to the random use of the *Homerocentrones* which were circulating at the time.
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There was a reciprocal action at work (at least some decades later when there were more documents to consider), where each would be measured against the other.\textsuperscript{153} However, in the first decades of the organizational life of the Church, where there was no list of recognized and authoritative books, "it might be rightly said", as Floyd V. Filson writes echoing patristic tradition, "that ecclesiastical tradition was prior to scripture and served as the touchstone of scripture's authority."\textsuperscript{154} This is exactly what Eujdokivmof has in mind when he tells us that 
\["\text{"ta; biblia th" } \text{Grafh" } \text{kata; nega neor" ajtiproswevoun } \text{"cronika; th" zwh" th" Ekkhsia; } \text{pou; diathose } \text{h} \text{Paradosh."}\]\textsuperscript{155} Documents ultimately recognized as orthodox played their own part in the initial canonical formulations of the early Christian community when later, these very writings that were witnessing to the authority of other texts, were admitted onto the authoritative list of commended books.\textsuperscript{156} This apparent vacillation in the setting apart of the "orthodox" from the "non-orthodox" books is surely a strength and not a sign of inconsistency in the deliberations of the patristic authors. On this important subject, the Sacred Scripture which Saint John Damascene says is the "divine paradise",\textsuperscript{157} Michael Pomazansky has accurately stated:

\textsuperscript{152} This point (which may at first seem out of context) is made here because the criterion of orthodoxy is the centre to which all the other factors gravitate towards: at its heart is faith which cannot be (strictly speaking) methodologically examined. This is not at all to deny an equal part to reason, for as Eta Linnemann has written, "[i]n the theology of faith, the necessary regulation of thought must occur through the Holy Scripture... it controls the thought process... thought must subordinate itself to the Word of God": Eta Linnemann, Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology? trans. R. W. Yarbrough, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), 111; Andreyev, one of the finest philosophical minds of his generation (yet hardly if at all known or cited in the West), wrote that "the ideal of the study of all theological knowledge is the construction of a unified, complete system of organic theology, and Fundamental Apologetic Theology does present itself, methodologically, as a basis for such a system": Ivan M. Andreyev, Orthodox Apologetic Theology, (Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 47.

\textsuperscript{153} Consider, for instance, the strong example from within the NT Canon itself where the author of 2Peter admonishes his readers not to "twist" [\textit{streblou'sin}] "the other scriptures" [\textit{ta; loipa; grafa;} (2Pt 3:16). The reference here is first of all to the Pauline corpus (3:15-16) to which our author is evidently presenting his own epistle (doctrine) to be judged against. And why does Peter say that "there are some things in them [Paul's letters] hard to understand" [\textit{dusnovhtav tina}] (3:16)? Because in Paul's writings there were to be found admonitions and teachings that were often with odds to the Jewish tradition (\textit{cf.} esp. Paul's doctrine of justification, Gal 3); see also Rev 22:18-19 where the Seer "warns" [\textit{marturw' ejgw;} his readers neither to "add" [\textit{ti' ejpiqh}; nor "take[s] away" [\textit{ti' ajfevlh;} "from the words of the book of this prophecy." S. Agouridh asks whether this is about the author's special need (to protect his work) or part of the process of canonization, "Prokeitai gia kai pou o.s. aisqetai tihn idai'vhn anaghk tou, h gia ton sungh tupo kanonikopoleh" biblivan sth' Agia Grafhv: S'bab" Agouridh", H. Apokalyph. Tou Iwannh (Qessalonivkh: Pournarav1994), 512.

\textsuperscript{154} Floyd V. Filson, \textit{op. cit.}, 140-164.

\textsuperscript{155} Eujdokivmof, \textit{op. cit.}, 256.

\textsuperscript{156} For instance the 'canonical' reference to the writings of Saint Paul in 2Pet 3:15-16; Clement of Alexandria referred to this pericope in defending orthodox doctrine against the Gnostics (\textit{Strom.} 7.16).

\textsuperscript{157} Cited in Michael Pomazansky, \textit{op. cit.}, 29.
The Fathers of the Church frequently entered certain books into their lists with reservations, with uncertainty or doubt, or else gave for this reason an incomplete list of Sacred Books. This was unavoidable and serves as a memorial to their exceptional caution in this holy matter. They did not trust themselves, but waited for the universal voice of the Church.\(^{158}\)

(d) Traditional Usage

_Blessed is he who reads aloud the words of the prophecy, Rev 1:3_

Traditional usage was the attention to whether a document had been traditionally used in the worship and teaching of the various churches.\(^{159}\) Apostolicity, catholicity, and orthodoxy refer to internal aspects of a particular book. Traditional usage differed from those criteria in an important respect: it made reference to an external aspect for it was used to testify to the customs and practices of the Church at large. As a criterion it became a determinant factor later in the formation of the NT Canon when the Church was in a position to look back on customs that had been established.\(^{160}\) When outlining their approach to the criteria of canonicity, some scholars, Gamble for instance,\(^{161}\) distinguish between catholicity and traditional usage (as I do in this present chapter). Others such as McDonald, do not, but prefer to look at catholicity as "another side of the criterion of usage."\(^{162}\)

Eusebius is very strong on this point and uses the criterion of traditional usage ["quotations from the ancients"/ _th' twν ajrcairwν paraqevsew_] in the formulations of his canon. Widespread use could serve to separate the "disputed" [ajntilevgontai] books from those that were "accepted" [wJmolovvghtai]. This criterion, too, he suggests, will come into effect in the final decision "in regard to the Apocalypse" [th' d j Ἄποκαλυψις]:

So much for our own account of these things. But in a more fitting place we shall attempt to show by quotations from the ancients, what others have said concerning them

\(^{158}\) _ibid._, 29.

\(^{159}\) Lee M. McDonald makes a critical point here when he speaks of _the needs of the greater church_, ["widespread use in the churches appears to be the best explanation of why some writings were recognized and preserved as authoritative in some churches but not in others, why some writings met the worship and instructional needs of the churches, but others did not. The writings that did not survive in the church did not meet the needs of the greater church": McDonald, _op. cit._, 246.

\(^{160}\) Metzger forwards the excellent example of Jerome in the context of the Epistle to the Hebrews when the emphasis is "on the verdict of eminent and ancient authors". Writing to Dardanes (a prefect of Gaul) in AD 414, Jerome "declares" concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, "[i]t does not matter who is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, for in any case it is the work of a church-writer (ecclesiastici viri) and is constantly read in the Churches": Quoted from Metzger, _The Canon_, 253.

\(^{161}\) Gamble, _Its Making and Meaning_, 67-72.

\(^{162}\) McDonald, _loc. cit._
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[the Gospels]. But of the writings of John, not only his gospel, but also the former of his epistles, have been accepted without dispute both now and in ancient times. But the other two are disputed. In regard to the Apocalypse, the opinions of most men are still divided. But at the proper time this question likewise shall be decided from the testimony of the ancients \( \text{\textit{ek th} \ \text{t} \ \text{w} \ \text{ajcaiw} \ \text{marturia}} \).\textsuperscript{163}

I refer the reader back to the section of this chapter on \textit{public readings}, observe the good example of this criterion at work in the defining position of Serapion of Antioch to do with the public reading of the so-called Gospel of Peter.\textsuperscript{164} But once more, this criterion alone was not a definitive factor. Early documents such as the widely esteemed Shepherd of Hermas, 1Clement, and The Teaching of the Twelve, "and possibly also Barnabas"\textsuperscript{165} which could have fulfilled the requirement of this criterion were eventually not admitted into the Canon.\textsuperscript{166} And other books that were received into the Canon, such as Philemon, 2Peter, Jude, 2 and 3 John, notes Lee M. McDonald, appear not to have been "used as frequently in the life of the churches as were several extra-biblical sources."\textsuperscript{167}

(e) Inspiration

\textit{The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him}, Rev 1:1

Inspiration was initially not a prominent factor as criterion of canonicity in the contentions of the early Church, it was certainly not the case (as is in some places today),\textsuperscript{168} that the authority of the NT documents depended on an explicit declaration or statement of supernatural inspiration.\textsuperscript{169} The authority of the Church (as the Body of Christ) was held to be

\textsuperscript{163} Hist. Eccl. 3.24.16-18. [italics added]

\textsuperscript{164} ibid., 6.12.4-6.

\textsuperscript{165} McDonald, \textit{op. cit.}, 247.

\textsuperscript{166} The Shepherd of Hermas, for example, is mentioned in the \textit{MF}, and it is worthwhile to quote here in full the justification for the negative verdict, "[b]ut Hermas wrote the \textit{Shepherd} very recently, in our times, in the city of Rome, while bishop Pius, his brother, was occupying the [episcopal] chair of the church of the city of Rome. And therefore it ought indeed to be read; but it cannot be read publicly to the people in church either among the prophets, whose number is complete, or among the apostles, for it is after [their] time": \textit{MF} 73-80.

\textsuperscript{167} McDonald, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{168} Perhaps the best example here is the frenzied entreaty to the Scripture by the proliferating tele-evangelist groups. The irony here is (which surely cannot be lost on them), that similarly to cult movements where the leader is ex cathedra the infallible interpreter of the Scriptures, these individuals set themselves up as the greater authority over the text. These groups are, as Bulman states, "[a] significant religious presence": Raymond F. Bulman, \textit{The Lure of the Millennium: The Year 2000 and Beyond}, (New York: Orbis Books, 1999), 51.

\textsuperscript{169} This connection can be traced to the "watchword" of the Reformation, \textit{sola Scriptura}. Scripture alone is the absolute norm of doctrine where it was identified as the \textit{principium cognoscendi}, the principle of knowing, "The views of the Reformers," as Muller writes, "developed out of a debate in the late medieval theology over the relation of Scripture and tradition, one party viewing the two as coequal norms, the other party viewing Scripture as the absolute and therefore prior norm...": Richard A. Muller, \textit{Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms}, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 284; to this was later attached a critically
inspired by the Holy Spirit and so the ultimate authoritative decree rested with her. The concept of inspiration, similarly to that of apostolicity, was broader than the criterion itself. If inspiration was to be accorded to a particular text it was chiefly because it was judged to have fulfilled other more pragmatic criteria in the spiritual experience of the Church, a *locus classicus* text 2Tim 3:16-17. Niko' Matsouka' has made a profound connection here from the perspective of a proper understanding of Tradition (as an *alive encounter with history*), between inspiration [σπνευστία] and the vision of God [σοφία], in the context of that alive encounter in the "experience of events" [ἐνέπειρα γεγονότων]:

> Ἡ σπνευστία συνέδεται αφράτα μετὰ πνευματικῶς δυναμὸν που προβίωσεν οἱ συμβουλεύοντες τὸν Θεόν συνελευθερώσει ἐν τῇ ἑνέπειρα γεγονότων. Μεν ἀλλὰ λογία ἐπὶ προσετέλευσεν ἡ ἑνέπειρα γεγονότων ἡ σοφία.

This is not to say, however, that specific books were not considered to be special or that they were not distinguished from other documents on account of a claim to divine provenance. Specific books that had been set aside were cited from the start similarly to references made to the Jewish Scriptures; particularly to the prophets. The fledgling church community held strongly to the inspiration of the OT, so that it could be reasonably argued that by association at least, the early Christian literature was considered to be inspired. Also the fact that a number of the NT books made the claim to inspiration in themselves, might not have required defined methodology to do with the inerrancy of the biblical documents as can be seen in *The Ligonier Statement* signed in the early 1970s by a group of respected scholars including: J. I. Packer, R. C. Sproul, and John Warwick Montgomery. See John W. Montgomery, (ed.), *God's Inerrant Word: An International Symposium on the Trustworthiness of Scripture* (Minnesota: Bethany Fellowship, 1973).

170 The deeper meaning and theological sense of these words has been stated in the well-known and often quoted reflection of Augustine, "Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas": *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant Fundamenti* 6.

171 "All scripture is inspired [γραφὴν, σπνευστὸν] by God and profitable for teaching [ἐνδοκίνησιν] proβ διδακτικίαν", for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work" (2Tim 3:16-17). See Gregory of Nyssa's spirited use of this text when he writes against Eunomius (Adv. Eunomius 7.1).

172 Niko' Matsouka', *Dogmatikh kai Sumbolikh Qeologiva A!*, (Qessalonivkh: Pournara', 1985), 188.

173 As a paradigm consider the ὁ παλαιός Ἰηρων pericope from Dan 7:9-14 (cf. Rev 1:12-16), of which Hippolytus was one of the first to interpret and whose high authority of the Book of Revelation we will later note. See Wilfred Sophrony Royer, "The Ancient of Days: Patristic and Modern Views of Daniel 7:9-14", *SVTQ* 45/2, (2001), 137-162.

initial qualification from the early Christian communities. The need to make a universal declaration to inspiration came in the decades following the death of the apostles, and in the years immediately after that period when appeals to fulfilled prophecy in the NT documents were customarily made.

The Book of Revelation was one of the books in circulation when the NT Canon was forming that proclaimed its inspiration explicitly, Rev. 1:1-2,11,19, 10:11, 22:6,8,16,18f. Throughout his book our author confirms writing [gravor] 1:11, seeing [etdon] 5:1, and hearing [hikousa] 16:1, all that appears before him. The revelation, is in fact, "[t]he revelation of Jesus Christ" [Apokalupi] Jhsou Cristou, (1:1). Jhsou Cristou is often interpreted by orthodox commentators as a subj. gen., which is, the revelation is from Jesus Christ, rather than about Jesus Christ which is an obj. gen. and the preference of David E. Aune. Notably, apart from subsequently canonized books which might too make the same claim, it was also expressly declared by two other apocalypses on the canonical margin: The Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter.

Holy Tradition

All that has preceded (the apparent pluralism in the approach to the bringing together of the Scriptures) is tightly and safely bound by Holy Tradition, which John Chryssavgis has well connected to the "spiritual authority of the Fathers." In the context of the Book of

---

175 For a thorough treatment of the biblical texts which point to divine inspiration and generally on the internal testimony of the divine provenance of the NT itself, see P. N. Trempevla, Dogmatikh Orqodovxou Kaqolikh Ekklhsiva (Tom. 1), (Athens: JO Swthvr, 1978), 108-121. These pericopes include Mt 5:17-19; Jn 10:35; Rom 15:4; 2Thess 2:15; 2Tim 3:16-17; 2Pet 1:19-21, 3:15-16 (cf. Rev 1:1-3). This claim to inspiration [not mechanical but dynamic i.e. the Holy Spirit working freely through the personality of the author], writes Trempevla was accepted by almost all the Fathers, "sungoroiin aj eJrmhnei' pavntwn scedon twn Patevrwn th" : ibid., 108.


178 Hermas Vis. 1.1.6, 1.3.3, passim; "Peter" in TABD (Vol. 5), 263.

179 "This pluralism", as the German Catholic theologian Rahner has so well expressed, "can ultimately be held together in unity only by the Church's single and living consciousness of the faith": Karl Rahner, Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity, trans. W. V. Dych, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1984), 378.


Revelation, it was this continuing *fiat* to the apocalyptic text by the Body of the Church that kept the Seer's work alive in her canonical consciousness when one or the other of the criteria of canonicity would question the document's authority. The formation of the NT Canon is a development whose validity cannot be established by Scripture alone, because it is itself a fundamental stage in the Tradition.\textsuperscript{182} The NT is the historical and dialectical result of the objectification\textsuperscript{183} of the early Christian community's consciousness of faith, and it is because of this universal affirmation that the Canon is transmitted to succeeding generations of the Church. In his important monograph for both Orthodox and non-orthodox students, *Living Tradition* (1978), Meyendorff links this critical transmission to the liturgical veneration of Scripture which "suggests to the faithful that it contains the very truth of Revelation, which the Church possesses precisely in a given written form."\textsuperscript{184} What do the Eastern Orthodox writers mean by this often misconstrued term, *Tradition*, which is usually appended by the adjectives *Holy* or *Sacred*? Dumitru Staniloae has plainly and succinctly defined the two meanings of Tradition as:

(a) the totality of the various ways by which Christ passes over into the reality of human lives under the form of the Church and all his works of sanctification and preaching; (b) the transmission of these ways from generation to generation.\textsuperscript{185}

The word *tradition* comes from the Latin *traditio*, lit. a giving up, delivering up, handing over, surrender.\textsuperscript{186} The Greeks, however, used another word to convey this idea in their theological treatises, the term *paradosis*.\textsuperscript{187} It ordinarily means: giving, offering, delivering.\textsuperscript{188} In ancient Greek it was often used in the context of the handing or passing down of a narrative or story or tale, of an inheritance, and of teachings [*didaskalw'n*].\textsuperscript{189} In the theological literature it came to denote any teaching or practice that was transmitted

\textsuperscript{182} Rahner, *op. cit.*, 377f.
\textsuperscript{183} Karl Rahner's term which makes the point of the historicity of the process extremely well, *op. cit.*, 388. See also Lossky's use of the term *nature* to signify a similar process (in the context of the unity of the body of believers): Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, (New York: SVS Press, 1976), 174.
\textsuperscript{184} Meyendorff, *Living Tradition*, 14.
\textsuperscript{185} Dumitru Staniloae, *op. cit.*, 48.
\textsuperscript{187} For the term in ancient literature and the NT references, see F. Wilbur Gingrich & Frederick W. Danker, *op. cit.*, 615f.
\textsuperscript{189} P. C. Dormparakh, *Epitonton Lexikon Th*η *Araian* Ελληνικη Υλουσχ", (ESTIAS, 1985), 605.
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throughout the life of the Church from each passing generation.\textsuperscript{190} It is necessary to be aware when considering the term in the ecclesiastical context of the important distinction between something "handed down" and something "handed over". For the Fathers of the Church it was the latter implication that was intended: Tradition is delivered to the faithful through the mouths of the prophets and apostles.\textsuperscript{191} Noting first of all the grace of the Holy Spirit in this process, Georges Florovsky explicates, "[u]ltimately, 'tradition' is the continuity of the divine assistance, the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit."\textsuperscript{192} In other words, this abiding presence, is the transmission of the Gospel in the Church through all ages.

Holy Tradition is founded, established, and encountered in the revelation of the NT Canon, it is the "outward form[s]" of the Bible itself.\textsuperscript{193} For it is only in the Scriptures that the faithful can come to read the original words of Christ and to see His works.\textsuperscript{194} Therefore the emphasis here is on a "Living Tradition".\textsuperscript{195} The essence of this Holy Tradition (the teaching delivered by the Lord to the first community of believers and which is itself to be handed over), is described straightforwardly by Saint Paul in the greater context of catholicity and "in the light", as John D. Zizioulas writes, "of the Eucharistic community."\textsuperscript{196} "For I received \textit{parevlabon} from the Lord what I also delivered \textit{parevdwka} to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, 'This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me'" (1Cor 11:23-24). He also declares that this teaching must be accepted by all Christians, "[a]s we have said before, so now I say again, If any one is preaching \textit{eujaggelizetai} to you a gospel contrary to that which you received \textit{parelabete}, let him be accursed" (Gal 1:9). Again speaking about the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, St Paul writes, "[f]or I delivered to you \textit{parevdwka} as of first importance what I also received \textit{parevlabon}" (1Cor 15:3). Finally he cautions, "[s]o then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions \textit{krateite",} \textit{paradose} which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth to by letter" (2Thess 2:15). Note that Paul is very much aware and makes the great distinction between the

\textsuperscript{190} See \textit{Eujdokimof, op. cit.,} 266.
\textsuperscript{191} "Oi Prophetai wj eijdon, oij Apostoloi wj eijdaxan, hj Ekkhsia wj parelaben..." [Sunodikon Z' Oikoumenikhs] Sunodou.
\textsuperscript{192} Cited by Staniloae, \textit{loc. cit.}, from "The Ethos of the Orthodox Church", in \textit{Orthodoxy, [A Faith and Order Dialogue]}, (Geneva, 1960), 40.
\textsuperscript{193} Ware, \textit{op. cit.}, 199f.
\textsuperscript{194} For penetrating thought on this challenging statement, see \textit{Eujdokimof, op. cit.,} 254-261.
\textsuperscript{195} Meyendorff, \textit{Living Tradition}, 13-26.
"traditions" of the Church and the "traditions of my fathers" [tων πατρικῶν μου paradwsewn] (Gal 1:14).197

Tradition is a gift of the Holy Spirit, it is a vital experience which is relived and renewed through time. It is not a theology endeavouring to restore the past or to keep the Church inert. This is a highly important distinction which Gewgio" Mantzarivdh" presents systematically when he distinguishes between "conservatism" and "Tradition", the critical difference being that of "creativity": "hJ paradosiakothtai deeu eiνai sunθρητικοντα, ajla; dhmiourgikothtai."198 It is an organic effect of the incarnation of the LOGOS,199 of Jesus Christ's crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, all of which took place in the created dimensions of space and time.200 It is an extension of the life of the Lord as the ultimate prophet, high priest, and "King of kings [basileu, basilew]" (Rev 19:16). In all three of these royal functions (which are consequences of His hypostatic union),201 He exercises His authority over the life of the Church in the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, their successors, and the whole body of the people of God as it extends through every age "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe [iνα οJ kovsmo' pisteuνθ/ that thou hast sent me" (Jn 17:21).202 Accordingly Basil can write, "[o]f the dogmata and kerygmatata which are kept in the church, we have some from the written teaching (εκ th' ejggrafou didaskaliva), and some we derive from the apostolic paradosi, which has been handed down εν mυσθριω. And both have the same strength (th'n auth' iJscw) in the matters of piety."203 There are not many

197 See A. Cole on whether Paul is here referring to "traditional explanations" or "my own family traditions": Alan Cole, Galatians, (Leicester: IVP, 1965), 49f.
198 Gewgio" Mantzarivdh", Dropdhkh Pneumatikh; Zwh; (Qessal onilh; Pournara; 1994). 17.
199 cf. especially the use of λογο" in Rev 19:13, "and the name by which he [the rider who sat upon the white horse] is called is The Word of God [oJ λογο" tou' Qeou'] with the absolute use of the term itself of the historical appearance of Jesus Christ in the Johannine prologue to the Gospel of John, "...kai; oJ λογο" hJ prof' t' ou' Qeou..." (Jn 1:1).
200 Which the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed [AD 325-381] for instance, made sure to emphasize with its surprising reference to the name of Pontius Pilate in the context of the Lord's crucifixion [Staurwqevnta te uJpe'r hJmw'n ejpi; Pontivou Pilavtou], thus localizing a specific place and time in history for one of the central testimonies of Christ; and in the Gospels themselves, the genealogies put down by Matthew (Matt 1:1-17) and Luke (Lk 3:23-38) firmly seek to establish Jesus within the dimension of recorded history.
202 See Mantzarivdh connection of this Johannine pericope in its wider sociological fulfilment and theological extension into the concept of "paternity", op. cit., 52-54.
203 Quoted by George Florovsky in "Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.).", 109. [Florovsky is citing Basil, De Spiritu Sancto 66]
traditions. There is one Tradition of the Church which links the Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers, for in essence, as Chryssavgis says, "[t]he Christian Church is a scriptural Church." This is, as Saint Irenaeus of Lyons pronounces in the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*:

> the preaching of the truth... which the prophets announced and Christ confirmed and the apostles handed over [παραδίδωμι] and the Church, in the whole world, hands down [ἐγκεκριμένω] to her children.

Athanasius the Great "with the kind of mind", as Torrance says, "which thinks connections", during the course of the fourth century in a letter to a certain Bishop Serapion (with whom he appeared to be on very good terms with), gives the most celebrated definition of Holy Tradition as an inseparable component of the teaching and faith of the *ecclesia catholica*, delivered by Christ, preached by the apostles, and guarded by the Fathers:

> [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ κράτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν υἱοίς οὗτοι παραδίδουσιν καὶ διδάσκομεν καὶ πιστεύομεν καὶ ἔκκλησια παραδόσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας καὶ πίστεως ἐκκλησία καὶ εἰς τοὺς γενειευμένους τοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐκπολέοντας καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἐκφυλέσσουν ἔν τινι γενειευμένῳ ἔκκλησία οἰκειοῖς τῳ πατρί καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἐμφανίζοντες ἔκκλησίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπεξεργάζονται].

The question can be justifiably asked, as to what is the direct significance of all this talk about Holy Tradition in the larger context of our ongoing discussion about the Canon, and especially as to how it concerns the Apocalypse of John (particularly as to the matter of apostolic authorship and date). Michael Pomazansky has connected very well, and quite simply, all three of our major themes, *Tradition*, *Scripture*, and *Apostolicity*, in an ordered manner when he states that:

---

204 Orthodox theologians have always distinguished between *Holy Tradition* which is of a dogmatic nature (which the Canon also belongs to) and other ordinary *traditions* of the Church which are of a topical and non binding character. See the important distinction which is not always an easy one to make, explained very well by Ware, *op. cit.*, 196-199; see also Chryssavgis, *The Way of the Fathers*, 63-69. "The Bible is not considered apart from Tradition but forms a part of it. It was always understood by the Fathers within the framework of the wider, living, and uninterrupted continuity of the apostolic tradition": *ibid.*, 67. [Chryssavgis cites Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 27, 66]

205 Chryssavgis, *op. cit.*, 63.

206 *Demonst.* 98. [from John Behr's translation, SVS Press (1997)].


208 *Ad Serap.* 1.28.
The witness of Sacred Tradition is indispensable for our certainty that all books of Sacred Scripture have been handed down to us from Apostolic times and are of Apostolic origin.\textsuperscript{209}

It is in the \textit{ecclesia universalis} (specifically revealed in history through the \textit{ejfsankvei}'\textsuperscript{2} of the Son), and instituted as a historical reality on the day of Pentecost with the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles (Acts 2:1-4), that we can abide in the presence of the Holy Trinity and where the Gospel as received by the Apostles can be transmitted, preserved, and as Saint Athanasius says in reference to the Canon, "handed down" \textit{[paradoqevnta]} and "accredited as Divine" \textit{[pistueqastate qaia]}\textsuperscript{210} John the Evangelist points further of this awesome manifestation of the Holy Trinity when he writes, "the life was made manifest \textit{[ejfanerwvqh]}, and we saw it \textit{[ejwravkamen]}, and testify to it \textit{[marturou'men]}, and proclaim \textit{[apaggevllomen]} to you the eternal life which was with the Father and was made manifest to us" (1Jn 1:2).\textsuperscript{211}

When Orthodox interpreters speak of the \textit{ecclesiological} or \textit{eucharistic} characteristic of Tradition, that is precisely what they mean: \textit{hj latreia ei\nhai hj phgh; th'' zwh'' th'' Ekdhsia''}\textsuperscript{212} So it might not be a coincidence that one of our first great witnesses to the authority of the Book of Revelation, Justin Martyr (AD c. 100-165), is also considered, as Josef A. Jungmann tells us, "[one of] the most important of the liturgical sources made known at the earlier period."\textsuperscript{213}

The Church, therefore, in her faithful apprehension, \textit{apprehensio fiducialis}, of divine revelation in history (for the community of believers is also a "historical community"), dictates and commends the content of the Canon. It is not the other way round. That is, it is not the NT Canon that "settles" on the Church. Nikos Matsoiu\textsuperscript{2} has written most cogently on this absorbing subject and reveals that Orthodox theology can also be very grounded, placing the required emphasis on the material dialectics of the question whenever necessary:

\begin{quote}
D kleistov' kai vartismes'' katalogo' twv kanonikhv biblion toso th'' P. Diaghle'' (49), o\lo' kai th'' K. Diaghle'' (27) efei ginei mesa sthnistorikhv koinohta ufi\ntera aposvuzhthao'' kai apofase''. Oi' d' ej ergale''
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{209} Pomazansky, \textit{op. cit.}, 34.

\textsuperscript{210} Fest. \textit{Epist.}

\textsuperscript{211} Augustine in the first of his ten homilies on the Epistle of John makes much of John's use of \textit{marturou'men} and uses the term to distinguish between \textit{witnesses} and \textit{martyrs}, writing that "the martyrs are God's witnesses": \textit{Epist. in Ioan.}, 1.2.

\textsuperscript{212} Mantzaridh', \textit{op. cit.}, 97-107; John Breck, \textit{The Power of the Word In the Worshiping Church}, (New York: SVS Press, 1986), 117-139.

\textsuperscript{213} Josef A. Jungmann, \textit{The Early Liturgy}, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980), 5. [Jungmann refers to Justin's first \textit{Apol.}, ch. 65-67]
Finally, I must close the chapter with a famous passage from Saint Basil's enduring treatise On the Holy Spirit [Peri; tou' aJgivou pneuvmato"], also cited by John Meyendorff in the same context of the "interdependence and essential unity of Scripture and Tradition."²¹⁵ And which to my opinion, also counters James D. G. Dunn's strong suspicion and charge of the limitations of broadening "apostolicity" to a "concept like the apostolic faith."²¹⁶ The celebrated Cappadocian Father writes:

Among the doctrines and teachings preserved by the Church, we hold some from written sources, and we have collected others transmitted in an unexplicit form from apostolic tradition. They have all the same value... For if we were to try to put aside the unwritten customs as having no great force, we should unknown to ourselves, be weakening the Gospel in its very essence; furthermore, we should be transforming the kerygma into mere word.²¹⁷

Conclusion

The literature review which introduced this chapter clearly indicated the importance of the study of the Biblical Canon in the wider field of biblical studies. It also highlighted the basic ideological tension which spans most of the works in the extensive bibliography dealing with the subject. That is, was the NT Canon, as we have received and possess it today, ultimately an exclusive result of socio-political and religio-historical motivations and forces or, to put it more simply, was it a singular act of God? Of course, these appear to be the two extremes. However, many biblical scholars do openly hold to the first approach (vis-à-vis the purely historical), whilst the second approach mentioned (vis-à-vis the purely supernatural) is not widely published and is usually found in marginalized fundamentalist writings. My position, which is not so uncommon in biblical scholarship, is to understand both the historical and supernatural force working together and meeting in a realised canonical dialectic²¹⁸ within the

²¹⁵ Meyendorff, Living Tradition, 16.
²¹⁶ Dunn, op. cit., 386.
²¹⁷ Meyendorff, loc. cit.
²¹⁸ In the world of secular literature the concept of 'canon' is, of course, all-pervading. I will cite an indicative example (which makes use of 'theological' language) from Neil James' introduction to a selection of Australian writers' responses on the occasion of the New South Wales Premier's Literary Awards. "The Premier's Awards have also helped to define the canon of Australian literature over the last two decades... [t]he Awards are a fundamental part of that 'invisible hand' which shapes literary reputations and their reception...":
historically established but divinely inspired, lit. ἀποκατέστατο, ecclesia catholica. The historical causes and motivations, the factors of the formation of the NT Canon and the criteria of canonicity\(^{219}\) (which unquestionably played their part in the canonical process), did so in congregation with Holy Tradition (vis-à-vis the Catholic Consciousness of the Church). This serves to explain, not only in connection with the Apocalypse of John but also with most of the other NT documents, why these selected twenty-seven texts considered to contain the authoritative Christian faith\(^{220}\) were ultimately admitted into the NT Canon by the community of the faithful when they did not absolutely comply with one or more of the criteria.\(^{221}\) And also why other early texts which did seem to comply were eventually omitted from the list. In the adventure of the Book of Revelation (as we shall later have reason to examine), the importance of the shifting genre and its author's preoccupation with both local and universal ecclesiology were additional narrative dynamics which opened up the book to a good number of potential reading strategies. Finally, the criteria and/or marks of canonicity, notae canonicitatis, proved to be legitimate and extremely useful as an approach to our investigation not only by helping to establish a scientific methodology, but also by analytically setting out the fundamental questions relating to the formation of the NT Canon.

---

219 Here Bruce M. Metzger has described the dual combination of forces very well, providing a balanced agency to each, "[d]iscussion of the notae canonicitatis, therefore, should distinguish between the ground of canonicity and the grounds for the conviction of canonicity. The former has to do with the idea of the canon and falls within the province of theology; the latter has to do with the extent of the canon and falls within the domain of the historian": Metzger, The Canon, 284.

220 "This act of recognition", Brinkmann believes, "is a function of the Church's infallible authority": Quoted from Hoffman, *art. cit.*, 464.

221 Simply stated, "[t]hose writings that were adaptable to the church's needs survived. The others did not": McDonald, *art. cit.*, 128.
CHAPTER 3
The Publication of the Apocalypse

Introduction

It is not possible to proceed with this thesis without a detailed investigation as to the most likely publication date of the Apocalypse of John (more often referred to as the Book of Revelation). Apart from the reasons that will shortly be highlighted below, the date of the book's writing is crucial: with its birth it begins and sets out on its adventure and contests for a position in the canonical consciousness of the Church. It may sometimes appear that Brevard S. Childs, who is an influence behind the methodological approach of this thesis, is none too interested in the question of date. However, this is a misunderstanding and an unfair reading of his position, for, on the contrary, he is most interested. Childs is concerned that the establishment of a "text's milieu" (which includes probable date, author, audience, and literary growth, among other things) does not take away or deflect from the ultimate purpose of the Canon, which is to "loosen the text from any one given historical setting, and to transcend the original addressee." The historicist reading of the biblical text is a dangerous approach "which assumes that the meaning of a text derives only from a specific historical referent." Therefore, the date of the birth of a specific document of the NT is significant both for its "historical development and its ecclesiastical function." For B. S. Childs then (and certainly for myself) it is vital to recognize:

1 "The title Ἀποκάλυψις Η Ἰωάννου may have found a place at the end of an early copy of the book, or on a label attached to the roll; in any case it seems to have been familiar before the end of the second century": Henry Barclay Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1922), xxii. The author cites: Gardthausen, Griech. Palaeographie, 53; Thomson, Greek and Latin Palaeography, 57f.; and Kenyon, Pal. of Greek papyri, 22.


3 We could say with C. J. Scalise that with its publication a document in quest of authority sets off on "a canonical journey into hermeneutics": Charles J. Scalise, From Scripture to Theology: A Canonical Journey into Hermeneutics. (Illinois: IVP, 1996).


5 ibid.

6 ibid., 23.

7 ibid.

8 ibid., 21.
The question concerning the date of the Apoc may not be as mysterious or as controversial as that of its authorship, but it too is intriguing. Nor may it have exercised as much scholarly interest in recent years as the questions of structure and genre, but it is as relevant. Not only because, as F. J. A. Hort has written, "date and authorship do hang together," but knowledge of the date will also shed more light on the form and character of the book. What relevance, for example, as to the shaping of the Seer's work (both structurally and theologically) would a date have that excluded the destruction of the Temple? That is, whether the work was composed before AD 70 or conversely after AD 70. More importantly, a good indication of date allows for a better knowledge of the Sitz-im-Leben in which the work was written. This is particularly relevant for the Book of Revelation which is framed in letter form and, "[s]ince a letter is a historically conditioned form, knowing the date of a letter is important to the process of understanding it." Christopher Rowland, though unnecessarily underestimating the importance of the date of writing, nonetheless puts the question in fair perspective:

In some respects the precise dating of Revelation does not radically affect the exegesis of the document, as the issues which appear to confront the writer can be understood in broadly similar terms whenever we date it. Nevertheless some idea of the general setting may help us in understanding why particular subjects should be of greater concern to the visionary than others.

On the same matter, as to the importance and significance of the date of the Apoc's composition, Donald Guthrie, although for the most part agreeing with Rowland, is more particular on the date:

---

9 ibid.


11 See for example Allan McNicol who concludes in part, "[a]s such it [Rev 11:1-14] fits into the broader structure of the Apocalypse as a development of the polemic in 2:9 and 3:9 against those who claim to be Jews but are not": "Revelation 11:1-14 and the Structure of the Apocalypse", ResQ 22/4, (1979), 193-202. McNicol illustrates this point primarily through his interpretation of the Jewish exegetical traditions of Rev 11:1-14 and on the view that the references to the Temple of Jerusalem in the Apoc "carry the sting of a verdict of judgement": ibid., 199.

12 Similarly Colin J. Hemer, "The problem of date, however, is a crucial factor in the historical Sitz-im-Leben": C. J. Hemer, The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 3.


An examination of the problem of the date of this writing [Rev] raises many problems which are by no means easy to solve, and several different hypotheses have been proposed in an effort to provide a satisfactory solution. Although the main purpose of the book may be considered apart from the question of date, this question is not unimportant in the quest to ascertain the precise historical background, nor is it entirely irrelevant for arriving at a satisfactory interpretation of the book.\textsuperscript{15}

Ison T. Beckwith, decades earlier, was more specific, and this would prove to be a significant focus of his commentary. He writes:

...it was the circumstances of their times which caused the apocalypses to be written and which determined important factors in their contents; they stand in close relation to their age. This is equally true of the Apocalypse of John.\textsuperscript{16}

We shall begin the investigation proper with an examination of the external evidence for the time of the Apoc's composition, that is, the earliest Patristic Tradition; afterwards will follow a review of modern scholarship beginning with the eighteenth century when the traditional Domitianic dating is questioned; next we shall turn our attention to the internal evidence, that is, for historical signposts from within the Book of Revelation itself. The sum of this evidence will then be presented as an argument either for or against the Domitianic position. If we cannot establish with a reasonable degree of certainty when the Apoc was written, then all other criteria of canonicity will rest on highly disputable grounds.

**External Evidence: The Early Church Testimony**

Strong testimony of early Christian witness\textsuperscript{17} favours a date during the reign (81-96 AD) of Titus Flavius Domitianus, chiefly remembered for his reign of terror against the Senate and for his insistence on being addressed as Our Lord and God, *Dominus et Deus noster*.\textsuperscript{18} Saint


\textsuperscript{16} Ison T. Beckwith, *The Apocalypse of St John*, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919), 197; this is being discussed again, especially as many apocalypses show signs of continuing editorial work. See the introductions to the *Apocalyptic Literature* in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments* (vol. I), James H. Charlesworth (ed.), (New York: Doubleday, 1983). For example, *2 Enoch* (94f.) and *The Fourth Book of Ezra* (519f.).

\textsuperscript{17} It is important to emphasize here that the value of this witness and tradition is further validated on account of its geographical distribution. Scholars may ignore this on the grounds that it does not preclude a pattern of dependence, but that would involve a circular argument. The witness is confirmed in Sardis- Melito; Lyons- Irenaeus [who was also a native of Asia Minor]; Alexandria- Clement; Pannonia Superior- Victorinus; Caesarea- Eusebius; Rome- Jerome, and others.

\textsuperscript{18} Suetonius, in his famed *De vita Caesarum* (*The Lives of the Caesars*), informs us that 'Lord and God' "became his [Domitian's] regular title both in writing and conversation": *Dom.* 13.
Irenaeus, who was himself a native of Asia Minor (the book's original destination, Rev 1:4), and writing around AD 180, with reference to the Beast of the Apoc (13:18) says:

...for if it were necessary that his name [the Beast] should be distinctly revealed in this present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld the apocalyptic vision. For that was seen no very long time since, but almost in our day, towards the end of Domitian's reign [προ τε δωτελθει ηθ' Δομετίαν ηρ' ρα'].

The credit of this early evidence, which J. A. T. Robinson considers good, continues with and is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Victorinus, Eusebius, and Jerome. To this list we could probably add Melito of Sardis (fl. AD 138-180) whose witness would pre-date even that of Irenaeus. There is also a possible allusion in Hippolytus. It is clear, as R. H. Charles writes, "[t]he earliest authorities are practically unanimous in assigning the Apocalypse to the last years of Domitian." However, a few other ancient

---

20 *Adv. haer.* 5.30.3.
22 "...on the tyrant’s death, he [John] returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos..." (*tou'terahnon tev elussanto" japo;th" Patmou thn" nh'sou methylqen jepiv th;n Efeson...*): *Quis div. salv.* 42.
23 "...oJ de; Ἰερουσαλημ βασιλευ", wJ' hJ paradosi" didaskei, katedivkase to;h jwaanhn martourohta dia; ton th" aj hopar" logon ej" Patmou thn nh'sor: *In Matt.* 16.6.
24 "...when John said these things he was in the island of Patmos, condemned to the labour of the mines by Caesar Domitian. There, therefore, he saw the Apocalypse...": *In Apoc.* 10.11. In the same book, "[t]he time must be understood in which the written Apocalypse was published, since then reigned Caesar Domitian...": 17.10.
25 "At that time the apostle and evangelist John, the one whom Jesus loved, was still living in Asia, and governing the churches of that region, having returned after the death of Domitian from his exile on the island" (*...meta; thn Donetianou tevar eluha jvarnd qno fugh*): *Hist. Eccl.* 3.23.1. Eusebius also quotes the testimony of Irenaeus: *ibid.*, 3.18.3, 5.8.6.
26 "...Domitian having raised a second persecution he [John] was banished to the island of Patmos, and wrote the Apocalypse...": *De viris illustr.* 9.
28 "According to Dionysius Barsalibi, Hippolytus followed Irenaeus in assigning the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian": Swete, *op. cit.*, xcix, cites Gwynn in *Hermathena*, vii. 137.
29 Charles (Vol. I), xcii.
witnesses assign the Apoc to the reigns of Caligula (AD 37-41), Claudius (AD 41-54), Nero (AD 54-68), or Trajan (AD 98-117). On examination these departures from the common tradition, "curious deviations" according to F. J. A. Hort, cannot be pressed on grounds both external and internal to the book. It is not improbable that some later writers, as H. B. Swete suggests, misunderstood statements of earlier witnesses and so arrived at different dates.

Eighteenth-Century Scholarship: The Seeds of Doubt
In the eighteenth century the Domitianic dating of the Apoc begins to be doubted by scholars including F. Abauzit, J. J. Wettstein, and G. Herder. They placed the book in the AD 60s, arguing for that date on the grounds that the Temple was still standing, based on their reading of Rev 11:1-2. This was also very much the tendency during the next century, with many scholars placing the date of the book not long after the death of Nero, during the brief seventh-month reign of Galba (AD 68-69). Included here is the work of scholars such as Neander, DeWette, Credner, Reuss, Baur, Zeller, Häsé, Guericke, Volkman, and the Cambridge trio of B. F. Westcott, J. B. Lightfoot, and F. J. A. Hort. Jakob Züllig, however, argued for a much earlier date between AD 44-47 during the reign of Claudius, rekindling an interest in the date first proposed by Epiphanius. There were nonetheless dissenting voices during these years that still argued for the later date, among them Mill,

---

For a date sometime between the reigns of Caligula and Claudius, see Epiphanius: Haer. 51.12.33.

Theophylact, praef. in Ioan.; also the earliest Syriac versions which place John's exile to the reign of Nero, (cited by Swete, op. cit., p. c).

As Charles writes, this is found only in very late authorities. Theophylact on Mt: 22, and in Synopsis de vita et morte prophetarum, which is attributed to Dorotheus: Charles (Vol. I), op. cit., xcii.

F. J. A. Hort, op. cit., xix.

For example a misunderstanding of such words as those in Irenaeus, 2.22.5, pareméne gar aúth [of johnn'] recriv t'vnh Traianou' crovnwn. Henry Barclay Swete, op. cit., p. c. Also cited by Charles (Vol. I), op. cit., xcii.


See J. Christian Wilson, "The Problem Of The Domitianic Date Of Revelation", NTS 39 (1993), 587. This is only a partial list of which the author derives from H. J. Holtzmann's (1892), Einleitung in das Neue Testament: ibid.

F. J. A. Hort is representative of the group when he writes, for example, "...to gather up the result of the whole, the evidence alleged by recent critics for the early date on the ground of sharp and absolutely decisive personal details seems too uncertain... [b]ut on the other hand the general historical bearings of the book are those of the early, and are not those of the late period": Hort, op. cit., xxxii.

Cited by Wainwright, op. cit., 118.

Epiphanius 51.12.32-33, who also suggested a date during the reign of Caligula (AD 37-41).
Basnage, Le Clerc, Lowman, and D. Brown. In the East the Orthodox writers continued to affirm (with a few notable exceptions) the traditional date, in the work for example of Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem (1856), and Apostolos Makrakis (1881). The great German scholar (co-founder of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule) Wilhelm Bousset, in his work Die Offenbarung Johannis (1906), supported the Domitianic date, as would other scholars towards the close of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. A major reason for this preference was that for the first time, beginning in the early 1880s, source criticism (a methodology used to discover individual sources supposedly used in the construction of particular literary units) was applied more frequently to the study of the Apoc. The implication of Rev 11:1-13 (esp. vs. 1-2) that the earthly Temple of Jerusalem is still standing, was now questioned by scholars using this particular technique in the analysis of the Book of Revelation. This shift back to the Irenaean tradition in the English-speaking world was encouraged also by the publication of three time-honoured commentaries on the Apoc by H. B. Swete (1906), Isbon T. Beckwith (1919), and R. H. Charles (1920). This celebrated trio of commentators argue that the historical background of the Book of Revelation was one of persecution, with the shadow of Domitian looming large.

40 These early scholars are cited in Clarke's Commentary (Vol. 3): Adam Clarke, (Nashville: Abingdon, n.d.), 960.
42 For example Nikolao" Danala" (1842-1892), cited by Jwovh" Karabidopoulou". Eijsagwgh; Sthn Kainh; Diaqhvkh; (Qessalonivkh: Pournara', 1983), 350-351.
46 "...the present writer is unable to see that the historical situation presupposed by the Apocalypse contradicts the testimony of Irenaeus which assigns the vision to the end of the reign of Domitian": Swete, op. cit., cvi; "...such a well-organized expansion of the cult as was already present was not reached before the last years of the century, that is, before the time of Domitian. The Apocalypse then could not have been written before that date": Beckwith, op. cit., 201; "We have now to discuss the bearing of the internal evidence on this question. This evidence, which is clearly in favour of the Domitianic date, is as follows...": Charles (Vol. I), op. cit., xciv-xcv. Charles is particularly convinced by the prominence of the imperial cult and the established myth of Nero-redivivus: ibid.

47 J. Christian Wilson, art. cit., 587ff., is extreme in his statement that Swete, Beckwith, and Charles, singularly relied on J. B. Lightfoot's arguments for Domitianic persecution of Christians as evidence for their late dating. Firstly, Lightfoot himself, as Wilson concedes, favoured a pre AD 70 dating of the Book of Revelation (ibid.), and more importantly, what swayed their favour towards the later date (particularly for Swete and Charles) was their examination of the early patristic witness. Swete, op. cit., xciv-cvi; Charles (Vol. I), op. cit., xci- xciii; whilst Beckwith in his discussion on the early Roman persecutions (op. cit., 201-207), though acknowledging Lightfoot (201, n.4), does not depend solely on Lightfoot's earlier conclusions. Beckwith also refers to Hardy, Linsenmeyer, and Ramsay: ibid.
A Survey of Recent Scholarship: The Major Positions Held

The vacillation has continued through the decades up to the present, but with a strong leaning towards the traditional date. In recent times, however, there are scholars who are again arguing for an earlier date. The English-speaking commentators will generally cite external evidence in support of the internal when favouring the later date; the German scholars of the twentieth century will usually cite Irenaeus as their primary evidence. The Greek theologians have for the greater part agreed on the Domitianic date through recourse to both early and later Church testimony, also on account in the acceptance of apostolic authorship.


---

48 See Robert L. Thomas for his survey and critique on this re-proposal of the earlier date, particularly on the positions of Kenneth L. Gentry and David Chilton. Thomas writes, "[s]ome late-twentieth-century support for an early date has originated in the movement known variously as 'dominion theology', 'Christian reconstructionism', or 'theonomy'. This world view foresees a progressive domination of world government and society by Christianity until God's kingdom on earth becomes a reality. It represents a recent revival in postmillennial eschatology": R. L. Thomas, Revelation (Vol. 1), (Chicago: Moody Press, 1992), 20.

49 For example Leon Morris, The Book of Revelation, (Leicester: IVP Press, 1976), 34; Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 36; R. L. Thomas (Vol. 1), 20; and John Sweet whose conclusion represents these interpreters as well, "[t]o sum up, the earlier date may be right, but the internal evidence is not sufficient to outweigh the firm tradition stemming from Irenaeus": J. Sweet, Revelation, (London: SCM Press, 1990), 27.

50 J. Christian Wilson, art. cit., 588.

51 See QKHE (Tnov²) 2, 1085-1088.

52 Though, certainly, this is not always the case. John Sweet, for instance, accepting the possibility of the Domitianic date, nonetheless writes that "Revelation was written at a time of comparative peace for the Christians...": Sweet, op. cit., 27. Similarly with Adela Yarbro Collins, "Domitian apparently took no steps against Christians as Christians... the origin of the Apocalypse, therefore, cannot be explained in terms of a response to that particular [persecution] kind of social crisis": A. Y. Collins, Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984), 104.
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Domitian, and Trajan. Leonard L. Thompson (1998) says that the best we can forward is "that Revelation was written sometime roughly between 68 and 120 CE."  

**Internal Evidence**

When we turn to the internal evidence to look for proofs of when the Apoc was written, we find six key areas that concern the scholars of the book, but not necessarily with equal regard. They are *(i)* The Seven Letters (2:1-3:22), *(ii)* The Temple in Jerusalem (11:1-2), *(iii)* The Name of Babylon (14:8), *(iv)* The Seven Kings (17:9-11), *(v)* The Extent of the Persecution, and *(vi)* The Rise of the Imperial Cult. Much discussion has been given over to these topics, including in the context of date. The arguments will not be rehearsed in full here, except to draw out key points.

---


57 G. K. Beale in his magisterial commentary on the Apoc also follows this established approach to the problem of date: Gregory K. Beale, The Book of Revelation, (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1999), 4-27.

58 The extent of the persecution and the rise of the imperial cult, were considered in-depth in my first dissertation where extensive bibliography (both primary and secondary) was presented: M. G. Michael, Thesis: 176-200, 201-225. It was demonstrated in those places, that they too (as internal historical markers), do not contradict the testimony of the external evidence that situates the book towards the end of Domitian's reign, AD c. 95. See especially S. R. F. Price, Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), and W. J. Shiels (ed.), Persecution and Toleration Papers Read at the Twenty-Second Summer Meeting and the Twenty-Third Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society, (Padstow: Basil Blackwell, 1984).


The Temple in Jerusalem

The Seer refers to the Temple [ναών] on no less than sixteen occasions: Rev 3:12, 7:15, 11:1,2,19 (twice), 14:15,17, 15:5,6,8 (twice), 16:1,17, 21:22 (twice). As Adela Yarbro Collins importantly points out, "[i]n the visions of the body of the book, apart from 11:1-2, the temple of God refers to the temple in heaven..." It should be noted however, that Collins argues "[i]t is unlikely that the author of Revelation in its present form could have composed 11:1-2." Briefly, her argument revolves around her understanding that apart from 11:1-2, there is "no positive interest in the historical earthly temple elsewhere in the book." Some have suggested (following either Wellhausen or Charles), that John uses here (11:1-2) a Zealot oracle which was in circulation before the destruction of Jerusalem and which promised God's protection. But it appears unlikely that John would integrate such a source when he was writing much after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. It would make no sense to include an oracle that clearly contradicted subsequent events. The prophetic action of measuring is a sign-action which the Seer uses to dramatize his prophetic utterances, as did the prophets of Israel before him. This "sign-action", as Fiorenza notes, seems patterned after Ezekiel 40:3. John is also told not to measure the court outside the Temple, to "leave that out" [ἐκβάλε ἐκ τοῦ] (v.2): because the court, like the Temple itself, has been destroyed and "abandoned to the heathen". In the NT ἐκβάλει is used for both ejection by force (Mt 15:17; Acts 27:28) and for a rejection with contempt (Lk 6:22). It is also used in the sense of expelling and forcing away (Lk 4:29). The cause for the exclusion is that the court is "given over to the nations" [ὅτι τὸν ἐξέδωκεν τοῖς ἐξεστίν]. Robert L. Thomas properly points out that the causal ὅτι "reveals that the outer court has fallen into Gentile hands."

---

60 Yarbro Collins, Crisis, 67.
61 ibid.
62 ibid.
63 But R. H. Charles (as John Sweet points out), argued that John completely re-interpreted the oracle: Sweet, op. cit., 181.
64 A logical argument put forward by a number of scholars, including Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Revelation: Vision of a Just World, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 76.
65 ibid.
66 Robert L. Thomas (Vol. 2), 83. Thomas also cites H. Alford and James Moffatt as supporters of this position: ibid.
67 For all the uses of the word, see The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised, Harold K. Moulton (ed.), (1978), 122.
68 Robert L. Thomas (Vol. 2), loc. cit.
The Name of Babylon

The Seer in a number of places refers to a city called Babylon and he vividly pictures its ultimate devastation (Rev 14:8, 16:19, 17:5, 18:2,10,21). Adela Yarbro Collins convinces in her argument that:

[i]t is highly unlikely that John would have been so interested in the fall of the historical Babylon, whether the major one in the sixth century B.C.E. or one of the minor ones in the Hellenistic period. It is equally improbable that John hoped for the destruction of the fortified town called Babylon at the head of the Nile delta in Egypt.69

This is also the position of most of the interpreters who have been reviewed, and it is from this point that they set out to interpret John's use of the symbol. Similarly E. Schüssler Fiorenza, though with the added caution says, "Babylon, however, must not be reduced to a simple code or steno-symbol for Rome since John uses the name 'Babylon' in order to evoke a whole range of scriptural meanings."70 That the name is to be understood symbolically is made evident by both the context and the text itself. John makes use of strong language to describe the city as "the great harlot" \[póvn\v\] \[θη' megavlh\] (17:1). She [the city] sits on the "scarlet beast" with the blasphemous names and she is arrayed in finery and dazzling jewellery. In her hand she holds "a golden cup" that is "full of abominations" and the "impurities" on account of "her fornication" (v.4). Significantly, John's use of the word "mystery" \[mysth\v\] (v.5), "implies that the name Babylon obscures as much as it reveals."71 The Seer will himself in any case, uncover part of this mystery when he tells us, "[a]nd the woman [hJ gunhv] that you saw is the great city [e\v\s\v\i\h\v\t\h\]n hJ poli\v\] hJ megavlh] which has dominion over the kings of the earth" (v.18). And furthermore, Rome was also represented in Jewish and early Christian literature of that period as an anti-type to Babylon.72

The two 'great cities' had both "shared in the dubious distinction of having destroyed Jerusalem and the temple",73 (4 Ezra 3:1-2,28-31; 2Bar. 10:1-3, 11:1, 67:7; Sib. Or.

---

69 A. Yarbro Collins, Crisis, 57.
70 Fiorenza, Vision, 89.
71 A. Yarbro Collins, loc. cit.
72 For a summary of the use of Babylon in the NT and why it cannot mean Jerusalem, see A Dictionary of the Bible (Vol. 1), (1910), "Babylon In NT", art. F. H. Chase, 213f. Chase informs us that the interpretation of Babylon in the Apoc as Rome is found in Iren., Adv. Haer., 5.26.1, Tert., Adv. Marc. 3.13, Adv. Judaeos, 9, also in Jerome, Augustine, and Andreas of Caesarea. The latter speaks of it as derived "from ancient teachers of the Church": ibid., 213; the earliest reference for Babylon as a symbolic name for Rome can be dated with confidence to the times of the Seer, SibOr 5.143,158. J. J. Collins dates the book sometime between AD 70 and 132. Collins comes to this conclusion on two counts: first, the prominence of the Nero legend in (2), (3), (4), and (5), and second, the favourable reference to Hadrian in verses 46-50, "which must have been written before the Jewish revolt of AD 132": The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments (Vol. 1), James H. Charlesworth (ed.), (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 390.
73 Fiorenza, Vision, loc. cit.
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5:143,159). On another level and with compliance to the mystery motif, we can look beyond the imagery, as did Saint Andrew of Caesarea. He believed that "[t]he writing upon the forehead [of the harlot] indicates the shamelessness of unrighteousness, the fullness of sin and disturbance of heart; she is a mother for she leads those in the cities under her by her fornication of the soul, giving birth thereby to iniquities which are vile before God." 74

The material relating to the Temple and Babylon marks a period long after the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. By the time the Seer wrote his work, legend, eschatological zeal, and the dreadful events that had transpired, had time to fuse into a single and powerful divine cosmology. It anticipated nothing less than the absolute overthrow of the world as recompense for the devastation of the holy city in order that the "new Jerusalem" [ Καινή Ιερουσαλήμ], would come "down out of heaven" [ ἐκ τοῦ ουρανοῦ] (21:2).75

The Seven Kings

The question of the Seven Kings (Rev 17:9-11) is more complex.76 If we identify the "seven kings" [ βασιλεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν τέχνων] (v.9) with seven Roman Emperors (in agreement with most interpreters), "the problem of precise identification", writes John M. Court, "is only just beginning."77 Court has shown that no logical starting point for the counting of a sequence of seven emperors (on the basis of political history) "is entirely satisfactory."78 Notwithstanding all that is involved, this present writer offers a slightly new approach regarding this process of identification. The "five" [ οἱ πέντε] who have "fallen" [ ἐφανερώθη] (17:10) are: (i) Tiberius (AD 14 to 37); (ii) Caligula (AD 37 to 41); (iii) Claudius (AD 41 to 54); (iv) Vespasian (AD 69 to 79); and (v) Titus (AD 79 to 81). The "one" who "is" [ ἦσε] (v.10), is the sixth Caesar who reigns as John writes, this is Domitian (AD 81 to 96). "The beast that was" [ ὁ θηριός ὁ θηριός] (v.11) is Nero, expected to return to life (Nero Redivivus myth)79 after his

75 This image of the "new Jerusalem" representing the triumphant Church of Christ adorned as the Lord's Bride, is the interpretation of the Fathers: Taushev, op. cit., 268.
76 Also see David E. Aune’s detailed analysis on this “subject of speculation”: Revelation 17-22 (52c), 945-949. Aune follows the “symbolic approach” and understands the number seven “as an apocalyptic symbol.”
78 Court comes to this conclusion if assumed that the author is working within a historical frame of reference: ibid., 126-129.
79 For good discussion on the 'Nero Redivivus' legend, namely that Nero had not actually died, but would return from Parthia to conquer his enemies and to regain his throne, see Court, Myth, 127-130. Court describes very well how 'Nero Redivivus' came to acquire supernatural attributes and was "assimilated into the mythology
"mortal wound" [\( \text{plh} \; \text{tou} \; \text{kanatou} \)] was "healed" [\( \text{ejgapeuvh} \)] (13:3). He is "the other" [\( \text{allo} \)] who has "not yet come" [\( \text{ou} \; \text{hilen} \)] (17:10). He is the seventh, but he is also the "eighth" [\( \text{ogdoov} \; \text{estin} \)] who also "belongs to the seven" [\( \text{kai} \; \text{ek tw'n eJptav} \; \text{estin} \)] (v.11).

In arriving at this conclusion, the initial assumption was made that the seven kings are representative of the Roman Empire and not a literal tabulation of rulers. John used the symbolic seven to present the total picture of imperial rule. Nonetheless, the possibility of a historical reality behind his list was not dismissed. Tiberius is chosen as the first as it was under his reign that Jesus Christ was crucified. Nero (who is in reality the eighth and the eschatological antichrist) is bypassed. Also omitted are the so-called three 'pretenders' (Galba, Otho, and Vitellius). As a pericope of theology the Seven Kings says much, but as witnesses to date it is not so forthcoming. Nevertheless, the Nero Redivivus motif points to a story that would have needed some time to circulate and to become lore. Also the only other emperor, able to fit the 'historical profile' of the redivivus legend as a Nero revisited, is Domitian. These two considerations alone argue for a date well past AD 70.

The Seven Letters (Rev 2:1-3:22)
The Seven Letters or Messages have often been ignored by commentators (or at least not accorded proper attention) on the question of the dating of the Apocalypse. Even when they are specifically considered in the context of date, as for example by Albert A. Bell, Jr., it is only the question of persecution that is generally drawn out at the expense of other indicators that can prove equally useful in the determination of the time of writing. Arguments of whether persecution is or is not evidenced in the messages, are not conclusive on their own. All possible clues of date have to be considered. The hesitation by some scholars such as J.

of Beliar and the serpent": \textit{ibid.}, 129; the legend was well known in antiquity, it is also referred to by \textit{Suet.}, \textit{Nero} 57.

80 “Since they were viewed as rebels rather than emperors”: G. R. Beasley-Murray, \textit{The Book of Revelation}, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1981), 257. They could however, "be given a place among the other Emperors by Suetonius, Josephus, and the Sibylline Oracles": \textit{Court, Myth}, 127.

81 I hold to the unity of the letters to the rest of Revelation and that consequently they are the work of the same author. This position stems from similar observations as those put down, for example, by Wilfrid J. Harrington, "[t]he messages to the seven Churches have the same literary characteristics as the properly apocalyptic part of Revelation... the links between these messages and the subsequent chapters, notably with the final chapters, are such that an independent existence of the former is unlikely. They are an integral part of the work from the start": \textit{W. J. Harrington, Revelation}, (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 55. "Indeed", as R. H. Charles writes, "the whole Book from 1:4 to its close is in fact an Epistle": \textit{Charles (Vol. I)}, 8. The Seven Churches were chosen on account of the sacredness of the number seven "not only in Jewish Apocalyptic and Judaism generally, but particularly in our Author": \textit{ibid.}, 8f.

Massyngberde Ford to accept the Letters as reliable testimony for date is because Revelation chapters 1-3 are considered "a later Christian addition."\(^\text{83}\)

In a work that was long overdue after W. M. Ramsay's classic study, *The Letters to the Seven Churches* (1904), Colin J. Hemer in his own commanding investigation, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting* (1986), writes of the historical importance of this section of the Apoc:

> ...the letters to the seven churches constitute the section [of the Apoc] in which the historical situation is most explicit and approachable. Here is the key to the easiest lock in an admittedly difficult text.\(^\text{84}\)

On the other hand, while allowing for some evidential value to the letters in the question of dating, Adela Yarbro Collins is hesitant, and in this she represents the general trend of scholarship in recent times:

> The seven messages contain little that points to a date with any precision.\(^\text{85}\)

As historical markers the significance of the letters rests somewhere between these two views. Taken on their own they cannot be pressed too far, nor indeed can the other points that have been raised above. But it is rather when the results of the individual studies are merged that the evidence becomes more settled. What can be drawn from the individual churches that may point to a date is admittedly not great; however, the information is of a significant nature and cannot on any grounds be ignored.\(^\text{86}\)

All the letters addressed to the seven churches follow a standard pattern or formula,\(^\text{87}\) though they do not conform to any known "letter-pattern."\(^\text{88}\)


\(^{84}\) Colin J. Hemer, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 1.

\(^{85}\) A. Yarbro Collins, *Crisis*, 75.

\(^{86}\) W. M. Ramsay's famous work, *The Letters to the Seven Churches and Their Place in the Plan of the Apocalypse*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904), remains a standard reference in any study of this area. The work has been recently updated and edited by Mark W. Wilson (1994). See especially 151-317 of the later edition. For a full bibliography of relevant literature, see Hemer, *op. cit.*, 284-297.

\(^{87}\) Wilfrid J. Harrington aptly observes that the common plan of the letters "...is redolent of Old Testament prophetic texts as this Christian prophet [the Seer] speaks, confidently, in the name of the Lord of the Churches": *op. cit.*, 56.

\(^{88}\) For discussion on the format of the letters, see Charles Homer Giblin, *The Book of Revelation: The Open Book of Prophecy*, (Minneapolis: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 49-52. "They [the letters] are a mixed genre created by John and combine features of a royal proclamation or edict, the prophetic judgement salvation-oracle, and an element from wisdom literature, the 'hearing formula' ([*Weckformel*]: *ibid.*, 49f.; Stanley K. Stowers (in the broad context of letter writing in antiquity) groups six of the seven letters in Revelation 2 and 3 (those to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, and Philadelphia) in Letters of Praise and Blame. He says, "[i]n good epistolary form they begin with praise and then turn to blaming or threatening": S. K. Stowers, *Letter
This formula is: (i) The Seer, John, is commanded to write to the angel of the church; (ii) Christ is introduced with a descriptive title; (iii) The condition of the church is summarized, beginning with Jesus' saying "I know," with praise or rebuke; (iv) Exhortations are given; (v) The letter concludes with "He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says..." and a promise is given to him who "overcomes." 

(i) Tw' aggelw th' ej Ef eisw ejk dhia' grayorΣ Tade legei ejkratw th' tou' ejpta; ajstera' ejn th' deka' au'tou' ejperipatw ejn mawtw ejpta; louzwv th' crswiΣ (Rev 2:1). Ephesus was the provincial Roman capital for Asia Minor and a strategic centre in the Roman world. Saint Paul established a church there AD c. 53-56 (Acts 19). Various cults flourished in the province including the official cults of Artemis and that of the Emperor. The reference to the Nicolaitans (Rev 2:6) does not help here. It is thought that this was an early gnostic sect that stressed Christian freedom to the extent that it tolerated gross immorality and idolatry. Some of the Church Fathers thought that the founder of this sect was an apostate named Nicholas, one of the original seven deacons (Acts 6:5). What is clear in Greco-Roman Antiquity, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1989), 80f; Orthodox commentators view the letters in similar fashion stressing that though the praise and blame was initially directed to the seven church communities, it is nonetheless equally directed to the Church Universal. "Osa levgontai sti; ejpta; ejpistole; kaluvptoun e{na iJkanopoihtiko; ajriqmo; katastavsewn kai; scevsewn pou; ti; ejp[zhse hJ  jEkklhsiva dia; mevsou tw'n aijwvnwn kai; qa; ti; zhvsh kai; stou; ejrcovmenou" aijw'ne" sth; gh' aujthv: Arcim Eujgnistou Bith. Ormlie' Pneumatikh' OiJkodomh' Sth;n jApokavluyh Tou' jIwavnnou, Tovmo A, (Qessalonivkh: jOrqovdoxo' Kuyevlh, 1997), 371. See especially 368-383 for an accurate review of the Orthodox teaching on the historical and theological implications of the seven letters.

89 The conqueror [oj nikwv], says Kiddle, "can only be the martyr". Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 77, explains that Kiddle comes to this conclusion from its relation to 20:4ff., and that it is based on the notion of Christ's victory which entailed His own death. But Beasley-Murray counters that this is to disregard the implications of the doxology of 1:5f., the song of exultation in 5:9f., and the nuptial imagery relating to the Church in 19:8ff. This, however, does not take into good account that in Rev 11:7, 13:7, and 17:14 at least, the idea is clearly one of victory in battle as the "presence of polem in the immediate context shows": Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament (Vol. 2), Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (eds), (1991), "nikv", 467f.; Victorinus in his commentary tells us that those who overcome "are not afraid of persecution": In Apoc. 2.11; Orthodox commentators along similar lines to Kiddle understand tw'nikwvti equally as a reference to martyrdom as to the 'conquering' of sin, "Ekheo' oj dboi' qeav nikshv thv apatalhv ajhartian ejthv zwhv kai thv fdo on tou marturikou qanavou cavin tou Cristou': Arcim Jwhv Gannakoupolo', Erntimou Th' Apokaluyw", (Qessalonikh: Pournara', 1991), 39.

90 For thorough discussion on the historical backgrounds of the seven letters and of the seven cities, see Hemer, op. cit., passim. For Ephesus, 35-56; Smyrna, 57-77; Pergamus, 78-105; Thyatira, 106-128; Sardis, 129-152; Philadelphia, 153-177; and for Laodicea, 178-209.

91 Irenaeus tells us that the Nicolaitans had doctrine similar to the gnostic heresy of Cerinthus: Adv. haer. 3.11.1. For a good summary of patristic thought on the identification of the Nicolaitans, see P. J. Mpratsiwvth', H Apokaluyw" Tou' Iwaneou (Achma: N. P. Mpratsiwvth', 1992), 88. See also "Nicolaitans", in The Anchor Bible Dictionary (Vol. 4), art. Duane F. Watson, 1106f. Watson supports the proposal that we could have here a wordplay of nika laon (he has conquered the people), a cryptic name for the sect.
from here, however, is that the letter had to be written some time well after AD 53-56 in order for the Church to have become sufficiently established to the extent that it is implied by the content.

(ii) Kai; τῷ αγγέλῳ τῆς ἑων Σμυρνῆς ἱερᾶς Ταδείου λέγει ὁ πρώτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτος, ὁ ἐγεμετάριον νεκροῦ καὶ ἐνθεόγενος (Rev 2:8). Smyrna, similarly to Ephesus, was a prosperous and wealthy city with a strong traditional allegiance to Rome and to the Empire. As early as 195 BC the city had erected a temple to the goddess of Rome, Dea Roma. Later in 23 BC Smyrna won the imperial permission over ten other Asian cities to build a temple in honour of the emperor Tiberius.92 Mounce writes, "[t]his strong allegiance to Rome plus a large Jewish population which was actively hostile to the Christians made it exceptionally difficult to live as a Christian in Smyrna."93 This large and influential Jewish community actively opposed the Christian church there, and it is perhaps for this reason that the church was poor, but spiritually rich (2:9). The reference to the "synagogue of Satan" 94 [synagogh; tou' satana'] (2:9) is helpful but inconclusive. These comments, as Adela Yarbo Collins rightly points out, "imply great hostility between at least some Christians and Jews of Asia Minor."95 But in the same verse the Seer also claims the name "Jew". Such a claim, argues John A. T. Robinson, presupposes a time when "the final separation of Christians and Jews had not yet taken place."96 For Robinson asks if the statements in Rev 2:9 and 3:9 would be credible if they were "made in that form after [AD] 70."97 Raymond E. Brown however, in his widely received work, The Community of the Beloved Disciple (1979), suggests that the activities of Jamnia AD c. 80-90, and particularly the reformulation of the Twelfth Benediction AD c. 85, which seemingly included a curse on the Jewish Christians, are witness to the separation.98 However, all this appears conjectural, and on this matter it is best to follow A. Y. Collins, who concludes:

92 Tacitus, Ann. iv. 55-56.
93 Mounce, op. cit., 91.
94 For helpful discussion on "synagogue of Satan", see J. Massyngberde Ford, op. cit., 392f. As Ford notes, the phrase is used here and in 3:9 but nowhere else in biblical or non-biblical writings. However she adds, "there may be a parallel in the community or assembly of Belial mentioned in 1QH 2:2": ibid., 393; Victorinus writes, that in the synagogue of Satan are those that "are gathered together by Antichrist": In Apoc. 2.9.
95 A. Yarbro Collins, Crisis, 75.
96 Cited by A. Yarbro Collins, ibid.
97 "For is it credible that the references in Rev 2:9 and 3:9 to those who 'claim to be Jews but are not' could have been made in that form after 70? For the implication is that Christians are the real Jews, the fullness of the twelve tribes (7:4-8; 21:12), and that if these Jews were genuinely the synagogue of Yahweh (as they claim) and not of satan they would not be slandering 'my beloved people'": J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., 227f.
The separation between Jews and Christians cannot be understood as a simple event that took place at a single moment in time and which held for every locality. The separation was gradual and very likely relative to individual perceptions and to the particular circumstances of each geographical area. The indirect claim in Rev 2:9 and 3:9 that Christians are the true Jews is not a reliable indication of date.99

A more concrete piece of evidence, although external but directly linked to the church of Smyrna and that would favour a date after AD 70, comes from Saint Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians.100 In that epistle, dated c. middle of the second century,101 the bishop of Smyrna and its most famous martyr writes:

For he [Paul] boasts of you in all those Churches which alone then knew the Lord; but we [of Smyrna] had not yet known Him. (Chap. XI).

Polycarp implies that the church of Smyrna was established later than the one in Philippi and after the death of Paul. The Church of Philippi, the first church in Europe, was founded by Paul on his so-called second missionary journey, some time around AD 52102 (Luke sets down the Macedonian ministry in Acts 16:12-40). On his third missionary journey the apostle made two further visits to Philippi about AD 57 (Acts 20:1-6). We can also say, with a good degree of certainty, that Paul died in Rome AD c. 67-68.103 This understanding of Polycarp's words is favoured by a number of scholars including R. H. Charles, W. G. Kümmel and Leon Morris.104 J. A. T. Robinson however, following J. B. Lightfoot, argues that Polycarp's words

99 A. Yarbro Collins, Crisis, 75f.

100 Polycarp wrote several letters to neighbouring Christian communities and to some of his fellow bishops, (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.20.8). Only the letter to the Philippians is extant.

101 See Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Vol. I), 79f.


have been misconstrued and that this conclusion "can be dismissed". 105 Regardless, the plain meaning of the words would support the former explication.

(iii) Kai; τὸ αἴγγελῳ τῆς ἐν Πέργαμῳ ἐξελισσεί γράφων ἔνθα τὸν ἐν γονατίσμα τῆς διστομῆς τὸν ἐκείνην ἐν τῷ (Rev 2:12) The capital city of the Roman province of Pergamum in Asia was a celebrated city, not only because of its natural landscape, built on top of a 1,000-foot hill, but also for it being a centre for pagan worship. 106 The imperial cult was strong in that province and it required its citizens to burn a pinch of incense at the foot of the emperor's statue. 107 Three points are of interest here: first, the mentioning of the Nicolaitans, which I have already discussed in reference to Ephesus; second, the martyrdom of Antipas; and third, the Seer's reference to "Satan's throne".

We know only little about Antipas, "the faithful one" [ὁ πιστός μου] (2:13). According to tradition he was bishop of Pergamum and a disciple of Saint John, and his martyrdom is said to have occurred in the year AD 92. The recorded year of his martyrdom can be traced back to at least the fifth century. He is said to have been burned to death inside a heated bronze bull after having confessed before the Roman governor that "Jesus is Lord". 108 But on its own, this evidence cannot be pressed. The aorist tense in the verb denied [ηρίθαψεν 2nd sg] v.13 often said to point to "one definite crisis rather than a continuing persecution" 109 need not be interpreted in that sense. The aorist tense in Greek idiom can be used as an emphatic signifier to emphasize the importance of an event or situation that need not necessarily have ended. 110

Much more has been written and said about "Satan's throne" [ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατάνα].

---

105 "But, as Lightfoot observed long ago, all that Polycarp actually says is that 'the Philippians were converted to the Gospel before the Smyrneans'": J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., 229f.

106 "It was [also] a great religious centre, partly because religion became a major instrument of policy": Hemer, op. cit., 81. For a detailed discussion of Pergamum as a religious centre and list of principal cults which included Zeus Soter and AthenaNicephorus: ibid., 81-87.

107 For the variety of libations offered to 'Augustus and Roma' at Pergamum, see S. R. F. Price, Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor, (Cambridge: CUP Press, 1984), 208f.

108 For Church tradition on Antipas and sources of reference, see ΟΚΗΕ (Vol. 2), 921f. His memory is honoured on the 11th of April. Antipas would have been no minor figure in the Church of Asia Minor. The Seer's reference to him as 'witness' [μαρτυρ] is a title that is usually reserved for Christ, Rev 1:5, 3:14; for the technical distinction between μαρτυρ and ὁμολογήτ, see Charles (Vol. 1), op. cit., 62.

109 Morris, op. cit., 67.

110 In the NT, for example, consider Saint Paul's use of the aorist 'raised' [ἀγιέρεν] (1Cor 6:14; 1Thess 1:10, etc). And yet it is because of the continuing power of this act, the raising up of Christ, that Christians can both know the Lord (Phil 3:10) and share in His resurrection (v.11).
This no doubt refers to Pergamum generally, as being the seat of pagan worship, but more specifically to that city being the first to build a temple dedicated to the worship of a living emperor, that being Augustus in 29 BC. A second temple was built there during the reign of Trajan (AD 98-117) and the city acquired the title "twice neokoros" [temple warden]. This tells us that the state sponsored cult was well established in that city, and that the Church of Pergamum had suffered for refusing to accede to it. We can say, with a little caution, that all this points to a period somewhere between AD 68 (assuming the late date for Antipas' death under a Neronic inspired persecution outside of Rome) and AD c. 96.

(iv) Kai; τῷ ἄγγελῳ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ταδέλες γεγονεῖ οὗτος τῷ οἴκῳ τουτ' ὄψιν φωτὸς ἀπό τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ κυρίου τουτ', ὡς γάρ τε οὐκ εἴδει οὐδέ χῦντος πλούτου· kai; o]j] poph]t] e]uj]t] tou]i] BM(N)T 1:18) Thyatira was a commercial city well known for its trade guilds (Acts 16:14). These guilds were pagan and could include rituals and cultic meals, to be celebrated and shared in patronal temples.114 In this letter we have another name that is mentioned, that of the woman Jezebel "who calls herself a prophetess" [gunaika jezabel, h]l]egousa euj]th]n profhtin| (Rev 2:20). Several identifications have been put forward for this woman with the "Nicolaitan orientation".115 The most prominent of these are well reviewed and critiqued by Robert L. Thomas.116 Some suggest she was the convert Lydia, the seller of purple from Thyatira who is mentioned in Acts (16:14-15). She was Paul's first Gentile convert to the Christian faith from Europe, the conversion taking place in Philippi. There is, however, absolutely no reason apart from her connection to the city to identify her with the Jezebel of the Apoc.117 E. Schürer is often cited for the argument that she

111 For the historical background to the reference, see Hemer, op. cit., 82-87. Hemer, as most of the interpreters, finds a reference here to "Pergamum's primacy in the imperial cult": ibid., 84; also in Orthodox commentary, "...a city [Pergamus] extremely corrupted by paganism, which is the meaning of the figurative expression 'thou dwellest even where satan's seat is'": Taushev, op. cit., 81.

112 Tacitus, Ann. iii. 37.

113 As C. J. Hemer notes, "[t]hree times Pergamum was the first to receive the honour or repetition of it [the neocorate]...": Hemer, op. cit., 83.

114 "Religion was characteristic of all of them [the collegia], writes Everett Ferguson, "because even the economic stationed were groups of foreign merchants who maintained their national identity in part by preserving their adherence to the native deity of their city or country": E. Ferguson, Backgrounds of Early Christianity. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), 132; see also Wilhelm Liebenam, Zur Geschichte und Organisation des Römischen Vereinswesens. (Leipzig, 1890): cited ibid.

115 Mounce, op. cit., 103.


117 In the Orthodox Church, the Lydia of the Book of Acts is held in high esteem as having believed in the true God of Judaism and then having confessed in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is considered to her honour that her name is thus recorded in the Bible. "Εἶναι μεγαλὴ τίμη τοῦ θεοῦ (Λυδία), τὸ δὲ τοῦ φόνου τῆς ἀναγράφθη".
may have been the Sibyl Sambathe, whose sanctuary was outside the walls of the city.\textsuperscript{118} It would appear, however, as Mounce says, that "[t]his view is unlikely in that it is doubtful that the religious syncretism of the day could have infected the church to the point that a Sibylline priestess could also function so effectively within the church itself."\textsuperscript{119} Charles similarly argues against Schürer's position.\textsuperscript{120} Mounce's own belief that she was probably "some prominent woman within the church"\textsuperscript{121} is far more convincing and is also considered by Charles\textsuperscript{122} and argued for by Robert L. Thomas.\textsuperscript{123} The other mentioned possibilities are conjectures and it is best that they remain as such. Unfortunately, as we cannot properly identify this woman, we cannot place her in a historical context. Nor is there any evidence of her legend being used at any other time. The most plausible interpretation is that in the eyes of John she was the successor to Jezebel of the OT (1Kings 16:31-33, 2Kings 9:22), the wife of king Ahab and devotee of Baal.\textsuperscript{124} She fought for her god to have equal standing with Yahweh, and she was opposed to the divine covenant established between the God of Israel, the king, and the people, preferring instead an absolute monarchy. The 'Thyatiran Jezebel' was a symbol of apostasy and rebellion for this supposedly Christian woman, who was, as Alan F. Johnson writes, "elevated to prominence in the church because of her unusual gifts."\textsuperscript{125} This interpretation receives exegetical support in that Balaam is similarly used in Rev 2:14 in the epistle to Pergamum: he taught infidelity against the Lord to the people of Israel in the OT (Num 31:16). Another proof is that Jezebel's teaching at Thyatira was the same as Balaam's at Pergamum, the practice of immorality and the eating of foods sacrificed to idols.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{118} E. Schürer, "Die Prophetin Isabel in Thyatira, Offenbarung Johannes 2.20", TA (1892), 39-58.
\textsuperscript{119} Mounce, \textit{op. cit.}, 102.
\textsuperscript{120} Charles (Vol. I), 70.
\textsuperscript{121} Mounce, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{122} Charles, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{123} Thomas (Vol. I), 214.
\textsuperscript{124} This interpretation is supported by most commentators including G. R. Beasley-Murray, \textit{op. cit.}, 90-92 and Gerhard A. Krodel, Revelation, (Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1989), 124-127. Krodel writes, "[t]he Old Testament is used to shed light on the present (cf. 2:14). The Gentile queen Jezebel who introduced idolatry and sorcery, magic, into Israel (cf. 2Kings 9:22; 1Kings 16:31) found her successor in the prophetess of Thyatira...": Krodel, \textit{ibid.}, 125.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{cf.} Vict., \textit{In Apoc.} 2.14-16.
There is a possible clue here that could prove very useful. John Sweet believes that Jezebel is one of the models of the harlot Babylon. The proposal commends itself favourably. Jezebel and the harlot are portrayed as alluring and beguiling women: they corrupt the people and they lead them to fornication (cf. Rev 2:20-23 with chap. 17). We have earlier noted that Babylon in the Apoc represents imperial Rome, a city marked by idolatry and godlessness, and that this name was applied specifically to Rome after the destruction of the Temple AD 70 (which similarly to Babylon destroyed the Temple and Jerusalem). If this argument that Jezebel is one of the inspirations for the 'human face' of Babylon can be pressed, then the former figure can be placed sometime between AD 70 and 95.

(v) Kai; tw' ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Σαρδίσης εἴη ἡ Σαρδίς ἐκδεχόμενης ἵνα ἐπελθῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐκκλησίας; ἐπί τῆς ἱερατικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῇ σ φρασίνῃ, χαίροντας, καὶ νεκρὸν εἶναι. (Rev 3:1) Sardis, once great and prosperous, was by the Seer's time in a state of decline. The great earthquake of AD 17 was, according to Tacitus, especially catastrophic here. Pliny spoke of this disaster as "the greatest earthquake in human memory... twelve Asiatic cities being overthrown in one night." Yet in AD 26 it was able to compete against ten other Asian cities for the honour of building an imperial temple, the favour eventually being granted to Smyrna. Rome, however, did make the city an administrative centre for Roman Asia. It was also known for its seemingly impregnable defences owing to being built on a very steep hill. The worship of the Asiatic mother-goddess Cybele along with the emperor cult was prominent there. Most commentators have missed the irony in the words of Christ, "you are alive, but you are dead" (3:1). Cybele was worshipped as the mistress of earth who "reawakened nature to new life every spring," and yet the Church of Sardis was spiritually dead. Of interest, Saint Melito bishop of Sardis (d. AD c. 180), is the first attested commentator of Revelation. There is even less evidence here to help, no names to offer possible clues as to a time of writing. As George Eldon Ladd and

---

127 Sweet, op. cit., 94.
128 Fornication [porneia] is often used in a figurative sense in the Apoc as the worship of idols (14:8, 17:2,4, 18:3, 19:2). Throughout Scripture "[t]he close relationship between Jehovah and Israel is spoken of under the figure of marriage, Israel being the unfaithful wife of the Lord, now rejected but yet to be restored": Merrill F. Unger, Unger's Bible Dictionary, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 378.
129 Tacitus, Ann. ii. 47.1-3, "Sardis suffered worst and attracted most sympathy." See also Strabo 13.4.8, and Dio Cass. 57.17.8.
130 Pliny, Nat. Hist. 2.86; see also Strabo, Geography, 12.579, 13.628.
131 Tacitus, Ann. iv. 55-56.
others point out, "[i]t is significant that nothing is said in the letter about Jewish hostility, about open persecution, or about heretical teaching." The Christian community here is best characterized by spiritual apathy: it is dead of spiritual works and its garments are "defiled" [jemovλunan] (3:4). At most we can say that this lull or lethargy could point to a time of quiet, where Christian and Jewish relations were not so tested, where Rome was not actively engaged in the persecution of the Christians. The only letter that could possibly suggest a date before AD 70.

(vi) Kai; τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Ἐφεσσᾶς ἐκκλήσίας ἔγραψεν ὁ θεός ἐκεῖνος οἱ ἁγίοι, οἱ ἁγιοί ἑαυτοῦ τῇ Κλεῳ τοῦ Δαυίδ, οἱ ἁγιοί καὶ οἱ ἁγιασμένοι· ὁ θεός καὶ ὁ θεός τῆς Κλήρου· (Rev 3:7). Philadelphia, the youngest of the seven cities, was built on a major fault line. The great earthquake of AD 17, which was catastrophic for Sardis, had severe impact here as well. A shrine to Germanicus, nephew and adopted son of the emperor Tiberius, was erected in the city some time around that period. It was also a centre for the pagan cult of Dionysus. However, the Philadelphian church remained faithful: it faced persecution not so much by the state, but by the Jewish community. Three strong references are relevant here that can be used as markers of time. The first of these, "synagogue of Satan" (3:9), I have previously referred to when discussing the message to the Church of Smyrna, in which the phrase first appears (2:9). The second of these is the Seer's mention of "the temple of my God" [τῷ θεῷ μου] (3:12) and of the "New Jerusalem, which comes down out of heaven" [τὴν Καινήν Ιερουσαλήμ] (v.12).

The reference to "the temple of my God" can be interpreted in one of two ways without any violence being done to the text. The Seer may be saying that, though the Christians of Philadelphia have been excommunicated from the Jewish synagogue, they are not to be alarmed, for their temple is not of this world, but rather, theirs is the spiritual temple of God. This could explain Rev 3:7, "...who [Christ] has the key of David, who opens and no one shall shut, who shuts and no one opens." This becomes even more probable when it is realized that the reference to the "key of David" [θῆ κλήν τοῦ Δαυίδ], alludes to Isaiah 22:19-25 and to...

---


135 On the connection of Ignatius' Epistle to the Philadelphians and Revelation 3, see Hemer, op. cit., 168-174.

136 For comment on this cult's influence and a possible allusion by John in the letter, see W. M. Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches, [1994 edition], 301.

137 Hemer, op. cit., 158; a reason for the choice of Dionysus as the principal deity was probably on account of Philadelphia being located in that renowned vine-growing district.
the occasion of transferring the high office of minister of state in Judah from the unfaithful Shebna to the faithful Eliakim. It is important to note here that v.8 literally reads "an opened door" [quvran hjnewgrn]. This is a perfect participle passive which suggests the present consequences of a past action. But equally, and in no way contradictory, it is true that "the temple of my God" is to be understood in the same context as "New Jerusalem." The temple is a spiritual one, and Jerusalem is "new" [kainh']. The city too is spiritual, for it comes "down out of heaven" [katabainosa ek tou' oujrou]. And this because it is after AD 70 and the Temple of Jerusalem has been destroyed, and in that process old Jerusalem was also pillaged and destroyed. This interpretation accords well with Rev 11:1-2,19.

(vii) Kai; tw'/ aġgelw' th'' ēn Laodikiea/ ekkh' hsi'a'' grayonΣ Taule legei ḏa'jhmw, oj nsw'tu' oj piste' ouj; aļ hoijnv, hļajrch;th'' ktimew' tou' qeouΣ (Rev 3:14) Laodicea, an important military outpost and trading centre, was situated in the fertile Lycus valley. Its immense wealth came from the glossy black wool of its famous sheep, its textiles, and from a salve ointment used to treat diseases of the eye. Laodicea was so wealthy that after the earthquake of AD 60 (which devastated the city), the citizens refused imperial help and rebuilt the city entirely on their own. Laodicea also boasted a famous school of medicine and a great temple was dedicated to the god of healing, Men Karou. Here there would also appear to have existed an influential Jewish community. The Church of Laodicea had become complacent; they were neither "cold nor hot" (v.15), and material possessions had deadened their original zeal. What is of interest here is Christ's rebuke to the Laodiceans in reference to the lauding over their wealth, "I am rich, have become wealthy, and have need of nothing" [o drużyn iajni kai; pepl ouwhka kai; oujhe creiaν eįw] v.17. This is very significant if interpreted, as in fact it is by many commentators, in the context of the city's re-emergence after a catastrophic earthquake.

138 The allusion by the Seer to Isaiah 22:ff. is accepted by most commentators as a strong one. See for instance: Sweet, op. cit., 101 and A. F. Johnson, op. cit., 56. Also see Charles who writes,"[a]s Eliakim carried the keys to the house of David in the court of Hezekiah, so does Christ in the kingdom of God: cf. Eph. 1:22": op. cit, 86.

139 Sweet, op. cit., 103.

140 Some have ascribed this to the great earthquake of AD 17 (A. F. Johnson, op. cit., 60). But this does not appear to be correct as C. J. Hemer writes "Laodicea is not mentioned as having suffered at that time [AD 17]": Hemer, op. cit., 193.

141 Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 27.

142 Hemer, op. cit., 208.

143 Morris, op. cit., 83; Paul Barnett, Apocalypse Now And Then, (Maryborough: Anglican Information Service, 1989), 64; and importantly, C. J. Hemer, who writes in one of his conclusions to his study on this particular church, "[i]t is also accepted that the words 'I am rich...' (v.17) allude to the aftermath of the great earthquake of AD 60. It is further suggested that this ostentatious self-sufficiency reached a climax when the
First, before anything definite can be made of this, the date of the earthquake has to be established. Some confusion has reigned here. Does the rebuilding of the city occur after the great earthquake of AD 17 or after the second one of AD 60? There is nothing to contradict C. J. Hemer’s conclusion that it was after the latter one. He writes in a note that explains the reason behind this confusion and helps to clear it up:

There was a different dating in later Christian tradition. In Eusebius, Chron. Olymp. 210.4 = AD 64, it follows the fire of Rome, and Orosius, 7.7.12, makes it one of a series of judgements on the pagan world consequent upon the fire and the Neronian persecution. The testimony of Tacitus should be accepted here [AD 60]. The moralized chronology of Orosius is aptly seen in this confusion of the great earthquake of AD 17 with that at the time of the Crucifixion (7.4.13, 18). Both the later writers link the names of the three NT cities of the Lycus valley as victims of the disaster under Nero, a detail absent from Tacitus. 144

If then, the later date is accepted as evidence suggests, this would presuppose some lengthy period of time for the city to fully rehabilitate not only its trade, but its material infrastructure as well, at least to the point where after such a devastation they could claim ‘to be rich and have need of nothing.’ The date that this letter would indicate is, therefore, somewhere between the late AD 60s at the very earliest, but more probably mid 70s onwards.

The seven letters, as individual witnesses to a time of composition for the Apoc, are not absolutely conclusive. But taken as a group they could testify to an earlier time of composition some time late AD 60s, but more certainly sometime after AD 70. Also the conclusion of Albert A. Bell, Jr., that “[n]othing, therefore, in the letters points to a time of persecution” 145 is not justified. For one, it overlooks the battle motif of twrikwiti which imbues the messages. When the evidence from the seven letters is combined to that of the Temple, Babylon and the Seven Kings, then as a whole it is more than probable that the Apoc was written well after AD 70. When this, in turn, is added to the compelling evidence of the activity of the imperial cult in Asia Minor 146 and to the general theatre of persecution, the date

reconstruction was completed by the erection of great buildings at the expense of individual citizens in the years immediately preceding the Domitianic date of the Revelation. The monumental triple gate thus donated may have been in mind in the writing of Rev 3:20”: Hemer, op. cit., 208.

144 Hemer, op. cit., Chapter 9, fn. 64.
145 Albert A. Bell, Jr., art. cit., 102.
146 There is wide agreement among commentators that the imperial cult looms large in the pages of the Apoc and that chapter 13 is a thinly veiled attack on emperor-worship. It is not difficult to reach such conclusion, for the Seer of Patmos presents to both his readers and listeners vital indications throughout his work. Dominique Cuss, Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament, (Fribourg: Fribourg University Press, 1974), has further corroborated, particularly through in-depth expositions on the ‘Blasphemous Titles’ of the First Beast and the Legend of ‘Nero Redivivus’, that this scholarly consensus is the correct one. S. R. F. Price, Rituals and
points even more conclusively to the time of the unbalanced Emperor Domitian, somewhere towards the latter part of his reign, AD c. 94-96. To this is joined the heavy weight of the early external evidence, that is, the tradition of the Ancient Church.

Conclusion

After our lengthy deliberation, which included a solid review of the scholarly debate and the critical analysis of the external and internal evidence, we have found that the firm tradition established by Irenaeus, that the Apoc was written \( \text{pro\, τῆς} \, \text{Domitianou\, αρχής} \), \(^{147}\) is the most probable. The date of the publication and the historical theatre of the Book of Revelation are a determining factor for most commentators of the work. \(^{148}\) They influence the interpretation of the book and shed light not only on the identity and on the nature of the Seer's adversaries, but also on the opponents of the early church community. For the immediate purposes of this dissertation the date of the text's first "publication" takes on another significant function: it reveals to us the religious and socio-political landscape of the first receivers of the Apoc who were called upon to "hear [\( \text{ἀκούσατε} \)], what the Spirit says to the churches" (Rev 2:7) and who were, in fact, the first actors and critics in the long chain of the canonical adventure. \(^{149}\) This "mode of transportation" \(^{150}\) directly linked to hermeneutics as it was, did not escape the sharp attention of the Seer of Patmos. He was expressly cognizant of his readers' importance for the authoritative, even the purely textual survival of his work. And so he would warn with a 'canonical formula' that no one should "add[s]/ \( \text{ἐπιθῇ} \) or "take[s] away/ \( \text{ἀφῆν} \) from the words of the book of this prophecy" (22:18-19). Not much further

---

\(^{147}\) \text{Adv. haer.} 5.30.3.

\(^{148}\) Frederic W. Farrar has captured this reality with great insight, "[f]or the sole key to the Apocalypse, as to every book which has any truth or greatness in it, lies in the heart of the writer; and the heart of every writer must be intensely influenced by the spirit or the circumstances of the times in which he writes. His words are addressed in the first instance to his living contemporaries, and it is only through them that he can hope to reach posterity. Now if there was ever any book which bears upon every page the impress of reality- the proof that it is written in words which came fresh and burning into the hearts of others- that book is the Apocalypse": F. W. Farrar, \textit{The Early Days of Christianity} (2 Vols), (London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., 1882), 186-187.

\(^{149}\) Gamble has properly described that the "literary consciousness of the author [the Seer], however, in some measure must also reflect the significance of texts in the Christian communities of his time and place. The textual orientation of the Apocalypse is manifest at the beginning. To the title that announces the work and stresses its importance (1:1-2), the author adds a reference to its audience: 'Blessed is the one who reads and those who hear the words of the prophecy and who keep the things that are written in it'” (1:3): Harry Y. Gamble, \textit{Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts}, (New Haven: Yale University), 104. In fairness to Gamble, however, I must add that he does not accept Rev 22:18-19 as a “formula of canonization”: \textit{ibid.}, 105.

\(^{150}\) C. J. Scalise, \textit{op. cit.}, 24.
down the adventure, as we shall have reason to examine very closely, the question of date became supremely significant, for it was immediately connected to the most important of all the criteria of canonicity, that of apostolicity. Ultimately, a dependable approximation of date directly helps to identify whether a particular author could, or could not have, written a specific book in that proposed time-frame for which the claim is being made.

---

151 One of our earliest references to the Book of Revelation, that by the celebrated apologist Justin Martyr (AD c. 100-165), makes specific appeal to John the Apostle as the author of the Apoc, "[a]nd further, there was a certain man with us, whose name was John [νεότητος Ἰωάννης] one of the apostles of Christ [ἐντὸς ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ] who prophesied, by a revelation [Ἐν ἁπαξ ἀποκάλυψις] that was made to him...: Try. Dial. lxxi.
CHAPTER 4
The Genre of the Apocalypse

Introduction
An essential component to most discussions on the Apoc (whether on a hermeneutical or analytical level) is the position of genre: a term "[that] denotes a group of things or beings which have important or distinguishing characteristics in common."\(^1\) Investigations into the factors and/or criteria of canonicity in the context of the Book of Revelation have either completely ignored or down-played the crucial role of genre in the Apoc's canonical adventure and ultimate survival in the NT Canon.\(^2\) The Apoc is the chameleon of the NT; it possessed the intrinsic capability to change its colour to fit in with the changing surroundings of both the ideological environment (i.e. chiliasm) and the diverse tensions in the inconsistent application of the criteria of canonicity. From the functional perspective of communication theory it can be said that it was this "open possibility to meet a certain description"\(^3\) that allowed for the Apoc to remain either on the edges of the developing Canon or to be unreservedly embraced.\(^4\) And it was precisely this open possibility which permitted the Church to meditate on the Seer's great christological and ecclesiological theologies till that time when a universal tradition would emerge to place an official imprimatur on his text.

In the following pages we shall look at apocalyptic as a distinct literature and search for a practical definition through a wide review of recent scholarly writings beginning with D. S. Russell's and Klaus Koch's warning that defining 'apocalyptic' is possessed with inherent difficulties. Next the genre question of the Book of Revelation itself will be discussed with reference to the SBL Apocalypse Group, we conclude with the argument that the Book of Revelation is not one genre, but a fusion of genres: Apocalypse, Prophecy, Epistle.

\(^1\) Richard N. Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 75. Soulen is defining the Ger. *Gattung* which fits perfectly with my understanding of genre as a designation "of larger literary entities": *ibid.*

\(^2\) Perhaps this has to do with the hesitation of a number of modern scholars to connect "réalité" and genre. For example, Barr who writes, "[l]iterary genres and the historical role of a writing can be discussed without immediate involvement in the ultimate questions of reality": James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 36.

\(^3\) See Martin Buss (ed.), *Encounter with the Text*, (Semeia Supplement; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

\(^4\) A telling example is the well-known polemical position of Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25) as compared to the unreserved acceptance of the Book of Revelation by Athanasius the Great (*Fest. Epist.* 39). Note that both were Bishops of the Great See of Alexandria, and both were celebrated with the cognomen "the Great".
The Genre of the Apocalypse

Throughout the chapter it will be kept in mind that genre and hermeneusis are directly related, as are hermeneusis and Canon itself, which Brevard S. Childs and Charles J. Scalise for instance (both working within the canonical approach) do very well to remind us.\(^5\)

Apocalyptic as a Distinct Literature

In a broad sense, the word *apocalyptic* designates ancient visionary writings that purport to disclose the presence and activity of God which would ordinarily "remain hidden from the people."\(^6\) More specifically apocalyptic\(^7\) is a collective term in the Judaeo-Christian tradition applied to a selection of writings concerned with the mysteries of the end of the age, and of the glories of the age to come, which flourished in the Oriental world around 200 BC and AD 100.\(^8\) However, as D. S. Russell (1964) noted more than three decades ago, "...it is often quite impossible to be certain concerning the origin of particular verses or passages or even whole books."\(^9\) Despite this uncertainty concerning dates, the general "matrix of concepts and theological motifs typical of this type of literature"\(^10\) is generally agreed.

Among the Jewish people, apocalyptic as a distinct literature distinguished by the so-called *vertical* (an other-worldly journey) and *horizontal* or *historical* (eschatological crisis) apocalypses, flourished after the decline of prophecy. Although a sharp distinction is often made between the prophet and the apocalyptist (namely, that the former are primarily concerned with the moral demands of God and the latter specifically with the Golden Age), it does not hold well. Strong apocalyptic pieces, for example, are found in Isa 24, Ezek 39, Joel 3, and Zech 8, 9. Equally strong moral admonitions are found in the work of the apocalyptists, for example 1En 15:1-7, 4Ezra 15:1-11, and the general tenor of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. In the Apoc itself the two threads are inexorably interwoven, (*cf*. Rev 2:1-3:22

---


\(^7\) "The subject becomes clearer if apocalypticism is divided into four related aspects: (1) ‘apocalyptic eschatology’, a system of religious beliefs; (2) ‘apocalypticism’ and ‘millenialism’, forms of collective behaviour based on those beliefs; (3) ‘apocalypse’, a type of literature giving written expression to those beliefs; and (4) ‘apocalyptic imagery’, the language and conceptions of apocalyptic eschatology found in bits and pieces in a variety of ancient literary setting": David E. Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987), 227.


with 20:1-22:1). This still remains a much discussed subject. It is best to understand the apocalyptic tradition as a "natural progression or conscious development of the prophetic form."11 A connected form which was adapted to suit a new situation in which the community of Israel and the 'new seers' now found themselves.

**Defining 'Apocalyptic'**

As Klaus Koch has shown, problems in defining the term *apocalyptic* more precisely occur when it no longer is filled out speculatively according to the particular bias of the theologian or philosopher, but has also to be brought into consonance with the historical texts.12 The precise origin of apocalyptic, however, is not clear, and scholars continue to disagree as to its beginnings. This uncertainty has also served to bring to the fore the problem of the definition of apocalyptic genre. For example, which texts according to the principles of the history-of-religions method13 belong with the Apoc and which do not.14 Those writings which are recognized as belonging together, on the basis of comparison, are called apocalyptic after the use of the word *apokalyptikos*15 in the first verse of John's Apoc. In the yet to be agreed Jewish apocalyptic collection are included:16 *Daniel*, First *Enoch* or *Ethiopic Enoch* (c. 164 BC),

---

11 D. S. Russell's chapter the *Decline of Prophecy and Rise of Apocalyptic: Method*, 73-103, remains a standard reference on this disputed subject. Russell's conclusion, in which the role of pseudonymity is finely brought out, is the best way to proceed, "...the apocalyptic, like the prophet, 'foretold' the purpose of God in his exposition of predictive prophecy. But is there here anything to compare with the prophetic 'forth-telling' in which he declares God's message, not for some far-off distant time, but for that very day and hour? At first sight no such comparison is at all obvious; the apocalyptist's utterances are so often couched in terms of the forecasting of the end. Such a judgement, however, is only an illusion brought about by the curious device of pseudonymity which gives the reader the impression of 'prediction proper' rather than of 'history in the guise of prediction'. This device should not blind us to the fact that, from the point of view of the apocalyptic writers and indeed from the point of view of the original readers, the End was not in some far-off time but was imminent. They were vitally interested in eschatology, but to them it was an 'about-to-be-realized' eschatology. The future they foresaw was an immediate future which was about to break into the present. Their message was timely and was directed towards the contemporary situation": ibid., 99. [italics added]; see also Joseph Ponthot, "The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: Features and Purpose of the Literary Genre", *LumV* 40/2, (1985), 153-166, and Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel: From the Settlement in the Land to the Hellenistic Period*, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983), 225-273.


13 A school of interpretation which applies the principles of comparative religion to the study of early Christianity. It holds that as a religion of the Roman Empire, Christianity was a syncretistic faith which borrowed from mystery religions and gnosticism. Also referred to as religio-historical criticism (Ger. *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*). Usually associated with the names of Hermann Gunkel, Johannes Weiss, and Wilhelm Bousset. Its general principles are useful in cross parallel studies of apocalyptic texts.

14 From a paradigmatic view using *The Shepherd of Hermas* (the model) and the Apocalypse of John, see David Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John", *Sem* 36, (1986).

15 This is a representative list taken from M. Eugene Boring, *Revelation*, (Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1989), 38. The dates that he suggests are those proposed by D. S. Russell, *Method*, 36-69. For a good critical summary of these books refer the same; for the collection from the Qumran literature see Boring, *loc. cit.* These books date from the second century BC to the first part of the first century AD.
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Jubilees (c. 150 BC), *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (c. 109 BC), *Assumption of Moses* (AD c. 6-30), *Second Enoch* or the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (first century AD), *Sibylline Oracles*, Book IV (AD c. 80), *Second Esdras [IV Ezra]* 3-14 (AD c. 90), *Second Baruch* or *Apocalypse of Baruch* (after AD 90), and *Sibylline Oracles*, Book V (second century AD). In his critically received work, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (1975), Paul D. Hanson, focusing on the "strand of eschatology" which he sees as "running at the heart" of many of the so-called apocalyptic works, writes:

...the rise of apocalyptic eschatology is neither sudden nor anomalous, but follows the pattern of an unbroken development from pre-exilic and exilic prophecy. Outside influences (e.g. Persian dualism and Hellenism) upon this apocalyptic eschatology appear to be late, coming only after its essential character was fully developed. They are thereby limited in their influence to peripheral embellishments.

Gerhard von Rad has argued that apocalyptic origins are to be sought in the Wisdom tradition and literature; H. H. Rowley writes "...[that] apocalyptic is the child of prophecy", David E. E. Betz accepts apocalyptic as a Hellenistic phenomenon; David E. Aune understands apocalypticism [the "four related aspects" of] as an amalgam of Jewish, Hellenistic, and Near Eastern apocalyptic traditions; M. Eugene Boring also finds an amalgam within a broad stream of Jewish, Christian, and Hellenistic apocalyptic traditions but with only some elements closely related to the Hellenistic writings; H. Conzelmann has argued for an


18 Hanson, *Dawn*, 7f.


21 Hans Dieter Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism", *JTC* 6, (1969), 134-156. "...we must learn to understand apocalypticism as a peculiar manifestation within the entire course of Hellenistic-oriental syncretism." [originally "Zum Problem des religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnisses der Apokalyptik": *ZThK* 63, (1966), 391-409].


23 "Revelation is not a unique literary or theological work but belongs within a broad stream of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic writings, with some elements closely related to Hellenistic writings resembling apocalyptic": Boring, *op. cit.*, 38.
Iranian connection;\(^{24}\) Martin Hengel suggests that apocalyptic should be understood in the context of a wider religious phenomenon in late antiquity;\(^{25}\) G. B. Caird traces the symbolism of the Apoc to the Jewish apocalypticists and to the Old Testament;\(^{26}\) D. S. Russell\(^{27}\) and Walter Schmithals, while acknowledging that apocalypticism draws from diverse sources and apocalyptic currents, nonetheless argue that the phenomenon, in its form, is essentially Jewish. The latter has written:

...it is undoubtedly true that every religious current which may be called 'apocalyptic' acquires this designation by a comparison with Jewish apocalyptic, which, by virtue of the scope of its literary traditions, and of its influence extending down to the present, is the norm for the essence of what is apocalyptic.\(^{28}\)

This renewed interest in apocalypticism of the last three decades or so, the *Apocalyptic Renaissance*\(^{29}\) as it has been called by Klaus Koch in his critical work, *The Rediscovery Of Apocalyptic* (1970), owes much to the following. First, Ernst Käsemann's seminal essay, *The Beginnings of Christian Theology* (1960),\(^{30}\) in which "...apocalyptic was rescued from its obscure status as an odd, specialist field in the history of religion..."\(^{31}\) Second, the emergence of genre as a central tool of hermeneutical theory.\(^{32}\) Third, the contributions as previously

---


\(^{25}\) Hengel calls this "higher wisdom by revelation": Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Vol. I), (1974), 217.

\(^{26}\) "When we begin to ask what John's symbolism means, we shall rightly expect guidance from the Jewish apocalypticists and from the Old Testament...": G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of Saint John*, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1966), 10.

\(^{27}\) "Its roots [apocalyptic] were widespread and drew nourishment from many sources, prophetic and mythological, native and foreign, esoteric and exotic; but there can be no doubt that the tap root, as it were, went deep down into Hebrew prophecy...": Russell, *Method*, 88.


\(^{30}\) "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie", *ZTK* 57, (1960), 162-85.

\(^{31}\) Koch, *op. cit.*, 14.

\(^{32}\) Which is now widely accepted and well documented as early as 1983 by Grant Osborne, "Genre Criticism- Sensus Literalis", *TRJ* 4, (1983), 1-27. A very important question that Osborne asks is whether genre relates to the whole or to the parts as well (p. 3). The scholar's conclusions are balanced, and like Blomberg after him (art. cit.), is concerned with the multiplicity of approaches [that have] continued unabated to the present, (p. 2). Osborne concludes this important paper, which clearly points out the pitfalls of unchecked deconstructionism and the in toto abandoning of the sui generis. He writes at the end, "[g]enre is particularly useful the further the contemporary situation is removed from the ancient culture. It forces one to recognize the proper language game. As such the primary purpose of genre is literary/aesthetic, i.e., it is an epistemological tool for discovering the intended meaning of a text. The apologetic result, i.e., the resolution of seeming discrepancies, is a secondary bi-product of this major goal. Nevertheless, genre is both
mentioned, of the SBL Genres Project (1979) and the International Colloquium on apocalypticism held in Uppsala (1979). Fourth, the work of David Hellholm, including his important essay, *The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John* (1982). And finally, the scholarly response to the fundamentalist interest in Revelation which has heightened during this last decade of our second Christian millennium.\(^{33}\)

### The Genre Question of the Apocalypse

The genre question of the Apocalypse is one that cannot be easily dismissed in most studies dealing with the book, particularly so when this question relates in some way to the hermeneutics of specific pericopes. Will the exegete interpret the Apoc as Jewish Apocalyptic, as Christian prophecy, as a Christian Apocalypse, as an Epistle, as a drama (Greek tragedy), as liturgy, as edict, or other? Authorship and genre are also related, as J. Ramsey Michaels points out, "[b]ecause the author is more likely to be identified in some genres than in others, questions of authorship and genre are intertwined. Nowhere is this more true than in the case of the Book of Revelation."\(^{34}\) As a recognized tool of NT study, analysis of literary genre begins to appear at the end of the twentieth century.\(^{35}\) David E. Aune makes the all-important but fine distinction between *literary genre* and *literary form*. It remains to be seen, however, whether this practical contrast will halt the unabated proposals of new genres:

> A literary genre may be defined as a group of texts that exhibit a coherent and recurring configuration of literary features involving form (including structure and style), content and function. Literary forms, on the other hand, while exhibiting similar recurring literary features, are primarily constituent elements of the genres that frame them.\(^{36}\)

### References


35 See Craig L. Blomberg's excellent review of genre criticism over the past ten years, "New Testament Genre Criticism for the 1990s", *Them* 15/2, (1990), 40-49. Blomberg's conclusion is worthy of note, "[g]enre criticism continues to flourish as the final decade of the twentieth century unfolds. Scholars have clearly abandoned the older positions which viewed the NT writings as largely sui generis, too distinctive from other ancient works to be helpfully classified with them. One must exercise care to avoid the other extreme; the canonical writings do exhibit unique features and combinations of features which fit no known generic moulds. But most readers will gain much insight if they understand the genres to which the biblical materials most closely approximate, and they will be more likely to interpret them in ways appropriate for their literary forms": ibid., 47.

A Review of Recent Scholarship

Scholars do not generally agree on the genre of the Apoc. Each brings their own conclusions of the book to conform to the specific generic form or definition they so choose to adopt. This practice is no doubt inspired by the unnecessary supposition, as G. R. Beasley-Murray rightly highlights, that the "Book of Revelation... has no counterpart in literature by which it may be judged, or from which guide-lines can be supplied. This assumption has encouraged an undisciplined freedom in the elucidation of the book... the unique character of the work is indisputable, but it is a mistake to consider it to be without analogy." The complexity of this question is compounded when it is realized that the author of the Apoc, within the first five verses of his prologue, uses three different "categories of composition" in referring to his work. These categories are 'revelation', (Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) 1:1, 'prophecy' (τοῦ λόγου τῆς προφητείας) 1:3, and the epistolary formula (Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) 1:4. J. Ramsey Michaels finds this uncertainty of composition reflected even in the variety of names by which the Apoc is known: the Book of Revelation; the Revelation of John; the Revelation of Jesus Christ; the Apocalypse; the Apocalypse of John; the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ.

G. R. Beasley-Murray and R. Bauckham argue for the unique combination of three forms or categories of literature, apocalypse, prophecy and letter. C. H. Talbert writes of prophetic/apocalyptic visions within an epistolary framework which "fit nicely into the apocalyptic genre." J. Ramsey Michaels is clear on his position that "the simplest solution to the problem of the Revelation's genre is to consider it a letter." M. Eugene Boring and Jürgen Roloff will emphasize the epistolary form and character of the book.

---

37 "No consensus exists as to a precise definition of genre, so discussions attempting to classify portions of the NT, including Revelation, are at best vague": Robert L. Thomas, Revelation (Vol. 1), (Chicago: Moody Press, 1992), 23.
39 ibid.
40 ibid.
41 "John's book takes its unusual character from its combination in a unique fashion of all three of these forms": Beasley-Murray, loc. cit.; also Richard Bauckham, "[t]hus we must try to do justice to the three categories of literature- apocalypse, prophecy and letter - into which Revelation seems to fall": Richard Bauckham, The Theology of the Book of Revelation, (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 2.
44 "As a letter, Revelation is not a collection of 'ideas' or 'general principles' but a particular message to a particular situation": Boring, op. cit., 7; also Jürgen Roloff, "[i]n summary, Revelation is a prophetic writing
understands the Apoc as a composite worship drama.\textsuperscript{45} James L. Blevins concludes that the writer of Revelation adapted the genre of Greek tragedy,\textsuperscript{46} Robert H. Mounce,\textsuperscript{47} whilst not denying that the Apoc shares characteristics common to the apocalyptic genre, nonetheless follows David Hill who argues that Revelation lacks many of the most characteristic features of that genre (apocalyptic), "[The Book of Revelation]... may justifiably, and probably correctly, be regarded as prophetic in intention and character, especially in its concern with and interpretation of history."\textsuperscript{48} Similarly F. D. Mazzaferrri who sees John (portraying himself) as a prophet from the classical school of Hebrew prophecy.\textsuperscript{49} And finally, what about Brevard S. Childs? Though his clear emphasis of the canonical shape of the Apoc in the context of the author's message is structure,\textsuperscript{50} he sees the Seer writing within a "traditional apocalyptic pattern," but with one major addition (and here Childs acknowledges P. S. Minear):

The crucial theological point turns on the alteration of this traditional apocalyptic pattern which the writer of the book of Revelation effected. On the basis of a new understanding of christology a profound alteration of the apocalyptic tradition took place. The eschatological drama which consummated God's plan for his creation now takes place on two different dimensions of both time and space.\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{The SBL Apocalypse Group: A Comprehensive Definition}

At the start I mentioned two important contributions to the question regarding the definition of apocalyptic genre. The work of the \textit{SBL Apocalypse Group} chaired by J. J. Collins (1979)
and the contributions of scholars from the *International Colloquium on Apocalypticism* (1979) was published under the editorship of D. Hellholm. Collins argued that there were specific elements that were constant in every work that the group had designated as an apocalypse. From this "common core of constant elements", based on the comparative analyzes of a great number of Jewish, Christian and Graeco-Roman apocalypses, including examples from Gnostic and Persian literature, the group formulated what it considered to be a comprehensive definition of the [Apocalypse] genre:

>'Apocalypse' is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by anotherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.

This definition though generally accepted as a good working paradigm of apocalyptic genre has had its critics. David Hellholm, for example, accepts Collins' definition as a "paradigmatically established definition" but finds a weakness in that there is no "statement of function." This is because, so Hellholm argues, that the definition operates on a fairly high abstraction level and it brings to one's mind the question: *why were Apocalypses ever written?*

I would be willing to accept the definition above [Collins'], provided the following addition on the same level of abstraction: "intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation by means of divine authority."

The position of this present thesis writer is that the Book of Revelation belongs to that "genre of revelatory literature" as defined by the *SBL Apocalypse Group* with Hellholm's added...
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qualification, "intended for a group in crisis". Other positions fail to take into good account the fluidity of the apocalyptic genre (for instance J. T. van Burkalow and James L. Blevins), an accommodating form which, as we have seen, is maximized by the Seer himself from the very beginning of his work (Rev. 1:1,3,4). Once the book is placed strictly onto the template of a particular genre it will invariably shift its borders. The strength of the supported definition is that, whilst it fits the book into a specific literary tradition (allowing for a more approximate interpretation), it is neither rigid nor exclusive. It permits of accentuation of other strands and, if needed, further qualification as new research comes to light. But, of course, such a warrant cannot be taken to excess,\(^{60}\) because the definition would then become functionless. The emphasis voiced here is that the "narrative framework" of the Apoc comprises of three forms of literature, apocalypse, prophecy and letter (e.g. G. R. Beasley-Murray, Richard Bauckham). In several instances the categories (apocalypse and prophecy) will share common features, further evidencing the cross-purposes of the genres (for example, strong symbolism, moral admonition, Day of the Lord, the sovereignty of God). The three forms of literature of the Apoc that I will now briefly turn my attention to are specifically related to the Collins/ Hellholm definition. In what way? That they were, at least, in the initial stages of the "canonical journey into hermeneutics",\(^{61}\) intended by the author of the Apoc as literary communications for a group in crisis.

The Three Forms of Literature of the Apocalypse

*The Book of Revelation as an Apocalypse*

(i) the Seer professes to be revealing God's purpose in history (αδει γενεσιν, Rev 1:1, 22:6); (ii) there is an emphasis of God's sovereign design despite the opposition of evil powers (ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, 11:16-18, 16:8, 21:22); (iii) the work is composed in prose episodes; (iv) there is a systematized doctrine of the coming of the Day of the Lord and the Kingdom of God (ἡ παρακάσων τοῦ θεοῦ, 11:15, 12:10); (v) the Seer freely borrows materials from the Old Testament\(^{62}\) (particularly the prophetic

---

\(^{60}\) Much caution should be exercised here, particularly where literary or genre theories may seek to impose western concepts on ancient literature, "[t]he ancient text comes from a culture far removed in time and space from that of the modern interpreter. This distance must be taken into account on our interpretation or else the exegesis will be distorted by reading modern values and presuppositions into the ancient text": Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Vol. 3), (Leicester: Apollos, 1987), 51.


\(^{62}\) It is widely recognized by commentators that the Book of Revelation "contains more Old Testament references than any other New Testament book": G. K. Beale (ed.), *Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New: The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 257. See Chapter 15, "The Use of the Old Testament in Revelation": *ibid.*, 257-276. Precise textual identification, however, is more difficult "since there are no formal quotations and most are allusive": *ibid.*, 258.
works), and makes use of apocalyptic traditions;\(^{63}\) (vi) the entire work is an account of a visionary experience (\(\text{και ἐν τῷ ἔδοξον 1:17, μετὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ 4:1}\)); (vii) intense symbolic imagery and language is evident throughout the book; (viii) the writer of the Apocalypse has a striking interest in numbers.\(^{64}\)

The Book of Revelation as Prophecy
(i) the Seer includes himself with the prophets of the Church (Rev 1:3, 10:7, 11:18, 19:10, 22:6,9); (ii) large portions of the book are strongly reminiscent of the prophetic oracles of the OT (for example, the Letters to the Seven Churches); (iii) the work is permeated with allusions to Old Testament prophecy (for example, the unquestionable Isanianic and Danielic influences); (iv) moral exhortations and admonitions are notable in the tradition of the old covenant prophets (2:5,20-22, 18:4-5 \(\text{cf. Isa 1:27, Jer 8:6, Ezek 14:6, 18:30}\)); (v) the proclamation of God's will is prominent throughout the book (\(\text{γραφὸν οὐν αἱ ἐστίν kai; a} \ \text{μετὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ, Rev 1:19, 22:6}\)); (vi) our author writes in his own name (1:1, 4, 9, 22:8) as did the great prophets before him and "feels no need of pseudonymity."\(^{65}\)

The Book of Revelation as an Epistle
(i) the Seer opens with an epistolary address and salutation resembling the openings to the Pauline letters (\(\text{cf. Rom 1:7, 1Cor 1:2-3 with Rev 1:4, 2:1}\)). He also concludes with the customary doxology (\(\text{cf. 1Cor 16:21-24, 1Thess 5:27-28 with Rev 22:20-21}\); (ii) the first major section of the work (1:9-3:22) consists of the seven letters to the churches in Asia; (iii) the entire work is intended to be read aloud (1:3, 22:18 \(\text{cf. with 1Thess 5:27}\)); (iv) the "explicit contemporaneity"\(^{66}\) of John with his readers; (v) the striking difference between John's apocalypse and the other apocalypses, is that the Seer's work, as J. L. Bailey and Vander Broek point out, "is the only known apocalypse to be enclosed in a letter framework."\(^{67}\)


\(^{65}\) Bauckham, Theology, 11.

\(^{66}\) ibid., 12.

Genre in Canonical Context

Robert W. Wall's and Eugene E. Lemcio's deliberations on this correlation have been of great benefit to my understanding of the chief significance of this question from the perspective of canonical criticism. If the New Testament Canon in its final form is, as the supporters of canonical criticism contend, "the product of an intentioned process", then "the distinctive role Revelation plays in forming the church's faith can be discerned." And that is precisely the crux of the matter. We shall find throughout the entire course of this thesis, particularly in the context of chiliast and post-chiliast readings of the book, that "the history of Revelation's canonization often illumines the history of its interpretation." Even the position of the Apoc within the Canon itself is not without relevance for hermeneutics, confirmed by B. S. Childs, but explained so well by Richard Bauckham, "[n]o other biblical book gathers up so comprehensively the whole biblical tradition in its direction towards the eschatological future... it gives the whole canon the character of the book which enables us to live towards that future." For the interpreter approaching and "reconstructing the history of Revelation's canonization" it is important that he/she be reminded that:

Revelation is not a literary composition in an isolated sense; it has been included in the list of 26 other writings as one part of the canon of Christian Scriptures, the New Testament. The distinctive role Revelation plays in forming the church's faith can be discerned when the interpreter seeks to interpret Revelation to all other writings which make up the whole biblical canon; only then can the whole truth be discerned.

Charles J. Scalise who has put forward a considered and sound defence for the canonical approach to hermeneusis as a "canonical hermeneutics" which is "postcritical" and who understands the patterns of Scripture as offering the "key to a deeper understanding of biblical authority" explains the fundamentals of this position:

70 Wall and Lemcio, loc. cit.
71 ibid., 278.
72 Childs, As Canon, 517.
73 Bauckham, The Theology, 146. The same scholar also speaks of the Apoc as "the Christian Canonical Prophecy": ibid., 144.
74 Wall and Lemcio, op. cit., 279.
75 Scalise, op.cit., 86.
It [canon. hermen.] does not deny the insights of critical scholarship but seeks to incorporate them into a larger pattern. The emphasis on pattern in canonical hermeneutics also finds affinity with traditional interpretation of the Bible, especially with the use of typology to highlight similar situations between diverse biblical texts. Canonical hermeneutics incorporates both traditional and critical biblical interpretation into its more comprehensive perspective.76

In the epilogue to his well-known work, Jesus Christ and The Temple (1980), Georges A. Barrois (himself a convert to Orthodoxy), speaks of The Passing of Figures in the context of his survey of the Hebrew sanctuaries and episodes related to the life of Jesus. This emphasis on pattern referred to above in my reference to Charles J. Scalise, is also the dominant force in Barrois' study where canonical hermeneutics is strongly aligned to Holy Tradition (for "no human being witnessed the resurrection").77 Both, therefore, canonical hermeneutics and Holy Tradition, can be together reasonably viewed as integral components of the parakat achiun of the Apostolic deposit of faith. This is manifestly connected to the:

...economy of Providence which... from the first day of creation to the Amen of the Apocalypse... consists in successive transpositions of the one theme... our salvation from sin and death, and the pageant of biblical history makes us assist to a continuous passing of figures such as each one of them is pregnant with a reality hitherto veiled, whose actualization foreshadows a further revelation and a further achievement.78

Conclusion

Though the Book of Revelation is rightly considered by the majority of commentators to possess a unique character, it has also been correctly said that "it is a mistake to consider it to be without analogy."79 The creation of unrealistic and artificial genres (encouraged by the introduction of literary criticism into the field of biblical studies),80 is not only unnecessary but can also pointlessly perplex the intended meaning of the author. During the past three decades or so, much time has been spent by scholars on the apocalyptic and genre issue and so the literature in this area (as has been documented) is both copious and accessible. The work of the SBL Apocalypse Group and that of David Hellholm, and more recently the astute

76 ibid., 87.
78 ibid., 161.
79 G. R. Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 12.
80 For a critical appraisal (of both the pitfalls and the promises) of the different literary approaches that some biblical exegetes are now using, see Tremper Longman III: op. cit., 47-62.
observations of David E. Aune, have allowed for the intrinsic fluidity of the apocalyptic genre and indeed for the Book of Revelation itself. This has enabled scholars to work within an appreciable definition irrespective of a particular emphasis of category. The tripartite form of the work (*apocalypse*, *prophecy*, and *epistle*) is consistent with the history of the interpretation of the book. Each of these forms when viewed as an "act of verbal communication from sender to receiver" becomes supremely effective as a multifunctional element of genre in canonical discourse in the context of hermeneusis. The high example of this "transvaluation" of categories will be noted in the following chapter on Chiliasm, where mid-stream entire passages (i.e. Rev 13, 20:4-10) had to be reinterpreted with the rise of the first Christian emperor and the consequent revisiting of the millennial reign of Christ. Yet the canonical discourse between reader and text continued through, not only undiminished, but with equal intensity and without iconoclastic responses to the authority of the document. Genre had allowed for a closer approximation of both the limits and exaggerations of the Apoc’s interpretation, permitting substantial flexibility of the criteria of canonicity when the community of believers was pressed to defend its list of divinely inspired books.

81 For the “range of possibilities still open to the interpreter of the Book of Revelation,” see John M. Court, *Myth and History in the Book of Revelation*, (London: SPCK, 1979), 1-19. As Court rightly states in the opening paragraph of his work, “[s]ome methods of interpretation have a remarkably long history of active use; others have moved in and out of fashion in a way that is not unrelated to the history and internal politics of the Christian Church; others are comparatively modern, being based on the scientific techniques of nineteenth and twentieth-century criticism”: *ibid.*, 1.

82 Tremper Longman III, *op. cit.*, 68.

CHAPTER 5
On The Millennial Reign of Christ

Introduction

The principal reason most studies treating the Book of Revelation cannot avoid some reference to chiliasm is that the theology of the second coming of Christ in the Apoc is directly connected with a millennium. Nonetheless, its association with the book has often been over-exaggerated and over-exploited. Millennialism today, like many other ancient or popular icons or symbols in the postmodernist landscape of the 1970s and beyond, has become a "free loading concept." It too has been distorted and reinvented. In the context of this present investigation, however, it is a major and ever-present factor for it played a determining role in the early history of the Apoc's canonical adventure. Its marked influence extends to both the history of the interpretation of the text as well as to the history of Christian doctrine. From the standpoint of reading as a dialectical process, it is highly significant to keep in mind throughout this chapter that the early readers of the text were "informed" and active contributors "to the production of textual meaning." As an implication chiliasm has

1 Richard Bauckham addresses this point very well, arguing that "the theological point of the millennium is solely to demonstrate the triumph of the martyrs": see R. Bauckham, The Theology of the Book of Revelation, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 106-108.

2 Graeme Goldsworthy also points this out when he writes, "...the millennium is not the central theme of Revelation... [i]t is one of many pieces of imagery which contribute to the overall pattern of John's revelation": G. Goldsworthy, The Gospel in Revelation: Gospel and Apocalypse, (UK: The Paternoster Press, 1994), 18.

3 For a contemporary criticism of chiliastic interpretations and theologies from a biblical perspective, see Gary North, Millennialism and Social Theory, (Texas: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990).

4 Tina Pippin's words in the context of her studies on the Book of Revelation are in themselves revealing, "[i]n this postmodern interdisciplinary place in which I find myself, I am often overwhelmed by the possibilities": T. Pippin, Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image, (New York: Routledge, 1999), 118.

5 It is what Salman Rushdie, for instance, wrote recently of the usurpation of Gandhi. The Mahatma's image was commandeered in a campaign for Apple! That Gandhi was a passionate opponent of modernity or that he would almost certainly have found the word processor abhorrent did not matter. "What counts" Rushdie continues, "is that he [Gandhi] is considered to be 'on the message', in line with the corporate philosophy of Apple": TIME, April 13, (1998), 77.

6 G. W. H. Lampe rightly states that the millenarian reign on earth was a "strong belief in the early Church" but which came to be "discredited through its association with Montanism" and later on "because it came to be regarded as a naive piece of literalism": Hubert Cunliffe-Jones (ed.), A History of Christian Doctrine, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 62.

meant different things to different people, but the following definition serves our purpose for
its conciseness:

CHILIASM. The materialistic and sensual aspect of millenarianism, the belief in an
earthly paradise lasting about one thousand years.  

Chiliasm is from the Greek θιλιας, a thousand. The word millennium comes from the Latin
mille, "a thousand", and annus, "year". It is the latter term, millennium, that has come to be
more often associated with both the period and doctrine. From the start it must be made clear
that the chiliasm that will be discussed in these pages has little to do with the religious
movements now associated with millennialism which can assimilate the ideas of almost any
religion or even of a secular ideology. Nor has it much to do with certain segments of
Protestant denominations such as the Adventists (even less still with such groups as the
Jehovah's Witnesses). The holders of such theology, which can also be spoken of as a
philosophy of history in a framework of ideological discourse, are known as chiliasts but
they are generally referred to as millennialists or millenarians. In the context of this chapter
(and of the thesis as a whole) we are concerned with the so-called chiliasm of the Apoc and of
its interpretation by the early ecclesiastical writers. The approach of what directly follows is
influenced from the above-mentioned position of "reading as a dialectical process" between
reader [Early Church Fathers] and the text [the Book of Revelation], that is, "confrontation as
discursive construction."

Ciliav [thousand]
Of the twenty-three occurrences of the word θιλιας in the New Testament [NT] nineteen of
these figure in the Apoc. These references point to multiples of one thousand (e.g. Lk 14:31,
Acts 4:4, Rev 14:3). In the Book of Revelation, however, the word is also loaded with another

---


9 Damian Thompson notes that some modern sociologists have applied the word millenarian to groups
ranging from Islamic Mahdist movements and Melanesian cargo cults right through to Marxism and Nazism: D.
Thompson, The End of Time: Faith and Fear in the Shadow of the Millennium, (Great Britain: Sinclair-
Stevenson, 1996), xii.

10 If we are to understand ideology in its normative use in contemporary philosophy "for a collection of beliefs
and values held by an individual or group for other than purely epistemic reasons" (Peter Railton, art.,
"Ideology", in The Oxford Companion To Philosophy, Ted Honderich (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
1995), 392.

University Press, 1994), 42.
meaning, the eschatological completion to do with end-time events. For example, the host of angels around the divine throne numbers "myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands" (Rev 5:11); the number of the sealed and of the redeemed is "a hundred and forty-four thousand" (7:4, 14:1,3); the great earthquake in Jerusalem kills "seven thousand people" (11:13); the heavenly Jerusalem will measure "twelve thousand stadia" in length, breadth, and height (21:16).

Revelation 20:2-7: The Matter of the Millennial Reign of Christ

This greatly contested pericope from which the whole question of the millennium arises contains no fewer than six references to a period of a thousand years. It continues to encourage acute debate and has been approached from diverse perspectives of interpretation across the centuries:

12

That this was a widely held conviction in the Ancient Church and one favoured by early interpreters of the Book of Revelation cannot be disputed.13 The belief was principally founded

12 Rev 20:2-7, taken literally, is relatively straightforward. Christ will reign on earth for a thousand years, together with the faithful who will share in the material spoils of His victory. A large number of diverse interpretations have arisen, however, because most biblical interpreters (at least since the time of Saint Augustine), have rejected the idea that Christ will reign on earth for a thousand years after His second coming. For a carefully evaluated presentation of the background and of the chief millennial views of Rev 20:2-7, see Millard J. Erickson, Contemporary Options in Eschatology: A Study of the Millennium (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987); the position of the Eastern Orthodox Church is that of amillennialism, of which Augustine (AD 354 - 430) is considered the first major interpreter. This position denies that there is any literal Millennium or physical reign of Christ on earth: de Civ. Dei, xx. 7-9. The one thousand years is symbolic of that period between the First and Second Coming of the Messiah and of the rule of Christ through the Church, in itself a manifestation of the Kingdom of God: see P. N. Trempevela, Dogmatikí (; Tom 3), 448-452.

13 In the Eastern Orthodox confession, where great credence is placed on the consensus of the Fathers, this reality is sometimes down-played. However, the correct position for the Orthodox is that described by Michael Pomazansky, "[i]f it was at one time possible to express chiliasm as private opinions, this was only until the Ecumenical Church expressed its judgement about this. But when the Second Ecumenical Council (AD 381), in condemning all the errors of the heretic Apollinarius, condemned also his teaching of the thousand-year
on the reading of Rev 20:4-5, which was believed to have taught a literal reign of Christ upon the earth in which He would set up a kingdom for a thousand years. Nowhere else in the NT can a case be made for this teaching, though sometimes it is suggested that perhaps Paul expected a millennium when he wrote that the reign of Christ would begin with the resurrection of "those who belong to Christ" and continue until "the end" (1Cor 15:20-28).

However, there is no mention at all of any length of time of that reign, and certainly no talk of a 'thousand years'. Isbon T. Beckwith's detailed response against those who would assign to Paul a belief in the millennium similar to that found in Jewish apocalyptic and in the Revelation of John on the basis of 1Cor 15:20-28 remains superior. His conclusion is worthy of quotation in full:

In reading this entire passage in Corinthians we must keep in mind that Paul sees the End as a whole; with a true prophetic vision which reaches across a timeless interval he seizes here the whole final issue summed in one. He forms neither for himself nor for us a program of processes and movements in a succession of ages. Though millenniums may be conceived to intervene between one step and another in the progress of the kingdom toward its completion, for him all is projected upon the one background of the End. What he sees, and probably all that he would have his readers see, is the certain, absolute triumph of the 'kingdom of Christ and of God' (Eph. 5:5), and the inheritance that there awaits the Christian.\(^\text{14}\)

\begin{quote}
In Other Jewish Writings
\end{quote}

But this is not to say that the idea or concept of a blessed time that precedes the last judgement is not found elsewhere in Jewish writings of the NT period: there are clear parallels.\(^\text{15}\) The millenarian \textit{Weltanschauung}, the idea of a messianic kingdom which will precede the consummation and the coming reign of God, is found in Eth. Enoch 91:12-17, 93:1-14; Sib. 3, 652-660; 2Esd. 7:28-33; Syr. Bar. 29:3, 30:1-5, 40:3. It develops an older view of the hope for the future deliverance and the restoration of the monarchy by a Davidic

---


\(^{15}\) An explicit parallel which Bruce M. Metzger calls "striking", but more than a century earlier, comes from the apocryphal book of Tobit c. 170 BC. Tobit's 'prayer of rejoicing' (13:1ff.) contains a poetic passage which is strongly reminiscent of the Seer's description of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:18-21). The pious author of the apocryphal work writes in part, "Jerusalem will be built with sapphires and emeralds, and her walls with precious stones, and her towers and battlements with pure gold. The streets of Jerusalem will be paved with beryl and ruby and stone of Ophir" (Tob 13:16-17). See B. Metzger, \textit{An Introduction to the Apocrypha}, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 166.
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king, but it has now been combined to that of a universal judgement, resurrection and the new aeon. Eth. Enoch speaks of the "week of righteousness", which can be understood as "the sabbath" or "the rest", but for Esdras the prophesied messianic kingdom would be a duration of "four hundred years." OT passages frequently cited for the reign of righteousness on earth are: Isa 2, 9:6-7, 63:1-6, 65-66; Jer 23:5-6, 30:8-11; Dan 2:44, 7:13-14; Hos 3:4-5; Amos 9:11-15; Mic 4:1-8; Zeph 3:14-20; Zech 8:1-8, 14:1-9. John J. Collins commenting on Dan 2:44 informs us that "the idea of a definitive lasting kingdom is now attested in a Babylonian source from the sixth century, the Uruk Prophecy."

The Thousand Years: To be taken literally or not?
The Seer of Patmos, as is customary with his unique brand of literary borrowing, has absorbed from the Jewish apocalyptic tradition the theology of a temporary messianic reign on earth before the Last Judgement and the New Creation (cf. 2Bar. 40:3; 2Esd. 7:28-9; b.Sanh.99a). But as with his other unique adaptations (for example the Nero redivivus and endtyrant traditions), he has constructed a doctrinal framework to suit his own eschatological projections. As Richard Bauckham has written, John gives the whole picture of the millennium a well-defined and specific function, "to depict an essential aspect of his concept of the victory of the martyrs over the beast." But the whole problem that arose then (as indeed it still does now), is if this picture is supposed to be taken literally, that it is a prophecy of an actual period of a thousand years in the future history of the world.

16 This is best amplified in the Isaianic prophecies of the birth of the Messianic king (Isa 9:1-7, 11:1-16). As Barry Webb writes, "[t]his oracle of salvation (9:2-7) is clearly the climax of the whole movement from darkness to light in 8:1-9:7... this oracle points directly to the coming of the Messiah, the great Son of David and the true light": B. Webb, The Message of Isaiah, (Leicester: IVP Press, 1996), 68f.


18 "This is an ex eventu prophecy", Collins continues, "that extols a king 'who will establish judgements for the land and restore the shrines of Uruk": John J. Collins, Daniel [Hermeneia], (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 170f.

19 Charles Homer Giblin puts this into good perspective in the context of the Seer's use of the OT at least, "[a]lthough Revelation never really quotes the Bible, it refers to or alludes to biblical passages more often than does the rest of the New Testament as a whole. John supposed that his hearers were familiar with it [OT], especially with the prophetic books": C. H. Giblin, The Book of Revelation: The Open Book of Prophecy, (Minnesotam: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 7f. [italics added]

20 For a critical survey of the history of the interpretation of Antichrist and the Seer's adaptation of that tradition, see M. G. Michael, Thesis: Chapter VIII.

21 Bauckham, Theology, 108.

22 ibid.; consider also Paul Tillich who connects the millennial symbol to the NT concept of kairos, "Tillich's insight on the meaning of the millennium was his understanding of Rev 20:1-10 as a rich, imaginative expression of the notion of kairos": Quoted from Raymond F. Bulman, The Lure of the Millennium, (New York: Orbis Books, 1999), 174f. And interestingly, "Tillich argued that the true intent of the millennial passage
If, however, the image is taken literally, as Bauckham writes, who has expressed views on this matter as sober as those of any scholar in recent decades, the "millennium becomes incomprehensible";\textsuperscript{23} which would then make it an almost impossible task of limiting it to its function, namely that of communicating an other worldly reality rather than the description of its actual realization:

But there is no more need to take it [the millennium] literally than to suppose that the sequences of judgements (the seals-openings, the trumpets, the bowls), are literal predictions. John no doubt expected there to be judgements, but his descriptions of them are imaginative schemes designed to depict the meaning of the judgments. John expected the martyrs to be vindicated, but the millennium depicts the meaning, rather than predicting the manner of their vindication.\textsuperscript{24}

Why Chiliasm Flourished as a Theology in the Ancient Church

The chief reasons that encouraged chiliasm to flourish as a theology during the early history of the Church combined in a unique way to forge an eschatological mind-set that would influence the interpretation of the Apoc for well over two centuries. The early holders of this view lived in an age of persecution. It is not quite correct, however, to refer to them collectively as the "Chiliasts" for they were certainly more than that, and it is this appellation that has sometimes exaggerated the movement or wrongly presented it as homogenous.\textsuperscript{25} This was a period in the life of the Church for which they initially thought that the Apoc was written, a view certainly not discouraged by the reading of the book. The persecution language in the Book of Revelation when compared to other apocalyptic literature is far more pronounced.\textsuperscript{26} We find in the Apoc, what I have elsewhere referred to, as a language of martyrdom.\textsuperscript{27} For example, and this list is only representative: \textit{ai̱na} (6:10,12, 8:8, 11:6, 12:11, 14:20, 16:3,4, 18:24, 19:2); \textit{apistanvein} (13:15); \textit{apistanoch} (2:13); \textit{apoghnaskote} (14:13); \textit{apistonei} (11:7); \textit{apistronespi} (6:11); \textit{epifagineun} (6:9, 18:24); \textit{qiye} (1:9); \textit{qiyeu} (7:14); \textit{qiyn} (2:9,10,22); \textit{marturian} (1:2,9, 6:9, 11:7, 12:17, 19:10, 20:4); \textit{nautu} (1:5, 2:13, 3:14); \textit{nautun} (17:6, 22:20); \textit{pascein} (2:10);

of Revelation 20 is far from utopian. To the contrary, it was meant as an actual warning against utopianism":\textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{23} Bauckham, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{25} Consider for example the differing positions on something as fundamental as the place of the New Jerusalem in the order of events: Iren., \textit{Adv. haer.} 5.35.2 \textit{contra} Tert., \textit{Adv. Marc.} 3.24.3. Or even as to the proximity of the millennium itself: Just., \textit{Dial. Try.} 28 \textit{contra} Lact., \textit{Div. inst.} 7.25.

\textsuperscript{26} M. G. Michael, \textit{Thesis}: 210-214.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{ibid.}
pēpeleukismēōn (20:4); peirasĥte (2:10); polōntēn (9:7, 9, 11:7, 12:17, 13:7, 16:14, 19:19, 20:8); ptwma, (11:8, 9); fulakhn (2:10). 28

It is paramount that this reality of oppression is not glossed over by the purported lack of documentary evidence 29 nor by some of the more popular applications of rhetorical theories of apocalyptic discourse (including that of gender). To do this would be to open the book to a whole group of bizarre and fantastic interpretations which are simply not there. 30 As David Aune has importantly pointed out (not denying that orality played a major part in the composition of the Apoc), many modern assumptions about the nature of ancient texts are misleading because "literature and rhetoric were closely connected in the ancient world." 31 The feature which linked these two genres of ancient reading was the fact that these particular texts would invariably be read aloud (a fact of which their authors were not incognizant). And it has already been documented how in such writings the terms "hear" and "read" are frequently used as synonyms, "a phenomenon which occurs in Revelation 1:3." 32 A similar assumption, but from the approach of a different interpretation which equally serves to diminish the reality of the realized violence of the communities to which the Apoc is addressed, is to simply locate the book onto diverse templates of protest literature. 33 Now, as Aune again points out (in the context of literary and social function), this may not be incorrectly understood, yet:

it is precisely this aspect of apocalyptic literature [the protest] most often hidden from the view of modern scholars and in many cases irrecoverable. 34

28 ibid.

29 When scholars begin their review of ancient literature for signs of the early persecution of the Church they will often underestimate or even overlook the evidence from within the NT itself. An example is found even in Adela Yarbro Collins' widely acknowledged study, Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984), 69f. Good evidence from First Peter (4:12-13, 17) and Epistle to the Hebrews (10:32-34, 11:36-38, 13:23), is quickly dismissed.

30 A telling example would be Tina Pippin's previously cited Apocalyptic Bodies (1999), wherein she presents a survey of recent representations of "apocalypse" (which is defined as "anxiety over and preparation for the end of time") in modern texts, art, music, and popular culture. Some fantastic conclusions of readings of the Apoc are: a narrative written by someone on hallucinogenic drugs, (p. 97), the joy of apocalyptic sex and homoeroticism (p. 117ff.), the question is even asked whether the Apocalypse is pornographic (p. 92f.).


32 ibid.

33 But as Pablo Richard has shown in "a fine example of Liberation Hermeneutics" (F. F. Segovia), the powerful element of social protest can be retained at the highest level of the hermeneusis of the Apoc without diminishing the reality of persecution experienced by the early communities to which the book was addressed: see P. Richard, Apocalypse: A People's Commentary on the Book of Revelation, (New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 3-5.

34 Aune, loc. cit.
The Apocalypse

More recently (encouraged by the millennial fervour that our generation has just witnessed) some impressive and some not so impressive literature has appeared attempting to interpret the millennium theology of the Book of Revelation and of apocalyptic in general. The more sober and more useful of these works have approached these millennial matters from critically sound theoretical frameworks. The most popular of these frameworks is that of rhetoric.

The Persecution

The Seer himself was exiled on the isle of Patmos "on account of the word of God and testimony of Jesus" (Rev 1:9). He also "shares" in the "tribulation" and the "patient endurance" (1:9). He exhorts the faithful of the churches to resist any attempt to make them give up their faith. The description of the compulsory worship of the beast (Rev 13) is a direct reference to the imperial cult of Rome and to emperor worship. At a historically precise time in the life of the Church when

---

35 Note, for example, Raymond F. Bulman's refreshing admission in the preface to his book: op. cit., xi.

36 Such works would include: Gary North's, Millennialism and Social Theory, (Texas: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990), which offers a biblically based critique of humanistic social theories that have usurped the unique version of the Christian millennium. Stephen D. O'Leary's well presented study, Arguing the Apocalypse: A Theory of Millennial Rhetoric, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), is a critical historical approach from the perspective of rhetorical theory and criticism. Damian Thompson's, The End of Time: Faith and Fear in the Shadow of the Millennium, (Great Britain: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1996), is a strong survey of millenarian and apocalyptic traditions approached from an "End of Time" context which the author argues "is one of the great driving forces of history" (xv). Jacques M. Chevalier, in a highly original work, A Postmodern Revelation: Signs of Astrology and the Apocalypse, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), argues that the heavenly imagery of the Book of Revelation is the key to the Apoc's interpretation and that it should be sought in the disciplines of ancient astromythicism and contemporary semiotics. Richard Kyle, Awaiting the Millennium: A History of End-Time Thinking, (Leicester: IVP, 1998), is an accessible presentation from the descriptive history approach but (as the author himself admits, has little critique of end-time views (11). Ulrich H. J. Körtner's, The End of the World: A Theological Interpretation, (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), [orig. publ. as Weltangst und Weltende, 1988], is an acknowledged work which deals with the theology and philosophy of apocalypticism (starting from a phenomenological description) in order to develop a "theological theory of apocalyptic world anxiety" (21). Thomas Robbins' and Susan J. Palmer's edited contribution, Millennium, Messiahs, and Mayhem: Contemporary Apocalyptic Movements, (New York: Routledge, 1997), is a collection of engaging essays from a variety of millennial perspectives which range across the political and social spectrums. Raymond F. Bulman provides an insightful discussion in his book: op. cit., The Lure. He starts from the belief that the millennium is a symbolic moment witnessing to the power of grace in history and that it has been taken over by apocalyptic literalism. Mention should also be made of the Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II, Tertio Millennio Adveniente, (1994), inspired by Heb 13:8 and the theology of the Incarnation as the prerequisite for the sending of the Holy Spirit.

37 O'Leary, loc. cit.

38 There is general agreement among commentators that the imperial cult looms large in the pages of the Apoc and that Chapter 13 is a thinly veiled attack on emperor-worship. It is not difficult to reach such conclusion for the Seer of Patmos presents to both his readers and listeners vital indications throughout his work. Dominique Cuss, Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament, (Fribourg: Fribourg University Press, 1974), has further corroborated, particularly through in-depth expositions on the 'Blasphemous Titles' of the First Beast and the Legend of 'Nero Redivivus', that this scholarly consensus is the correct one. A decade later S. R. F.
Christians were tempted to compromise their faith in order to avoid suffering, the Apocalypse constantly calls for endurance and steadfastness, and importantly, it extended the promise of an everlasting ecstatic rapture (Rev 21, 22). The celebrated pericope cited also by Origen in the context of a discussion on the "entrance of souls into divine things," is the great declaration "from the loud voice from the throne" (as the holy city prepared as a bride comes down out of heaven from God) of the promise of the "new heaven" and the "new earth" when the "former things [including mourning, crying, and pain], have passed away":

1 Kai; eidon oujron kai non kai; gh' kainhν kai gar prw'to' oujard; kai; ἥ prw'th gh' aphiλγαν kai; ἥ φαλασα ouk eστιν eπι. 2 kai; thn poiκιν thn agiaν Ἰερωσαλημ kai n τιν εἰ τού oujronou' apod; tou' peo' ἕκατανθαιναν ἐν νυκτιν ἡ κογνησθαιναν των Ἰηνδρικαν; aujιν. 3 kai; ἡ κογνησθαιναν μεγαλιν' ἐν τού peo'ou leγον'ειν': ἣν ὑστορίν; tou' peo'ou μετα; των αἰνικρων, kai; σκιννηρεῖ net! aujιν; kai; aujι; lαι; aujι; eστοικται; kai; aujι; δ' ὑστορίν; net! aujιν; eσται ταujιν; peo'ou, 4 kai; εγκελαριναν ἐκ των ἐπι τού ραμνιν aujιν; kai; ἔγκελαριναν ouk eσται eπι oufε peαρντ; oufε kraugh; oufε poκοντ; ouk eσται eπι, αἰνιγον'ta; prw'ta aphiλγαν. (Rev 21:1-4)

These were years of a realized physical and mental suffering for the believers, who lived in fear of imprisonment, torture, and even death. Though it appears more historically accurate to view these outbreaks of persecution as intermittent and short-lived, there is equally no doubt that they occurred over a long period of time, that they were severe and that they were ordered by Rome. Chiliasm offered an idealistic and interiorized way out of the sponsored fear that

Price, in a landmark study (Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), established by sound reference of the primary sources and critical evaluation of secondary material, confirmed the earlier conclusions of Cuss. In one part he states, "[t]he interpretation of Revelation in general and of this passage (Ch. 13) in particular is notoriously controversial, but there is general agreement that the work refers at least in part to contemporary circumstances and has special reference to Asia... [t]he beast from the sea clearly represents the power of Rome, and the second beast symbolizes a local authority concerned with the worship of the beast from the sea. Disagreement over the interpretation arises when one tries to go beyond these agreed and obvious points": ibid., 196f.


40 Contra Cels. 6.23.

41 Some scholars will speak of the toleration of the Jewish religion under the Romans, but as Peter Garnsey says, "[t]he Roman beneficium to the Jews, however, was not secure; it had to be renewed with every change of government. Moreover, those Romans who were friendly to the Jews were guided primarily by political considerations, not moral principles. And the initiative always came from the Jewish side": W. J. Sheils (ed.), Persecution and Toleration, 10.

42 For the particulars, given the range of the conflicting evidence, we cannot be dogmatic. The sources are, nevertheless, definite on this: at one time between the reigns of Nero and Domitian, Rome directly assaulted the Christian church and many Christians were killed. For sources to do with the persecutions of the immediate emperors, see Leon H. Canfield, The Early Persecutions of the Christians, (New York: AMS Press, 1968), 176-
the state could inspire, it was in a sense, a deadening of the pain of persecution. The early
Christians released the angst of their oppression by focussing their anger and frustrations on
the institutions and leaders that threatened and harassed them. This was also an internalised
need, a psychological retreat, which was supremely met by the Apoc. John Gager would call
this the Book of Revelation's "therapeutic function".43 The salient imagery supplied by the
Seer, with its uncompromising portrayal of the overthrow of the satanic powers and the
establishment of a new world order, was particularly compelling to the first "informed
readers" of the book. Not unlike the Book of Exodus many centuries before it, the Apoc
brought to the people of the New Covenant the promise of deliverance. The text, like the early
community itself, "oscillates", as Stephen D. O'Leary has characteristically said, ". . . between
terror and triumph."44

209. This persecution was widespread in the sense that it could break out anywhere in the Empire. The mistake
has been made however, to equate 'widespread' with the extent of the persecution. Though disputed it is possible
that "a legal disposition against Christianity existed in the 1st century even though it did not determine specific
rules on procedure": Joseph Plescia, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted", LatL (1971), 120. Here is
another way of explaining the apparent contradiction between secular and Christian sources. There is strong
evidence that accords with the uncoordinated course of Rome, the waveriug of the Emperors, and the impulses
of the local governing authorities and prefects, that there were periods of respite (Clem. Epsit. Cor. V, Plin.
Letters 10:96-97). This would explain the two almost differing reports that have come down to us concerning
the policy and behaviour of Domitian. Is it not possible that there were waves of persecution? Both Hegesippus
and Tertullian speak of Domitian rescinding from his actions and of "peace being established" (Hist. Eccl. 3. 20,
Apology V). Furthermore, Lactantius also writes that for a time Domitian "ruled in safety" (De moribitis
persecutorum III). Each group emphasized that part of the history of the primitive Church that was relevant or
significant for them. For the greater part this has been the practice of the universal chronicler. G. R. Elton
writes, ",[t]emperaments differ: some historians like to see 'profound significance' (usually of a morally based
kind) at every turn; others take a delight in discovering only the commonplace or petty or accidental...[p]erhaps
the historian's most difficult handicap - much worse than any mere prejudice- lies in his inevitable hindsight": G.
R. Elton, The Practice of History, (1967), 127. It is this apparent 'indecisiveness' of our records that has led to
much argument and unnecessary exaggeration of conclusions. Apologetic rhetoric on the one side, and
academic resolve on the other, has clouded the alternate and most likely path that our sources point to: a
widespread and violent persecution, encouraged and supported by Rome, at the caprice of local governing
authorities, and of limited durations. An 'indecisiveness' which is also hinted at by the Seer himself through his
use of the aor. subj., notably in 13:15. ἄρει ὑπὲρ οὐδεὶς ἡ πρόσκυνσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ
apokargysin. Christianity was especially signalled out on account, that unlike Judaism for example, it was a
religio without a political basis, "hence a superstition" under political suspicion": Joseph Plescia, art. cit., 123.
They (the tribulations), are both present and future, for the author of the Book of Revelation understands them in
the context of the eschatological ordeal (and so the mixture of grammatical tenses of time). For the use by the
author of the Apoc of the durative, aoristic, futural, and perfective categories, see G. Mussies' exhaustive work,
A persecution 'that was', 'and is', and 'will be' (a time frame familiar to the Seer, cf. Rev 17:11). G. Mussies
writes of the "shifts of time" in the Apoc. He attributes these 'shifts' to the apocalyptic genre: ibid., 349.

43 Gager, loc. cit.
The Prediction of the Assuagement

This idea, then, the prediction of the assuagement of the oppressed as experienced by the Early Church community, can be understood as a displacement or projection of an archetypal or collective nature. It can be viewed in terms of an acute internal conflict which is not resolved as an interior situation in its own realm, but experienced vicariously as if it were encouraged by an outside reality, an actual political or cosmic struggle. This is not a simple personal event about the idiosyncrasies of an eccentric writer or a private individual. It is rather, as J. N. H. Perkins describes a violent upheaval of a very deep archetypal origin, non-personal and as interiorly objective as outer social-political or cosmic events are themselves. This does not mean that there is no connection to outward things, as some interpreters of the Apoc have wanted to imply. That would be something akin to the "belief in the dream as a revelation" that we readily meet with in the literature of the ancient Near East, "and is present in our earliest Greek documents, the poems of Homer."

A few years before the First World War, Carl Jung (1875-1961), the famous Swiss psychiatrist and psychologist, dreamed of oceans of blood flooding Europe but not touching Switzerland. He feared insanity until the war broke out. But the dream was not so much a forecast of outer events, as an access to the inner psychic-spiritual situation that eventually gave rise to the outer catastrophe. The displacement is not from simply personal conscious things to a larger sphere, but an exterior version of an interior objective event. Another example could focus on the Russian messianism literature of the 1800’s and the sociological and political consequences of that movement, evident for instance in the work of Dostoyevsky. The question regarding such things, Perkins explains from the psychotherapist perspective, is not whether they are true, but where, or on what level they are properly valid.

---

45 For the helpful commentary and academic references to Carl Jung that follow, I am especially indebted to the Jungian psychotherapist, John N. H. Perkins, B.D. From: "John N. H. Perkins" <baracks@pluto.njcc.com> Date: Wed 28 Apr 1999, Subject: C. G. Jung, To: "Michael George Michael" <mgmichael@shoalhaven.net.au>.

46 This becomes especially problematic if we move outside the original intent of the author (of which there is general agreement) and seek to impose 20th century meta-readings on his text. Gender analysis is a prominent example which is connected to a critique of patriarchal religion. And so, for instance, Sonia Johnson, "an ex-Mormon radical feminist… preaches a message of lesbian apocalypticism": cited in Robins and Palmer (eds), op. cit., 162f.

47 "Dreams in Ancient Greece", in Richard L. Gregory (ed.), The Oxford Companion to the Mind, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 203. Note especially the distinction between "significant" and "non-significant dreams".


49 Perkins, loc. cit.
The rivers of blood episode is recounted in Jung’s autobiography and it is worthy here of quotation in full:

In October, while I was alone on a journey, I was suddenly seized by an overpowering vision: I saw a monstrous flood covering all the northern and low-lying lands between the North Sea and the Alps. When it came up to Switzerland I saw that the mountains grew higher and higher to protect our country. I realized that a frightful catastrophe was in progress. I saw the mighty yellow waves, the floating rubble of civilization, and the drowned bodies of uncounted thousands. Then the whole sea turned to blood. The vision lasted about an hour. I was perplexed and nauseated, and ashamed of my weakness. Two weeks passed and then the vision recurred, under the same conditions, even more vividly than before, and the blood was more emphasized. An inner voice spoke, ‘Look at it well; it is wholly real and will be so. You cannot doubt it.’ That winter someone asked me what I thought about the political prospects of the world in the near future. I replied that I had no thoughts on the matter, but that I saw rivers of blood. I asked myself whether these visions pointed to a revolution, but could not really imagine anything of the sort. And so I drew the conclusion that they had to do with me myself, and decided that I was menaced by a psychosis. The idea of war did not occur to me at all. Soon afterward, in the spring and early summer of 1914, I had a thrice repeated dream that in the middle of the summer an Arctic cold wave descended and froze the land to ice. I saw, for example, the whole of Lorraine and its canals frozen and the entire region totally deserted by human beings. All living green things were killed by the frost. This dream came in April and May, and for the last time in June 1914. In the third dream frightful cold had again descended from out of the cosmos. This dream, however, had an unexpected end. There stood a leaf-bearing tree, but without fruit (my tree of life, I thought), whose leaves had been transformed by the effects of the frost into sweet grapes full of healing juices. I plucked the grapes and gave them to a large waiting crowd. . . On August 1, the world war broke out. Now my task was clear: I had to understand what had happened and to what extent my own experience coincided with that of mankind in general.50

Interpreters of the Apoc in the Second and Third Centuries
A good number of the Apoc’s interpreters in the second and third centuries held to a chiliastic conviction.51 They believed that the Christians who had already died would rise from the grave when Christ returned to earth, and, together with the believers who were still alive, inherit an earthly paradise and reign with Christ for a thousand years. The martyrs would hold


51 Michael Pomazansky, a Russian Orthodox theologian, admits to the reality of this interpretation and lists some of these writers (which is sometimes difficult for an eastern interpreter to concede without some type of further qualification): see Michael Pomazansky, Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, [trans. Seraphim Rose], (California: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1997), 341-344.
the great distinction of all the loyal believers in this new age of material prosperity. Such an eschatological expectation, when surrounded and compressed by the uncertainties and injustices of the present age, was a future prospect that was welcomed. The great restoration would come, albeit through great and unimaginable suffering for those who would remain steadfast and endure according to the promise of the prophecy (Rev 2:7, 6:9, 7:13, 22:1-9). The compression of uncertainty and the evolution from hellfire warning to victorious proclamation from within the context of a "fluid succession of presents" (as Joyce himself says of his well-known work), is a key element of the Dubliner's semi-auto-biographical novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916). Now, this is clearly not the place for me to launch into a critical analysis of Joyce's technique of *stream of consciousness* and the coining of word blends, but an argument could be made of his use of time and space and his obvious demonstration to immerse the reader into his own emerging consciousness as comparative techniques with the Apoc. However, what has also struck me at times, is the proximity of Joyce's philosophical understanding of time throughout his works in connection to Augustine's own theological concept of the eternal present. This is of noticeable interest, because as we know, Augustine was one of the great supporters and interpreters of the Book of Revelation. This brief excursus might appear to be exaggerating the point, but I may have found some good support in Jean-Pierre Prévost:

To penetrate the world of the Apocalypse is to enter into a fantastic universe in which symbols are linked or clash, without ever giving the reader a break. It is almost like a twentieth-century video-clip.

---

52 P. S. Minear has written with good clarity what these "promises" suggest as to the view of the Church which are established on "John's vision of Jerusalem": Paul S. Minear, *Horizons of Christian Community* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1959), 70-73.

53 See Alter's fascinating discussion of James Joyce's connection to the Bible (especially the literature of ancient Israel) as a "fundamental allusive matrix": Robert Alter, *Canon and Creativity: Modern Writing and the Authority of Scripture* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 151-183.


55 Of course, it should be stressed here, that the author of the Book of Revelation is very much concerned with order and differs from "the seemingly random mingling of thoughts" that has come to characterize the *stream of consciousness* movement: Beckson, *op. cit.*., 240. What I am looking at is more of the effect, consequence and goal, rather than the technique *per se*.

56 For Saint Augustine and the eternal present, see *Confessions*, Bk 11.20. See also Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1991), 351-353. I should add that Augustine was the middle name of James Joyce!

57 "For which reason also the Apostle John writes to the seven churches (Rev 1:4), showing in that way that he writes to the totality of the one Church": *De civ. Dei*, 17.4.

The Unpredictable Realm of the Early Christian Communities

The Christian communities, similarly to the persecuted Orthodox many centuries later under the murderous Bolshevik/Stalinist regime, were at once subject to other menaces that all the denizens of the Roman Empire had to face. The classics scholar, U. E. Paoli, has written of the assault to the senses even from an architectural standpoint, "most people fail to appreciate how constantly and completely the appearance of ancient Rome changed, that within a very short period it might alter out of all recognition." Civil wars and the threat of the Empire disintegrating from internal insurrection served to further tensions between Rome and the minorities. Awful plagues, as well, lasted for years and severe famines struck the Empire. The rebellion of the Jews against Rome that began in AD 66 culminating in the merciless attack on Jerusalem and the destruction of the magnificent Temple in AD 70 (famously described by Josephus in the Wars), would also leave an indelible mark on the collective consciousness of the early community of the faithful. On another front, the Empire itself had to face external threats as enemy armies made forays into its extensive borders. In the third century the Goths proved ominous, taking the Roman province of Dacia and crossing the Danube to rule its entire territory through to the Black Sea. Illyricum and Thrace were plundered and burned; at around this time, Matthew Bunson says, "Asia Minor was wide open for pillage and treasure." Raids were carried through to Chalcedon, which was burned, to Bithynia, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Cappadocia, other major cities. Such was their threatening presence that in the fourth century the raiders were permitted to live within the empire itself, but more revolts followed. Here, too, Christians were at risk of losing their lives and of being called to give "testimony of Jesus" (Rev 1:9), as

59 See Edvard Radzinsky, Stalin, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1996), 237f; see the same work throughout for the author's brilliant glimpses into the Bolshevik use of apocalyptic narrative and Stalin's rhetorical intimations of the Apoc. The paranoid Soviet leader had studied the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation as a seminarian; see also Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church, (London: Mowbrays, 1970).


61 For a list of these disasters that the Seer, himself, might have been referring to in his own prophecy, see J. Massyngberde Ford, Revelation, (New York: Doubleday, 1975), 108f.

62 The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William Whiston, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), Vol. I, 351ff; it is not without significance that the writings of Josephus initially forgotten by "the Jewish community… were preserved in the Christian Church": ibid., Foreword.


65 ibid.
were faithful communities afterwards. For these "first urban Christians" the desert was yet to become the 'not of this world' option, nor was it a simple matter of crossing the border. Lactantius (AD c. 240-320), the "Christian Cicero", writes of the devastation that these early believing communities must have felt "as the end of this world approaches" and of the prophetic presentiment of the change of the empires. And similarly to the Seer of Patmos before him, uses especially the Danielic apocalyptic mise en scène to describe the "dread[s]" (Dan 7, 8):

And my mind dreads to relate it, but I will relate it, because it is about to happen... the cause of this desolation and confusion will be this; because the Roman name, by which the world is now ruled, will be taken away from the earth, and the government return to Asia; and the East will again bear rule, and the West be reduced to servitude. [italics added]

In considering such outside perils in the context of the "sixth bowl" (Rev 16:12-16), Massyngberde Ford reminds us "war" appears as one of the "curses" in both the Levitical and Deuteronomic lists. "However", she continues, "the irony of the sixth bowl lies in the fact that on at least two occasions water "stood still" so that the Israelites could pass over safely." This good news, of course, could not escape the attention of the believing "communities of the Last Days", for they were absorbed in the literature and drama of the OT and could make the necessary prophetic associations. Eugen Weber's generalization in this context of eschatological conviction at a time of crisis is manifestly correct and well documented across the centuries when he writes (following Henri Focillon), that "periods of dislocations and societies that are deeply troubled tend to give an apocalyptic interpretation to history." Or as

---

66 "Before it was the general custom to count the years from the birth of Christ", Ricciotti informs us, "many Christian communities used a system which reckoned from the age of the martyrs-beginning with the first year of Diocletian's rule"; Giuseppe Ricciotti, The Age of Martyrs: Christianity from Diocletian to Constantine, (USA: Barnes and Noble Books, 1992), v.


70 Div. Inst. 7.15; also see Wilhelm Bousset, The Antichrist Legend, trans. A. H. Keane, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 79-82, for Lactantius' theological motivations as he surveyed his compressing environment.

71 Massyngberde Ford, op. cit., 273.

72 The title of C. Marvin Pate's informative recent study, Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel, (Leicester: Apollos, 2000).

R. E. Clements says after his reading of the famous Isaianic promise (Isa 11:6-9), "[i]t is the ending of violence in all its forms which establishes the primary focus of the future promise." When we speak of chiliasm, per se, the words of The Preacher are here not out of place, "...and there is nothing new under the sun" (Eccl 1:9).

The Beginnings of Chiliasm
The Ancient Testimony of Papias

The first Christian writer known to hold these views of chiliasm was Papias (AD c. 70-160), bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor. Though his works are long lost and no direct statements by the bishop about the millennium survive, there is little doubt that he was indebted to the Apoc. Papias, according to the historian Eusebius who was hostile to chiliasm himself, not only based his belief on a misunderstanding of the "apostolic accounts", but was also of "very limited understanding" [σφόδρα σμικρότερην]. It is quite likely, as most scholars would agree, that other early chiliasts either derived their views from him or were at least influenced in their own speculations. Saint Irenaeus preserves without censure the coarse views attributed to the "elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord... and borne witness to in writing by Papias, the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp..." He goes on to say:

The days will come, in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and in each ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and in each one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and on every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed will give five and twenty metres of wine. And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, "I am a better cluster, take me; bless the Lord through me."

---

74 Peter J. Harland & Robert Hayward (eds), New Heaven & New Earth, Prophecy & the Millennium, (Brill: Leiden, 1999), 85.
75 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.39.12.
76 Ned Bernard Stonehouse's reasoned deductions on this matter, in which he takes into account the writers who knew of Papias' work (primarily his Exposition of Dominical Oracles), and also the fact "the contemporaries of Papias used the Apocalypse as an authority", are strong reasons to hold this position. See N. B. Stonehouse, The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church: A Study in the History of the New Testament Canon, (Goess, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929), 7-9. These indications will be examined closely in the later chapters of the thesis.
77 Hist. Eccl. 3.39.12.
79 Adv. haer. 5.33.3.
The Other Ancient Witnesses

It is highly significant that the first writer whose thoughts concerning the Apocalypse have directly survived, Justin Martyr (d. AD c. 165), held strongly to the chiliastic view. We meet with the doctrine also in the Epistle of Barnabas (AD c. 100). Other prominent ecclesiastical writers of the Ancient Church who were similarly in favour of the belief, in varying degrees, however, subject to their own particular appropriation were: Irenaeus (AD c. 130-200), Tertullian (AD c. 165-225), Hippolytus (AD c. 170-230), Victorinus (d. AD c. 304), Lactantius (AD c. 240-320), and Methodius (d. AD c. 311). And each one of these theologians, as we will register at the proper time, a distinguished supporter of the Book of Revelation, whose conceptions on the subject would influence authors well into the future; not least "the apocalyptic testimonial style in their use of the first person." 

We are inevitably shaped and fixed firmly to our times. Outside revolutionary theo-ideologies such as apocalypticism (or the science-fiction genre with the emphasis on evolutionary change) there is no 'fleshy' escaping of our history. And so it is not without relevance, as A. W. Wainwright will similarly underscore, that most of these writers who would seek 'escape' endured persecution or suffered on account of their belief. Justin and Victorinus it is known were put to death, Methodius also evidently died a martyr. Hippolytus was exiled and also...

---

80 Dial. Try. 80.
81 Barn. 15.
82 Adv. haer. 5.30.4; 5.33.1- 35.2.
83 Adv. Marc. 3.24.
84 In Dan. 4.
85 In Apoc. 68.2; 21.1.
86 Div. inst. 7.24.25.
87 Symp. 9.5.
88 Stuart Weeks, "in Harland and Hayward", op. cit., 169.
90 Wainwright, op. cit., 23.
91 The account of Justin's death (by beheading) in AD 165 during the prefecture of Junius Rusticus is related in the Martyrdom of the Holy Martyrs considered among the most trustworthy of the Martyria and based upon an official court report: see Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Vol. 1), (Maryland: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986), 197. Victorinus also "received the crown of martyrdom" AD c. 304 during the Diocletian persecution: De vir. ill. 74.
92 See Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Vol. II), (Belmont: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986), 129.
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martyred, whilst Lactantius "the Christian Cicero", lost his prestigious post as a teacher of Latin rhetoric. Irenaeus was not martyred in the flesh, but his tutor Polycarp suffered martyrdom "most nobly", whilst "the blessed Pothinus", his predecessor as bishop of Lyons, died from the aftermath of a vicious assault. For his part, Tertullian the first Christian theologian to write a major corpus in Latin, was prepared to suffer martyrdom and exhorted against flight from persecution with the famous lines:

The oftener we are mown down by you, the more in number we grow; the blood of Christians is seed.

Much closer to our time the graphic but poignant poetics of the so-called "war poets" is a gripping example of an apocalyptic empathy that can be established between writer/reader in times of doom and despair. These soldier-poets surrounded and compressed by the ferocious enemy, were also prepared to sacrifice their lives and to "martyr" for the collective ideological belief. The millennial paradise for these men, however, lay far enough away, anywhere, from the bloody and merciless theatre of combat. Consider for instance the poetry of Wilfred Owen (1893-1918) "[h]appy are men who yet before they are killed/ Can let their veins run cold"; and Siegfried Sassoon (1886-1967) "[a]nd hope, with furtive eyes and grappling fists/ Flounders in mud. O Jesus, make it stop!" In the Second World War Meville Hardiment reflects on the order of the day, "[t]he Lord is with us, saith the General, Behold His doing; war is nearly done." Also Eric De Mauny petitions in the form of a litany, "Lord, let it not be in vain: as we cannot escape, give us courage/ Lord, let it not be in vain: distinguish the dog from the rabbit." A contextual relation between this type of "military" literature and the sensory and figurative representations in chiliastic writing can be established. Images of soldiery and battles and wars are not at all lacking in the commentary of early (and of course, later) interpreters of the Apoc. These are archetypal

93 Hippolytus was banished to Sardinia and it was possibly there that he was killed AD c. 235-239 by drowning after being thrown into a canal during the reign of Maximin the Thracian: see The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Vol. V), (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990), 6.
94 cf. Jerome, De vir. ill.80, Epist. 58.10.
95 Adv. haer. 3.3.4.
96 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 5.1.29-31.
97 Apol. 50.
On the Millennial Reign of Christ

symbols, their vitality and integrity is not diminished by the passing of the centuries, they are perpetual to the human condition. These are "trigger words" and can, paradoxically, point as Morris West writes in another none too dissimilar context:

[to] the breakdown of communication-and, specifically, the breakdown of language as a means of communication-between individuals and communities. It is a fact, I think, that human experience always outstrips the means to communicate it.

Rousseau wrote in his *Confessions* that, if he wished to describe Spring well, "it must be in Winter." 101 And so it was during these periods of affliction (the Winter) that the Apoc was especially pressed into the service of the early Christians. The book strengthened their faith and gave reason for their terrible adversity. More importantly perhaps, certainly in that context of martyrdom, the Seer confirmed to them the promise of Jesus Christ, that there would come a time in the future when conditions would be reversed (the Spring). The oppressed themselves would hold royal office and authority in a new kingdom that had been prepared especially for them. They could look forward to a millennium of unfathomable bliss in contrast to the present torments of persecution (Rev 20, 21). And here, I think, Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944), one of the most famous of the Marxist converts to Orthodoxy, has made such a telling observation to do with these first readers of the Apoc as compared to the later generations:

The Revelation begins and ends with the good news of the speedy coming of Christ. To whom then is the promise given? Is it only to the first generations of Christians, to the seer's contemporaries who in their simplicity and inexperience daily expected Christ's promised coming? They who were very different from us, the sobered the disillusioned, who, tired, of waiting, began as early as the second century to pray pro mora finis and later simply ceased to think about the parousia. 102

Stephen D. O'Leary's perspective on the issue of "confrontation" from a discursive construction approach (with the emphasis on millennial rhetoric) is deserving of note here. Not only does it agree with the historical and theological interpretation of this chapter, but it succinctly describes the core of the dilemma of the "reality of suffering" which looked forward to the "materiality of redemption":

The experiential reality of suffering must be confronted and justified. Since the beginning of the Christian era, believers have found such a justification in the millennial

kingdom of apocalyptic prophecy, which provides a conclusion to the cosmic narrative in which materiality of evil is counterbalanced by the materiality of redemption.\textsuperscript{103}

Justin, who perhaps nowadays could be considered a political and religious activist, making synoptic use of Isaiah the Prophet and the Seer of Patmos, audaciously announced to Trypho what appeared to him to be the received wisdom, that the redeemed "will live for a thousand years [c\textsuperscript{i}tk\textsuperscript{m}a e\textsuperscript{t}h] in Jerusalem."\textsuperscript{104} Irenaeus, scandalously for many later interpreters (both ancient and modern), illustrated the joys of the millennium in the reign of righteousness context of Isaiah 65 and expected that "[m]en and women will build houses, plant vineyards and enjoy the fruits of the harvest."\textsuperscript{105} The same Isanianic passage, as did the legendary Sibylla whom he "frequently quotes as his authority"\textsuperscript{106} inspired Lactantius' blueprint of the future kingdom which was a more literal description. "During those thousand years", he declared:

...they who shall be alive in their bodies shall not die... [they] shall produce an infinite multitude, and their offspring shall be holy, and beloved by God; ...darkness will be taken away from the world with which heaven will be overspread and darkened, and the moon will receive brightness of the sun, nor will it be further diminished: but the sun will become seven times brighter than it now is; and the earth will open its fruitfulness, and bring forth most abundant fruits of its own accord; the rocky mountains shall drop with honey; streams of wine shall run down, and rivers flow with milk... in short, the world itself shall rejoice, and all nature exult, being rescued and set free from the dominion of evil... lions and calves shall stand together at the manger, the wolf shall not carry off the sheep...\textsuperscript{107}

Chiliast Perspectives on the End Time Plan

\textit{The New Jerusalem}

Chiliasts might have agreed on most of the material blessings, but were divided in their opinion about the place of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:1-22:5) in the order of events.\textsuperscript{108}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{103} O'Leary, \textit{op. cit.}, 42.
\bibitem{104} \textit{Dial. Try}. 81.
\bibitem{105} \textit{Adv. haer}. 5.30.4; 5.33.1-35.2.
\bibitem{106} Bousset, \textit{op. cit.}, 81.
\bibitem{107} \textit{Div. inst}. 7.24.
\bibitem{108} My perspective on the presentation and order of events, including citation of the standard patristic references in sections of this chapter, has been influenced and drawn from Arthur W. Wainwright's outstanding organisation of the subject which could not be faulted (to have introduced lightweight proofs given the relevant paucity of parallel sources would have served no purpose). In those parts I have confirmed those sources and where possible have added to them, developed and extended the context, and brought out the original Greek in a number of key places where the meaning or thrust of the reference might have remained unclear. See Wainwright, \textit{op. cit.}, 21-34.
\end{thebibliography}
Irenaeus of Lyons, similarly to Vladimir Soloviev many centuries later, thought that it would descend from heaven after the last judgement upon the new earth. Tertullian and Victorinus believed that it would come down at the start of the millennium. Commodianus, another early holder of the doctrine, of whom Gennadius notes, however, was "very little acquainted with our literature," was committed to the idea that "from heaven will descend the city in the first resurrection." Nevertheless, however this apocalyptic event was to occur for each of our interpreters, it would be the culmination of the age and the first light of the paradisiacal experience. Ultimately, what really mattered, was that this awesome and celestial manifestation which was overtly prophesied would be realized, for as Hippolytus with an invulnerable certainty pronounces, "[t]hese things, then, [touētwn oih ejanевmēn] being to come to pass." We have here a "collective representation" in the context of an Émile Durkheim sociology, "of the concept of reality." This on the ball insight in the wider background of our discussion is an essential point to remember, and I will refer to it again.

Another contradiction amongst the holders of chiliasm was that, though they anticipated a future millennium on account as Aleksandr Bukharev would say, of the Apoc's "hopeful prophecies", they held differing convictions as to its proximity. Justin, whose apologetic zeal was connected to the blossoming eschatology of the community of faith, believed that the reign of the "thousand years" could begin at any time, and that "thereafter... the eternal resurrection and judgement of all men would likewise take place".

---

110 Adv. haer. 5.35.2.
111 Adv. Marc. 3.24.3-6.
112 In Apoc. 21.1.
113 Angelo Di Berardino calls him "the enigmatic Commodian". Scholars are still not settled on his precise dates of activity, but Di Berardino does note that "if a poll were taken today, the clear majority of scholars would be in favour of a date in the third century; an opinion which seems preferable for various reasons": Patrology (Vol. IV), Angelo Di Berardino (ed.), (Maryland: Christian Classics, Inc., 1994), 259.
114 Gennadius, De vir. ill.15.
115 Instruct. 1.44; also cf. 1.43, 45.
116 Antichr. 64.
118 Paul Valliere, Modern Russian Theology. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 84.
place." Tertullian, who was the first writer to identify the "restraining force" of 2Thess 2:6 with the Roman Empire (Apology 32), said that the signs of the event were by now apparent, "[d]uring a Roman expedition to the East, even pagan soldiers," he reported, "saw heavenly Jerusalem suspended in the sky. The vision came early each morning for forty days." No doubt the author of this dreamlike report wishes for his readers to recall the "forty days and forty nights" of Jesus Christ "into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil" (Matt 4:1f), but more exactly the "the words of the covenant" given to Moses who "was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights" (Ex 34:28). Interestingly, the famous Russian writer Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1821-1881), compelled by a strong Russian messianism, thought along the same lines as to the closeness of the event. The apocalypse was imminent, as G. Kjetsaa writes, "an eschatological prophecy that was being fulfilled in his [FD’s] own time." On the other hand, both Hippolytus and Lactantius thought that the millennium was not as close, anticipating it around 6,000 years after Creation (Gen 1, 2) for they "must needs be accomplished, in order that the Sabbath may come", hence about AD 500. This aspect of chiliasm, "the lure of the millennium" as has been smartly captured by R. F. Bulman, is the defining characteristic of the movement and still visible in a variety of manifestations to this present day.

Rome the New Babylon

Rome played a central part in the chiliastic interpretation and definition of good and evil. The city of the emperors shared many characteristics with the Babylon of the Apoc (Rev 14:8, 17-18). It had persecuted the saints and was herself, like her infamous predecessor, materialistic and oppressive. Here could also be found the background to the Cult of the Emperor and the apotheosis of Caesar. Additionally, the prestigious and powerful office of the high priest,
known as both *sacerdos* and *flamen* could also be initially connected to Rome. The seven hills on which the city was built pointed to the seven heads of the beast which also had the ten horns (17:7). In the tradition of the apocalyptic *Gattung* the Apoc includes graphic references to fantastic beasts (13;17), straightforwardly connected by our early commentators to the 'satanic' powers of the Roman Empire. Irenaeus in fact suggested the possibility that 666, the number of the first beast, might indeed answer to *Lateinos* (that is, the Roman Empire).

But Rome was also identified with that power that will restrain [*oJ katevcwn*] the advent of the Antichrist that he may be "revealed [*apokaufqh'nai*] in his time" (2Thess 2:6). This was not at all anything positive towards Rome, but was rather to be understood as an expedient of providence. This identification is found in Tertullian and Hippolytus, and both are not friends of Rome. Tertullian blames Rome for the death of the martyrs and depicts her as the Babylon of the Apoc (Rev 18). Hippolytus identifies her with the beast from the sea and says that the Antichrist, a Jew from the Tribe of Dan, would revive the Empire. In a striking example he compares the Roman Empire with the Kingdom of Jesus Christ:

...the apostles gathered the nations together in the name of Christ, the Emperor, however, gathers them together in the name of Satan.

****

**Chiliasm and the Antichrist**

The pseudonymous *[Epistle of Barnabas]*, whose use of the allegorical method of interpretation points strongly to Alexandria, does not use the term *antichrist*, but the implication is clear that the fourth empire of Daniel is the antichrist which is identified with the Roman Empire. The

---

128 Jens H. Vanggaard, *The Flamen: A Study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion*, (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1988), 21. [In Asia the title was *ajrciereu*;]

129 On the difficult matter of the identity of the 'restrainer' [*oJ katevcwn*] (v.7) Orthodox interpreters have generally held this to be either the permissive decree of God or the Roman Empire: see P. N. Trempevla", *Epismi Eij Tav Epistolav Th" Kainh" Diachlht"* (Tovmo" B), (Aqhai: D Swtih, 1979), 324f. The 'restrainer' has a "positive function and is a factor in the postponement of the end of the world within a fixed tradition of a 'delay' effected by God himself": (*kateov* in EDNT (Vol. 2), art., W. Trilling, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991), 271f. See also the paper by Otto Betz for a connection between the Antichrist and the 'restrainer', "Der Katechon", *NTS* 9, (1963), 276-291. Betz ends his discussion on a metaphysical note, "[m]it ihm wird in kritischer Stunde ein kleiner Ausschnitt aus Israels Geschichte, eschatologisch gedeutet, als Gottes Wort verkündigt, das einen unzeitgemäßen Enthusiasmus niederhält und somit - wenn man so sagen will - selbst zum Katechon wird": *art. cit.*, 291.

130 *Apologeticum* 32.1; *Scorpiace* 12.11.

131 *Antichr.* 15, 25, 49-50.
readers of the epistle are called to "understand" that the "fourth beast, [is] wicked and powerful, and more savage than all the beasts of the earth." In these cases the author cites Daniel very loosely. Justin Martyr also makes plain reference to endtyrant traditions, though like Barnabas, there is no mention of the term antichrist. In the Dialogue with Trypho he refers to the one who will "speak blasphemous [blasphemia] and daring [tollhra] things", also makes mention of "false prophets" [yeudoprofsanqewopo], and of the "man of apostasy" [jothapostasia]. Chapter 32 interprets the "times" of Dan 7:25 which is concerned with the arrival of the one who will "speak blasphemies". The reference to false prophets in chapter 51 suggests Mk 13:22, while chapter 110 intimates the tradition and language of 2Thess 2:1-12, in keeping with the belief that Christ will return only after the coming "of the lawless one".

Irenaeus directly speaks of the Antichrist and connects him to impiety, lawlessness and apostasy, "he [the antichrist] being an apostate and a robber, is anxious to be adored as God." In his own person he [the antichrist] "concentrates" the apostasy. The infamous 666, "the number of the beast" (Rev 13:18), is also connected to the antichrist, and Irenaeus argues for the correct reading of that number against the variant readings that had crept into the MS tradition even at that early stage. The famous bishop of Lyons even offers some solutions, with LATEINOS [the Latin Kingdom] considered the most probable. The Book of Daniel, 2Thess, and the Apoc are directly cited. Tertullian, who writes of the endtyrant figure from within the 2Thess tradition, says that "according to our view, he is the Antichrist; as it is taught us in both the ancient and the new prophecies [the recognized Scriptures] and especially by the Apostle John."  

---

133 Epist. Barn. 4.  
135 Adv. haer. 5.25.1.  
136 ibid., 5.28.2.  
137 For a review of the MS tradition of the Book of Revelation in the context of the variant readings of "666", see M. G. Michael, "666 or 616 (Rev 13:18)". BBS 19, (July-Dec 2000), 77-83.  
138 Adv. haer. 5.30.1-3; also Hippolytus, Antichr. 50.  
139 For an overview of this whole question regarding the exegetical difficulties with the interpretation of "666", see M. G. Michael, "For it is the number of a man", BBS 19, (Jan-June, 2000), 79-89.  
140 Adv. Marc. 5.16.1.
Hippolytus of Rome even wrote a widely acknowledged tract, *The Antichrist* [Περὶ τοῦ ἀντικρίστου], written some time about AD 200. Hipppolytus cites the Apoc throughout this work and also connects "666" with the "Antichrist". In one notable place he not only makes sure to establish that Christ himself delivered the prophecies of the Book of Revelation, but he also becomes a major influence behind the hermeneutical tradition of antichrist as the great impostor:

Now, as our Lord Jesus Christ, who is also God, who prophesied of under the figure of a lion, on account of His royalty and glory, in the same way have the Scriptures also aforetime spoken of Antichrist as a lion, on account of his tyranny and violence. For the deceiver seeks to liken himself in all things to the Son of God... 

In his Commentary on the Apoc Victorinus holds to the Neronic interpretation of the Antichrist and connects him to the false prophet of Rev 13. He is also possibly the first commentator to link the end-time tyrant to the beast (one of the seven kings) that "was and is not and is to come" (17:8). Lactantius (who also cites the Sibyls) speaks of "that detested tyrant" and makes a further connection between the end-time figure and the ultimate devastation of Rome. All these infernal characteristics maybe summarized in Soloviev's literary figure, *Griadushchii chelovek*. Bernard McGinn's outstanding study *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (1996), delves deep into the various manifestations of "antichrist" across a wide range of the humanities:

Antichrist as the false messiah, the "pseudo-Christ," is first and foremost the great deceiver, the arch-hypocrite. The history of the Antichrist legend reveals, above all, how Christians have viewed the perversion of true religion, the masquerades that can be used to hide evil intent under the guise of religious probity.

---

141 Hippolytus himself refers to this work in his *Commentary on Daniel*, 4.7.1.
142 Antichr. 49-50.
143 Antichr. 6.
144 See Bousset for commentary on Victorinus' Neronic interpretation, *op. cit.*, 29f.
145 *ibid.*, 124f.
146 Valliere, *op. cit.*, 214.
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Chiliasm versus Gnosticism

On the Proper Use of the Scriptures

The Church was experiencing an internal crisis of her own, one that threatened the unity of the believers, "unity" (with the eucharist at its centre)\(^{148}\) being a fundamental of the faith which defended the believers against heresy.\(^{149}\) These 'non-orthodox' movements are often intimated in interpretations of the Apoc. One of the most influential of these groups who flourished in the second and third centuries were the Gnostics.\(^{150}\) They were condemned as heretics and were attacked by chiliast interpretation. Gnosticism was repelled by the thought of a physical resurrection, the separation of the soul from the body was looked forward to with profound expectation. For the Gnostic, life after death heralded an absolute spiritual existence, free from the temptations and restrictions of the flesh.\(^{151}\) In a famous quotation Justin warns the true 'orthodox' against them, "[d]o not suppose them to be Christians!" he said. "Right-minded Christians \([\text{\acute o}r\text{n\acute o}v\text{n\acute w}\text{\acute o}m\text{o}ne] \text{kata; p\text{a}t\text{a} a\text{\acute C\text{\acute r\text{\acute i}t\text{\acute a}}n}\text{o}\text{\acute i}v]\) believe in a resurrection of the flesh and a millennium \([k\text{a}i; c\text{i}l\text{\acute i}\text{a} \text{\acute e}f\text{\acute h}]\)."\(^{152}\)

How did the Gnostics understand salvation?\(^{153}\) And how is salvation \textit{gnosis}? It was knowledge (\textit{gnosis}) of one's origin, nature and destiny which sets the individual free from the present state of ignorance and imprisonment in an alien body, itself subject to an antagonistic

---

\(^{148}\) For the early witness, see especially Ignatius, \textit{Eph. 20.2}. Here he speaks of the eucharist as "the medicine of immortality" \(\text{\acute a\text{n\acute a\text{\acute k\text{\acute o\text{\acute n}\acute a}p\text{a}\text{\acute r\text{\acute s}}}\text{\acute i}v}]\) of which its celebration around "the bishop" \(\text{\acute t}\text{\acute w}/ \text{\acute e\text{\acute p\text{\acute i\text{\acute s}\text{\acute k}o}\text{\acute p}w}\text{\acute y}]\) signified the Church as a Eucharistic society: \textit{Magn. 6.1} and particularly \textit{Smyrn. 8.1-2}.

\(^{149}\) For an extended exposition on the unity of the Church from a Father of the first three centuries, see Cyprian's treatise \textit{On the Unity of the Church} [written around AD 251 on the occasion of the schism of Novatian]. Cyprian speaks of "[t]his sacrament of unity, this bond of a concord...": \textit{De unit.7}.

\(^{150}\) An important meeting, a landmark in the field of the study of Gnosticism was the Colloquium of Messina (Colloquio di Messina, 1966). Here an attempt was made to clarify scholarly terminology and to draw a distinction between Gnosticism pure and simple, and \textit{gnosis} itself which has the more general meaning "of knowledge of the divine mysteries reserved for an élite": The Messina Colloquium: U. Bianchi (ed.), (1967).

\(^{151}\) See especially Book One of Irenaeus' \textit{Adversus haereses} for a detailed description of the Gnostic systems flourishing during the course of his literary activity. His exposing of this "abyss of madness", he considers his "duty": \textit{Adv. haer.}, 1. \textit{Pref}.

\(^{152}\) \textit{Dial. Try. 80}.

world governed by Fate \(\varepsilon\iota\hbar\nu\rho\alpha\nu\nu\nu\). In a Marcosian (not to be confused with Marcion) declaration preserved by Irenaeus, both the cosmic and metaphysical conclusions of salvation as \textit{gnosis} are summed up:

The perfect redemption is said to be the knowledge of the ineffable Greatness. From ignorance both deficiency and passion arise; through knowledge will the entire substance derived from ignorance be destroyed. Therefore this knowledge is redemption of the inner man.\(^{155}\)

As there was no universally recognized canon in the first and early second centuries a fundamental tension between the adherents of chiliasm and those of gnosticism had to do with boundaries of religious texts, "[c]onventional Christians as well as their gnostic opponents" writes Pheme Perkins, "made conscious attempts to formalize the diverse traditions inherited from the first century."\(^{156}\) The chiliasts, in citing the Apoc to acknowledge their reverence for the OT, could have been aiming at Gnostics and quasi-Gnostics like Marcion, who rejected the authority of the OT altogether.\(^{157}\) But they also contradicted over the number of genuine gospels. Irenaeus referred to the Apoc (4:7) in one part of his contention to argue that only four gospels could be authentic, "[f]or the cherubim, too, were four-faced, and their faces were images of the dispensation of the Son of God" \(\text{Adv. haer.} 3.11.8\). This figurative and typological treatment between the cherubim, the gospels, and a little further down between the four living creatures read in "the light of the \textit{hypothesis}\(^{158}\) secured Irenaeus as one of the founders of a long tradition of interpretation which was at first designed to exclude particular documents from the Bible. "And it helps to explain", argues R. A. Norris, "why it is he [Iren.] who first begins to quote the apostolic writings with formulas customarily employed to cite Scripture."\(^{159}\)

\(^{154}\) Clement of Alexandria in his \textit{Excerpta ex Theodoto} 78.1-2 has preserved a definition of what second-century Gnostics understood by salvation (the \textit{gnosis} of our origin, nature and destiny), but sometimes it is difficult to separate the words of Clement himself from those of his sources.

\(^{155}\) \textit{Adv. haer.} 1.21.4.

\(^{156}\) Pheme Perkins, \textit{Gnosticism and the New Testament}, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 37. But Perkins also points out the interesting conflict in the gnostic tradition itself, "[t]he bitter opposition to orthodox Christianity that one finds in \textit{Apocalypse of Peter} and \textit{Testimony of Truth} is not evident in writings like \textit{Gospel of Truth, Gospel of Philip, or Tripartite Tractate}": ibid., 184.

\(^{157}\) For the errors attributed to Marcion, see especially Tertullian's five book treatise, \textit{Adversus Marcionem} (written between AD 190-200). The renowned Latin ecclesiastical writer was particularly concerned with Marcion's "separation of the law and the gospel" that his followers may also "contend for a diversity of gods": \textit{Adv. Marc.}, 1.19.


\(^{159}\) \textit{ibid.},
Then again what of the Gnostics and the Book of Revelation? Justin's much quoted condemnation of their denial for a millennium (Dial. Try. 80) has often been understood to mean that the Apoc was not part of their textual arsenal. However, in an important passage Tertullian tells us that Valentinus, the Christian gnostic leader who flourished in Rome in the middle of the second century, used all the Scriptures and perverted them, whilst Marcion cut out with a knife what he did not like. Tertullian's declaration is significant:

One man perverts the Scriptures with his hand, another their meaning by his exposition. For although Valentinus seems to use the entire volume, he has none the less laid violent hands on the truth only with a more cunning mind and skill than Marcion. Marcion expressly and openly used the knife, not the pen, since he made such an excision of the Scriptures as suited his own subject-matter. Valentinus, however, abstained from such excision, because he did not invent Scriptures to square with his own subject-matter, but adapted his matter to the Scriptures; and yet he took away more, and added more, by removing the proper meaning of every particular word, and adding fantastic arrangements of things which had no real existence.

Principles of Interpretation

From the OT to Recapitulation

As we have already seen, there was no ready consensus of interpretation on the Apoc by those holding to a chiliastic viewpoint. Agreement on the one major point, namely, the millennium, did not automatically translate to the rest of the book. Hippolytus and Tertullian thought that the "two witnesses" of Apoc 11 (Rev 11:3-12), who are translated into heaven without undergoing physical death, were "Elias the Tishbite" and Enoch. On the other hand, Victorinus of Pettau identifies them with Elijah and Jeremiah, arguing that the deaths of these two prophets "to the nations" are "not heard of". The discussion on the question of the "dusin nartusin" continues; proposals have taken different approaches depending on whether the "dusin" are understood as individual prophets or as representative of the Christian community. Contrasting interpretations were also given of the 144,000 of Apoc 14 (14:3-4).

---

160 Along with Saturninus and Basilides, he [Valentinus] was one of the first Christians, "it would seem... to develop a thoroughgoing Platonic understanding of the world in terms of a hierarchy of being on two levels... the transcendent, spiritual level... and the terrestrial material level...": Alastair H. B. Logan, Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 12.

161 Praescript. 38.4ff.

162 Hippolytus specifically speaks of "Elias the Tishbite": Antichr. 46.

163 De anima 50.5.

164 In Apoc. 11.5.

Tertullian\textsuperscript{166} and Methodius\textsuperscript{167} consider them to be literal virgins, but Victorinus\textsuperscript{168} differs and holds them to stand for the totality of the Jewish Christians in the Church. As Wainwright duly points out, it would be interesting to note here, also, the interpretation of this same controversial pericope from an early non-chiliast perspective. Origen, for instance, is closer to Victorinus, when he considers this number of the sealed, "though it admits of mystical interpretation", to denote "those who have come to the divine word out of the Gentile world."\textsuperscript{169} In the Orthodox hermeneutical tradition the "144,000" are the symbolic number of the Church in its fullness of both the dispensations (12x12x1000), the communion of saints which Paul speaks of as the "pure bride [\textit{parqevnon ajgnh;n}]" (2Cor 11:2).\textsuperscript{170}

It is surprising to students of the Book of Revelation that not one of the early ecclesiastical writers who favoured the chiliastic position has passed down to us a definite plan or method of interpretation for the Apoc.\textsuperscript{171} Though Victorinus is frequently cited or intimated in the literature for his use of the principle of \textit{recapitulation},\textsuperscript{172} according to which the latter chapters of the book prophesy the same events as those which had preceded (the vision of the New Jerusalem, for example, recapitulates the vision of the Millennium), he nowhere states the rule. What he does do, however, is to imply it almost casually, "…order is not to be looked for in the Apocalypse."\textsuperscript{173} But this concept or method would dominate the interpretation of the book for many centuries, and is evident in both the Donatist Tyconius and Irenaeus who, as John M. Court points out, uses the term \textit{ajakef al aiwsï} widely.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{166} De res. mort. 27:1. \\
\textsuperscript{167} Symp. 1.5. \\
\textsuperscript{168} In Apoc. 12:4; 20:1. \\
\textsuperscript{169} In Ioann 1.2. \\
\textsuperscript{170} I\textit{whlv Giannekopoul o"}, \textit{Erimneia th" Apokaluyew"}, (Qessal onih: Pournaray1991). 150f. \\
\textsuperscript{171} For a survey of the methods employed in the interpretation of the Apoc from the earliest of times to the present, see John M. Court, \textit{Myth and History in the Book of Revelation}, (London: SPCK, 1979), 1-19. \\
\textsuperscript{172} See for example Ibson T. Beckwith, \textit{op. cit.}, 318, 322; G. R. Beasley-Murray, \textit{Revelation}, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1981), 29-32; \textit{I\textit{whlv Giannekopoul o"}, Erimneia Th" Apokaluyew"}, (Qessal onih: Pournaray1991), 15-17; however, David E. Aune has argued "that no form of the recapitulation theory is valid for the present text of Revelation"; D. E. Aune, \textit{Revelation 1-5} (52A), (Texas: Word Books, 1997), xciii. But Aune comes to this conclusion from the methodological position of narrative discourse, which poses its own inconsistencies as he readily admits: \textit{ibid}. \\
\textsuperscript{173} For the summary of the "recapitulation theory", see Court, \textit{op. cit.}, 5-7. \\
\textsuperscript{174} See Court, \textit{op. cit.}, 5-7.
It is certainly clear that these early informed readers of the Book of Revelation held that the OT was a principal source for the interpretation of the Apoc; the work of these writers is saturated in OT citation. Reference to the prophetic books is by far the more dominant, and amongst these the text of Daniel with its "revolutionist mentality" stands out conspicuously. The striking apocalyptic imagery of the four earthly kingdoms and the four beasts, the golden image, the everlasting kingdom, the little horn, the vision of the last days, the end of the tribulation and the sealing of the prophecy, is regularly brought into play and set up against the spectacular iconic tapestry of the Apoc. Should we look for something analogous in the world of later literature, that of picture and word distinctly combining with apocalyptic, there is the highly imaginative work of the poet, engraver, visionary, and millenarian William Blake (1757-1827). His prophetic vision and "invention of new poetry" made frequent use of John's revelation and of the OT prophets. From Isaiah and Ezekiel, the chiliasts following after the pattern of the Seer of Patmos himself, were taken especially by the images of renewal to describe the idea of the millennium and the New Jerusalem. The philosopher R. G. Collingwood can help to explain these powerful and effective trans-historical connections when he considers the importance of shared imagination and belief in understanding the other "by feeling one's way into one's subject's skin."

Our author's comprehensible theology of a providentia extraordinaria and the recognizable cosmology of the Apoc by those who favoured the chiliastic approach to eschatological speculation, spoke directly to the fervent spirit of the early Christian communities and to their shared concept of reality. In this instance, the "utopian mentality" of apocalypticism. An explicit, though sometimes mysteriously cryptic association of the millennium with the salient imagery of the final overthrow of the satanic forces made the teaching to the anticipating Militant Church, as Wainwright writes, "vivid and easy to understand."

---

175 Each of these writers has been treated separately in individual entries in chapters 8 and 9 of this dissertation. Hippolytus' Peri; tou' janticrivstou (written AD c. 200) and Victorinus' Commentary on the Apocalypse of the Blessed John (the author's only extant commentary) are the best concentrated examples.


177 See fn. 172.


179 ibid.


181 Reid, loc. cit.

182 Wainwright, op. cit., 30f.
Revelation gave the anxious believers the divine assurance that in God's "appointed time" (Rom 9:9, cf. Gen 18:10), their term of tribulation would come to an end through the intervention of supernatural forces and the return of Christ to earth (Rev 17-22). For the first Christians who possessed nothing of the temporal power required to rise up against the might of the "qhrivon", the Roman Empire personified in her emperor[s] (Rev 13; 17), the divine promise was reassuring. Now, there was a palpable incongruity in this amazingly optimistic presentation, but the Seer provided a "logical model", as the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss might argue, that was "capable of overcoming a contradiction."

But this self-evident contradiction was not overcome by the construction of a myth (i.e. Levi-Strauss); rather it was explained in the context of a theology of salvation in the 'millennium pericope' itself (Rev 20:2-7). It is what Bauckham interprets as the demonstration of the "theological point of the millennium":

Life and rule- the two issues on which the contest between the martyrs and the beast had focussed- are the sole themes of 20:4-6, and they are merely asserted, without elaboration. This shows that the theological point of the millennium is solely to demonstrate the triumph of the martyrs: that those whom the beast put to death are those who will truly live- eschatologically, and that those who contested his right to rule and suffered for it are those who will in the end rule as universally as he -and for much longer: a thousand years! Finally, to demonstrate that their triumph in Christ's kingdom is not one which evil can reverse, that it is God's last word for good against evil, the devil is given a last chance to deceive the nations again (20:7-8). But it is no re-run of the rule of the beast. The citadel of the saints proves impregnable (20:9).

Chiliasm Undone and Re-interpreted

It would be misleading and incorrect, as Arthur W. Wainwright has shown in his expert treatment of the subject, to suggest that the chilists had it all their own way or that the movement was "uniformly popular." Later in the thesis we will note some of the early voices, and these were not few, which strongly dissented from this point of view. Origen, for

---

183 Here I have preferred the NIV to the RSV which instead translates "[a]bout this time"; also see John A. McGuckin, "Eschaton and Kerygma: The Future of the Past in the Present Kairos: The Concept of Living Tradition in Orthodox Theology", SVTQ 42/3-4, (1998), 225-271.

184 Cited in O'Leary, op. cit., 34.

185 Bauckham, op. cit., 107.

186 Wainwright, op. cit., 30-34.
instance, who wrote the famous *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, and whose own father was martyred under Septimius Severus (who himself [Orig.] died after imprisonment and torture from the persecution of Decius), was no chiliast. And then, of course, there are the well documented disapprovals of chiliasm by Eusebius, and Dionysius of Alexandria. Eastern Orthodox commentators, sensitive to the early patristic charges into the movement, will usually highlight the list of this opposing side. Still, the fact that the attention-grabbing presentation of the millennial kingdom to the persecuted believers was in the convention of popular religion characterized by graphic but "acceptable language" and "bizarre allegories and symbols" guaranteed its initial widespread success. It was not until the reign of Constantine the Great (AD 306-337), the first of the Christian emperors, that chiliasm started to fall from favour. This should not, however, surprise us so much, for, as Alexander Schmemann has knowledgeably summed up:

> The conversion of the Emperor Constantine resulted in the greatest change that the Church had ever undergone. Its significance was by no means limited to the altered relations between Church and state - the external conditions of Church life. Far more important were the developments in the mind of Christianity itself, the profound internal transformation that took place gradually in the Church community.

This contradiction between the two *Romes* (that of the Caesars and that of Christendom), was ideally confronted many centuries later by Vladimir S. Soloviev (1853-1900) in his own exposition and "belief in an Eternal Rome". Florovsky explains that it was "characteristic of Soloviev to consider Christian theocracy as having a double foundation: Biblical and

---

187 The *exhortation* was written in AD 235 at Caesarea during the persecution of Maximin the Thracian. It is preserved in the *Codex Basilianensis*, *Codex Parisinus*, and *Codex Venetus Marcianus*.


189 D. S. Russell, *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 25. Russell sums up very well, "[t]he hellenistic age with its admixture of traditions and beliefs representing both east and west provide the matrix from which in due course emerged a literature [i.e. apocalyptic] which was at one and the same time distinctive, reflecting the Jewish religion and culture, and yet in many ways a product of the heterogenous population of the Mesopotamian world": *ibid.*, 24.

190 Sweet's connection here, too, with the 'political cartoon' is a successful one, "[t]here is cryptic reference to current affairs in bizarre allegories and symbols, sometimes decoded, but for the most part obvious enough to the original audience, like our political cartoons": John Sweet, *Revelation*, (London: SCM Press, 1990), 2.


In fact, the Apoc's eschatological lesson (or that found in the Book of Daniel) remains stable; it is the shifting religious and political climate that leads interpreters into misinterpretations on account of the *preterite present* impulses of their own historical theatre. This condition is altogether summed up by Soloviev's improbable suggestion that "Simon Peter should be regarded as the successor to Julius Caesar." The controversial writer, influenced nonetheless by the Optino elders, concluded that the:

Roman Empire was not a part of the monstrous colossus doomed to destruction, but it was the abiding material framework and mould of the Kingdom of God (*le cadre et le moule matériel du royaume de Dieu*). The great powers of the ancient world were merely passing figures upon the stage of history; Rome alone lives forever (*Rome seule vit toujours*). The rock of the Capitol was hallowed by the stone of the Bible, and the Roman Empire was transformed into the great mountain which sprang from that stone in the prophetic vision.

Ockham's argument that the *propositio vocalis* is posterior to and dependent upon the *propositio mentalis* is useful to keep in mind here in the context which follows. When Constantine *accepted* Christianity and made it the *quasi* state religion (which was initiated with the *Edict of Milan* in AD 313), chiliasm lost much of its earlier appeal and force. Rome could no longer be popularly considered the "harlot" nor could the Emperor be universally identified with the "antichrist." The dreadful waves of persecution, too, were now by degrees coming to an end. But what did *not* happen, which was the cause of the new interpretation (supported by the dynamics of the apocalyptic narrative) of that perplexing...
The Apocalypse

millennium pericope (Rev 20:4-6), was the expected return of Christ after the great tribulation. The pre-Constantine interpretation of the millennium did not coincide with the *Heilsgeschichte* which unfolded. In rather broad Hegelian terms a unitary solution, the promised and anticipated synthesis of universal reconciliation, had not hitherto been realized. The collective reality, also brought about by the demonstrative tension between *theologia viatorum* and *theologia beatorum*, would now have to be reassessed and a new plan would have to be forwarded. "Traditional historical-grammatical exegesis" can help explain more fully the reading strategies behind the new hermeneutics which would now communally emerge.203 Eusebius' account of the building of churches in the region of Tyre, for instance, becomes a favoured paradigm which will stand in a long line of tradition. He now suggests, most sensibly, that the New Jerusalem is to some extent already present.204 And it might be that a church built [*kateskeuazeto*] in Jerusalem by the Emperor Constantine himself, is the "New Jerusalem" [h] nea... [j]erousal hoi.205 In considering such passages Arthur W. Wainwright has rightly stated that "[s]uch a viewpoint leaves no room for Chiliasm."206 The two chief sponsors of the new line of approach flourished in north Africa. And what is intriguing, as Millard J. Erickson writes, though both "saw the church as already in the millennium",207 they were to become great adversaries. One of these men was Tyconius, a lay member of the breakaway church of the Donatists.208 The other was the truth-seeking bishop of Hippo, Augustine, who would both systematize and popularize amillennialism.209 In its traditional form210 this is the official approach to Rev 20 of the Eastern Orthodox Church:

It is not difficult to see the error of the chiliastic interpretation of the 20th chapter of the Apocalypse. Parallel passages in Sacred Scripture clearly indicate that the "first resurrection" signifies spiritual rebirth into eternal life in Christ through baptism, a

---

203 ibid., 84; Paul Tillich's interpretation of the millennium which we have noted earlier could be useful in this place, (Bulman, *loc. cit.*).
204 *Hist Eccl.* 10.2-4.
205 *De Vita Constantini* 3.33 (though authorship of this work continues to be disputed it still proves the point of the changing interpretation on account of the accession of a Christian emperor).
206 Wainwright, *op. cit.*, 34.
208 See Court, *op. cit.*, 5f. Tyconius, whose views, as Court says, have to be reconstructed from quotations, puts forward a "distinct type of recapitulation... in what is basically a spiritual interpretation, the system of recapitulation emphasizes the totality of the forces involved": ibid., 6.
209 For a concise review from Charles Kannengiesser of Saint Augustine's paradigms and principles of interpretation in which his "theoretical interests" are also considered, see "Augustine" in Donald K. McKim (ed.), *op. cit.*, 22-28; also see Erickson, *op. cit.*, 75f.
210 For the different perspectives and nuances of "amillennialism", see Erickson, *ibid.*, 73-89.
On the Millennial Reign of Christ

resurrection through faith in Christ, according to the words "[a]wake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light " (Eph 5:14). "Ye are risen with Christ", we read many times in the Apostles (Col 3:1, 2;12; Eph 2:5-6). Proceeding from this by the thousand year reign one must understand the period of time from the very beginning of the kingdom of grace of the Church of Christ, and in particular of the triumphant Church of heaven, until the end of the world. The Church which is militant upon earth in essence also is triumphant in the victory performed by the Saviour, but it is still undergoing battle with the "prince of this world", a battle which will end with the defeat of satan and the final casting of him into the lake of fire.211

Conclusion
We have seen that any critical study which would seek to investigate the early circulation and initial reception of the Book of Revelation must of necessity deal with the question of the millennial reign of Christ. The first readers of the Apoc (from the point of view of reading as a dialectical process),212 were, as we noted at the start of this chapter, "informed readers". That is, they "contributed to the production of textual meaning"213 and were capable of supplying commentary to portions of the text that might not have been written but "are [was] implied."214 This was especially true of the millennial reign of Christ pericope (Rev 20:4-6). The chiliasts were also the first to sift the Apoc through an emerging canonical filter and to deal with the most fundamental criteria of canonicity: authorship and date. It is the strong "community commendation"215 from this most critical phase of the canonical process of the Apoc's adventure (the first being the publication of the book itself), that saw it survive the occasional but serious assaults to its claim of authority as "sacred literature".216 Significantly, and this is something that I would like to especially highlight, these writers/interpreters in successfully transmitting a book which had been initially thought to have been published for a particular period and group (and then reconsigned), legitimized the use of "strategic ambiguity"217 in the reception history of the Apoc. This permitted for the exegetical flexibility of the text in any crisis of authority that the document would face in future generations, particularly in the context of hermeneusis.218

211 Pomazansky, op. cit., 343.
212 Ressegue, op. cit., 28.
213 ibid.
214 ibid.
216 ibid.
217 O'Leary, op. cit., 152.
218 And yet it is precisely this exegetical 'flexibility' which has allowed for the Apoc's 'hijacking' and made it the most susceptible of the NT books to a fantastic and unwarranted array of eisegesis. For a more recent exploration of this phenomenon, see Raymond F. Bulman's informed study, op. cit.
CHAPTER 6
The Church in the Apocalypse

Introduction

If the Book of Revelation were not ecclesiological, that is, if it were not saturated in the experience and worship of the early Church community-of-the-cross,1 the Seer's work would, similarly to other early Apocalypses,2 probably not have achieved canonical status. This becomes more certain after a comparative reading against one of the oldest Christian apocryphal apocalypses, the Apocalypse of Peter (which merited mention in theMF).3 Above all, when the authority of the Book of Revelation was called into question, the ecclesia universalis could not easily disregard a document which claimed to have come from "John" (Rev 1:1,4,9, 21:2, 22:8).4 More particularly, it was a book that had succoured the early martyrs, inspired heavenly worship and preserved fragments of the liturgical tradition, promised the faithful the covenantal blessings of Old Israel, and presented the believers with a faithful scheme of the things to come. And of course, to this we add the penetrating theology of the work, especially its pneumatology, christology, and eschatology.5 In this present

---

1 I borrow this effective description from Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Sanctorum Communio: A Theological Study of the Sociology of the Church, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 151. This community, "the specifically Christian church-community", Bonhoeffer writes, "exists only through the Easter message": ibid.; the theology of Apocalypse and Community is, of course, prominent in the first-rate commentaries of both Robert W. Wall and Stephen S. Smalley to which I will refer during the course of my own presentation in the Eastern Orthodox framework of communio sanctorum [koinwnia agion]; more generally, and in the context of Australian scholarship, see the essential theology of community and Church knowledgeably presented by Kevin Giles, What on Earth is the Church?, (Victoria: Dove, 1995). For the purposes of this dissertation, see especially his discussion on the use of communio (communion) as a synonym of communitas (community), 15-19.

2 For a list of these works and for expert discussion on the 'popularity' of apocalyptic, including the "apocalyptic-style" books of the Qumran community, see D. S. Russell, Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 32-59.

3 The Apocalypse of Peter is preserved in Greek fragments and in Ethiopic, "probably composed around 135 C.E., since the activity of the Jewish messianic claimant, Bar Kokhba is indirectly portrayed as the eschatological crisis": "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism" in TABD (Vol. 1), art., Adela Yarbro Collins, 291.

4 The earliest external witness of the Fathers comes down conclusively in favour of the author of the Book of Revelation being Saint John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee and the disciple of Christ (Matt 4:21). It is confirmed by Justin Martyr, Melito of Sardis, Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Hippolytus. The MF twice mentions the author as "Iohanis" (apparently meaning the apostle). "So strong is the evidence," writes Guthrie, "that it is difficult to believe that they all made a mistake in confusing the John of the Apocalypse with John the Apostle": Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, (Illinois: IVP Press, 1970), 935.

chapter, however, I am concerned with the ecclesiological manifestations of the book in the context of the "Christian community of faith and practice." At the same time the elevated ecclesiology of the Book of Revelation will be matched up against the OT expression of elected community, God's covenant with Israel.

The reader should not expect this chapter to be loaded with patristic citation in defence of my position. On the contrary, I have consciously avoided such an exercise. I am not at this point of the thesis asking the question how many ecclesiastical writers cited "ecclesiological" pericopes from the Apoc (this approach proper belongs to Chapters 7-9 of the dissertation and here it would be a case of 'putting the cart before the horse'). What I am asking, however, is on what interior grounds would the early Fathers advance the Book of Revelation as an authoritative document of the NT Canon. We have seen thus far that genre alone could not attest to the Apoc's authoritative reception, nor indeed could the clinical application of the criteria of canonicity. It is my strong contention that what finally did secure the successful transmission of our book, and completed what was lacking in the conditions of genre and the criteria, was the Seer's dominant interest in the Church, both local and universal. In this chapter we will also test for proofs of this interest, particularly in the Old Israel and New Israel typologies, and delve into some of the more relevant theological and practical extensions of the Apoc's ecclesiology in the context of "a religious community." Throughout we will be asking the question of why this would be of fundamental significance to the community of the faithful, and how it supplied the decisive push for the book to vault from the margins into the mainstream of canonical discourse. Whereas Brevard S. Childs would view the importance of this approach from within the context of the literary structure and composition of the Apoc, I would depart to some extent from this position (though still

---

---

---
acknowledging its undeniable importance) and emphasize the force of genre, which allowed for the literary structure to unfold in the first place. It is my position that, before structure, there was genre.\(^\text{12}\)

A strong component of the theology of the Apoc is contextual, that is, it is influenced by its religio-historical setting.\(^\text{13}\) The book is addressed to Christians suffering persecution to sustain them in their trials, and to assure them that God will vindicate the righteous community and punish the evil oppressor. This unbridgeable conflict between the forces of light and the forces of darkness confirms two distinct assemblies,\(^\text{14}\) each comprising both supernatural and terrestrial forces. One assembly, the Christian community which is the Church, has given itself over to the Lord. It is called to "hear" [\(\text{akousatw}\)] (Rev 2:7,11) and to "conquer[s]" [\(\text{nikw'n}\)] (Rev 2:11,26). The other, the Roman Empire and all those who share in her ideologies and crimes, belongs to the devil, who claims the religious loyalty due to God. The eschatological counterfeiter is the "beast" [\(\text{qhrivon}\)] who utters "blasphemies" [\(\text{blasfhmiva}\)] (13:1-6) and who "make[s] war on the saints" [\(\text{polhsai poleron meta; tw'n aJgivwn}\)] (13:7). In this setting the Church is described as undertaking a second exodus identified with the Old Israel, similarly dedicated to a holy commission, but this time led by the Lamb whose divine mission is to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. A high number of commentators have argued that the Apoc is written to encourage the suffering Christian community on earth or that at least that it was a principal reason,\(^\text{15}\) and if this is correct, as Kevin Giles points out, "...then [D. J.] Harrington's claim that the church is the centre of interest of this book must be seriously considered."\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{12}\) For a point of contact on this position and Hermann Gunkel's "all-important issue of identifying the genre of a text in the process of interpretation", see Tremper Longman III, Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation, (Leicester: Apollos, 1987), 15f.

\(^{13}\) No serious student of the Apoc would disagree with Christopher Rowland when he says, "Revelation reminds us more keenly than most New Testament documents that it belongs to another age and culture. Its thought forms and language seems so far removed from our own... it is necessary to remember that it was written to particular people at a particular time and place": Christopher Rowland, Revelation, (London: Epworth Press, 1993), 16.

\(^{14}\) Certainly this dualistic framework is not unique to the Book of Revelation, for example, the eschatological war in the apocalypticism of the Dead Sea Scrolls. See especially Rule of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, (1QM).


\(^{16}\) Kevin Giles, What on Earth is the Church? (Victoria: Dove, 1995), 174.
Part A - Prolegomenon

A Distinct Ecclesiology

One of the key arguments of this dissertation is that the distinctness of the Apoc's ecclesiology played a major role in the book's ability to adapt theologically to the diverse tensions (especially the chiliastic controversies) to which it was invariably subject in the early centuries of its canonical adventure, and ultimately for its survival in the NT Canon itself. The book is pervaded by a strong church consciousness. But this central conviction had to be tested and if found to be faulty would have had to be abandoned. So what began as a hypothesis and belief of this present writer, gradually became an obvious and foundational position of the study. And it was precisely this church consciousness that saw the book survive its first massive test, namely, the critical judgements of Dionysius of Alexandria (AD c. 200-265) (which will be discussed in Chapter 9 of the thesis).

As a formal unit the ecclesiology of the Apoc is often absent from works dealing with the theology of the book. This is difficult to understand, particularly in the context of the rise of Formgeschichte, but it can be partially explained. The widespread preterist or literary-critical approach to the Book of Revelation nowadays, is fundamentally concerned with the contemporary events of the Seer's time and the purely historical substance of the Church, the missionary and suffering congregation. This is a balance that needs to be re-addressed by future interpreters when they comment on the work. However, the ecclesiology of the Apoc is an integral component in the whole theological infrastructure of the book, and must be affirmed together with other dominant theologies of the work, such as christology, pneumatology, and eschatology. John the Seer is a prophet who is steeped in the covenantal

---

17 By ecclesiology is here meant and throughout the chapter, "the doctrine and experience of the Church": Alexander Schmemann, Church, World, Mission: Reflections on Orthodoxy in the West, (New York: SVS Press, 1979), 210.

18 For my understanding and definition of the critical concept of "church consciousness" as I have considered and applied it throughout this thesis, see the Introduction where I appeal to the work of Michael Pomazansky and Pauvlo Eujdokivmof.

19 Longman III, op. cit., 23.


21 This is precisely where B. S. Childs' strong push for the interconnectedness of structure and theology is at its most visible point and which he further connects to "form and function": Childs, As Canon, 508-513.

22 As most students of the Book of Revelation have noted, it is difficult to speak of the central theological theme of the Apoc when consistent readings of the text emphasize different perspectives of the Seer's theology. This is evidenced by the profusion of structures which appeal to the theology of the work. For a recent review of the structure question and for the presentation of those positions that are presently dominating, see M. G. Michael, Thesis: Chapter VI, Structure.
Theology of the OT\textsuperscript{23} and this flows over into the concept of the \textit{ekklesia}.\textsuperscript{24} A book which spoke of the Church so directly could not be rejected without a good fight nor easily cast aside by its opponents.

\textit{The Essential Background}

The Church in the Apoc is presented essentially in terms of a communal entity, and the general witness of the book is unfolded on the stage of an ecclesiastical awareness, that is, "a corporate setting".\textsuperscript{25} This is evidenced from the very start of the book which is appointed to be read in the context of the life of "the seven churches that are in Asia" \textit{[JEPTA; ekklesiasa] \mbox{en} th' Asia} (Rev 1:4). This communal understanding of the Church is overarching; it does not lessen as the revelation progresses. When the focus shifts in later chapters it is turned to the Church as a whole, the "great multitude which no man could number" \textit{[bcli\' ou\, \dun jariqmh\'a\, aujto\, oujdei;] \mbox{eukratei}} (7:9). Nonetheless, the seven messages should be kept in mind throughout the visions that follow: their influence is not diminished. The Seer's concern is still with these troubled churches. His purpose, as Wilfrid J. Harrington succinctly says, "is firmly pastoral."\textsuperscript{26}

This is not to suggest that individuals are not ever mentioned, this would be a serious misreading of the Seer's ecclesiological discernment, which as Athanasius Mitilinaios says, "extends to the whole Church."\textsuperscript{27} For example, there is Antipas the martyr (Rev 2:13),\textsuperscript{28} and

\textsuperscript{23} J. Massyngberde Ford made sure to highlight this fact in her commentary which has sometimes escaped the serious attention of recent commentators. This commentary, despite its extreme approach to the authorship question, does well to highlight the importance of rabbinc materials. The tabulation in parallel columns of the blessings for observance of the law (Exod 23:22-31; Lev 26:4-13; Deut 28:1-14), the afflictions in Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy and the covenantal curses (Lev 26:16-45, Deut 28:16-57), next to the curses against the unfaithful in Revelation (Rev 8:1-6, 16:1-12), reveals another extension of the covenantal framework of the Apoc: J. Massyngberde Ford, \textit{Revelation}, (New York: Doubleday, 1975), 265-275. See also Joel Nobel Musvosvi's, \textit{Vengeance in the Apocalypse}, (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1993). Musvosvi focuses on the vengeance aspect of the covenant but shows the association of the biblical and Near Eastern background of that strand, at least, to the Book of Revelation.

\textsuperscript{24} By \textit{ekklesia} I will mean pure and simple, "the Church as above all a communion in which God is present sacramentally: the sacrament is, in effect, the way in which the death and resurrection of the Lord are 'commemorated' and by which his Second Coming is proclaimed and anticipated": John Meyendorff, \textit{The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today}, (1981), 212. This ties in perfectly with the theology of the Apoc (1:17-19, 5:5, 22:12-13).

\textsuperscript{25} In recent times it has been Stephen S. Smalley who has emphasized this important point (for it also leads to the covenant) and from whom I have gained valuable insights: see Stephen S. Smalley, \textit{Thunder and Love: John's Revelation and John's Community}, (Great Britain: Nelson Word, 1994), esp., 154-157.


the two witnesses of Apoc 11, the former representing the persecuted, the latter the "Church's witness to the Gospel." But even in these two instances the individual represents the Body of the Church and is symptomatic of the present position of the community of believers at large; these are individuals whose providence is to "serve the realization of God's rule in the church-community." We have of course, also, the great transcendent figure of the "woman clothed with the sun" (Rev 12). Above all, as Stephen S. Smalley writes by pointing to Rev 2-3 after having considered these individual references, it is the community of believers as a whole which is addressed:

...corporately criticised, praised, divided, attacked and persecuted. The faithful together, working, confessing, enduring, conquering, worshipping, and listening.

If we speak of a Johannine School, as some scholars have argued that we should, we note across the Johannine corpus an ecclesiology which is articulated in the context of the salvation of an elect group. In the Johannine Epistles and in the Apoc particularly, the community is established in a response to a crisis brought about either by division or persecution (1Jn 2:18-28; Rev 13). The theology initially addresses the threats directed against the believers from those outside the community of the faithful. The congregatio

---

28 We know little about Antipas, "the faithful one" (Rev 2:13). According to church tradition he was bishop of Pergamum and a disciple of Saint John. His martyrdom is said to have occurred in the year AD 92. The recorded year of his martyrdom can be traced back to at least the fifth century. He is said to have been burned to death inside a heated bronze bull after having confessed before the Roman governor that "Jesus is Lord." For the tradition on Antipas and sources of reference, see QKHE (Vol. 2), 921f. Antipas would have been no minor figure in the Church of Asia Minor. The Seer's reference to him as 'witness' [μαρτυρ] is a title that is usually reserved for Christ (Rev 1:5, 3:14); for the technical distinction between μαρτυρ and ὁμολογθεῖν, see R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John (Vol. I), (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920), 62.

29 Almost always in patristic interpretation these witnesses have been understood as Enoch (Gen 5:24) and Elias (2Kings 2:11), who were both taken alive into heaven; see Averky Taushev, The Apocalypse: In the Teaching of Ancient Christianity, (California: St Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 166f.


32 Smalley, op. cit., 154.

sanctorum is called to separate itself from the world and from all heresy, from those that "went out from us" [ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθεν] (1Jn 2:19) and to be prepared for the "war" [πόλεμον] (Rev 13:7) that will be unleashed upon them. It is therefore not without cause that the antichrist tradition\textsuperscript{34} would be especially referred to in the Johannine epistles and in the Apoc, serving to further highlight the strong 'insider' v. 'outsider' identities. As Raymond E. Brown writes, commenting on the Johannine Epistles (1Jn 4:1-3), the communities are commanded to "distinguish[ing] the Spirit of God from that of the Antichrist."\textsuperscript{35} The Johannine tradition is always emphasizing the personal communion that exists between God and His people, that is, the community of believers [κοινωνία ἑκάτερον Ἰησοῦ] (1Jn 1:3, cf. Rev 7, 21). It is because of this relationship that the texts go on to speak of the power that the Christians collectively possess to conquer the threat of the outside (Jn 8:47, 15:19; 1Jn 4; 2Jn 7; Rev 1:4; 7:1-9, 14:1-5).

\textbf{\textit{Εκκλησία} in Classical Use}

The term \textit{ἐκκλησία} was used at least from the times of Euripides and Herodotus, that is, from the fifth century BC. The noun is originally derived from \textit{ἐκ} and \textit{kaleō} (\textit{kaleō}, to call) which was used for the call to the army to assemble. Outside this technical usage it took on the meaning of the popular assembly of the citizens of the πόλις, the city.\textsuperscript{36} This was an important convocation of the people which met regularly to decide on changes of the law and to discuss matters of internal and external policy. The \textit{ἐκκλησία} began its proceedings with prayers and sacrifices to the gods of its city.\textsuperscript{37} The reason for this sharp excursus is to point out that the word was known and used in a political context for a long period before the Gk translation of the OT and the writing down of the documents of the NT. We should note, as L. Coenen tells us, that:

\\textsuperscript{34} For discussion on 'antichrist' in the Johannine epistles, see Raymond E. Brown, \textit{The Epistles of John}, (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 332-341. 'The term 'Antichrist', peculiar to the Johannine Epistles in the NT, represents a convergence of various background factors in Judaism: (A) THE SEA MONSTER... (B) THE SATAN OR ANGELIC ADVERSARY... (C) THE HUMAN RULER EMBODYING EVIL... (D) THE FALSE PROPHET...": passim; on the possible identity of the 'antichrists' and of their doctrines in 1 Jn, see John Painter, "The 'Opponents' in 1 John", \textit{NTS} 32, (1986), 48-71; it is agreed, however, by most scholars that it is Revelation which gives the most complete description of the Antichrist and of his raging battle against the Church of God. Although the name is missing from the book itself, all that is said in chapter 13 concerning the two beasts 'clearly contains' as E. Kauder writes, the "traits of a personified power opposed to God, which is in fact a blasphemous parody of Christ": "Antichrist" in \textit{DNTT} (Vol. 1), \textit{art. Erwin Kauder}, 125; also see \textit{Sabba\i\ Agourivdh}, \textit{H Apokaluyh Tou Iwavnnh}, (Qessal onikhe Pournarav, 1994), 297-311.


\textsuperscript{36} \textit{ Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum} (Vol. I), 739, no. 1567.

\textsuperscript{37} Aristot., \textit{Ath. Pol.} 45.
The Church in the Apocalypse

...it [the ekklesia] was clearly characterized as a political phenomenon, repeated according to certain rules and within a certain framework... it was the assembly of full citizens, functionally rooted in the constitution of the democracy, an assembly in which fundamental political and judicial decisions were taken.

In the Septuagint

In the Septuagint (LXX) the word ἑκκλησία occurs some one hundred times, twenty-two of these occurrences being found in the Apocrypha. L. Coenen tells us that it exclusively represents the Heb. qahal which is related to qol (voice), which means a summons to an assembly and the act of the assembling itself. On the other hand, synagoge appears 225 times (for the Heb. edah). This word is related to the root yaad, to appoint. It came to have the general sense and be characteristic of the "community centered in the cult or the law." Thus, it would appear that though synagoge was capable of expressing the sense of both Heb. terms, "ekklesia could only be used with a specific meaning."

If one compares the use of the two Heb. words, it becomes clear, from the passages in which both occur in the same context (eg Exod 12:1ff.; 16:1ff.; Num 14:1ff; 20:1ff.; 1 Ki 12:1ff.) that edah is the unambiguous and permanent term for covenant community as a whole. On the other hand, qahal is the ceremonial expression for the assembly that results from the covenant, for the Sinai community and, in the deuteronomistic sense, for the community in its present form. It can also stand for the regular assembly of the people on secular (Num 10:7; 1 Ki 12:3) or religious occasions (Ps 22:26), as well as for a gathering crowd (Num 14:5; 17:12).

Ekklēsia in the New Testament

Of all the occurrences in the NT the word ἑκκλησία is found more times in the Pauline corpus (62 occurrences). Then follows the Book of Acts (23 occurrences); in the Book of Revelation there are 20 occurrences; in Hebrews (two occurrences); in 3 John (3 occurrences); and in James (one occurrence). In the Gospels the word occurs only three times, on each occasion in Matthew (16:18; 18:17 twice). On most of these occurrences, ekklesia is interpreted in the context of NT revelation, it is translated, as Jürgen Roloff explains, "with congregation or congregational assembly or c(C)hurch":

38 “Church, Synagogue”, in DNTT (Vol. 1), art., L. Coenen, 291.
39 ibid., 292.
40 ibid.
41 ibid., 293.
42 ibid., 292.
43 ibid., 295.
44 “ekklesia” in EDNT (Vol. 1), art., J. Roloff, 411.
Distinguishing among passages that use *ekklesia* with these different meanings is possible only within limits. The distinction between congregation/ church (the body of Christians at a specific place; Germ. *Gemeinde*) and Church (the supra-congregational association of God's people or the totality of all Christians; Germ. *Kirche*) is foreign to the NT. Closely related is the fact that early Christianity did not conceive of *ekklesia* primarily as an organizational, but rather as theological entity. The *ecclesia universalis* is neither a secondary union made up of individual autonomous churches, nor is the local congregation only an organizational sub-unit of the total Church. Rather, both the local assembly of Christians and the trans-local community of believers are equally legitimate forms of the *ekklesia* created by God.\(^{45}\)

**In the Apocalypse**

The first thing that strikes the interpreter after the occurrences are noted is precisely where they are found. Of the twenty occurrences mentioned, nineteen "are in formalized phrases"\(^{46}\) in the letters addressed to the seven churches at the beginning of the book (Rev 1-3). The exception is Rev 22:16, this time at the end of the book. Argument amongst interpreters of the Apoc, however, continues as to what the Seer exactly had in mind when he addressed the "church" of a specific city (Rev 2:1,8,12,18, 3:1,7,14).\(^{47}\) The discussion (especially from the historicist and preterist approaches), basically concerns whether John is speaking of a small house church or a larger local community. But a house church would have only a small number of members and it would appear much more likely, as others also note,\(^{48}\) that the word *ekklesia* is here being used of a larger group of Christian communities. Despite the local and national distinctions within the wide breadth of the empire, the faithful community is fundamentally one. It is called to the same witness of the Lord Jesus Christ by opposing heresy and remaining steadfast in the face of persecution. Therefore, *ekklesia* probably refers to Christians of the particular physical sphere to which the seven messages are addressed.

\(^{45}\) ibid.

\(^{46}\) ibid.

\(^{47}\) For the historicist, though seven specific churches received the seven letters, these churches ideally represented the seven periods of church history with each period reflecting the spiritual conditions of the original church [E. B. Elliott, (1847), R. Caringola, (1995)]. The preterist position argues that the seven churches were active religious communities in Asia previous to the Jewish war of AD 66-70, and that the seven letters authentically describe the existing conditions of each church community [Milton S. Terry (1898), D. Chilton (1987)]. The futurist approach is not always clear, whilst most would favour a historicist position, others have suggested a preterist or even a spiritual interpretation [A. C. Gaebelien, (1915), R. C. Stedman, (1991)]. For the interpreter of the spiritual position the number seven is symbolic of the universal Church throughout all time, the letters are applicable to any church which reflects the conditions of these ancient Christian communities [S. L. Morris (1928), G. B. Wilson, (1985)].

addressed. "His [the Seer's] main emphasis," as Kevin Giles writes, "seems to be on the witness of these believers in their own city" (2:2,9,13, 3:1,8,15,17). By the "angel of the church" (2:1,8,12,18, 3:1,7,14), there seems no good reason to understand this any differently from its literal sense. In the Apoc the word "angel" is commonly used to refer to a heavenly entity (7:1, 9:14, 10:1, 18:21, 19:17, 22:16), and it is probable that the Seer believed that each church community had its own guardian angel distinguishing each angelic being by the article τω. Robert L. Thomas has argued differently, suggesting that the seven were men "who represented their churches."

Implications of the Local Church in Ecclesiology

John D. Zizioulas, who writes from within the theological tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy, has expressed afresh in recent times the theology of the local church as catholic. His work on ecclesiology is extremely useful at this point of the discussion for it helps to make clearer one of the pivotal positions of this chapter: that though the Seer addresses his book topically to one historical church community, his kerygma of salvation through endurance is not limited by geography, space or time. For he, the author of the Apoc, is addressing the Church as a eucharistic community which is founded in Christ, the "Lamb that was slain" (Rev 13:8). But what is meant by eucharistic community? In the context of Paul's eucharistic teaching in 1Cor 10:16-17, "[t]he cup of blessing which we bless is it not a communion [κοινωνία] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf." Zizioulas writes:

The idea of the incorporation of the "many" into the "one," or of the "one" as a representative of the "many" goes back to a time earlier than Paul. It is an idea basically

---

49 Giles, op. cit., 175.

50 I. Broer agrees with this position by correctly noting, "...the angels of the churches (2:1- 3:22), [which] are to be understood as real angels, since άγγελος in Revelation always means real angels and the underlying conception is readily understandable against the background of the Jewish views on the angels of the nations and the angel of Israel...": "άγγελος" in EDNT (Vol. 1), 15.


52 Zizioulas, who is, as John Meyendorff has said, "one of the most influential Orthodox theologians of the younger generation", begins his position by arguing that "[t]he Church is not simply an institution. She is a 'mode of existence', a way of being...": John D. Zizioulas, Being As Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church, (New York: SVS Press, 1985), 15.

53 Saint Chrysostom in his Homily on Hebrews connects this doctrine of the eucharistic community (through faith) to the Lamb as a paschal type Who is slain for the deliverance of the believers: 27.1.

54 As Zizioulas points out, this is not the only time that Paul speaks of the "many" as being "one" in Christ (2Cor 11:2; Gal 3:28; Eph 2:15). He further makes the point, "and not just a neuter 'one' but a masculine 'one'": Zizioulas, op. cit., 145.
connected with the figures of the "Servant of God" and the "Son of Man." But what is significant for us here is that this idea was from the beginning connected with the eucharistic consciousness of the Church. Paul, in writing those words to the Corinthians, was simply echoing a conviction apparently widely spread in the primitive Church.\textsuperscript{55}

The Book of Revelation is addressed to the Church as a eucharistic community\textsuperscript{56} in which the Seer himself, though physically absent \{\textit{apomakru\smash{\textit{s}}}\}, is still a member of each of the seven congregations. \textit{Iwa\textit{v}nv\textit{h}\ Karabi\textit{d}opou\textit{o}}\ has expressed this ecclesiology of participation in liturgical terms when he speaks of John as sharing in the eucharistic community \{\textit{e\textit{ucarist}i\textit{a}kh\textit{v} koi\textit{n}o\textit{v}h\textit{t}a}\}, even though he is topically \{\textit{topik}a\textit{v}\} at a distance:

\begin{quote}
A\textit{p}eu\textit{q}h\textit{v}netai [\textit{Apoc}] sth \textit{e}k\textit{hs}\textit{i}a w' \textit{e\textit{ucarist}i\textit{a}kh\textit{v} koi\textit{n}o\textit{v}h\textit{t}a}, sth\textit{n opo}i\textit{u} met\textit{e}z\textit{ei} an kai \textit{topik}a\textit{v} \textit{apomakru\smash{\textit{s}}}\, o \textit{Iwa\textit{v}nv\textit{h}v}.
\end{quote}

Significantly, this timeless interconnectedness is also to be found in the prophetic address of the Apoc. The prophecy communicated to each of the individual churches, is at the same time (through the eucharistic community), extended outwards to the church(es) of all time.\textsuperscript{58} The prophetic witness of both modes, the horizontal and the vertical,\textsuperscript{59} is inspired by the Holy Spirit (Rev 2:7, 22:17); both point to the Lamb's triumph (1:4-8, 14:1-5), and to the Father's authority (2:28, 12:10), and both are concerned, as Richard Bauckham understands, "with the establishment of God's kingdom in the world":

Prophecy within the churches equips the churches to fulfil their prophetic ministry to the world, which is their indispensable role in the coming of God's kingdom, the task to which it is the function of Revelation to call them.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{ibid.}, 145f.
\textsuperscript{56} The theology of a 'eucharistic community' was advanced early. See especially Ignatius of Antioch (AD c. 35-107), who speaks of the eucharist as "the medicine of immortality" \{\textit{f\textit{a}m\textit{a}n\textit{ko}n a\textit{p}a\textit{n}a\textit{si}a}\}, of which its celebration around "the bishop" \{\textit{t\textit{w} ep\textit{i}sko\textit{p}w\textit{u}}\} signified the Church as a Eucharistic society: \textit{Eph}, 20.2, also \textit{Magn.} 6.1, and \textit{Smyrnn.} 8.1-2; for a contemporary perspective of an Eastern Orthodox standpoint on the eucharist, see Petros Vassiliadis, \textit{Eucharist and Witness: Orthodox Perspectives on the Unity and Mission of the Church}, (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1998), 49-66.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Iwa\textit{v}nv\textit{h}\ Karabi\textit{d}opou\textit{o}}, "Ekk\textit{h}\textit{s}i\textit{a} Kai P\textit{neu}n\textit{at}i\textit{k}h\textit{v} Z\textit{h}h\textit{v} S\textit{t}i" Ep\textit{t}a\textit{v} Ep\textit{i}st\textit{o}l\textit{e}v\textit{h} Th\textit{\''} Ap\textit{ok}a\textit{ly}\textit{h}, \textit{Khr\textit{on}o\textit{m}ia} 27 A-B, (1995), 76.
\textsuperscript{58} Augustine's qualified amillennialism, based on a non-literal interpretation of Rev 20, in which the thousand years represent that whole period beginning from the first advent of Christ until the last judgement, agrees perfectly: \textit{De civ. Dei.} 20.7.
\textsuperscript{59} Both the 'horizontal' (the Spirit prophesying to the \textit{Militant} Church) and the 'vertical' (the Spirit prophesying to the \textit{Triumphant} Church) are linked by the "actualization of one, single, unrepeatable event... [the Eucharist]": Alexander Schmemann, \textit{Introduction to Liturgical Theology}, (New York: SVS Press, 1986), 43.
\textsuperscript{60} Richard Bauckham, \textit{The Theology of the Book of Revelation}, (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 121.
The Symbolism of Numbers

Symbolism plays a major role in apocalyptic literature. Klaus Koch speaks of the language of apocalyptic taking "on a concealed meaning by means of mythical images rich in symbolism. So also in the Book of Revelation which would be unintelligible otherwise. However, as John Sweet writes, modern commentators who are aware of the book's symbolic nature must not let their ingenuity in elucidating symbols and allusions take them beyond what "the writer could have intended and what the hearers could have taken in." What concerns us here, out of the rich symbolic landscape of the Apoc, is John's use of numbers, specifically the number seven in its received tradition of completeness. The use of numerical symbolism in the tradition of the Ancient East and in the Bible, "and that on a large scale", as W. T. Smith says, "cannot reasonably be doubted." Among the array of numbers which are unquestionably used with more or less symbolic meaning are 7 (and its multiples), 3, 4, 10 and 12.


62 Klaus Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy, (London: SCM Press, 1972), 26. Koch further writes that in apocalyptic, "[t]he forces of history and of the present, i.e., the forces of the world-time (olam, aion) are reduced to their outstanding basic characteristics, appearing as dangerous, often unnaturally degenerate beasts or as huge trees or rushing waters": ibid.

63 "As a balance against over-attention to detail we should be sensitive to the general effect Revelation's imagery would have conveyed": John Sweet, Revelation, (London: SCM Press, 1990), 13f.

64 Irenaeus of Lyons, who as we previously noted was one of the most distinguished of the early supporters of the Book of Revelation, understood the symbolic nature of John's use of numbers and admonished strongly against any abuse of this "uncertain mode of proceeding": Adv. Haer. 2.24.1-6; 2.25.1-4.

65 "Number" in ISBE (Vol. III), art., William Taylor Smith, 2159.

66 See especially Ethelbert W. Bullinger's study, Number in Scripture: Its Supernatural Design and Spiritual Significance, (Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1967), Pt. II, 50-292. Nonetheless, he is rightly criticized by John J. Davis for his silence re: Pythagoras and other relevant literature, "[t]he thing that is of special interest, however, is the gross silence in the works of the above men [Ivan Panin, E. W. Bullinger] concerning the origin of their exegetical systems. No credit is ever given to Pythagoras, the Talmudic or Cabalistic literature from which their methodology is derived": Davis, op. cit., 133. The Cabalistic literature, however, is later than the NT.
Numbers in the Apocalypse

Scholars agree that numbers form a major part of the symbolic network established by John. Jean-Pierre Prévost appropriately notes, "...we cannot fail to be struck by the omnipresence of numbers in the Apocalypse." The symbolic associations that the Seer of Patmos generally ascribes to the more significant of the above-mentioned numbers are borrowed from the OT, and are a part of the allegorical arithmetic of apocalyptic. The number seven, "already known as the biblical number", is to be understood as symbolic of "fullness", "totality", and "perfection". Apart from the "seven churches", note also the "seven spirits" (Rev 1:4), the "seven golden lampstands" (1:12), the "seven stars" (1:16), the "seven burning lamps" (4:5), the "seven seals" (5:1), the "seven trumpets" (8:2), and more. It is not without some good interest here, as David E. Aune informs us, that 4QShirShabb "refers to seven hierarchically ordered angelic priesthoods, each presiding in one of the seven sanctuaries of the heavenly temple." All this further reinforces the argument that the Apoc is not only addressed to the churches in Asia, but to the ecclesia universalis. Karl Barth's view on catholicity (as Avery Dulles understands it) is exactly the same, "that any local or regional church be linked to the una sancta."

The Seer's apocalyptic message is addressed to the Johannine churches of Asia as a unified whole (Rev 2-3), but at the same time there were also Pauline churches in the area, least of all in Ephesus. It is together in divine concert that the many churches and the one Church, the

---

67 See particularly the commentaries of Swete and Beckwith for very useful discussions: Henry Barclay Swete, The Apocalypse of St John, (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1922), cxxxv-cxxxix; Isbon T. Beckwith, The Apocalypse of John, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919), 250-255. For the use of numbers in the Bible generally, see Bullinger, op. cit., "[i]here we shall find both design and significance": ibid., 4; Davis, op. cit.: "[t]here are several factors that must be considered in the analysis of numbers. One such factor is the terminology employed in the context in which numbers are used": ibid., 25.


69 D. S. Russell's discussion on allegorical arithmetic in the context of apocalyptic and interpretation of prophecy is an illuminating presentation of the question. For the apocalypticists "numbers have meaning, and meaning can be expressed in terms of numbers": D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, (London: SCM Press, 1971), 195.

70 Prévost, op. cit., 33. As it is further noted, the number "seven" [ἐπτά], is John's favourite. It is used in the Apoc 54 times out of a possible 87 in the whole of the NT: ibid., 29.

71 For commentary on the "groups of seven", see David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), (Dallas: Word Books), 34f.

72 ibid., 35.
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una sancta, are infused in the Spirit's words of prophecy (1:1-17, 4:1-11). Without the Body of the Church, which goes to make up the communion of believers, there would be no "seven lampstands [which] are the seven churches" (1:20). That we are to understand these seven congregations symbolically is further evidenced when the Seer speaks of them in the context of "the mystery" [τὸ μυστήριον] (1:20).

Interestingly, biblical commentaries from Qumran make use of the term "mystery" [raz], as "a mystery formula to introduce eschatological scenarios." The Apoc is a document, as Iwavnnh" Karabidopoul o" emphasizes in a recent study of the seven letters from the perspective of a spirituality approach, which is not directed to one person, but to seven churches and through them to the entirety of Christ's Church:

H Apokaluyh eixai keireno pou apeuquetai oai se esa atono, alla se eptav ekkl hsiē' kai di' autw ou se oμh thn ekkl hsiān tou Cristouv.

Each congregation is encouraged to conquer and overcome by obeying the message that the Spirit proclaims. And to do this courageously as a suffering congregation, the Seer supplies them with a vision of the eschatological future which extends to the whole of the church in the later chapters (Rev 21, 22). The prophetic utterance to the seven local churches is adjusted to the unique situation of each, to be ultimately made applicable in all of its fullness in "the great climax of John's whole visionary revelation: the vision of the New Jerusalem."

All seven messages, as Richard Bauckham writes:

[en]d with the encouragement and eschatological promise. Whether a church's need is for repentance or simply for endurance, all are invited to 'conquer' so that they may inherit the eschatological promises.

The Number Seven as Completion

We have seen that the number seven is symbolic and denotes "completion" or "perfection". Adela Yarbro Collins suggests that "the repetition of the number [seven] and its sacred

75 As David E. Aune notes, the term musthion which is found four times in the Apoc (1:20; 10:7; 17:5,7), "was a quasi-technical term in both prophetic and apocalyptic texts in early Judaism and early Christianity": Aune, Revelation 1-5, 106. S. Agouridh" connects the use of the word with Dan 2:47, "[H] levi musthio scetiletai me tou Danih v thn apokaluyh 'musthion sto Naboucodonosora": S. Agouridh", H Apokaluyh Tou I wavnh (Qessal oniKh: Poumarav 1994), 105.
76 Aune, Rev. 1-5, 106.
78 Bauckham, Theology, 125.
79 ibid.
character may have had an emotional impact on the audience of this book [Apoc] as well.\footnote{Adela Yarbro Collins, Cosmology and Eschatology, 14.} When the book is addressed to the "seven churches which are in Asia" (Rev 1:4,11) it is not only to these topical congregations that it is delivered, but to the universal Church on earth. This is further corroborated by the refrain at the conclusion of each of the seven letters, "[h]e who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches" (2:7,11,17,29, 3:6,13,22). As a whole the Apoc is a prophetic message to the Christian churches of Asia Minor at a specific time in history when they faced persecution and marginalization. The power of the prophetic word, however, spoke to all who would listen and continues to speak to all who will listen. The Spirit\footnote{For an illuminating discussion of the expression \textit{ej pneuvmati} as used in the Apoc, see Richard L. Jeske, "Spirit and Community in the Johannine Apocalypse", NTS 31, (1985), 452-466. In one part Jeske concludes, "The \textit{ej pneuvmati} passages in Rev aside, it is clear that the work of the Spirit in Revelation is related to the life of the community as a whole": \textit{ibid.}, 462.} of Jesus speaks through the Seer of Patmos to the local churches \textit{in time} (2:2-6,9-10,13-16,19-25, 3:1-5,8-12,15-20), and to the Church of God \textit{throughout time} (7:9, 14:1, 19:6, 20, 20-22). This is possible because the Lamb has triumphed over the world and brings all things under His rule (1:5, 6:1, 17:14). For even as John wrote down his prophecies, the Lord was being worshipped both in heaven and on earth (5:11-14, 7).\footnote{For a review of the literature for the hypothesis of a liturgical setting, see Aune, \textit{Revelation 1-5}, 28-32.}

It is not by chance that the Seer connects the letters of chapters two and three to the Christophany of chapter one. For outside "the testimony [\textit{marturivan}] of Jesus" (Rev 1:9)\footnote{G. K. Beale, \textit{The Book of Revelation}, (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: Grand Rapids, 1999), 202.} the revelation which follows would be no different to any other oracle and given to the same corruptions. Our author then, makes absolutely sure that the letters themselves, as M. Eugene Boring has properly pointed out, are interpreted outside that same Christophany:

\begin{quote}
The first three chapters of Revelation form one indivisible unit that must be interpreted together. The vision of Christ in 1:9-20 cannot be considered by itself, for the only act of Christ in this vision is to dictate the message to the seven churches.\footnote{M. Eugene Boring, \textit{Revelation}, (Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1989), 63.}
\end{quote}

The seven messages (Rev 2-3) are of vital importance to the Seer's revelation. John steers his readers' attention to these letters through a standard pattern or formula,\footnote{Wilfrid J. Harrington observes that the common plan of the letters "...is redolent of Old Testament prophetic texts as this Christian prophet [the Seer] speaks, confidently, in the name of the Lord of the Churches": W. J. Harrington, \textit{Revelation}, (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 56.} though they do not
conform to any known "letter-pattern." This formula is: (i) The Seer, John, is commanded to write to the angel of the church; (ii) Christ is introduced with a descriptive title; (iii) The condition of the church is summarized, beginning with Jesus' saying "I know," with praise or rebuke; (iv) Exhortations are given; (v) The letter concludes with "He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says" and a promise is given to him who "overcomes". It is also crucial to note (given the historical-theological approach of this thesis), that the readers' or hearers' resulting interpretation of the rest of the book, that is, whether to fathom it as paraenesis or as a word of correction from God, is largely determined by the congregation which "a reader belongs to". The key reason for this is that apocalypses make strong use of symbols at the expense of normal discourse, which would encourage diverse strategies of reading from each congregation or Christian era, according to the prevailing religio-historical conditions. This would have direct implications in the context of the NT Canon when we consider the unconditional importance that history of interpretation plays in the reception of a document claiming catholic authority. Finally, the covenantal form of the seven letters cannot be

86 For discussion on the format of the letters, see Charles Homer Giblin, The Book of Revelation: The Open Book of Prophecy, (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 49-52. "They [the letters] are a mixed genre created by John and combine features of a royal proclamation or edict, the prophetic judgement salvation-oracle, and an element from wisdom literature, the 'hearing formula' (Weckformel)": ibid., 49f.; Stanley K. Stowers, in the broad context of letter writing in antiquity, groups six of the seven letters in Revelation 2 and 3 (those to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, and Philadelphia) in Letters of Praise and Blame. He says, "[i]n good epistolary form they begin with praise and then turn to blaming or threatening": S. K. Stowers, Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 80f.; Eastern Orthodox commentators view the letters in a similar way, stressing that though the "praise" and "blame" was initially directed to the seven church communities, it is nonetheless equally directed to the Church Universal: " Οσα λέγονται στή, ἐπίτα, ἐπιστολεί, καὶ ὑπότου ἐπά, ἵνα πολιτικό, ἀρχον τῶν κάτω τῶν και συνεργών τούτων, ἐπιστολεῖ ποιήσει οὖν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ δια, ἀπερημότως πρὸς ἀγίους και; σοματικὸν κατοικίαν, εἰς τῶν ἐκκλησίων τῆς ἁγίας τῆς οἰκουμένης χαῖρε, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἰδιότητί τῆς εὐγένειας, τούτῳ θεῷ καὶ θε manners. Eusebius, Patristic History, (Oxford, 1997), 371, 378-383.


88 Bauckham, Theology, 16.

89 Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza calls these historical conditions (the socio-political and religious-theological) the social location. "Readers of Revelation are members of interpretative communities that share common assumptions about Revelation and employ standard strategies of interpretation... [t]hese different strategies of interpretation have led and still lead to different judgements about the religious and theological authority of the book, and they engender different ecclesial and cultural practices": E. Schüssler Fiorenza, Revelation: Vision of a Just World, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 5.

90 We noted this fundamental element earlier in Chapter 5, when I critically reviewed the role of chiliasm in the reception history of the Book of Revelation.

91 For "the structure of the covenant identified in the letters to the Seven Churches", see William H. Shea, "The Covenant Form of the Letters to the Seven Churches", AUSS 21/1, (1983), 71-84; also see Kenneth A. Strand, "A Further Note on the Covenant Form in the Book of Revelation", AUSS 21/3, (1983), 251-264.
overestimated, not only do "they follow the form of more ancient statements of the covenant", as William H. Shea tells us, but they "witness to the covenant concept throughout Revelation", which fits in ideally with the second part of this chapter (when the concept of covenant and community are explored).

**Church Militant and Church Triumphant**

The governing characteristic of the Church on earth is the concept of community, that there is communion between the faithful. Similarly we find the same idea of fellowship to be characteristic of the Church in heaven. At the centre of the drama which is revealed to the Seer is the assembly of the New Israel. Indicative of this theology is that the great heavenly roll call is by tribes and not by personal names (Rev 7:4-8), and that the vision which follows this scene is of an innumerable multitude of the redeemed (7:9-10). "Such a concept of a 'spiritual Judaism'", Eugenio Corsini has reflected commenting on Rev 7:4-10, "could not be limited to any ethnic group not even before the coming of Christ." It is as a community that the faithful worship and receive healing and salvation through judgement (21:3-4). This is in the deuteronomistic tradition of the renewed choice of life versus death covenant on Mount Ebal (Deut 27-30).

On earth it is the militant state of the nature that is made known to the community of believers; the Church in heaven is triumphant and is known to the saints. This double aspect of the Church as both Militant (Rev 2:1-3:22) and Triumphant (4:1-11, 7:9-17, 11:15-19, 14:1-5, 19:1-9), allows the Seer to transport both himself and his readers...
from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth as his theology demands. It is vital to comprehend a fundamental point that our author is making. The new heaven which is being revealed and the earth on which the apocalyptic drama will unfold are not completely separated: the New Jerusalem comes "down out of heaven from God" (21:1-2). But why is this so important? Because it is through this tremendous eschatological event that all the Church, on earth and in heaven, will wait for the coming of its Lord (1:7, 2:5, 3:3, 16:16, 22:12,20). Robert W. Wall has expressed this ecclesiological interdependence in simple but precise words, "[w]hat is true in heaven will be true on earth." In christological terms we could here use the instructive analogy of the *communicatio idiomatum*.

This is also explicitly portrayed in a series of "up-down" reciprocals which Stephen S. Smalley has brought together and juxtaposed very well, the Seer himself is on a definite earthly point, Patmos, sharing in the "persecution" and "the patient endurance" (Rev 1:9), yet he is transported to the heavenly realm to be shown what "must take place after this" (4:1); the great angel that comes down from heaven and puts his feet on both land and sea (10:1-2, 18:1); the martyred and resurrected prophets of this world go up to heaven ('from the great city') in a cloud (11:7-12); the messianic child is born on earth, but taken up in rapture to God in heaven (12:5); the glorified Lamb takes His place with the community of the redeemed on Mount Zion (14:1); the angel who soars above the world proclaims the gospel to those still on earth (14:6). John emphasizes the covenantal dimensions of his narrative when the angel with the little scroll who comes down from heaven does so "wrapped in a cloud, with a rainbow over his head, and his face was like the sun, and his legs like pillars of fire" (10:1). These recall the signs and symbols of God's covenant with Noah (Gen 9:12-17), and His presence among the people of Israel (Ex 13:17-22). Stephen Smalley's illustrative juxtapositions fit in perfectly with the more impassioned typological approach to canonical criticism that we find, for example, in the work of Charles J. Scalise, and in the Eastern Orthodox hermeneutical tradition itself.

---

98 See Smalley, *op. cit.*, 155.
The Seer of Patmos, whilst spatially distinguishing between the two modes of the revelation of the Church, never makes this distinction intrinsic: each is given the charge to bear witness and to worship the Lamb (Rev 4:1-22:5). The "fullness and completeness of the whole Church", Aleksei Khomiakov the Russian lay theologian reflects, "[is] appointed to appear at the final judgement of all creation." Precisely the position of the author of the Book of Revelation, it is from this perspective that the Seer expounds his profoundest ecclesiology in the concluding chapters of his work where he introduces his theologia of the apokatastasis (21-22). I use "apokatastasis", here, in the context of the words of Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944), who when commenting on the Apoc's eschatological dimension, writes:

Christ's promise [surely I come quickly] is at the same time a fulfilment, having power and authority. It should always be kept in heart and mind as a transcendent manifestation of the life of the world to come. The consciousness of this should be the central and most essential thing in our life, the highest and most indubitable spiritual reality.

---

Part B- The Church as Community

The Church as Israel

The Seer tells us that the Jews who oppose the Church are not worthy of their name (Rev 2:9, 3:9) and are the "synagogue of satan" [sunagwgh' tou' satana'], "[i]mplying" K. Giles says, "a contrast with the church of God."103 G. K. Beale points us to a parallel in Qumran, where the apostate Jews are called "a congregation of Belial" in contrast to the Jews in the Qumran community who have "leaned on your covenant."104 In the letter to the church of Smyrna, John writes that he knows "the slander" [t'n blasfhmivan] (2:9) of those who say that they are Jews. In other places in the Apoc this same word is used to describe the blasphemous actions of both the "beast" [qhrion] and the "mother of harlots" [hJ mhvthr tw'n pornw'n] (13, 17). An idea closely linked to the manifestation of hubris: insolent pride and arrogance. In a typological context, Hippolytus will connect these terrible results to the false prophets [yeudapostолов'], sent in like manner [qhmw' perye] by the Antichrist to mimic the true apostles.105

In the ecclesiological plans of the author, the Church is the spiritual successor to the historic Israel; this typological association is made at the outset in connection with the OT. On at least two occasions the Seer will cite the celebrated covenant passage of Exodus 19:6 in direct reference to the Christians who now take upon themselves the promises that were previously made to the Jewish people.106 He proclaims that they have been made a "kingdom, priests serving [his] God" (Rev 1:6, 5:10, cf. 20:6). The Christian community redeemed from the slavery of death by the Lamb is seen as taking part in a second exodus. They will savour the blessings of the new covenant. The enemies of the Lamb's faithful fall under the judgement of God and suffer the plagues that are sent down. The earthly Jerusalem signifying Judaism becomes "Sodom and Egypt" (11:8), while the Christian community becomes Israel and inherits the promises made previously to the twelve tribes of Israel (7:1-8). This is momentous for there is an eternal consequence. Though the broad use of the OT in the Apoc is not questioned,107 the application of these references to the Christian community remain

103 Giles, op. cit., 175.
105 Antichr. 6.
106 See 1Pet 2:9 where the author of that epistle makes use of the collective noun "iJeravteuma" (reflecting the LXX), suggesting that the Christian community has now become a priestly body in all of its entirety.
fundamental, for they point, Zizioulas reflects elsewhere in a comparable context, "towards a synthesis of the historical and the eschatological."\textsuperscript{108}

With the authority of the OT prophets, John of Patmos announces, that three sets of seven judgements will fall from heaven on the adversaries of the Christian community on earth: the "seven seals" (ch. 6); the "seven trumpets" (ch. 8); and the "seven plagues" (ch. 15). The Seer, however, has included three interludes in between his report of the heavenly chastisements, where, in the context of the judgements, he describes both the present and future condition of the Militant Church which is called to become the new "Israel".\textsuperscript{109} It is the first of these three interludes located in chapter seven, between the account of the breaking open of the sixth and seventh seals, which is of direct interest to us here. Two visions are related with the express aim of assuring the community of the faithful that it will ultimately triumph (Rev 7:1-8, 9-17). The first vision describes the "one hundred forty-four thousand" out of every tribe of Israel who are "sealed" [ἐφάγας τὴν κρίσιν] (7:4),\textsuperscript{110} and which we are later told have the "name" [προσώπου] of the Lamb and of the Father "written on their foreheads" [γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῷ χρυσῷ] (14:1).\textsuperscript{111} To be "sealed" is both a sign of God's ownership and the promise of His protection (7:3, 9:4). The second vision refers to a "great multitude which no man could number" [οὐκ ἔχουσι τὸ ἔργον οἱ ἁριωθοῦντες αὐτὸν οὐδὲ] (7:9). This multitude includes the "one hundred forty-four thousand" for the author merges both Militant and Triumphant Church into an organic whole at the climax of world history. These elect, proclaims Victorinus, have kept "the grace which they have received."\textsuperscript{112}

\textit{The Measuring of the Temple}

There is another indication in these interludes which provides further proof that the Christian community, the Church, is the New Israel. The second vision of the second interlude (Rev 10:1-11:13), this time between the sixth and seventh trumpet, commences with the symbolic Jean", \textit{NRT 77}, (1955), 113-22, and P. Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation", \textit{JTS} 17, (1966), 82-88.

\textsuperscript{108} Zizioulas, \textit{op. cit.}, 181.

\textsuperscript{109} Kevin Giles too underscores the importance of the interludes in the shift of identification between the 'two' Israels. The same author also cites the epigrammatic statement of Schweizer who says that the universal church is "no longer merely the legitimate development of Israel-it is Israel": \textit{op. cit.}, 175f.

\textsuperscript{110} Origen as we might expect writes, "[t]he statement about the hundred and forty-four thousand no doubt admits of mystical interpretation": \textit{Comment. in Jn.} 1.2.

\textsuperscript{111} Cyprian of Carthage interprets this verse in the context of the intriguing "mark the sign" pericope of Ezek 9:4: \textit{Test. libri III}, 2.22.

\textsuperscript{112} Victorinus, \textit{In Apoc.} 7.9.
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act of the measuring of the temple. The background for this vision is clearly Ezekiel chapters 40, 41 where in the context of the new temple proclamation, the prophet speaks of Israel in the land in the coming age (43-48).\textsuperscript{113} In John's vision, however, the temple is the Church and the community of the two witnesses (Rev 11:1-12)\textsuperscript{114} who are not only given "authority" [\textit{ekousian}] to perform wonders, but also to "prophesy" [\textit{profheia\ a\ujtw'n}] (11:6).\textsuperscript{115} This would indicate, in the unique theological unveiling of our author, both the continuity and transfiguration (in the sense of an 'in depth' extension of the incarnation)\textsuperscript{116} of the Old Israel into the New Israel. And here we have the Apoc's governing typology of the revelatory connection between the two communities (one past and one present) of which God remains the "spearhead" and through which He is "acting in the world".\textsuperscript{117} What has been previously prophesied can now also be witnessed. In the Book of Revelation, prophecy and witnessing, as Kevin Giles has correctly stated, "are closely related" (1:2, 19:10).\textsuperscript{118}

\textit{The Ageless Conflict between God and Satan Revisited}

Predictively we find yet another indication of the transfiguration of the Old Israel into the New Israel, this time as an inheritor of the ageless conflict between God and Satan and the beastly powers of the deep.\textsuperscript{119} The author of the Apoc is immersed in order and structure,\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{113} As John B. Taylor explains the "chief problem in these chapters is that of interpretation." For useful discussion of the relative merits of the four main views that have been held (\textit{literal prophetic, symbolic Christian, dispensationalist, and apocalyptic}), see J. B. Taylor, \textit{Ezekiel}. (Leicester: IVP 1969), 251-254.

\textsuperscript{114} Columba Graham Flegg has summarized very well the traditional interpretation of the identity of the two witnesses, "[t]he two witnesses have often been taken to be Moses and Elijah, representing the Law and the Prophets, the same two witnesses who appeared to the apostles at the Transfiguration. They can thus also be understood as signifying the dead and the living at the time of the Parousia (which the Transfiguration is explicitly associated in Orthodox hymnology). Alternatively, they have been seen as Enoch and Elijah. In the context here, however, it seems more likely that they represent the Church's witness to the Gospel, two being the minimum required for valid witness, as is explicitly stated in Deuteronomy 19, and taken up in John 8:17-18": C. G. Flegg, \textit{An Introduction to Reading the Apocalypse}. (New York: SVS Press, 1999), 93f. [italics added]

\textsuperscript{115} Note the direct connection between \textit{authority} and \textit{prophecy}. Whether we identify the two witnesses with Elijah and Enoch (or Moses), is not the major point here. What we should observe is that the authority to the "prophesying church... has been given by God": John G. Strelan, \textit{Where Earth Meets Heaven; A Commentary on Revelation}. (Adelaide: Openbook Publishers, 1994), 178.


\textsuperscript{117} \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{118} Giles, \textit{op. cit.}, 175f.
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which also effects emphasis and recall. This is evident here also, three interludes and three
demonstrations. In the third interlude (Rev 12:1-14:20), which earmarks the principal division
of the text, prior to the description of "the seven bowls of the wrath of God" (16:1), John
interprets the causes for the tribulation of the Christian community in powerful symbolism.
Satan's acts are now discernible through such figures and agents as a dragon and beasts, and a
demonic number "six hundred and sixty-six" (ch. 13). Though the Lamb has been
victorious on account of the Cross, the ancient adversary, the "serpent" (12:9) continues to
deceive and persecute the faithful, but his agent [the beast] receives on one of its heads a
"mortal wound" [ὁ ἀγγείων ἐν ἀγωγῆς] (13:3). The Seer is not alarmed at what he sees,
because ultimately he can foretell the victory of the persecuted and so strengthens them in
their temporal tribulations.

The Age of the New Saints

Revelation 12:1-14:20 brims with the theology of a New Israel. On at least three direct
occasions the Christian community is called "the saints" [των ἁγιων] (13:7, 10, 14:12). This is important for it was typically used for the Israel of the OT (2Chron 6:41; Ps 16:3,
148:14; Dan 7:27). In the NT itself ἁγιος was "associated", H. Balz informs us, "with things,
places, and persons connected with the Jewish cult and the OT tradition." At the same time,
the Church is also described symbolically as the Israel of the last days. The woman of Rev
12:1 crowned with the twelve stars ("astral symbols") is the Church, the heavenly

---

120 This would imply a conscious literary intention, in which case, it can be argued, appeal cannot be made to
rapture to explain stylistic peculiarities. But this is to assume to understand not only the mode of revelation or
inspiration or workings of ecstasy, but the Seer's inner condition as well. We simply cannot know the exact and
minute detail of how John put his book together. It is possible, and there is nothing in the Apoc to contradict
this, that he had the visions first and wrote them down later, in which case rapture and literary intention would
not contradict. Nor can we be absolutely certain that all of the Seer's prophetic visions and auditions fall into
parapsychological categories. For example, as Boyce M. Bennett writes in an illuminating work, Anatomy of
"Jeremiah's vision of the almond branch (Jer 1:11-12) is interpreted to mean that God is 'watching' over Israel.
Such a vision is not paranormal in itself, nor is the interpretation easily put into the categories of clairvoyance,
telepathy, or precognition": ibid., 98; for a critical review of recently proposed structures of the Book of

121 See M. G. Michael for an extensive discussion into the background, sources, and history of interpretation of
"the number of the beast": ibid., 237-307; see esp. Richard Bauckham, The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on

122 Observe here, as G. E. Ladd explains, that the "chief objects of the beast's wrath are the saints": George
180. But who are the saints, Ladd goes on to ask. They are "those who keep the commandments of God and
bear testimony to Jesus" (Rev 12:17).

123 ἁγιος in EDNT (Vol.1), art. H. Balz, 17.

124 For an interesting perspective on the Apoc and "astral symbols", see James Turley van Burkalow, A
Jerusalem and the successor to Israel (which in patristic exegesis has taken two approaches). In Jewish literature Zion is often spoken of as the mother of Israel (Isa 54:1; 2Esdra 10:7; cf. Gal 4:26). The Seer writes that the dragon made war with the children of the woman, "those who keep the commandments of God and hold the testimony of Jesus" (Rev 17). This interpretation is justified when in chapter 14 John describes the ultimate triumph of the redeemed as the Church of the "one hundred forty-four thousand", the complete Israel standing on Mount Zion with the triumphant Lamb. For "the true and new Israel", Hans Küng typologically interprets (which sits very well with both Eastern Orthodox interpreters and B. S. Childs):

...[is] already realized within the old; externally little different, inwardly already very different, but still waiting for the *metanoia* and the faith of the whole people of the promise.

As Covenant Community

A second critical extension of John's ecclesiology is the covenant between God and His people, the community of believers, which if eschatologically projected, certainly for Eastern Orthodox theologians, is the communion of saints, *koinwnia ajiwn*. In Latin theology referred to as the *communio sanctorum*, also as the *congregatio sanctorum* [congregation of saints]. The members of the Church are holy and are called to this communion because of the sacrifice and righteousness of Christ. But as Paul Evdokimov says, at the same time [*tautozōrona*], the communion of saints is also a 'communion of sinners' who are in communion with the *aġia* [holy], and who are made holy on account of their divinized union with the only Holy: "*Koinwnia ajiwn, koinwnia dhladí; twn ajiartw'n me; ta;*"

---

125 First, the mystical woman of Rev 12:1 is the Holy Theotokos, the Mother of God (Epiphanius, Ephraim the Syrian, Ecumenios). Second, and the view which prevails, the woman is understood to represent the Universal Church, comprising the faithful of both the Old and New Dispensations (Hippolytus, Methodius, Andrew of Caesarea). This second approach was principally the view right up until the ninth century. *Salbeı' Agourivdhi' contra Stearqio Salko* and Vasile Mihoc, has convincingly argued this position in his commentary with strong reference to both testamental and extra-testamental sources, and a comparison of the introverted Mary of the gospel narrative against the universal persona of Apoc 12: *Agourivdhi', op. cit.*, 284-293. This is the Christian community, argues *Agourivd*, more particularly the Church of the Old and New Covenants, as it is giving birth [*kaqów égkumoni*] and brings to life [*f emei sth zwh*] the Messiah: *ibid.*, 290.

126 Aune citing as one of his parallels Rev 17:1 writes that this section (14:1-5), "is an elaboration of the author's characteristic use of participial phrases that more closely identify an individual or a group": David E. Aune, *Revelation 6-16 52B*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998), 796.

127 Hans Küng, *The Church*, (Kent: Burns & Oates, 1968), 109. Küng moves on to describe the peculiar forms of the early Christian community which "pointed to a distinctive development". These are: baptism, communal service of prayer, communal eschatological meal, leaders composed of the eschatological Israel, community living fellowship of love (the *koinwnia*): *ibid.*, 109-111.
The use of covenantal theology in the Apoc, as throughout the NT generally and the Book of Hebrews in particular (cf. esp. Heb 8, 9), carries over (the new covenant completing what was lacking in the old) from the covenantal concept as developed in the OT. This is a determining idea for our study of the book and is intimately related to the notion of canon consciousness, for the Seer writes within an established tradition of religious literature. Against this it might be argued that covenant language is not outstanding in the Apoc. In fact, the actual term \textit{diathike} \[\text{th}' \text{ diaqhvkh}\] appears just once, and that is in the vision of the heavenly ark of God's covenant in Rev 11:19. But this surprising phenomenon \textit{Sabbata Agourivdh} has responded in his commentary, does not present a hermeneutical difficulty, for what essentially matters is the overriding context of the eschatological narrative: the salvation of all believers across time \[\text{aparchv}' \text{ mevcri}' \text{ tevlou}'\]. However, the Seer will often allude to the concept of a covenantal relationship between God and His Church (Rev 1:3, 21:1-8, 22:10:14,18-19), and it is directly connected with the theology of redemption. And this is because now, as Vladimir Lossky christologically expounds, after "successive elections" of patriarchs and institutions from the OT, redemption shall forevermore be connected to the economy of the Son, the realized "mystery of the Incarnation."  

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[128]{\textit{Paul o' Eujdokimof, H. Dragoulo{, (B. Rhgopoulo'': Qessalonivkh, 1972), 195.}}
\footnotetext[129]{That is, as Guthrie writes, "...the power to enable people to live in a manner worthy of the salvation which God had provided": Donald Guthrie, \textit{New Testament Theology}, (Leicester: IVP, 1981), 435; for patristic commentary on the Book of Hebrews (the authorship of which still puzzles), see \textit{Trempeva}, \textit{Upomhina} \(G\), 22-213.}
\footnotetext[130]{For an in-depth introduction to the nature of ancient covenants, and the connections of the biblical covenants to later post-biblical developments in which the authors are careful to distinguish between covenants as "socially enacted historical realities... that were expected to bring about functional changes in patterns of behaviour, and covenants as formal or symbolic dogmatic concepts... that were supposed to be the objects of tradition and belief" (1179f.), see "Covenant" in \textit{ABD} \(Vol. 1\), (1992), \textit{art. G. E. Mendenhall and G. A. Herion}, 1179-1202; see also F. C. Fensham, "The Covenant as Giving Expression to the Relationship between Old and New Testament", \textit{TB} 22, (1971), 82-94, and J. Begrich, "Berit. Ein Beitrag zur Erfassung einer alttestamentlichen Denkform", \textit{ZAW} 60, (1944), 1-11.}
\footnotetext[131]{I do not mean a specific and defined religious canon, but an established tradition of religious literature with a specifically defined belief system and a universal world-view.}
\footnotetext[132]{\textit{Diachih} is "used relatively seldom" in the NT with most occurrences appearing in Hebrews (17 times). Most of the references belong to the tradition of the Lord's Supper or to "passages influenced" by its theology: \textit{"diachih"} in \textit{EDNT} \(Vol. 1\), \textit{art. Harald Hegermann}, 299; see also F. Hahn, "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der uchristlichen Herrenmahlüberlieferung". \textit{EvT} 27, (1967), 337-374.}
\footnotetext[133]{Given our author's practice of loose citation and paraphrase, this is hardly surprising and that the actual term is not prominent is of no great difficulty. What is important, as \textit{Sabbata Agourivdh} has said, is that the context of \textit{diathike} has to do with the salvation of the faithful of all time. "... en prwvtoi' toniaei [John] ovi h swthria perianantasei doul' tou' pistolei, aparchv' mevri' tevlo'... autovchi waei... kai' h qeai' th' kiwtoutou' diachih''...": \textit{Agourivdh}, \textit{op. cit.}, 279.}
\footnotetext[134]{Vladimir Lossky, \textit{The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church}, (New York: SVS Press, 1976), 140.}
\end{footnotes}
The Symbols of the New Covenantal Relationship

The covenantal relationship between God and His elect, signified by the symbolism of the ark and of the temple (Rev 11:19, 15:5), defines the essence of the communion between the Creator and the created as "essentially spiritual and relational in nature". However, as Robert W. Wall continues, "this too will be perfected in human experience." Here too, as was the case with the Old Israel, the covenant which originates in God is to be understood as an act of grace (1:5-6,21,22). The OT covenant, which saw several manifestations, was ultimately established after the Exodus with Moses (Ex 24). However, even during the OT dispensation "a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah" is promised (Jer 31:31-34). And notably, in the Book of Revelation:

...the leading reference of 'covenant' is corporate: God keeps faith with His people, as a company. The theology of covenant also manifests, again, an exact balance; for the relationship within the agreement is both divine and human. It is God who acts in mercy, and calls Israel and the new Israel to respond.  

The "reward" [ομισθότης] (Rev 22:12) to come, the eschatological promise of the covenant, is paralleled by the blessings of paradise prefigured by the wanderings in the wilderness during the time of the Exodus. An early eschatological expectation of Judaism, David E. Aune explains, "was that the future of salvation would correspond to the period of wilderness wandering in which God would again supply manna miraculously." This could be the significance of the reference at Rev 2:17 of the "hidden manna" [μαννά του' κεκρυμμένου]. The Messiah appears as a slain Lamb at Rev 5:6, which is clearly a reference to the defenceless lamb which suffers for others described by the prophet Isaiah (Isa 53:7 cf. Ps 44:22). But it is also the Passover lamb whose blood made possible the redemption of Israel in Egypt (Ex 12). The reference to the seal of God at Rev 7:2 is most probably a connection with the blood of the Passover lamb, which was used to mark out the houses of the Israelites in order to protect them from the destroyer of the Egyptians (Ex 12:7,13). It is also signifies the "blood of the Lamb" [αιματι του' αιρημου] poured out for the salvation of the elect (Rev 135 Wall, op. cit., 155.

136 That which G. E. Mendenhall and G. A. Herion have written of the OT covenant motifs in the NT certainly applies here, "[t]here is here the recognition that in the ongoing quest for a truly "blessed" community, the behaviour of individuals must correspond directly to the "blessings" they have already received (and not to some impersonal codification of laws, statutes, and ordinances)": "Covenant" in TABD (Vol.1), 1200.

137 Smalley, op. cit., 155.

138 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 189.
The Apocalypse

7:14. The Seer of Patmos worships Jesus as the Lamb of God, whose fulfilment of the christological mission made possible the last covenant between God and His people. This is, as Hans Küng says, the "eschatological community of salvation." A recognized sign of God's covenant with the earth was the Noahic rainbow (Gen 9:12-17, cf. Ezek 1:28). In ancient folklore, this brilliant phenomenon was considered in many places to be a heavenly bridge, connecting the worlds of gods and men (a type of metaphorical *Aurea Catena*). Note also the reference to the "rainbow" [ιχθύς] which is "κυκλωμένον τού θανάτου" in the striking vision of Rev 4:3. This is an unambiguous signal of the rekindling of that celebrated pledge in the Genesis account between God and His created order. For the angel who comes down from heaven with the "little scroll" [βιβλιαρίδιον] (Rev 10:1-2) is complemented by a rainbow, a "σημαδιον" [a sign] properly interprets, "πως οι σκότεινες νεκρες του κατακλυσμου περιερχονται." But also by cloud and fiery pillars, this time reminiscent of the symbols of the Exodus (13:17-22) and of the Lord's "covenant theology" with Israel, the "consecrated" people (Ex 19). These motifs are now connected in the ark vision of Rev 11, whilst the seven plagues of Rev 15 and 16 train the Exodus account (7-11):

...including the battle between good and evil staged by Moses and Pharaoh... now perceived as the conflict between a divided church and a persecuting Roman Society.

The Redemptive Work of Jesus Christ, Who is the Lamb

The Seer presents his covenantal theology of the Church in the doctrinal framework of the new covenant into which the faithful can now enter (cf. Heb 4) through the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. The living creatures in the throne room (Rev 5) and the elders fall down before the

---

139 Note as C. G. Flegg points out, that "the great tribulation is mentioned as if it were a past event, though in the sequence of visions it is yet to be revealed": Columba Graham Flegg, *An Introduction to Reading the Apocalypse*, (New York: SVS Press, 1999), 92.


141 In Hebrew there is no specific term for the word "rainbow", a lit. trans. would be "war-bow".

142 The scroll is "little" possibly on account as Flegg considers, it could "include[s] only those parts of the plan which have been revealed through the Scripture to mankind": Flegg, *op. cit.*, 93.

143 *Agorioun*, *op. cit.*, 259.

144 Rolf Rendtorff in his widely recognized study on the OT covenant formula, makes the very important contact between the terms "covenant" and "choose" as "an element of theological language which is introduced in a highly conscious manner... [i]n this way the covenant formula contributes essentially to the expression and differentiation of the thematic field which may be summarily termed 'covenant theology'": Rendtorff, *The Covenant*, 92.

145 Wall, *op. cit.*, 192.
Lamb with bowls of incense in their hands (v.8). The Seer, as he often does, describes the earthly reality behind this heavenly acclamation which reminds us of the song of salvation of Ps 98, and tells us that the "golden bowls full of incense" are the "prayers of the saints" (Rev 5:8). This has been traditionally understood as a reference to the faithful of the old covenant often associated with the Church triumphant, but it might equally refer to the believers of the new covenant as the word "saint" [\(\text{\textgreek{a}\textgreek{g}\textgreek{i}\textgreek{o}}\)] is normally used in the NT for Christians. However, it would do no violence to the interpretation of the pericope if we were to see here, as P. Mpratsiwh\(^\text{\textsuperscript{148}}\) has argued, a reference to the redeemed of both dispensations. This can be further corroborated if we recall that the "seal of the living God" (Rev 7:2) points back to the Passover in making its direct reference to the sealing of the Christian through baptism as a true member of the New Israel: here and now, hic et nunc.

The creation of a new covenantal community which bears witness to God's power and authority by offering themselves to the Lamb in worship does not attenuate the covenantal and communal aspects of the Exodus typology of the OT.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{149}}\) Significantly, the term \textsc{skhnhv} [dwelling] in connection with the tabernacle (Ex 29:45), as David E. Aune informs us, "occurs three times in Revelation (Rev 13:6, 15:5, 21:3), and all three occurrences are articular since the author apparently assumes that his readers are acquainted with that institution."\(^\text{\textsuperscript{150}}\) John guards this theology because to do away completely with the corporate nature of God's love could encourage early gnostic teaching, which understood the effects of God's offer of salvation in individualistic and interiorized ways.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{151}}\)

---

\(^\text{146}\) Jwhv Giannakopoulo\(,\) \textit{Ermmheiu Th\'' Apokaluvyew\''}, (Qessalonivkh: Pournara\textquoteleft, 1991\textquoteright, 62f.

\(^\text{147}\) \textgreek{a}\textgreek{g}\textgreek{i}\textgreek{o}\) is common in the NT and occurs no less than 230 times. It is not to be confused with \textgreek{i}\textgreek{b}\textgreek{r}\textgreek{v} which occurs only 3 times. When used with the article it is almost always for "Christians in general... with a total of 61 occurrences": \"\textgreek{a}\textgreek{g}\textgreek{i}\textgreek{o}\" in \textit{EDNT} (Vol. 1), \textit{art.}, H. Balz, 16.

\(^\text{148}\) Mpratsiwh\(,\) \textit{op. cit.}, 129; also Pablo Richard who writes from the perspective of liberation hermeneutics, "[t]he number twenty-four represents the people in its perfection: the people of the twelve tribes of Israel and the people of the twelve apostles" (\textit{Apocalypse: A People's Commentary on the Book of Revelation}, (New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 66.

\(^\text{149}\) The community of the covenant of the ark is now become the community of the covenant of the cross. Dietrich Bonhoeffer's "community-of-the-cross" fits in perfectly and is suitable: Bonhoeffer, \textit{op. cit.}, 151.

\(^\text{150}\) D. E. Aune, \textit{op. cit.}, 52c, 1123; in the same place Aune considers connections based on the \textit{verba solemnia} "associated with adoption" with other OT passages (Lev 26:11-12; Jer 7:23, 31:1; Zech 8:3; Ezek 37:26-27, 43:7; Ps 95:7), early Jewish literature, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, (11QTemple 59:13, 29:7-8a).

\(^\text{151}\) Consider for instance the earliest extant interpretation of Rev 1:19 (middle second century AD) from the Gnostic Apocryphon of John 2.15-2 where the emphasis is on the perfect Man, "[n]ow I have come to teach you what is, and what was, and what will come to pass, that you may know the things which are not yet revealed and those which are revealed, and to teach you concerning the unwavering race of the perfect Man": \textit{The Nag Hammadi Library}, J. M. Robinson (ed.), (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988), 105f.
doctrine and consequences of the love of Christ who "stand[s] at the door and knock[s]" (Rev 3:20) and seeks each person, is the focal point of the new community. Paul Evdokimov describes the epigraphy on a reliquary of a martyr: *In isto vaso sancto congregabuntur membra Christi*. And, as he continues, this gives a correct picture of the realism of the Biblical understanding for the Body, i.e. the *new community*.152

The declaration of the Lamb concerning His resurrection in the early section of the book (Rev 2:9-10) is meant to reassure the suffering communities which struggle to survive on the margins of the social order. This is a primary motif of apocalyptic literature, the promise of the reversal of the dreadful socio-economic conditions of the believers who will be restored to power when in the fullness of time God triumphs over the Evil One.153 For the present, these negative conditions which afflict the faithful on account of their belonging to the Christian community are a testimony of their devotion to God. It is something akin to the idea of Maximus the Confessor who saw the power of unity as "a suffering power, not a triumphant one."154 The reversal of this marginal status, however, is not far, "for the time is near" [*kairò; ejgguv*] (1:3).155 Ultimately, John makes it plain that the old biblical idea of the covenant which included both conditional and unconditional components was not redundant, it remains a focal emphasis, it is the hub, in a sense the *Mitte* [lit. middle] of the Bible.

*The Ideal of Fellowship*

Fellowship is an essential element of the new community, for the redemptive consequences of the Lord's sacrifice flow first of all through the body of believers, the Church. Whereas previously the biblical idea of covenant was a relationship entered into by God's love through the chosen community's response to the Law (Ex 19-23, Deut 27-29), now it is entered into through the Church's response of faith (Rev 13:10, 12:17, 14:12). It is from within this divinely established foundation that the relationship with God is confirmed to begin with, and which becomes the channel of His grace through the abiding faithfulness of the Church to the Lord. Importantly, we should remember that Rev 3:20 does not in the first instance refer to an

152 Evdokimov, *op. cit.*, 193.


eschatological supper, but is a promise and celebration of the restoration of fellowship.\textsuperscript{156} Christ promises the community of conquerors (should they follow His "pattern of martyrdom"),\textsuperscript{157} the right to "a place with me on my throne" (Rev 3:21-22). "Its fulfilment is portrayed in [Rev] 20:4ff., the millennial rule of Christ," as G. R. Beasley-Murray writes, "but also in 22:5, the eternal kingdom of the new creation."\textsuperscript{158} And here too, we should note that the Seer interprets the earlier messages to the faithful of the seven churches as finding their culmination in this "fulfilment", which he makes abundantly clear, "[t]hose who conquer will inherit these things..." (21:7). This includes the believing community's rule over the new kingdom as "priests" \textsuperscript{159} serving God (1:6, 5:10) \textit{cf}. 1Pet 2:5; Ex 19:6; Isa 61:6. For as W. Howard-Brook and Anthony Gwyther rightly say, commenting on Rev 21:22, "all those who live with God are 'priests'," the division between the people and the priests insisted upon in Ezekiel's vision (ch. 44) is no more, for in New Jerusalem there is no temple "since God the Almighty and the Lamb is its temple."\textsuperscript{159}

The Exodus typology is now reversed by the schema of the Christian model of salvation. There no longer exists an election theology of the sort that denies access to those who are not of the tribes of Israel (Rev 5:9, 7:9 \textit{contra} Ex 19:1-24:18). In Jesus Christ there is one eschatological community: it is inclusive and comprised of believers "from every [\textit{pant}o'] nation, from all tribes and peoples and tongues" (Rev 7:9). \textit{Gewgiod' Mantzariu'nh}, speaking from a sociological perspective of this \textit{eschatologikh; koinwnia} and fitting in comfortably with John's ecclesiology, understands it as a preparatory stage in the history of the Church, to bring together all the nations with the transcendence of the racial distinctions:

\begin{quote}
Tevlo'to; efo go th' Ekkhsia', pou sunistatai sthn proparaskeuain th' \textit{eschatologikh} au'th' koinwnia' mea sthn iSteria, ehai hj efpopokash olwn twh Iawh me; thn uperbash twh diakrisewn au'th'.\textsuperscript{160}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{156} See, for instance, the references to this text by Jerome (\textit{Epist}. 22.26), and by Cassian (\textit{Instit.} 5.17). Though the latter places it more firmly in the context of the "coming of Christ" and where, interestingly, (if we recall that Cassian was writing as early as AD 495), he cites from the Gospel of John (14:23) immediately before his reference to the Apoc (3:20).

\textsuperscript{157} Boring, \textit{op. cit.}, 97.


\textsuperscript{159} Wes Howard-Brook & Anthony Gwyther, \textit{Unveiling Empire: Reading Revelation Then and Now}, (New York: Orbis Books, 1999), 185.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Gewgiod' Mantzariu'nh}, \textit{Oropochox Qeologia kai Koinwnia Zwhr} (Qessal onikh Pournara', 1996), 179.
On Earth as it is in Heaven

The Seer of Patmos wants his readers and listeners, the elect community of the last days, to know that another foundation for their hope and salvation, is the transcendent fellowship that exists between the Militant and Triumphant worshipping communities. With a futuristic insight to iconographic technique, for as Egon Sendler remind us, "...we do not say paint an icon but write an icon,"¹⁶¹ John describes this ραστικλήδασκαλία of the worshipping Church through the bravura of the heavenly temple symbolism. This becomes the categorical conviction of his ecclesiology, and is inevitably linked to his eschatology. The Temple motif, as R. W. Wall says, symbolizes the "perfect and permanent realization" of God's covenant with Israel within history, "this would then explain the Seer's interpretation of his vision of the heavenly temple in terms of the church's eternal relationship with the Lord God Almighty (Rev 11:17) and the Lamb (21:22)."¹⁶² The ark of the covenant, which the author could be setting up against the ancient Roman insignia of official authority, the fasces,¹⁶³ stands for the promise that God will be present in the redeemed community; the former was located in the inner sanctuary where only the high priest could enter on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:17; Heb 10:1-9). This is vital, for when John signals to it, "the ark of his covenant" ἁγιϊκαὶ ναῷ τῇ διακήδυν τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev 11:19),¹⁶⁴ he reveals that this vision anticipates the inauguration of a sweeping new κοινωνία with God on account of the atoning death of Christ. "John", writes J. L. Resseguie, "deforms traditional expectations of messianic conquest by redefining conquest in terms of sacrificial death."¹⁶⁵ Andrew of Caesarea here expounds, "[i]t is the revelation of the good things prepared for the saints, which things, according to the Apostle [Paul], are all hidden in Christ... (Col. 2:9)."¹⁶⁶ The author of the Apoc testifies to this eschatological conviction by imitating the covenantal formula of the Davidic covenant, "I will be a father to him, and he


¹⁶² Wall, op. cit., 155.


¹⁶⁴ This is the only place in the entire Apoc where the actual word διακήδυν occurs, and it is quite surprising how often commentators of the book will fail to note it. "But", as William H. Shea has written on this apparent deviation, "this one occurrence is at the very centre of the book (11:19) and is connected with the Ark of the Covenant, just as the ten stipulations of the Mosaic covenant were connected with the Ark at the centre of the Israelite tabernacle"; art. cit., 72.


shall be a son to me" (2Sam 7:14) cf. with "I will be their God and they will be my children" (Rev 21:7). This new order of existence, essentially characterized by the presence of God and the absence of evil (21, 22), can be synoptically described in the words of Irenaeus as "[the] rejoicing in that splendour which is from thy God."168

In a typically spectacular, one could again say, iconographic display,169 John, as he has done throughout his work, juxtaposes at the end of the book the two existent realms of earth and heaven. Theologia viatorum comes face-to-face with theologia beatorum. The last vision of "all things made new" (Rev 21-22) is the expression of God's new covenant with His people through the Son. The New Jerusalem that comes down from heaven symbolizing a new creation (21:2) is the ultimate proof that the two realms that had for so long opposed each other are now integrated into the one eternal dimension: no more is there a material temple, which according to Tertullian, "Ezekiel had knowledge of and the Apostle John beheld."170 The confirmation of this astonishing revelation is the declaration of God's immanent communion with the believing community, "He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people" (Rev 21:3). The eschatological victory now won must be entered into by the believers (reminiscent of the "rest" in Heb 4:1-3), for until it is entered into, it remains in progress. The loser in this eschatological battle, Satan (and his cohorts), though chained and confined (Rev 20:1-3) will not be completely bound until the final judgement.172

John's presentation of the corporate substantia of the Church extends naturally to a theology of salvation, and once more we witness the function of reciprocation at work. Epigrammatically this could be stated in the words of Aleksei Khomiakov, "[n]o one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her and in union with all her other members."173 The revelation of the heavenly city, in which the redeemed will "need no

167 For the "covenant formula" in its "exegetical context", see Rendtorff, The Covenant, 39-56.
168 Adv. haer. 5.35.1
169 This is a favorite topic of the iconographers. See a fine example in Kounoundoura, op. cit., 146.
170 Adv. Marc. 3.25.
171 The RSV trans. skhwaéi with "dwell", where "tabernacle" would be closer to the idea of our author, as immediately before he speaks of Ἰησοῦς υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.
172 Mitilinaios says of this representation, "[w]ithout there being a historical sequence of events, but a description of them in one and the same image": Athanasios Mitilinaios, The Book of Revelation of St. John the Evangelist, (Wescosville, PA, 1993), 52.
173 Cited Kallistos Ware, The Orthodox Way, (New York: SVS, 1995), 107f. This reciprocity is at the highest level: in concreto and in abstracto. These terms are of course more properly associated with Christological discourse on the communicatio idiomatum; however, it is justifiable to use them in the above context given that we are addressing matters to do with the Church, which is the Body of Christ.
light of lamp or sun" for the "Lord God will be their light [οἰ̃ς οἶκος θεώσει]"\(^{174}\) (Rev 22:5), is also a vivid reminder of two fundamental soteriological consequences: (i) the consummation of each believer's salvation is completed only within the context of the eschatological community, for, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer has written, "Christian eschatology is essentially eschatology of the church-community [Gemeindeeschatologie]",\(^{175}\) and (ii) the reign [βασιλευσίν] of the faithful (which is also corporate) is eternal, "for ever and ever" [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] (22:5). Which, in addition to, E. Schüssler Fiorenza nicely abridges, observing the "curious measurements" between the city and the wall around it, "[t]he city seems to function as the universal cosmic symbolization of salvation."\(^{176}\) The Seer, however, warns that although this salvation may be anticipated from the now (2:7, 7:4, 21:7) for the believer's entry into the New Jerusalem begins from the present (2:3,10, 3:2,19,21), the preparation is in the form of "enduring patiently [πάσχοντες καὶ ἐπιζήσαντες]" (2:3)\(^{177}\) that the "crown [στέφανος]" (3:11) is not seized beforehand. This is not a contradiction, but the covenant irrespective of its divine constitution, will be of no use to those who are not subject to its treaty.\(^{178}\) As Cyprian of Carthage characteristically admonished in reference to John's corporate and individual censuring of the church in Laodicea, future rewards are not to be expected if they are to be confused with the material fortunes of the present world:

You are mistaken, and deceived, whosoever you are, that think yourself rich in this world. Listen to the voice of your Lord in the Apocalypse... [y]ou therefore, who are rich and wealthy, buy for yourself of Christ gold tried by fire; that you may be pure gold, with your filth burnt out as if by fire, if you are purged by almsgiving and righteous works... [a]nd you who are a wealthy and rich matron in Christ's Church, anoint your eyes, not with the collyrium of the devil, but with Christ's eye-slave, that you may be able to attain to see God...\(^{179}\)

\(^{174}\) In a variation from Isa 60:1, 19f., our author also declares that the heavenly Jerusalem needs neither sun nor moon, since it is illuminated by the "glory of God" (Rev 21:23).

\(^{175}\) Bonhoeffer, op. cit., 283.

\(^{176}\) Fiorenza, Vision, 112.

\(^{177}\) Arethas makes the contrast in the context of a cowardly behaviour, "Οὐ̃ κεκοπίακα αὕτη τοῦ οὐκ ἀπεκατοθηκα" ἡ ἀκτί: τοῦ ἐπικαταθήσα": cited Ἐπιθέσιος, op. cit., 86.

\(^{178}\) For there is a link between "covenant formula and recognition formula (Ex 6:2-8, 29:45f.)... the declaration of recognition joins directly on to the covenant formula, and again, its primary, essential substance is the knowledge 'that I am Yhwh their God": Rolf Rendtorff, The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 91. This is directly applicable to the Apoc which as we have seen, is steeped in OT covenantal theology (including the connection of election). Cf. "I will be his God [εἰς ναὸν αὐτῶν]" that "he shall be my son [αὐτός ἐσται ναὶ υἱός]" (Rev 21:7).

\(^{179}\) De opere et eleem.14.
The Church as a Community of Conquerors

The Saints are Called to Conquer

Each of the seven messages of the Apoc (Rev 2 and 3) which are addressed to the persecuted churches of Asia Minor concludes with a note of encouragement and an eschatological promise (i.e. 2:7,11; 3:17,26-27). However, irrespective of whether the local church is in need of endurance or repentance, it is called to "conquer" [tw̓rikw̓ti or q̓rikw̓]180 so that the divine promise may be inherited. Richard Bauckham has effectively phrased this divine invitation, "to live faithfully and courageously according to the truth of God now requires a vision of that eschatological future."181 The promise of an inheritance is to those who overcome (21:7). Though the earthly powers will sometimes succeed in this conflict and score their own victory (6:2, 11:7, 13:7), these victories are temporal. At the conclusion of the apocalyptic conflict between God and the eschatological adversary, it is the Lamb who triumphs. The vision of the "eschatological future", however, demands both an act of faith, actus fidei, and an act of trust, actus fiduciae. For this victory, though already founded and secure in the triumph of Christ, is still one that remains in anticipation.

The conqueror [q̓rikw̓], contends Martin Kiddle, "can only be the martyr".182 G. R. Beasley-Murray argues that Kiddle comes to this conclusion from its relation to Rev 20:4ff and that it is based on the notion of Christ's victory which entailed His own death. But Beasley-Murray counters that this is to disregard the implications of the doxology of 1:5f., the song of exultation in 5:9f., and the nuptial imagery relating to the Church in 19:8ff.183 This, however, as T. Holtz has shown, does not take into good account that in Rev 11:7, 13:7, and 17:14 "at least", the idea is one of victory in battle as the "presence of polém in the immediate context shows."184 Eastern Orthodox commentators along similar lines to Kiddle understand tw̓rikw̓ti equally as a reference to martyrdom, but also as to the 'conquering' of sin. Ἰωάννης Γιαννακοπούλου is representative of this agreement when he comments on Rev 2:7, "Εκείνον ὁ ὑποίημα ἐνάντια ἠμαρτημα ἐν τῷ ζῶντι ζωὴν καὶ τῷ νομίζοντι νικήν ἐν οἴκῳ".

---

180 As Traugott Holtz notes, excluding the 17 occurrences of "rikaw" in the Book of Revelation and the 6 in 1John, the verb is found only in Luke (11:22), John (16:33) Romans (3:4, 12:21 [bis]), and the substantive in 1John (5:4): "rikaw" in EDNT (Vol. 2), art. T. Holtz, 467. "The absolute use of rikaw in the Apoc represents the eschatological trial through which participation in salvation and exaltation are achieved. At its base lies the concept of the world as the theater of the battle waged by the antigod against God, in which the historical actions of the individual can either support or oppose the antigod": Holtz, ibid., 468.

181 Bauckham, op. cit., 125.


183 G. R. Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 77.

184 "rikaw" in EDNT (Vol. 2), art. T Holtz, 467f.
And Victorinus in his commentary tells us that those who overcome are not afraid of persecution.

*I Am Making All Things New* (Rev 21:5)

One of the most visible symbols which the Seer uses to distinguish the community of conquerors is that of *newness*, to bring out the idea of 'unique' and 'unsullied'. To those who conquer the Lord will give "a white stone" on which "is written a new name [pronai kainon]" (Rev 2:17). The city of God is the "new Jerusalem [kainh Jerusal hnh]" (3:12). The saints "sing a new song [wijn kainnh]" (5:9). John sees "a new heaven [ouj anon kainon] and a new earth [ghn kainho]" (21:1). The Lamb too, has "my own new name [pronavnu to; kaino]" (3:12). This theology of regeneration is so integral to the fundamental message of the prophecy that we are told that God Himself seated on the throne, said, "Behold, I am making all things new [kain; poiw pavnta]" (21:5). There must be a reason for these incredible pronouncements. It is because the old things have "passed away [japhl qan]" (21:1). The conceptual framework, behind this eschatological new creation (made up from collective elements of OT, late Israelite, and early Christian apocalyptic), "is formed by the tradition of the 'day of Yahweh'". Though J. Baumgarten has correctly added that "the newness is understood especially as a reversal of earthly relationships", it is equally true of those in heaven (7:9-17, 14:1-5).


186 In Apoc. 2.11.

187 See esp. Rom 6:4 [kainovthi zwh'] and 7:6 [kainovthi pneuamat'] For a thoughtful and often cited discussion of the concept of 'newness' in the NT in which the distinctive qualities of the theology are carefully drawn out, see R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the NT", *JBL* 74, (1955), 69-79; Raymond F. Collins has correctly noted that the 'eschatological aspect of 'new' is predominant in the apocalyptic scenarios of the book of Revelation, which speak of the new heavens and the new earth (21:1; cf. 2Pet 3:13), the new Jerusalem (2:12, 21:2), a new hymn (5:9, 14:3), and a new name (2:17, 3:12)." Collins continues on to say that, "[e]lements of comparison and contrast are present in all of these descriptions [cited], but finality is the preeminent aspect": "New" in *ABD* (Vol. 4), art. R. F. Collins, 1087.

188 St. Andrew of Caesarea in his fifth-century commentary on the Apoc captures this theology well when he writes, "[t]he renewal of what is grown old does not signify its obliteration and annihilation, but the putting away of its agedness and wrinkles": *Ch*. 65.

189 Of the 38 occurrences that the adjective "kainov" appears in the NT it is found more times in the Apoc (8 times). It also occurs another five times in the rest of the Johannine corpus, (twice in the Gospel 13:34; 19:41, and three times in the Epistles, 1Jn 2:7,8; 2Jn 5).


192 *ibid.*
The hope of the conquering community, which has struggled with the hostile beasts and with all things that these two monsters represent (in whatever transmutation: be it political, social or amoral),\textsuperscript{193} will be realized and vindicated when "Jesus Christ the faithful witness" \[\text{\[oJ mavrtu\]}, \text{\[oJ pistov\]}\] (Rev 1:5) returns, when "all the tribes of the earth will wail on account of Him" (1:7). Although the dragon and the beasts conquer the saints (11:7, 13:7), their victory is only ever temporal (19:17-21). The beast and the false prophet are "captured" \[\text{\[epliasch\]}\] (v.20).\textsuperscript{195} The dragon, who is the devil, joins his cohorts and is "thrown" \[\text{\[ejblhvqh\]}\] into the lake of fire and sulphur" (20:10). The "war" \[\text{\[polvero\]}\] (12:7,17) has been conclusively and eternally won by the followers of the Lamb who will reign forever, because the Lamb Himself (and not \text{aeterna})\textsuperscript{196} is eternal (22:12f.). J. L. Resseguie, who investigated the Book of Revelation from a narrative critical approach, appositely concludes:

In the final analysis, good does triumph over evil. From the below perspective it appears that evil has the upper hand, but from the above perspective good triumphs. For those who remain faithful and conquer, a place is promised in the new promised land, the New Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{197}

To Conquer is to Serve

The idea of conquering, of gaining victory over the oppressor and rejecting all heresy, also implies the concept of servitude.\textsuperscript{198} The death of Christ on the Cross, and the spilling of His blood, result in the establishment of the new order which had earlier been intimated by the "new song" \[\text{\[w/jdh;n kainh;n\]}\] at the Lamb's exaltation (Rev 5:9-10). This is the economy of

\textsuperscript{193} The comments here of an interpreter from the perspective of Liberation Hermeneutics are valuable, "[t]he basic historical context of Revelation is the economic, political, cultural, social, and religious clash of the people of God and the Christian community with the Roman Empire and the supernatural powers of evil": Pablo Richard, Apocalypse: A People's Commentary on the Book of Revelation. (New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 5.

\textsuperscript{194} For theological commentary on the titles of Christ in vs.5, see Agourides, \textit{op. cit}, 83-87. He connects them to Christ's "soteriological mission" \[\text{\swt hriwv apostolv\}.\]

\textsuperscript{195} Note the "effect of the chiasm" here (vs. 17-21), which, as Michaels points out, "is to dramatize the inevitability of the outcome": J. Ramsey Michaels, Revelation. (Illinois: IVP, 1997), 218.

\textsuperscript{196} "The myth of \textit{aeterna} was another part of Rome's ideological edifice": Wes Howard-Brook and Anthony Gwyther, Unveiling Empire: Reading Revelation. Then and Now. (New York: Orbis Books, 1999), 233. Howard-Brook and Gwyther go on to speak of "eternity" (\textit{ai\=on}) from John's perspective as "counter-myth": \textit{idem}.

\textsuperscript{197} Resseguie, \textit{op. cit.}, 135.

\textsuperscript{198} "Service" in the Apoc is a theme that has not been sufficiently explored, on most occasions (if mentioned at all), it is usually connected in the setting of worship. Yet it has much further extension: the Spirit, the Lamb, the Seer, the angels, the believers, are ministering and testifying in the context of their "service" to God. Similarly, the two beasts (together with their cosmic alliances), are in the "service" of the Dragon.

\textsuperscript{199} Savas Agourides connects splendidly the "new song" in the eschatological context of divine liturgy and temporal history, "\textit{O Iwavnnh} pantote sunpledai letourgia kai istoria. Malkista, qavliege kalev pw"
the Son of God, to place victory squarely on the Cross and, as Vladimir Lossky says, "to unite[s] paradise... with the terrestrial reality." It was the Lamb's blood that redeemed, not through any militancy or violence of the conquerors themselves. Therefore, the conquering community is also a community of priests to serve God which the Seer had again previously linked to the "new song". G. R. Beasley-Murray, bringing together the political [emancipation] and spiritual [priestly] manifestations of the "conquering", concludes very well in emphasizing the soteriological component of the victory:

It is in keeping with the passover-theology of John that the sacrifice of the Lamb led not simply to a general emancipation of men, but to the creation of a people for God. The redeemed become a kingdom and priests to our God. Inasmuch as the exaltation of the Lamb initiates the new age, the privilege of being kingly priests for God belongs to the emancipated people even now.

The conquering community, whose faith is patterned after the apostles (Rev 21:14), is also, by virtue of its call to transformation and divine election, the eschatological community, or, as Küng has more precisely offered, "the eschatological community of salvation." This community is eschatological because it will complete the temporal order and enter into the eternal kingdom (21, 22). Though temporally represented by the two witnesses who have been killed and disposed of by the beasts for universal ridicule (11:7-10), the community will be purified and perfected at the second coming of Jesus Christ (Rev 21, 22). But it is also the "servant" and "believing community" called to "restoration of fellowship".

\[\text{os o dukol oterh givnetai gia tou ' agiou' h } bivwsh \ th'' písth', katiw apov apamgrwpe'' istorikë'\]  
\[\text{sunqhvke'},\text{ tovso teletourgikovterh parousia, h } ourania leitourgia, ki autov givnetai pro' \] 
\[\text{eschatologi} \text{h} \text{enqavrrunsh} \text{ kai enivscush} \text{twn pistwr': Sábba'" Agouriédh', op. cit., 187; cf. also Ps 33:3, 40:3, 144:9.}\]

\[\text{200 Lossky, op. cit., 137.}\]
\[\text{201 Beasley-Murray, op. cit., 127f.}\]
\[\text{202 Küng, op. cit., 79ff.}\]
\[\text{203 "The congregatio fidelium only exists as con-vocatio Dei, the communio sanctorum only exists as institutio Dei": ibid., 86.}\]
\[\text{204 These two prophets will be overcome and killed, writes Hippolytus, "because they will not give glory to Antichrist": Antichr. 47.}\]
\[\text{205 Perfection and purification signal endurance and sacrifice. It not only applies to Christ’s role as overcomer, "but also establishes a new pattern for the authorial audience": Resseguiè, op. cit., 134.}\]
\[\text{206 Wall, op. cit., 87.}\]
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The Eschatological Community

What is meant by eschatological community? First it could be taken to mean a community that is eschatologically pre-occupied or obsessed with matters to do with the "last things" or "the end-times"; but it could also mean a community whose phronema is eschatological in the sense that it acknowledges "the decisive and definitive reality of God's rule and realm" within its members and acts accordingly. This is how the church communities with which the Seer of Patmos interacts are presented to his listeners and readers (Rev 11:15, 19:15-16). One of the great misfortunes in the 'eschatological' readings of the Apoc, especially in unchecked debates between schools influenced by Albert Schweitzer (i.e. eschatology of Jesus Christ radically discontinuous with the present) and of C. H. Dodd (i.e. concept of realized eschatology), is the reluctance to acknowledge that the Seer's eschatological theology rests somewhere between the two approaches. The Seer is admittedly absorbed on the events that shall be (4:1-22:5), but from a temporal point of view (1:1-3:22) which the narrative critical approach from a perspective of rhetoric has recently further highlighted. The doctrine in the imposing eschatology of the Book of Revelation is squarely centred on the second coming of Christ (5:1-14, 19:11-16, 22:20).

---

207 The definition to "eschatological" is complicated on two fronts: first, it is a diverse phenomenon, and second, because of its stock connection to apocalyptic. Especially in recent times many works have been written on the subject (connecting it strongly to the millennium). The following two studies are extremely useful: Millard J. Erickson, Contemporary Options in Eschatology, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987); Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (eds), Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997).


210 See A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, (New York: Holt, 1931), 84. Here Schweitzer speaks of a messianic kingdom in 'transition' between the present evil age and the age to come. This can be argued from Rev 20:4-6, but it exaggerates the pericope over others, i.e. 1:1,3, 22:6-7,10,20.


212 J. L. Resseguie, op. cit., 45-47.

213 As Richard Bauckham importantly tells us, "[f]or this future coming of Christ in glory, Revelation does not use the word parousia, which is common elsewhere in the New Testament, but it does regularly use the verb 'to come'. The hope and warning of Christ's imminent coming dominate the book (1:7, 2:5,16, 3:11, 16:15, 22:7,12,20)"; Bauckham, op. cit., 63f.
visions of the OT prophets (esp. Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah) and the symbolism of the Jewish apocalyptic books.

The Present and Future as the Eternal Present

Consistent with John's theological dialectics between realized and future eschatology (he brings together the present and the future, the temporal and the eternal in similar form to the Book of Daniel which also addressed a community in crisis), the second coming is sometimes described as a spiritual manifestation which takes effect in history (Rev 2:5, 3:20). But often it is the realized return of the Lamb which belongs to the end of the age (14:1-5, 19:6-10). And yet other times the second coming is said to be near (2:17, 3:11, 22:10-20) with its end of divine judgement (22:10-14). God himself will be the judge but Christ too will sit in judgement (22:1-20). The justification of God and of the worshippers of the "Lamb who was slain" (5:12), which is described in the climactic vision of Christ's glorious return (20-22), results from the judgement of the antichristian kingdom and of death itself (20:7-14). This anticipated victory will be an occasion of everlasting celebration for those who belong to the eschatological community (20:4-6, 21:1-8), but eternal misery for those who are not saved (19:11-21, 20:7-15).

Directly connected, then, to the "coming" (22:12) of the Lord is the need for the faithful in the present to remain steadfast as they await their future vindication. This is the eschatological "call for the endurance and

214 For plentiful examples and keen analysis see G. K. Beale, The Book of Revelation, (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1999), 76-99. Beale in part concludes, "[p]erhaps one reason for the high degree of OT influence in the Apocalypse is that the author could think of no better way to describe some of his visions than with the language used by the OT prophets to describe similar visions": ibid., 96.

215 For one of the most informative introductions to Jewish apocalyptic, see D. S. Russell, Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

216 There are striking similarities (but differences also) with the situational impulses which helped to create the eschatological delivery to the communities of Daniel and John of Patmos. This is one of the reasons why the Book of Daniel is so influential in the text of the Seer. The stress of the present [salvation] serves in equal part to accent its consummation of the future [realized]. Daniel's readers were living in the difficult times of Antiochus Epiphanes, whilst John's listeners found themselves in the era of the Caesars, the imperial cult/antichrist. Both groups lived in anxiety of an eschatological tribulation where one crisis would lead to the anticipation of another, more severe in affliction and in duration; for expert insights into the influence of Daniel on the Book of Revelation, see John J. Collins, Daniel Hermeneia, (Augsburg Fortress: Minneapolis, 1993), art. Adela Yarbro Collins, 102-105.

217 "Victory is achieved through self-sacrificing love. This sudden appearance of the Lamb reminds us of the sudden appearance of the ram which saved Isaac. But we do not see it slain. Christ's sacrifice is once and for all and cannot be repeated. This is an important aspect of eucharistic doctrine. There can be no repetition of Calvary": Flegg, op. cit., 88. [italics added]

218 The "polemical parallelism" that Paul Barnett has spoken of in context to the general theatre of the Apoc, can be further taken into the realm of eschatology and judgement: Paul Barnett, "Polemical Parallelism: Some Further Reflections on the Apocalypse", JSNT 35, (1989), 111-120.
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faith [uponh; kai; h' piste'] of the saints" (13:10). But for these things to occur certain events must first take place; these are what the students of the Apocalypse refer to as the *signs of the end*.\(^{219}\) Similarly to the non-canonical books of the same genre the Apoc has much to say on end-time events, but it is not given to gross imaginings or drawn-out calculations which were common to Jewish Apocalyptic.\(^{220}\)

The difficult teaching of the millennial reign of Christ on earth (Rev 20:4-6), outside parallel traditions of the *Golden Age* or the *Two Ages*, is unique to the Book of Revelation and has caused much controversy since it differs from the standard doctrine on the end-times of the NT.\(^{221}\) The belief, however, is found in other Jewish literature.\(^{222}\) After the millennial reign Satan will be "loosed" [\(\text{loqhvsetai}\)] one final time to "deceive the nations" [\(\text{planhsai ta; e[qnh}\)] (20:7-9).\(^{223}\) The end-time scheme also involves two resurrections and two judgements (vs. 4-15). The first is of the martyred saints who had been beheaded for their "testimony to Jesus" [\(\text{marturivan jIhsou'}\)] and the second (after the thousand years has ended) for the "rest of the dead" [\(\text{oiJ loipoi; tw'n nekrw'n}\).\(^{224}\) The first judgement concerns the overthrow of Satan and his cohorts who are "thrown [\(\text{epl hqf}\)] into the lake of fire", and


\(^{220}\) The Book of Revelation, similarly to the non-canonical books of the same genre speaks much of the signs of the end, and of the events to come. But it avoids the gross imaginings and the fanciful drawn-out calculations, which are characteristic of the typical Jewish Apocalypses: e.g. Enoch 10:12, 91:12-17, Assump. Moses 10:29, Sibyll. Or 4:27, 2Esd 14:11-12.

\(^{221}\) Yet in their essential treatment of the end-time anticipation all books of the NT nourish the eschatological consciousness \([\text{ejscatologikhv suneivdhsh}\] by concentrated focus on the heavenly kingdom, "[\(\text{hJ proshvlwsh stov oujravnio polivteuma trevfei kaiv thvn ejscatologikhv suneivdhsh}\]"). Gewvrgio" Mantzarivdh", jOrqovdoxh Qeologiva kaiv Koinwnikhv Zwhv, (Qessalonivkh: Pournara', 1996), 121; for dualism in apocalyptic, see D. S. Russell, *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 104-115.

\(^{222}\) See Chapter 5 of the dissertation [In Other Jewish Writings].

\(^{223}\) As Thompson notes on Rev 20:7-10, "much of this scene is drawn from Ezekiel's description of Gog, prince of the land of Magog (Ezek 38-39)... in later Jewish visionary literature, however, both Gog and Magog become lands or kingdoms that oppose God and his people at the time of the end...": Leonard L. Thompson, *Revelation*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 178f.

\(^{224}\) *Mratsiwh*

\(^{225}\) "\(\text{vnou'ntai o}j\ h\ ajnhvkonte' eij' thn kathgorian tw'n mellovntwn na; sunbasileusvi neta;}\) to\(\text{ Cristou'}\): ibid., 290.

\(^{226}\) For the "resurrection event" under its various titles in the Scriptures, see Roy L. Aldrich, "Divisions of the First Resurrection", *BSac* 128, (1971), 117-119; for the resurrections of Rev 20 which Shepherd calls "foundational for pre-millennial eschatology", see Norman Shepherd, *The Resurrections of Revelation 20*, *WTJ* 37, (1974-75), 34-43.
the one that follows is the general judgement for all of the dead when the "books were opened" [biblia hioiqhsan].

This startling intimation of the 'present and future as the eternal present', was, to a comparable degree, also on the mind of the great Albert Einstein when in a contemplative mood close to the end of his own life. Reflecting on the death of his close friend, Michele Besso, he wrote to the latter's widow, "[f]or those of us who believe in physics, this separation between past, present, and future is only an illusion, however tenacious." Of course, it was the equally celebrated Augustine, a "self-centred intellectual" with "theoretical interests" who would specifically introduce the clinical theology of the 'eternal present' [cf. with Einstein's 'simultaneous events' re. the relativity paper] into patristic literature:

But in what sense is something long or short that is nonexistent? For the past is not now, and the future is not yet... Let us not, therefore, say, "Time past was long," for we shall not discover what it was that was long because, since it is past, it no longer exists. Rather, let us say that "time present was long, because when it was present it was long."

The Doctrine of Final Rewards and the Culmination of the Age

Our author describes to the anticipating communio fidelium in popular symbolic language and OT imagery the doctrine of final rewards. All who have conquered and remained steadfast will secure amongst other things: the "crown of life" [stefanon th' zwh'] (Rev 2:10), the "hidden manna" [maυna tou keκrumeνou] (2:17), a "new name" [o性价 kainoν] (2:17), a place "before the throne" and "before the Lamb" [eννωπιον tou ajríou] (7:9), they "shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more" [ouj peinavēsin eti ouj de; diψavēsin] (7:16),

227 "This is an allusion" as Aune writes, "to a particular aspect of the judgement scene in Dan 7:10... the plural in both Dan 7:10 and here probably reflects the early Jewish tradition of two heavenly books, one for reckoning the deeds of the righteous and the other for recording the deeds of the wicked": David E. Aune, Revelation 17-22 (52c), 1102.


229 Kannengiesser "in Donald K. McKim", 25.

230 Brian, op. cit., 64f; it is none too irrelevant, that like the Seer himself, Einstein's world was "full of symbols": ibid., 56.

231 Augustine "in J. J. C. Smart", op. cit., 59.

232 For a theological framework of how to best interpret the "violent imagery" associated with the Apoc, see Sleeper who writes, "John makes an even more profound transformation of the biblical images when he says that Christ's real victory was won on the Cross. That is when the powers of Satan were defeated": C. Freeman Sleeper, The Victorious Christ: A Study of the Book of Revelation, (Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1996), 122-127.
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they "shall see his face and his name shall be on their foreheads" [οὕτως ἔρχεται τῷ πρόσωπῳ αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εἰπί; τῷ μετώπῳ αὐτοῦ] (22:4), they "shall reign for ever and ever" [Βασιλέας οὗ ἐπὶ τῷ οἴχων τῷ αἰῶνα τῷ αἰῶνων] (22:5), the "right to the tree of life" [ἐκουσία αὐτῷ εἰπί; τῷ διάδοχῷ τῇ ζωῇ] (22:14). Those who did not listen to the Lamb’s call to conquer but who chose instead to follow the beast will suffer "the second death" [καταναθήναι τοῦ δεύτερου] (2:11, 20:6,14, 21:8) and the "lake of fire" [τὸ πῦρ τοῦ λίμνην] (19:20, 20:10, 21:8) which are unique to the Apoc among the NT writings, but which do occur in rabbinical and Apocalyptic literature.

The community of the faithful is more specifically a realized eschatological one, where future eschatological salvation is experienced as a present reality (the eschatological tradition of the early Church). Realized and future eschatologies meet in "the eschaton of Jesus Christ". The promised age has begun through the manifestation of the Spirit and through the defeat of death on the Cross by the "Lamb" [αἰματόν] which was "as though it had been slain" [ἐστηκὼς ἐξεσφάγμην] (Rev 5:6). However, its conclusion cannot yet be fully realized because the dragon and his beasts are still waging "war on the saints" [πολέμον μετά τῷ αἰγίῳ] (13:7). Salvation will be wholly realized only when evil and death are

---

233 As Giannakovpoulo simply says, after he compares the lists of the eschatological rewards and punishments, "κατα ναθάνει τοῦ μετώπου τῆς ἁγίασσας, καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ φροντὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τῆς καταναθήσεως, καὶ τῷ τοῦ διὰ καταναθήσεως τῆς καταναθήσεως" [θαυμάζων, ἀγιασμόν, καταναθήναι, καταναθήσεως, ἀγιασμόν], op. cit., 236.

234 We are informed by Aune that the concept ["the second death"] (which is mentioned four times in the Apoc) "does not occur in the rest of the NT, in second-century Christian literature, or in pre-Christian Greek literature": David E. Aune, Revelation 17 - 22 (52c), 1091.


237 Here we should note three significant denotations in the context of our investigation of the NT Canon and the Apoc. (i) the "realized eschatology" of the Apoc is in keeping with the realized eschatology of the NT generally: see "Eschatology (Early Christian)" in TABD (Vol. 2), 599-607; (ii) [i]the benefits of future eschatological salvation were experienced as present realities by the Johannine community": ibid., 606; (iii) the NT is on the whole apocalyptic in thought: see "Apocalypse and Apocalypticism" in TABD (Vol. 1), 288-291. "It is widely agreed", says Adela Yarbro Collins, "that Paul's view was apocalyptic": ibid., 290.

238 Rahner, op. cit., 435.

239 Sabba" A gouridh" makes a telling observation here with the Johannine use of the "Lamb" motif in the Gospel of John (Jn 1:36) and considers that it could be a traditional soteriological term [παραδοσιακόν σωτηριαλογικόν αἰματόν] borrowed from apocalyptic: A gouridh, op. cit., 181.

240 For fuller discussion on this integral context of martyrdom, see Mitchell G. Reddish, "Martyr Christology in the Apocalypse", JSNT 33, (188), 85-95. "Whether or not an accurate depiction of the historical situation is given in the Apocalypse, John conveys the impression that he was writing in a time of extreme crisis": ibid., 86.
consumed, when they are "thrown into the lake of fire" (20:14). Until that time the believing community remains militant, still anticipating the promised and eternal succour of redemption. They will not be satisfied until they see that justice "should be complete" [plhrwqsin] (6:11).241 The faithful have therefore been given the promise of salvation in the present, with its actual realization still in the future, which is, better understood as G. Mantzaridis" prefers to say, "stoI legomeno leitourgiko; croo th" Ekklhsia".242 The eschatological plan is unveiled in liturgical terms and presented within the dimension of temporal time as well as of eternity.243 The Lord will come soon to the local churches (2:1-3:22), the Spirit is speaking [legei] to the congregations (2:11), and already He stands knocking [krouw] at the door (3:20). Our author cannot find any contradiction in this, for the sacrifice of the Lamb is now put at the centre of the Heilsgeschichte244 of God's people. Time is now redefined in the context of His lordship over all things, totus Christus, which includes all the spatial dimensions, "I am the Alpha and the Omega" [Egw ejmi to a[la kai; to; w] (1:8).245 This "merism", a figure of speech, G. K. Beale notes, "expresses God's control of all history, especially by bringing it to an end in salvation and judgment."246 The people of the new covenant are therefore already able to share in the promised blessings of the future, the eschatological future is in process and so a new dimension to existence is possible from the here and now. The rule of God penetrates into history, and the "Revelation of John" according to Feodor (Bukharev) as Paul Valliere reads him, "opens the curtain on this grand process."247 It is, however, ultimately established at the consummation of the age. Robert W. Wall describes this time-spatial conclusion splendidly in the context of a "realized christology" and "covenant":

241 "They complain in the form of a communal lament", Thompson writes and cites Ps 79:5-6, 10; Jer 12:4; Dan 8:13; Zech 1:12; 1Macc 6:22; 2Esdr 4:35-37; Enoch 44:7: L. L. Thompson, Revelation, 104.

242 "D leitourgiko; croo" de'n parousiametai wJ pareqesh mesa ston iJstoriko; croo, alla; wJ suvqesh kai; ubepbash tou: Gewgido Mantzaridh, Propostikh Qelogia kai Koinwnikh, Zwh, (Qessal onilh: Pournara; 1996), 201.

243 It is most fascinating to read that some philosophers are concerned, "that developments in physics connected with the theory of relativity... seem to demonstrate that the notion of an absolute 'now' must be abandoned...": "Time" in The Oxford Companion to Philosophy, Ted Honderich (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 875f.

244 Heilsgeschichte in the sense of the theological principle which interprets Scripture as the ongoing story of the redemptive operation of God in sacred history. Gerhard von Rad is often associated with the term, having made good use of this compound word in his work on Deuteronomy (esp. 26:5-11) and the Hexateuch: Deuteronomy, (London: SCM Press, 1966).

245 For the titles of Christ in Rev 1:5-8 "Oi titi o Io hso Cristo" see Agouridis", op. cit., 83-87.

246 G. K. Beale, The Book of Revelation NIGTC, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1999), 199. "...a merism states polar opposites in order to highlight everything between the opposites... [s]imilar merisms are "the Beginning and the End" (Rev 21:6, 22:13) and "the First and the Last" (22:13)": ibid.

247 Paul Valliere, Modern Russian Theology, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 84.
The Church in the Apocalypse

The life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth constitute the elements of a 'realized' christology in that together they fulfil the promise of God's salvation and trigger the pouring out of its covenant blessings on the disciples of Jesus in every age.  

The Church as Worshipping Community

Worship as a Strong Demonstration of Church Consciousness

For the author of the Book of Revelation worship is fundamental to the communal life organized around the victory of the Lamb (Rev 5:8-10, 7:9-17, 15:3f., 19:1-10). And, as Josef A. Jungmann has written in his classic study on the early liturgy, a communal life based around worship demands adaptation without question. So fundamental is the worship of the Church and so distinctly presented, particularly in the symbolism of the heavenly assembly, that, as Gregory Dix has said, the Church triumphant in the visions of the Revelation of Saint John is the real "assembly" of which all earthly churches are only symbols and foreshadowings. The Seer himself was worshipping "on the Lord's day" when he received the "revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:1).

248 Wall, op. cit, 106.

249 For instructive discussion from different hermeneutical perspectives on the liturgical and worshipping element of the Apoc, see Peter Basil, "Basil", in H. Apokalujv Tout Iwavn [Eijkhiwv] ST! Sunaxwv! Drozdovn Bibikw Qed qwv, art. "Letourgia kaiv Apokaluvh", (Leukuvv Jere Jerav Arceipiskoph Kyprou 1991), 253-268. One of the important contributions of this paper is the argument for the "connection between liturgical worship and historical and social reality": ibid., 268; see also Leonard L. Thompson, The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 53-73. Thompson emphasizes the eschatological and unifying dimension of the Apoc's language of worship, "through liturgical celebration eschatological expectations are experienced presently... worship, then, becomes a context that integrally relates the visions in Revelation with John's original revelatory experience...": 72f.

250 Though, of course, too early to speak of an established liturgy, J. A. Jungmann's words are here not without some telling relevance, "[l]iturgy implies a communal life, and a communal life that is solidly organized, to which the individual must adapt himself without question": Josef A. Jungmann, The Early Liturgy, (USA: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), 10.

251 Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, (London: A. & C. Black, 1945), 28. In this widely acknowledged classic on the subject, Dix confidently reckons "[i]t seems probable that it is the symbolism of the book [the Apoc] which has been suggested by the current practice of the church in the first century and not vice versa, because the arrangement described was that which was traditional in churches which disputed the inspiration and canonicity of the Apocalypse...": ibid.

252 As J. A. Fitzmyer notes, the "kuriakhv" though a possible reference to the OT "day of the Lord" (Isa 13:9; Joel 2:31), "reveals by its adj. form that it refers to a day celebrated by Christians in honor of their risen Lord, probably "the first day of the week" (1Cor 16:2; Jn 20:1,19; Did. 14:1); EDNT (Vol. 2), J. A. Fitzmyer, art., "kuriakos", 331.

253 The title "Apokaluvh" or "Apokaluyi" Iwavn may have found a place at the end of an early copy of the book, or on a label attached to the roll; in any case it seems to have been familiar before the end of the second century": Henry Barclay Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1922), xxii.; note that "in the NT and Revelation prophecy comes from Christ to a prophet, and the content of the
One of the strongest demonstrations of the Seer's church consciousness is the presence of worship and of the powerful auditory impact that the referring terms would have on the community of listeners.\(^{254}\) The liturgical language of the Apoc, the praise of God and Jesus with the stress on the divinity,\(^{255}\) is a continual element in the book which determines to unite the faithful. There is here an "intended effect": to cause those hearing or reading the liturgical or praise formulae (Rev 4:8, 15:3, 19:1-8) to act or to respond in a certain way.\(^{256}\) This is closely, I would suggest, along the lines of the English philosopher H. P. Grice (1913-1988) who "saw an utterance's meaning in terms of the complex structure of intentions with which it was used."\(^{257}\) But more precisely, there is a variant of this approach which might locate a type of utterance only with a certain intention, "such as intending to induce a certain belief, or intending to signal that one has oneself a certain belief."\(^{258}\) The cornerstone of this praise is the declaration of the rule of the almighty God \([\text{o} \text{qeo;} \text{qantkra} \text{vtr}]\) (Rev 4:8)\(^{259}\) over and against that of the blasphemous emperor \([\text{to;chrion}]\) (13:1-8). Saviour \(\text{Agourivdh}\) describes this eschatological proclamation in the revelatory framework of a heavenly liturgy, "[o] \text{qianb'o} \text{tou} \text{Qeouv} \text{epiv} \text{ou} \text{satanav} \text{enianizetai} \text{upouth} \text{morf} \text{hnegal} \text{oprepoul} \text{ourania}" \(\text{l etourgiai}.\)\(^{260}\) This testimony is crucial for it intends to unite the worshipping community in its allegiance (this time through the signal of worship) to the Kingdom of God, and to set it apart from the ritual or 'liturgical' demands of the Roman Empire, that is, from the imperial cult (13:1-18). Peter \(\text{Peto} \text{Basileiadh}\) has expressed this fundamental function exactly when he speaking of the meaning of worship in the Apoc:

\[
\text{H e\'moia, loipou, th' latrei\'a sthum A\'pokaluyh e\'h} \text{ai diakhwuxh th' kuriarcia} \text{tou Qeouv kai\'o} \text{t} \text{ou au\'okratora, h\' nevalia} \text{logia, apodochu} \text{thu}.
\]

message is not always information about Christ. Rev. 22:16,20 confirm this by portraying Jesus as the One who bears revelatory testimony through his angel to the churches": G. K. Beale, \textit{op. cit.}, 183.

\(^{254}\) For the psychology of music, its stimulating and entrancing effects and of its "internalized musical grammar" which serve to account for the span of short-term memory, see "Psychology of Music", in The Oxford Companion To The Mind, art., Natasha Spender, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), (ed.) R. L. Gregory, 499-504.

\(^{255}\) R. Bauckham's informed study of the self-declarations of God and Christ show how central the overriding concept of the divinity was for John, particularly in the context of "Christ's participation in the eternal being of God": Bauckham, \textit{Theology}, 54-65.

\(^{256}\) This "intended effect" can be connected to the idea of "function" in the context of the canonical criticism approach.

\(^{257}\) S. Blackburn "Problems of the Philosophy of Language", in Ted Honderich (ed.), \textit{op. cit.}, 460.

\(^{258}\) \textit{ibid}.

\(^{259}\) Of the ten occurrences of the noun \textit{pantokratwr} in the NT nine are found in the Book of Revelation: 1:8, 4:8, 11:17, 15:3, 16:7,14, 19:6,15, 21:22, (the other appears in 2Cor 6:18).

\(^{260}\) \textit{Agourivdh}, \textit{op. cit.}, 579.
The Church in the Apocalypse

The language of worship, that is, the adoration and praise offered to God and the Lamb, permeates the book, and at the same time, as Leonard L. Thompson has recently shown, "language of worship plays an important role in unifying the book [the Apoc], that is, in making it a coherent apocalypse in both form and content." A vision of the worship in heaven begins the opening of the book proper (Rev 4:1-11), and similarly the text concludes with a vision of the heavenly Jerusalem where worship will be without cease (22:1-5). Proskunein itself is used on at least 24 occasions. Though the adoration is usually described as belonging to the heavenly realm (i.e. 4:10, 5:14, 7:11, 11:16, 19:4), it is also an important part of the testimony of the believing community still on the earth (11:1, 14:7, 15:4). However, such is its significance to testimony that the beasts who seek to usurp the power of God desire it for themselves (9:20, 13:4, 12, 15, 16:2, 19:20). So then, we have true worship (the sign of God's presence), which must be distinguished from false worship (the mark of Satan's kingdom).

---

261 Basileia" tou Qeou', ejnw'j ajntivqeta hJ latreia tou' qhrivou ei
ai ajntivqesh s! aujthv thvbasileia kaiv eJpomevnw" ajpovrriyhv", 261.

262 The Liturgics of the Apocalypse
The language of worship, that is, the adoration and praise offered to God and the Lamb, permeates the book, and at the same time, as Leonard L. Thompson has recently shown, "language of worship plays an important role in unifying the book [the Apoc], that is, in making it a coherent apocalypse in both form and content." A vision of the worship in heaven begins the opening of the book proper (Rev 4:1-11), and similarly the text concludes with a vision of the heavenly Jerusalem where worship will be without cease (22:1-5). Proskunein itself is used on at least 24 occasions. Though the adoration is usually described as belonging to the heavenly realm (i.e. 4:10, 5:14, 7:11, 11:16, 19:4), it is also an important part of the testimony of the believing community still on the earth (11:1, 14:7, 15:4). However, such is its significance to testimony that the beasts who seek to usurp the power of God desire it for themselves (9:20, 13:4, 12, 15, 16:2, 19:20). So then, we have true worship (the sign of God's presence), which must be distinguished from false worship (the mark of Satan's kingdom).

---

263 ibid.

264 This includes the great 'throne scene' with its thrice-holy liturgy, "[t]he throne is the central object; everything else is positioned in relation to it": ibid., 57; Gregory Dix will stress the 'altar', "[i]n this book [the Apoc] everything centres upon 'the golden altar which is before the throne of God'": Dix, op. cit., 28.

265 It is not by chance that the Seer decided for this technical expression of worship, a loaded concept in the context of the imperial cult which was rampant in Asia Minor (of which chapter 13 is a thinly veiled attack). For good background discussion of proskunein see J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "The Divinity of Alexander the Great", Historia (Vol. I), (1950), 371-383. In brief then, "proskunein is, in its origin, the Greek for to 'blow a kiss' and in the act of worship Greeks, conscious that they were not in physical proximity to their gods, would, in their devotion, round their thumb and first finger, bring their hand to their mouth and so blow the god a kiss. From this the word acquired a secondary meaning, 'to worship', to do homage', 'to abase oneself before'... [i]n worship the Greeks sometimes went down on their knees, but not as a general practice and not with physical abasement as extreme as that of Persian proskuneisi...": ibid., 374; this could be a reference to the worshipping of an emperor's statue or bust. An infamous incident revolves around Caligula, who sought to set up his statue in the "temple of God" (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 8.2). Caligula himself "paid homage to the Roman eagles and standards, and to the statues of the Caesars": Suet. Calig. 14.

266 The 'kingdom' of Satan, that is, the imperial cult which deceives with false worship, is made clear in chapter 13 of the Apocalypse. Apart from the acknowledged connection of the Imperial Cult and Rome to
"Hallelujah" [αλληλοω] the liturgical formula from the psalter, "in the literature of primitive Christianity", Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn informs us, "...is almost entirely limited to 4 occurrences in Revelation 19, where it appears in the description of a heavenly service of thanksgiving."267

The start of the brief hymn of praise sung by the heavenly multitude in vv. 1, 3, and 6 opens with the αλληλοωAnd "in an apparent reversal of usual liturgical sequence"268 in v.4 the chief members of the hierarchy acknowledge the praise of the multitude "by means of the responsive αλληλοωαλληλοω.269 Apart from this interesting fact, which serves to only emphasize the liturgical atmosphere of the book,270 is that at the centre of this celestial acclamatio is God. But at the same time it is also a disclosure by the Seer to the community of believers still on earth, that the reason for this doxology is the "ανανεωση", as Σαββας Αγουρινθ recognizes, "θη αίσθησις βασιλείας νησα στον κόσμον."271 This connection is no literary happenstance; let us remember that the revelation took place on the "Lord's day" [κυριακήν] (Rev 1:10).272 "That fact is very suggestive", observes Allen Cabaniss:

...in his exile on the Isle of Patmos, deprived of the inspiration of common worship with his fellow-Christians, his mind was inevitably drawn to the solemn service he was missing, and in spirit he was joining with his comrades in their prayers, praise, and Scripture lessons...273

chapters 13 and 17, references to Imperial Rome (the 'new' Babylon), the Caesars (the " beast"), the cult in Asia Minor (where Satan's "throne" is, Pergamum), titles claimed by the emperors conferred upon the Christ (i.e. κυριότερον, ουρανόφιλον, ...could make these indications obvious. However, one major voice that has not readily accepted the prominent part that interpreters give to the Roman emperors is that of Ernst Lohmeyer, (Die Offenbarung des Johannes, 113ff.; cited by William Kimbro Hedrick, The Sources and Use of the Imagery in Apocalypse 12. (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1971), 146. Further, Hedrick cites Lyder Brun and Roland Schuetz as successfully countering Lohmeyer's arguments: ibid; see also Dominique Cuss, Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament, (Fribourg: Fribourg University Press, 1974), and S. R. F. Price, Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

267 "αλληλοω in EDNT (Vol. 1), 63.
268 ibid.
269 ibid.
270 "Whence came this vivid conception of celestial service [in the Apoc]?") asks Cabaniss. He points to four areas for the pronounced features of heavenly worship in the Seer's book. (i)...from the Old Testament descriptions of temple and tabernacle and from the books of Daniel and Ezekiel, (ii)...some influence from the Hellenistic world, (iii)...echoes of many other sources, such as Babylonian, Egyptian, Iranian, and Indian, and (iv) the vision of the heavenly worship must have been definitely moulded by actual liturgical practices in the early church: Allen Cabaniss, "Liturgy-Making Factors In Primitive Christianity", JR 23/1, (1943), 43-58.
271 Αγουρινθ, Αποκαλυψις 417. See also the same scholar's reflections on the topic in the addendum "Λειτουργία και Μυθολογία στήν Αποκάλυψις", ibid., 579-587.
272 For the different views on the meaning of "κυριακήν" and for its use in early Christian literature, see David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), 82-84. Aune points out that "many of the early Christian references to κυριακήν (κυριακήν) could either refer to Sunday or Easter": ibid., 84.
273 Cabaniss, art. cit., 50.
Ugo Vanni has further demonstrated the prevalence of the liturgical interests of the Seer of Patmos in a landmark paper published a little over a decade ago, "Liturgical dialogue as a literary form in the Book of Revelation" (1991). The solemn form of the beatitudes of the Apoc play a major role in "uniting the lector and hearers in the same macarism." By considering such pericopes as "makario" oJ ajnaginwvskwn kai; oiJ ajkouvonte" tou; lovgou" th" profhteiva" (Rev 1:3), Vanni argues (citing relevant references) that this passage "makes one think of the liturgical assemblies of the synagogue and the early Christian church, in which as we know, there was a kind of dialogue between lector and hearers." The question this scholar then asks is whether "such a setting [is] to be detected and pointed out throughout the Book of Revelation?" Searching carefully for this "dialectical literary development" [John/lector, and churches/hearers], the scholar comes to some very important conclusions which fit perfectly with the general schema of the "realized millennialism" of the Apoc and suggest more reasons for the book's elevation by the community of believers to commended literature. In Ugo Vanni's own words then:

(i) the lector is not always John, he is a variable figure, although constantly linked to John's message,
(ii) like the lector, the group of hearers can also vary according to the time and space... although the reference to the seven churches of Asia will remain a constant element,
(iii) the liturgical dialogue of 1:4 - 8 is not attached to any specific occasion, but is what we could call a model of the dialogue that will actually take place every time a lector reads John's message to a group of hearers that recognizes itself as a part of the totality of the church symbolized by the seven churches in Asia.

In another significant paper, written some 40 years earlier, the liturgical character of the Apoc is once more confirmed. Otto A. Piper, in his study "The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church" (1951), examines "the liturgical framework of the Apocalypse" and

---

275 ibid., 348.
276 ibid.
277 ibid., 349.
278 ibid.
279 Robert G. Clouse (ed.), The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views, (Illinois: IVP, 1977), 155; "the lector and the hearers are the real partners in the dialogue, but they are also spokesmen for transcendent persons...": Vanni, art. cit., 371.
280 Vanni, art. cit., 355.
281 ibid.
282 ibid.
argues that it is from the "liturgical character of the Apocalypse that the historical development of the Christian liturgy becomes intelligible." Piper, who is strong throughout on the connection between Christian worship as participation in heavenly liturgy, points to the most important features of this "framework". These are, in his own words (the additional notes excluded): the ideas of the Eucharistic Parousia, the Church's participation in the angelic worship, the emphasis placed upon the worthiness of the interpreter of Scripture, the connection between the Confession of Sins and the Eucharist, the separation of the believers and unbelievers prior to the heavenly meal, the celebration of the Eucharist as an act of the Church in its cosmic totality, the association of the Eucharist with the Judgement of the World, and the interpretation of the liturgy as a spiritual battle. The emphasis once again, here too, in the conclusion of Otto Piper's paper, is that of the communio sanctorum as ecclesia universalis, "John's conception of the oneness of the heavenly and earthly worship." In this whole atmosphere of liturgical worship, the "confidence" of the faithful "in their prayer", as Nicholas Cabasilas writes of the Divine Liturgy in general, "is not confidence in self, but in God who has promised to grant what they are seeking."
The Great Hymns of the Apocalypse

A compelling liturgical atmosphere would of course presuppose a good number of hymns.292 It is surely significant, that within this profoundly rich liturgical atmosphere "[t]he worship of Christ", as Marianne M. Thompson precisely concluded, "leads to the joint worship of God and Christ, in a formula in which God retains the primacy."293 John J. O'Rourke, following L. Mowry294 and D. G. Delling,295 published a valuable paper on this subject in the Catholic Biblical Quarterly in 1968 which is often followed by supporters of his conclusion, but which is, nonetheless, rarely cited.296 O'Rourke sets down the following criteria for the search of the "hymnic material" in the Apoc: parallelism similar to that found in the Psalms; solemn tone of expression apt for use in worship, and grammatical inconcinnity.297 Based on these criteria the author separates three categories of hymnic material:

- the sayings which provide the most likely examples of hymnic material are the doxologies (Ap 1,6; 5,13; 7,12), the acclamations of worthiness (Ap 4,11; 5,9; 5,12) and the trisagion (Ap 4,8b).298

In the end, "from start to finish", the Book of Revelation is inundated in paraenesis, catechesis, praise, and worship. These are the outstanding components of liturgy; they are centred about the eschatological culmination, openly and formulary evidenced in the Divine

---


293 Marianne Meye Thompson, "Worship in the Book of Revelation", ExA 8, 50.

294 Lucetta Mowry, art. cit.


296 John J. O'Rourke concludes that John "borrowed consciously from preexisting liturgical sources when he composed his book, it would seem almost certain that he did when he wrote Ap 1,4,5.8b; 4,8b; 7,12,15-17; 11,15,17-18; 19,5,6b-8": O'Rourke, art. cit., 409. I should note, however, that I am not convinced that this material was necessarily in its entirety "preexisting", but I certainly do take on board that these are "liturgical hymns" which clearly reveal to us today "how rich was the doctrinal expression used in the singing of early churches": ibid.; D. Peterson in reviewing both the work of O'Rourke and M. H. Shepherd cites Gerhard Delling's "more sober judgment" who has argued that "elements of Christian and Jewish services may have been interwoven in the portrayal of the heavenly worship, but that it is now impossible to separate the details...": David Peterson, "Worship in the Revelation to John", RTR 47/3, (1988), 67-77.

297 O'Rourke, art. cit., 400. The author does admit, however, that "[i]n any approach of this type the element of subjectivity is always present": ibid.

298 ibid. O'Rourke, referencing A. Gelin, also makes mention of a "false liturgy, one celebrating the beast" which is said to be found in Rev 13:4 and possibly "based on a formula used in the imperial cult". However, he forwards reasons against such a position, especially that he doubts "John would have dared to substitute 'beast' for 'God' in a line taken from a prayer": 406.
Liturgy and eucharistic celebration ascribed to Saint John Chrysostom, and much earlier in a liturgical text from Qumran, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Accordingly S. Agourivdh appropriately begins a special focus on the subject in appendix (E) of his commentary:

AparcheV peripou naevri" telou' th' Apk., ta escatologikagogordra arcioumy me leitourgia ston ouranovi kai leitourgia ston ouranoveli pou ta empnaei, ta uposthriai kai tel eitourigkavta exumeina naevri telou', naevri th suntribhwn antiapmvn duraemvn met on escatologikovpolamn.

The Church as Bride of the Lamb and as New Jerusalem

An Ecclesiology of Universal Dimension

Confusion over the identity-ies of the Bride of the Lamb (Rev 21:9) and New Jerusalem, the holy city (21:10) has mostly arisen because some readers of the Apoc have persisted in reading them as distinct references. Or alternatively, because others though realizing that they are not to be distinguished, have failed to note a subtle but important distinction which needs to be clarified. The Seer himself tells us that *bride* and *city* are for the greater part synonymous, "And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride[νυμφή] adorned for her husband" (21:2). However, it is the holy city [*polin thn agian*] which is prepared "as" [*νυμφή*] the bride, and not the bride as the holy city. This matters, for the nuptial imagery that follows in chapter 20 is then locked into the marriage metaphor as presented in the OT. Notably, the Seer now provides for a set referential, *Jerusalem*, which is, the name of the bride. This distinction

299 Cabasilas, op. cit., 65-95.
301 Agourivdh, op. cit., 579; 579-587.
303 Despite the problems that Eusebius might have had with the canonicity of the Book of Revelation, he does appear to be referring to Rev 21:2 in his panegyric on the occasion of the building of the churches in Tyre: *Hist. Eccl.* 10.4.2-3.
304 The most compelling of all the references is found in the Book of Hosea in the great acknowledgment of God's love [as husband] for faithless Israel and His promise that He would renew the covenant that was broken because of her infidelity (2:18-20). This quest of God for Israel is powerfully symbolized in the context of Hosea's own relationship with his adulterous wife, "Gomer daughter of Diblaim" (1:2). The Seer of Patmos alludes to various sections of this book on no less than a dozen occasions. See also Isa 54:5. For a synoptic discussion on the theology of marriage in the OT, see Paul Heinisch, *Theology of the Old Testament*, (North Central Publishing Company: Minnesota, 1955), 203-207. "Marital fidelity" was "highly praised": *ibid.*, 203.
helps with another difficult question. Is the city of Revelation (21-22) to be understood, as Jan Fekkes III duly asks, "as an entity in itself in some way distinct from the redeemed community, or is wholly a collective symbol of the community, to the exclusion of other physical and spatial realities." 305

From the beginning of this section of his work (chapter 21), the author declares an unmistakable ecclesiology of universal dimension. All things are "new" [καινόν]. There is a "new heaven" and a "new earth", (v.1) and the "holy city" is the "new Jerusalem" (v.2). 306 Barbara R. Rossing has described this aspect succinctly, "the New Jerusalem landscape contrasts directly with the picture of death and mourning in Babylon." 307 We are told that the "first things have passed away [τα πρώτα απελθάν]" (v.4). And yet, remarkably (as only our author can successfully achieve), the communal ecclesiological dimension also clearly remains. The holy city, the New Jerusalem, the transformed and transfigured existence, is only ever accessible to "those who conquer [κείμαι]" (21:7). But for the elect, as well, the "city" [πόλις] is not only present reality but future hope (v.5-8). Historical Israel is now succeeded by the Spiritual Israel, the Church is presented as a new creation of God "but the focus now is not on judgement, though that is not lost sight of (21:1,8,27)", as G. K. Beale well says, "but on the consummate blessing of God's people." 308

In the tradition of the OT prophets the Seer presents the covenant relationship between God and the community of believers as a type of marriage between God's Lamb and His bride (Rev 19-21). The concept of marriage in terms of union and fidelity is central to prophetic typology (Isa 61:10, 62:1-5; Jer 2:2; Ezek 16:8; Hos 4). The prophets predicted a time when Israel would become the faithful bride of God and occasionally this era of blessedness was associated with the Messiah. 309 As with John's typological reading of the OT throughout the

306 "The New Jerusalem", as Thompson has so well composed, "forms a complex boundary with sacred space on earth, eschatological time, and heaven above- a boundary that cannot be charted in an ordinary space-time grid": Leonard L. Thompson, op. cit., 47f.; Saint Augustine (pointing to Rev 21:9), connects Jerusalem to "the Bride of my Lord": NPNF First Series (Vol. 8), 114.
309 The great OT pericope is the Isaianic suffering servant (42-44). This prophecy has two extensions. First, Israel as the servant of God. Second, Jesus Christ as God's servant. The servant was given by God "as a covenant to the people" (42:6). Ultimately God's chosen individual, will redeem and restore the people from Babylon, they will then "declare [God's] praise" (43:21). Barry Webb's words on Is 42:8-9 are insightful
Apoc, the marriage typology points to a present and realised reality. The old covenantal relationship between God and Israel which was based on the acceptance of the Abrahamic promise, reaffirmed in the long line of patriarchs, has now been fulfilled in Jesus Christ who is also the Groom. For the true Israel of God is the Bride of the Lamb, which is the Church (the believing community[ies]).\(^{310}\) It is as Saint Paul writes to the Ephesians, "...the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God..." \([\text{oikonomia tou musthriou tou ajpokekrummevou}]\) (Eph 3:9). The bride's wedding dress reflects the Seer's idea of one side of the covenantal nature of the Church, for it consists of the "righteous deeds of the saints" \([\text{dikaiwvata tw'n aJgivwn}]\) (Rev 19:8). These righteous acts, which point to eternal life and to fellowship with God and the Lamb, directly reflect the apostolic witness to the testimony of Jesus Christ (21:14) and the history of Israel (21:12). The final vindication of the suffering community's faithfulness to God during the course of their distress in this present age is expressed in the use of the marriage typology. A suggestion by some scholars (ignoring the rhetorical shift)\(^{311}\) that John has confused the marriage typology on account of his changing the status of the Church at the wedding feast from bride to guest has been very well answered in recent times by G. R. Beasley-Murray:

The perfection in glory of the bride belongs to the eschatological future. In this figure, therefore, the now and the not yet of the New Testament doctrine of salvation in the kingdom of God is perfectly exemplified. The Church is the Bride of Christ now, but her marriage lies in the future.\(^{312}\)

The Seer is largely dependent upon Ezekiel's vision\(^{313}\) of the New Jerusalem for his portrait of the "holy city", so we can safely understand John's interpretation of his vision as the

---

\(^{310}\) That is, the "believing community" which either rejected or commended writings as either spurious or elevated them to sacred: James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 34.

\(^{311}\) These shifts are common in the Apoc and operate to attract the reader's attention to strategic transitions in the text (cf. 7:4, 14:1). In the previous instance the Seer rehearses his readers for the climactic vision of God's triumph which begins at Rev 19:11.

\(^{312}\) Beasley-Murray, *op. cit.*, 273f.

\(^{313}\) See Ezek 48:30-35, but generally 40:1-48:35 (there are also a few elements lifted from Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah). Taylor writing on the Ezekiel pericope has noted that the "chief problem in these chapters is that of
The Church in the Apocalypse

fulfilment of the prophecy of the eschatological cultus. However, as with his general use of biblical and apocalyptic traditions, he awakens his readers to another interpretation. John tells us that the New Jerusalem now reveals the "basic makeup" of the New Heaven and the New Earth. Significantly, however, John does not subordinate the New Jerusalem to the new temple as Ezekiel does in his own vision of the temple (Ezek 40). This is a masterful re-interpretation of Ezekiel for a new situation. "The Church", declares Cyril of Alexandria (commenting on Heb 7:19), "is the holy city which has not been sanctified by observing the law, for the law made nothing perfect."314 A localized temple is no longer a requirement. For the prophet it was a question of a transformed cultus, but for the Seer of Patmos it was about a transformed people. This also represents the parousia of Jesus Christ, so the parallel meaning is that of a new order of human existence. And what Vladimir Lossky has written of the Church generally, it is also very much applicable here," [i]n truth, we are not concerned with individuals and with collectivity but with human persons who can only attain to perfection within the unity of nature."315 Calculated care has been taken in the presentation of this new order to make sure to bring out the essence of the Apoc's eschatological doctrine which provides the community of believers with the raison d'etre for a faithful witness to God's judgements and to the Gospel of Christ. This is God's coming triumph over evil and over every beastly power, and the promise that the transformed community will forever "dwell" [sēkhneβε] in the company of God (21:1-4).316 "The parallel structure of Revelation's two city visions", B. R. Rossing writes from the perspective of rhetorical function, "heightens the rhetorical impact of their contrasting imagery... Babylon is the idolatrous city that seduces and oppresses... New Jerusalem is the city of well being and justice..."317 John's description of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21-22:6) also serves as an eschatological metaphor for the redeemed people of God.318 The glorification of the redeemed stands also for a testimony that they are "freed" [λωσαντι] from their sins, they are forgiven "by his blood" [εν τ' αιματι αυτου] (1:5, cf. 5:9).319 Their names are written in the "book of life" [...bibliion

interpretation". He lists the four main views that have been held: (i) literal prophetic, (ii) symbolic Christian, (iii) dispensationalist, and (iv) apocalyptic: John B. Taylor, Ezekiel, (Leicester: IVP, 1969), 251-253.

314 Cited Lossky, op. cit., 177.
315 Lossky, op. cit., 176.
316 For fuller discussion on the Seer's use of God's "tabernacling presence", see G. K. Beale, The Book of Revelation, 1046-1050. It is in the context of these verses, Beale argues, that there "is the first hint that there is no literal temple in the new Jerusalem": ibid., 1048.
317 Rossing, op. cit., 1f.
318 Wall, op. cit., 245.
John stresses that the revelation of this new scheme of things, "these words" \([\text{ou} \text{t} \text{o} \text{i} \text{d} \text{j} \text{o} \text{goi}]\) are "trustworthy and true" \([\text{p} \text{i} \text{s} \text{t} \text{o} \text{i} \text{;} \text{k} \text{a} \text{i} \text{;} \text{a} \text{} \text{h} \text{\eta} \text{r} \text{n} \text{i} \text{y}]\) (22:6).\(^{320}\) At the centre of this victorious declaration is the worshipping community, comprised of redeemed and transformed believers who live forever with God and the Lamb (21-22). This is the integral component of the Book of Revelation and has strong canonical extensions,\(^{321}\) for as Paul Barnett assuredly concludes, "[c]learly John sees his book of prophecy as being of absolute importance, to be read and observed in the churches."\(^{322}\)

"Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them" (Rev 20:3). The word translated "dwelling" \((\text{skhnh})\) is used in the Septuagint to translate the Heb word \((\text{miskan})\) for "tabernacle" and is associated with the glorious presence \((\text{shekinah})\) of God.\(^{323}\) The theological lesson here is that, though the old order has passed, this does not change the spiritual nature of Israel's covenantal relationship with God. In making everything new, God removes all that interferes with the formation of a covenantal relationship with the believing community. "The economy of Providence", writes G. A. Barrois in his study Jesus Christ and The Temple, "consists in successive transpositions of the one theme… our salvation from sin and death.\(^{324}\) There is, in the new order, however, a qualitative distinction, \(\text{uparxikh;} \text{ejnevlixh}\).\(^{325}\) It is a new and transfigured life, calling the faithful to an increasing realization of the mystery of the Church, the Bride of the Lamb. The use of this New Jerusalem typology transfers the transforming grace and abiding glory of God from the temple of a restored Jerusalem (Dan 5:12; 2Esdras 7:26, 10:49, cf. Heb 12:22), to a transfigured community who are the New Jerusalem of the Seer's vision. So the Seer can declare that he "saw no temple in the city \([\text{nao;n ouj} \text{ekon en au} \text{t} \text{i} \text{h}]\), for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (21:22). Now this is quite important, for as David E. Aune reminds us, "[i]n Judaism, the

\(^{320}\) For discussion on the structural importance of these words and the parallel references "coming as they do at the beginning and with such emphasis at the end", see Paul Barnett, Apocalypse Now and Then, 162-165.

\(^{321}\) Whatever else it is, the Apoc is a Letter from a noted leader-apostle, and that, as read in the churches of the province, would have been regarded as Scripture and therefore readily recognised as canonical. "Other genre marks (apocalyptic, prophecy) would not so readily find acceptance as the 'word of the Lord'." 1Cor 14:37 the prophetic oracles, for instance, must defer to the apostolic, mediated as this was, as literature in the epistolary form. I thank Paul Barnett for sharing these critical observations and for his extended explanations. Paul Barnett<pbarnett@laurel.ocs.mq.edu.au> "Canon". Tue, 05 Mar 2002. M. G. Michael<mgjm@1earth.net>.

\(^{322}\) Barnett, op. cit., 163.

\(^{323}\) On this point see Caird whose sharp analysis in his commentary is very helpful and concise: G. B. Caird, The Revelation of John, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1966), 263-265.

\(^{324}\) Barrois, op. cit., 161.

\(^{325}\) Eudokimov, op. cit., 445.
eschatological expectation of a New Jerusalem generally implied a new temple." Once more the Seer of Patmos reverses the expected order of events with an 'unexpected twist' to the eschatological narrative.

The Lamb's bride is strikingly contrasted with the other woman, the "mother of harlots" [μηθύρ τῆς πόρνης], (Rev 17:5) who is "drunk with the blood of the saints" [μεμομίσθη ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῆς αγίας] (17:6). "The metonymic trope linking heavenly city and bride", as Robert M. Royalty, Jr. points out, "also links Babylon and New Jerusalem." This repetition of the bride metaphor from 19:6-10 in 21:2 calls for comparison by the audience between the New Jerusalem and Babylon not only as opposing cities of good and evil, but also as archetypal models of existence. Note that the holy city comes down from God "out of heaven" (21:2), whereas the "whore of Babylon" is thrown into the sea "and will be found no more" (18:21). However, Jan Fekkes III has rightly stressed, the essential distinction between the two women is one of inward character and purpose, "[h]arlot-Babylon entices men to become involved in an evil system, while the Bride-New Jerusalem draws men to glory in order to worship the true God." Similarly to the eschatological Jerusalem of Ezekiel's vision (Ezk 48:30-34), the wall of the Jerusalem that John is describing has twelve gates (Rev 21:12), corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel (Rev 7:1-8). The twelve foundations, however, correspond to the twelve apostles of the Lamb (21:14) and "[t]hereby the Seer", as R. H. Charles significantly affirms, "maintains the continuity of the O.T. and the

---

326 David E. Aune, Revelation 17-22 (52C), 1166.
327 For discussion of these striking contrasts from a rhetorical perspective in the context of "prophetic reappropriation", see Rossing, op. cit., 1-16.
329 For informative insights on "the paradigm of good and evil (ἀγερτός and κακία) as contrasting feminine figures" in the classical tradition, see Rossing, op. cit., 17-59.
330 Jan Fekkes III, art. cit., 284.
331 "On the fantastic size of the New Jerusalem, as delineated in the received text", see Michael Topham, "The Dimensions of the New Jerusalem", ExpTim (Oct. 1988), 417-419.
332 As C. R. Smith says "many commentators have been struck by the unusual order and combination of tribal names in the list." Smith also cites George Eldon Ladd who acknowledges, "John's list agrees with no known list of the enumeration of the twelve tribes of Israel." Smith, who reviews the positions of a good number of scholars on this perplexing question (including Charles, Draper, Farrer, Feuillet, Gray, Hengstenberg, Mounce and Swete), concludes that though "it is virtually impossible to account for the unusual order... the number 144,000 is much better explained by its symbolic import- 12x12x10x10x10 expressing completion in a salvific, covenant sense- than as a literal census of a Jewish remnant": Christopher R. Smith, "The Portrayal of the Church as the New Israel in the Names and Order of the Tribes in Revelation 7.5-8", JSNT 39, (1990), 111-118.
Christian Church. This is an eschatological community of many nations for it is comprised (on account of the "blood" of Christ) "from every tribe and tongue and people and nation" [ek pash' ful h' kai; gl'wsh' kai; laou' kai; ejnoun'] (5:9). In an informative paper on the portrayal of the Church as the New Israel where the names and order of the tribes in Rev 7:5-8 are considered, Christopher R. Smith concluded, that "the message of the chapter is then one of hope and reassurance for John's late first-century Christian audience, which he is warning of the impending resumption of imperial persecution."

All that we have encountered and which I have endeavoured to describe to this point (in complementary dialogue between East and West), has pre-supposed a "dynamism" centred about the Kingdom of God. Which, for Niko' Matsouka" (himself strongly influenced by the universal ecclesiology of Basil the Great and Maximus the Confessor), is at the core of the successive phases [th' kape fash'] of the Church in "the light of the divine glory." Importantly, this prominent Orthodox theologian and philosopher, emphasizes the 'oneness' of the Militant and Triumphant worshipping communities; they are always the Church, together, from the beginning to the end. In summarizing the Eastern Orthodox position on this ecclesiological correlation, Matsouka", has in effect, also perfectly condensed the comparable vision of the Seer of Patmos:

333 Charles (Vol. II), 162.
334 Christopher R. Smith, "The Portrayal of the Church as the New Israel in the Names and Order of the Tribes in Revelation 7.5-8", JSNT 39, (1990), 111-118.
335 Niko' Matsouka", Dogmatikhv kaiv Sumbolikhv Qeologiva (B), (Qessalonivkh: Pournara', 1985), 379.
336 ibid., passim.
337 ibid., loc. cit.
338 ibid.
339 ibid., 377f.
Conclusion

If not for the extensive and over-arching ecclesiological dimensions that were found to be at the heart of the book, the Apoc may not have survived in its quest for sacred commendation. Particularly as we found in Chapter 2, the criteria of canonicity (apostolicity, catholicity, orthodoxy, traditional usage and inspiration) were not consistently applied in the canonical formulations of the Ancient Church. In the greater context it was the church consciousness of the early communities of the faithful that fuelled the initial discussions on the NT Canon, and the Book of Revelation, as we saw, was deeply imbued with this ecclesiological cognizance. The author of our book sought after this spiritual realization, and declared it unambiguously in his elevated *khvrgma* of salvation. Everywhere there is a sense of the Church, the eschatological community of salvation, made even stronger by its typological covenantal connections to the OT.\(^{340}\) It was from the beginning a writing (as will shall discover in the following chapters), that could not have been given up without a mighty contest by the canon sensitive "flesh-and-blood"\(^{341}\) readers who were the original recipients of the work. The integral element was the Seer's covenantal theology which spilled over into his community-of-the-cross, manifesting itself in the distinct presentations of the Church as the Bride of the Lamb and as New Jerusalem for example; and in the various expressions of the covenant community,\(^{342}\) which very significantly included the tradition of a liturgical worship. It was an ideal text for the worshipping church communities. Importantly, though the Seer initially addresses his prophecy to the seven local churches, they are from the start connected to the *ecclesia universalis*, held fast to the *una sancta*. To all of this, of course, we add and highlight the striking "cosmical" and "eschatological" ecclesiology which so distinctly appealed to the early "patristic Church".\(^{343}\) These unmistakable qualities of the Apoc, together with the aura connected with John's name and apostolate in Asia Minor,\(^{344}\) would have compelled the

---

\(^{340}\) Within the school of canonical criticism the importance of typology in the context of hermeneutics has been competently summarized by Charles J. Scalise, *op. cit.* 74-76; for an Eastern Orthodox expression on typology, see Breck, *op. cit.*, 37-44. Typology is connected to the "complementarity [which] characterizes the activity of the Spirit and the Son within the New Israel of the Church": *ibid.*, 43.

\(^{341}\) That is, (as I have elsewhere discussed in the thesis in the context of a narrative critical approach), the reader "as a real live person... not [as] a construct of the text": J. L. Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse*, (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 29f.

\(^{342}\) "The importance of the community idea in the NT", declares Guthrie, "cannot be over-stressed. Although salvation is applied individually and the processes of sanctification must be personally pursued, yet there is no sense in which the NT conceives of lone believers. The repeated emphasis on groups of believers shows the basic character of the idea of the church": Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, (Illinois: IVP, 1981), 787. The Apoc would appear to be, to my mind at least, the best representative of Guthrie's considered inspection.


\(^{344}\) "Furthermore, both the New Testament and church tradition", write Wall and Lemcio, "agree on a Pauline and Johannine presence there [Ephesus]": Wall and Lemcio, *op. cit.*, 399. See the fascinating discussion on the
churches [the canonizing faith-community-ies] of that region to receive and to read the "Epistle" in a liturgical, hence canonical *Sitz-im-Leben*.

possibility that Ephesus could have been the place, itself, where "if we cannot speak of the birth of canon in a certain place and time, might there be clues to its conception in a particular environment?" [the *Sitz im Leben des Kanons* approach is employed by its authors]; *ibid.*, 335-360; see also Johnson's very helpful paper (particularly in reference to archaeology and inscriptions), Sherman E. Johnson, "Early Christianity in Asia Minor", A Presidential Address delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December 30, 1957, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.


Aune, commenting on Rev 1:3 and 22:7, "Blessed is he who reads aloud [οις ἐγνωκέντος] the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear [οἴκου]"; and who keep what is written therein", significantly says, "[t]his pronouncement of blessing upon reader and upon those who both hear and obey is very likely based on the practice of beginning or concluding readings or presentations of the words of God (whether Scripture or other types of revelatory messages)... this verse also makes it evident that the author intended, even designed, his composition to be read aloud before Christian congregations assembled for worship. Since he calls his book "the words of this prophecy" and the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible had been included in synagogue services readings complementary to reading from the Pentateuch, *John places his book on an equal footing with OT Scripture*": David E. Aune, *Revelation 1-5* (52A), (Texas: Word Books, 1997), 23. [italics added]
CHAPTER 7
Six Factors Positively Affecting Revelation's Early Circulation: The Apocalypse in the Apostolic Fathers

Introduction
It is generally conceded that few if any explicit traces of the Book of Revelation are to be found in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. This position, widespread and supported as it may be, is too readily accepted, particularly since H. B. Swete (1906), Isbon T. Beckwith (1919), R. H. Charles (1920) and N. B. Stonehouse (1929) passed it into Anglo-American bibliography. Nonetheless, each argued for the Apoc's early recognition as an authoritative Scripture. The former position has also been the sweeping conclusion, a quick dismissal of the question, by almost all other bibliographies. For the most part, commentators of the Apoc have been content to take on board conclusions from older works and to begin their own investigations or studies with Justin Martyr (d. AD c. 165), Irenaeus of Lyons (d. AD c. 202), Clement of Alexandria (d. AD c. 215), and Hippolytus of Rome (d. AD c. 235).


2 For instance, consider Beckwith who wrote almost a century ago, "[n]o other writing of the New Testament can claim in comparison with the Apocalypse more abundant and more trustworthy evidence that it was widely known at an early date. It is also shown beyond question to have been recognized from an early time in a part of the Church, and by certain fathers in all parts of the Church, as belonging in the category of authoritative Scriptures": Beckwith, op. cit., 337.

3 For an extensive bibliography which includes some of the major works on the Apoc from German and French scholars, see G. K. Beale, The Book of Revelation. (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1999), xxviii-lxiv; and David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), xxviii-xliv; see also the enduring study, The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, by A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905). I must add, here, that I made the conscious decision from the outset to conduct my own investigation of the use of the Apoc by the Apostolic Fathers independently, of this, still very valuable study of the Oxford Society.

4 For instance, Robert H. Mounce in his very good commentary is satisfied with repeating Stonehouse's conclusions, The Book of Revelation. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 36f. This is also the case in another fine work, Alan F. Johnson, Revelation. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), 8.
The Apocalypse

I am not setting out necessarily to disprove this general consensus. When we are confronted with a limited and previously well-reviewed congress of sources, major surprises are not generally forthcoming. However, a great deal of this reservation has been based on earlier hearsay and it is time that the evidence is sifted and reconsidered afresh, especially in the light of a received theology, and one that is not solely based on lexical templates. The exaggerated concern with the minutiae is a symptom of a postcritical philosophy which has entered into areas of hermeneutical theology choosing to ignore the larger picture. For, as Geerhardus Vos has rightly said (in the context of the antichrist tradition), this "by no means implies that the real person or the real thing called by other names but resembling to a larger or smaller extent the conception, is equally non-existent." Before we consider the Apostolic Fathers more closely for any evidence of knowledge and/or use of the Apoc, I will bring together six factors that would strongly suggest that these early ecclesiastical writers would almost certainly have come into some form of contact with the book.

Six Factors Positively Affecting the Early Circulation of the Apoc

Each of the six factors has either been addressed at length or at least intimated in the relevant chapters of this thesis. Each of these on its own would have been an effective agent of transmission. But together they would have guaranteed that the Book of Revelation would be in a most favourable position to become one of the earliest attested and most widely distributed of all the sacred books in the Ancient Church. However, as these six factors were not directly linked in the context of circulation earlier, they merit collective reference, for special appeal to early circulation will be made during the course of this chapter.

---

5 By this is meant that later works (within set and defined parameters) can be used to shed light on earlier texts whose reference is not as clear as modern commentators might wish. For example, attention to the endtyrant tradition established by the time of Irenaeus allows for a closer comprehension and investigation of the legend in its earlier Christian manifestation. The anxiety expressed by many scholars not to follow this route can be traced back to the radically suspicious reading of the Bible which G. Green (following Paul Ricoeur) calls the "hermeneutics of suspicion": See Garrett Green, Theology, Hermeneutics, and Imagination: The Crisis of Interpretation at the End of Modernity, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

6 If a researcher, for instance, were to do a search for certain key words from the Book of Revelation on the TLG database for the period AD 100-150 and few hits were displayed, would that necessarily mean that little or no interest was shown for these words by the book's author? Obviously that would be a rash and faulty conclusion, for other words or synonyms, inferences or allusions could have been used for those specific word searches. Great religious or historical realities can exist for considerable lengths of time prior to their "finding [a] unifying designation in the theological and eschatological vocabulary": Geerhardus Vos, The Pauline Eschatology, (Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 1994), 94.


8 Vos, op. cit., 94.

9 Beckwith, loc. cit.
(i) The Apoc Addressed as an Epistle to Specific Churches

Each of the communities of the seven churches to which the epistle was sent would have been likely to secure not only a copy of the particular message addressed to itself (Rev 2:1-3:22), but of the complete work. The text would then be transcribed for the community's own use (particularly as it contained material for worship and words of encouragement), and then passed on to other nearby congregations that would similarly repeat the process. As Richard N. Soulen notes, "[n]one of the NT letters is, strictly speaking, private correspondence; all were intended for the larger community, even Philemon which deals with a personal matter." The Apoc (as I have noted earlier in the discussion of genre) bears the hallmarks of the literary form of the letter. However, if we are to agree with David E. Aune and view the Book of Revelation as a NT letter "in the form of an encyclical[s]", then the argument for its rapid circulation becomes even stronger. Harry Y. Gamble has expertly discussed the "textual orientation" of the Apoc, which "is manifest at the beginning [Rev 1]". "The blessing", Gamble explains, "concerns the use of the text as text -not only its reading and hearing, but also its copying and transmission."

Apart from the fact that "John's use of the letter form", as Bailey and Vander Broek write, "has to do with his [John's] desire to exhort his reader", at the same time this form also

---

10 This assumes the unity of the work, for which there is ample proof, particularly in the compelling evidence of a clearly defined and established structure. Though there has been reason to refer to structure on a number of occasions throughout the thesis, I again highlight the conclusions of A. Y. Collins, who has argued for a septenary or seven-fold structure which is, in itself, canvassed on two cycles of visions. "The Book of Revelation is organized in two great cycles of visions, 1:9-11:19 and 12:1-22:5. Each cycle consists of three series of seven: (1) the seven messages, seals, and trumpets; (2) seven unnumbered visions, the seven bowls, and a second series of seven unnumbered visions. The first cycle is introduced by the vision of 1:9-3:22, in which the seer is commissioned, and it concerns the revelation of the content of the scroll with seven seals. The second cycle is introduced by the vision of ch. 10, in which the seer is commissioned a second time. The revelation contained in this cycle is symbolized by the little scroll of ch. 10": Adela Yarbro Collins, The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation, (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 31f. Collins does acknowledge, however, that her own starting point (as far as the series of sevens are concerned), was the work of Austin Farrer, A Rebirth of Images (Boston: Beacon, 1949). Farrer argues that the series of sevens in Revelation reflects the Jewish festal calendar and the lectionary; he also links the sevens with the days of creation.


13 Aune (on the basis of Rev 1:4-7), ibid., 101. Aune also considers Acts, 1 & 2 Peter, and James to be in the form of the encyclical.


announces its clear intention to be circulated. If this development was to be followed through to its practical conclusion, it would not have taken long for the book to be circulated beyond the bounds of its original design. A decade (or less) is certainly no exaggeration, particularly if we are to accept its use by the Apostolic Fathers. We have noted throughout this thesis the powerful and compelling charisms of the Apoc; these theo-liturgical manifestations were taken up as spiritual foundation stones by each of the communities as they came into contact with the inspired prophecy of the Seer of Patmos. And as Henry Barclay Swete has well encapsulated:

[i]n one or all of these ways (the spontaneous action of the Asian societies, or in answer to the appeal of foreign churches, or through the agency of individual Christians upon their travels) the great Christian apocalypses would have passed from Church to Church and from province to province, and wherever it went it could not fail to excite the interest of Christian readers.

(ii) The Apoc Addressed to the Universal Church
This second factor follows immediately from the one just mentioned (it is an amplification). The Apoc was also viewed as a message addressed to the whole Church (Rev 1:1-3, 7, 14, 21, 22); it was equally concerned with the life-situation of believers throughout Christendom (esp. chaps 7, 13, 14). This was suggestive when later on it would match up well against one of the criteria of canonicity, that of catholicity. That is, to be recognized as authoritative a document had to be intended by its author to be relevant to the ecclesia universalis and not only particularis. From the start then, the Book of Revelation could claim territory outside Asia Minor, particularly Rome, the seat of the persecutions and the source of the imperial cult.

17 Swete, *op. cit.*, cvii.
18 Augustine's detailed definition of the criterion of catholicity is one of the most precise in patristic literature and is an invaluable synopsis of the theological dialogue that preceded it. In brief his argument fixes on the following standard, "to prefer those [Scriptures] that are received by all the catholic churches to those which some do not receive": *De Doct. Christ.* 2.8.12. The inconsistency of the application of this criterion is considered more fully in Chapter 2 of the dissertation.
19 Sources for a spectrum persecution are abundant but largely ignored. They have been previously detailed in M. G. Michael, *Thesis*: 215-225. Here I will note a graphic description from Tacitus, who was no friend of the Christians and had no reason to exaggerate their affliction. In part he writes, "[t]o suppress this rumour [instigation of the fire of Rome], Nero fabricated scapegoats- and punished with every refinement the notoriously depraved Christians... Nero had self-acknowledged Christians arrested... [t]heir deaths were made farcical. Dressed in wild animal's skins, they were torn to pieces by dogs, or crucified, or made into torches to be ignited after dark as substitutes for daylight... [d]espite their guilt as Christians, and the ruthless punishment it deserved, the victims were pitied. For it was felt that they were being sacrificed to one man's brutality rather than to national interest": *Annals*, 15. 44.
Significantly, when the Apoc is preferred over the Apocalypse of Peter in the ancient collection of Christian scriptures listed in the *MF* (AD c. 200), one of the reasons would appear to be that "though he [John] writes to seven churches, nevertheless speaks to all."²¹

(iii) *The Apoc Sent to the Great Cities of Asia Minor*

The Book of Revelation had a sure start to its adventure by having first been sent to the central market places, as it were, of Asia Minor. As it was heard when first read in the troubled congregations of Asia, "it must have stirred", as Isbon T. Beckwith has suitably imagined, "the profoundest emotions, and eventually copies of it could hardly fail to be carried afar in the busy intercourse of Asia Minor with the world."²² Here we have a document not only full of succour and promise, which would appeal immediately to the persecuted communities in Rome and in Asia (and so hasten its transportation), but also a book which claimed an oracular conduit to the great and revered prophets of the OT. The cities to which the letters to the seven churches are sent were not haphazardly selected by our author, but were revealed to John from the Lord Himself:

Write what you see in a book and send it to the seven churches, to Ephesus and to Smyrna and to Pergamum and to Thyatira and to Sardis and to Philadelphia and to Laodicea (Rev 1:11).

Each of the cities, W. M. Ramsay writes, "lay on important roads which connected them with one another."²³ Much more recently Colin J. Hemer (accepting Ramsay's general conclusions with few reservations) says that this grouping "[i]n its essentials corresponds clearly to the facts of communication, and is capable of being worked rigorously as a highly practical system for the most efficient dissemination of messages to all those cities of proconsular Asia..."²⁴ Ephesus, for example, as Hemer continues to tell us, was "the messenger's natural place of entry to the mainland of the province of Asia, and the other cities lay in sequence on

---


²¹ *MF* 58-60.

²² Beckwith, op. cit., 337.


a circular route round its inner territories.”

This is even more convincing when we consider that other equally important churches (and in some instances more prestigious) were omitted from John's list on account of the fact that they were not efficient centres of circulation, i.e. Troas, Cyzicus, Tralles, Magnesia, and Miletus. We could say, borrowing a descriptive term from the modern ethnographer's tool-kit, that the Seer of Patmos as an experienced fieldworker, was in the serious 'business' of mapping out social and religious networks.

(iv) The Apoc Written by a Prophet

The book was written by a prophet and teacher known to the Christian communities to which it was first addressed (Rev 1:1,9). We see here strong evidence of authority which is assumed by the writer (1:4); he orders the letter to be circulated (1:10). Major prophecies in the book were related to the difficult times into which the early Christian communities were now entering (13-19). At the time of the publication of John's revelation, prophets were highly esteemed by the Church, as is seen in the Apoc itself (1:1-3, 10:7). The author of the Book of Revelation includes himself among the prophets of the Church (1:3, 10:7, 11:18, 19:10, 22:6,9). But he also seeks to establish himself firmly in the ancient tradition of the prophets of old, to validate his prophetic office in the context of a legitimate succession: (a) large portions of the book are strongly reminiscent of the prophetic oracles of the OT (for example, the Letters to the Seven Churches); (b) the work is permeated with allusions to Old Testament prophecy (for example, the unquestionable Isanianic and Danielic influences); (c) moral exhortations and admonitions are notable in the tradition of the old covenant prophets (2:5,20-22, 18:4-5 cf. Isa 1:27; Jer 8:6; Ezek 14:6, 18:30); (d) the proclamation of God's will is

25 ibid.

26 ibid.

27 Here it is correct, as N. B. Stonehouse has written, that though this factor would have favoured the book it was certainly "not of decisive moment in determining the attitude taken toward it": Stonehouse, op. cit., 152. If this was the predominant reason for the book's redemption, then why did so many of the other so-called apocalypses (including the Apocryphon or Secret Book of John and the oldest Christian apocryphal apocalypse the Ascension of Isaiah), which claimed prophetic inspiration, quickly fail the test? Alone the authorship of a document by a prophet was no guarantee of canonical deliberation. The "prophetic view" is strongly evident, for example, in the commentaries of Arno C. Gaebeliein, The Revelation: An Analysis and Exposition of the Last Book of the Bible, (Neptune: Loizeaux Bros., 1915), and R. C. Stedman, God's Final Word: Understanding Revelation, (Grand Rapids: Discovery House, 1991). But it is also evident to some extent, for instance, in the more recognizable works of Theodor Zahn, Die Offenbarung des Johannes (Vols. 1 & 2), (Leipzig: Deichert, 1924-26) and George Eldon Ladd, A Commentary on the Revelation of John, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972).

prominent throughout the book (grαyōn ouh a{ei'de' kai; a{eijsin kai a)mel ei genescal
meta;taauta (1:19, 22:6) cf. (Jer 1:11; Hab 2:2).

(v) The Historical Theatre of the Times
The background of the times (which includes the world of ideas) in which the Seer of
Patmos wrote his prophetic work was the ideal historical theatre for the book to flourish. John
wrote at a time when, as M. Eugene Boring has exactly said: "the earth itself seemed
unstable". Asia had been devastated by earthquakes in the sixties. Famines and food
shortages struck Rome, Greece, and Judea. Wars and insurrections were on the increase. The
sacking of Jerusalem by Rome and the burning of the Temple in AD 70 were momentous
events with lasting consequences. Widespread persecution and local harassment of Christian
communities heightened eschatological expectations. Political instability and the rapid and
violent demise of successive emperors further encouraged the belief that Rome was sowing

31 The earthquake of Laodicea in AD 60 almost entirely destroyed the city. The Roman cities of Pompeii and
Herculaneum, along with the neighbouring Stabiae, were first damaged by an earthquake in AD 62. Seventeen
years later in AD 79 they were completely destroyed by the eruption of Vesuvius. As Barnett notes "Pliny's
description of this disaster from a ship in the Bay of Naples (Bk VI, Epistles 16, 20) could well match John's
words that the 'sun turned black... and the moon blood red... and every mountain and island was removed from
32 For the primary sources of these accounts, see David E. Aune, Revelation 6-16 (52B), (Nashville: Thomas
33 Wainwright has rightly identified these "perils" as contributing to the millenarianism of the early church:
34 The Jewish War no doubt left indelible memories on John and his audience. In AD 66, after a series of
clashes and sporadic resistance, the Jews combined in revolt and liberated Jerusalem from the Romans.
However, on the 10th of the month of Av (August) in AD 70 Jerusalem fell once more to the force of Rome and
the rebellion was crushed. The Roman legions under the command of Titus marched triumphantly into the City
of David, and the great Temple was burned. This might have been one of the scenes behind the "great sword"
[macaira regaln] of the second seal (Rev 6:4). For the graphic account of the Sack of Jerusalem, see Joseph.,
Wars Bk 6, chaps 8-10.
35 Outside the NT and patristic testimonies our standard Roman sources are: Tacitus, Annals, XV, 44;
Suetonius, Lives of the Caesars, Nero, 16; Domitian, 15; Cassius Dio, Roman History, LXVI, 9; LXVII, 14;
Sulpicius Severus, Sacred History, II, 28, 29, 31. Suetonius writes that, "[p]unishments [during the reign of
Nero] were also inflicted on the Christians, a sect professing a new and mischievous belief": Nero, 16.
36 The Senate condemns the emperor to death, Nero flees and suicides in AD 68. Power was assumed by
Galba in June of that year, but he was murdered seven months later. The next emperor, like Nero, also took his
own life; Otho committed suicide in April of AD 69. The following emperor, Vitellius had the same fate as
Galba, he was killed before the end of that year. The rapidity in which the Emperors have "fallen" [epesan]
(Rev 17:10), and the possibility of such an episode being repeated was not lost on the Seer (17:10-11). Court
has tried to put some reasonable order into this intrigue and his chronology of the events is useful (the sequence
begins with Augustus and the unsuccessful rulers in the Year of the Four Emperors are discounted): John M.
the seeds of her own destruction and that truly "Fallen, fallen [ἐπεσεν] is Babylon the great!" (Rev 18:2).

(vi) The Fusion of Genres

Early in the thesis close attention was given to the important question of genre. We saw that the Apoc cannot be fitted neatly onto a particular genre, for its diverse content defies absolute category. However, the number of recurring characteristics in the work that are common to apocalyptic (for example: discourse cycles, visions, mythical images, eschatology) clearly indicate that the Book of Revelation should be first established in the apocalyptic genre, with the immediate qualification that it also shares fundamentals with prophecy and epistle. This fusion of genres is further evidence of the "open-ended and polyvalent nature" of John's symbolism, which would make it possible for the book to be received and interpreted in distinct ways and to fulfil the needs of each community as they might arise. This we have already seen to have occurred spectacularly in the context of the interpretation of the chiliastic pericope of the Apoc before and after Constantine the Great.

How quickly then could the Book of Revelation have circulated after its original publication (AD c. 95), and how accessible and known could it have been to the early Christian writers who came onto the scene immediately after the Seer of Patmos? The six factors positive to early transmission (three of which are directly linked to genre) from the outset would favour the rapid circulation of the Apoc as it set out on its canonical adventure. Given this evidence, and holding to a publication date of around AD 94-95 during the time of the persecution of Domitian, it would not be unreasonable to hold that the Apoc was copied and circulated around the start of the second century. This would be made all the more certain when it is remembered that the book was delivered by an individual of great influence and authority to seven major churches and meeting points of Asia Minor. And in the context of sacred "legitimization" (vis-à-vis the Canon) this would be critical for the Seer of Patmos, as Paul Barnett concludes in his commentary, expected that his work would "be read and observed in the churches."
The Apostolic Fathers

The term *Apostolic Fathers* has been widely applied since Jean Baptiste Cotelier published his *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicos floruere opera* in 1672 (the title was abbreviated to *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum* by L. J. Ittig in the edition of 1699). However, the term *Apostolic* was used from the early second century to designate selected writings, revered persons and churches. Typically, Saint Ignatius in his Epistle to the Trallians greets the Church "after the apostolic manner" [ἐν ἀποστολικῷ χαρακτῆρι].\(^{41}\) Though not everything written by the Apostolic Fathers is of equal merit theologically, as a whole, however, the literature of this period is of inestimable value for the study of early Christianity (both for church history and the history of doctrines).\(^{42}\) These are our principal sources for the life of the Church in the immediate generations after the time of the Apostles. They were Christian writers of the late first and early second centuries. The writings are a bridge between the recognized Canon and the more fully developed Christianity of the late second century. The table of contents will generally include:\(^{43}\) The Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians (1Clem); An Ancient Christian Sermon (2Clem); The Seven Letters of Ignatius; The Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians; The Martyrdom of Polycarp; The Didache; The Epistle of Barnabas; The Shepherd of Hermas; The Epistle to Diognetus; The Fragments of Papias; and the Reliques of the Elders Preserved in Irenaeus.

The Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers

*The Didache* (AD c. 80-120)

*Manuscript tradition:*\(^{44}\) one Greek text; one Greek fragment; one Coptic text (10.3b-12.1a); one Georgian text. The Didache (sometimes called The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)

---

\(^{41}\) *Trall. praef.*


\(^{43}\) Here I am following the tabulation of Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999). For the critical editions and textual apparatus utilized by Holmes, see: *ibid*: vii-xii; J. B. Lightfoot also tabulates the *Reliques of the Elders Preserved in Irenaeus*, *The Apostolic Fathers*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956). Though, Holmes does cite the *Reliques*, he argues that more correctly, they belong to the study of Irenaeus: Holmes, *op. cit.*, 560; for further bibliography of editions and translations, where the importance of the editions in *Sources Chrétiennes* is especially pointed out, see Simon Tugwell, *The Apostolic Fathers*, (Pennsylvania: Morehouse Publishing, 1989), xif; for specific critical editions see Mauritii Geerard (ed.), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Vol. I), (Brepols-Turnhout, 1983).

The Apocalypse was probably written in Egypt or Syria sometime in the second century;\textsuperscript{45} it is the oldest surviving Church typikon.\textsuperscript{46} It is comprised of sixteen short chapters concerned with morals, church practice, catechism, and eschatology. It was quoted extensively (particularly in Egypt) during the fourth and fifth centuries, and as Bruce M. Metzger notes, "Eusebius and Athanasius even considered it to be on the fringe of the New Testament canon."\textsuperscript{47} It also formed the basis of chapter 7 of the fourth-century Apostolic Constitutions. It was only through such references that the Didache was known to scholars until a Greek manuscript, written in 1056, was discovered in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople in 1875 by Metropolitan Philotheos Bryennios (it was published in 1883).\textsuperscript{48} Two fragments of the work were later discovered, a fourth-century Greek papyrus in Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, and a fifth-century Coptic papyrus in the British Museum.\textsuperscript{49} It is not a unified tract but a compilation of regulations that acquired authority in the early Church by sheer force of its traditional usage. Several pre-existing written sources could have been used and later compiled by an unknown hand.\textsuperscript{50}

The first six chapters give ethical instruction concerning the "two ways" [οἱ δύο οἰκουμενικοὶ (of life [τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἀγαθῇ] and death [τῷ φαναρίῳ]),\textsuperscript{51} they also reflect an early Christian adaptation of a Jewish pattern of catechesis (in this instance catechumens for Baptism). Chapters seven to fifteen discuss baptism, fasting, prayer, the Eucharist, how to receive and test travelling apostles and prophets, and the appointment of bishops and deacons. Chapter sixteen, which is the final chapter, deliberates on the signs of the Second Coming of the Lord. It is highly unlikely that the text can be located close to the apostolic period; internal evidence would

\textsuperscript{45} As Jefford notes, though no absolute date is certain "the broadest consensus of current thought would place the composition of the text in all of its various stages between AD 70 and 150": \textit{ibid.}, 37.

\textsuperscript{46} See "Tupiκɔο" in \textit{QKHE} (Tom 11), 900-904.


\textsuperscript{48} Metzger, \textit{The Canon}, 49; but both Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 246, and Jefford, \textit{op. cit.}, 33, date the discovery of the document to 1873. However, the 1875 date is also preferred by Kirsopp Lake, \textit{The Apostolic Fathers} (Vol. I), \textit{Loeb Classical Library} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 305. Lake also informs us that the manuscript contains I and II Clement: \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{49} Jefford, \textit{op. cit.}, 33f.

\textsuperscript{50} Kirsopp Lake's general observations on this difficult subject are still relevant as is his question concerning the connection between the Didache and the \textit{Epistle of Barnabas} (which used which), "or both used a common source": \textit{ibid.}, 305-307; also see J. A. Draper, "Barnabas and the Riddle of the Didache Revisited", \textit{JSNT} 58, (1995), 89-113.

\textsuperscript{51} Cyril Richardson informs us that the "Two Ways' was an independent catechism current in several versions... and that Jerome and Rufinus seem to have known it in some connection with Peter's name": Richardson, \textit{op. cit.}, 162.
favour a date when the apostolic age had passed on.\textsuperscript{52} The rising antagonism between the Jewish and Christian communities appears to be established, but also the synagogue is no longer subject to the ritual and custom that would have been conspicuous had the document been written at a much earlier time. Importantly, and what is perhaps the strongest proof in favor of a later dating, the collection of the ecclesiastical ordinances as we have here in the Didache, would presuppose a period of institution.\textsuperscript{53} Very significantly, based on the eucharistic prayers of the document (\textit{Did.} 9-10) in reference to the Fourth Gospel (6:25-28), Bruce M. Metzger does not dismiss "a tradition common to him (the \textit{Did.}) and the Fourth Evangelist."\textsuperscript{54}

Possible allusions and/or references:

\textbf{(i)} ouj mh; ἐγκαταλιθῆναι ἐντολὰς κυρίου, πλησίον δὲ αὐτῶν, μὴ νυν ἀφαίρειν; \textit{Didache} 4.13

ἐπιτί ἐπίρρησιν αὐτὰ... τοῦ λόγου τὸν πρόφητον... καὶ ἐπιτὶ αὐτῶν λογισμὸν... \textit{Rev} 22:18,19

\textbf{(ii)} ou[τ]ῶν συναγωνίων σου ἡ ἐκκλησία απὸ τῶν περατῶν τῇ ἁγίᾳ εἰ] τὸν σὸν βασιλείαν \textit{Didache} 9.4

...οἱ ἐπίσταντες τοὺς ἔναντι ἁγιασμοῖς εἰ] τὸν πᾶσαν τὴν ἁγίαν... \textit{Rev} 5:6

\textbf{(iii)} καὶ συναυχότας τὸν ἐκκλησίαν τοῖς πέσαναι αἰνεῖς, τὴν ἁγιασμόν, εἰ] τὸν σὸν βασιλείαν, ἡ ἡγίασμα αὐτὸς \textit{Didache} 10.5

Μετὰ τὸν τέσσαραν ἁγιασμὸν, τοῦτον ἐκτίμησεν ἐπίτιαν, τοῖς τέσσαραν ἁγιασμοῖς εἰ] τὸν πᾶσαν τὴν ἁγίαν... \textit{Rev} 7:1

\textbf{(iv)} καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησίας τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς, δέ τινί ἐπί θάνατον δικαίωσεν καὶ ἐπί τοῖς ἁγιοῖς καὶ ἐπί τοῖς ἁγιασμοῖς, δέ τινι... \textit{Didache} 16.4

\textsuperscript{52} Also Harnack's persuasion (which Bettenson sites but dismisses) that "in the \textit{Didache} we see a state of transition; the local ministry is beginning to take over the authority of the charismatic" further supports a later date of composition: Henry Bettenson, \textit{The Early Christian Fathers}, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 7.

\textsuperscript{53} After a review of some of the major scholarly influences on the question (including those of Audet, Bigg, Goodspeed, Grant, J. A. T. Robinson, Vokes, and Tuilier) Metzger concludes, "most prefer a date in the first half of the second century": Metzger, \textit{The Canon}, 49-51.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{ibid.}, 50f.
The Apocalypse

Rev 13:13,14

The First Letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (AD c. 92-101)

Manuscript tradition:55 two Greek texts (one without 57.7-63.4); one Latin text; one Syriac text; two Coptic texts (one without 34.6-42.2; one with 1.1-26.2 only); numerous later quotations. It still unclear who this Clement of Rome was, especially because his title implies an early establishment of the monepiscopate when the "terms bishop and presbyter", as Cyril C. Richardson notes, "were not yet clearly distinguished in Clement's time."56 According to the oldest list of Roman bishops, which has been preserved for us by Irenaeus, Clement was the third bishop of Rome after St. Peter.57 This is also confirmed by Hegesippus.58 This is further reported by Eusebius, the church historian who places Clement's bishopric from AD 92 to 101 (that is, from the twelfth year of Domitian's reign to the third year of Trajan's).59 We can only speculate on the details of his life, and most of what has come down to us is of legendary character.60 He is well known as the author of two Epistles to the Corinthians, of which his authorship of the first is traditionally attested and which, as Johannes Quasten confirms, "is among the most important documents of sub-apostolic times."61 So highly was this epistle regarded by the Church of Corinth that it was read together with the Scriptures as late as AD 170. Consider, for example, the high regard in which the epistle is held by Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, as recorded by Eusebius, "[t]oday we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice, as also from the former epistle, which was written to us through Clement."62 The letter is invaluable as a witness to the early life and organization of the Church; it is the most ancient Christian document that we possess outside the received NT

55 Jefford, op. cit., 98-100; see also CPG, op. cit., 5-11.
56 Richardson, op. cit., 36.
57 Iren., Adv. haer. 3.3.3.
58 Richardson, op. cit., 36.
59 Hist. Eccl. 3.15.34
60 For some speculative biographical notes cf. Richardson, op. cit., 36-39 and Pan K. Chrístou in QKHE (Tom 7), 626-636. The Greek Orthodox scholar also makes sure to note the scarcity of biographical information. "JÁteleivwta ei
ai kai; ta; alla peri; to;n bivon aujtou'' problhvmata": ibid., 626.
62 Hist. Eccl. 4.23.11. Eusebius concludes from the high praise of Dionysius that this showed "that it had been the custom from the beginning to read it [the epistle] in the church": ibid.
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Canon. This letter, which originated from Rome, is in fact, anonymous; it is the weight of ancient tradition that ascribes it to Clement. 63 This is especially significant, if we accept as Irenaeus tells us that, "he [Clement] had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them..."64 The following parallel between Clement and the Apoc cannot be dismissed easily:

\[
\text{pro} \, \text{legei} \, \text{gar} \, \text{hmin} \, \text{Ioudai ev} \, \\text{apodouhai eijastw} \, \text{kata} \, \text{to} \, \text{e} \, \text{ergon eijsti} \text{en} \, \text{autw}.
\]

\[
\text{Ioudai e} \, \text{ro} \text{mai tautai} \text{en} \, \text{misqovn} \, \text{meu meti} \text{e} \, \text{apodouhai eijastw} \, \text{to} \, \text{efgon eijsti} \text{en} \, \text{autw}.
\]

Rev 22:12

It could be pressed, however, that Clement is here sourcing Isa 40:10 or Jer 17:10, but in both of those cases "eijastw" and "misqov" are not found together. These operative words in this specific pericope appear together only in Clement and the Apoc. It is not outside the realm of possibility that, if this early churchman did not have the actual text from the Book of Revelation before him, then at least it was this particular verse from the Apoc that was in his mind. As I will strongly stress and explain at the conclusion to this present chapter, we are not in these early instances looking for exact precision in the quotation of scriptural pericopes.

The Shepherd of Hermas (AD c. 95-150)

Manuscript tradition:65 three Greek texts (incomplete); two Latin texts; one Ethiopian text; numerous fragments in Greek, Coptic, and Middle Persian. Hermas is numbered among the Apostolic Fathers, but as Carolyn Osiek also says, "Hermas forces the question of the limits of apocalyptic genre."66 This honoured text has an inconsistent reception history. The MF has no place for it in its collection of canonical documents,67 and though it can still be read it is placed firmly outside the margins of the received tradition because it was written "quite

---

63 For a list of the earliest and most important of these patristic sources, see Kl hm in QKHE (Tomo 7), 625-635. Pan. K. Chrístou, critical analysis remains a very useful introduction of the enigmatic Clement and of the epistles that have been associated with that name.

64 Adv. haer. 3.3.3.

65 Jefford, op. cit., 134-136; see also CPG, op. cit., 22f.

66 Carolyn Osiek, The Shepherd of Hermas Hermeneia Series (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 11. Osiek also points out that "in the definition and survey of apocalyptic literature in Semeia 14, Hermas qualifies to be listed and discussed as a Christian apocalypse...": ibid., 10; but note also Quasten, the Shepherd of Hermas "belongs in reality to the apocryphal apocalypses": Johannes Quasten (Vol. 1), op. cit., 92.

67 "As a potential member of the New Testament canon the Shepherd of Hermas had several things going against it. First is its questionable apostolicity. Hermas never claims himself to be an apostle nor to have sat at the feet of an apostle": J. Christian Wilson, Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas; Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apostolicity, and the Absence of the Name 'Jesus Christ', (Lampeter: Mellen Biblical Press, 1995), 53.
recently" and besides, the number of the prophets is now "complete". But on a number of occasions Clement will cite the book with authority, (despite his acknowledged inconsistency with the citing of scriptural texts). Eusebius numbers "the so-called Shepherd" immediately before the Apocalypse of Peter, and both "among the rejected writings". Nonetheless, Athanasius the Great, understanding too well the importance of the writing's traditional usage, says (similarly to the author[s] of the Muratorian list before him), that it should be read, but not as Scripture. Like the Letter of Barnabas, it too is found in the fourth-century vellum MS Codex Sinaiticus, and it follows both the Book of Revelation and Barnabas. The Shepherd is a book of revelations granted to Hermas in Rome by two heavenly figures, the first of which was an old woman and the second an angel in the form of a shepherd (to whom the book owes its title). Carolyn Osiek has adeptly described the main method with which the visions are detailed by the writer of the book:

> [a]llegory is heavily used and favored by the author, yet allegory does not drive the book and the whole is not pure allegory, since the primary referent is Hermas himself, who is meant to be taken as a historical character, and the primary narrative is of his experiences, which are allegorized in themselves. The principal image of the Visions, the building of the tower, is an allegory of the community in its historical and eschatological aspects.

The time of composition is as intriguing as is the identity of the author[s] himself. In the book itself we find only one telling clue, but that in itself contradicts later testimony. In the second vision (4.3) Hermas is commanded by the Church to make two copies of the revelation, one he will give to Clement who must in turn send it to distant cities. The Clement referred to here is generally accepted to be Pope Clement of Rome, who wrote his own Epistle to the Corinthians around AD 96. But this tradition does not fit in well with the

---

68 MF 75.
69 ANF (Vol. II), 348, 357, 360, 422, 510.
70 Hist. Eccl. 3.25.4.
71 Fest. Epist. 39.7. Hermas belongs to "other books... appointed by the Fathers to be read..." but Athanasius will make very sure to let it be known, that these other books are "not indeed included in the Canon": ibid.
73 Osiek, op. cit., 11.
74 All we know about the author[s] outside of the work itself, is what we find in the MF. Given this meagre evidence, the advice of Tugwell seems proper, "[w]hat relationship there is between the author's real personality and his literary persona it is unprofitable to consider": Tugwell, op. cit., 48; "The thematic unity of the book", writes Osiek, "in spite of some divergences indicates a guiding hand throughout": Osiek, op. cit., 10.
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evidence that we find in the *MF*, which says of our present author, "[a]nd very recently in our own times [*nuperrime temporibus nostris*], in the city of Rome, Hermas wrote the Shepherd, when his brother Pius, the bishop sat upon the chair of the city of Rome." The reign of Pius I, however, falls within AD 140-150. Johannes Quasten appears to have solved this contradiction with his simple suggestion that the two dates are explained by the way in which the book was compiled, "the older portions would most likely go back to Clement's day while the present redaction would be of Pius' time." Geoffrey Mark Hahneman also examines the idea of a multiple authorship of the Shepherd and traces the acknowledgment of the possibility to different editions to the study of Martin Dibelius. Hahneman, who says that the *Shepherd* "is a rambling prophetic work which cannot be easily systematized," accepts that there are signs of an editorial hand[s] especially because *Vision V* has been given different titles in different manuscripts, and because it appears to be the beginning of the work in the Michigan papyrus and the Sahidic version. Amazingly, the visionary never uses the name "Jesus Christ" (preferring the "Son of God"), but often uses the word ἐκκλησία.

Possible allusions and/or references:

(i) καὶ πνευματίκαι εἶχαν καὶ αὐθεντικά μὴ δί αὐτοῦ τινὸς... *Vision* 1.1.3
καὶ ἀποκαλεῖ τινὸς μὴ δί αὐτοῦ τινὸς... *Rev* 17:3

(ii) προσευκομενοὺς δείχνει οὐρανὸς καὶ ἐφανομενοὶ ἡμᾶς γίνεται εἰς τοὺς ἔθνους... *Jer* 1:14
Καὶ σήμερον μεγά λύφη εἰς τῷ οὐρανῷ γυνὴ; περιβλέπει τὸν θιόν... *Rev* 12:1

(iii) τελεσαντος οὖν τα ἐγγράμματα του βιβλίου εἰκονίζειν ἡ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἔχει θήνας κείροντος το βιβλίον ἔστιν ἔστιν ἐν τῷ θεῷ... *Vision* 2.5.4
καὶ αἱμὸν προς τόν αγγέλον λέγειν αὐτῷ δουλαίον μοι το βιβλιάριον... καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν το βιβλιάριον εἰκήν θήνας κείρον το αγγέλειν... *Rev* 10:9, 10

75 *MF* 73-76.
76 Quasten (Vol I), *loc. cit.*
77 Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *op. cit.*, n. 25.
78 *ibid.*
79 *ibid.*; here Hahneman follows the research of K. Lake, 'The Shepherd of Hermas', *HTR* 18, (1925), 279-80.
80 Wilson, *op. cit.*, 74ff.
To these very strong parallels, which for the better part (given the unquestionable proximity of not only the terminology but also of the context) I consider most probable borrowings from the Apoc by Hermas, we could add numerous others by virtue of the shared landscape of the apocalyptic genre and the shared "vision" motif. Hermas, similarly to the Seer of Patmos, puts his hope in the Church [community]: εγνώνευς, εις τὸν προτέρων ὄχριον τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ του προσκυνησειν τῷ ἐνὶ ἁγίῳ τῷ ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἕκκλησια τῇ οἰκουμένῃ (Vision 4.23.2). When the question of apostolicity, however, became a more urgent matter, when the Church was in a better position to critically reflect on the normativeness and canonicity of her literature, Hermas would fail (whereas the Seer of Patmos would prove more successful).\(^81\)

---

\(^81\) For a full discussion on the authorship and the related questions of Hermas, see Wilson, *op. cit.*, 13-37.

\(^82\) Jefford, *op. cit.*, 11-13; see also *CPG, op. cit.*, 21.

\(^83\) Soulen, *loc. cit.*

\(^84\) Jefford, *op. cit.*, 11.
normally point to Alexandria as the place of the letter's origin and would explain to a good extent why it was so well received by the theologians of that region.\textsuperscript{86} The high level respect for the letter is further evidenced from the writings of Clement of Alexandria, who lifts a number of quotations from the document and in the process recognizes the Apostle Barnabas as its author.\textsuperscript{87} Origen counts the letter among the books of Sacred Scripture.\textsuperscript{88} Eusebius, however, demotes it to the disputed writings.\textsuperscript{89} To begin with, nowhere in the letter does the writer claim to be the Apostle Barnabas (the name is not mentioned), and, as others including J. B. Lightfoot have noted,\textsuperscript{90} there is nothing in his language to connect him at all with the Apostles.

Significantly he has little if anything positive to say of the Jews, and this is in great contradistinction to Saint Paul, of whom Barnabas was a close associate on the missionary field.\textsuperscript{91} At the close of the second century Clement of Alexandria quotes the work frequently and identifies Barnabas with the apostles, "[r]ightely, therefore, the Apostle Barnabas says..."\textsuperscript{92} But elsewhere he demotes him to the rank of the Seventy, which could hardly mean that he considered the document to possess unquestionable authority.\textsuperscript{93} The best we can say given the limited evidence, was that this Barnabas was a namesake of the Apostle. He is an uncompromising opponent of Judaism\textsuperscript{94} and yet he quotes the Prophets often as Scripture [\textit{legei gar hJ grafh}]\textsuperscript{95} and he considers them to be authoritative.\textsuperscript{96} Nonetheless he accuses the Jews of not only completely misunderstanding the prophets, but of also making ritual that which ought to have been received in a "spiritual sense"\textsuperscript{97} [\textit{ou{tw} [Moses] ej pneuarmi...}]

\textsuperscript{85} See Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 270-273.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{87} J. B. Lightfoot, \textit{The Apostolic Fathers}, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 133.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.25.4.
\textsuperscript{90} J. B. Lightfoot, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Strom.} 2.6; 2.7.
\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Strom.} 2.20; and elsewhere he derives his authority from Saint Paul, \textit{Strom.} 5.10.
\textsuperscript{94} See Holmes on the position of the author of \textit{Barnabas} regarding Israel's forfeiture of God's covenant because of "idolatry, disobedience, and ignorance": Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 271. \textit{cf.} 4.8, 8.7, 9.4.
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{Barn.}, 4.11.
\textsuperscript{96} \textit{ibid.}, i.e. 2.5, 3.3, 4.11, 5.4, 6.2, 9.1, 10.1, 11.4, 12.10, 14.7, 15.2. \textit{Barnabas} has a strong preference for Isaiah.
\textsuperscript{97} \textit{ibid.}, 10.9.
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ej alhisen, things, for instance, pertaining to food, circumcision and the sabbath. At the same time it was the "apostles" [apostolou] "who were destined to preach [khrussein] his [Christ's] gospel [eujaggevion]." With a good degree of confidence we can state that the epistle was written sometime, but not long after, the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus in AD 70, the devastation of which it strongly intimates. "It [the Temple] was torn [kaqh/revqh] down by their enemies." Barnabas is clear on the pre-existence of Christ and expounds the motives behind the Incarnation. He is also strong on baptism in the context of adoption and remission of sin.

Possible allusions and/or references:

(i) jeggu; oj kuvo' kai; oj misop' auj; od Barn. 21.3

...oj kairo'; gar egguv e'stin Rev 22:10

...oj kairo'; gar egguv e'stin Rev 22:10

(j) suni'xai ouin of elvet e Barn. 4.6

...We hisofia e'stin oj e'xen mou... Rev 13:18.

(iii) epeidh; ojkontai auj; on tove th' hhexa/ton podoh e'konta... kai; ejrousin Ou;j outfiv e'stin oj pote h'kei" e'staurovsamen Barn. 7.9

...kai; ejvatou auj; on pa" oj pl met" kai; on'ine" auj; on ekekevthsan... Rev 1:7

...oijai on uijin a'piovou e'jedunweon podoh... Rev 1:13

(iv) legei de; Kuvio'; jodou; poiwtta; e'cata w' ta; prwta Barn. 6.13

...jodou; kaina; poiw pant a... Rev 21:5

(v) ekasot' kaquv; epoihsen komeitai: ejan h' aigaov; h'di kaioswan auj; ou; proghseitai auj; ou; ejan h';ponhrov; oj misopv; th" ponhria" e'jpraso gen auj; out Barn. 4.12

98 ibid., 9; 10; 15.
99 ibid., 5.9.
100 ibid.
101 ibid., 16.4.
102 ibid., 5.
103 ibid., 11.8.
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The Letters of Ignatius (AD c. 105-110)

Manuscript tradition: three versions with numerous examples in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and Arabic. Saint Ignatius was second bishop of Antioch in Syria and a contemporary of the Apostles. It is possible that he knew St. John personally, but it is unlikely (if we take into account the primary sources). Given the authority and tone of his voice, it is not difficult to agree with Henry Bettenson, who writes, "Ignatius seems to have been a leader loved and trusted in Asia Minor as well as in Syria." Though we have no record of his life prior to his arrest, his seven letters, written during his journey from Antioch to Rome (as a prisoner condemned to die for his faith), form an important source of knowledge of the Christian Church at the beginning of the second century. The epistles provide valuable

104 Jefford, op. cit., 53f.; see also CPG, op. cit., 12-15.
105 Origen, PG 13, 1815 contra Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.22.

106 It is difficult to believe, as others have also pointed out, that if he was indeed a disciple of John he would not mention him in his epistle to the Ephesians, whilst in that same letter he does speak of Paul. Chrysostom will later pick up on that tradition, but he remains vague: Eij Ignatius 1.
107 Henry Bettenson, op. cit., 5.
108 Ignatius' letters have been assembled, as C. N. Jefford notes, into three different versions "traditionally distinguished as the short, middle, and long recensions." It is the middle recension which is supported as authentic by a majority of scholars, and the one which Eusebius appears to recognize when he speaks of "Ignatius, who was chosen bishop of Antioch" (Hist. Eccl. 3.36). For a summary of these versions, see Jefford, op. cit., 54; consider also the interesting fact, rarely mentioned, that we find seven letters sent to the churches by the Seer of Patmos and seven letters sent to the communities of the faithful by Ignatius.
109 For the "setting and occasion" of the letters and for "Ignatius's attitude toward martyrdom", see Holmes, op. cit., 128-131.
110 Though the genuineness of the letters was often disputed in the West (at least until the spirited and independent defence of Zahn and Lightfoot), it is "widely held today" that the seven letters contained in the so-called middle recension are authentic: Holmes, ibid., 131f. For their early attestation, see Polycarp's Epistle to
proof of early orthodox doctrine and they are of "inestimable importance for the history of dogma.\textsuperscript{111} Ignatius insisted on the reality of both the divinity and humanity of Christ, and in his opening address to the Ephesians calls Him "Jesus Christ our God" [\textit{Ihsou' Cristou' tou' qeou' hjmw'n}]; he spoke strongly for the centrality of the Eucharist which he connects to immortality [\textit{fa amakon aijranasie'}],\textsuperscript{112} and advocated a clearly defined hierarchical structure of the Church with an emphasis on episcopal authority.\textsuperscript{113} It is certainly worth considering, that some years earlier the Seer of Patmos also dispatched seven letters in a context none too dissimilar.\textsuperscript{114} "Early Christianity", as Aune says [noting the seven genuine letters of Ignatius], "knew several collections of seven."\textsuperscript{115}

Possible illusions and/or references:

(i) oujde'n lanqavnei to;n kuvrion, yalla; kai;ta; krupta; hjmw'n jeggu'; auj'tw' jstin. panta' ou;n po'iwhen w'/ auj'o'; jen hjmw'h kai' kou'to'; i'la; when auj'o'; na'di; kai; auj'o'; jen hjmw'h qeo'; hjmw'n, aper i'la; kai; jstin kai; fanh'etai pro; prosw'pou hjmw'h, ex wh di' kai'w' aijapw'hen auj'tw'. Eph. 15.3

(ii) Ean de; ti' hJoudai'mo;n ejrmhneuvh/ uJmi'n, mh; ajkouvete auj'tou'. a'meinon gavr ejstin para; ajdro'; peritomh' qeov' Cristianismo;n ajkouvein h[ para; akrobutou' hJoudai'mou' ejk' de; ajmfov'toi peri; hjsw' Cristou' mh; lalw'sin, ouj'toi ejmi'; sthlai'v ejsin kai; tavo'i nekrw'h, ej ol' ge'egraptai movnon ojnovmata ajnqrw'pawn. Phil. 6.1


\textsuperscript{111} Quasten (Vol. I), 64.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Eph}. 20.2.

\textsuperscript{113} Magn. 6: "the bishop presiding in the place (\textit{eij} tovpon) of God".

\textsuperscript{114} Aune cites Mitton (\textit{Formation}, 33) who argues "that the seven-letter Pauline corpus served as a model for both Rev 2-3 and Ignatius": David E. Aune, \textit{Revelation 1-5} (52A), 130.

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{ibid.}, 130.
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The Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians (AD c. 120-135)

Manuscript tradition: one Latin text; nine short Greek texts (chapters 1-9); Syriac fragments. Saint Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna and the leading second century Christian figure in Roman Asia. He is a priceless link between the apostolic and patristic ages. Irenaeus records that Polycarp was "instructed by apostles" and that he was appointed by them "bishop of the Church in Smyrna." Frederick W. Weidmann, who has considered the evidence afresh concerning the traditional connection of Polycarp to the Apostle John, concluded that "Irenaeus' testimony is part of a greater and broader tradition." The "most admirable [qaunasiwaton] Polycarp" was a defender of orthodoxy and fought heresy with universally acknowledged zeal, particularly the Marcionite, gnostic groups "and the rest of the heretics" which sought to establish communities in Asia Minor. His only surviving work, a letter to the Philippians, is equally important, for it appears during the starting stages of the development of the fundamental theological literature of Christianity. Important to note here, that in his arguments against docetism he specifically appeals to the Pauline texts, for they themselves would appeal to Paul. Polycarp's orthodox use of St. Paul's writings constituted an important advance in the Christian theology of biblical interpretation. The importance of the era in which Polycarp was active (including the establishment of the NT Canon), has been elucidated well by C. C. Richardson:

...his career [Polycarp's] spanned that critical era of the Church's development which witnessed, after the passing of its apostolic founders and missionaries, the menacing growth of persecution by the Roman State and the emergence of the Docetic and Gnostic heresies, and in response to this situation- the establishment of monoepiscopacy and the crystallization of the canon of the New Testament... in these momentous issues

116 Jefford, op. cit., 72f; see also CPG, op. cit., 18f.
117 For specific details and ancient testimonies, see Frederick W. Weidmann, Polycarp & John: The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Tradition, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 2-8. Here Weidmann also discusses "the so-called Life of Polycarp" ascribed to Pionius.
118 Iren., Adv. haer. 3.3.4.
119 Weidmann, op. cit., 132.
120 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.15.9.
121 Adv. haer. 3.3.4.
122 ibid.
123 Irenaeus informs us that Polycarp had written letters to other neighbouring churches and to fellow-bishops: Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 5.20.8.
124 Pol., Phil., 7.
125 "While apparently none of the NT books are cited as 'Scripture' (Pol., Phil. 12.1 a possible exception)", as M. W. Holmes writes, "the manner in which he refers to them clearly shows that he considered them to be authoritative": "Polycarp of Smyrna" in DLNT, art., M. W. Holmes, 936.
Polycarp was destined to be intimately involved and to exercise upon them the force of his commanding personality and influence.\textsuperscript{126}

His epistle to the Philippians, which Irenaeus calls "very powerful", is a response to an earlier letter from that church itself (Pol., Phil. 3.1, 13.1). A precise date for the writing of the letter is not clear. It has been suggested that the epistle contains not one, but two letters. But this is subject to the interpreter's reading of 1.1, 9.1, where references to Ignatius point to him as already having died, whereas in 13.2 Polycarp enquires of his fate. However, as Michael W. Holmes and others point out, this discrepancy can be resolved if Polycarp had not as yet "received a confirmatory report."\textsuperscript{127} Irrespective of how this question is resolved, most would date the letter close to the time of Ignatius' martyrdom, during the later years of the reign of Trajan (AD 98-117).\textsuperscript{128} Polycarp's good use of a select list of NT documents and his matter-of-fact reference leave little doubt that he viewed those texts as authoritative.\textsuperscript{129} "The text is inundated with quotes from the scriptures", Clayton N. Jefford observes, "though very few of these are from that traditional standard of authority, or canon, which was recognized within the early church- the Old Testament."\textsuperscript{130} We do not know whether he cited the Apoc in his now lost letters, but does he cite the book in his one surviving epistle? The short (and perhaps easy) answer is no. Quick as scholars have been to dismiss any direct citation, which is the case, a hasty dismissal of allusion is another matter altogether. I will not press the following references, but I do present them as possible contacts given the context and period of Polycarp's activity:

\begin{verbatim}
  ou|to; a|i|na  jekzhthvsei o|j  qeo;"  japo; tw'n  japeiqouvntwn aujtw'/.
  Polyc., Phil., 2.1

  kai; ejxedivkhsen to; ai|na  tw'n douvlwn aujtou'
  Rev 19:2
\end{verbatim}

The reciprocal use of "ai|na", in the context of the 'avenging of the spilling of the blood' of Christ in the reference by Polycarp, and of the martyrs by John, is worth considering (though it could also point to Luke 11:50-51). Once again the citation is loose, as is commonplace in the writings and in the citing conventions of these early church writers, but what is important

\textsuperscript{126} Richardson, op. cit., 121.

\textsuperscript{127} Michael W. Holmes, op. cit., 203f.

\textsuperscript{128} ibid., 203f; also see Simon Tugwell's note of sources on the discussion of date in which Lightfoot's contribution is highlighted: Tugwell, op. cit., 134f.

\textsuperscript{129} "In evidence among Polycarp's sources are the authentic letters of Paul, the so-called Pastoral Epistles (1-2 Timothy and Titus), 1 Peter, and 1 John... he did make some limited use of the Gospel of Matthew and obviously recognized the authority of that gospel tradition": Jefford, op. cit., 81.

\textsuperscript{130} Jefford, ibid.
is the architectural context of the references in question. This is not a purely based morphological analysis or a grammatically tagged query.\textsuperscript{131} It is also certainly worthwhile to note that in the \textit{Martyrdom of Polycarp} (AD c. 155-160), there could be a more definite contact with the Apoc. David E. Aune, commenting on Rev 2:10d "the crown of life" [\textit{t\'on st\'ef\'an\'on th\'e zwh'}], together with Heb 2:9, considers a possible parallel in \textit{Mart. Pol.} 17.1 "where it is said that Polycarp the martyr 'was wreathed with the wreath of immortality'".\textsuperscript{132}

\textit{Papias} (d. AD c.160)

Papias, who was not as an insignificant a figure as the bad press of Eusebius would have him,\textsuperscript{133} was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor sometime between AD 140-160.\textsuperscript{134} What little we know of his life comes from a commendatory statement made by Irenaeus that Papias was "a hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp", and that there "were five books compiled [\textit{sunt\'etagn\'e\'a}] by him".\textsuperscript{135} Eusebius will add that "he [Papias] appears to have been of very limited understanding [\textit{sf\'o\'\'ra smik\'r\'o\'\'t\'on nou\'h}], as one can see from his discourses".\textsuperscript{136} These five books, written "within a decade or so of A.D. 130"\textsuperscript{137} and titled 'Explanations of the Sayings of the Lord' (\textit{Logiv\'wn kuriak\'w'n ejxhghsew}), survive only in quotations and across a spread of centuries.\textsuperscript{138} It is also to Papias that the reference to the mysterious "presbyter of John" is traced back to.\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Pan Crh\'st\'ou} brings out a strong point which might account for Papias' conflicting legacy, it has to do with his attempt to combine two methods of biblical

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{132} David E. Aune, \textit{Revelation 1-5} (52A), (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1997), 167. Though, Aune does say, "however, the presence of the term \textit{brab\'eb\'\'on}, 'reward, prize', indicates that athletic imagery is in view": \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{133} The unfavourable report by Eusebius regarding the persona of Papias is no doubt influenced by the latter's enthusiastic espousal of chiliasm: \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.39.11-13.

\textsuperscript{134} "Papia\'n" in \textit{QKHE (Tom 10)}, art. \textit{Pan Crh\'st\'ou}, 6-11.

\textsuperscript{135} Iren., \textit{Adv. haer.} 5.33.4; note, however, Eusebius' contradiction of Irenaeus. "Papias himself in the preface to his discourses by no means declares that he was himself a hearer and eye-witness of the holy apostles": \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.39.2.


\textsuperscript{137} Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 556.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{ibid.}, 562-595.

The enthusiastic criticism which Eusebius measured out to Papias is not difficult to explain, though at one point he does admit that Papias "became well known" [kaq! o{n ejgnwrivzeto].

Not only did Papias defend and circulate the belief in the millennium (which was anathema to our church historian), but he also demonstrated critical judgement of a very poor sort in getting these "ideas through a misunderstanding of the apostolic accounts [apostolika; parekdexavmenon dihghvsei]," not perceiving that the things said by them were spoken mystically in figures [mustikw' ejrhmevna]. However, whatever little we possess of the original work and despite the assumed weaknesses, it remains extremely valuable, for it contains in part the oral teachings of the earliest disciples of the Church. He is, as Pan. Chrystou says, "oj prvto" ajxiovlogo" ekskafeu; tou' metalleivou th'" prof orikh" paradosew.

From a study of the various collections of the Fragments of Papias, it is possible to come to only one conclusion, that this bishop of Hierapolis "one of the leading figures of the postapostolic era," clearly testifies to the "early church's stance on the millennium and the authorship of Matthew, Mark, John, and Revelation." The references which connect Papias to the Apostle John and to the teaching of the millennium are not altogether unknown. Here I will simply cite the places in the ancient church literature where these connections are made and include some few more which are neglected. Eusebius, Chronicle; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3.36.1-2, 3.39; Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 5.33.3-4; Jerome, De vir. illus. 18, Epist. Theod. 75.3; Philip of Side, Church History; Andrew of Caesarea, Pref. Apoc. From these

---

141 Hist. Eccl. 3.36.2.
142 ibid., 3.39.12; also see Iren., Adv. haer. 5.32.
143 Eusebius groups Papias' doctrine on the millennium with "certain strange parables and teachings... and some other mythical things [kaiv tina alla muqiktera]": Hist. Eccl. 3.39.11-12.
144 ibid., 3.39.12.
146 See also CPG, op. cit., 20.
147 Holmes, op. cit., 556.
148 ibid.
149 ibid., 563.
150 ibid., 573.
passages, the latter one from Andrew of Caesarea (AD c. 563-637)\textsuperscript{152} compactly congregates the general resonance of the fragments:

\begin{quote}
Peri; mevntoi tou apopneustou th" biblou [th" Apokaluvyew" Iounou]
perittón nhkwein ton logon hgiourneva, twh makarivwn Grhgorivou fhn; tou/ qpol ougou kai; KuriMou, proseti de kai;twh ajcaioteww Papiou, Eijhnaivou, Meoplwou kai; Jppol utwv tawtwv prosmartuoutwn to; ajxiovpiston.\textsuperscript{153}
\end{quote}

\section*{Conclusion}
Is it correct then, as Isbon T. Beckwith, R. H. Charles, N. B. Stonehouse and others have claimed, that the works of the Apostolic Fathers contain no certain trace of acquaintance with the Book of Revelation? Though many modern commentators have been quick to answer in the affirmative, it seems to me far more correct to say both: \textit{Yes} and \textit{No}. There is no certain trace, if by that we mean an exact copy of a long word order that has been morphologically or grammatically tagged. But the Seer himself hardly, if ever, cites any part of the OT "formally" though he is very plainly and very deliberately immersed in its literature.\textsuperscript{154} Citation of NT literature in the early writings of our ecclesiastical authors, as we know, was loose, allusive, and irregular, as it was frequently drawn from memory.\textsuperscript{155} The wording of the so-called quotations of the Apostolic Fathers, for they were not direct quotations in the literal sense, were often, as Birger Gerhardsson and others have acknowledged, "reproduced freely or adapted in some way to the context."\textsuperscript{156} The early Christians were in many respects a

\textsuperscript{151} ibid., 577.

\textsuperscript{152} “Saint Andrew, Archbishop of Caesarea”, writes Archbishop Averky a little too enthusiastically, "gives a summary of the whole understanding of the Apocalypse in the pre-Nicean period": Averky Taushev and Seraphim Rose, \textit{The Apocalypse: In the Teachings of Ancient Christianity}. (California: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 39.

\textsuperscript{153} Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, 576. [italics added]

\textsuperscript{154} See especially "The Use of the Old Testament in Revelation" in \textit{Essays on the Use of the Old Testament: The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts}? G. K. Beale (ed.), (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 257-276. Beale writes, "[t]here is general acknowledgment that the Apocalypse contains more old Testament references than any other New Testament book..." The author, however, continues on to say, "[t]he text form of the Old Testament references in Revelation needs in-depth discussion since there are no formal quotations and most are allusive, a phenomenon often making textual identification more difficult": ibid., 257f.

\textsuperscript{155} See Birger Gerhardsson, \textit{Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity}. (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1998), 194-207. Gerhardsson cites many examples, and situates the testimony of the Post-Apostolic Church into "traditionist categories" re. "the items of information": ibid., 194. A notable example comes from as 'late' as Irenaeus who describes listening to Polycarp recounting everything according to the Scriptures, "carefully, copying it down, not on paper, but in my heart" [upomnhamatizovmeno] ajucaou epi cautiavajl | e/en th/h e/thi/kardijl: ibid., 294. In the same place Irenaeus speaks of the blessed Polycarp, himself, delivering "the addresses" [ta; dialevxei] as he "remembered their words" [apemporhmovneue tou; logou] ajucaou: ibid.

\textsuperscript{156} Gerhardsson, \textit{ibid.}, 198.
community on the run, literally. Consider, for instance, Saint Ignatius of Antioch, whose letters are a major contribution to the early literature of the Church, and were written while he was led prisoner from Antioch to Rome, where he was martyred. These were hardly the conditions for precision referencing, nor as Cyril C. Richardson adds "for careful reflection." In stating the obvious, I am simply putting down what other writers who dismiss any direct connection between the Apostolic Fathers and the Apocalypse of John fail in any good measure to take into account. The Book of Revelation given its apocalyptic framework, had a specific appeal; the Gospels and the Pauline corpus certainly more frequent and more direct in comparison had an earlier circulation and a longer period to be absorbed by the first Christians. Investigators have only a select number of texts to examine in their search for possible literary dependence between the book of the Seer of Patmos and the writings of the immediate generation. From within these texts an even lesser group of possible parallels are presented for consideration, to which, I have, been able to add a small but nevertheless significant number to that previously forwarded in the past century.

But is there no certain trace? If by that we mean is there no intimation, or even the probability of a direct reference in some instances as I have suggested. The answer has to be, that, there is a trace. The evidence presented suggests that contrary to the reservations of many scholars, the Apostolic Fathers did, in fact, make reference to the Apocalypse of John. That the Apoc circulated rapidly and was known widely (not surprisingly cited by Asia Minor writers, but probably by Hermas in Rome also) is not out of the ordinary when we consider that an express purpose of such writings was to be circulated. To this we add the six factors

157 Epist. Rom. 4, 5.
158 Richardson, op. cit., 74.
159 Brevard S. Childs, The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction, (London: SCM Press, 1984), 514-517. "The traditional apocalyptic scenario which the first-century author has painted with a Roman backdrop now serves only as a vivid illustration of that recurring eschatological threat by which each successive generation of the faithful was challenged to endure": ibid., 514.
160 But here also, as Birger Gerhardsson writes in his major study previously mentioned (Memory and Manuscript), the way in which the Apostolic Fathers used the gospel material is somewhat confusing. "[t]here are many difficulties. These appear first and foremost when we examine the formulae of quotation... further difficulty arises when we examine the source references... a final difficulty is found when examining the wording of the so-called quotations... reproduced freely or adapted in some way to the context": ibid., 197ff. This is similarly the case with their use of the NT Epistles, "freely"... even when using short quotations from the OT "they adapt": Gerhardsson, loc. cit.
161 Compare my broader list of both the possible and probable apostolic references to the Apoc presented in this chapter and in the Appendix, to the more limited list put forward by the four writers acknowledged at the beginning of the chapter. For instance, cf. with Charles (Vol I), xcvi-xcvii.
introduced at the start of this chapter which positively affected the Apoc's early circulation. Together these six factors provided an impetus that would almost certainly guarantee the Seer's text an enviable start in its quest for sacred commendation among the believing communities of the Ancient Church. The form of the _epistle_ on which the Apoc was strategically structured was also a sure sign that the document was to be transmitted and read, it was an urgent instruction found in the text itself (Rev 1:3). 163 A major purpose of this chapter was either to confirm or challenge the general agreement that we cannot be certain that the Apostolic Fathers made use of the Seer's work. I here challenged it, arguing that quick dismissal of the question is unjustified. This perhaps explains the contradiction that we found in those writers, who, whilst accepting that the Apoc enjoyed a wide and early circulation, do not find it cited with any great certainty in this collection of early Christian literature.

---

CHAPTER 8
From the Muratorian Fragment
to Origen of Alexandria

Introduction

We now enter a formative period for both the development of the NT Canon and the adventure of the Apoc, spanning roughly over one hundred years (from the publication of the MF to the death of Origen). Whereas prior to this time our sources and arguments are subject to considerable debate, given the scarcity of literary evidence and the short time for a universal tradition to become established, there is now a clearer picture emerging (though of course still not fully developed). Our literary sources are richer and a universally acknowledged concept of Tradition is emerging in regards to both the Canon of the NT and to doctrine. This is also the time when Marcion appeared, considered by some to have sparked the canonical debate itself, and Montanus, whose teachings came dangerously close to usurping the Apoc and did the Seer’s text no favor (the Alogi of Asia Minor who repudiated the book are the standard example). Significantly, this is an era where the great and influential centres of Christendom begin to forward us their opinions on the matter at hand. Stabilizing positions on the NT Canon and the Seer’s book are emerging from Rome, Lyons, Carthage, Alexandria, Asia Minor, and Syria. Illustrious names such as those of Justin Martyr, Melito of Sardis, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and of course Origen, are ecclesiastical writers whose instrumental opinions we are now in a position to examine. Evidence for the circulation and authoritative use [or not] of the Book of Revelation can now be positively established and critically analyzed. We begin our investigation with the earliest

---

1 This is not to say that such a distinction of Church epochs is a simple matter (clearly it is not). But for the purposes of a consistent methodology along the lines of a grouping of a particular assembly of ecclesiastical writers in the context of a recognizable school or common theological impulses [and/ or limitations], it is justified for in this instance we have moved beyond that group commonly referred to as the Apostolic Fathers; for a similar position and division of the investigation into the "peripeteia" [adventure] of the Canon, see Jwaunth Karabidpolou, Eijagwghv Sthu Kainhv Diachphl, (Qessalonivkh: Pournara, 1998), 95-119; also see Hubert Cunliffe-Jones (ed.), A History of Christian Doctrine, (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1980), 23-29.

2 Even prior to this time, "Christian doctrine" as Lampe has said, "had already undergone a long period of development by the time that the latest books in the canon of the New Testament had been written": Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, ibid., 23.

list in our possession of those NT documents accepted by the Early Church as divinely inspired (certainly in Rome), that is, the prized Muratorian Fragment.

The Testimony of the Fathers

The Muratorian Fragment (AD c. 180-200), prov., Rome

For John also in the Apocalypse, MF 57-58

The MF (sometimes attributed to Hippolytus of Rome)⁴ was named after its publisher L. A. Muratori, who discovered it in 1740 from an eighth-century manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan.⁵ It is written in rough Latin (though it is still disputed by some whether the fragment was originally written in Greek) and it claims to list those writings which were received in the Early Church as authoritative, but significantly also calls attention to other writings which were not received. Generally considered as holding "the greatest importance for the history of the canon"⁶ for it is the oldest extant list of the NT documents that was accepted as inspired by the Early Church, the MF, which is mutilated at both ends, commences in the middle of a sentence referring to the Gospel of Mark and comprises 85 lines.⁷

Most scholars set the limits for the date of the MF origin by its statement: "[b]ut Hermas wrote the Shepherd very recently in our times [nuperrime temporibus nostris], in the city of Rome, while bishop Pius, his brother, was occupying the chair of the church of the city of Rome."⁸ This would be around AD 142-155 during the pontificate of Pius I, which helps to explain the negative position of the MF on the question of Montanism, further suggesting a time about the close of the second century.⁹ So a date between AD 155 to 200 appears to be

---


⁶ Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Vol. II), 207.


⁸ MF 73-76.

⁹ ibid.
the most likely. That the document originated in the West and probably in Rome is more certain; the reference to urbe roma itself, would seem to promote this view. This is further supported by the author[s]' of the fragment intimate knowledge of the origin of the Shepherd of Hermas and the silence as to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James, but the inclusion of the Apoc. Of particular significance, as J. wavnhn" Karabidoupolou" writes, is that it is highly probable that the canon was written in the church of Rome and that it reflects not the opinion of one isolated figure, but rather that of the church community:

...katapasa piaqanovhta grafhske sth' ekkhsia" th' Rwmnh" kai' aphcei'tiV apoyei' oti eghv nevnonmenou proswe piaj auth' ekkhsia"...

Also of germane importance is that the external evidence for the reception of Hermas, despite its prophetic claims and positive reception history, as J. Christian Wilson and Carolyn Osiek have expertly demonstrated, did not mean that the book was necessarily received as canonical, nor did its prophecies automatically allow it to be deemed inspired. The author or authors of the list argue against those who might wish to ascribe to Hermas absolute canonical status by pointing out that the book was not written by an apostle nor by another writer who

---

10 This is also around the time that Metzger is prepared to consider seriously: Bruce M. Metzger, The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance, (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1997), 194. Metzger also cites Harnack, Lagrange, Quasten, Altaner and Tregelles, who all place the dates of the episcopate of Pius somewhere between AD 140-157: ibid.

11 For the intricacies and traditions relating to the authorship question, including the most discussed Hippolytean suggestion, see G. M. Hahneman's condensed summary who, himself, concludes with Westcott's position that "there is no sufficient evidence to determine the authorship of the Fragment": Hahneman, op. cit., 30f.

12 I am certainly aware of G. M. Hahneman's strong views to the contrary (to which I refer at the conclusion of the thesis bringing to my support Bruce M. Metzger, et al.). For Hahneman's opposition on these very points, see Hahneman, op. cit., 22f.; for now I bring to the readers attention some of E. Ferguson's thoughts presented at the conclusion of his critical review of Hahneman's work. "The affinities of the Muratorian Fragment with the late-second-century West have not been explained away... (1) Only second century heretics are mentioned... (2) The similarity to the Roman regula fidei fits the second-century West... (3) Luke's relation to Paul is described by a technical term, iuris studiosum... (4) The designation of the two parts of Scripture as the prophets and apostles is comparable to Justin, I Apology 67.3": Everett Ferguson, "The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon, by Geoffrey Mark Hahneman", JTS 44, (1993), 697.


14 J. Christian Wilson, Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name of 'Jesus Christ', (Lampeter: Mellen Biblical Press, 1996), 51-79; Carolyn Osiek, The Shepherd of Hermas, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999). "No other noncanonical writing was as popular before the fourth century as the Shepherd of Hermas. It is the most frequently attested postcanonical text in the surviving Christian manuscripts of Egypt well into the fifth century": ibid., 1.
was in close contact to an apostle. Once more the conclusion from this interiorized canonical discourse indicates that for a document to be received as a book of the NT it would have to be either written by an apostle or by someone (at least) very close to one of the Twelve. The charisma of prophecy is not at issue here but the question of whether the book can be traced back to the apostolic age. So though prophecy was highly valued, it could not on its own determine the fate of a book. I have little doubt, that the essential reason of why the Shepherd remained active in the canonical discoursing of the early community of believers, had to do with its author's sustained concern for the Church. Carolyn Osiek describes this ecclesiological comprehension very well (exactly reminiscent of the Apoc), "[t]he strongest current running through the entire book is concern for the life of the church, especially its suffering members, from the perspective of the world beyond."  

About the Apocalypse of John the MF is clear and leaves no uncertainty as to its authoritative reception: "[w]e receive only the apocalypses of John and Peter, though some of us are not willing that the latter be read in church." The Apoc is received in this particular church community without any censure and with all authority, but also note the early cautious position on the so-called Apocalypse of Peter. The author of the list does not appear to know of any reasons why the Book of Revelation should be excluded from this authoritative group of documents. Elsewhere the canon speaks of the catholicity of the book, and this is highly significant at this time: "[f]or John also in the Apocalypse, though he writes to seven churches, nevertheless speaks to all." When the document refers to the Fourth Gospel its author is identified as the disciple, for similarly to Irenaeus, our writer apparently knows of only one John as the author of the writings handed down by that name. So in addition to the criterion of catholicity the other indispensable evidence is here suggested, apostolicity.

---

15 MF 73-80.
16 Yet, I feel that from the outset, that despite its positive start Hermas was doomed. Not only did it have to contend with the question of apostolicity, but as Wilson has emphasized for us in his study, Hermas nowhere in his book mentions the name of Jesus Christ. "Only in a single textual variant in the very late Codex Athous does the term 'Christ' appear": Wilson, op. cit., 73.
17 Osiek, op. cit., 11.
18 Ibid., 71-72.
19 As Metzger notes, "[t]his, of course, means that the text must have been read publicly to congregations": Metzger, The Canon, 198.
20 MF 57-60.
21 Ibid., 8-9.
It is apostolicity, more than the criterion of catholicity, that is especially important for the compiler of this canonical list, particularly as the measure of judgement in the reception of the Apoc. We have already noted this criterion in regard to the Fourth Gospel, but also the Book of Acts which are: "the acts of all the apostles". And notably of the Gospel of Luke, of which the author of the book is spoken of as "the well-known physician" and associate of Paul. At this stage the criteria of canonicity are established and functioning as standards of reception. Apostolicity, however, is the guiding criterion in the canon consciousness of the compiler[s]. The Apocalypses of both the Seer and Peter, despite the controversy with apocalypses and their use by the 'non-orthodox', are received because they were accepted as documents written by the apostles. And though the Apocalypse of Peter is collected with caution, it is highly regarded on account of its association with the Apostle Peter. But it is this precise doubt over its Petrine origin that clouds it with some suspicion. On the other hand, the Shepherd of Hermas, which was written too recently to the author's time to have been the product of an apostle or the companion of one, is rejected despite its claim to prophecy, for the number of prophets "is complete" [completum]. Proof of apostolicity was essential. And without that evidence, a writing was not received. This was particularly connected to prophetic writings because of the controversy that was now increasingly attached to this genre. What is especially striking and what Stonehouse did well to bring out clearly in his own formulations on the MF, is that we should not look here for:

new evidence of a process of transition or a change to a new criterion. Rather the supposition of the Canon, as of Irenaeus, is that this concept of apostolicity was the ruling one at the time.

This is correct, for all the documents (gospels, epistles, and prophetic writings) had to fall into place and conform to this rule of apostolicity if they were to be received as authoritative and canonical by the Church. And though it is true, as Stonehouse continues, that it is "unmistakable that the writer's fundamental principal is apostolicity," it was not only this.

---

22 ibid., 34.
23 ibid., 3-5.
24 ibid., 71-72.
25 ibid., 79.
26 For the nature of early Christian prophecy, especially in the context of "charismatic exegesis" and its social functions, see Christopher Forbes, Prophecy and Inspired Speech: In Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment. (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 218-250.
27 Stonehouse, op. cit., 86.
28 ibid.
And this is fundamental. The author had to come to this conclusion from another source of authority; the appeal to 'apostolicity' could not have been made, let us say, *deus ex machina*. This other source was Tradition, which, as we have previously seen, was not static and was flexible enough to accommodate the other criteria in support of a book that the Church had from ancient times admitted into the canonical dialogue.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that it is a determining factor in the adventures of the Apoc that the *MF* records its early status from the perspective of the assembly of the Church of Rome. The Canon Muratorian without qualification informs us that the Apoc of John is received. The Book of Revelation belongs to the NT which is comprised, as we have previously noted, of the "apostles", and as such it is authoritative and to be read publicly precisely because it is of apostolic origin. And this of course means that the Apoc (as indeed the other documents listed in the canon) must have been used and cited consistently previous to this time. In the context of the canonical criticism approach, therefore, Brevard S. Childs can write:

> [t]he process of stabilizing a canon of authoritative New Testament writings was effected within the process of the church's continued use of them. The selection and shaping of the books of scripture took place in the context of the worship of the struggling church as it determined canonicity by the use and effect of the books themselves.  

---

**Marcion (d. AD c. 160), prov., Pontus-Rome**

*The Antitheses*

Marcion is an interesting figure, not less than "the first born of Satan", according to the venerable Polycarp, and he has inspired lively debate. Sources tell us that he was the son of the bishop of Sinope in Pontus and that he was a wealthy "ship-master" who made his way to Rome around AD 140. Once there he joined the fledgling Christian community, becoming

---

29 Brevard S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*, (London: SCM Press, 1984), 31. It is from this point that Childs moves on to consider the role of the criteria of "canonization": *ibid.*, 31f.


a prominent member. Not long afterwards in AD 144, he repudiated the church and was excommunicated as a heretic of gnostic sympathies. He argued for the existence of two gods (a religious dualism), the creator-judge of OT Israel, and the one revealed by Jesus. Marcion's fundamental argument was that the Church erred in holding to the monotheism of the OT and in accepting Jesus as the Messiah who was foretold by the Jewish prophets. According to Marcion, the God who was revealed in Jesus who manifested suddenly as a full-grown man without natural origins, is of a different nature from the God of exacting justice that was revealed to Moses. Marcion was led to this conclusion based on his understanding of the literariness of the OT which portrayed God as imperfect and showed creation to be filled with flaws, and which he related both to the chaos of nature and to the depravity of the actors described in the Hebrew texts. This conflict demanded a God that was law-making and tyrannical in order to preserve the world and to set the bounds of morality. The God of Jesus, however, as was revealed in His sermon on the mount, is the God of love and of mercy: the "unknown god" who appeared to those who did not know Him. Christianity was for Marcion a unique and unprecedented revelation. The author of this new revelation was the God of Love, who is to be distinguished from the wrathful God who is taught in the Hebrew Scriptures. Such a radical distinction between the Old and New dispensation was something that orthodox Christianity in Rome could not contemplate.

Marcion's coalition of the divine books was an attempt to register the "unknown god" in a collection of authoritative texts. This list of books, in effect Marcion's own compilation of the NT, comprised the Gospel of Luke (minus the infancy narrative), and a collection of selected epistles from Saint Paul to which the so-called Marcionite prologues were later added, calling back the reader "to the true evangelical faith." It was Paul alone, according to Marcion, who

32 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.11.2; Tert., Adv. Marc. 3.6; 4.9.
33 Adv. haer. 1.27.2.
34 Apart from Tertullian's well-known treatise against Marcion which consists of five books, Adversus Marcionem (written between AD 190-200), cf. also Justin, Apol., 1.26, 58, also the Dialogue with Trypho; Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 1.27.2-4; 4.8.1, 34; Hippolytus, Refut. 7.17; 10.15; and Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4.11, 5.13.4; 5.16.21.
35 Adv. Marc. 1.9.
36 It is by no means agreed that Marcion wrote these prologues or that they are strictly 'Marcionite' at all. As Bruce points out, the prologues were "sufficiently objective in character to have been subsequently taken over and reproduced in 'orthodox' copies of the Latin New Testament": F. F. Bruce, The Canon Of Scripture, (Illinois: IVP Press, 1988), 141. However, as Bruce has further noted, H. von Campenhausen has argued that the author of the Muratorian list was familiar with the prologues and that perhaps the "intention was to counter them [the prologues] directly with its own sound catholic observations": ibid., 143f. See also N. A. Dahl, The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters', Sem 12, (1978), 233-277.
restored the purity and true nature of Christ's teaching after it had been contaminated by the Jewish world of ideas and Hebrew Scriptures as put forward by the Apostles and the other writers of the NT. The private compilation which documented Marcion's absolute rejection of Judaism and the OT was therefore (according to its author) the "standard of the Christian faith". The material that was excised from the Pauline and Lucan writings had resulted from later Jewish additions to the original texts. Tertullian, who is the early authority on Marcion, writes of the latter's "contradictory propositions" in the separation of the law and the gospel:

Marcion's special and principal work is the separation of the law and the gospel, and his disciples will not deny that in this point they have the very best pretext for initiating and confirming themselves in this heresy. These are Marcion's Antitheses... which aim at distinguishing the gospel from the Law in order that from the diversity of the two documents that contain them, they may contend for a diversity of gods also.

Whether this, then, was the first known canon of Christian writings (comprising Gospel and Apostle) is a complex question that has been generously debated without any definitive result. What was important for us, however, was to note what factors contributed to the making of the list and if that would throw any light on Marcion's acceptance or rejection of the Apoc. It most certainly does. Marcion as we saw, did not include the Apoc in his list of authoritative books, presumably because its connection to the OT was too obvious. Apocalyptic genre, which D. S. Russell aptly calls "Divine Disclosure", was characteristically Jewish. And paradoxically it might be argued that this stance could point to a confirmation by Marcion as to the Johannine authorship, that is, the apostolicity of the Seer's book. That Marcion rejected the Book of Revelation would seem to indicate that the book was accepted

37 Knox's thoughts on the practical extensions of such a challenge to the Early Church (whether we agree or disagree with his leanings towards von Harnack's conclusions contra Zahn), are still very useful as insights of the general discourse of the times: John Knox, Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon, (Chicago: UCP, 1980, [orig. 1942]), 19-38. Especially important was Knox's persistent question throughout of what do we actually mean by the term "Scripture": ibid., 19.

38 Adv. Marc. 1.19.

39 From the available evidence it would appear that Marcion does not refer to his collection of writings as either "scripture" or "canon" (though that could very well have been its function). But this fact is too readily overlooked by investigators because it reveals a crucial element hidden on account of the marginalization of the role of theology in the whole process in the evolution of the Canon: that it was the Church as a whole, the collective of early Christian tradition (the community's church consciousness), that collected the authoritative Scripture cognizant of its active role in the separation of the "wheat from the chaff"; for the development of this idea see Karabidopoulou, op. cit., 117-119. Also see Michael Pomazansky, Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, trans., Seraphim Rose, (California: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood): "[t]hey [the Fathers] did not trust themselves, but waited for the universal voice of the Church": 29.

as authoritative in Rome during the time of his close contact with the church community of that city (confirmed by the MF).\footnote{I accept Stonehouse's prima facie position here: Stonehouse, op. cit., 12. But this would also appear to be the view of Tenney: Merril C. Tenney, New Testament Survey, (Leicester: IVP, 1996), 408.}

There is, however, one more significant consequence of what has preceded. Marcion's collection did at least make the Church more deliberate of a need to define publicly an authoritative list of Christian writings that would become her official Scripture.\footnote{"In the case of Marcion", as Wainwright has very economically put it, "the chief task of the Church must have been to oppose the reduction of Christian substance": Geoffrey Wainwright, The New Testament as Canon, SJT 28, (1975), 553.} It is from this time onwards with apostolicity emerging as a "basic criterion in the history of the formation of the canon", as John Meyendorff says, that we find a more concentrated devotion to the concept of an authoritative collection of documents. Why? Because apostolicity "is also the only true characteristic of the Christian kerygma."\footnote{John Meyendorff, Living Tradition, (New York: SVS Press, 1978), 15. Meyendorff is here speaking generally on the formation of the canon but his words are directly relevant to the phase that I have just outlined.} But this is not to agree with either Adolf von Harnack or Hans von Campenhausen (two of the most famous and most often cited scholars), who have argued trenchantly for Marcion's importance, and who in the words of the latter believe that "...the idea and the reality of a Christian Bible were the work of Marcion..."\footnote{Hans von Campenhausen, The Formation of the Christian Bible [Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel (1968)], trans., J. A. Baker, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 148. But before that Harnack had confidently asserted that "[t]he NT is an anti-Marcionite creation on a Marcionite basis": The Origin of the New Testament, [Eng. trans.], (London, 1925).} There is no conclusive proof for such "an extravagant point of view" as J. N. D. Kelly states in his own analysis of Marcion's significance, "[t]he Church already had its roughly defined collection... of Christian books [which] it was beginning to treat as Scripture."\footnote{J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1977), 57.} Especially when it can be argued, for instance, that early in the second century the Apostolic Fathers, and in particular Ignatius of Antioch, appear to be familiar with a Corpus Paulinum.\footnote{For a balanced view from an Eastern Orthodox perspective, where the Marcion dynamic is acknowledged but where such extreme positions as those of Harnack and Campenhausen are refuted on the basis of a convincing list of canonical antecedents (with emphasis on Ignatius of Antioch), see Karabidopoulou, op. cit., 100-102.}
Justin (AD c. 100-165), prov., Ephesus-Rome

John, One of the Apostles of Christ, Dial. Try. 81

Justin Martyr belongs to the group of early Christian writers of the period between AD 120-200 known as the Apologists on account of their being the first to produce a defence of the Christian faith on the ground of reasoning processes appealed to by thinkers and opponents outside the Catholic Church. These are a select company of theologians who defended Christianity against popular slander and who provided an invaluable deposit of early Christian beliefs and practices. I. M. Andreyev writes of these persons as "remarkable apologists from among former pagan philosophers and savants."

It is one of these apologists, Justin Martyr, known also as the Philosopher, from whom the first explicit witness to the apostolic origin and authoritative standing of the Apoc is found (Dial. Try. 81). Let us also not forget that Justin spent his early years with the church community at Ephesus, and so not only would he be reporting to us the state of the Apoc in Rome, but also of an earlier time in Asia Minor. It is most unlikely that he would not have related any contradiction between the churches, given the open and critical nature of his thinking. Consider, for instance, as Karen O'Dell Bullock notes, Justin's "intellectual pilgrimage": from stoic, to peripatetic, to pythagorean, to platonist, and finally, to Christian.

Justin wrote during the formative period of the growth of the Church, both in regards to her "church consciousness" (that is, the community's) and her position on sacred literature. We cannot expect the explicitness of the generation that followed which clearly spoke of a second Testament alongside the universally received Old Testament of the Prophets whose number (together with that of the Apostles), was complete. The apologist represents a highly unifying force of Tradition in the development of doctrine even prior to the final settlement of the canonical NT Scripture. Compare this formative period for instance with the crisis of interpretation "in the twilight of modernity" that Christians are facing today and which Green has done so well

47 See the splendid discussion on the Apoluxta by Pan. K. Crsntou in which the method and approach (depending on the intended audience) are clearly defined in: QKHE (Tom 2), 1133-1140.

48 For a selection of the more prominent names, see ibid. However, as Crsntou emphasizes, the list of the apologists, strictly speaking, can extend through to the time of the Mohammedan threat of the seventh century AD.

49 I. M. Andreyev, Orthodox Apologetic Theology, (Platina: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 53.

50 For the historical context of Justin's writings and for biographical notes, see Karen O'Dell Bullock, The Writings of Justin Martyr, Shepherd's Notes (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1998), 7-16.

51 ibid., 13.


53 This serves again to emphasize the unifying force of Tradition in the development of doctrine even prior to the final settlement of the canonical NT Scripture. Compare this formative period for instance with the crisis of interpretation "in the twilight of modernity" that Christians are facing today and which Green has done so well
decisive stage in the reflection of the Church, which reveres the OT and is attempting to place its new body of literature in that context of divine and inspired writings. As Charles H. Cosgrove has well highlighted, Justin holds the OT to be inspired and holy, and in the course of his apologia his appeal to the prophets is constant (Dial. Try., passim). He turns to these inspired witnesses for the fulfilled and future prophecies of the life of Jesus; the OT is his groundwork. This cannot be underestimated, for the respect that he accords to these writings he instinctively confers to another group of documents which he would also consider as normative for the faithful of the Church: the writings of the apostles and of their immediate followers. These documents are to be read in the Christian community on the same level as the writings of the prophets.

Proof of this is to be seen in the fact that Justin's appeal to Rev 20:4f, which is preceded by quotations from the OT to do with the promised Messianic rule in the new age (Isa 65:17-25), is followed by a reference to the NT (2Pet 3:8) and a saying of the Lord (Lk 20:35f.). This positively indicates that for this second-century apologist the authority of the Apoc was not inferior to that of the OT documents. Justin, viewing the prophetic character of the book with high regard, writes of the text's author before making reference to the Apoc pericope of the "thousand years" [κιλια ε̄]:

And further, there was a certain man with us, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied, by a revelation that was made to him, that those who believed in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem...

It is highly significant that in the evolving context of both apostolicity and tradition, Justin not only tells us that the name of the prophet was "John" [Ἰωάννης], but that he was also "one of the apostles of Christ" [των αποστόλων του Χριστου]. The celebrated apologist confirms that this is not a document clouded in pseudonymity, it is the work of an apostle whose name is not unknown. Justin re-affirms the belief as to the authority and source of the book, but also appeals to the high office of the prophetic ministry as a mark of


54 Cosgrove, art. cit.

55 In many places, for example, Dial. Try. 95-110, where commenting on "Scripture" in the context of Christ's passion and resurrection, both Testaments are expertly intertwined in Justin's testimony.

56 Dial. Try. 81.

57 This is fundamental in itself, for, as D. G. Meade says, "[F]irst, its [apocalyptic] writings are almost universally pseudonymous": David G. Meade, Pseudonymity and Canon, (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1987), 73. See esp. Authorship, Revelation and Canon in the Apocalyptic Tradition, 73-102.
genuineness. The activity of the false prophet which was prominent earlier in the Didache is a major issue in the work of Justin, who considers them as glorifying "the spirits and demons of error." Yet this conviction does not restrict him from testifying that the true prophetic office is an authentic expression in the life of the Church. Finally, I would note that in the context of the liturgical dimensions of the Apoc that we have reviewed in a preceding chapter, it may not be simply a coincidence, that Justin who is one of the most important witnesses of the early Rezeption history of the Apoc, is also one of the "most important of the liturgical sources", as Josef A. Jungmann tells us, "at the earlier period."

**Tatian the Syrian (d. AD c. 175), prov., Syria-Rome**

*Compiler of the Diatessaron*

Tatian is the author of *The Discourse to the Greeks* and of the *Diatessaron*. These are his only works which are extant. The former is sometimes considered an apology, but it is more of a polemic against the culture and civilization of the Greeks. 

The *Diatessaron* (or Harmony of the Four Gospels), which is the more important of the two, is exactly that, a harmony of the four gospels in the form of a continuous narrative with some good editing. "The original was lost", as Raymond E. Brown informs us, "and so [it] has to be reconstructed from later harmonies and particularly from St. Ephrem's commentary on it." Until the fifth century the work was officially used in the liturgy of the Syrian Church.

---

58 For example, let us recall Did. 11.8 which speaks of the "false prophet" ["yeudoprofhvth"] as one who does not "exhibit[s] the Lord's ways" ["tou; trovpou" kurivou] and says that by his "conduct" ["trovpwn"] will he be "recognized" ["gnwsqhvsetai"].

59 "The false prophets", are for Justin Martyr, "[individuals] who are filled with the lying unclean spirit, neither have done nor do, but venture to work certain wonderful deeds for the purpose of astonishing men, and glorify the spirits and demons of error": Dial. Try. 7.

60 See for instance his passionate insistence that prophecy comes "only by the man to whom God and His Christ have imparted wisdom": ibid.


62 Johannes Quasten is correct when he says "that the speech [of the Discourse] is not so much an apology for Christianity as it is a vehement, immoderate polemic treatise which rejects and belittles the whole culture of the Greeks": Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. I), (Maryland: Christian Classics, 1986), 221.


64 As Metzger reports to us, Theodoret (who was elevated to the bishopric of Cyrus in upper Syria in AD 423) destroyed some 200 copies of the *Diatessaron* that were in use within his diocese for fear that "orthodox Christians were in danger of being corrupted by using Tatian's work": Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 89. Though no complete copy of the *Diatessaron* is extant today (as Metzger himself notes, *ibid.*, 90), the "entire text", writes Quasten, "can be reconstructed from extant translations": Quasten (Vol. I), *op. cit.*, 225.
Stonehouse makes the critical comment that Tatian was also at Rome at some stage during the period of Marcion's activity and that this could point to some connection between Marcion's canon and that of the early Syrian Church, for there are, as he importantly notes, "remarkable similarities." A notable similarity is the exclusion of the Apoc from the NT of the early Syrian Church, a book which, as we earlier noted, Marcion rejected. This contact could be further evidenced by the fact that in Syria there was a Marcionite sect. Furthermore, it is intriguing that Tatian was in fact a pupil of Justin Martyr, and, similarly to his teacher, wandered much before deciding on the Christian faith as against all other philosophies. Yet, as Johannes Quasten writes, "we notice sharp contrasts between them as soon as we compare their writings." It is interesting to compare further these "contrasts" for possible hints as to why one man would uncompromisingly hold to the Apoc (Justin), and the other (Tatian) would, as it appears from his surviving works, nowhere even consider citing it. The contrasts are "especially evident", Quasten continues:

in the evaluation which they place on non-Christian philosophy and culture. Whereas Justin attempts to find at least elements of truth in the writings of some Greek thinkers, Tatian teaches complete renunciation of all Greek philosophy on principle. Justin in his defence of Christianity paid high respect to non-Christian philosophy. Tatian betrays a determined hatred of all that belongs to Greek civilization, art, science and language.

From this fact alone, but also on account of the distinctiveness of their language and the geographical boundaries, we can detect that the Syrian writers would begin to chart their own methodological course and exegetical traditions. And, clearly, what is plain from the start, any position which rejects outright the Greek spirit and which is hostile to Greek culture will form and construct itself differently to the rest of the ecclesiastical body. Chiliasm would not sit well with such an approach, particularly if it could be traced back to the Sibyl and when it could betray the deceitfulness of the Greek philosophers! A question which remains, and

65 Stonehouse, op. cit., 139.
66 ibid.
68 ANF (Vol. II), 61-63.
69 Quasten (Vol.1), op. cit., 220.
70 Though is there perhaps a tantalizing hint as A. Cleveland Coxe might appear to be suggesting? See ANF (Vol. II), 74.
71 Quasten, op. cit., 220f.
72 For "Christianity in Syria" and development of Syriac exegetical traditions, see TABD (Vol. 1), art., David Bundy, 970-979.
73 See The Discourse to the Greeks, esp. Chaps 21-30.
which is in itself quite fascinating, assuming that Tatian did make contact with Marcion whilst the two were in Rome: did Marcion influence Tatian more than Justin? Irenaeus certainly implies as much and he attributes Tatian's "peculiar type of doctrine" to his neglect of Justin's teaching.\(^{74}\) This is interesting, for we can assume that Tatian would have known the high view of the Apoc held by his teacher. Our present writer, "half father and half heretic" as he has sometimes been called,\(^{75}\) went on to found the sect of the Encratites upon his return to Syria\(^{76}\) who at their height even condemned marriage as adultery,\(^{77}\) so he would hardly find a place for a book that reportedly supported the coarse materialism of chiliasm. Marcion's canon, then, would have suited and supported the Syrian cause perfectly. The NT Canon of the Syrian Church was greatly influenced by the dialectical and practical stratagems of this time.\(^{78}\)

**Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne** (AD 177), *prov.*, Gaul

*That the Scripture Might be Fulfilled*, Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 5.1.58

The Churches of Lyons and Vienne, in an epistle\(^ {79}\) to the believers in Asia and Phrygia (AD 177), preserved by Eusebius\(^ {80}\) as a testimony "to the churches of Christ"\(^ {81}\) [*Cristou\(\text{ekklhsia}\)*], cite or allude to the Book of Revelation on at least four occasions (Rev 12:1, 14:4, 19:9, 22:11). The early view expressed by A. C. McGiffert, that "there can be no doubt as to the early date and reliability of the epistle", has not to my knowledge been conclusively challenged.\(^ {82}\) McGiffert supports this position for ",[i]t bears no traces of a later age, and contains little of the marvellous, which entered so largely into the spurious martyrlogies of a

\(^{74}\) Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1.28.1. "He [Tatian] was a hearer of Justin's, and as long as he remained with him he expressed no such views; but after his martyrdom he separated from the Church, and excited and puffed up by the thought of being a teacher, as if he was superior to others, he composed his own peculiar type of doctrine": *ibid.*

\(^{75}\) *ANF*, loc. cit.

\(^{76}\) *ibid.*

\(^{77}\) *ibid.*

\(^{78}\) For discussion on the Syriac versions of the Bible, including the Syriac Peshitta, see *TABD* (Vol. 1), 973f. As the author of the article points out, the Apocalypse and General Epistles which are included by the Bible Society in its edition of the *New Testament in Syriac* were not part of the Peshitta translation, "but based on the Philoxenian version" which dates later to AD 507-8: *ibid.*, 974.

\(^{79}\) "The Epistle of the Churches at Lyons and Vienne", writes Bruce Metzger, "is remarkable for the abundance and the precision of the reminiscences of New Testament texts that it contains": Metzger, *The Canon*, 152.

\(^{80}\) *Hist. Eccl.* 5.1.

\(^{81}\) *ibid.*, 5.2.1.

\(^{82}\) See Metzger, *op. cit.*, 152f.
The manifest fellowship between these two church communities, says much, recalling also that Irenaeus of Lyons (AD c. 130-200) was a native of Asia Minor "and most probably it was Smyrna." We note to begin with that the letter is sent to believers from where the Apoc was originally circulated, Asia Minor. Another contact with the 'sister church' is the person of Attalus, "a pillar and foundation", who is a native of Pergamum, a seat of one of the Christian churches referred to by John (Rev 2:12). However, more important than these recognizable contacts (at least for our purposes), is that one of the references from the Apoc (22:11) is introduced with a NT formula for the citation of Scripture:

\[ \text{...i̇fa  ḥ  graf ḥ; pl hrwchỵ  ọ  jạhonọ  ajohnysatw  ef̣i,  kai; ọ  dịlaịo  dị  kaiwchtw  ef̣i.}\]

The rise of Montanism in Asia Minor was of interest to the churches of Lyon and Vienne, and quite probably we have in a letter sent by these congregations to the Roman bishop, Eleutherios, the earliest existing reference to the movement. The faithful communities of Gaul, whilst sharing in the general judgement of the Church that the New Prophecy was false and heretical, did not favour the position of the extreme antimontanists. This was due to the estimable reception of the Apoc in the tradition of these churches and was made clear in the lengthy letter sent to the churches in Phrygia and Asia relating to the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius. However, what is of principal interest in this instance, and another signpost in the Apoc's adventure, is that in this letter for the first time the Book of Revelation is cited with the canonical formula \[\text{i̇fa  ḥ  graf ḥ; pl hrwchỵ}.\] The citation is a loose rendering of Rev 22:11: \[\text{oj ajdikw'n ajdikhsavtw ef̣i  kai; ọ  ṛjuparo'  ṛjupanqhvtw ef̣i,  kai; ọ  dịlai o'  dị  kaiaschtw ef̣i.}\]

---

83 NPNF (Vol. I) Second Series, 212.
84 Quasten (Vol. 1), 287.
85 Hist. Eccl. 5.1.58. [italics added]
86 ibid., 5.3.4.
87 Eusebius appears to have confused the reign of Marcus Aurelius with that of Lucius Verus. So, the "seventeenth year" (HE 5.1.1), is in reality that belonging to the reign of the former, putting the year to AD 177. On this apparent confusion see the fine discussion by A. C. McGiffert, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (Vol. 1), 390f. McGiffert argues in one place that "the explanation seems to [me to] lie in the circumstance that Eusebius attempted to reconcile the tradition that Marcus Aurelius was not a persecutor with the fact known to him as a historian, that the emperor who succeeded Antonius Pius was": ibid.
88 Hist. Eccl. 5.1.58.
89 For the attested variants, see Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), lii.
This epistle from the church communities of Lyons and Vienne, and its references to the Apoc, is a valuable paradigm in the context of a canonical criticism approach. First, in its quest for hermeneutical authority the book is "received" into the "believing community"; second, it is set apart and "commended" as sacred; third, it is marked with a "function"; and fourth, its gospel message is passed on "to be accessible to every succeeding generation of Christians." The witness of this "community of faith", as Brevard S. Childs prefers, ranks on the same levels of confirmation to the Apoc, as does the acceptance of the book by the community of believers in Rome responsible for the canonical list of books cited in the MF. We can also record here, if we are to assume that the community of believers in Asia Minor who received this letter similarly held to the Apoc's authority, an "act of canonization by the faith-community" of both hemispheres of the Church (the sender, West/ and the receiver, East). The instructive words of Saint Irenaeus of Lyons, reveal much to us about this reciprocal commendation (re. the authoritas Scripturae):

For although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. For the Churches which have been planted in Germany do not believe or hand down anything different, nor do those in Spain, nor those in Gaul, nor those in the East, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those which have been established in the central regions of the world.

Theophilus of Antioch (AD c. 115-188), prov., Antioch in Syria
Testimonies from the Apocalypse of John, Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.24.1
Similarly to most of the early pastors of the Church, little is known of Theophilus of Antioch in Syria. Once more we must turn to the ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius. He informs us that Theophilus was the sixth bishop of Antioch "from the Apostles" [apost. wh apost. down]. We are informed by Jerome, as well, that he had written a number of works against the prevailing heresies of the time. However, only the three books Ad Autolycum are extant. In these works the bishop defends Christianity, possibly against a previous work published by

---

90 Sanders, Canon and Community, 34.
91 ibid.
92 ibid., 37. That is, it has already entered into the realm of an "authoritative tradition[s]": ibid.
93 ibid., 40.
95 Adv. haer. 1.10.2. [italics added]
96 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.20.
97 De vir. ilustr. 25.
his friend Autolycus. Johannes Quasten notes that these books must have been composed shortly after the year AD 180 "because the third book contains a chronology of the history of the world which reaches down to the death of Marcus Aurelius (March 17, 180 AD)." His lost work "against Marcion", is especially commended by Eusebius. Marcus Dods says of Theophilus, "as an apologist [he is] intimately allied in spirit to Justin and Irenaeus." It is indeed tragic that no other works of Theophilus are extant, when we consider that he is apparently, the first Christian writer to use the word Trinity [th" triado"] for the union of the three divine persons in God, and also the first to distinguish between the logon ejndiavqeton and the logon [egevnnhsen] prof orikou. Given also that Theophilus occupies a position "after Ignatius, in the succession of faithful men who represented Barnabas and other prophets and teachers of Antioch", his stance on the Apoc is very significant at this stage. So does Theophilus refer to the Apoc in his works which have been preserved? And if he does, is it positively or negatively?

It was a great surprise, indeed, that Stonehouse did not make much of Eusebius' reference to the use of the Book of Revelation by Theophilus in one of his writings. In his work entitled Against the Heresy of Hermogenes, we are informed by the church historian that the "bishop of the church of Antioch" made use "of testimonies from the Apocalypse of John" [ejn w/| ejk th" jApokaluvyew" jIwavnnou kevvcrhtai marturia"]. But what was this heresy? A. C. McGiffert says, that if we look at references by Hippolytus, Tertullian's Ad Hermogenem, and reports on this figure, Hermogenes, by Clement of Alexandria (and if this person be the same as the figure of Theophilus' treatise), then he taught "that God did not create the world out of nothing, but only formed it out of matter, which like himself, was eternally existent." Another possible reference to the Apoc, though admittedly unclear but by no means improbable, is a statement in Book I of Ad Autolycum where Theophilus speaks of "the prophetic Scriptures" to which reverential attention must be paid. Here, perhaps, Marcus Dods who considers it in the context of Rev 19:10, is influenced by some of the

---

98 Quasten (Vol. I), op. cit., 237.
99 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.24.3.
100 ANF (Vol. II), 87.
101 Ad Autolycum, 2.10 [ejndiavqeton], 2.15 [triado'], 2.22 [prof orikou].
102 ANF (Vol. II), loc. cit.
103 N. B. Stonehouse makes only passing mention of this major reference in a footnote: Stonehouse, op. cit., 81, fn. 155.
105 NPNF (Vol. I), [second series], 202.
surrounding context.\footnote{Dods, \textit{op. cit.}, 93.} But it must remain speculative, though a case can certainly be made. That Theophilus had a high view of the "sacred Scriptures" \footnote{\textit{Ad Autolycum}, 1.14, 2.22, 3.12,14.} is unquestionable, for "[t]he divine word teaches us" \footnote{\textit{ibid.}, 3.14.} And, he is, as Johannes Quasten states, "the first who clearly teaches the inspiration of the New Testament."\footnote{Quasten (Vol. I), \textit{op. cit.}, 239.} There can be little doubt, then, that if he used the Apoc to fight heresy, he would almost certainly have regarded the book as part of those inspired "sacred Scriptures". Especially given the proximity of his thought to Justin and Irenaeus to whom, also, as an apologist, he is "intimately allied in spirit."\footnote{Dods, \textit{loc.cit.}} It is noteworthy that a large group of scholars either choose to ignore Theophilus on the question of the Book of Revelation with little more than passing reference,\footnote{Charles, however, does set the reference apart as testimony from Western Syria: R. H. Charles, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John} (Vol. I), (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), xcix.} or simply refuse to acknowledge the greater importance of his testimony of the Seer's text on the grounds of its one concrete reference. This only serves to continue with the misleading perception of our book's canonical adventure in Antioch Syria, and in the East more generally. As we found in the previous chapter where we investigated the post apostolic witness to the Apoc, we are not to look for heavy quotation of specific NT books from these early ecclesiastical writers.\footnote{One of the connections between Theophilus and the earlier ecclesiastical authors is that, he too, would appear to have a preference for the citing of material from memory, "\textit{parage\textit{\i}en apo\textit{\o}m\textit{\i}khi}": see \textit{Pan K. Chr\textit{\i}stou} in \textit{OKHE} (Tom 6), 396.} In Book III, I should also add, the writer speaks passionately on the authority of the OT in opposition to secular philosophy.

Citation of the Book of Revelation \textit{might} be absent from the extant work of the profound theologian Theophilus who, incidentally, considers the apostle John one of the "spirit bearers",\footnote{Consider once more \textit{Ad Autolycum} 1.14 where the author commends his reader to "give reverential attention to the prophetic Scriptures"; \textit{ibid.}, 2.22.} but that in itself proves only that he found no occasion to cite the document on this particular occasion (whereas at another time, as we know, he did cite it). Eusebius' reference, then, to Theophilus' use of the Seer's work becomes all the more significant when we consider that the Church Historian, himself, had very mixed feelings when it came to the Apoc.\footnote{Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.25.5.} In the three books, \textit{Prov Autolukon} there is no reference to chiliasm, but given the
provenance of this work it is not unexpected. Could this be one of the reasons why Eusebius has, inadvertently perhaps, saved this crucial testimony?

I have sought to indicate that Theophilus more likely than not, did make use of the Book of Revelation and that for him it would have possessed *authoritas Scripturae*. On account not only of our author's Antiochean origin, but also because of his episcopal succession from a line of esteemed figures (including Ignatius)\(^{115}\) from within the body of the believing community where the *canonical guideline* was passed on. These points are never incidental, for ultimately, as Staniloae writes, "[t]radition gives a permanent reality to the dialogue of the Church with Christ."\(^{116}\)

**Montanus (fl. AD 2nd century), prov., Asia Minor**

*The New Prophecy*

Montanus was active towards the later part of the second century AD. Our sources are limited, but it would appear that prior to his conversion to Christianity he was already familiar with the ecstatic state, having served as a priest in the cult of Cybele.\(^{117}\) He is first located in the Phrygian region of Asia Minor, where as a recent convert he displays, according to Eusebius, "his unquenchable desire for leadership."\(^{118}\) Eusebius continues to describe in graphic detail the ecstatic state into which Montanus caused himself to enter, but note also the church historian's recourse to tradition in order to refute this "contrary" behaviour:

> And he [Montanus] became beside himself, and being suddenly in a sort of frenzy and ecstasy, he raved, and began to babble and utter strange things, prophesying in a manner contrary to the constant custom of the Church handed down by tradition from the beginning.\(^{119}\)

Declaring himself the voice of the Holy Spirit, he announced that the gospel promise of Pentecost was now being fulfilled and that the millenarian kingdom, to be inaugurated by the

\(^{115}\) ibid., 4.20.


\(^{117}\) Two studies that have been widely heralded by scholars of Montanism and which are thorough in their presentation of the movement and of the early sources are: R. E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, (Patristic Monograph Series 14, 1989), and W. Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources*, (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996).

\(^{118}\) *Hist. Eccl.* 5.16.7. It is in this chapter that Eusebius speaks of "the so-called Phrygian heresy" [*tın legomenhν kàtα Frúsag* ailešin].

\(^{119}\) ibid.
appearance of the New Jerusalem (at Pepouza where all Christians would gather), was imminent. Closely associated to this activity was his conviction that the end of the world was near. Furthermore, he claimed that the Holy Spirit was giving new revelations to the Church; this was consequently referred to as the New Prophecy. Montanus, together with two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, where the chief prophets of the new community. A basic part of their teaching was a rigoristic asceticism and morality which were supposed to detach them from material desires. Among the Montanist leaders in the West, whom Eusebius refers to as "the leader of the Phrygian heresy", was Proclus, against whom the obscure Roman presbyter Caius published his "disputation". The seizures and the speaking of the "strange things" described by Eusebius were understood by the members of Montanus' flock as oracles of the Holy Spirit and from the prophetic charism. Though he refuted the evolving hierarchical structures of the Church, he nonetheless regarded tradition and accepted the Scriptures as the foundation of the Christian faith. On this matter Eric Osborn has noted:

[a]ccording to a source in Epiphanius, the Montanists accepted what became the testaments of the Christian bible, a trinitarian faith and the new prophecies of Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla, with the requirement that others must exhibit the same spiritual gifts.

With the threat of Montanism spreading further into susceptible church communities, the orthodox opponents of this movement openly acknowledged that charismatic gifts were always to be present in the living Body of Christ, but only the prophecies which were to be

120 The failure of the Montanist prophecy to materialize was the fundamental reason for the attack and continued censure of the movement from Eusebius and his sources: Hist. Eccl. 5.16-19. The section of work which Eusebius concludes with the strong resignation of "so much for these persons [Montanists]": 5.19.4.

121 For the New Prophecy and for Tertullian's connection to the movement, see David Rankin, Tertullian and the Church, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 41-64. Also see Eric Osborn, Tertullian: First Theologian of the West, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 209-13. For the standard sources of the movement in the writings of Epiphanius, see Osborn, ibid.

122 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 5.14. These two are the women that "he [Montanus] stirred up... and filled them with the false spirit, so that they talked wildly and unreasonably...": Hist. Eccl. 5.16.9. But note Tertullian's matter of course statement that the Bishop of Rome [Victor?] had "acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla": Adv. Prax. 1.

123 Marriage and holiness, for instance, are not compatible, and, as Eric Osborn writes commenting on Adv. Marc. 4.22.5, "[t]he New Prophecy offers the gift of ecstasy which is above reason and mind": Osborn, op. cit., 213.

124 Euseb., Hist Eccl. 2.25.5-7.

125 "w' ajiw pneumati kai profhtikw carismati": ibid., 5.16.8.

126 Osborn, op. cit., 209. The scholar is referring to Epiphanius, Pan. 48.1.4.
found in the commended Canon of the OT were to be read in the Church. The only other writings outside the OT which were permitted to be read and which claimed prophetic authority were to be those texts which gave evidence of their apostolic origin and were accepted as normative for Christian teaching. But similarly to the case of Marcion, Montanus was not singularly responsible for this vigilance of the Church; it heightened her watchfulness and providence, but this process was already under way, given all of the available indications.

The Church was prompted to define more clearly the rules and standards by which her divine books where to be selected and used for instruction and worship by the faithful. In the context of this canonical discourse, R. W. Wall and E. E. Lemcio are surely right to make the passionate appeal that "it is time to recognize that the hermeneutical enterprise belongs to a community of interpreters, with different interests and methods necessary to recover the whole meaning of multivalent texts."

However, where Montanus is more important for us than Marcion in the context of this thesis, is that a great part of the resulting controversy that the Apoc was subject to "can be traced", as Stonehouse correctly finds, "to a reaction over against the extremes of Montanism."

What some modern investigators of the Montanist phenomenon will sometimes fail to note adequately when they review the tracts of the heresiologists who wrote against the movement, is that it was not the prophecy itself that was condemned, but the form of its eccentric manifestation. The indictment against the founders of the movement was never one against the prophetic office itself, as Eusebius had earlier pointed out to us, but against demonic possession and false prophecy, which, as Christopher Forbes has contended, smacked in part of "'Dionysiac'... ecstatic or frenzied nature."

---

127 This unshakeable position has its roots in the documents of the NT itself. See Richard N. Longenecker's indispensable study, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995).

128 Representative here is Irenaeus' famous paragraph on the "two testaments among the two peoples": Iren., Adv. haer. 4.32. See also Christopher A. Hall, Reading Scripture with the Church Fathers, (Illinois: IVP, 1998), 132-176.

129 Karabidopoulo, op. cit., 100-103. The Greek NT scholar (after considering the phraseology of the Pauline references) points to the likely knowledge of a Corpus Paulinum by early church writers such as Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and Justin Martyr; this position fits in perfectly with the thesis put forward by Wall and Lemcio (following J. D. Godsey) after an examination of the "canonical Sitz im Leben" of Paul's epistles that the "New Testament Canon would seem to give prominence to the corpus of Pauline letters": Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, The New Testament as Canon: A Reader in Canonical Criticism, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 145.

130 Wall and Lemcio, op. cit., 143.

131 Stonehouse, op. cit., 49.

132 Christopher Forbes' review of the "oracular obscurity" of Montanist prophecy, wherein he argues that "there is no unambiguous evidence whatsoever that it took glossolalic form", concludes with the persuasive position that it "resembled Delphic enthusiasm in that the inspired speech that resulted from it was intelligible,
Chiliasm alone would certainly not have seen the Montanists condemned so unreservedly by their orthodox opponents, but it did play a part in the calculations of the Alogi. This group, which flourished in Asia Minor in the late second century, went to the extreme of denying the authority of the Seer's work, ascribing it to a certain Cerinthus, and argued that the Apoc itself contained false prophecy. This would hardly have been the case if the Book of Revelation was not an authoritative text for Montanism (especially in the context of their eschatological calculations), and, besides, Tertullian's unequivocal embrace of the book would prove the point by itself. The other reason for their securing of the heretical status seems the more urgent, as Nicola Denzey describes:

We also know a fundamental component of the marginalization and rejection of the New Prophecy derived from their conviction that prophecy was ongoing, along with the revelation of new texts from new sources, which they then incorporated into their canon.

One final point that I would like to call attention to before continuing, is that though both Tatian and the Montanists were typically rigorists, the former rejected the Apoc probably because of the book's chilastic overtones, whilst the latter appeared to have accepted it precisely because of them. This again points to the various readings that the apocalyptic Gattung was open to outside any shared "conventions of literary communication."

Melito of Sardis (fl. 2nd century), prov., Asia Minor

On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John, Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.26

Melito, a prolific [πολυγραφόν] and highly esteemed [υἱόλογον] writer in the middle of the second century, was bishop of Sardis in Lydia. From the literary evidence that we

133 Epiphanius of Salamis (AD c. 315-403) writes of these "rejectors of the writings of John" who do not accept John's Gospel "nor his Apocalypse" [τὸν αὐτὸν Ἀποκαλυπτὴν]: Epiphanius Scr. Eccl., Panarion, TLG (2021 002) 2.250.16.

134 N. Denzey has recently considered "the possibility that the New Prophecy may have found certain so-called 'gnostic' writings from the Nag Hammadi Library compatible enough with their theology to have both known and included them within their canon": Nicola Denzey, "What did the Montanists Read", HTR 94/4, (Oct 2001), 428.

135 Tertullian who made plentiful use of the Apoc was a convert, or at least most sympathetic to the Montanist cause. For Tertullian's relationship to the "New Prophecy Movement", see David Rankin, Tertullian and the Church, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 41-51.

136 Denzey, art. cit., 447.


138 Dhm. G. Tsadha, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Γραμματολογία, (Qessaloniκά: Πούρναραν, 1985), 64.
possess, he was probably the first author to embark on an extensive treatise dealing with the Apoc.\textsuperscript{140} The work, unfortunately long lost, is often given the title \textit{On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John}. Jerome considered this to be two works,\textsuperscript{141} but the MSS. read it differently.\textsuperscript{142} Though N. B. Stonehouse is correct in saying that we do not know whether the book was an exegetical writing or a polemical writing, he is equally incorrect in the assumption that the title of the work "gives us no clue as to its subject matter."\textsuperscript{143} The title here reveals much more than it could be concealing, and though it would not be critical to labour the point that it was a commentary, it may very well have been. More importantly, Melito was from Asia Minor, the place where the book was intended to be first circulated. We know that by his time the Apoc was recognized and transmitted, and it is inconceivable that an ecclesiastical figure of his high rank and place of activity would be ignorant of the work. It is no small matter that his bishopric Sardis, "one of the more illustrious cities of ancient Anatolia",\textsuperscript{144} was one of the seven churches mentioned by John (Rev 3:1).

Melito, who would appear to be strongly interested in the area of prophecy and wrote at least one work on the subject, \textit{On Christian Life and the Prophets},\textsuperscript{145} would no doubt have taken a keen interest on the Montanist movement in Asia Minor. He was certainly "anti-Gnostic."\textsuperscript{146} From his one surviving work, \textit{Peri Pasca}, we can importantly note as Charles Kannengiesser writes, "the christological focus of the canonical gospel narratives."\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{147}} Though our evidence is admittedly of a fragmentary nature, it is not, however, unreasonable to conclude, that the Apocalypse of John was included in Melito's list of authoritative NT books.

\begin{itemize}
    \item[139] See Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 4.26. Therein Eusebius speaks of Melito's "great distinction" and sets down a list of the bishop's works, including "the books On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John".
    \item[140] For a list of the early church writers who cite him, see \textit{QKHE} (Tom 8), \textit{art.} \textit{Melitwn}, Pan. K. Chriatou, 978; Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 4.26.
    \item[141] \textit{Vir. ill.} 24
    \item[142] The Greek MSS. read: $\text{kai; ta; peri; tou' diabovlou, kai; th' ajpokaluyev$ $\text{jIwavnnou}$ suggesting, as A. C. McGiffert says, "making but one work, with two or more books". McGiffert in the same place points to Harnack, who notes that the Syriac "apparently agrees with the Greek": The \textit{Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers} (Vol. I), 204, n.19. However, Johannes Quasten (perhaps following Rufinus and Jerome), lists the books separately: \textit{Patrology} (Vol. I), 246.
    \item[143] Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 72.
    \item[144] David E. Aune, \textit{Revelation 1-5} (52A), (Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1997), 218.
    \item[145] Johannes Quasten has, not unreasonably, supposed that this treatise "is probably of anti-Montanistic character": Quasten (Vol.1), \textit{op. cit.}, 246.
    \item[147] Kannengiesser, \textit{ibid.}
\end{itemize}
The Alogi in Asia Minor (fl. late 2nd century)

The Apocalypse Contains False Prophecy

Irenaeus advises us that there are those who "set aside at once both the Gospel and the prophetic Spirit." These are the false prophets "vain, unlearned, and also audacious" who corrupted and misinterpreted the promises of Christ in the Gospel, some of which are ready to give up the Gospel lest their enemy use it to support their claims. This is quite probably that controversial group in Asia Minor of which our knowledge is only limited, the so-called Alogi who flourished late in the second century. Epiphanius of Salamis (AD c. 315-403) characteristically reports, that they rejected the Johannine writings in response to the ever-increasing threat of Montanism. Could the supposed attack on the Apoc from Caius of Rome, "who arose under Zephyrinus", have been dependent on an earlier treatise of the Alogi in Asia Minor? It has been suggested by Stonehouse, and it is a suggestion which merits some consideration, that this view is supported by the compilation of the fragments of Caius' dialogue with the writings of those who ascribed the Apoc to Cerinthus, "a man who was educated in the wisdom of the Egyptians." We first encounter Cerinthus in the writings of Irenaeus, who lists his doctrines together with those of the Ebionites, and Nicolaitanes (Adv. haer. 1.26). Not surprisingly perhaps, Irenaeus tells us nothing of Cerinthus' coarse chiliasm (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 3.28.2-3).

---

148 Adv. haer. 3.11.9.
149 ibid.
150 The Alogi (sometimes Alogoi) were so named because they were said to have denied the doctrine of the Logos (Word) as taught in the Gospel of John: Epiphanius Scr. Eccl., Panarion, TLG (2021 002) 2.250.16.
151 ibid.
152 Caius is another early figure of whom we know very little about. Eusebius tells us that he rose under Zephyrinus, which would be sometime between AD 198-217. The church historian also informs us that Caius had published a "dialogue" against a certain Proclus, a defender of the Phrygian heresy, and that Caius was "a very learned man": Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 6.20.
153 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 2.25.6; Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, AD c. 198-217.
154 Stonehouse, 64.
155 We can suppose that this figure lived towards the close of the first century: NPNF (Vol. I), second series, 160. Some had incredibly suggested that it was Cerinthus himself who had authored the Book of Revelation (and the Gospel of John), and though Dionysius of Alexandria does not seem to mind the propagation of a connection between Cerinthus and the Apoc, he is not willing to press the matter: Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.25.2-4. See also 3.28.3-6 (where the famous incident in the baths between John the Apostle and Cerinthus is also recounted).
I mentioned that the suggestion of Stonehouse merited consideration, but only in the context of an attack against the Montanists (which is of course supported by Caius' documented dispute with Proclus), and not necessarily for all of the Johannine corpus. The basis for such a position primarily rests on a reading of Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.28.1-2. In this passage Caius condemns Cerinthus' doctrine of the "period of a thousand years for marriage festivals" \(\text{[ajrignon ciliontaetia\; en\; gavmwebrth]}\), refers to him as "an enemy of the Scriptures of God" \(\text{[e\jcro;\; uparxw\; tai\; graf\; ai\; tou\; qeou]}\), and accuses him of pretence and false claims \(\text{[yeudouren]}\). These claims are of being the "great apostle" \(\text{[apostolv\; negalvou]}\), who is John. But, I think too much has been made of the Caius persona given his limited influence, and when not too many other Church writers are apparently interested in him. "The history of Caius", as A. C. McGiffert said, "is veiled in obscurity." \(^{157}\) His position on the Apoc, for instance, does not warrant the highlight put on him by R. W. Wall and E. E. Lecimio.\(^{158}\)

We cannot say with certainty that the Alogi are unequivocally, or even only, an antimontanist group (or that they can be quickly identified with "Irenaeus' anonymous antimontanists").\(^{159}\) One tell-tale sign that they are, however, is their attack on the Book of Revelation as containing false prophecy and their argument that the Montanist church at Thyatira is not worthy to be called a Christian church.\(^{160}\) But this latter charge, is not of the critical type, for instance, that Dionysius of Alexandria would forward, and so would indicate an open hostility towards the Montanists.\(^{161}\) That they were committed to their goal of the \(\text{de-commendation of the Johannine literature}\)\(^{162}\) and particularly the Apocalypse \(\text{[thn\; de;\; Apokaluyin\; apobdlm\; onto]}\), Epiphanius of Salamis makes plainly clear:

\[\text{Faskousin\; to\; in\; oj\; Alogoi\; tawthn\; gar\; au\; toi\;\; epitigymi\; thn\; epowvnian\; apa;\; gar\; th\; deuro\; oufw\; kl\; \chi\; phi\;\; tai\; kal;oufw\;\; ajgaphto\;\; epiguvh\; au\; toi\;\; dhono,\; toutestin\; Alogwn\; elton\; men\; gar\; thn\; aifiesen\; kalou\; me\; dh,\; apobdlm\; ou\; san}\]

\(^{156}\) Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 6.20.3.

\(^{157}\) NPNF (Vol. I) Second Series, 129.

\(^{158}\) Wall and Lecimio, op. cit., 276.

\(^{159}\) The history and identification of the Alogi is far more complex than I have suggested here. N. B. Stonehouse, however, has wonderfully unravelled much of the confusion that we meet with in Irenaeus' Hippolytus' and Epiphanius' references to this enigmatic group, that I dare not complicate the matter: Stonehouse, op. cit., 61-64.

\(^{160}\) ibid.

\(^{161}\) ibid.

\(^{162}\) Whether this "...apobdlm\; ou\; san..." included all of the Johannine corpus, however, we cannot be definite. Epiphanius, himself, is somewhat unclear on this matter which has confused a number of modern writers.
It is quite probable given the available evidence, as Stonehouse had also concluded, that this group had forerunners who had opposed the Montanists decades earlier in Asia Minor, and that "here one would expect to find the most radical criticism." The negative position of the Alogi on the Apoc, and of the Johannine literature in general, certainly stands out as an intriguing deviation to the course that we have thus far charted of our book's adventure. The reasons for their departure, which are far from the critical observations of a Dionysius of Alexandria (let us say), and which led to their incredible stance of rejecting even the Gospel of John to refute the authority of the Apoc, reveal how strongly the Book of Revelation had already been established in the canon consciousness of the believing community as a commended text (that such an extreme position to dislodge it would have to be resorted to).

Irenaeus of Lyons (AD c. 130-200), prov., Asia Minor-Gaul

_Irenaeus_, a native of Smyrna and later bishop of Lyons in Gaul, is widely considered the major link in the theological tradition between East and West. It is not without importance that he had also studied in Rome, so he would have direct knowledge of the Apoc's position in the tradition of this influential church community of the faithful. As a youth he had heard the famous Bishop of Smyrna, Polycarp, "[who] always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down." And Polycarp, it must be remembered, is said to have had a close connection to the Apostle John himself. His great work \_Elenchos kai; anatriph; th' yeudonou oupwardw\_, better known as \_Adversus Haereses\_, is for a good part an uncompromising repudiation of the heresy of Gnosticism. In

---

164 Stonehouse, _loc. cit._
165 Unexpectedly, for all his importance "as the most profound and influential theologian of the second century", as Behr notes, "we know relatively little about Irenaeus." For a synoptic biographical sketch, see John Behr, _On the Apostolic Preaching_. (New York: SVS Press, 1997), 1-5.
166 _Adv. haer._ 3.3.4; Irenaeus' contact with Polycarp is also recounted by Eusebius: _Hist. Eccl._ 5.20; elsewhere Irenaeus tells us, that Polycarp retold everything in "accordance with the Scriptures", [\_sunwra ta" Grafai\_]; Quoted from Gerhardsson, _op. cit._, 204.
167 _Hist. Eccl._ 5.20.6.
168 Lit. from the Gk. _Detection and Overthrow of the Pretended but False Gnosis_. From the lost Greek original we possess fragments, but they are not lacking in number (preserved by Hippolytus, Eusebius and
opposition to the gnostics he stressed tradition, the episcopate, the Canon of Scripture, and held firm to the theological formulae and dogmas that existed at the time.\textsuperscript{169} He did, however, develop the doctrine of \textit{recapitulation}: the completion of human evolution in the humanity of the \textit{eijnaskwsi}' of the \textit{Lego}.\textsuperscript{170} The correct reading of Scripture was critical for all of the above components, "it must be guided", as George Florovsky notes of our author, "by the rule of faith":

The favorite phrase of Irenaeus in this regard was the "rule of truth", \textit{kanw$\nu$ th$\nu$ ajh$\nu$qa$\nu$}, \textit{regula veritatis}. Now this rule was, in fact, nothing else than the witness and preaching of the apostles, their \textit{khvrgma} and \textit{praedicatio} (or \textit{praeconium}), which was deposited in the church and entrusted to her by the apostles, and then faithfully kept and handed down, with complete unanimity in all places, by the succession of accredited pastors...\textsuperscript{171}

The immense contribution of Irenaeus to our subject cannot be overestimated. We are not limited to the conjecturing of his position from fragmentary sources, nor are his references to the Apoc incidental. Apart from those two major elements we are also dealing with a writer who was uniquely informed,\textsuperscript{172} who had heard Polycarp, who had himself been instructed by the apostles,\textsuperscript{173} and whose orthodoxy was not questioned.\textsuperscript{174} Irenaeus also appeals to the elders of Asia Minor (like many of the Christians in Gaul, he had spent several years of his life in that region).\textsuperscript{175} Of course, this has been said many times before, but its awesome
significance merits repeating, for as Robert M. Grant has said of Irenaeus, “[i]n his own person he united the major traditions of Christendom from Asia Minor, Syria, Rome, and Gaul.”\(^\text{176}\) The canonical approach with its emphasis on the use of the Bible as Scripture,\(^\text{177}\) is especially relevant as we consider the position of the Apoc in the exposition of this ecclesiastical figure for whom the sacred text was paramount. I am aware, that for Irenaeus the authority of some books, Hebrews for instance, and James, are not considered equal in authority to other scriptures. But the probe here, is not for a closed NT Canon (that phase will come with Athanasius), but whether the Book of Revelation is, itself, considered a sacred document. It is also argued that the other apocalypse, the Shepherd of Hermas, is cited as "Scripture" (\textit{AH} 4.20.2). That is correct, on one occasion and not specifically, but among a group of readings which includes the prophet Malachi, the apostle Paul, and the Apoc (Rev 3:7).

In his famous work \textit{Against Heresies} he quotes from at least sixteen of the twenty-two chapters of the Apoc (this is not noted in the \textit{TLG} as it does not draw on the Latin copies). From the NT generally, we find over one-thousand citations.\(^\text{178}\) He appealed to Revelation for support with the same authority as he did to the normative documents of the OT. Typically, in one section where he is presenting an argument in defence of his eschatology, and where Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel are cited with the \textit{formula of declaration} [i.e. "Isaiah declares"], we find Irenaeus citing the Seer together and between the prophets. In this instance, he refers to Rev 20:6, "[a]gain John also says the very same in the Apocalypse: 'Blessed and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection.'"\(^\text{179}\) Evidence that the Apoc possessed \textit{authentia} for Irenaeus: it is Scripture in its own right. In a passage plenteously discussed by commentators (\textit{AH} 5.30.1), he elucidates on the interpretation of the number "666" \(\times \xi^2 \S\) from Rev 13:18.\(^\text{180}\) There a variant reading, that of "616", is denounced as spurious. And as I have elsewhere made a case, starting with the earliest witness \textit{P}47, the Majority Text, and the history of interpretation, he was correct.\(^\text{181}\) He declares, pointing to Rev 22:19 with its canonical intimation \[kai; ejan ti" af evn aportwv logn tov biblou,\] that those who have deliberately changed the text "for the sake of vain glory" to suit their own

\[^{176}\] Grant, \textit{op. cit.}, 1.

\[^{177}\] Charles J. Scalise, \textit{op. cit.}, 60.

\[^{178}\] According to the lists forwarded by Hoh, in \textit{AH} Irenaeus will quote 29 times from the Apoc: J. Hoh, \textit{Die Lehre des Irenäus über das Neue Testament}, (Münster, 1919), see especially 189-197; reviewing the evidence for Irenaeus' canon, Metzger includes the \textit{Shepherd}, but "somewhat doubtfully": \textit{The Canon}, \textit{op. cit.}, 155.

\[^{179}\] \textit{Adv. haer.} 5.34.2.


interpretation "shall not come forth without loss." One reason being that "there shall be no
light punishment inflicted upon him who either adds or subtracts anything from the
Scripture." Irenaeus establishes the authoritas Scripturae, for without the Spirit
the apostles would not know "such thing[s]" by signifying to the believing community
that the Apoc is the revelation of the Spiritus Sancti, explaining that the name of the
Antichrist, "is suppressed, because it is not worthy of being proclaimed by the Holy Spirit." Yet our author lists EUANQAS as a possibility containing "the required number." LATEINOS, however, [the Latin Kingdom], is a "very probable" solution to the
conundrum. Nevertheless, TEITAN, too, is not outside the bounds of possibility. And commenting on Rev 13 he interprets the bloodcurdling number as a "summing up" of the
apostasy, which has strong typological associations in itself. What cannot be lost on us, in all
this discussion on "666", is that before Irenaeus begins his reflections on the subject, he
makes the manifestly critical observation that copies of the Apoc were not lacking. So even
by this time the book was widely circulated and copied, to such an extent that "fault[s] of the
copyists" were creeping into the MSS. Furthermore, he even speaks of "the most
approved and ancient copies" [ἐν πασὶ τοῖς θεμοφόροις καὶ ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ]. It
is certainly worth noting here, and a point which Euaggelía Amoiridou has underlined in
her own study of the "number", is that Irenaeus is far more concerned with what the number
symbolizes, "…ἐκ οὗ τὸν θερμοφόρον θεοφόρον ἀγγέλον τὸν θεοφόρον τοῦ θεοφόρον…", rather than
with what it discloses.

Why? Because the "antichrist" should be recognizable in any
case. This approach would in no wise be outside the interest of students of C. G. Jung and
his "concept of the archetype", or indeed in the context of the collective unconscious.

---

183 ibid., 5.30.2.
184 ibid., 3. 17. 1.
185 ibid., 5.30.4; also 5.28.1-4 for further discourse by the writer on the apostasy, antichrist, and the "image" and "mark" of "the beast". Therein Irenaeus confirms that "John has thus described in the Apocalypse."
186 ibid., 5.30. 3.
187 ibid.
188 ibid.
189 ibid., 5. 28. 2.
190 ibid., 5.30.1.
191 ibid.; see M. G. Michael, art. cit., "666 or 616" where the question of the MSS is explored in-depth.
193 ibid.
194 Christopher Bryant, Jung and the Christian Way, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 89; there are, however, other contacts with Irenaeus, also, to do with the "psychological concept of the self": ibid., 90f.
From the Muratorian Fragment to Origen of Alexandria

Here, too, Irenaeus was influential in later Orthodox (and certainly evangelical) interpretation. The "number of the beast" invariably, and in some instances quite creatively, being connected to each successive archenemy (sometimes perceived and occasionally real) of Church and State. This became especially evident, for example, during the long years of the Turkish occupation of Greece in which the Greek Church continued on in "stable perseverance". Principal interpreters of this period are Maximo" o Peloponnhvsio", Zacariva" Gerganov, Gewvrgio" Korevssio", Iwavnnh" o Episkopo" Muwn, Qedwhto" o ex Iwannivnwn, and Kurillo" Patreuv" o Laurioth".

The Seer's prophecy is normally cited by Irenaeus with the formula "John declare[s] in the Apocalypse..." [ jIwavnnh ejn th'/ jApokaluvyei levgei]. Elsewhere he might speak simply of "the Apocalypse" or of "the Apocalypse of John" for instance in a place where he talks of the Nicolaitans. In another example, when he discourses on the triumphant Kingdom, he deliberately points to the apostolicity of the Apoc's writer by choosing to use the words, "John also, the Lord's disciple, when beholding the sacerdotal and glorious advent of His Kingdom, says in the Apocalypse." In the same way, "Paul declared..." (AH 3.2.1), "Esaias says..." (3.6.2), and "Jeremiah also says..." (3.6.3). It was said above that in some cases Irenaeus will preface his citation of the Apoc with reference to the apostolicity of its author, signifying at least two validations. First, for him there is only one Apocalypse received by the believing community; second, its author John was a disciple of the Lord. There is an assumption, here, that his readers would recognize the authority of the book and John's high prophetic office. Furthermore, the visionary of Patmos is explicitly identified with the disciple "whom Jesus...


See the countless examples across the confessional board of the Church in Bernard McGinn, ibid.

On the intricate relations between Church and State in the setting of the Byzantine Empire and beyond, see Steven Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 55-111.

Sir Paul Rycaut cited in Timothy Ware, The Orthodox Church, (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 87. Also see Ware for a review of the Church under Islam, ibid., 87-101.

See Euaggeliva Amoiridou, op. cit., 152-226.

Adv. haer. 4.14.2; also 3.21.3.

ibid., 5.28.2.

ibid., 1.26.3; for this mysterious group mentioned in Rev 2:6, 15, see Duane F. Watson, "Nicolaitans" in TABD (Vol. 4), 1106f; cf. Hipp., Haer. 7.24, Clem., Strom. 2.20, Tert., Adv. Marc. 1.29, Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.29.

Adv. haer. 4.20.11. [italics added]
loved" (Jn 21:20), in that place where it is related to us that John could not endure the sight of the visions and that he was revived by the Word, "reminding him that it was He upon whose bosom he had leaned at the supper."203 The author of Revelation was also one of the "prophets" that "beheld" the Lord.204 Montanism does not curb his zeal for the Apoc nor for the "prophetic Spirit" or the "prophetic gifts".205 Nor indeed, as M. Parmentier reminds us (pointing to AH 5.6.1), was glossolalia only the "privilege of the Gnostics."206

The bishop of Lyons, similarly to the Seer of Patmos, is intensely concerned with the notion of the Church as ecclesia universalis, for Irenaeus, as Quasten says, "speaks so clearly of the Church's motherhood."207 That the apostolicity of the Apoc, and of the NT collection as a whole was of great importance to Irenaeus, is also clearly seen in his anxiety to establish this criterion in the Rezeption tradition of the gospels.208 Our theologian, for whose use of the commended texts we can epigrammatically say: Scriptura sacra locuta, res decisa est, is manifestly aware that he possesses in these NT documents a second authoritative collection.209 These he judged as a group alongside the OT and which, as R. A. Norris writes, are "the source of his understanding of the church's rule or norm of faith."210 As if wanting to dispel all doubt as to the authority of the texts that were now in the possession of the Christian Church, he makes sure to connect the books of both dispensations to the one source, "the one and the same Spirit of God" who is proclaimed in the prophets and by the apostles.211 The bishop of Lyons writes that the "tradition from the apostles does thus exist in the Church" and that in their writings the community of the faithful can turn to for "Scriptural proof... in which

203 ibid.
204 ibid., 4.20.12. In this place, Irenaeus is pointing back to one of his previous references in 4.20.11 where he had immediately cited Rev 19:11-17, the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" pericope.
205 ibid., 3.11.9; also 4.33.10-15.
207 Quasten (Vol. II), 202.
208 Consider, for instance, Irenaeus' evident concern to connect the gospels of Mark and Luke to the apostolic tradition: Adv. haer. 3.14.1; and in his sustained attack of the Montanists, he appeals to "the Gospels of the Apostles": ibid., 3.11.9
209 "It is, in fact", as John Behr writes, "his [Iren.] understanding of the apostolic preaching, its particular texture and authority, that enables him to embrace in one comprehensive and consistent vision the whole history of salvation as it is unfolded in the one body of Scripture": Behr, Asceticism and Anthropology, 29.
211 Adv. haer. 3.21.4; also 3.9.1-3.
they [the apostles] recorded the doctrine regarding God."\textsuperscript{212} The discourses of the Lord Himself, the demonstrations of the apostles, and utterances of the prophets, all together agree with Saint Paul's confession that "[t]here is one God, the Father, who is above all".\textsuperscript{213} When refuting the views of the heretics, Irenaeus refers to this commended list of books in his possession collectively, as "the authoritative Scriptures" [\textit{dominicis scripturis}]\textsuperscript{214} "\textit{Thv scevsh tw'n Diachiwkw',} J\textit{vawnh'' Panaqopoul o'}" concludes after considering our author's theology of the divine economy, "\textit{carakthrizei stereovta oJ Eijhrainb' nevtnx oto 'sunwria' (consonare), thw oqoia ajagnwrisi ejw\textit{e}jwterikhvprooptikhuth' qei\textit{a}'' oij\textit{konomia'}.}"\textsuperscript{215} In \textit{The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching}, where Irenaeus sets down a "summary memorandum" [\textit{kefalaiwdh;} \textit{uJpovmnhma}]\textsuperscript{216} of the faith for his dear friend Marcianus, the bishop at the conclusion speaks plainly of this "preaching of the truth" (in which the concept of canon is also evidently implied):

...which the prophets announced and Christ confirmed and the apostles handed over (\textit{paradivdwmi}) and the Church, in the whole world, hands down (\textit{ejgceirivzw}) to her children.\textsuperscript{217}

The question of Irenaeus' connection to chiliasm is truly an interesting one, especially for some Orthodox interpreters, precisely because of his orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{218} However, not only does he support the teaching, but he completes it more carefully than those who had gone before him. In speaking of Papias "the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp", Irenaeus refers to Papias' fourth book "for there were five books compiled [\textit{suntetagmevna}] by him."\textsuperscript{219} There follows a description of this future ideal condition, "[a]nd the infant boy shall thrust his hand into the asp's den, into the nest also of the adder's brood; and they shall do no harm", with support references from Isaiah 65:17-25. Certainly, chiliasm is a small intrusion into a large theological system. Yet it is there. And no doubt, as other investigators have also pointed out,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{212} ibid., 3.5.1; also 3.4.1-3.
\item \textsuperscript{213} ibid., 2.2.5.
\item \textsuperscript{214} ibid., 2.30.6 [\textit{kurivwn graf wh}].
\item \textsuperscript{215} J\textit{vawnh'' Panaqopoul o'}, \textit{H Erinthei\textit{u} Th'' Agia'' Grafh'' Sth\textit{a} Ekkh\textit{si}a Tw'h Pate\textit{a}ewn (\textit{Achta:} \textit{Akrivta''}, 1991), 198.
\item \textsuperscript{216} Behr, \textit{On the Apostolic Preaching}, 7.
\item \textsuperscript{217} ibid., 100; early in his address Irenaeus speaks of "the rule [\textit{karnw}] of faith": ibid., 41.
\item \textsuperscript{218} See for instance the treatment of "Chiliasm" in \textit{Mikrov Cristianikou Ledikov Eujquvmio' Stuvlio"}, (\textit{Achta: Eptalof o'\textit{',} 1982), 197. Any reference here to any of the prominent ecclesiastical writers associated initially with the doctrine (let alone Irenaeus) is avoided.
\item \textsuperscript{219} \textit{Adv. haer.} 5.33.4.
\end{itemize}
given that the Apoc enjoyed the unqualified status that it did with Irenaeus, it further permitted him the enjoyment of this teaching. So, then, how are we to explain this apparent deviation of our celebrated Church Father from whom we read such strong pronouncements on tradition as: "[f]or although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same." There is no simple answer, except to say that Irenaeus does not refer to the teaching of chiliasm as doctrina divina, and that on the other hand, the doctrine that he does espouse as the teaching of Scripture (and speaks of it as such), that which as we have seen relates to the consensus ecclesiae catholicae, would, itself, repudiate the teaching of a full blown chiliasm. So, those very "checks and balances" that he, himself, helped to establish and put into place, come into play here in the most paradoxical of ways. At the same time, Michael Pomazansky's measured response to Irenaeus' patent chiliasm need not be viewed as overtly apologetic, but considered against the theological context of the Eastern Orthodox conception of the Ecumenical Council:

"If it was at one time possible to express chiliastic ideas as private opinions, this was only until the Ecumenical Church (Second Ecumenical Council (AD 381) expressed its judgement on this [i.e. chiliasm]."

Clement of Alexandria (AD c. 150-215), prov., Athens-Alexandria

The Apoc in Alexandria and in those areas influenced by the centre of allegorical exegesis is one of contradiction. As early as the last decades of the second century and certainly by the first decades of the third century, the book could claim canonical status. However, Alexandrian theology, which sometimes could carry to excess its denial of the literal sense of a biblical pericope, played a dominant part in the book's position in Alexandria. Allegory could do away with the more difficult exegetical challenges or scandals that the Seer's text could forward and so elicit, as R. Alter writes in reference to narrative specification, "multiple 'levels' of interpretation."
Clement of Alexandria, active in this city during the last two decades of the second century, succeeded the famous Pantaenos as head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria and was himself succeeded by his great pupil Origen in AD 202.\textsuperscript{224} He is a notable early witness in our investigation, not only for Alexandria but within the Church more generally. Some writers place his birth in Athens,\textsuperscript{225} and Clement, himself, chronicles as Griggs points out, that "he traveled widely to receive instruction from various teachers and philosophers."\textsuperscript{226} It would seem that Clement, like the other ecclesiastical writers of his generation, had knowledge of only one John the Apostle, the author of the documents handed down under this revered name.\textsuperscript{227} In a significant narrative recorded by Eusebius concerning John the Apostle, we are informed by Clement that after the death of the tyrant Domitian, the apostle John, who was of extreme age, left the island of Patmos to move to Ephesus.\textsuperscript{228} Clement makes sure to record this testimony for the benefit of the community of the faithful in his homily on Mark 10:17-31 "Quis dives salvetur?" when he speaks of a "narrative, handed down and committed to the custody of memory, about the Apostle John."\textsuperscript{229}

Actual confirmation for Clement's belief in the commended teaching of the Apocalypse comes out of a diverse selection of passages from his work. In one part where he is speaking of the degrees of glory in heaven, he cites the testimony of the Seer of Patmos in reference to Rev 4:4, 11:16, with "as John says in the Apocalypse" and a little further down he summarizes all that has preceded with "the Scriptures say".\textsuperscript{230} He also introduces a quotation connected to the multitude with the "white robes" (Rev 6:11, 7:9) with the simple formula, "The Apocalypse says" "[\textit{Apokaluyi} f\hspace{0.1em}hsin]",\textsuperscript{231} and in another where he speaks of "the four-and-twenty

\textsuperscript{224} For the ambiguous relationship between Clement and Origen ("Origen never quotes Clement by name"), see Henri Crouzel, \textit{Origen}, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), 7f.; see Eusebius, who speaks clearly of Clement's succession of Pantaenus "of the catechetical instruction in Alexandria" and of Origen "while still a boy, was one of his [Clement's] pupils": \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 6.6.

\textsuperscript{225} Following Epiphanius, who, Griggs informs us, "records two traditions known in his day", "\textit{Klhvmh te, on fasiv tine} \textit{Alexandreva, eteroi de, Aqhnai'ri}" Quoted from C. Wilfred Griggs, \textit{Early Egyptian Christianity: From its origins to 451 CE}, (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 56.

\textsuperscript{226} Griggs, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{227} During the Hellenistic age \textit{\textit{Iwavnnh}} "was especially popular amongst the priesthood": \textit{TABD} (Vol. 3), art. "John", S. T. Carrol, 886.

\textsuperscript{228} Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.23; the context would indicate that Eusebius understood Clement to mean Domitian. Also note when citing Irenaeus and Clement in this section Eusebius writes, "[t]hey should be trustworthy who have maintained the orthodoxy of the Church...": \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{229} \textit{Quis div. salv.} 42.

\textsuperscript{230} \textit{Strom.}, 6.13.

\textsuperscript{231} \textit{ibid.}, 2.11.
The Apocalypse

232 Further evidence which would indicate not only his own position on the book, but also that of the Church of Alexandria, is shown in a passage where he says that certain women who sought to defend their taste for precious stones by appealing to the description of the sacred stones of the heavenly city (Rev 21:18-21), "comprehend not the symbolism of Scripture." In another place he speaks of "οὗτος ἡμών ἐν τῇ Ἀποκάλυψις." To this we might add the information from Eusebius that in his Hypotyposes Clement gave "abridged accounts of all the canonical Scripture" from which we could reasonably suppose that the Book of Revelation was included. It is not without interest, here, that though Eusebius is silent on the Apoc he makes sure to mention that Clement did not omit the "disputed books" which included "the so-called Apocalypse of Peter." 235

It would appear then, from this very reasonable evidence, that the matter at least in regards to Clement was closed. However, apart from the fact that his use of the Apoc is much less frequent compared to the other ecclesiastical writers who accepted the book (though that in itself is not crucial), upon closer inspection there are some difficulties that need to be examined. In the place where we are told that he comments on all the "canonical Scripture", he is said to also offer an exposition on the Epistle of Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter, and even on the so-called "antilegomena" αντιλεγομενα. His works show that with the exception of 2Peter and 3John, and possibly James, he made use of and regarded as authoritative all of the documents in the present NT Canon. However, what they also appear to show is that the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas amongst others were, as Lee M. McDonald notes, "also quoted in support of his ideas." 237

We have seen that Clement believed that the Book of Revelation had been written by John the Apostle. 238 But a problem arises because Clement would appear to also be ascribing

233 Paed. 2.13.
234 Clemens Alexandrinus Theol., Fragmenta, TLG (0555 008) 11.2.
236 ibid.
238 Apostolicity in the traditional sense is not absent from the workings of Clement. He traces the origin of the Gospel of Mark to Saint Peter: Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 2.15.
'apostolicity' to 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas, for he introduces quotations from these
texts with the form "the apostle says".\textsuperscript{239} And so it would seem fair to conclude, at least on
this point, that evidence put forward for Clement's use of the Apoc as commended and
apostolic remains suspect. Coupled to this inexactness of the apparent use of certain post-
apostolic writings on the level with the documents of the NT,\textsuperscript{240} there is also a similar
problem of Clement's ambiguity of a specific distinction between Scripture and non-
scriptures.\textsuperscript{241} But does all this, as Stonehouse appears to initially suggest, make Clement's
authoritative use of the Apoc lose force? No. For then he rightly counters that the same
author's inexact language, which at the same time declares his cognizance of the recognition
of a select group of documents,\textsuperscript{242} is well illustrated when we find that though he recognizes
only four gospels, he does in fact appeal to others (the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of
the Egyptians, and the Tradition of Matthias).\textsuperscript{243} John Behr's following insight into Clement's
so-called 'inconsistencies' greatly helps to explain where this impreciseness in his work is
most probably derived from:

Clement was a complex and subtle thinker, yet he was in no sense systematic, especially
in his terminology. Indeed, in the \textit{Stromateis} he deliberately aims to be obscure, "to
speak imperceptibly, to exhibit secretly and demonstrate silently",\textsuperscript{244} ... [w]e must,
therefore, pay careful attention not only to his overt assertions, but also to the movement
of his thought, with all its tensions and \textit{apparent inconsistencies}.\textsuperscript{245}

Though some might wish to argue that this impreciseness could show that Clement is not
overly anxious about an authoritative list of NT documents, it would be a rash and
unsatisfactory conclusion. On the contrary, he is sensitive to the whole question of a select

\textsuperscript{239} See for example \textit{Strom}. 4.17; but why cannot this be a rank of reverence? Clement obviously knew that
this title could not in any way be here applied literally.

\textsuperscript{240} See for instance Clement's reference to another apocalyptic work, \textit{The Shepherd of Hermas}, "[d]ivinely,
therefore, the power which spoke to Hermas by revelation said...": \textit{ibid.}, 1.29.

\textsuperscript{241} But as Gamble has expertly demonstrated in the context of early Christian literature, "[t]here is no
justification in bibliographic terms, for example, for an a priori discrimination between scriptural and

\textsuperscript{242} Which is connected to Clement's fundamental position on the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures:
\textit{Iwvnh" Panagovpoulo"}, \textit{JH JErhnneiva Th'" JAgiva" Grafh'" Sthvn JEkklhisa Twh Patewn} (\textit{Aschoe:

\textsuperscript{243} McDonald, \textit{op. cit.}, 200; Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 115.

\textsuperscript{244} \textit{Strom}. 1.1.15.

\textsuperscript{245} Behr, \textit{Asceticism and Anthropology}, 131f. [italics added]
group of sacred and commended books which are distinguished and set apart.\textsuperscript{246} Stonehouse, however, makes too much of the fact that when Clement refers to the OT and NT it is generally not as writings but "rather to dispensations or covenants."\textsuperscript{247} Evidence shows that Clement is cognizant of the important connection of the idea of sacred texts to both collections of authoritative writings. From the \textit{Hypotyposes}, in a fragment saved by Eusebius, we find "that he [Clement] accepted the fourfold canon of the Gospels... and insists upon the accord of the teaching of the Synoptics and John."\textsuperscript{248} This is not surprising when we recall Jerome's high praise of the Alexandrian, that he was "the most learned of all the fathers."\textsuperscript{249} On more than one occasion Clement will use the specific term NT to refer to a document or to a collection of texts.\textsuperscript{250} Though he does not apply his terms of scriptural reference consistently;\textsuperscript{251} nevertheless, there is no doubt that he understands the authority of the apostles as being equal to that of the prophets.\textsuperscript{252} Where, for example, he writes of "the Scriptures" as the criterion by which truth and heresy are to be distinguished, Clement says "[f]or we have, as the source of teaching, the Lord, both the prophets, the Gospel, and the blessed apostles."\textsuperscript{253} In a poetic refrain he describes the "harmony" of the prophets and the apostles as an "ecclesiastical symphony."\textsuperscript{254} It is the one Lord who speaks authoritatively in both the tradition of the Holy Scriptures and in later Church tradition. This position demonstrates to the heretics that between the law and the prophets, on the one hand, and the \textit{diakvkh} introduced by the Lord at His coming, on the other, there is complete agreement.\textsuperscript{255} More

\textsuperscript{246} See Metzger for a list of the technical terms employed by Clement to set apart his books, including the word 'canon', which Clement uses "some twenty-one times in several different connections": Metzger, \textit{The Canon}, 131.

\textsuperscript{247} Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 112.

\textsuperscript{248} Metzger, \textit{The Canon}, 132; Clement, however, also knows of the \textit{ap\i\v{g}raf\i}, of the 'unwritten sayings' attributed to Jesus "not written in the canonical Gospels": \textit{ibid}; perhaps this broad terminology used by our writer, is but a result of a normal consequence given his connection to a great school and rich libraries. For discussion on this interesting topic to do with early Christian libraries (both private and public) and the catechetical school at Alexandria "as a school of higher Christian studies": see Harry Y. Gamble, \textit{Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts} (London: Yale University Press, 1995), 154-161.

\textsuperscript{249} \textit{Ep.}, 70.4.


\textsuperscript{251} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{252} In one place he will refer to the "Testaments" in close proximity to "the prophets and apostles": \textit{Strom.} 1:9.

\textsuperscript{253} \textit{Ibid.}, 7.16; see also his compelling testimony to the universal authority of the Scriptures where he comments on 2Tim 3:16: \textit{Exhort.} 9.

\textsuperscript{254} \textit{Strom.} 6.11.

\textsuperscript{255} \textit{Ibid.}, 6.15.
evidence for this position is found in the author's vigorous appeal to tradition which was before all heresies. Clement of Alexandria declares:

[i]n the nature of the One, then, is associated in a joint heritage the one Church, which they strive to cut asunder into many sects. Therefore in substance and idea, in origin, in pre-eminence, we say that the ancient and Catholic Church is alone, collecting as it does into the unity of the one faith- which results from the peculiar Testaments, or rather the one Testament in different times by the will of the one God through one Lord...  

Thomas F. Torrance has spoken fluently on the hermeneutics of Clement, as indeed he has on the theology of other Fathers. Here what is of particular interest to us is his thought on Clement's theology which helps to further explain the Alexandrian's inconsistency in the use of the canonical Scripture, and which also reveals how Tradition was the safe-guard when the 'technical' language of theology was still being determined. That is, that the testimony of the Scriptures, themselves, and the statements of the Church, did not become "detached from any objective ground in the eternal being and truth of God." Torrance continues to describe this double tension (a problem which "faced" the Church in the 2nd and 3rd centuries):

Clement's theology is not easy to interpret consistently. On the one hand, it is deeply traditional, and takes pains to apply to it rigorous scientific method (ἐπιστήμη) in order to let the truth disclose itself in its own light and nature, unobstructed and undistorted by preconceived opinion. On the other hand, however, he operates with philosophical and cosmological assumptions that have far-reaching epistemological implications (γνώσις) and that determine from behind both his understanding of the saving economy in the heart of the kerygma and his interpretation of the Scriptures where that is set forth.

Clement does not speak of a millennium, and his general eschatology is in contradistinction to the eschatological approach and earthly expectations of the chiliasts. The strong element of Platonism that figures in his work, and his allegorical exegesis, would have none of the literal and materialistic interpretations and excesses that had come to be associated with chiliasm. For Clement it is the communion of the soul with God and its separation from all

256 ibid., 7.17.
257 Thomas F. Torrance Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 152; in considering Clement and his challenging use of 'canon' per se I have sometimes reflected on a similar but more contemporary example of the knotty or evolving use of fundamental terminology, that of Marshall McLuhan's use of the word "media" throughout his own widely recognized canon, see Eric McLuhan & Frank Zingrone, Essential McLuhan, (Ontario: BasicBooks, 1995).
258 Torrance, op. cit., 154.
259 See, for instance, this acknowledgment for the Greek philosopher in the passage "Plato an imitator of Moses in Framing Laws": Strom. 1.25; 5.14; see also Behr, Ascticism and Anthropology, 137.
things which comes before him as the highest of all virtues; this is the "final vision of God in \textit{gnosis}".\textsuperscript{260} "Knowledge \([\text{gnwsi}^{\text{[15]}}]\)\textquotedblright, writes Clement, "is essentially a contemplation of existences on the part of the soul, either of a certain thing or of certain things, and when perfected, of all together.\textsuperscript{261} It is necessary to recognize this predilection of his eschatological theology because it could explain "or at least partly account", as Stonehouse has knowingly pointed out, "for the infrequency of his use of the Apocalypse.\textsuperscript{262} And although, for example, \textit{The Shepherd of Hermas} is cited more frequently by our author than the Apoc, the former is not spoken of as Scripture.\textsuperscript{263} Once again, the controlling hermeneutic points to the Church, the \textit{congregatio sanctorum} which reads both texts, but raises only one to the level of sacred.

\textbf{Tertullian} (AD c. 160-220), \textit{prov.}, Carthage, northern Africa

\textit{Revelation of John, De res. carn.} 25

Some fair discussion has centred on the question of whether or not Tertullian favoured a chiliastic eschatology prior to his conversion to Montanism.\textsuperscript{264} We know that this great western Christian, the first of the Latins to write a magisterial theology,\textsuperscript{265} converted to the revelation of Montanus "during his middle period around 207-8."\textsuperscript{266} We also know that his moral treatise \textit{De spectaculis}, in which his unreserved condemnation of public games is voiced, was written sometime about AD 197.\textsuperscript{267} This is important, for in this treatise we find the exclamation of "that fast-approaching advent of our Lord" and "the city New Jerusalem".\textsuperscript{268} This language is strong in chiliastic overtones and theology. As we might expect, it is especially in his Montanist treatises, in this instance the \textit{De fuga in persecutione},

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{260} Behr, \textit{ibid.}, 193; see especially John Behr's meticulous treatment of Clement's theology of "The Higher Christian Life", in the context of \textit{gnosis}, \textit{apatheia}, and \textit{agape}: \textit{ibid.}, 185-207.
  \item \textsuperscript{261} \textit{Strom.}, 6.8.
  \item \textsuperscript{262} Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 116.
  \item \textsuperscript{263} \textit{ibid.}
  \item \textsuperscript{264} Wainwright, has, I believe, interpreted fundamental passages from Tertullian in their proper 'chiliastic' context: Arthur W. Wainwright, \textit{Mysterious Apocalypse: Interpreting the Book of Revelation}, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 23-28.
  \item \textsuperscript{265} Major reconsiderations of Tertullian's theology and influence on the formation of Western Christian tradition are two recently published works which have been cited for their sharp and sustained analysis of the Latin doctor's theological thought: David Rankin, \textit{Tertullian and the Church}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), and Eric Osborn, \textit{Tertullian: First Theologian of the West}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
  \item \textsuperscript{266} This is the position of Osborn (and others), who continues to say that it was then [AD 207-8] "when signs of Montanist influence begin to appear": Osborn, \textit{ibid.}, 9; see also Johannes Quasten (Vol. II), \textit{op. cit.}, 247.
  \item \textsuperscript{267} Quasten, \textit{ibid.}, 293.
  \item \textsuperscript{268} \textit{De Spect.} 30.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
From the Muratorian Fragment to Origen of Alexandria

that we find expressions of his strong conviction that the last time is present, "with Antichrist now close at hand". In this eschatological framework he sets his defence of the doctrines introduced by the New Prophets, their entry had ushered in the final world epoch, and the church was now ready for the things that could not be placed upon her before. The emphasis is upon the Kingdom of God as an everlasting and heavenly possession, but he says this shall be preceded by a "kingdom [is] promised to us upon the earth." It will be another state of existence "inasmuch as it will be after the resurrection for a thousand years in the divinely-built city of Jerusalem." These things, declares Tertullian, "Ezekiel had knowledge of and the Apostle John beheld." The Book of Revelation had become a major reference in his scriptural armoury.

Fundamental to the contention of Tertullian is the Montanist view that the prophets of the Paraclete are not innovative, and that their presence in the last world epoch as prophets of a special message from the Spirit to the Church, should not be considered something extraordinary, "[it] is a part of our belief". From this position he proceeds to argue that the ecstasy of these last harbingers is an inseparable characteristic of true prophets, for, as Tertullian argues, "in the cause of the new prophecy, that to grace ecstasy or rapture is incident". The Latin doctor, who grasps well the central significance of the biblical revelation to his faith and the principle of the Rule of Faith, cites the famous Pentecost pericope from the Book of Joel (2:28f.) and says that through the new prophecy, "which descends in copious streams from the Paraclete" (the ultimate fulfilment of that OT scripture), the perplexities of the past are now dispersed "by the open and perspicuous explanation of the entire mystery." This was the final outpouring of the Spirit which fell upon the Montanist

269 Fug. 12; this treatise, addressed to Tertullian's friend Fabius, "has ample evidence for the Montanist point of view (ch.1; 11; 14)", says Johannes Quasten, "[t]hus it ought to be dated in the year 212 AD": Quasten (Vol. II), 310.
270 For thorough treatments on Tertullian's theology of the Church, see Osborne, op. cit., 163-182, and Rankin, op. cit., 91-116. "Tertullian's presentation of the church as the Body of Christ is reflected in his employment of the images 'corpus', 'Christus', 'Spiritus' and 'trinity'": ibid., 112.
271 Ad Marc. 3.24.
272 ibid.
273 ibid.
274 Adv. Marc. 3.25.
275 ibid., 4.22.
276 "For wherever it shall be manifest that the true Christian rule and faith shall be, there will likewise be the true Scriptures and expositions thereof, and all the Christian traditions": De praescr. haer. 19.
277 De res. carn. 63.
prophets and the immediate assembly of their followers.\textsuperscript{278} It is only on account of this ultimate revelation of the \textit{Paraclete} that "righteousness" has progressed to maturity after being first in a rudimentary state, having a natural fear of God:

\begin{quote}
...from that stage it advanced, through the Law and the Prophets, to infancy; from that stage it passed, through the Gospel, to the fervour of youth: now, through the Paraclete it is settling into maturity.\textsuperscript{279}
\end{quote}

Tertullian, in his sustained polemic against the penitential discipline of the Church of North Africa, \textit{De pudicitia} [On Modesty], warns that any who do not recognize the Paraclete in these "special prophets" cannot make claim to the Holy Spirit nor possess Him "in and through the Apostles" as they would want to demonstrate.\textsuperscript{280} So it follows that he would deny these "heathens and heretics" the revelation of the Paraclete and petition to the Scriptures for they "have received another".\textsuperscript{281} On the other hand, he appeals to the oracles of the new prophets with the same legitimacy as he would cite the prophecies of both Old and New Testaments. Not only are the new prophets the harbingers of the Spirit's new revelation and can be legitimately read alongside the other authoritative writings, but this new revelation also explains the earlier one which was made to the Apostles themselves.\textsuperscript{282} We should also expect it to supersede the first revelation as the end of the present world order, the \textit{Age of the Paraclete}, draws nearer.\textsuperscript{283}

I should stress, here, that Tertullian did not hold to the oracles of the Montanists as adding to the Gospel, and that he accepted as normative and authoritative the same documents as the Church. "Along with Irenaeus", writes R. Kearsley, "he [Tert] laid the foundation for a tradition of biblical interpretation that assumed the substantial unity of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures."\textsuperscript{284} \"The Paraclete\", Tertullian is anxious to emphasize, "introduces nothing new" [\textit{nihil novi Paracletus inducit}].\textsuperscript{285} Tertullian's "breakaway from the Catholic

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{278} Tertullian describes this fundamental Montanist principle in the typological context of the Lucan account of the Transfiguration (Lk 9:28-36): \textit{Adv. Marc}. 4.22., cf also \textit{De res. carn}. 63.

\textsuperscript{279} \textit{De virg. vel}. 1.

\textsuperscript{280} \textit{De pud}. 12.

\textsuperscript{281} \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{282} \textit{De res. carn}. 63; "The uniqueness of the apostolic witness", writes David Rankin, "is by no means undermined, but rather reinforced. An important example is Tertullian's validation of the status, work, and authority of the Spirit by reference to the so-called 'Paraclete' passages from John 14-16": Rankin, \textit{op. cit.}, 48.

\textsuperscript{283} For "the Scriptures", says Tertullian, "indicate the stages of the last times": \textit{De res. carn}. 25.

\textsuperscript{284} "Tertullian" in Donald K. McKim (ed.), \textit{art.}, R. Kearsley, 60-65.

\textsuperscript{285} \textit{De monogamia} 3.9.
\end{footnotes}
Church”, as David Rankin and others argue, "need not be exaggerated; for he fought only on the narrow front of penitential discipline.” The oracles are a separate revelation; they are linked to the writings of the Apostles in the same way as the latter were linked to the Prophets. Importantly for the investigator into the canonical thought of Tertullian, it must be understood that for him the era of apostolic revelation was closed. And it is from within this canonical affirmation that he speaks of the authoritative collection of documents as the NT, but also frequently with the term instrumentum. In addition to the Gospel of John and the First Epistle, the Seer's Apocalypse (as we shall note) is well established in this collection.

How does an apparently orthodox and legalistic mind like that of Tertullian's defend the new teachings introduced by the Montanists? His defence of these innovations is essentially centred on the one argument, that of the revelation of the "new prophecy which is a part of our belief". These select few initiated into "the word" made known that the Church was now prepared to accept teaching that was not possible previously, but was now because the appearance of the new prophets had ushered in the end-times. As Tertullian immersed himself increasingly into the world-view of the Montanist, millenarianism became a part of his belief system. Though he is orthodox in his claim that the Kingdom of God is eternal and heavenly, he does add that this eternal kingdom will be preceded by another kingdom on

---

286 Rankin, op. cit., 29; see especially the well drawn out conclusions in Rankin's chapter where he examines the reasons for the persistent and erroneous view, in his judgement, that Tertullian defected from the Church to join a "schismatic conventicle": Tertullian's relationship to the Catholic Church, 27-40.

287 Adv. Marc. 5.17; it is certainly surprising to note "that Tertullian himself refers to Montanist oracles on only six occasions in his entire extant corpus": Rankin, op. cit., 47.

288 De monogamia 3.9; see Rankin, op. cit., 47f.

289 Kearsley, op. cit., 63f.

290 Here I am grateful to David Rankin for unravelling to me Tertullian's uses of "instrument" and "testament". Tertullian makes use of the terms instrumentum and testamentum for "Testament" almost interchangeably. At Adv. Marc. 4.1.1 he speaks of the two instrumenti and at 4.6.1 of the veteris et novi testamenti (Old and New Testaments) and at 5.11.4 of the testamentum novum (also at Adv. Prax 31.1 and de Pud. 6.5). When talking of the Old and New Covenants, as distinct from the collection of writings, he almost invariably uses testimonium. He employs testamentum as a Latin equivalent for the Gk. diakonh. David Rankin<DavidR@uccentre.ucaqld.com.au> "Tertullian". Mon, 18 Mar 2002. MGMichael<mgjm@1earth.net>.


292 On the ministerial office of the prophet in Tertullian's thought where he is "concerned to demonstrate that godly prophecy had not ceased with John the Baptist but was alive and flourishing in the New Prophecy movement", see Rankin, op. cit., 183-185.

293 Adv. Marc. 3.24; yet it is not, as Eric Osborn tell us, "[t]he spectacular millenarianism if Irenaeus": Osborn, op. cit., 216.
This earthly kingdom will be experienced in another state of being, for it follows the resurrection and it will continue for one thousand years in the "divinely-built city of Jerusalem let down from heaven." Not surprisingly, given his moral austerity, Tertullian's concept of the millennium does not dwell on the material descriptions of the earlier chiliasts. Though he is convinced that time will end for the millennial age to begin, the emphasis here is on a heavenly city and spiritual blessings.

He was an uncompromising opponent of heresy, and at one stage he would deny gnostics the Scriptures for fear that they would be misused. Even declaring that on account of the "open and perspicuous explanation of the entire mystery, through the new prophecy, which descends in copious streams from the Paraclete" he was able to refute the use of the Scriptures by heretics. Yet at the same time, together with his appeals to the testamenti, he would also authoritatively cite the oracles of the New Prophets. The oracles (which are part of the new revelation) confirm, explain and succeed the earlier revelation made to the apostles, for the age is coming to a close. This final outpouring of the Spirit is upon the prophets of the Montanist community and upon those who follow them.

Tertullian, directly acknowledges the Book of Revelation as the work of "the Apostle John" or "John", most significantly in the treatise De paenitentia [Concerning Repentance] of "the Spirit" and in another instance in the tract against the gnostic Hermogenes of Carthage he appears to be saying that the words of the Apoc are in fact, those of Christ Himself. At other times he will simply cite the book as the "Revelation" or the "Revelation of John".

---

294 ibid.


296 "...and fruits thereof": ibid.

297 De praescript. 15.3.

298 De res. carn. 63.

299 ibid.

300 "And the word of the new prophecy which is a part of our belief": Adv. Marc. 3.24.

301 Ad. Marc. 3.24:6; Scap. 4,8; for Tertullian's scheme of the end-times "where the second advent of Christ is pivotal", see Osborn, op. cit., 209-224.

302 Adv. Marc. 3.14, 24 (Rev 1:16, 20:4-6); Scorp. 12 (Rev 21:8).

303 De paenit. 8.


306 De fuga 7 (Rev 21:8).
And in another instance pointing to Rev 22:18-19, he refers to the Apoc as "the written word". He appeals authoritatively to the Apoc in support of his chiliastic theology, and quotes the Apoc using the traditional formula "it is written" [scriptum est]. He even cites the Apoc in showing an example of the heresies condemned by the Apostles. In one other place after appealing to Paul's letters in support of his position (that we should not flee persecution), he refers to the teaching of John and cites 1Jn and then prompts the attention of his readers to the Apoc, "his own [John's] Revelation." In one other passage Peter, James, John and Paul are spoken of as "the School of Christ", who were appointed "masters to instruct us in all points", to which declaration are added citations from 1Pet, 1Jn, and the Apoc (Rev 2:10,13, 3:10, 6:9, 7:14, 17:6, 21:8). Finally, in his important treatise dealing with ecclesiastical authority, De pudicitia [On Modesty], in which chapters twelve to nineteen are addressed to the teaching of the apostolic instrument on adultery, the latter chapter will in part counter the objections from the Book of Revelation. Tertullian's obvious sympathies for the cause of Montanism does not confuse his position on the NT Canon, his understanding of a closed group of NT documents, or his extreme regard for apostolic teaching and the Rule of Faith.

**Hippolytus of Rome** (d. AD c. 235), prov., Asia Minor-Rome

*Blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord, Antichr. 36*

Hippolytus of Rome was in varying degrees a paradox. He was the first anti-pope, yet died as a martyr in AD 235, to be later venerated as a saint. This priest, whose sermon *On the Praise of our Lord and Saviour* was heard by his contemporary Origen, was also the last...

---

307 *De res. carn.* 25, 27 (Rev 14:4; 6:9-10).
308 *Adv. Herm.* 22; elsewhere in the context of eschatology as a component of “the Scriptures”: *De res. carn.* 25.
310 *De exhort. cast.* 7 (on Rev 1:6).
311 "John", Tertullian tells us, "in the Apocalypse is charged to chastise": *Præscript.* 33. In the same chapter he refers to 1Jn (re. the Antichrists), and cites it in terms of "his [John's] epistle": *ibid.*
312 *De fuga* 9; in this chapter also, where he speaks of the author of the Apoc, Tertullian begins with the awesome words, "[t]he teaching of the apostles was surely in everything according to the mind of God: they forgot and omitted nothing of the Gospel": *ibid.*
313 *Scorp.* 12.
314 He says in one place referring to Rev 21:8, "[i]n short, this Apocalypse... has assigned..."; *De pud.* 19.
315 For full discussion on Tertullian's "constitutionalist" doctrine of the Church, see Rankin, *op. cit.*, 55-116; "[t]he Rule of Faith is witnessed to by the tradition of the church and its order...": R. F. Evans, quoted from Rankin, *ibid.*, 197.
Christian author of Rome to write in Greek.\textsuperscript{317} That he was even a Roman, however, is not certain. It is more probable, as Johannes Quasten argues, that he actually came from the East.\textsuperscript{318} Some of the chief reasons for this conclusion (apart from the language in which he chose to write) are Hippolytus' impressive knowledge of Greek philosophy, his familiarity with the Greek mystery cults, and the relation of his teaching of the Logos to the Greek theologians, which would indicate a Hellenistic training and certainly at least some association with Alexandria.\textsuperscript{319} He wrote across a number of theological subjects, but he was particularly drawn to the anti-heretical treatise. Speculation that would make him a disciple of Irenaeus (originally claimed by Photius) is difficult to prove.\textsuperscript{320}

As Bernard McGinn reports, the third century AD witnessed two new developments in the literalist understanding of the figure of Antichrist, "the rise of a double Antichrist tradition, and the beginnings of attempts to describe the appearance of the Final Enemy."\textsuperscript{321} In these unfolding end-time deliberations Hippolytus will make copious and direct references to the Book of Revelation. The high judgement of the Apoc in the writings of Hippolytus is absolute after a review of his dogmatic tract on the Antichrist [\textit{Peri; tou' antikrivstou}],\textsuperscript{322} which is addressed to a "beloved brother" Theophilus and his commentary on the Book of Daniel.\textsuperscript{323} The Holy Scripture, which he understands to be comprised of the received and authoritative

\textsuperscript{317} For a concise introduction of the life, thought, and writings of Hippolytus, see "\textit{Hippolutus}" in \textit{QKHE} (Tom 6), 990-996. Marcel Richard speaks generally of Hippolytus' concentrated theological method, "\textit{Hippolutus' a\i\perg, pd\perg, sugkekrimevnhn skevin. Exali\perg, af hghthtv, den hgapa ta, af hhrnnea} \textsuperscript{618}"; \textit{ibid.}, 995.

\textsuperscript{318} Quasten (Vol. II), 163f.


\textsuperscript{320} Photius the Great (AD 810-895) calls Hippolytus "the pupil of Irenaeus", when he makes a reference to the former's \textit{Syntagma} [\textit{Pro\perg, a\perg, a\perg, ta, a\perg, a}]; \textit{Bibl. cod.} 121.


\textsuperscript{322} Written around AD 200, the tract is preserved in the original Greek, but it also survives in Old Slavonic and Georgian translations. Hippolytus himself in his later treatise on the \textit{Commentary on Daniel} refers to the tract as his own: \textit{In Dan}. 4.7.1. cf. also 13.1.

\textsuperscript{323} Of Hippolytus' best preserved exegetical treatises, Johannes Quasten tells us, is \textit{The Commentary on Daniel}. It was written sometime about AD 204 "and represents the earliest known exegetical treatise of the Christian Church that we possess": Quasten (Vol II), 171. Most of the text is extant in the original Greek [in the fragments], and in its entirety in Old Slavonic. In the first book Hippolytus "deals with the story of Susanna... [and] sees in her the prefiguration of the immaculate Bride of Christ, the Church..."; \textit{ibid.}, 171f.
writings of the NT and OT,\textsuperscript{324} is the source of all revelation and Truth (on account of "the Word").\textsuperscript{325} As if wanting to incontrovertibly underscore this canonical location to his readers, Hippolytus saturates these works in scriptural citation from both Testaments; especially Daniel, which provided the theologian with much of the material for his discoursing on the Antichrist.\textsuperscript{326} It should be noted, that the word itself, "\textit{antikristo'}"\textsuperscript{327} is nowhere mentioned in Book of Revelation (it is connected to the "beast" [\textit{qhrion}] of Rev 13). The term, 'antichrist', "not found outside Christian circles"\textsuperscript{327} is, however, importantly enough, borrowed from the Johannine corpus: 1Jn 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2Jn 7.\textsuperscript{328}

It is certainly notable that for the most part, early writers dealing with the persona of the antichrist and the symbolism of the Roman Empire, have been able to approach their study of these end-time subjects outside what we may term today a western capitalist perspective of history (emphasis on the \textit{persona}), or a Marxist-Leninist interpretation (emphasis on the \textit{cult}).\textsuperscript{329} "Historians", as Ian Kershaw says, "have always had to face up to the difficult task of balancing the relative importance of 'personality' and impersonal 'structures' and forces in the process of historical development."\textsuperscript{330} The broad balance that we encounter in the patristic treatises on the examination of history generally, and on the apocalyptic subject more specifically, I believe, is due fundamentally to the following reasons: first, the espousal of a theology that understands \textit{revelation} to be consummated in the Son of Man who "lives among us";\textsuperscript{331} and second, the deliberate \textit{con}-fusion by the Seer of Patmos of the eschatological \textit{cosmic villains} themselves.\textsuperscript{332} And so, the \textit{persona} becomes the \textit{cult}, and the \textit{cult} becomes the \textit{persona}.\textsuperscript{333}

\textsuperscript{324} "Scripture itself": Antichr. 67; Homily on the Heresy of Noetus, 9.
\textsuperscript{325} Kat \textalpha\textit{pa\v{s}h\v{n al\v{f}ere\v{n e\v{g}co"}': 28, 29.
\textsuperscript{326} Antichr., \textit{passim}; In Dan., \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{327} Arndt and Gingrich, \textit{op. cit.}, 76.
\textsuperscript{328} The term 'Antichrist', as Brown writes, "peculiar to the Johannine Epistles in the NT, represents a convergence of various background factors in Judaism": see Ramond E. Brown's critical excursus of the term, The Epistles of John, (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 332-337; cf. also 2Thess 2:1-12 for Saint Paul's discourse on the \textit{man of lawlessness [\textit{qhrion}]}]. For an instructive discussion, see F. F. Bruce, \textit{1&2 Thessalonians}, (Texas: Word Books, 1982), 159-188.
\textsuperscript{329} This is especially evident in the differing approaches that modern historians have taken in their reviews of Hitler and Nazi Germany, see Ian Kershaw, \textit{Profiles in Power: Hitler}, (London: Longman, 1991), 1-15.
\textsuperscript{330} \textit{ibid.}, 4.
\textsuperscript{332} See M. G. Michael, \textit{Thesis} 125-175.
\textsuperscript{333} In modern times this can be typically exemplified in the reign of the former Soviet ruler, Joseph Stalin, see Edvard Radzinsky, \textit{Stalin}, (Great Britain: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996), \textit{passim}. 
In numerous places throughout this thesis we have found strong contacts between canonical criticism and the Eastern Orthodox conception of Canon and Church Consciousness. Another contact as I have already suggested, is that of typology. John Breck (following Georges Barrois) says, that "[t]ypology is based upon the premise that historical events in Israel's history are related in terms either of 'promise and fulfillment' or of 'prototype to antitype'."\(^{334}\)

Now, there is a plentiful and well-known treasure-house of such examples, but Hippolytus (similarly to Irenaeus), adds another dimension to this theology by extending it to an archetypal realm\(^{335}\) to include a parallel address of the 'opposites'. The following passage from his treatise on the Antichrist is marvellously emblematic. It begins with the comparative figure of the "lion" [leōn] (cf. Rev 5:5) which ideally belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ, but which, will be deceitfully claimed by the Antichrist in his futile efforts to usurp the Son of God:

\[
\text{Tou=meh ouÅn kuri¿ou kai]=swth}=moj hòw½ Xristou= Ihs ou=tou=uiou=tou=qeou=diatolbasilikoh kai]=Aðoc=m= wj leênto=j proekhrugmehou, to)b auto=tropoj ka}il to)b a]htigor=stoj o}moinj leênta proa]nhgorou=sa]= an ai], grafaidialto]turannikoh auto]=kai]=bi]=qion. kata]=pahta gat e]momialoj= qai boul}=etai o=p]hajoj t½w½wi½ t}=ou=qeou]=le}=wn me]=o] Xristoj, kai]=le}=wn me]=o] a]htigor=stoj, basi]=le]=uj o] Xristoj, kai]=bas]=le]=uj e]p}geloi]=o] a]htigor=stoj, e]wei]=gh o] s}=wtht wj a]m}gni]=n, ka}il auto]=o}moinj fa}n]=h}setai wj a]m}gni]=n, e]A}=doen i]koj wü, e]mperi]=gor}j=} o}h}g}en o] s}wtht e}=j to)b k}=so]=m}en, kai]=a}uto]=o}moinj e}leu]=setai. a]=pe]=tele}n o]=ku}r}=oj tou} ap]=ost}==fo]=uj e}=j pa}=hta ta]le}=ñh, kai]=a}uto]=o}moinj= p}=em}y}e}j ye]=da]=p}=o]=sto]=fo]=uj. su}=nh}g}=e}=ta]d}i]=s}e]=k}r}=p}=i]=sm}eh}a]= p}=o]=b}=ta= o]=s}wtht, kai]=a}uto]=o}moinj e}pi]=n}=u}=na}=ç}=e}=i= to)=b} d}ies}k}r}=p}=i]=sm}eh}o]=la}== =hm} t}w}h} le}d}ai]=ñh. e}=å}=w}k}=e}=n o]=ku}r}=oj s}f}=r}=gi]=ñ}a}= to}=j e}=j a}=uto]=p}=i]=ste}=u]=b}=u]=s}in, kai]=a}uto]=d}w}se]=i]=o}moinj. e}=h} s}=xh}=m}=ati a]=h}=q}=r}w}=p}=ou e}=f}a]=ñh}= o]= ku}r}=oj, kai]=a}uto]=e}=h} s}=xh}=m}=ati a]=h}=q}=r}w}=p}=ou e}=leu]=setai. a]=h}=ë}=ths}e}n o]=s}wtht kai]=a}=p]=e}=de}i]=se} th} a]=m}gi]=ñ= ]sa}=ñ}=ka a}=uto]=w}=j =na}=ñh, kai]=a}uto]=a]=h)=}a}=ñh}se}i]=to}b} e}=h} l}e]=ro]=s}o]=u]=m}oj li]=g}i]=ñ}=o]=n]=n=na}=ñh. kai]=i]=ta]=u]=ñ= me]=t}al}=pl}=a]=ñ= a}=uto]=e}=x}=na]=m}=a}=ta} e}=h} to}=j} e}=t}h}e}=d}h}=l}w}=s}o}=m}=e}=n, nuni]=le}=j}p}=jo}=t}=l}=p}=o]=k}=e}=i]=me}=ñ}=o]=n} t}r}=p}a]=w}=m}=th}e}n.\(^{336}\)
\]

The Book of Revelation is an absolute component of Hippolytus' dogmatic locus, as it was for a whole group of ecclesiastical writers, members of the worshiping Church and who had come before him. Establishing, therefore, not only the authoritas of the Apoc as normative, but also commending it along the canonical guidelines of the sacred writings.\(^{337}\) This is


\(^{336}\) Antichr. 6.

\(^{337}\) Note also that in the catalogue of Hippolytus' lost writings are included two works specifically dealing with the defence of the Apoc against those who rejected the prophecy (the first of which Epiphanius of Salamis
openly evidenced by the author when he writes that the Scriptures themselves speak of "the coming of Antichrist" [h|tou ajnticristou parousia], and is then immediately authenticated when he says that his name [the Antichrist's] is "indicated by the number in the Scripture [ejn th' grafh]". Elsewhere in the same treatise [Antichr.], commenting once more on the "number of the beast", he expressly says, "the Holy Spirit [aqion pneuma] has also mystically indicated [mustikw ejdhvlwsen] his name [the Antichrist's] by means of a number." The antichrist figure is related to the notorious "666".

When Hippolytus directly proceeds to speak of the "beast coming up out of the earth" he writes, "John then speaks thus". Connecting the OT and NT in an eschatological argument, the prophet Isaiah is quoted (Isa 47:1-15) and Hippolytus in a rhetorical frame of mind asks, "[l]et us see now whether John has spoken to the same effect." He then immediately cites Rev 17 and proceeds with another question which importantly for us extends the focus onto apostolicity, "[t]ell me, blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord [lego moi, w makarie jIwavnh, apostole kai; maqhta; tou kurivou], what didst thou see and hear concerning Babylon?" We cannot help but note here, a similar exhortation to Saint John concerning the mysteries of the Apoc coming from the mouth of Gregory Nazianzus, "v' jwavnh didaskei me dia; th' apokaluyew".

Equally the prophetic charism, which is directly connected to eschatological discourse, is highlighted when John who "gives no false witness" [ouj yeudetai] is grouped together in elevated praise with Ezekiel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel who also speak of the "coming
The Apocalypse

of the Antichrist. He speaks of the "blessed prophets" who recount things "mystically" and then cites Rev 17:9, "[t]his calls for a mind with wisdom." The criterion of apostolicity here dominates and is connected to the prophetic office. On most occasions when Hippolytus, one of "the outstanding commentator[s]" for Averky Taushev, cites the Apoc he will introduce the pericope from the Seer's text with the simple but authoritatively accepted formula (reminiscent of the OT prophets): "John then speaks thus" or with "w' geγραπται", The Seer of Patmos is also one of "the prophets", The emphatic connection between apostolicity and prophecy takes on further significance that the Church, as Dumitru Staniloae expounds, is "the instrument for preserving revelation."

The "obstinate" Roman is a notable example of one who holds unreservedly to the authority of the Apoc and yet does not share overly in the chiliastic zeal which the book could inspire. He prefers to speak of the thousand year period not in literal terms, but rather as representing the entire span of an undisclosed eschatological moment, "as John says in His Apocalypse..." for a day with the Lord is as a thousand years." Is he purposely distancing himself from the more literal interpretation of the "thousand years" preferred by his great teacher Irenaeus and by Justin and Papias before him? By emphasizing the spiritual dimension of the millennial controversy he cannot be considered a chiliast in the strict sense, though like those, in that tradition before him, "chronological schemes" are certainly not outside his interest. It rests better, however, with the exposition of his eschatology to say, that Hippolytus is more

---

348 ibid., 19.
351 Antichr. 47.
352 Hippolytus, Commentarium in Danielem, TLG (2115 030) 4.52.4.4.
353 ibid., 4.33.2.1.
354 Dumitru Staniloae, op. cit., 53-78.
355 Tsaan, op. cit., 72.
356 ANF (Vol. V), 179; but this reference is not clear, who or what book is Hippolytus actually quoting, Ps 90:4 or 2Pet 3:8! Stonehouse misses this extraordinary misquote, citing it naturally as coming from Hippolytus' reading of the Apoc: Stonehouse, op. cit., 104.
357 For a concise summary of Hippolytus' "chronological scheme" from the combination of the creation week with Ps 90:4, Ex 25:10f., as well as Jn 19:14, see Stonehouse, ibid. 104f.
concerned with a general scheme of the end times rather than holding on to a strict literalist interpretation.358 This view also matches the eschatological plan of the Antichristus where he wants to make clear his position, that the destruction of the world will take place when the Lord returns "who shall bring the conflagration and just judgment upon all who have refused to believe on Him."359 "Hippolytus", as Constantine N. Tsirpanlis writes in the context of the kingdom of the saints (Rev 20:6), "emphasizes (in disagreement with Irenaeus) its spiritual nature and healing rather than its 'earthly' enjoyment and satisfaction in this creation."360 Nevertheless, W. Bousset rightly points out, that in places our early interpreter is inconsistent in his treatment of the Seer's prophecy.361 In this particular instance, his unexpected deviation from John's eschatological position on the Roman Empire.

Hippolytus is a fantastically rich source (demonstrably evident from the assembled data in our Appendix) during this middle course of the Apoc's adventure, and his witness presents an instructive paradigm in the context of a canonical criticism approach. First, he belongs to a link of successive Christian generations who received the book as it was commended, conferred with sacredness, and transmitted to the community of believers. In his case, it was also a reception from a line of episcopal and revered ecclesiastical exemplars going right back to the Apostle John himself: Hippolytus was disciple of Irenaeus, Irenaeus of Polycarp, and Polycarp of Saint John.362 Here the appeal to tradition is very strong. E. Earle Ellis, arguing from the position of "corporate authorship", says that "[t]he Book of Revelation is identified at its opening (1:3) as sacred tradition that is to be observed by the recipients."363 This identifiable universal appeal is surely absent from the two other main apocalypses: notably from Hermas, and clearly from that attributed to Peter. The Apoc, too, had a weighty

358 This could be connected to Hippolytus' Greek education, yet the framework of his eschatology is decidedly influenced by the west, "hj peri; twv opcalwv ajnti;hyiv tou etai safwv dutikh;" Marcel Richard, op. cit., 990.

359 Antichr. 64.


362 See ANF (Vol. V), 7. The position of Hippolytus on the Apoc is all the more important given his "propinquity... to the apostolic age": ibid. It is the same, of course, with the testimony of Irenaeus.

363 E. E. Ellis, The Making of the New Testament Documents, (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 222. In Rev 1:3, Ellis points to ajaginwv[en][in church], akouwv[en][the words of this prophecy], and threi[en][the things written in it]. He further notes that "[a] similar appeal to tradition that has previously been (delivered and) received is made by the exalted Christ in Rev 3:3. 8." Here, again, Ellis asks us to note mhnouen, lantwv, akouwv, and threi whilst the force of kratwv at Rev 2:13ff., 24f.; 3:11 is the same, 'to hold fast' to (the content of) a received tradition: ibid., 222f.
"function" for Hippolytus, not only as an exegete and apologist as is correctly highlighted, but also in the context of his intention (from a canonical approach), to declare the khvrgma of the Church (during a time of crisis).

**Origen** (AD c.185-254), prov., Alexandria-Caesarea

*In the Apocalypse the Apostle and Evangelist, In Ioann. 2.4*

The indefatigable Origen, famous pupil and successor of Clement at the Catechetical School of Alexandria, spoken of by Didymus the Blind as the "Master of the Churches after the Apostle" and whom J. W. Trigg has called "the first great theologian of the church," is an extraordinary ecclesiastical personality. When exiled by bishop Demetrios of Alexandria and deposed from both his position as head of the School and from his priesthood, he found refuge in Caesarea where he soon established another school around AD 231. He was a prolific author (active for most of the first half of the third century), and a writer who throughout his life defended the divine inspiration and canonicity of Scripture. The allegorical method, which had as its object "to present absolute, eternal, ahistorical or at least transhistorical truth", is a central part of Origen's biblical theology. His witness to the Apoc is one of the most important in the Ancient Church, both for his explicit reference to the canonical authority of the book as for the frequency of his citation. These quotations are not always facsimiles of the Seer's text, but nonetheless plainly demonstrate that Origen accepted

---


365 Henri Crouzel cites Gregory of Nazianzus (as reported by the Souda) as saying of the great Alexandrian master, "[h]e is the stone which sharpens us all" and "the Master of the Churches after the Apostle", to quote Didymus the Blind (copied by Jerome): Henri Crouzel, *Origen*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), trans. A. S. Worrall, xi.

366 Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church, Joseph Wilson Trigg, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983), 1; for a list of standard texts dealing with Origen, see Crouzel, *ibid.*, xi-xvi.

367 Classic studies into the life and thought of this controversial figure who continues to inspire fundamental differences of opinion about his complex theological system, are those of Crouzel, *ibid.*; Trigg, *ibid.*; Jean Daniélou, *Origène*, (Paris: La Table Ronde, 1948); and Hal Koch's seminal contribution which looked at bringing together the Platonist and Christian Origen, *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1932); see especially Crouzel, *ibid.*, 1-36.

368 See Crouzel, *ibid.*, 61-84. "Origen, like many of the ancient Fathers, had an inadequate idea of the inspiration of Scripture: he thought of it rather like dictation. The Holy Spirit is the author of the Bible, the human author is of little account": *ibid.*, 71.

369 "Origen" in Donald K. McKim (ed.), *art.*, B. Nassif, 52-60.


371 Stonehouse informs us that "[a] fairly accurate conception of the extent to which he [Origen] used its [the Apoc's] language and directly quoted from it can be best obtained by turning to the Text Registers of the eight volumes of Origen's works in the Berlin Academy Edition, where more than one hundred and fifty references are noted": Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, 118.
the Book of Revelation as both authoritative and divinely inspired. Why is this most important? Because "[i]n every book, chapter, verse and letter of the Bible", as Nassif tells us, "Origen traces the breath of the Holy Spirit at work."372 Again we are not probing our writer for a closed NT Canon.373 The final list (yet to be decided by the consensus ecclesiae catholicae) was still not settled at this time. Though the majority of the commended books had been set apart, others continued on the margin of the believing community's canonical discourse.374 We are, here, specifically enquiring into Origen's position on the reception of the Seer's book as normative Scripture.

The pioneer biblical scholar, who was eighteen years of age when first given charge of the renowned Catechetical School of Alexandria,375 introduces pericopes from the Book of Revelation with signatures for canonical Scripture recognized by the believing community, for instance: "that which is written in the Apocalypse of John".376 At other times he will use the simple formula, "John speaks in the Apocalypse" [ ] or "in the Apocalypse of John";378 and even "John in his Apocalypse".379 Compare these references, just for example, with "[t]he Apostle [Paul] says (Rom 7:8f), "we find it written (Jn 12:48)",380 "Wisdom speaks in the Proverbs (Prov 8:22)".381 In one major moment when pointing back to the Rev 5:1-5 commenting on the scroll "in the right hand of the one seated on the throne", Origen declares, "[f]or the book here spoken of means the whole of Scripture."382 Elsewhere in his Commentary on John where he is discoursing on the Logos, Origen not only highlights the apostolicity of the Apoc by directly connecting it to "the apostle and the evangelist" [ ] , but he brings out the author's prophetic charisma as well, "and the Apocalypse entitles him [John]..."

372 Nassif, op. cit., 57.
373 For a review of Origen's NT canon and terminology, see McDonald, The Formation, 201-205.
374 Apart from the four canonical Gospels which Origen accepts, he also receives "an unspecified number of Paul's epistles, as well as 1 John, Revelation, and Hebrews… He tentatively considered 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John… [and] apparently made use of James and Jude with some hesitation…": ibid., 203.
375 Tsanhu, op. cit., 82.
376 Ierem. Hom. 9.
377 De Principiis 1.2.10.
378 In Ioann. 1.23.
379 ibid., 1.1.
380 ibid., 2.9.
381 ibid., 1.17.
382 ibid., 5.4.
to be styled a prophet, too.\textsuperscript{383} The Johannine authorship and hence, the apostolicity of the Book of Revelation, is cited naturally as something handed down by the community of the faithful and commended:

Again, in his [John's] description in the Apocalypse of the Logos of God, the Apostle and Evangelist (and the Apocalypse entitles him to be styled a prophet, too) says he saw the Word of God in the opened heaven, and that He was riding on a white horse.\textsuperscript{384}

Origen considers the Seer of Patmos as one of "the other prophets" when he quotes "from John in his Apocalypse" commenting on Rev 7:3-4.\textsuperscript{385} The idea of apostolicity is prominent, the identity of the author not questioned; it is "the same John in the Apocalypse", writes Origen, speaking of the author of the Gospel of John to whom he had just referred.\textsuperscript{386} In another place, the author will quote Rev 3:20 "Behold, I stand at the door and knock...", as the very words of Jesus Christ without any mention of the Apoc.\textsuperscript{387} Apostolicity, is therefore, directly connected to the orthodoxy of the text, but equally as Wall and Lemcio importantly point out in the canonical context, "with the theological tradition the apostle John 'founded'.\textsuperscript{388} In a most valuable for our investigation preserved fragment from Origen's Fifth Book on John, where Adamantius (as he was called by some owing to his strong disposition) is speaking of the literary remains of the apostles, he says:

[w]hy need we speak of him who reclined upon the bosom of Jesus, John, who has left us one Gospel, though he confessed that he might write so many that the world could not contain them? And he wrote also the Apocalypse, but was commanded to keep silence and not to write the words of the seven thunders.\textsuperscript{389}

The dynamics of tradition, centered around "the Logos", are in full force in Origen's hermeneutical system.\textsuperscript{390} "Origen", writes George Florovsky, "insisted on the catholic interpretation of Scripture that is offered in the church: \textit{audiens in ecclesia verbum Dei}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[383] ibid., 2.4. [italics added]
\item[384] ibid.
\item[385] In Ioann. 1.1. [Note that Origen begins his \textit{Commentary on the Gospel of John} with pericopes from the Apocalypse, this would certainly interest those approaching the canon from Brevard S. Childs' perspective].
\item[386] ibid., 2.4.
\item[387] Origenes Theol., \textit{Commentarii in evangelium Joannis}, TLG (2042 005) 13.32.199.1.
\item[388] Wall and Lemcio, \textit{op. cit.}, 285.
\item[389] Hist. Eccl. 6.25.7-10 [italics added]. In the same place Origen also notes that some cast doubt on the authenticity of at least two of the Johannine epistles.
\item[390] See \textit{Panagopoul o'}, \textit{op. cit.}, 260-265.
\end{footnotes}
He is aware of disputed books which are "doubted" but the commended texts which he accepts as authoritative have come to him through past generations conscious of the authority of the "Church of God". That the Apoc held normative status among the writings in the NT as Origen knew it, is confirmed by the passages preserved by Eusebius giving Origen's explicit demonstrations on the Canon. The "Scriptures" in which there is no "conflict" are divided into "Old Scriptures with the New, or of the Law with the Prophets, or of the Gospels with the Apostles, or of the Apostolic Scriptures with each other." And it is the "same Spirit" who was active "before the advent of Christ" who now also speaks through the "evangelists and apostles". This is momentous, for the "Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God." Therefore, for Origen, as Panagopolou summarizes after an extensive survey into the subject,  "ὁ θεοπνευστής ὁ θεός ἐκφέρει τὴν θνητὴν λειτουργίαν τούτην. αὐτὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκφέρει ἐν τοῖς γραφημάτις τούτοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς διευθυνόμενοις τοῖς διακονοῦσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἐν πάσης μεθόδευσιν τὸν θεοπνευστὴν θεόν." That is, divine inspiration, sweeps into every facet of the life of those authors who have written the Holy Scriptures. And so it is in this context, also, that our indomitable theologian will discourse on Christ’s disciples as "scribes" though they were perceived as "unlearned" and "ignorant".

Origen's spiritualizing position on chiliasm helps explain his high view of the Apoc; he was not bound by the literalist interpretation of Rev 20:4-6 as is plainly obvious when he speaks

391 George Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.), op. cit., 113. [Florovsky is citing Origen Homilies on Leviticus 4.5]
392 See McDonald for the standard texts collected from Eusebius: Lee M. McDonald, The Formation, 201f. McDonald also cites Metzger, albeit critically, who "noted that Origen never wrote a commentary on a book not found in the later NT: ibid., 203. On Rufinus translation of Origen's Homilies on Joshua 7 (AD c. 400) "our second principle source... on the contents of Origen's NT canon", McDonald concludes (following Kalin) that it "presents us more with Rufinus' canon than it does Origen's": ibid., 204.
393 Contra Celsus XLVIII; Origen, however, "tentatively considered" 2Peter and 2 and 3 John, and made use of James and Jude "with some hesitation": McDonald, ibid., 203.
394 Eusebius, Hist Eccl. 6.25.3-14.
395 In Matt. 2. [ANF (Vol. X), 413]
396 ibid., 4.16.
397 De Principiis, Pref. 8.
398 Panagopolou, op. cit., 246.
399 In Matt. 10.14.
on the prevarications of "the earthly city of Jerusalem." Those who look for a materialistic kingdom here on earth and to the carnal pleasures and the physical restoration of the body, are "disciples of the letter alone" who do not follow "the opinion of the Apostle Paul regarding the resurrection of a spiritual body." His Platonism, to which, as Andrew Louth says, Origen "was deeply indebted", prepared him to exegete at a high allegorical level, and biblical passages which could appear to be stumbling blocks to some, were not so for him. He tells us in his famous treatise De Principiis Peri Arcwī, "that we should not receive what is presented by the letter alone." Commenting on Rev 21, on the heavenly Jerusalem "and of its foundations and gates", he speaks of "the road" which is "indicated by symbols." Interestingly (an aspect of Origen's thought that scholars pay little attention to), the upholding of the spiritualizing approach to the Scriptures did not lead him to the denial of the literal coming of the Antichrist. He is, for instance, spirited in his admonition of Celsus who ignorantly "rejects the statements concerning Antichrist... having neither read what is said of him in the Book of Daniel nor in the writings of Paul, nor what the Saviour in the Gospels has predicted about his coming...", and then proceeds to treat the subject at some length. Though Origen's persuasion of Platonism could, as Stonehouse has said, threaten "to displace the biblical elements of his eschatology and that his allegorical exegesis was often exaggerated and unnatural", nonetheless:

---

400 De Principiis 2.11.2.
401 ibid.; see also In Ioann. 10.26.
403 For illuminating discussion on Origen's "spiritual or allegorical exegesis", see Crouzel, op. cit., 61-84. The author, himself, points to H. de Lubac, Histoire et Esprit, (Paris, 1950). "The main theological justification [of spiritual exegesis]", writes Crouzel, "proceeds from the fact that for us Christians the revelation is identified with Christ": ibid., 69; "the controlling hermeneutic that dominated Origen's approach to Scripture was the interconnectedness of God, his Logos and humanity... Origen explains his hermeneutical theory in book 4 of On First Principles... basing himself squarely in the tradition of allegorical exegesis as exemplified by Aristobulus, Philo, Pantaenus and Clement, Origen claims that Scripture itself reveals how we should understand the Bible": Nassif, op. cit., 59.
404 De Principiis 4.18.
405 ibid., 6.23.
406 Contra Cels. 6.45-46.
his utter lack of sympathy with the chiliasmic expectations, which were based largely upon the Apoc, gives his unequivocal testimony to the canonicity of the Apocalypse even greater weight.\textsuperscript{407}

Some might suppose to diminish Origen's overall witness dealing with matters ecclesiastical on account of his supposed 'apostasy', however, let us take our line from Henri Crouzel, who speaks by far for the overwhelming majority (and which nowadays is also becoming the position for many of those writing within the Eastern Orthodox tradition).\textsuperscript{408}

\cite{stonehouse1995, ware1995}

\textit{likewise if Origen had been notoriously an apostate, how would he have been granted the burial in the cathedral of Tyre described by Dom Delarue? But 'the legend of the fall', even if it is rejected nowadays by all Origen scholars, has none the less through the ages weighed heavily on his memory.}\textsuperscript{409}

Conclusion

Much has occurred during this phase of the Apoc's canonical adventure. During this period the Book of Revelation met with a cluster of interesting trials. What were they? What eventuated? And what was the position of the Apoc in the context of the canonical process which was evolving within the community of the faithful as the book (and the community itself),\textsuperscript{410} moved into the next century and beyond? To summarize: The Book of Revelation was excluded from Marcion's so-called canon which rejected all discernible Hebrew influences. But far from this casting a spectre on the authority of the book, it compelled the orthodox to a stricter formulation of the concept of the NT Canon according to the standard of the \textit{regula veritatis}.\textsuperscript{411} And in these critical deliberations the document was well received by the \textit{ecclesia catholica}. Paradoxically, it was the enthusiastic reception of the Book of Revelation by a community outside the orthodox Church, the Montanists (the "Phrygian

\textsuperscript{407} Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 122.

\textsuperscript{408} Ware, for instance, cites Origen as one of the "Greek Father[s]": Kallistos Ware, \textit{The Orthodox Way}, (New York: SVS Press, 1995), 154.

\textsuperscript{409} Crouzel, \textit{op. cit.}, 36. [italics added]

\textsuperscript{410} "The biblical community of faith as a people on the way, a 'pilgrim people'": Bernhard W. Anderson, "Tradition and Scripture in the Community of Faith", \textit{JBL} 100/1, (1981), 9.

\textsuperscript{411} This would occur through the recognition of the body of Christ, the Church, that a particular document was functioning as Scripture in accordance to "the rule of truth" [\textit{kanw\nt\'h\n\,(\textit{ajh\p\v\n})}]. "When we ask how Scripture functions as a sacred text within the faith-community, three components suggest themselves as essential. This literature is revered as (1) \textit{inspired}, i.e., originating from and communicating the Spirit of God; (2) in some sense \textit{normative} for the community; and (3) \textit{canonical}, having official and unique authoritative status": Hoffman, \textit{art. cit.}, 454.
which threatened the canonical recognition of the Seer's prophecy. The chiliastic centralism of this group and its doctrine of the New Prophecy was troubling for many church figures. It was feared that the teachings of the movement would be legitimized if appeal was made to a book received as normative by the believing community. An extreme response to this anxiety was that of the obscure Alogi, who not only rejected the Apoc, but it might seem all the Corpus Johanneum. Similarly, too, the Syrian churches, under the influence of Tatian (who appears, himself, to have been influenced by Marcion), are wary of the Apoc apparently concerned by its perceived instruction of a material chiliasm. Serious as these blows could be, they did not, in the long term, diminish the recognition of the book. They did force a collective response, however, of ecclesiastical writers to a defence of an orthodox interpretation of the Apoc and a more consistent application of the criteria of canonicity. If the Book of Revelation was a book of the Church, which it so dramatically proclaimed, then only within the Body of Christ could it be authentically interpreted. For the "content of apostolic tradition", as Richard Bauckham writes explaining the coincidence view of the Early Church, "coincides with the content of Scripture." Prophecy, also, was not adversely affected. The Church Fathers insisted on the distinction between false prophets and those  

412 Hist. Eccl. 5.16.7.  
414 Yet consider the authoritative reception of the Apoc by the sixth bishop of Antioch in Syria, the learned Theophilus (AD c. 115-188). His testimony is especially important when we consider that he is "the first who clearly teaches the inspiration of the New Testament": Quasten (Vol. I), 239. Eusebius informs us that Theophilus made use of the Apoc in a work entitled Against the Heresy of Hermogenes (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 4.24.1) [ἐν ἔκχρισθεν Ἀποκαλύφθη Ἰωαννου καὶ θηταὶ νομοθετικοῖ]. Equally striking is that the two lost works of Hippolytus, which dealt specifically with the defence of the Apocalypse of John, are, in fact, testified by "the Syrian Ebedjesu": Quasten (Vol. II), 197.  
415 From the start "someone belonging to the community of faith who had received the book [the Apoc] offers a canonical guideline by means of which the book was to function as authoritative scripture for generations long after the author. It defines the special quality of this writing which is not hindered by its time-conditionality from conveying the divine Word": Childs, As Canon, 517. This "canonical guideline", I understand, from the confessional position of Orthodoxy, as being an integral component of the κανων τῆς ἀληθείας. This was the safeguard that though the sacred text could be misinterpreted by 'outsiders' and misused, it could never be claimed nor interpreted authentically by anyone outside the community of faith, for it is only within the "body of Christ" [σῶμα Χριστοῦ] (1Cor 12:27), that the Holy Spirit dwells and instructs (Rev 2:7). For discussion and references to principal patristic passages within this present context, see Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", 97-124.  
416 The problem is not always the inconsistent application or not of the criteria of canonicity, but equally, the lack of a universal system of 'canonical' definitions. "There is no justification", writes Gamble, "in bibliographic terms, for example, for an a priori discrimination between scriptural and nonscriptural texts, not only because the scriptural canon had not yet been determined, but also because the methods of producing and circulating texts were the same for all texts": Gamble, Books and Readers, 94.  
prophets sent by the Holy Spirit. As the next phase of the Apoc's canonical adventure begins, we find, it is the only apocalypse consistently cited as a proof text not only in the defence of doctrine, but also in its development.\footnote{Quoted at length is a passage from Bauckham where the profound nature of the theology of the Apoc is drawn out, and which, serves to explain what the early ecclesiastical writers encountered in the text as a dynamic theological narrative. "Because Revelation does not contain theological discourse or argument of the kind with which readers of the New Testament are familiar in, for example, the Pauline letters, it should not be thought to be any less a product of a profound theological reflection. Its images are by no means a vaguer or more impressionistic means of expression than the relatively more abstract conceptual argument of a Pauline letter. They are capable both of considerable precision of meaning and of compressing a wealth of meaning into a brief space by evoking a range of associations. The method and conceptuality of the theology of Revelation are relatively different from the rest of the New Testament, but once they are appreciated in their own right, Revelation can be seen to be not only one of the finest literary works in the New Testament, but also one of the greatest theological achievements of early Christianity. Moreover, the literary and theological greatness are not separable": Richard Bauckham, The Theology of the Book of Revelation, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 22.} Though the notae canonicitatis were foremost at different stages (particularly the criterion of apostolicity), it was Holy Tradition, the church consciousness of the faithful community, that would ultimately canonize, bestow upon the text authentia Scripturae. The recognition of the Apoc's canonicity, in the setting of the "canonical guidelines" of two founding faith-communities of the Ancient Church: that in Rome, which is responsible for the list of sacred books catalogued in the MF, and that in Lyons and Vienne which used the text as normative Scripture and which commended the Revelation to sister churches in Asia Minor, is a marturia of the Ekkhhsia evstikto for successive generations of believers.
CHAPTER 9
From Cyprian of Carthage to Athanasius the Great

Introduction
We found that the Book of Revelation gradually grew in stature across Christendom (with the notable exception of Syria), and that the Seer’s text was the only serious canonical contender of the early apocalypses as we enter into this third phase of the exploration. However, this is not to suggest that the proceedings of the formation of the NT Canon were now uniform and clear-cut; even at this relatively advanced phase in our particular text’s adventure we are not dealing "in a straight line," as Bruce Metzger characteristically writes, "but in a zig-zag development." And so we cross the threshold into the final stretch of our rigorous survey. An equally critical period but with the added significance that it will be during this time, when canon consciousness was a more clearly defined and practised theology, that the question of the legitimacy and authority of the Apoc would be further secured, despite the mixed reception of the book by our ecclesiastical chronicler Eusebius on account of its notional profession of chiliasm. It is also during this point in time that the position of the West (from Carthage right through to Rome) is further established, and in the East Athanasius answers

---

1 For a bibliography and synopsis of the adventure of the two main rival [apocryphal] apocalypses attributed to Saint Peter and Saint Paul, see Bruce Metzger, The Canon of The New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 184-187; the Apocalypse of Peter, first cited in the MF around AD 200 with strong advice that it ought not to be read in church (MF 72-73), dates from about AD 125-150. Notably Clement of Alexandria appears to accept it as the apostle's work (Ecl. proph., 41.2), but Eusebius reckons it "among the rejected writings": Hist. Eccl. 3.25.4; the so-called Apocalypse of Paul, as Metzger says, written probably in Egypt about AD 250, makes good use of its earlier counterpart and although it did not ever seriously challenge for a position in the Canon and was "unrecognized by the ancients", it still was Sozomen tells us, "esteemed by most of the monks": cited Metzger, ibid., 186.

2 ibid., 264.

3 Pan Trempevla argues that it was during the middle to late decades of the fourth century AD that the Canon was officially recognized by the Church as evidenced by major synodical proclamations, "Ἡ ἀπίσθημι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀγανακρίνει τὰ Καθαρή🟢α της ἀποκαλύπτει τινὰ ἀποκομμένα τοῦ Νασαίου τοῦ Αἰτίου, ἐν τῇ Καρθάγη τῇ Πανταχώριῇ...": P. N. Trempelea, Εγκυκλοπαίδεια Τῆς Θεολογίας, (Αθήναι: Ο ΣΤΘΗΡ, 1989), 189.

4 A long list of distinguished commendations could be cited here of the unique regard in which Athanasius was held. However, the high praise of his younger contemporary, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus (AD c. 329-390), suffices. Gregory, only one of three churchmen to be called "the theologian", writes that "[i]n praising Athanasius, I shall be praising virtue." Later in the same place, he groups Athanasius "among lawgivers, generals, priests, Prophets, Evangelists, Apostles, shepherds, teachers, and all the spiritual host and band", then
for the influential diocese of Alexandria, denying the earlier refutations of Dionysius (which if left unchecked could have proved a very difficult hurdle to overcome in the Greek speaking churches). If the book had faltered previously it could have been rescued during the course of the next two centuries. However, if it was to be dismissed during those times, when the criteria of canonicity were more fundamentally applied\(^5\) and the general parameters of the NT Canon were more or less set,\(^6\) it would have been an extremely difficult and highly unlikely task for the Apoc to receive canonical legitimacy during the course of the fifth and sixth centuries. There was, also, something extremely critical that this next generation of Christian writers received from those who had just preceded them, a *universal sense* of belonging, to a group called and set apart. "This sense of the catholic unity of faith, life, and knowledge", declares Justin Popovich, "constitutes the essence of the Church's ecclesial reality.\(^7\)

**Cyprian of Carthage** (AD c. 200-258), prov., Carthage, northern Africa  
*Also in the Apocalypse, Test. 2.26*

Cyprian, the second of the famous writers from the church of Africa was elevated to the bishopric of Carthage sometime about AD 249. "As a theologian", writes Johannes Quasten, "Cyprian is entirely dependent on Tertullian."\(^8\) At first this may appear overstated but the words of Jerome support the argument, "he [Cyprian] was accustomed never to pass a day without reading Tertullian and he frequently said to his secretary, 'Hand me the master [*magister*]', meaning by this, Tertullian.\(^9\) This is not without importance, because it provides clear insights as to the reasons for his own position on the Book of Revelation. Cyprian, like Tertullian his "master" before him, made frequent use of the Apoc alongside the recognized writings of Scripture.\(^10\) All of the authoritative writings of the Church came as a result of the prophets of old and the apostles subsequently "being full of the Holy Spirit.\(^11\) In this

\(^3\) This was precisely the reason for the tension and for the qualified acceptance of the Apoc in the canonical deliberations of Eusebius who would otherwise have it omitted: *Hist. Eccl.* 3.25.5.

\(^5\) The books that were ultimately listed in the Canon had by this stage either been universally accepted as authoritative or were sitting on the margins awaiting the final *fiat*. But the main point I wish to make here is, that no other scriptural texts would be admitted into the canonical dialogue, the ground rules of canonicity had been laid. Also *Trempevla*, loc. cit.


\(^9\) *De vir. ill.* 53.

\(^10\) Cyprian does not cite Philemon, James, 2Peter, 2 and 3 John, or Jude.

\(^11\) *De lapsis* 7.
instance, also, we find a bishop of the Early Church, who was alert to the "common mind" [unanimitatis], which was "the spirit in which the new community of the believers obeyed." Cyprian cites Rev 21:6-7 amongst other references from both the Old and New Testaments in presenting his proofs for the divinity for Christ. On other occasions he introduces passages from the Seer's book with the established form for citing Scripture or simply "[a]lso in the Apocalypse". As Metzger says, Cyprian "scarcely ever makes a Scriptural quotation without using an introductory formula, thus separating the quotation from his own comments." In his well-known treatise De lapsis [On the Lapsed], written in AD 251, he prefaces Rev 2:5 which speaks of repentance with "scriptum est" [it is written]. Further on he again cites the Apoc (this time Rev 6:10), when he speaks of the "slain martyrs". Though Cyprian does not always mention the Seer by name, he will on occasion just refer to him as "John" or just cite the book in running commentary. In other places he will cite the book in the general context of the Scriptures, "[a]nd again, the divine Scripture says". Elsewhere, again, in the context of many other scriptures which he draws together on the subject of the benefits of martyrdom, he cites at least five pericopes from the Book of Revelation with: "of this same thing in the Apocalypse." Often, too, he will congress OT passages next to pericopes of the Apoc that together they may reveal the fuller meaning of what "the Lord says". The clear message remains, however, that for Cyprian the words found in the Book of Revelation are spoken by the Lord Himself. When in one of his epistles he cites Rev 14:9-11 to warn emphatically against the "mark" and the worship of the beast, he writes, "[i]n the Apocalypse also, we read

---

12 De unit. 25.
13 ibid.
14 Ad Quirinum 2.6.
15 Test. 2.26; also ANF (Vol. V), 595. [many times]
17 De lapsis 16.
18 ibid., 18.
19 Adv. Novat. 17; I should note, however, that a sizeable group of scholars consider this treatise, written sometime towards the end of Cyprian's own life, of questionable authority.
20 Epist. 8.
21 Epist. 27.
22 Test. 3.16.
23 Test. 2.22. Here Cyprian places together Ezek 9:4-6 and Rev 14:1, 22:13-14, where he discourses on the sign of the Cross as salvation for those who are marked [sealed] on their foreheads.
the anger of the Lord threatening, and saying..."\(^{24}\) F. F. Bruce's concise observation agrees entirely with my presentation here:

As for the Apocalypse, he [Cyprian] manifests a marked predilection for it, quoting it frequently as a source-book for Christology and for the blessings of martyrdom...\(^{25}\)

It should be noted here, that chiliasm did not sway Cyprian's high regard for the Apoc, though his "master" Tertullian made very clear his own chiliasmic sympathies.\(^{26}\) He looked further abroad to the consensus, the cathedra Petri, the ecclesia principalis.\(^{27}\) It was Cyprian, too, who made famous the comparison between the Church and the ark of Noah.\(^{28}\) And his famous treatise De ecclesiae catholicae unitate,\(^{29}\) where the "oneness" and the "unity" of the Church is proclaimed, Maurice Bévenot tells us, "is the earliest work on the subject which has survived."\(^{30}\) Here, also, for a writer "immersed", as Bévenot neatly captures, in "the living tradition of the church from the moment of his conversion",\(^{31}\) we find a powerful (and illustrative example) that even before the rise of Constantine the Great in the early 300's, the refutation of chiliasm did not diminish the high esteem in which the Book of Revelation could be held. Though Cyprian agrees in part with an idea connected to a millenary scheme that the world is to endure six thousand years and which he describes to a certain Fortunatus, "[s]ix thousand years are now nearly completed since the devil first attacked man",\(^{32}\) nowhere do we find Cyprian expressing the belief of an earthly kingdom that was to last for a thousand years following the second coming of Christ. Cyprian points to many places in both the OT and NT to show that when Christ returns He will come as a "judge" and as a "king" to reign forever in

\(^{24}\) Epist. 63.1; Rev 14:9-11 is again cited by Cyprian in Ad Fortunatum 3 and in Test. 59.


\(^{26}\) Adv. Marc. 3.24.

\(^{27}\) Epist. 59.14; however, as Quasten wants to make clear, "he does not concede to Rome any higher right to legislate for other sees": Quasten (Vol. II), 376.

\(^{28}\) "If any one could escape who was outside the ark of Noah, then he also may escape who shall be outside of the Church": De unit. 6; but see also his poetic imagery "of our Mother, the Church": Epist. 8 (and De unit. 6).

\(^{29}\) For the various problems that the title has raised in the MSS tradition, and for how best to translate "unitate", see Maurice Bévenot, St. Cyprian Ancient Christian Writers No. 25, (New York: The Newman Press, 1956), 74-76.

\(^{30}\) ibid., 5.

\(^{31}\) ibid., 76.

\(^{32}\) Ad Fortunatum 2.
The Apocalypse

a kingdom "not of this world" (Jn 18:36). Perhaps here too, as Charles Kannengiesser writes of the Latin doctors generally, Cyprian "adequately translated the interpretive tradition of the Greek-speaking churches."[34]

**Dionysius of Alexandria** (AD c. 200-265), prov., Alexandria, Egypt

*But the Apocalypse is different*, Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25.22

Elected to the bishopric of Alexandria around AD 248, Dionysius (one of a select group of Church Fathers with the cognomen *the Great*) was a pupil of Origen and for many years head of the celebrated catechetical school.[35] He was one of the most influential leaders of the church in Egypt until his death in AD 264. The weighty consideration that is given to the "different" position of Dionysius on the status of the Book of Revelation is understandable but much exaggerated. And ironically his reservations are taken up and made more of by modern critical scholars[36] than did his influence in the period after his disapproving opinions about the Apoc were made known. Dionysius’ stance is more significant by virtue of his position and reputation in the Early Church than by its abiding influence in the generations that would follow. As Georges Florovsky notes, the Patriarch of Alexandria was not only the "eipif anesterō" of Origen’s pupils, but he was "eiponomazomeno" Mega [Great] ἐπὶ ὑπὸ τῶν συγκροτῶν του"[37] This certainly sits very well with Athanasius’ bold characterization of Dionysius as "kaqolikh" ekkh'hsia" didaskalο".[38]

Chiliasm was a prominent factor in the cautious stance taken by Dionysius in respect to the Book of Revelation. Origenist eschatology was losing ground in parts of Egypt and some

---

33 Test. 2.28-30; in Test. 2.30 Cyprian cites Rev 19:11-16 with the same authority as he does "the Gospel" (Matt 25:31-46).


35 For a very helpful overview by George Florovsky in the context of the available sources of the life, work and theology of the Alexandria bishop, see "Patriarcal" in *QKHE* (Tom 50), 14-19.

36 In his epoch-making work (originally published in 1920), R. H. Charles, who drew up his own registry of stylistic and linguistic differences between John’s Gospel and the Apocalypse, concluded that "...the theory of Dionysius as to diversity of authorship has passed out of the reign of hypothesis and may now be safely regarded as an established conclusion": R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St John* (Vol I), (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), xl.; also J. Roloff "[m]odern interpretation cannot agree with ancient church witnesses who claimed that the author of Revelation is the same as that of the Gospel of John... [i]n addition, the identification of the writer of Revelation with the fourth evangelist encounters insuperable substantive obstacles as Dionysius of Alexandria already recognized...": Jürgen Roloff, *The Revelation of John*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 11.

37 Florovsky, *loc. cit.*

38 *ibid.*, 14f.
Christian communities were pursuing stricter and more literal interpretations of prophecy. An Egyptian bishop, Nepos of Arsinoë, was one of the defenders of the literal exegesis of prophetic literature; his position was outlined in a work no longer extant, entitled Refutation of the Allegorists. He was particularly zealous to argue for a literal interpretation of the Apoc in support of the strong chiliastic anticipation in his own region. His attack was coordinated to meet Origen and the allegorical interpreters who resisted the materialistic approach to the Book of Revelation by excessively spiritualizing the Seer's language. Eusebius records that Dionysius visited the district and that after three days of discussion and accepting "whatever was established by the proofs and teachings of the Holy Scriptures" was able to convince his opponents that their literalist approach was not capable of defence.

From this period onwards and continuing to the rise of the Emperor Constantine, scholars generally concede, that the teaching of chiliasm becomes less of a theological preoccupation in the writings of the Church Fathers, and certainly as a positive phenomenon its appeal was diminishing. From this theatre of critical dialogue as outlined above, Dionysius produced his two volume work Peri; epaggelw'n [On the Promises]; "the occasion of these was Nepos". The entire work is no longer extant, but Eusebius preserves extracts from the second volume which dealt specifically with the Book of Revelation and set down the arguments why it could not have been John the Apostle who had written the Apoc. The first volume contained Dionysius' "own opinion of the dogma [chiliasm]". Obviously, most unfavourable, for this was "a certain millennium of bodily luxury upon this earth."

Until this time, about the middle of the third century, there is little if any orthodox dissent regarding the authoritative status of the Apoc. As Mounce agrees, after reviewing this early evidence (following NBS), "...it cannot be disputed that the Apocalypse was widely accepted.

39 For an opinion on the specific seat of Nepos' bishopric and for his association with Arsinoë, see C. Wilfred Griggs, Early Egyptian Christianity: From its Origin to 451 CE, (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 109; for the general Sitz-im-Leben of this group see David Frankfurter, Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 270-279.
40 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.24.1; our information on this Egyptian bishop, Nepos, is limited to this chapter of Eusebius' work.
41 ibid., 7.24.
42 ibid., 7.24.8-9.
43 ibid., 7.24.1.
44 ibid., 7.24.5.
45 ibid., 7.24.1-3.
46 ibid., 7.24.1.
by the second-century church as the work of John the apostle.47 This makes the "Dionysian exception" as I have elsewhere called it, a dissenting early witness that has to be studied closely by the supporters of apostolic authorship. Later objection, and in fact modern biblical criticism which would in great part deny apostolic authorship of the work, is firmly founded in the Alexandrian's inventory of critical refutations. But this noteworthy exception, as we shall presently find, is both cautious and qualified.

The bishop as we saw, concerned by a growing support of chiliasm in his diocese, a "doctrine" which taught "that the kingdom of Christ will be an earthly one" and consist of sensual pleasures,48 hoped to have the Apocalypse removed from his opponents list of authoritative books. He sought to do this by proving that Saint John the Disciple, the author of the Gospel and the Epistle, could not possibly have written the Apocalypse, which could also be distinguished from them in both language and style, as well as thought. Eusebius, certainly, is very pleased to record Dionysius' hesitations:

In fact, it is plainly to be seen that one and the same character marks the Gospel and the Epistle throughout. But the Apocalypse is different [ἀλλοτρίῳ] from these writings and foreign [ξενῷ] to them; not touching, nor in the least bordering upon them; almost, so to speak, without even a syllable in common with them. Nay more, the Epistle— for I pass by the Gospel— does not mention nor does it contain any intimation of the Apocalypse, nor does the Apocalypse of the Epistle... Moreover, it can also be shown that the diction of the Gospel and Epistle differs from that of the Apocalypse. For they were written not only without error as regards the Greek language, but also with elegance in their expression, in their reasonings, and in their entire structure. They are far indeed from betraying any barbarism or solecism, or any vulgarism whatever... I do not deny [οὐκ ἀρτέρῳ] that the other writer [the Seer] saw a revelation and received knowledge and prophecy [ἀποκάλυψιν... γνῶσιν... προφθείαν]... I would not have any one think that I have said these things in a spirit of ridicule, for I have said what I have only with the purpose of showing clearly the difference [τὴν ἁγνοιοδιάθεσι] between the writings.49

However, even the refutations of Dionysius are not without serious flaw when put under scrutiny: (i) he chooses to ignore the strong consensual witness which preceded him, even though he plainly refers to it; 50 (ii) his hypothesis of a 'second John' is drawn from a traveller's

48 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.25.3.
49 ibid., 7.25.22-27.
50 ibid., 7.25.4.
tale about two tombs of John in Ephesus. 51 Another John at this time, one which hailed from Ephesus, who was an early Christian worthy of the respect accorded to the prophet of the Apocalypse, is not known in Church history; (iii) he does not fully appreciate the Semitic influences in the Gospel of John; 52 (iv) the solecisms which he perceives are in some part agreed even by opponents of apostolic authorship not to be necessarily due to ignorance of the author but to deliberate constructions. 53

Incredibly, almost always what is omitted when discussing the position of Dionysius is that after he presents his critical inventory (especially against literalism), he does not contest the Apoc's authority; 54 he is questioning its claims to apostolic authorship for it does not answer to the literary standards of the other Johannine literature. It is then, and only then, that he is prepared to sow the seeds of doubt. This in itself is significant for it reveals once more the close link that had begun to exist between apostolic authorship and canonicity. In this context, too, we should understand the bishop's anxiety to connect the prophecy to someone other than the "apostles" [ἀποστόλων] or the "saints", and so he suggests Cerinthus "who founded the sect which was called after him the Cerinthian." 55 It is correct, but surely a massive understatement, to quote N. B. Stonehouse who has written, that "[o]ne gets the impression that Dionysius has a pious regard for the work." 56 It is certainly much more than just an "impression", it is a public acknowledgment pointing to the high and credible position of the book in the tradition of the believing community. Whoever this "other writer" was, the Alexandrian bishop does "not deny" [οὐκ ἄντερ] the claim that the author of the Apoc "saw a revelation [ἀποκάλυψις]" and received knowledge [γνῶσις] and prophecy

51 "It is to be observed that Dionysius does not cite Papias for this, but a traveller's report (fasivn), and his suggestion about a second John is no more than tentative (Allon dev tina . . . .)": Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, (Illinois: IVP, 1970), 946.
53 R. H. Charles for example, "[w]e have found that these abnormalities [solecisms] are not instances of mere licence nor yet mere blunders, as they have been most wrongly described, but are constructions deliberately chosen by the author": Charles (Vol. I), cli; see also cxlii-cliv; also Ozanne who writes, "[t]he explanation which the present writer believes to be correct is that the author deliberately modelled his grammar on the pattern of the classical Hebrew of the Old Testament": C. G. Ozanne, "The Language of the Apocalypse", 73, 16, (1965), 4.
54 This is notable for example in many commentaries, see for example Wilfrid J. Harrington, Revelation, (Minnesotat: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 8; also in M. Eugene Boring, Revelation, (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1989), 3.
55 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.25.2.
56 N. B. Stonehouse, The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church, (Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929), 125.
Clearly, he does not want to appear overly overt in support of an argument that might seem to be calling for the Book of Revelation to be struck off a list of authoritative books. This alone would indicate that the Apoc was (at the very least), a major player in the canonical discoursing of the community of the faithful. For Dionysius, given his position, amazingly confesses, and in the process, would appear to contradict himself:

[b]ut I could not venture to reject the book [ἐγὼ δὲ άβεβηκαί ἐν οὐκ άφην αὐτὸν τινήσαμι τῷ βιβλίῳ], as many brethren hold it in high esteem [πολλῷ αὐτοῦ δὲ σπουδάσαντες έποντεύων ατάλληλος]. But I suppose that it is beyond my comprehension, and that there is a certain concealed and more wonderful meaning in every part. For I do not understand I suspect that a deeper sense lies beneath the words. I do not measure and judge them by my own reason, but leaving the more to faith I regard them as too high for me to grasp. And I do not reject what I cannot comprehend, but rather wonder because I do not understand it.  

Dionysius was determined in his quest to diminish the influence of the Apoc (if not everywhere), at least throughout his episcopacy. He was aware of course, given his argumentations, that the NT was now widely considered a collection of authoritative documents of which apostolicity was emerging as a chief criterion. One way open for him to rattle the Apoc's credibility was to cast suspicion over the book's origin, for we have seen from the start the loyalty that Revelation was capable of inspiring. Dionysius, like Eusebius after him, understood too well that the Apoc would only be relegated from the NT Canon if it became general persuasion that the work was not apostolic. This is what had happened earlier, for instance, to the Didache and to the Shepherd of Hermas. The canonical guidelines that were already in place (in this instance the "canonical hermeneutics"), made it clear that the community of the faithful had "recognized" that this particular book, the Apocalypse of John, belonged to a sacred collection of documents that went to make up the NT Canon.  

Victorinus of Pettau (d. AD c. 304), prov., Petabio in Pannonia Superior  
First Extant Commentary on the Apoc  
Victorinus, bishop of Petabio in Pannonia Superior, Johannes Quasten informs us, was "the first exegete to write in Latin" and is a conspicuous actor in the adventure of the Apoc. He

58 ibid., 7.25.4; to be fair to Dionysius, he earlier says, "[s]ome before us have set aside and rejected the book [the Apoc] altogether, criticising it chapter by chapter, and pronouncing it without sense or argument, and maintaining that the title is fraudulent": ibid., 7.25.1.
60 Quasten (Vol. II), 411.
too suffered the fate which was reserved for many of his predecessors, martyrdom. His death took place around AD 304 during the Diocletian persecutions. Jerome not only informs us of the manner of Victorinus' death, but also of his literary abilities and a list of his works.\textsuperscript{61} This impressive list includes commentaries and a work against heresies. Importantly for our purposes, of all the commentaries cited by Jerome, only one remains, "On the Apocalypse of John".\textsuperscript{62} This is also the first commentary of the Book of Revelation which is extant. Jerome, however, who often refers to chiliasm as Jewish and who finds it objectionable,\textsuperscript{63} revised Victorinus' commentary to such an extent as almost to suppress the original work.\textsuperscript{64}

Chiliasm was still to be encountered in the West during this time; it would not fade out so easily. Particularly at the close of the third century when the Diocletian persecutions would again test the faith of the Christians. Victorinus, in the tradition of his fellow chiliasm, appealed to the Apoc as an authoritative book of the NT which had been passed down in the church.\textsuperscript{65} Commenting on Rev 11:1, when the Seer speaks of having been given "a reed like a measuring rod", Victorinus is very clear on the unquestionable authority of the book which he would appear to put on the level of the Gospel:

\begin{quote}
A reed was shown like to a rod. This itself is the Apocalypse which he [the Seer] subsequently exhibited to the churches; for the Gospel of the complete faith he subsequently wrote for the sake of our salvation.\textsuperscript{66}
\end{quote}

In his commentary the twentieth chapter of the Apoc is the central focus for his exposition on chiliasm. "I do not think the reign of a thousand years is eternal; or if it is thus to be thought of, they cease to reign when the thousand years are finished."\textsuperscript{67} He goes on to explain that in his judgement, "the tenfold number signifies the decalogue, and the hundredfold sets forth the crown of virginity."\textsuperscript{68} The chiliasm disposition that we find in the bishop of Petabio's

\textsuperscript{61}De vir. ill. 74; it is surely interesting that Victorinus, the author of the first extant commentary on the Apoc, was better equipped to write in Greek, "Victorinus... was not equally as familiar with Latin as with Greek": \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{62}The text was first published in 1916 [CSEL 49] and preserved in \textit{Codex Ottobon. lat. 3288 A saec. XV}.

\textsuperscript{63}In Dan. 2.

\textsuperscript{64}See for instance the editor's hand in \textit{In Apoc.} 20.2.

\textsuperscript{65}In Apoc. 1.16, 4.1,8, 5.5,8,9, 10.1-3,11, esp. note 11.1.

\textsuperscript{66}\textit{ibid.}, 11.1.

\textsuperscript{67}\textit{ibid.}, 20.6.

\textsuperscript{68}\textit{ibid.}
commentary on the Apoc is explicitly noted in the fragment De fabrica mundi, \(^{69}\) in which he refers to the speculation on the six days of creation; these are followed by the seventh day of rest, the millennium when Christ reigns with the elect:

Wherefore, as I have narrated, that true Sabbath will be in the seventh millenary of years, when Christ with His elect shall reign.\(^{70}\)

The eighth day is the day "of that future judgement" which comes after the millennium for it passes "beyond the order of the sevenfold arrangement".\(^{71}\) Two further points of note that I will make here relate to his understanding of "the number of seven churches" and his interpretation of the number of the beast. First, Victorinus holds very strongly to the catholicity of the Apoc and after a series of presentations, including references to Saint Paul and the Prophet Isaiah, where he would show why the number seven is symbolic of the greater whole, he declares, "[t]herefore in these seven churches, of one Catholic Church are believers, because it is one in seven by the quality of faith and election."\(^{72}\) Second, behind the dreaded 666 he sees the figure of the Antichrist. After speaking of how the number has been calculated "from the Greek characters":

which name if you wish to turn into Latin, it is understood by the antiphrase DICLUX, which letters are reckoned in this manner: since D figures five hundred, I one, C a hundred, L fifty, V five, X ten,- which by the reckoning up of the letters makes similarly six hundred and sixty-six, that is, what in Greek gives \(\text{teitan}\) to wit, what in Latin is called DICLUX; by which name, expressed by antiphrases, we understand Antichrist.\(^{73}\)

Methodius of Olympus (d. AD c. 311), prov., Macedonia-Asia Minor

*The Christ-possessed John, Symp. 1.5*

Methodius, one of the most important of the Greek theologians of his time, was also one of the most well known of the anti-Origenists.\(^{74}\) He was specifically opposed to the Origenistic

---

\(^{69}\) Also known as *On the Creation of the World*, the fragment was first published in 1688 from *Codex Lambethanus 414 saec. IX*. Johannes Quasten confirms that the "style and thought are those of Victorinus": Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. II), 412.

\(^{70}\) *De fab mundi* 10.

\(^{71}\) *ibid.*, 5.

\(^{72}\) *ibid.*, 1.16.

\(^{73}\) *ibid.*, 13.18

\(^{74}\) Though it might appear that earlier in his life his thought was closer to Origen's than he might have later on admitted. *cf.* Methodius' *The Banquet/Symposium or On Virginity* with Origen's *Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles*. As Johannes Quasten writes, the works share "the same ideas and the same allegory and follow[s] the same mystical interpretation": Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. II), 133.
doctrine of the pre-existence of the souls and the spiritualization of the resurrection of the body.\textsuperscript{75} He was the author of many treatises of which, unfortunately, only a relatively small number remain. Remarkably, he is not mentioned in Eusebius' \textit{Ekklhsiastikh n Jstorian}. N. B. Stonehouse's contention, that this was probably because of his [Methodius'] stand against Origen,\textsuperscript{76} would appear to be incorrect.\textsuperscript{77} This type of situation hardly ever bothered the Father of Church History before. He certainly did not blot out Papias, for instance. It is more reasonable to assume that Methodius, for reasons that we cannot be entirely certain of, just did not figure in Eusebius' calculations which was, as \textit{Pan Crhistou} says, "\textit{olkw ajsunh\h"}.\textsuperscript{78}

Methodius' interpretation of the Apoc is intriguing because, though an avowed anti-Origenist, his opposition to Origen did not compel him to the literalism, for example, which Nepos had earlier defended.\textsuperscript{79} There is little doubt of his dependence on the Origenist allegorical method of exegesis.\textsuperscript{80} N. B. Stonehouse, however, has made a critical observation that needs to be underscored:

Consequently his [Methodius] use of the Apocalypse may be viewed as representing the viewpoint of those who were well acquainted with the Origenist standpoint, and were not altogether untouched by it, but nevertheless were unsympathetic with many of the tendencies of the movement.\textsuperscript{81}

Methodius will quote the Apoc often, but more incredibly he refers to it as "the mind of Scripture".\textsuperscript{82} When citing Rev 14:1-4 he speaks of the book as the work of the "Christ-possessed John".\textsuperscript{83} In a similar context, this time referring to Rev 7:4 and 14:4 on "the company of the virgins", he writes, the "for the Word says" and this he connects a little further

\textsuperscript{75} See esp. Methodius' treatise \textit{On the Resurrection}, where he refutes both Origen's theory of resurrection in a spiritual body and the Alexandrian's teaching of the pre-existence of the soul.

\textsuperscript{76} Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 134.

\textsuperscript{77} Reference to Methodius by Eusebius is not altogether missing, "\textit{den e\thai apol\dot o\tho\"}, as \textit{Pan Crhistou} tells us. "...\textit{diath\thai ou\tho\"} t\textit{mnh\thai tou ef\thio\thou\thou Peri; Auj\thio\thiou...": "\textit{Mepol\tho\"} in \textit{QKHE} (Tom 8), 892.

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 7.24.1.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Pan Crhistou}, \textit{op. cit.}, 892-899.

\textsuperscript{81} Stonehouse, \textit{op. cit.}, 129.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Symp.} 8.7.

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Ibid.}, 1.5.
down to "John signifies". His approach to the Apoc, as may be noted from his enthusiastic exegesis in Symp. 8, was of a spiritual nature. The child of the woman of Rev 12 is not Christ but "those who are baptized". Consider especially his ideological interpretation of the ten horns and seven heads of the beast (Rev 13) in the context of the vices as opposed to the decalogue. And most notably, the negative position of Dionysius of Alexandria had no effect whatsoever on this writer. Perhaps, on the contrary, it even strengthened his resolve in support of the book.

Of much interest is the bishop's view on chiliasm, and, given his spiritual hermeneutics of the Apoc, it would be expected to be a highly negative one. But it is more of a case of his position being influenced by his opposition to Origen than to chiliasm itself. And as Stonehouse has rightly seen here, "both these aspects of his theological thinking reveal themselves in his own description of the future kingdom." Methodius, in fact, shows some sympathy towards chiliasm, but he makes sure to "spiritualize" it. Though he does not talk about the place of where the "festival of the resurrection" will be celebrated, it is not suggested as taking place on earth. The day of judgement, however, at the end of the present order, would come before the "millennium of rest, which is called the seventh day, even the true Sabbath." The "festival of the resurrection" is the path "into the very house of God" where the believer will leave behind the human form ("after the space of a thousand years") to exchange it for that of an angel's.

In the same work Methodius not only demonstrates his spiritualizing and allegorical approach to the Scriptures very clearly (including his unexpected closeness to Origen and fondness for Plato), but in a lengthy piece it is the Apocalypse that is heavily drawn upon to argue for a spiritual image of the Church. Methodius studiously considers Rev 12 (and in particular "the woman who appeared in heaven clothed with the sun, and crowned with twelve stars...").

---

84 *ibid.*, 6.5.
85 Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, 130.
86 The blueprint that Methodius puts down is not as clear as some might think, with a number of phases and places visited along the way to where people move "to greater and better things": *ibid.*; for some elucidation on this subject, see "Mepoldo" in *QKHE* (Tom 8), art., *Pan K. Chrysotou*, 893-895.
87 Symp. 9.5. [italics added]
88 *ibid*.
89 For a summary of these interesting contacts, especially as we are often informed that Methodius was an adversary of Origen, see Quasten, (Vol. II), 130-133. But perhaps, as Johannes Quasten also notes, in earlier times Methodius might in fact, have held Origen in high esteem (*Adv. Ruf.* 1.11).
90 *ibid.*, 8.4-7.
The Scripture is introduced thus: "John, in the course of the Apocalypse, says..."\textsuperscript{91} The bishop of Olympus begins with an exhortation to virginity, again appealing to Rev 12 and entreats his readers to be "like your Mother, who gives birth to the male Virgin in heaven..."\textsuperscript{92} Continuing for some time with the virginity exhortation he builds his case to ultimately draw this spiritualizing exegesis together and declare that the woman is "the Church"/ "Mother" who through her "labour-pains" conceives and gives "birth to those who are baptized".\textsuperscript{93} This interpretation of Methodius, preferring the "woman" [\textit{gynh}] of Rev 12 to represent the Church and not Mary, the Mother of God, is an important one and has even caused strong debate in the Eastern Orthodox Church itself.\textsuperscript{94} Savvva" Agourivdh" has vigorously argued and presented a convincing list of reasons (including literary evidence from Qumran, the OT, and history of interpretation) why the "woman" cannot be Mary;\textsuperscript{95} and here he follows an established ancient tradition which also includes "such outstanding commentators as St. Hippolytus, St. Methodius, and St. Andrew of Caesarea."\textsuperscript{96}

At this point we meet with a denotative paradigm: three great theologians of the Ancient Church, Irenaeus (Lyons), Origen (Alexandria), and Methodius (Asia Minor), all holding to the divine authority of the Book of Revelation without question, and yet each approaching and interpreting the chiliasm "problem" in their own unique way. There is in this strong proof that the Apoc possessed both an unbroken history of traditional usage and a theology of the \textit{ecclesia universalis} so compelling, that the book could meet the challenges to its authority and successfully negotiate even the most difficult terrain. How was this possible? Because, as Brevard S. Childs says, when he considers the canonical interpretation of the Apoc:

[F]rom a canonical perspective the decisive move by which the book of Revelation could be appropriated by successive generations of believers has already been made by the

\textsuperscript{91} ibid., 8.4.
\textsuperscript{92} ibid.
\textsuperscript{93} ibid., 8.7.
\textsuperscript{94} C. G. Flegg has tried to reconcile these two approaches, "[a] number of commentators have seen the woman as being the Mother of God, and, in a sense, they are right, because Mary is indeed the type of the Church": Columba Graham Flegg, \textit{An Introduction to Reading the Apocalypse}, (New York: SVS Press, 1999), 94.
\textsuperscript{95} Agourivdh", \textit{Apokaluhl}, 290-293. "H gunaika kai h ge

\textsuperscript{96} Averky Taushev & Seraphim Rose, \textit{The Apocalypse: In the Teachings of Ancient Christianity}, (California: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 177. "These torments of birthgiving signify the difficulties which had to be overcome by the Church of Christ when it was being established (martyrdom, the spreading of heresies): ibid., 178.
original author. The continuing message of the book was indeed moored in history, namely, God's history in Christ.

**Lactantius (d. AD c. 318), prov., Asia Minor-Gaul**

*As John Teaches in the Revelation, Epitome 42*

Lactantius, an African by birth, spent several years in Asia Minor (Bithynia) teaching Latin rhetoric (*Div. inst. 5.2.2*), but returned to the West (Gaul) toward the end of his life. Pico della Mirandola dubbed him the "Christian Cicero", however, Johannes Quasten writes, "unfortunately, the quality of his thought does not correspond to the excellence of its expression." The *Divinae institutiones*, which comprised Seven Books, and which, Elizabeth DePalma Digeser says, "most closely resembles... the *Preparation for the Gospel (Praeparatio evangelica)* by Eusebius of Caesarea", is Lactantius' most important work. It is the first major undertaking of a Latin compendium of Christian thought and references "many classical authors... addressing those familiar with the common school traditions." It sought to show the falsehood of pagan religion and of certain anti-Christian writings and to present the true doctrine, worship, and claims of Christianity:

> We undertake, therefore, to discuss religion and divine things... that we may put an end to deadly superstitions and most disgraceful errors.

In the *Div. inst.* 17 where he speaks of the false prophet, together with 2Thess 2, he refers to Rev 13:15 "an image to speak". And a little further down, in the same chapter, he points to

---


98 See "Lactantius" in Hans von Campenhausen, *The Fathers of the Church*, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 61-86. "Lactantius is a theologian of revelation. Even when he refers to the nature and reason of man, it is always God who must make accessible the way to real cognition": *ibid.*, 70.


100 Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. II), 393f.

101 Given the internal evidence (for instance the closing eulogy to Constantine in Bk 7 and Lactantius' own references to other writings) we can date the completed work between AD 304 and 313. That is, it was begun just after the writer's *De opificio dei* (20) and concluded sometime after the edict of Milan.

102 Digeser, *op. cit.*, 11.

103 For primary sources, studies relating to Lactantius, and his general theatre of influence, see *ibid.*, 177-195; see also the very helpful article by Oliver Nicholson, "The Source of the Dates in Lactantius' *Divine Institutes*", *JThS* 36, (1985), 291-310.

104 Digeser, *op. cit.*, 11.

105 *Div. inst.* 1.1.
Rev 13:16-17 and speaks of those "who shall refuse his [the false prophet's] mark". In the final chapter of the *Div. inst.* 27, he alludes to Rev 21:7 and 22:17, describing "the water of salvation from an ever-flowing mountain". A. Cleveland Coxe also holds that these references are "noteworthy as proof of the currency of the Apocalypse in North Africa."106

It is in the *Epitome* (a work appended to the *Div. inst.*) that he explicitly appeals to the author of the Apoc as a teacher by name with reference to Rev 19:12:

His [the Son's] name is known to none, except to Himself and the Father, as John teaches in the Revelation.107

Of interest is Lactantius' appeal to the Sibyl who "testifies and says",108 when he speaks of the renewed world to support his chiliast position. But it is not only the Sibyl, or the prophets, "but even the bards, and poets, and philosophers, who agree that "there will be a resurrection of the dead."109 The "Christian Cicero" straightforwardly heralds:

[but] He, when He shall have destroyed unrighteousness, and executed His great judgements, and shall have recalled to life the righteous, who have lived from the beginning, will be engaged among men a thousand years, and will rule them with most just command. Which the Sibyl proclaims in another place, as she utters her inspired predictions...110

**Eusebius** (AD c. 260-340), prov., Caesarea

*Shall be Decided from the Testimony of the Ancients*, Hist. Eccl. 3.24.18

In a notable section of his *Ekklesiastikhistoria*111 (3.25) Eusebius presents a summary of the state of the NT writings: *ajakefalaiwaspai* ta; *dhlwqesa* th' *Kainh* *Diaqhvkh*

---

106 *ANF* (Vol. VII), 223.

107 The *Epitome* addressed to a "brother Pentadius" (*pref.*) is according to its own author "an epitome" of the *Divinae institutiones*: *ibid.* It is, as Quasten says, if we are to judge from its contents, "not an excerpt of the main work but an abridged re-edition": Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. II), 399. The work would appear to have been written some years after AD 314. Jerome had referred to an incomplete copy of the text as "the book without a head": *De vir. ill.* 80. The complete text was found in a seventh-century manuscript (Cod. Taurinesis I b VI 28 saec. VII).


109 *ibid.*

110 *ibid.*

111 For the standard Editions and studies of this momentous work, see Quasten (Vol. 111), 315-317; see also *TABD* (Vol. 2), 676; and Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, (London: Harvard University Press, 1981), 280-283, 406-442. For a most valuable and expert discussion on the "fabric of the Ecclesiastical History", see *ibid.*, 126-147.
The books are divided into three classes: "accepted" (οὐχὶ ὁμογενῆς), disputed (ἀντιλεγομένων), and "rejected" (νομίζω). Lee M. McDonald's feeling "what probably was most determinative in the selection process was the widespread use of a writing in the churches" is borne out a little further down when Eusebius stumbles on the Apoc. Nowhere is the intricate canonical adventure of the Apoc better represented than here: the book is grouped both under the "accepted" and the "disputed". Eusebius, I wish to add, is not formulating a canon; he is recording (with some fair bias) the state of the NT Canon. Our ecclesiastical author is what B. W. Anderson might call, a "pilgrim people" in the wider "traditio-historical Process". On a personal level, however, he would not hesitate to classify the Book of Revelation with the disputed writings alone, but he is constrained by a fundamental factor, the Apoc's healthy canonical report. This "hesitating attitude", as N. B. Stonehouse has correctly concluded, "can only mean that Eusebius was at odds with the church." Its secure reputation in the West and its accruing reputation in the East compelled Eusebius the historian to report the Apoc's true rank in spite of his own low view of the book. It is not true, I would argue, that Eusebius necessarily contradicts himself, as Stonehouse believes. Eusebius openly admits that "[i]n regard to the Apocalypse, the opinions of most men are still divided." But scholars, unfortunately, have not always pointed out how Eusebius held that this contradiction was to be resolved:

But at the proper time this question likewise shall be decided from the testimony of the ancients \\

Eusebius was not an incidental figure. He was a powerful and familiar presence in the court of the Emperor, and his part in the proceedings at the Council of Nicea in the year AD 325

---

112 Hist. Eccl. 3.25.1.
113 ibid., 3.25.3-4.
114 Lee Martin McDonald, "The Integrity of the Biblical Canon in Light of Its Historical Development", BBR 6, (1996), 127; but this begs the question, what determined "the widespread use of a writing" in the first place?
115 ibid., 3.25.5.
117 Stonehouse, op. cit., 133.
118 ibid.
119 Hist. Eccl. 3.24.18.
120 ibid.
121 A. C. McGiffert's Prolegomena to the Ecclesiastical History in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (Vol. 1), 3-56, though dated in quite a few places, still remains one of the most balanced critiques of Eusebius' Hist. Eccl., (see esp. § Eusebius as a Historian. The Merits and Defects of his History, 46-52). "The value of the
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(consequently controversial given his distrust for the term communion was not insignificant. Nor can it pass without comment, given our express interest in the Canon, that Constantine himself requested Eusebius prepare fifty copies of the Scriptures for use in Constantinople (AD c. 334-336). It is also most interesting to know, given their differing positions on the Apoc, that Eusebius was greatly influenced by the legend of Origen who had been a frequent visitor to Caesarea in Palestine. Of the several places that can be cited for Eusebius' admiration and respect for Origen, it is enough to mention his spirited defence of the great Alexandrian against the "slander" of Porphyry the Neo-Platonist (Hist. Eccl. 6.19). Perhaps their differing approach to the Book of Revelation was because as Timothy D. Barnes believes, "[a]lthough Eusebius had learned from Origen to express the Christian view of God and man in terms of Middle Platonism, he never completely mastered the philosophical issues,"

An entire chapter of Eusebius' Hist. Eccl. is given over to the reporting of Dionysius' critical position against the Apoc. It fits in very well with Eusebius' own negative predisposition. This becomes even clearer in that part of the Hist. Eccl. in which he speaks of the preface of Papias' Exposition, where Eusebius criticizes Irenaeus for his statement that Papias was a hearer of John. It is pointed out that Papias was apparently referring to two Johns, the apostle himself, but also to another, the presbyter. This is a confirmation, Eusebius says, of the story

History to us lies not in its literary merit, but in the wealth of the materials which it furnishes for a knowledge of the early Church": ibid., 46.

122 Eusebius describes the opening of the Council in the Vita Constantini (3.10). It is quite probable, that Eusebius himself delivered the opening address, something which Sozomen confirms in his own History (Hist. Eccl. 1.19); cf. Vita Constantini (1.1). For an explanation of the contradictory reports by Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Philostorgius (according to Nicetas Choniates, Thes. de orthod. fid. V.7), see McGiffert, op. cit., 19f.

123 I have found no evidence to contradict the position of McDonald who says that these fifty copies of the scriptures were "presumably the NT": Lee M. McDonald, The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon, (Hendrickson Publishers: Massachusetts, 1995), 186; G. A. Robbins' contention that these copies consisted only of the Gospels: G. A. Robbins, "Entire Bibles or Gospel Books?", StudP 19, (1989), 91-98, is again in my opinion correctly countered by McDonald, "...but we find his [Robbins'] reasoning questionable. He does not account for the widespread acceptance of most of the NT writings in the fourth century, nor does he explain why such an elaborate copy of the fifty gospels would be sent to Constantinople for lectionary purposes without the rest of the recognized scriptures": McDonald, op. cit., fn. 38.

124 Here (Hist. Eccl. 6.19), Eusebius also speaks of the honour bestowed upon Origen by the bishops of the church in Caesarea "to preach and expound the Scriptures publicly, although he had not yet been ordained as presbyter"; see also Barnes, op. cit., 81-105.

125 Barnes, op. cit., 100.

126 Hist. Eccl. 7.25.
that in Ephesus "there were two tombs" called John's. Eusebius' hasty refutation of Irenaeus
does not end here. This evidence is "important", he continues, because:

...it is probable that it was the second, if one is not willing to admit that it was the first
that saw the Revelation, which is ascribed by name to John.

This ingenious suggestion, as A. C. McGiffert in my opinion has correctly concluded, "[is]
a very clever one, and yet it is only a guess, and does not pretend to be more." There is little
doubt that Eusebius is strongly inclined to the position of Dionysius of Alexandria (who had
made a similar suggestion and which was recorded by our writer), that the "faith-
community" is not to consider at a critical level the claim that the Apoc was written by
John the Apostle. Why? Because he knew well, as Thomas A. Hoffman deftly captures, that
"it is the act of canonization by the faith-community that makes the text canonical, an act
which recognizes the text as inspired and normative, but which confers a third and separate
character upon the text, viz., canonicity." Eusebius also considers that he finds solid proof
in the reference to Papias' two Johns to counter the arguments against the proposal. Another
instance of Eusebius' one-sided use of his sources is his reference to the ecclesiastical writer
Caius, whom he featured as rejecting the Apoc. He quotes from Caius, highlighting his
orthodoxy and antichiliasm, but is suspiciously quiet about his attack upon the Gospel in the
same work, as he is neglectful in failing to mention that Hippolytus had written a work in
refutation of Caius' objections. Even more incredible is the lack of direct reference in the

---

128 Ibid.
129 McGiffert, op. cit., 171.
130 Hist. Eccl. 7.25.16.
131 Thomas A. Hoffman, S.J., "Inspiration, Normativeness, Canonicity, and the Unique Sacred Character of
132 Ibid.
133 Ibid., 3. 39. 5-6.
134 Very little can be said with certainty about the obscure figure of Caius. Eusebius is our only direct source
for it would seem that later writers (including Jerome) have simply repeated his accounts. From Eusebius we
learn that Caius was a church man "who rose under Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome" and that he was in
"disputation with Proclus" the leader of the Phrygian heresy: Hist Eccl. 2.25.6. Later, we are also told that Caius
wrote against Cerinthus, "the author of another heresy" (3.28.1). Photius will add other detail including Caius'
bishopric and a series of works (Bibl. xlviii), however, this information, as others have also noted, is not only
new, but recorded some six hundred years after Caius' death.
135 Hist. Eccl. 3.38.2.
136 Quasten (Vol. II), 197.
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Hist. Eccl. to one of the foremost theologians of that era, Methodius of Olympus (d. AD c. 311). This could be explained by that writer's uncertain views on the question of chiliasm.  

Eusebius, whose low view of the chiliasts is further evidenced by his condescending description of Papias, would not find it difficult to follow through with his dogmatic bias and to create such doubt about the Apoc's authority as to have it legitimately questioned. I would suggest, however, that Stonehouse, goes too far in saying that Eusebius was "quite ready to destroy the influence of the Apocalypse in the Church." Though Eusebius certainly supports those writers who were suspicious of the book's origins on account of the supposed chiliasm of its author, he cannot in his treatment, given the sheer weight and high credibility of the evidence, ignore the ancient depositions of the Apoc's use as a commended text. In fact, as we have earlier noted, he will on occasion even appeal to these testimonies himself. This makes Eusebius' alternative classification of the Book of Revelation as "accepted" [οξμογωνευμενοι] of great importance and proof that his, or anyone else's enduring bias, would ultimately have to be measured against a prevailing tradition of canon which undergirded the εμπειρία of the ecclesia catholica. Here, it is imperative to point out, that though Eusebius "questions the credentials of Revelation", as Barnes rightly notes, "he knew of no early writer who had denied Johannine authorship." For it is a clear admission that there was a strong voice in the Church, "the living communities of faith", which openly held to the apostolic origin of the book and which had received it as Scriptura sacra. 

The tantalizing point remains, however, that if our ecclesiastical historian was singularly committed to the removal of the Apoc from the canon consciousness of the Church, he has surprisingly recorded more arguments and testimonies for the inclusion of the Seer's book in the NT Canon than for its exclusion! We have already noted that he would leave the definitive decision as to the ultimate authority of the work to the "testimony of the ancients" [των αικαιων μαρτυρίαν]. For it was critically comprehended by the great theologians of the Ancient Church, that "the unique authority of the Bible is based on its use as Scripture by diverse communities of faith." So Eusebius would still waver on the definitive position of

---

137 Symp. 9.5.
139 Stonehouse, loc. cit.
140 Barnes, op. cit., 140.
141 Scalise, op. cit., 18.
142 Hist. Eccl. 3.24.18.
143 Scalise, op. cit., 84.
the Apoc, which is further evidenced in that there are times when he will cite the book simply as  "the Apocalypse of John" [\( \text{I} \text{wavnu} \ \text{\text{	extae}pokal\textywv} \)]\(^{144}\) without intimation that its authority was ever considered doubtful.\(^ {145}\) Our present author might summons proofs \textit{contra} apostolic authorship, but he quickly stumbles on the vital question of traditional usage. Let us not lose sight of this important fact, for Eusebius (also the bishop), as W. J. Abraham says, was one of "the greatest apologists of the patristic age",\(^ {146}\) and appeal to the "ancients" was for the apologists (and bishops) a fundamental component of trustworthy theology which witnessed to the catholicity of the Church.\(^ {147}\)

The Book of Revelation was a religious document which had initially proclaimed triumphantly from within a fantastical liturgical atmosphere both a \textit{realised} and \textit{future} eschatology to a marginalised and persecuted minority. It was received with a powerfully different spiritual cognisance to other early apocalypses.\(^ {148}\) From the moment of its publication it was conferred with a divine "function" by its inspired author and the community of the faithful. It was possessed, as we can say, from the perspective of canonical criticism, of a "fuller theological statement, or Word."\(^ {149}\) Eusebius, like Dionysius before him, was supremely conscious and alert to this sacred function in the life of the Early Church, and even if it was, ever so paradoxically, in the context of the early interpretations of chiliasm. He finds, for instance, the prophecy of the New Jerusalem fulfilled in Constantine's restoration of the city in Palestine.\(^ {150}\) Significantly, in the context of our approach, Eusebius, as Barnes

\(^{144}\) In his attack of Montanus (where Eusebius refers to the records of Apollonius) he speaks of the leader of the "so-called Phrygian heresy" as making use of the "testimonies also from the Revelation of John" [\( \text{marturiar} \ \text{apoth} \ \text{I} \text{wavnu} \ \text{\text{	extae}pokal\textywv} \)] (\textit{Hist. Eccl}. 5.18.13). See also the Appendix [Eusebius] for further references.

\(^{145}\) Eusebius the "Father of Ecclesiastical History", would have understood perhaps more than most not only after battling and sifting through all of the rich sources at his disposal, but that he was a bishop as well of the episcopal see of Caesarea (something which amazingly many commentators choose to ignore), that "[i]t is the church's decision, and this alone, not some inherent component of inspiration or normativeness, that is the ultimate reason why a book is or is not canonical": Hoffman, \textit{art. cit.}, 463.


\(^{147}\) Why is this so important in the context of the NT Canon? Because "[t]he Church had only to define the 'canon', not to compose inspired writings": John Meyendorff, \textit{Living Tradition}, (New York: SVS Press, 1978), 14.

\(^{148}\) See Wall and Lemcio for the Apocalypse in canonical context where the immediately distinguishing canonical features of the Seer's work are expertly brought and analysed, Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, \textit{The New Testament as Canon: A Reader in Canonical Criticism}, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), Chapter 12.


\(^{150}\) \textit{Demonst. Evan}. 8.2.31.
acknowledges, was completely aware that ultimately, he was writing "the story of a community founded by the Son of God."\(^{151}\)

**Athenasius the Great** (AD c. 295-373), prov., Alexandria, Egypt

*The 39th Festal Epistle and the NT Canon*

Few ecclesiastical figures of the Early Church held the universal respect of Athanasius the Great, bishop of Alexandria from AD 329 to the time of his death in AD 373. His influence in the Egyptian church during the fourth century was unmatched.\(^{152}\) Athanasius travelled more widely than his predecessors and even stayed in Rome for a long period of time; he was therefore familiar with the varying traditions of the churches. He has been described by Constantine N. Tsirpanlis as one of the formulators of "the classic patristic doctrine on creation and theology of History",\(^{153}\) and Hans von Campenhausen has said that "[t]he whole subsequent development of the Greek-Byzantine Imperial Church was based on the struggle and success of this one man."\(^{154}\) Therefore not only is the bishop's position on the Apoc supremely important for the investigation of the book's adventure, but also any pronouncements on the Canon itself are of great significance. The importance that is being attached to Athanasius can be essentially associated with his theological approach and exegetical method. He appealed to the mind of the Church, "to that faith which had been once delivered and then devoutly kept."\(^{155}\)Athanasius' position on the Apoc here was paramount, particularly in the context of the eastern churches, where the Seer's book was subject to the critical judgements of Dionysius of Alexandria and the negative position of Eusebius.

It was a custom for the bishops of Alexandria (see for example Dionysius and Cyril)\(^{156}\) to send to the churches of the diocese encyclicals\(^{157}\) on matters of ecclesiastical importance. The

---

\(^{151}\) Barnes, *op. cit.*, 146.

\(^{152}\) For the life and times of Athanasius, see Alvyn Pettersen, *Athenasius*, (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1995), 1-18. Of course, his influence did not mean that his episcopal rule was without its problems, "seventeen years, out of forty-six as bishop, Athanasius had spent in exile": *ibid.*, 18; see also Khaled Anatolios, *Athenasius: The Coherence of his Thought*, (London: Routledge, 1998). For bibliography, *ibid.*, 248-255.


\(^{156}\) Eusebius cites the festal epistles of Dionysius "in which he [Dion.] uses words of panegyric respecting the passover feast": *Hist. Eccl.* 7.20.
practice of the announcement of Easter in the circular letter was in all probability inspired by the controversy over the date of the great feast which was subject to continuing debate. One of the most important, the 39th Festal Epistle (Ἑρμαρτησία) was sent out by Athanasius in AD 367. Included in this letter is a list of the books of the Holy Scriptures, the earliest of which contain exactly the same writings as our present NT, and are accorded canonical status. Given Athanasius' episcopal authority in the Church at large, it could be expected that his pronouncement on the Canon would prove decisive for many ecclesiastical writers who continued to vacillate on the authority of certain books, including the Book of Revelation.

It is essential to note the following element at this particular period of the Apoc's adventure, another factor that argues characteristically for the document's multi-layered dimension and canonical function. When the book was in danger of being budged from the emerging NT Canon (primarily on account of its association with pre-Constantine chiliasm), it was on this occasion saved by the massive weight of tradition which linked into the criteria of canonicity and confirmed the text's "authenticity". This is not strictly speaking a shift in the interpretative tradition, as for instance we would find in modern philosophical or theological dialogue. In the Apoc we have movements or shifts in focus when "the location of the flash-point of experience (where the immanent touches the transcendent)" is not moved. Athanasius, being the faithful churchman that he was, could not ignore such a universal voice in support for the book coming from the ancients. At the time of the writing of this festal

157 For a good overview of the history and canonical extensions of official church epistolography (which includes the encyclical) in the eastern tradition, see ΟΙΕΗ, (Τον Τέλειο), J. Kotswah, art., "Graumaa", 637-641.
159 "It was an ancient custom for the bishop of Alexandria to write, if possible, every year soon after Epiphany a so-called Festal Epistle (Ἑρμαρτησία) to the Egyptian churches and monasteries under his authority, in which he informed them of the date of Easter and the beginning of the Lenten fasts. By fixing the date of Easter this yearly epistle fixed also the dates of all Christian festivals of the year": Metzger, The Canon, 211.
160 "'The year 367 marks, thus,' as Metzger says, "the first time that the scope of the New Testament canon is declared to be exactly the twenty-seven books accepted today as canonical": ibid., 212.
161 See Meyendorff who writes, "[t]his authenticity, of course, is to be understood in a wider sense and as concerning certainly the content, but not necessarily the form of scriptural texts": John Meyendorff, Living Tradition, (New York: SVS Press, 1978), 14.
162 For example as in readings of Martin Heidegger which alternate between "reading him as a Hegelian and reading him as a champion of difference": Graham Ward, Barth, Derrida and the Language of Theology, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 122.
163 Ward, ibid. (Note that Graham Ward is not speaking here of the Apoc but of a connection within phenomenology; however, his words fit the context well).
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epistle, apocryphal works were "apparently popular" in some of the churches in Egypt as C. Wilfred Griggs informs us,164 which Athanasius sought to set apart clearly and distinguish from the authoritative Scripture. The great significance that the bishop put on his declaration as the "arbiter of doctrinal limitation" and "orthodoxy on a grand scale",165 is seen from the fact that he uses the prologue of Luke as a model to introduce the list of canonical documents:

'Forasmuch as some have taken in hand' to reduce into order for themselves the books (tav kanonixovmena)...166

Athanasius continues to name the books of both the Old and New Testaments, the Book of Revelation recorded at the end: kai; pavln jwanou jApolaluyi". In all of these documents, which are the "fountains of salvation",167 the true faith is expounded. From this body of books in which alone is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness (and reminiscent of Apoc 22:18-19), "[l]et no man add to these, neither let him take ought from these."168 Outside this collection all else is apocryphal, put down by "heretics" [aiJretikw'n] to "lead astray the simple".169 And whereas Eusebius had spoken of ajntilegomevnwn,170 the Alexandrian leader does not. For Athanasius there is only one body of books, the "canonical" [kanonixovmena]. In this canonical body of texts the Book of Revelation is listed as a matter of fact, "[a]nd besides, the Revelation of John."171 Athanasius also distinguishes clearly the canonical writings from other edifying works which were "appointed by the Fathers to be read [by recent converts]... for instruction in the word of godliness."172 These books include the Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, "and that which is called the Teaching of the Apostles [Didache], and the Shepherd [of Hermas]."173 The Apoc, is of course, used by Athanasius as Scripture. I will note here the most representative found in the Discourses against the Arians. In arguing that the Son is eternal and not created, the patriarch of

165 ibid.
166 Festal Epistle 39.3.
167 ibid., 39.6.
168 ibid.
169 ibid.
170 Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.25.3-4.
171 Festal Epistle 39.5.
172 ibid., 39.7.
173 ibid.
Alexandria speaks of the testimony of the "holy Scripture" and cites the famous proclamation of John 1:1, immediately after he refers to Rev 1:4 with ταῦτα λέγει.\(^{174}\)

The role of Arianism in Athanasius' deliberations of the Canon is undoubtedly relevant and directly connected to his canonical discourse: in appealing to the "mind of the Church" \([\text{τὸν \ Ραμνὴ \ θυμὸν \ τῆς \ Χρυσῆ \ θυμοῦ}{]}^{175}\) in his opposition to the heresy, he argued that the correct interpretation of particular texts is only possible if the principle of interpretation is the rule or "the scope of faith" \([\text{τὸν \ Ραμνὴ \ πίστης}{]}^{176}\). George Florovsky cites the illustrious theologian "who in writing to Bishop Serapion on the topic of the Holy Spirit, Athanasius contends that the Arians ignored or missed 'the scope of the Divine Scripture' \([\text{οἱ \ εἰσί \ τὸν \ Ραμνὴ \ θυμὸν τῆς \ Θεοῦ \ Γραφῆς}{]}^{177}\). At one other place, George Florovsky observes, the three nouns \([\text{τὰ \ Παραδοσία \ καὶ \ Διδασκαλία \ καὶ \ Πίστις}{]}\) "actually coincide."\(^{178}\) Athanasius, the Alexandrian bishop, declares, "[l]et us look from the beginning at that very tradition, teaching, and faith of the catholic church which the Lord gave \((\text{ἐδώκει})\), the apostles preached \((\text{εὐκοθέω})\), and the Fathers preserved \((\text{εὐχωρίω})\). Upon this the church is founded."\(^{179}\) And it was from such a theological atmosphere that the famous 39th Festal Epistle was crafted, in which the Biblical Canon of the Scripture is listed in full.

The eschatology of Athanasius is not elaborate in the sense of detailed end-time speculation.\(^{180}\) Yet, he does (perhaps surprisingly for some), spend time speaking of the "Antichrist", particularly in the false prophet (Arian) setting.\(^{181}\) His position on the Apoc was not influenced by the negative press during the years when the chiliast controversy was at its highest. This is very significant, because it suggests that the distinguished Alexandrian bishop received the Apoc as a document of the NT, especially because he considered it a writing

---

\(^{174}\) Orat. 1.4.11.

\(^{175}\) Contra Arianos 1.44.

\(^{176}\) ibid., 3.35.

\(^{177}\) Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.), 105. [Florovsky is citing Ad Serapionem 2.7 ]; see also Paragrapoul o for an astute examination of the biblical hermeneutics and the "εἰκὴν \ Παραδόσια \ καὶ \ Διδασκαλία \ καὶ \ Πίστις" in Athanasius' thought which is ultimately connected to the "economy of the Incarnation": op. cit., 336-341.

\(^{178}\) ibid., 106.

\(^{179}\) ibid., [citing Ad Serapionem 1.28]

\(^{180}\) Athanasius is more concerned with the consequences of the resurrection in the soteriological context of Christ's bodily resurrection than with the events that will necessarily lead to the eschatological completion (cf. De Incarn. Verbi 27).

\(^{181}\) For instance, "δε τὴν αἰγείνην αἰγείνην κριστοναγων οὐσιαν καὶ τὸν αἵντικριστον προδομὸν": Athanasius Theol., Apologia contra Arianos sive Apologia secunda, TLG (2035 005) 90.3.4. Also in the typological context of the Book of Daniel, Historia Arianorum, TLG (2035 009) 77.1.2.
handed down by those who had come before him. These were persons forming, as we have seen above, a succession to the "tradition" [paradosi:] and "teaching" [didaskalía] of the Church. In the context of the reception of the Apoc and the NT generally, from the perspective of canonical criticism (at least from the positions of Charles J. Scalise and Brevard S. Childs), we would here speak of the community of the believers being handed down the "canonical guideline". The controversy of chiliasm did not make him, Athanasius, uneasy or apologetic about his judgement on the canonicity of the book: Tradition was far and above particular local disputes. And this precise and vital point James A. Sanders, from his own particular perspective and time-frame, has relayed to the modern reader most proficiently:

...once the sanctity of such reputation was transmitted along with community commendation, canon existed for the community and persisted whether or not the value derived was consistent, high, low, or latent for this or that community or generation. At that point when sacredness had been superimposed by the communities, then the survival power of the sacred literature as canon was assured without its having always to prove itself.183

The Final Station, Why?

Before closing this chapter with a brief but necessary survey of a group of Athanasius' eminent contemporaries, let us take a moment to recall the famous 39th Festal Epistle. This epistle, which for Eastern Orthodoxy as Karabidopoulou states in his appraisal of the NT Canon, represents that "...final station in the development [éxevlìxh] and ultimate formation [diamovrfìsh] of the Sacred Scriptures." It was Athanasius, as well, who was the first to unambiguously use the term "kannôn" to denote "the body of the books [tou' swrâ to' tw'h bibliw'n] of the Holy Scripture."184

All' epeidh periíme'n tw' aìretikw'n ekhàthw's qhmen w'j nekrw's periìde'h òmhm w'j ekòntwn proj swthriân taj qeìj grafàj, kailìfoboumai mhòw'j, w'j ègr'aye Korinqiôij Pauìjoj, ol'gòij tw' akeraìnñ a'pò th' a'pòthtoj kailì th' a'pòthtoj planhqw'sin a'pò th' panourgìaj tw' a'hqw'w'n, kaili loiòbèh t'hugxàa'he'jì éteìjì 72 toij j legome'nòij a'pòkru'fòjì, a'patw'menòi tov òmwnumì' tw'ò' a'hqw'm biblìw'n, paràka'l w'da'he'kesèjì, eíi' periìwò epi'st'asèjì.

182 Childs, As Canon, 517; Scalise, op. cit., 42f.
183 Sanders, op. cit., 34.
The Apocalypse

periì tou/twn ka)gwÜ mnhmoneu/wn gra/fw dia/te thb a)haqkhn kailot|xrh|s|mon th|=
ekkl hsiaj. M elfl|w|n del tou|fwn mnhmoneu|än, xrh|s|oma|i| pro| susta|sin th|=
ema|uto|to|f mh|j t%¼up% tou=ue|v|g|el is|to|u=L ouka=I e|g|w|n kail au|to|j: Epeidh/
per tinej e|pe|xie|hs an a|ha|ta|sa qai e|u|to|ij| t|a|l|e|go|me|na a|pokrufa |kai|lim|tai
tau|a| tv|mepo|neus\%% gra|fw|=pe|ri|lh| e|pl|h|ro|for|h|hm|en, ka|qw|j| par|odos a|ntoj| patra|sin oi, ap| a|xh|j| au|to|ptai kail up|h|refai geno|me|noi tou=lo|g|ou, edoce
ka|mo|q| pro|tra|pe|ht|i| para|g|h|s|ijn|a|a|elf|w|kai|l|im|aq|to |a|w|q|en e|th|j| ekqes qai
ta|kan|iz|o|me|na| kail par|adoq|eta|, pisteuq|e|hta te qei|a e|i|ai|bibliq, i|a|a
ek|as|to|j, el|me|b h|a|th|h|g, ka|ta|g\%% pl|an|hs|a|ht|w, o|del|kaqar|oj| dia|miae|q
xa|fv| p|a|l|in upo|m|mn|h|sko|me|noj. Esta|t|oi|q|gt|h j me|b| pala|ai|j| dia - 73 qhkjh
bibliq t%¼at|q|%|ta|pa|hta e|ko|sid|u|b, to|so|ua|b|a ga|f, wj h|a|ou|sa, kai|t|al
sto|ixeia|t|al|pa|r' Ebra|gi|j|e|i|a|i| pa|ra|ded|otai, tv=de|ta|tei kai|t|%¼o|ho|mati
e\t|in|ek|a|sto|n ou|awj: pr|w|wn Gen|e|jesij: e|i|a| 
Deco|doj: e|i|a| Leu|ti|ko|n|: ka|i|meta

tou|bou Ar|miq|oi|ka|i|loi|op|h, to|l| Deu|ter|on|on|i|on: e|th|j| del|to|u|oj| e|th|i| h|s|ou|j| o
tou=N au|u|h|skai K|ri|ta|q| kai|meta|t|ou|to|h |Rouq: kai|palin e|th|j|, Bas|il|ei|w|k| 
bibli|q| te|ss|ara: kail tou|fwn to|l|me|b pr|w|wn kail deu|teron ejf ea| bib|lign
atiqme|lai|, to|l| de|t|ri|o|n kail te|ta|rt|on o|mo|i|wj ejf e|a| m|et|a|l del ta|u|a,
Para|leipome|hn pr|w|wn kail deu|teron, omo|i|wj ejf e|a| bib|lign pa|lin
atiqmoumena: e|i|a| Edro| pr|w|wn kail deu|teron o|mo|i|wj ejf e|a| meta|l de|ta|u|a,
bib|lo|j Y a|l|w|q|kail e|th|j| Paro|mij|a: e|i|a| Ekk|hs|la|sthj: kai|a|s|ma
#s ma|fw|n: pro|t|ou|oj e\at|k|ai|i|w|b: kail o|i|p|h, Pro|rhi|ai, o|me|b|dwe|ka ejf
ea| bib|lign a|tiqmoumenoi, e|i|a| Hsiaj|, |Jeremij|a, |Kai|l|s|ub| au|%¼ Barouk,
Qr|h|mo|kail|epi|74 stol|h|kail|met' au|to|f te|zekhi|l kail Dan|hi|f. a|x|ri tou|fwn
tal|the| palai|a|j dia|q|kh|j i|atatai. Ta|\del|the| kaih|j|pal|in ouk o|kh|te|do|n
epi|ei|h.Esta|t|gat|au|wa: Eu\ag|g|el|ia| te|ss|ara, ka|ta| Matqa|b|n, ka|ta|Ma|f|kon, ka|ta|Louka|m |kai|kata|Iwa|nhn: e|i|a| meta|l ta|u|a|
pra|je|j a|postol|wn, kai episto|lei|a| kaq|ol|i|ki|ka|l|ou|men|oi tw|k| apo|sto|l|w e|pta|
ou|wj|: lak|w|bou me|b |m|a, Pe|t|rou de|l|dub, e|i|a| Iwa|nhnou treij, kai|me|
tau|aj| lou|da |mi|j: pro|t|ou|oj Paul|ou a|postol|ou e|i|s|h episto|lei|a
dekate|sa|rej, pro|t|ou|oj pr|w|th, pro|t|RM|w|ai|gj, e|i|a| pro|t|
Koriniqiguj|u|b, kai|me|ta|l|ta|u|b|a| pro|Ga|la|faj, ka|ile|q|ei|j| pro|
Efe|si|gj, e|i|a| pro|
Filip|phs|igj, kai| pro| Kolos|sa|ej, kai|me|ta|w|a| pro|
Qe|sa|lon|ike|j| u|b, kai|h|pro|j|Ebra|gi|j, ka|ile|u|h|uj| pro|me|Tim|o|de|on|u|b,
pro|t|ou|T|i|o|n mi|j, kai|te|l|e|uta|ij |h|pro|F il|h|mona mi|j: kai|pal|in Iwa|nhn
Apokau|yj: 75 Tau|a| ph|gia|loit|ou=s w|th|ri|g|u, 
bTe|to|h| dy|w|k|ta eh|fo|rei|aqi|a
tw|e|h|tou|to|ji|l|ogijn: e|h|tou|to|j| mo|hijn|t|oi|h|th|j e|u|she|be|gij|did|ka|k|ai|e|bijn
ue|ug|gel|ig|eta|j: m|he|di|j tou|to|j ep|ba|li|etw, m|he|deltou|fwn a|fai|re|ig|w ti. Peri|
del|tou|fwn o|ku|ro|ioj| Sada|ou|kai|gj me|b|e||u|w|p|ei, le|eg|j: 'Pla|na|e|qe m|he|i|e|do|fej
taj|gra|faj m|he|de|l|h|nu|h|mn|au|t|w|o|, toi|el|de|l|ou|da|gij|par|v|ne|i:e: 'Ere|una|be|taj|gra|faj, ofi|a|ul|ai|ej|in|a|i, ma|tur|mousai|e|peri|le|j|ou=|A|il|e|\a|ka|/ge
ple|i|noj ak|ri|be|gj|pro|st|gh|mi| kail tou|bou| gra|f|w a|h|akgai|w|j, wj ofi|e|t|i|k|ai|e
E||era|bibi||a|tou|n|e|w|q|en, ou|ka|non|iz|o|me|na meh, tetu|p|w|men|a|del|para|t|w|a
pat|er|w|n a|haginw|e|se|qaj toi|el|a| pro|ser|x|me|hoi|j| kail boulome|noi|j
kai|the|lei|qai toi|el|h|j| e|u|she|be|gij|lo|gon: Sof|ij| Solom|w|o|j kai|Sof|ij|
Sirak kai|E|s|q|ht kai|l|ou|di|g|kai|Tw|bij|j kai|Did|ax|\ll|a|la|um|eh|w tw|k|apo|sto|l
ka|ilo| Poimhn. Kail|ou|w|j, a|\ap|htoiq|ka|ke|igj|kai - 76 no|i|z|o|me|noj, kail\ntou|n
a|haginwsko|me|noj, ou|la|ma|ou=tw|6 a|pokrufwn mnh|hn, a|\a|la|a|\ire|tkw|w\%|ek|ti
epigo|a, gra|fo|ht|wn me|b ofe|q els|u|s in a|u|ta|x arizome|me|noj de\kail|pro|st|i|q|g|htwn
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On the Contemporaries of Athanasius

For the reasons outlined above it was decided to conclude our investigation of the patristic testimony into the circulation and early use of the Apoc with Athanasius the Great and his landmark for canonical studies, the 39th Festal Epistle. Of course, there were other illustrious servants of the Church that could have been added to our list that arrived on the scene at about the same time as the Alexandrian bishop, or just a little later. Of these ecclesiastical writers we could have added (had space and the scope of this thesis permitted) such distinguished names as: Ephraim the Syrian (AD c. 309-373), Didymus the Blind (AD c. 313-398), Cyril of Jerusalem (AD c. 313-386), Epiphanius of Salamis (AD c. 315-403), Gregory of Nazianzus (AD c. 329-390), Basil the Great (AD c. 330-379), Gregory of Nyssa (AD c. 330-394), Amphilochius of Iconium (d. AD c. 394), John Chrysostom (AD c. 347-407).

185 TLG (2035 014) 71.10. [bold added]
186 See the Appendix of the dissertation. I should add that a number of the records for this particular writer were included with some reservation pertaining to their genuineness. The witness of Ephraim the Syrian is a weighty matter given his place of origin and must be considered further in greater detail.
187 Despite his great handicap of losing his sight by the age of four (Paladius Hist., Lausiac 4), Didymus was so highly regarded for both his asceticism and learning, that Athanasius elevated him to head of the catechetical school of Alexandria (Rufinus, Hist. Eccl. 2.7). Jerome, one of his most famous pupils speaks unreservedly of Didymus' influence on ecclesiastical writers in both the West and the East and refers to him as his "magister" (Epist. 50.1, 84.3). Rufinus, another of his students, acknowledges Didymus as a "prophet" and "apostolic man" (Ruf., Apol. in Hier. 2.25). Didymus was afterwards anathematized on account of his association with the defence of Origen's De Principiis (as a holder of the pre-existence of the soul and the Apokatastasis) by the Fifth Council of Constantinople in AD 553 (along with Origen and Evagrius Ponticus). Didymus quotes the Apoc extensively (see the Appendix for the list of proofs). The book is cited normatively as Scripture, "th' grafh'... jApokaluvyei jIwavnnou": Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl., Commentarii in Zacchariam, TLG (2102 010) 1.278.1.
188 At one point in the catechetical lectures, Cyril lists the books of both the OT and NT which alone are to be "read in Churches" [ejn ejkklhsiva/ meta; parrhsiva" ajnaginwskomen] (following closely the classification employed by Eusebius). From this authoritative list of "the divinely-inspired Scriptures" the Book of Revelation is omitted and presumably grouped in the "secondary rank": Catech. 4.33-36. Yet there might be some grounds to believe that he did in fact refer to the book: ibid., 1.4 (Rev 2:17); 10.3 (Rev 5:5); 19.10 (Rev 7:17).
189 Epiphanius became bishop of Constantia (ancient Salamis) in Cyprus around AD 367. He is considered one of the three Cappadocian Fathers in the context of Athanasius' invaluable contribution to the theological definitions arising out of the early Ecumenical Councils, "[c]omplimentary to his work [Athan] was that of the three Cappadocian Fathers, Saints Gregory of Nazianzus,... Basil the Great, and
and Cyril of Alexandria (AD c. 378-444). Illustrious names from the West include Hilary of Poitiers (AD c. 312-367), Ambrose (AD 339-397), Jerome (AD c. 347-420), and Augustine (AD 354-430). This elevated group of episcopal churchmen positively reflect

his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa": Ware, The Orthodox Church, 23. Both Basil and Gregory of Nyssa cite the Apoc as Scripture and have no reservations whatsoever about the book's canonical status. Basil for instance begins one section of an argument citing (Rev 1:4) with "Kai en th' Ἀποκάλυψις": Basilius Theol., Adversus Eunomium (libri 5), TLG (2040 019) 29.677.42. Gregory of Nyssa discoursing on the Psalms will start in one place with "Ἀποκάλυψις του Ἰωάννου": Gregory Nyssenus Theol., In inscriptiones Psalmorum, TLG (2017 027) 5.114.11. Gregory of Nazianzus is very interesting on this point. He does not include the Book of Revelation in his NT canon, but similarly to his two illustrious contemporaries he nowhere decrys it. "Although Gregory thus excludes the Apocalypse from the canon", correctly observes Bruce Metzger, "he knows of its existence, and on rare occasions in his other works quotes from it": Metzger, The Canon, 212. In fact, given Gregory's 'official' position on the Apoc, it is intriguing to find not only does he quote from the book, but he also declares his debt to its teachings, "Ἀπόκαλυπσις διδάσκει με δαίμονα": Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol., Supremum vale (orat. 42), TLG (2022 050) 36.469.7. [See the Appendix for a fuller list of the records]

Amphilochius of Iconium does not include the Apoc in his list of NT documents, however, he does not categorically reject it either. At the end of his catalogue of 'officially' recognised books he states, "[a]nd again the Revelation of John, Some approve, but most Say it is spurious": Quoted from Metzger, The Canon, 314.

We often read that Saint John Chrysostom either "paid little attention to it [the Apoc]", (Wainwright, Mysterious Apocalypse, 33), or that he "never referred to it", (W. J. Harrington, Revelation, 9). This contradiction demonstrates that the question of Chrysostom's use or not of the Book of Revelation is far from settled, and that he should not be cited as a closed opponent of the book. This is a complicated matter, but one which I hope to later address in a paper arguing, if not for Chrysostom's direct citation of the Seer's work, at least to numerous allusions (especially in the context of the worshipping community and to the false prophet motif).

Cyril of Alexandria was a prolific writer. Quasten informs us that his works "fill ten volumes of Migne's edition" (MG 68-77). It would have been problematic if someone with such an output either ignored the Apoc or refuted it. He does neither. Two representative passages indicate plainly his position. The Book of Revelation is commended as the work of the "wise John": Cyrilus Theol., De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate, TLG (4090 096) 68.433.16. In another place, as we have seen previously with other Fathers, the great Johannine prologue of Jn 1:1 is cited immediately before a pericope from the book of the Seer of Patmos. In this instance it is Rev 1:8 with the formula for Scripture, Ἰησοῦν ταῦτα ἐγέρσει Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρῶτον: Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate, TLG (4090 109) 75.37 84.

Hilary of Poitiers (celebrated for his twelve books De Trinitate), together with Athanasius, writes Bernard McGinn, "is among the oldest of the teachers officially declared doctor ecclesiae": (McGinn, Doctors, 37). In the Homilies on the Psalms, Hilary cites Rev 22:1 as an event "testified by Saint John in the Apocalypse": ibid., 1.17.

"The strong-willed Ambrose", writes Bernard McGinn, "was the most powerful bishop in the Western Empire": McGinn, op. cit. 52. Ambrose makes frequent use of the Apoc which he cites as Scripture: On the Christian Faith 2.4.35; On Belief in the Resurrection 2.105-106, and in many other places.

Whatever problems Jerome might have had with the connection of chiliasm to the Apoc, it did not dissuade him from the conviction that the author of the Book of Revelation was "John, the apostle whom Jesus most loved, the son of Zebedee...": De vir. ill. 9. Elsewhere he also uses the Apoc as a type for all Scripture in the context of its interpretation "through Him who has the key of David": Epist. 53.5.

Few writers have been able to capture the enormity of Augustine in as few words as Bernard McGinn, who says of the bishop of Hippo, "Augustine is one of those rare figures who both perfectly define an age- in his case Late Antiquity- and yet also surpass their era to become resources for every age": McGinn, op. cit. 66. Augustine accepted the Book of Revelation as Scripture and cites the book authoritatively throughout his work,
(with some noted exceptions) the wide transmission and sacred commendation of the Apoc that we have hitherto found in the reception tradition of the believing community of the Early Church. During this period we also have the tradition of four critical MSS: (i) Codex Vaticanus [B], c. 331-350 (Alexandria); (ii) Codex Sinaiticus [ rękę], c. 331-350 (Egypt); (iii) Codex Alexandrinus [A], c. 425 (Asia Minor); (iv) Syriac Peshitta, c. 400 (Eastern Syria). The Book of Revelation is included in rękę, A, but not found in B (the MS ends at Heb 9:14), nor is it included in the Syriac Peshitta. To this list we could also add the catalogue in Codex Claromontanus c. 303-367 (Egypt) in which the Apoc is included, but precise dating of this MS is difficult. Most interestingly, as Bruce M. Metzger tells us, though Barnabas, the Shepherd, the Acts of Paul, and the Apocalypse of Peter are also recorded in Claromontanus, ”[i]t is significant that these [the] four titles... have a short horizontal line extending into the left-hand margin... [v]ery likely the purpose of the lines was to distinguish these titles from those the scribe regarded as authoritative.” Notwithstanding, the Apoc is further found in the Mommsen Catalogue c. 360-375 (northern Africa).

Conclusion
Though debate concerning the NT Canon did continue, the era that we have just examined set down in clear terms the limits and parameters. Certainly, as Meyendorff says, "no one

but it is especially notable in his De civitate Dei [The City of God], which Angelo Di Berardino reckons "among Augustine's masterpieces": Patrology (Vol IV), 363. Of the numerous examples we could cite for his authoritative use of the Apoc, two will suffice. First, the Apoc of the "Apostle John" speaks not just to the seven churches in Asia, but to the "totality of the one Church": De civ. dei 17.4; and second, the book's listing in Augustine's presentation of "the whole canon of Scripture": On Christian Doctrine 2.8.13. Augustine was also the "first theologian of any stature to embrace the amillennial system of theology": Robert P. Lightner, The Last Days Handbook, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 79. See esp. De civ. dei 20.7, 9.

198 Why is the opinion of these ecclesiastical hierarchs so important (apart from the obvious facts of their high church office, proximity to the events, and the consensus patrum/consensus ecclesiae catholicae)? See McGinn's insightful presentation of "what is a doctor of the Church", Bernard McGinn, The Doctors of the Church, (New York: A Crossroad Book, 1999), 1-21.


200 Metzger, ibid., 229f.

201 ibid.

202 ibid., 231.

203 One of the major reasons for this fact which Lee M. McDonald has well drawn out, "and what seems to lead away from the notion that the NT canon was largely settled in the second century", is that "the terms for canonization, therefore, were simply not current lingua franca in the Church until the fourth century"; McDonald, art. cit., 119. For fuller discussion on this semantic point McDonald points to E. Ferguson's review of G. M. Hahneman in JTS 44 (1993), 696f.
ever suggested... that anything besides apostolic writings should be included in the canon.\textsuperscript{205} The principal books had been established throughout Christendom, and there is now, as J. A. Sanders might say of a later period, "stabilizing of text, content, and order."\textsuperscript{206} Great councils, also, would later put their \textit{fiat} to the canonical tradition bequeathed to the community of the faithful by Athanasius and his predecessors.\textsuperscript{207} The Book of Revelation, once confirmed and commended in Athanasius’ NT Canon as a sacred document, would now be impossible to shift into the outer margins of canonical discourse. Doubts that both Dionysius (with his critical refutations) and Eusebius (with his limited recognition) might have expressed about the authority of the Apoc would surface occasionally, but their combined legacy could not override the overwhelming inheritance from the “\textit{Traditio-historical Process}” of the "biblical community of faith"\textsuperscript{208} that commended the Apoc throughout its canonical adventure. This sacred commendation of the Seer’s prophecy, as we plainly found, was distinctively established as part of the Tradition founded in the "rule of faith". The "cosmical" and "eschatological" basis of the Book of Revelation continued to appeal intrinsically to the members of the universal Body of Christ, "the \textit{leitourgia} of the Church's cult."\textsuperscript{209} As a principle, the criteria of canonicity are now more evenly applied in the overall proofs for authenticity in the process of canonization, though apostolicity and traditional usage remain prominent. The patristic testimony here too, in this period, as in eras that preceded materializes from all of the major geographical centres of Christendom. Syria, however, in part (for reasons that we have addressed in other places), stands differently. The kerygmatic function and canonical authority of the Apoc as part of the normative literature of the \textit{ecclesia catholica}, was conclusively confirmed by two towering figures in the Church: in the East by

\textsuperscript{204} Though McDonald argues that the process of canonization "probably began its final stages during the burning of books brought by Diocletian in his persecution of the Church that was initiated in 303. When Christians were being asked to hand over their sacred literature under threat of death or imprisonment, surely the individual churches had by that time begun to finalize the issue of which writings were sacred and which were not as important to its life and ministry", he will still nonetheless report that "[t]he most widely accepted view today is that by the end of the second century CE the process of canonization of the Church's NT was largely complete and only minor modifications occurred after that": McDonald, \textit{art.cit.}, 118-120.

\textsuperscript{205} Meyendorff, \textit{Living Tradition}, 15.

\textsuperscript{206} Sanders, \textit{op. cit.}, 32.

\textsuperscript{207} On the authority of the Ancient Councils and the Tradition of the Fathers, see Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", 115-124.

\textsuperscript{208} Anderson, \textit{art. cit.}, 9.

Athanasius the Great (AD c. 295-373), and in the West by Augustine of Hippo (AD 354-430).²¹⁰

 Augustine did not figure in the general plan of my chronological scheme which was strictly followed, so except for those places throughout the thesis where I have particularly referred to him, he is not individually discussed in the dissertation. His high view of the Apoc, however, (as I have elsewhere stated) is well known and established; for Augustine's position on the millennium, see A. W. Wainwright, Mysterious Apocalypse: Interpreting the Book of Revelation, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 36-39; for discussion on the Latin Father's effective role on the formation of the NT Canon (gleaned especially from his De doctrina christiana), see Metzger, The Canon, 236-238.
CHAPTER 10
Conclusion

The Five Principal Questions

Borrowing James Barr's effective use of the word "adventures" (in respect to the biblical document per se), we set out to investigate the canonical adventure of the Apocalypse in the Ancient Church in the context of its Circulation [Cir], Reception [Rn], and Traditional Usage [TradU]. From the date of its first publication (AD c. 95) to the time of one of the great stabilizing voices for the final shape of the NT Canon in the Early Church, that being the weighty fiat of Athanasius the Great of Alexandria (AD c. 295-373). Certainly discussion on the Canon continued even during and after this time and debates would still occasionally flare up, but the limits and parameters of the argument had been clearly set down. During the course of this investigation five principal questions pressed throughout with which the great part of this thesis was concerned. First, was it correct, as has often been said or at least implied, that the Book of Revelation was a late agent in the whole dialectical processes of the

---

2 As Aune has pointed out in his discussion on Date, "[d]uring the last half of the twentieth century, most scholars concerned with the question expressed support for the Domitianic date": David E. Aune, Revelation 1-5 (52A), (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1997), lvii.
3 Gregory of Nazianzus adulatory praise of Athanasius is not without some merit, "[f]rom meditating on every book of the Old and New Testament, with a depth such as none else has applied even to one of them, he grew rich in contemplation, rich in splendor of life": Orat. 21.6.
4 Consider, for example, the lists of authoritative NT books approved by the Synod of Laodicea (AD c. 363), and those from the Third Synod of Carthage (AD 397). The Book of Revelation is not included in the former, but is included in the latter. The book is not included in the NT canon of Gregory Nazianzus (AD c. 329-389), but is included (with some reservation) in the NT canon of Amphilochius of Iconium (d. AD c. 394).
5 As Meyendorff has rightly stated, "[n]o one ever suggested... that anything besides apostolic writings should be included in the canon; and it is this general principle which determined the rejection of the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas from the canon of Scripture": John Meyendorff, Living Tradition, (New York: SVS Press, 1978), 15.
6 See, for instance, "in Di Berardino (ed.)" the very surprising statement in the context of Jerome's reception and revision of Victorinus' commentary of the Apoc, "[s]ince this book [the Apoc] was not accepted in the East...": Angelo Di Berardino (ed.), Patrology (Vol. IV), (Maryland: Christian Classics, 1994), 235. But also H. Y. Gamble, The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 56; and Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, The New Testament as Canon: A Reader in Canonical Criticism, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 276; the position of Karabidopoulou is closer to the truth when he speaks of the East as not dismissing the prophecy of the Seer, but nevertheless, as exercising "great caution" polueifualaktikhv in its reception: Jwainh D. Karabidopoulou, Eijysagwghv Sthna Kainthia, (Qessal onin: Pournara, 1998), 110; here it should be mentioned, that it is invariably stated that the Book of Revelation is omitted from the Orthodox Typicon: Charles H. Talbert, The Apocalypse: A Reading of the Revelation of John, (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 2. This is not altogether correct. The Typicon does, in fact, "give it a place in a part of the services which is seldom if ever performed in our days."
CirRnTradU workings? Second, to what extent did the factors of canonicity (factors in the broader sense) operate either positively or negatively during the early part of the Apoc's defining adventure as it sought to establish itself in the canon consciousness of the Church? Third, given that the criteria of canonicity themselves, were not always applied universally or with equal standard, what else could have operated in the Apoc's favour to see the book survive the direct challenge to its apostolic authority? Fourth, what primary evidence exists for the use of the book in the immediate years just after its original publication? And fifth, what do we learn about the canonical adventure of the Apoc from the surveys conducted into the patristic usage of the Seer's work in Chapters 7 to 9 of this present thesis, and from the extensive investigation reported in the Appendix?

The Five Responses

Findings

It is true of all the canonized documents, but particularly of the Apoc (given its connection to the apocalyptic Gattung), that diverse factors came into constant inter-play as it was received into the first community of readers/believers, irrespective of whether they were "informed reader[s]" or "flesh-and-blood reader[s]". And so, just as the Seer's work is a fusion of genres, it was also very much a merging of diverse factors and canonical operations that braced the document in its quest for authoritas (defined in terms of its authentia) and "commendation". This was best exemplified, as we found, by the well-known position of Dionysius of Alexandria (AD c. 200-265), who does not accept apostolic authorship of the book, but is clearly willing to accept some form of authority, given the traditional usage of the work. The argument for this element of combination of diverse factors is also one of the key

Seraphim Rose continues and citing Averky Taushev, he informs us of when this occurs, "[a]t the Saturday night Vigil, all the New Testament Epistles and the Apocalypse are appointed to be read in order between Vespers and Matins, beginning with the Sunday of All Saints": Averky Taushev & Seraphim Rose, The Apocalypse: In the Teachings of Ancient Christianity, (California: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1995), 34. [italics added]


9 See M. G. Michael, "The Genre of the Apocalypse: What are they saying now?", BBS 18, (July-December 1999), 115-126.

10 These terms are very important and in the patristic tradition they are connected, as Bebis writes, to the biblical teaching of "the absolute authority (exousia)" of Christ Himself": George S. Bebis, The Mind of the Fathers, (Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1994), 18f.

11 Sanders, loc. cit.

12 Euseb., Hist Eccl. 7.25.
contributions of this dissertation. Mass exegetical problems have arisen, especially since postmodern interpreters (who for the better part have romanced science in an era of reductionist obsession) have sought to strip down the book into bare elements, focussing on 'this' strand or 'that' aspect, putting the document under the theoretical paradigm of almost every approach imaginable. If there was one unifying agent or movement (and the argument in this thesis is that there definitely was), it was the force of Holy Tradition, the "instinct" of the Church which in the theological framework of this dissertation was understood as its "canon" and/or "church consciousness" as experienced by and "belonging", as Brevard S. Childs would say, "to the community of faith." It was the general

13 Postmodern biblical criticism, broadly speaking, as Adam outlines, denies any privileged starting point for the establishment of truth and seeks to show that ideals are characteristically grounded in ideology or economic or political self-interest. A fine introduction of the postmodernist movement in biblical studies is the study by A. K. M. Adam, What is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); however, there is some common ground between postmodernism and Christianity, both on social issues and in the stress that all claims (universal and/or particular), have to be made with the backing of a sound and tested methodology: see John W. Riggs, Postmodern Christianity: Doing Theology in the Contemporary World, (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2002).

14 Euphokrinon speaks (in the context of the faith of the Church) of the "eftikto th' Dpropovnik" which through its experience "epemiar" leads to the consensus patrum et apostolicam of the Church: Paul o' Euphokrinon, H Dpropovnik (Qessal onikh. Rhgopoul o", 1972), op. cit., 257.

15 Here we find one of the most fundamental contacts between those belonging to the more 'traditional' school of canonical criticism, Brevard S. Childs, and Charles J. Scalise, for instance, and my own conception and understanding of the theological content of these terms (and, of course, here I am speaking on my own behalf and not on behalf of Childs nor of my Confession). "Canon consciousness" belongs to, and is a great component of the kanon th' aj jheiai'/ regula veritatis. Why? Because, as George Florovsky explains, "[in]ow this rule, was in fact, nothing else than the witness and preaching of the apostles, their kthugma...": Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", 102. It is, this preaching of the Apostles, that was to be faithfully recorded in the NT Canon. Here, too, note the emphasis on the kerygyma "function" which for Childs is critical for the true hermeneusis of the biblical text: Brevard S. Childs, As Canon, 52. "Church consciousness" (not the "Consciousness of the Church" from which the teaching, itself, is drawn from) is the cognizance and/or the awareness that you, as an individual, belong to the greater body of the Church, to Christ Himself. As Saint Paul declares, "oJ nwh ejmephtou swaro toj aujot" (Eph 5:30). And the connection between the two? Brilliantly put by Ellen Flesseman-von Leer, "[r]eal interpretation of Scripture is church preaching, is tradition": quoted by Florovsky, op. cit., 104. There remains, then, the idea of apostolic succession, that which guarantees the faithful transmission of the apostolic deposit and the "rules" for the authentic interpretation of the Scriptures, that is, the Canon. For the Eastern Orthodox the stress (in the context of the comprehension of Holy Tradition as parakatadjh) is on both the deposit and the interpretation, "mesa st ejjhxthn ej doha th' dikonomia", opou pragmatopoiotei opa Cristof": Euphokrinon, op. cit., 268. But here, too, we find some good contact with Childs on the second of these (the interpretation), when he speaks, for instance, of one believing community passing over to the next the "canonical guideline" for the correct interpretation of the sacred document, "by means of which the book was to function as authoritative scripture for generations long after the author": Childs, ibid., 517. Saint Paul's admonition to the community of believers in Thessalonica is the document, "by means of which the book was to function as authoritative scripture for generations long after the author": Childs, ibid., 517. Saint Paul's admonition to the community of believers in Thessalonica is the

16 Brevard S. Childs, The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction, (London: SCM Press, 1984), 517. In this instance Childs is more specifically speaking in the setting of the "canonical guideline": Hoffman has expressed most concisely the critical point that I am attempting to make here, "it is the act of canonization by
theatre in which the adventure of the book was played out, and it guaranteed that, though it might slip from one ideological track onto another, the document itself would remain safely on road to final acceptance where other highly regarded apocalypses would fail.\textsuperscript{17} The Book of Revelation was written for the succouring of the existing Church communities and the preaching of the Gospel of Christ,\textsuperscript{18} and these were its principal canonical "functions".\textsuperscript{19} And ultimately, it was this commendation that allowed it to lock on, as it were, to the \textit{e\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{f}stikto}} of the ecclesia universalis. In other words, the Apoc reflected the actual doctrinal and liturgical practices of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{20}

\textit{(I) On Whether the Apoc was a Late Entry in the CirRnTradU Theatre}

We found that the Book of Revelation was circulated soon after it was written by its author, the Seer of Patmos, sometime AD c. 95. Though scholars have been very hesitant to attribute any firm knowledge of the book to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, this position was shown to be not so secure as had been previously argued.\textsuperscript{21} The book is certainly a universal source by the time of Justin Martyr (AD c. 100-165) as an "informed" reader (if we are to

---

\textit{the faith-community} that makes the text canonical": Thomas A. Hoffman, "Inspiration, Normativeness, Canonicity, and the Unique Sacred Character of the Bible", \textit{CBQ} 44, (1982), 464. [italics added]

\textsuperscript{17} The Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter, for example, which are two major examples of early Christian "apocalyptic literature". Amongst other things, the former is included in the fourth-century vellum MS \textit{Codex Sinaiticus}, whilst the later is cited by Clement of Alexandria as a canonical writing: Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 6.14.1.

\textsuperscript{18} It is not \textit{apokaluyi} \textit{\joanou} but \textit{\scriptsize{i}Apokaluyi \Jo\scriptsize{hsou Cristou}} (Rev 1:1). "Notice that we have a revelation originally from the Father to our Lord Jesus Christ. The stated chain of communication is God - Jesus - an angel - John - the churches. It is, however, primarily, the 'testimony of Jesus Christ', Columba Graham Flegg, \textit{An Introduction to Reading the Apocalypse}. (New York: SVS Press, 1999), 64.

\textsuperscript{19} That is, as Wall and Lemcio, plainly explain, "about how Revelation functions as part of the church's rule of faith, the Christian biblical canon": Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, \textit{The New Testament as Canon: A Reader in Canonical Criticism}. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 275; and this is, of course, directly connected to "hermeneutics by which the tradition or text functions": Sanders, \textit{Canon and Community}, 61.

\textsuperscript{20} "The New Testament canon in its final form", write Wall and Lemcio, \textit{is the product of an intentioned process}. In this sense, neither the inclusion of Revelation within the New Testament canon nor its specific location within the New Testament canon are the results of arbitrary and abstract decisions made by a few. \textit{The shaping of the New Testament reflects the actual practice of the Church...}: Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, \textit{op. cit.}, 279. [italics added]; here, too, we could certainly reflect on the Apoc's cultic setting with "the \textit{visio Christi} as a central point"; see David E. Aune, \textit{The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology In Early Christianity}. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 95f; in this context also, see John Breck, \textit{The Power of the Word in the Worshipping Church}. (New York: SVS Press, 1986), 44f.

\textsuperscript{21} More recently this position has also been expressed by Stephen S. Smalley, \textit{Thunder and Love: John's Revelation and John's Community}. (Great Britain: Nelson Word, 1994). "There is no explicit mention of the Apocalypse among the apostolic Fathers": \textit{ibid.}, 35. I should add, that Smalley does qualify this statement, "[h]owever, the silence of the earliest Fathers does not prove their ignorance of Revelation": \textit{ibid}. But the initial point, that there is "no explicit mention", still stands.
place him in light of recent reception theory terminology),\(^{22}\) and during that period, as we noted throughout the study, the Apoc made it into the most ancient list of authoritative NT books, the MF (AD c. 200).\(^{23}\) It is also very likely, as was suggested in an earlier chapter, that one of the first commentaries to be written on a document of the NT Canon was that of the Book of Revelation authored by Melito of Sardis (fl. 2nd century).\(^{24}\) The practical reasons for the early entry of the Apoc into the CirRnTradU theatre were clearly outlined in Chapter 7. To this we add the high ecclesiology of the book, particularly in the cardinal context of the covenant community (and New Israel),\(^{25}\) and its ability to succour its persecuted readers during times of crisis with its so-called chiliastic promise of eternal bliss in the face of insufferable persecution. And of course, its ability to shift genres allowed for it to be read in varying contexts as the conditions, period, and hermeneutical traditions might demand. Of these chiliasm was shown to be the key paradigm.


\(^{24}\) In Eusebius' catalogue of the works of Melito of Sardis (late second century AD), the church historian mentions "the books on the Devil and the Apocalypse of John" 

\[^{25}\] An integral expression of the Seer's Apocalypse also splendidly highlighted in one of the finest commentaries on the Revelation in recent times, by Robert W. Wall, Revelation, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991). Wall, who wrote his commentary with a perspective gleaned from the canonical criticism approach, and who was an inspiration behind my own approach to Part 2 of Chapter 6 of the dissertation, also makes the critical identification of the woman [γυνή] in Rev 12:1 with the "community"; and so following in the ancient tradition established by Methodius of Olympus (d. AD. c. 311), Wall says in part, "[m]ost would contend that this woman refers to a community rather than to an individual person such as Mary. Her exact identity, whether a religious subgroup within ethnic Israel such as messianic Judaism, or eschatological Israel, remains debated... [whatever], the woman symbolizes the faithful people of God..."; Wall, ibid., 159; Stephen S. Smalley, who has also written one of the outstanding commentaries on the Apoc, similarly featured the church, community, and covenant dimensions of the Seer's work, and he, too, helped to shape my own approach and presentation of the multiple ecclesiological extensions of the Book of Revelation. "It is important, first, to notice that the Apocalypse is acted out in predominantly corporate terms. Throughout the book, it is mostly the church as a whole, or local churches as collective units, which John portrays... [t]ogetherness, then, is a mark of the church on earth, in Revelation... [m]anifestly, however, the same is true of the church in heaven, as it is described in the Apocalypse": Smalley, op. cit., 154-157. Yet my strong sense and analogous description of these theological connections had already been formulated. It had been first ignited by my reading of the "ekklesiologiva" in the work of Eujdokivmof, he had much earlier theologized deeply on a number of the profound designations that both Wall and Smalley have since brilliantly drawn out for a Western audience, especially in the context of a typological hermeneusis. See Paul of Eujdokivmof, op. cit., 165-466. One of the most exciting and fulfilling aspects of writing up this dissertation, was to discover such ecumenical alliances of critical theological thought, to utilize them where no superior approach offered itself, and to make them known through my own work to a wider circle of scholarship where, in some places, the quest for originalité has exploded out of all reasonable and pragmatic proportions.
(II) To What Extent Did the Criteria of Canonicity Operate Either Negatively or Positively?

During the early part of the Apoc's published history, as it sought to establish itself in the canon consciousness of the Church, it had to come under the probe of some fundamental questions, often referred to by scholars as the "criteria of canonicity". These criteria notae canonicitatis, which were outlined and discussed in Chapter 2, were the test generally applied to determine the claims of a particular document to apostolic status (and hence authoritative for use in the Church). Though apostolicity was a fundamental criterion, we found that its application did not necessarily rule out books by a non-apostle, and that it was extended to contain the writings of Paul, for instance, as one who had close contact with the apostles. The author of the Apoc himself proclaims that his name is Ἰωάννης, and this on no less than four occasions, Rev 1:1,4,9, 22:8. This open declaration had to be considered by the early church communities, for there was only one John who was universally known and who would assume to put on the apostolic mantle. Especially "with those assemblies in Asia Minor", which as Gordon W. Lathrop writes, "to which he [the Seer] is connected." An obviously recognizable case of pseudepigraphy was not present here, so the question of apostolic authorship could not be dismissed so easily. On the other criteria also, as we found, the book stood strong and convincing, so when one criterion was brought into dispute, apostolicity for example, the others would come to support it, catholicity for instance, and strengthen its claims to be received. And so the application of the criteria of canonicity in

---

26 Gamble, op. cit., 67-72.
28 For the "canonizing community's intentions" and for a "canonical perspective" and introduction to the Pauline corpus in which the "abiding significance of the apostolic parousia motif" is highlighted, see Wall and Lemic, op. cit., 142-160.
29 "This repetition of the author's name, together with the frequent use of first-person singular verb forms that regularly punctuate the vision narratives, serves to emphasize his role [John's] as a witness to the revelatory visions he narrates, a phenomenon with parallels in other Jewish apocalypses": David E. Aune, op. cit., 18.
30 "So strong is this evidence" Guthrie emphasizes, "that it is difficult to believe that they all made a mistake in confusing the John of the Apocalypse with John the Apostle": Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, (Illinois: IVP, 1970), 935.
31 Gordon W. Lathrop, Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 53. Note especially that Lathrop is commenting here on the Apoc in the context of the early Christian ordo which he rightly connects to the "Lord's day".
32 "In the apocalyptic tradition", concludes D. G. Meade in one of his summaries, "attribution is primarily a claim to authoritative tradition, not a statement of literary origins": David G. Meade, Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ., Co., 1986), 102.
33 A notable paradigm here is the ambivalent position of Eusebius. Though he disputed the author of the Apoc as being the Apostle John, he nonetheless, wavered on the book waiting on the future verdict of the "traditional
their totality rule in favour of the Book of Revelation, when for instance, they could not for the Shepherd of Hermas or the Apocalypse of Peter. We found throughout this study, given the documentary evidence of the research, that the application of these criteria was not only legitimate, but highly critical.

(III) The Other Factors Which Operated in the Apoc's Favour

Given that the criteria of canonicity in themselves were not always universally applied or enforced with equal rigor, what else could have operated in the Apoc's favour to see the book survive the direct challenge to its apostolic authority or when the other criteria where deemed redundant by the book's opponents? We found that the book has an overarching and profound ecclesiology with powerful elements of liturgical worship and concentrated doctrine; it is essentially a book about the tribulations of the marginalized and persecuted Church community and its redemption by its transfigured Lord. This direct presentation of both its ecclesiology (as "cosmical" and "eschatological") and canonical function

usage" and/ or "catholicity" criterion (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 3.24.18). Richard Bauckham explains this in the context of the "universality principle" and/ or "coincidence view" which I had earlier connected to the "consensus patrum et apostolicum": Richard Bauckham<brj@st-andrews.ac.uk>. "Easter". Mon, 16 Apr 2001. MGMichael<brjm@1earth.net>. 

34 The Shepherd was received positively in its early adventure, at least until the time of Origen, on account of its paraenesis, ecclesiology, and its strong sense of community (and possibly also by reason of its geographical provenance). However, in due course, its suspect Christology, the apparent disinterest of appeal to other Scripture for its authority, the uncertainty of its date, and general confusion as to its authorship, eventually saw the esteemed prophecy outside the officially recognized list of authoritative books of the Church: Clayton N. Jefford, Reading the Apostolic Fathers. (Hendrickson Publishers: Massachusetts, 1996), 144-153.

35 Even on purely literary grounds it could hardly have proven edifying, for it "contained lurid pictures of the torments of the damned, which in due course exercised some influence on Dante's Inferno": F. F Bruce, The Canon of Scripture. (Illinois: IVP, 1988), 164. But Bruce appears to be saying that these "pictures" did not negatively affect the reputation of the book. It is far more likely that the pseudonymous connection to Saint Peter was the reason that the Apocalypse of Peter survived for so long on the margins of canonical discourse, for the content itself could not have stood up against the criteria and test of orthodoxy. It contained "gnostic teachings, especially with regard to the nature of Jesus. It is a docetic view of Jesus in which a literal crucifixion, preceded by Jesus' suffering is denied": "Peter" in TABD (Vol. 5), 263.

36 For an analytical extension of "the criteria" into other and more complex areas of application in the setting of the "modern critical and historical disciplines", see Lee Martin McDonald, "The Integrity of the Biblical Canon in Light of Its Historical Development", BBR 6, (1996), 126-129.

37 Marcion, or the Alogi, for instance: see Chapter 8, passim.

38 On this major point, the "profound theology" of the Book of Revelation, "which is inseparable from its literary structure and composition", see especially the expert treatment by Richard Bauckham, The Theology of the Book of Revelation. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

39 Here I stress strongly what Schmemann has illuminatingly written about early patristic ecclesiology, which conforms exactly to the initial developments as we find them in John's Apoc, "[h]ere is the essential point: in the early patristic Church, ecclesiology is cosmical and eschatological. The Church is the mystery of the new creation and she is the mystery of the Kingdom. It has often been said that there is no ecclesiology, in the modern sense of this word, in the writings of the Fathers. The reason for this, however, is not a lack of interest
despite the plentiful use of apocalyptic imagery could not escape the "informed reader" who had the first say in the book's preservation.\textsuperscript{40} We spoke of this strong ecclesiological element as the Seer's of Patmos church consciousness which served to link theologically with the canon consciousness of the Early Church community.\textsuperscript{41} This canon consciousness of the Church (as it relates to her decision processes re. the \textit{authoritas} and \textit{authentia} of the Scriptures) which is an integral component of Holy Tradition,\textsuperscript{42} continually supplemented that which might be lacking with its subtle but enduring appeal to the "principle of universality".\textsuperscript{43}

One group of readers would, therefore, influence and in turn affect the others (in the context of a "canonical guideline"),\textsuperscript{44} the successive Christian generations.\textsuperscript{45} The other integral factors have already been mentioned above and discussed in Chapters 3, 4 and 5: Date, Genre and Chiliasm. The fixing of a date allows for a clearer and more confident view on the difficult question of authorship, that of apostolicity, which is directly connected to the \textit{kerygma} of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{46} The ambiguity of the genre allowed the book to be read either as an apocalypse, Christian prophecy, or letter. Each sub-genre served well on the adventure, during times for example, when apocalyptic was viewed with suspicion the text could be read as a Christian prophecy when earlier it was apocalypses that were popular. Also, that the Apoc was written

\textsuperscript{40} Resseguie, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{41} It was most reassuring when during the final revision of the thesis, A. W. Wainwright confirmed that my argument for the importance of the ecclesiological component of the Apoc in its quest for canonical authority, was a very good point and that it certainly made sense: Arthur Wainwright <awainwr@emory.edu>. "Mysterious Apocalypse". Fri, 26 Jul 2002. MGMichael <mgjm@1earth.net>.

\textsuperscript{42} Eujdokimof, \textit{op. cit.}, 254-261; see also a penetrating discussion on "Tradition in the Fathers", by George S. Bebis, \textit{op. cit.}, 1-29. "One might say that they [the Fathers] not only were thrilled about Tradition, but they felt and lived Tradition. Tradition for them was not the enumeration of quotations from the Scriptures or the previous Fathers; it was the offspring of the incarnation of the Word of God which took place in space and time. Thus Tradition was a continuous extension into history of the incarnation of the Son of God": \textit{ibid.}, 21.

\textsuperscript{43} See fn. 33.

\textsuperscript{44} Childs, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{45} Which is "the community of faith who had received the book [Apoc] offers a canonical guideline by means of which the book was to function as authoritative scripture for generations long after the author": Breward S. Childs, \textit{ibid.;} or as Aghiorgoussis compactly says, "[t]he Bible is the product and the \textit{epiphenomenon} of the life of the Church, being also the work of men": Maximos Aghiorgoussis in \textit{A Companion to the Greek Orthodox Church}, (New York: Dept. of Communication Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, 1985); Fotios K. Litsas (ed.), 151.

\textsuperscript{46} "Apostolicity", as John Meyendorff stresses in his well-known study, "thus remained the basic criterion in the history of the formation of the canon because it was also the only true characteristic of the Christian kerygma as such": Meyendorff, \textit{loc. cit.}
in the form of a letter would assure an "explicit contemporaneity" with Christian generations into the future. Crucially this fusion of genre saw the book outlast one of its most difficult tests, its authoritative survival with the Fall of the Roman Empire of the Caesars and the rise of the Christian Empire of Constantine the Great: it permitted for the millennial pericope of the text (Rev 20:4-7) to be re-interpreted in the light of the new historical conditions and theological context. When the operation of these powerful and too often neglected or marginalized 'factors' are combined with the usually positive application of the criteria of canonicity, compelling evidence is presented for the solid ground on which the Apoc stood in the early centuries of its peripevteia. Three canonical functions of the Book of Revelation have also been noted throughout this investigation: (a) to succour in time of affliction; (b) to establish the community of believers in the Church; and (c) to witness faithfully to the Gospel of Christ.

(IV) Primary Evidence for the Use of the Apoc in the Apostolic Church

The Book of Revelation is either cited or at least intimated in the very beginnings of the first Christian literature outside the NT, and across the communities of believers from Asia Minor (Papias, for instance) right through to Rome (Hermas, for example). That these references in the Apostolic Fathers are relatively few and scattered has less to do with the authority of the book and more to do with its late publication in comparison to the rest of the NT documents, particularly that of the Pauline corpus. We also found that the method and approach to the


49 Here, I should point out that B. S. Childs, whose fundamental philosophy of canon played an important role in my own formulations on the subject, is not much predisposed on the issue of the criteria, considering them a "one-sided characterization": Brevard S. Childs, As Canon, 31f.


51 All three functions are, in fact, tied into "the proclamation of Jesus and the creation of gathered communities, both Jewish and Gentile": Paul Barnett, Jesus and the Logic of History, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1997), 127.

52 I am grateful to Paul Barnett for bringing to my attention a critical observation that escaped my attention of another fundamental reason as to why the Apoc could have been received early and enthusiastically by the first Christian communities. This has to do with Earle Ellis' construct that (based on Gal 2:7-9) there were ultimately four apostolates operating in the NT era: that of James, Cephas, John, and Paul and that the literature of the NT flows from these four. Barnett <pbarnett@laurel.ocs.mq.edu.au>. "Re: question re Apostolicity". Mon, 18 Feb 2002. MGMichael <mgjm@1earth.net>.

citation of the Scripture by the early ecclesiastical writers was often by memory or word of mouth, it was "reproduced freely", as Birger Gerhardsson says, and "adapted in some way to the context." A plain example is the contact between The Letter of Barnabas, for instance, and the Apoc's eschatology. Allusions to the Apoc in the early apostolic literature have been previously too easily discounted. We also found that six factors in particular also positively affected the Apoc's early and wide circulation (see Chapter 7). Finally, such investigations (for they are invariably linked to date) help in the research to do with the question of authorship, i.e. apostolicity.

(V) Results of the Survey into the Patristic Testimony

The evidence here in the context of the Apoc's circulation, reception, and traditional usage is overwhelming, from the first direct reference to the book's fulfilment of the most fundamental of the criteria of canonicity [apostolicity] in the writings of Justin Martyr (perhaps as early as AD 135). The Christian apologist writes with reference to Revelation 20, "[a]nd further, there was a certain man with us, whose name was John [w|+/ o[noma jIwavnnh] one of the apostles of Christ [el|+ tw'n ajpostovlwn tou' Cristou'] who prophesied, by a revelation [ejn ajpokaluvyei] that was made to him..." Note here that we are told the name, we are informed of the high office, and the function of the charisma. From this time onwards, until we reach the landmark testimony of the NT canon of Athanasius of Alexandria recorded in his 39th Festal Epistle (AD 367), our investigation into the canonical adventure of the Apoc confirmed that the book not only circulated rapidly across all the major centres of Christendom (including Asia Minor, North Africa, Egypt, Syria, Gaul and Rome), but also that it was received and commended as sacred literature from one Christian generation to


55 For example Barn. 21.3 with Rev 22:10,12 (see Chapter 7 passim).


58 Dial. Try. lxxxi.

59 Athanasius, as Griggs concludes, was evidently aware of his awesome influence and set out to consciously arbitrate on the pressing question of the final settlement of the NT Canon: C. Wilfred Griggs, Early Egyptian Christianity: From its Origins to 451 CE, (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 173. "In this letter [the 39th Fest. Epist.] Athanasius becomes the arbiter of doctrinal limitation and orthodoxy on a grand scale, a move that he most likely could not have made with success during the early decades of his episcopacy": ibid., 173.

60 For a summary of the adventure of the NT Canon in the Syriac churches, see Karab dipoulo', op. cit., 115-117.
The Apocalypse

Another. Certainly, there were some challenging boycotts along the way—those, too, is clear. For instance, the qualified inventory of critical refutations set down by the universally revered Dionysius the Great (AD c. 200-265), the usurpation of the Apoc by the strongly denounced Montanist movement, the outright rejection of the book by the so-called Alogi, the poor reception of the book in Syria, its absence from a number of canonical lists, and the wavering as to its authority by the influential ecclesiastical historian Eusebius (AD c. 260-340). And though these obstacles might appear serious enough, they only served to reveal, and paradoxically at that, the secure reception history of the Seer's work. Consider the following and compare against some of the negatives that were just listed: the book is absolutely and authoritatively secured in the canonical literature cited (or at least intimated) by a whole list of highly influential ecclesiastical figures, including Justin Martyr (AD c. 100-165), Theophilus of Antioch (AD c. 115-188), Melito of Sardis (fl. 2nd century), Irenaeus of Lyons (AD c. 130-200), Clement of Alexandria (AD c. 150-215), Tertullian (AD c. 160-220), Hippolytus of Rome (d. AD c. 235), Origen (AD c. 185-254), Cyprian of Carthage (AD c. 200-258), Victorinus of Pettau (d. AD c. 304), Methodius of Olympus (d. AD c. 311), Lactantius (d. AD c. 318), and Athanasius the Great (AD c. 295-373). Note especially the episcopal order of most of these writers, the wide spread of their geographical locale and/or

— In the theological understanding of the "ελθείτε" which Athanasius uses in his renowned statement of "tradition" to Bishop Serapion: Ad Serapionem 1.28.

— Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 7.25.

— ibid., 5.16.

— Epiphanius, haer. 51.3-6.

Which as we found in Chapter 8 in our discussion of Tatian the Syrian (d. AD c. 175), the tradition of the suspicion towards the Apoc in Syria can possibly be traced back to Marcion himself, whom Tatian preferred to imitate in his own probable rejection of the Apoc at the expense of following the authoritative reception of the book by his teacher, Justin Martyr (Iren., Adv. haer. 1.28.1).


— Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3.25.4.

For instance both Dionysius and Eusebius are permanently put forward as the examples of the poor reception history of the Apoc in the East. But, on the contrary, I hope to have shown that not only do they not deny the Book of Revelation, but that in their acknowledged expression of disfavour they inadvertently both commend the text and evidence to the book's widespread traditional usage in the Ancient Church! See Chapter 9 of the dissertation where I present the documentary evidence from the Greek text of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and present the arguments in support for this atypical position of mine. Here I will remind the reader of two highly significant points. First, Dionysius does "not deny" ἀποκαλύψις that the author of the Apoc, did in indeed see a "revelation" [ἀπωθέτηι], receive "knowledge" [γνῶσις] and "prophecy" [προφήτευμα] (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. 7.25.26). Second, Eusebius himself, leaves the question of the Apoc's authority open, to be decided "at the proper time" from the "testimony of the ancients" [των ἁγιασμένων μαρτυρίων] (ibid., 3.24.18).

In describing only a very small part of the individual Fathers' theological system in Chapters 7-9, I have but scratched the surface. Some standard reference to a theology, however, was positively required in order to locate
sphere of influence, and most importantly, the "church consciousness" that saturates their respective works (especially in the context of the famous declaration as set down by Irenaeus of Lyons):

Where, therefore, the charismata of the Lord have been deposited (posita sunt), there is it proper to learn the truth, namely from those who have that succession of the church which is from the apostles (apud quos est ea quae est ab apostolis ecclesiae successio), and who display a sound and blameless conduct and an unadulterated and incorrupt speech. For these also preserve this faith of ours in one God who created all things, and they increase that love for the Son of God, who accomplished such marvellous dispensation for our sake, and they expound the Scriptures to us without danger, neither blaspheming God, nor dishonoring the patriarchs, nor despising the prophets.⁷⁰

To the above mentioned group of th" Ekklhsiva" hgouvmeni we must, of course, include the invaluable testimonies as to the absolute and normative acceptance of the Apoc by the believing communities of Rome (Muratorian Fragment) and those of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne. In the preceding chapter other great ecclesiastical personalities are also listed, as is the majority witness of the MSS. Finally, as I have elsewhere noted, more than a few of our authors invariably linked to the West (e.g. Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Lactantius), had intimate knowledge of the traditions of the East. They brought over to the expanding congregations, to their sister churches, the positive tradition of the Seer's book first established in the Johannine communities of Asia Minor. As for Dionysius and Eusebius, I hope to have shown that they were, in fact, critical "supporters" of the Seer's work, albeit inadvertently.

both their position on the NT Canon and use of the Apocalypse. I have, nonetheless, made sure to cite a number of highly credible Eastern Orthodox patristic scholars should the reader wish to further explore subjects that have been raised. On a personal level, I have gained much recently from the work of John Chryssavgis, especially his masterful exposition of the methodology of patristic thought in The Way of the Fathers: Exploring the Patristic Mind, (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1998). "So far as exegetical method was concerned, positions and theories varied from Father to Father, from school to school, from treatise to treatise, as well as from East to West. Nonetheless, the starting-point in Patristic exegesis was always the context of faith. This presupposed that Scripture was a living reality, not a dead book. It was the living testimony of lived history about the relationship of a living God with a living people. This living contact of faith is incarnated in the fundamental principal of Patristic method of scriptural interpretation, namely typology": ibid., 64. C. J. Scalise, considers this "typology" as an integral element from within his own canonical approach to the Scriptures and calls for a "rehabilitating typology": Scalise, op. cit., 74-76.

⁷⁰ Quoted from George Florovsky "in Daniel B. Clendenin (ed.)", 103. [Florovsky is here citing Ad. haer. 4.26.5]; I must note, that even if we were to remove, for example, even those "controversial" figures from that list (Tertullian, and Origen), the conclusion would not change; see also McGuckin who in his own paper expertly elucidates the position of Florovsky, himself, (and other major contemporary Orthodox writers), on the "ideas about catholicity": John A. McGuckin, "Eschaton and Kerygma", art. cit., 254-269.

⁷¹ Ellhnikhv Patrologiva (Tom 1), (Kedron Paterikwn Ekdovewn: Aqhoai, 1987), Prolegomena ff.
The conventional argument that the Book of Revelation was not wanted in the East early in its transmission history is demonstrably flawed. It is based, in part, on the exaggerated emphasis put upon the small assembly of the dissenting voices to the Apocalypse's authority, by a long line of past and present modern-day commentators.

Some Concluding Observations

I did not set out to pre-emptively re-invent the wheel. In places I have followed the tried and tested paths set down by professorial giants who have done battle with fundamental aspects of the difficult terrains before me, and even should I have possessed the required talents to blaze and abandon, I doubt whether I would have sought such a precarious distinction. Forced originality, like the bizarre, has no reason for existence. However, new perspectives and

72 In the pursuit for 'originality' in the undertaking of higher research degrees or in the present academic environment of 'publish' or 'perish' which "rewards originality above all", more damage can be done to the exegetical integrity of the Biblical documents than any presumed critical stride forward. To offhandedly dispense with the primary sources of the ancients or to pull apart proven hermeneutical structures which are not in need of repair, simply because they are no longer 'fashionable' given the rise or influence of a particular school or system, is to my mind at least, the exercise of suspect judgment. F. Copleston also pointed to "...fashions in the world of philosophy as elsewhere..." which would invariably decline: Frederick Copleston, A History of Philosophy (Vol. IX), (New York: Image Books, 1994), 341. M. J. Christensen, in reviewing the work of C. S. Lewis, has made some sound observations on the subject of "originality": Michael J. Christensen, C. S. Lewis on Scripture, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979), 81f. On the very same question, reflect on the humbling and instructive thoughts of Albert Einstein, himself, who responded passionately to the subject when it was raised: Denis Brian, Einstein: A Life, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996), 423f. And this, of course, is to not for one moment disconnect from any form of critical engagement or the original presentation and assessment of existing knowledge, a unique contribution in itself. It is sometimes, a fine line, between the important and enlightening contributions of biblical scholarship and the ideological or sensationalist literature which can, occasionally, travel in the same credible channels. Nowadays, a sharp and experienced eye is required to distinguish between a 'methodology' and an 'ideology', particularly when there are so many competing positions and approaches outside the traditional biblical disciplines. For a stimulating and challenging discussion on this subject, see the reflections of a former Bultmannian turned evangelical, Eta Linnemann, Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?, trans. Robert W. Yarbrough, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1990); for a synopsis of the philosophy of the Eastern Orthodox approach to NT research in the light of higher criticism, see Maximos Aghiorgousis, op. cit., 150f; and especially Savvati Agouridhis, "Horqovdoxh Ekklhsiva kai h ermhneiva th Bivblou", DBM 17, (July-Dec., 1998), 109-128; see also Timothy [Kallistos] Ware, The Orthodox Church, (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 199-201. "Christianity, if true, has nothing to fear from honest inquiry. Orthodoxy, while regarding the Church as the authoritative interpreter of Scripture, does not forbid the critical and historical study of the Bible...": ibid., 201. Always at the centre of this approach is the faithfulness to the apostolic kerygma of the resurrected Christ.

73 Auguste Rodin cited "in Rodin: A Biography", Frederic Grunfeld, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 583f; consider for a moment, how much poorer and terribly inaccurate our understanding of the Antichrist tradition would be (methodological considerations aside), if for instance Bousset, McGinn, Jenks, and Peerbolte had dispensed with the locus classicus sources or each other, to go off on fantastic flights of fancy. A very long list of similar and equally significant examples could be noted here: however, outside our immediate discipline, I remind the reader of Sigmund Freud's unquestionable contribution to our knowledge and understanding of many facets of human behaviour. Nonetheless, a major part of that contribution was the presentation of a body of knowledge that had already been documented in different places, but which he, Freud, forwarded collectively and assessed in a critically superior and original way. And so, in short, he has become universally known as the "founder of psychoanalysis". See Giovanni Costigan, Sigmund Freud: A Short
discoveries, and some valuable insights have emerged, which, when combined with the conclusions forwarded from the greater part of the dissertation, will be of reasonable and practical use to both students and future researchers of the Seer's awe-inspiring prophecy. I also ask the reader to give considerable attention to the extensive and detailed footnotes of the dissertation where a great deal of the constructive and critical information has been stored. But also the literature reviews and the bibliographies to be found throughout the present work.

I have clearly not put aside the eminent and enduring work of Ned Bernard Stonehouse, and where I could in Chapters 8 and 9 of this present investigation, have made sure to involve him directly into the conversation. And in those places where I could neither improve nor add, particularly to do with the natural limits of those parts of the sources dealing with the canonical intimations and the interpretive commentary, I drew and reported directly from him. In other places, however, I put right a group of incorrectly cited patristic references, discovered and forwarded additional primary proofs, differed on a number of important points, and I delivered the Greek text for most, if not all, of the principal citations. Moreover, where that author might specifically highlight the regions of influence in his approach, I have preferred to set out my own investigation by biographical chronology, clearly identifying individual writers and their theological standpoint. This allowed for a more reliable indication of the authority of Holy Tradition as a universal force in the life of the ecclesia catholica, as opposed to the regional and local influences of the ecclesia particularis.

Apart from the overwhelming confirmation of Stonehouse's general conclusion, that "its [the Apoc's] position in the Canon of the church as a whole was [n]ever in doubt", I have in the Appendix conducted the first automated Greek text-based analysis of the book utilizing the

Biography. (London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1967); a telling example of 'forced originality' leading to the 'bizarre' was Freud's unwillingness, on the other hand, to acknowledge that the cause of repression, for instance, can be caused by factors other than sexual trauma, a dreadfully exaggerated position which C. G. Jung successfully countered: see C. G. Jung Memories, Dreams, Reflections, (London: Fontana Press, 1995), 169-193; in the context of the Apoc, Auguste Rodin's cited axiom is terrifically suitable, and as for the examples, alas, there is no end.

74 For an engaging account of Ned Bernard Stonehouse's life and works (affectionately known as "Stoney" to his colleagues and students... he loved baseball!), see Walter A. Elwell & J. D. Weaver, Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A selection of Evangelical Voices, (Michigan: Baker Books, 1999), 154-164. It was interesting to discover that in one of his articles published in the Westminster Theological Journal, "The Elders and the Living Beings in the Apocalypse", he argues that "the twenty-four elders and the living creatures refer to angelic beings, not to Israel or the church": ibid., 162. Stonehouse, "best remembered as an evangelical scholar who always remained deeply committed to the Reformed confessions, yet also pursued with enormous integrity every question regarding the text of the New Testament" was born in 1902 in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and died in 1962: ibid., 154f.

TLG database and carried out the search afresh at a comprehensive level. Thus not only cataloguing specifically, but adding also by a long way to the treasure-house of sources which the evangelical scholar, himself, first begun to gather in connection to the traditional usage of the Seer's prophecy. Furthermore, I have, therein, created and established a methodology which is replicable for similar investigative projects. In a few words, whereas those researchers (who have agreed with NBS' conclusion) have been satisfied to remain with the affirmation that the Book of Revelation "enjoyed wide distribution and early recognition",76 I have taken a step further to a painstaking and extensive demonstration of this position.77 But also I have expressed in clearer terms the function of apostolicity in the greater context of Tradition (which Stonehouse refers to but never actually defines),78 and have established (with the support of A. W. Wainwright) that chiliasm played a far more significant part in the adventure of the Apoc than he, Stonehouse, had originally supposed.79 I have also sought to introduce the criteria of canonicity80 into a more vigorous correlation with the general tenets of the canonical criticism approach of the "canonical process".81

76 Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 36. Mounce cites Stonehouse, not that he was entirely unjustified, pointing to the latter's "complete and thorough treatment": *ibid.*

77 Though, it is rarely noted, if ever, that Stonehouse tempers his enthusiastic and highly positive conclusion regarding the Apoc's circulation and reception with an unexpected qualification, "[on] the other hand, there is little or nothing which supports the contention that this prophecy was a special favourite in the early church or that its spread was particularly rapid. Indeed, one gets the impression that it was used neither as much nor as widely as the more didactic Christian writings": Stonehouse, *loc. cit.*

78 I do feel, however, that he does try to connect it more directly to the "life of the church" and to the "church's conviction that the Apocalypse was apostolic in origin": *ibid.*, 153.

79 Stonehouse has underestimated the function of chiliasm in the Early Church when he contends, "chiliasm may not be regarded as an essential element": *ibid.*, 151. But this was a misconception, which Wainwright (as I have elsewhere highlighted), not only redressed but also put to rest with a classic treatment of the subject, see Arthur W. Wainwright, Mysterious Apocalypse: Interpreting the Book of Revelation, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 21-103; it would appear, however, that this was something that the Russian Orthodox interpreter Aleksandr Buharev (Feodor) had also investigated, "[t]he Revelation of John comforts and fortifies the church by means of hopeful prophecies": see Paul Valliere, Modern Russian Theology, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 84. [italics added]

80 See McDonald's tight summation of "the criteria" where he submits the critical questions concerning their applicability in the modern biblical landscape. "More than discussing their ancient application, perhaps we should ask the question about how legitimate these criteria are for establishing our canon today": Lee Martin McDonald, *art. cit.*, 128.

81 Sanders, Canon and Community, 21-45. The "canonical process... stresses the nature and function of canon, and the process by which canon was shaped in antiquity, not solely as shaped at the end of a history of literary formation, but as shaped from the earliest moments when repetition of a 'value' rendered it a tradition down to a final, ordered collection of those traditions": *ibid.*, 22; see also Childs, As Canon, 18-33. "The process of stabilizing a canon of authoritative New Testament writings was effected within the process of the church's continued use of them. The selection and shaping of the books of scripture took place in the context of worship of the struggling church as it determined canonicity by the use and effect of the books themselves": *ibid.*, 31. I have not accepted the term "canonical process" without qualification. I have understood it as a process which energized to action, so to speak, the community of believers, and allowed for the structures of canonization to
Lastly, it is my heartfelt hope, that I have demonstrated and established a methodological and theological affinity between the "canon consciousness"\(^{82}\) (including the wider application of apostolicity) underlying the canonical criticism approach to the study of the NT by Brevard S. Childs (and others)\(^{83}\) and one of the fundamental parts of the Eastern Orthodox conception of Holy Tradition, the \textit{parakataqhvkh}\(^{84}\). For in the final analysis, the "controlling hermeneutic" is the same: the communion of saints [the \textit{communio sanctorum}], which is, the Church.

---

\(^{82}\) Childs, \textit{As Canon}, 21.

\(^{83}\) This is, of course, an involved matter which I have referred to in various ways throughout the thesis. One of the great problems is that which relates to "meaning" and "definition". Suffice, to say, that I nowhere sought to imply that \textit{canonical criticism} is a singular body of interpretation. Quite clearly, it is not. I believe Wall and Lemcio, themselves, coming from a "canonical approach" have expressed it best when comparing the technique between two of its most famous practitioners, Brevard S. Childs and James A. Sanders. I will repeat here, for it is worth the emphasis, that which I quoted in an earlier chapter. "Within this complex debate", write Wall and Lemcio, "some of which they have generated, Childs and Sanders raise common questions, although their answers vary sharply. To what extent, in what sense and how should the canon be considered as authoritative when Scripture is appealed to in theological reflection?": Wall and Lemcio, \textit{op. cit.}, 30; perhaps one of the tensions here, between the two approaches, is that which Sheppard has well highlighted from James Barr's own work, between "sola scriptura" on the one hand, and the "sufficiency" of Scripture on the other: see Gerald T. Sheppard, "Canon Criticism: The Proposal of Brevard Childs and an Assessment for Evangelical Hermeneutics", \textit{SBT 4}, (1974), 15. This is an excellent essay with many unique insights into the thinking of Childs, given that the author wrote the article whilst pursuing his doctoral degree in OT at Yale University under Brevard Childs, himself. See also Gerald T. Sheppard, "Canonization: Hearing the Voice of the Same God through Historically Dissimilar Traditions", \textit{Int} 34, (1982), 21-33. "After all, while the techniques may change, the dominant hermeneutical construct of Christian Scripture must remain the same: the gospel of Jesus Christ": \textit{ibid.}, 33.

\(^{84}\) More specifically, as I have elsewhere mentioned, that component of Holy Tradition which relates to the \textit{parakataqhvkh} of the Apostolic deposit of faith (in the context of that part of the "deposit" and hermeneusis connected to the documents of the NT Canon). Doubtless, I am not the only one to have seen this link; Bauckham makes a passing, but very important reference to the "eastern Orthodox tradition" in an elucidating discussion on tradition in relation to Scripture and reason: Richard Bauckham & Benjamin Drewery, \textit{Scripture, Tradition and Reason: A Study in the Criteria of Christian Doctrine}, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 118; but see especially Scalise, who writing from within the canonical approach highlights a fundamental contact with the Orthodox when deliberating on the \textit{holistic view to canonical hermeneutics}. "We cannot understand the ways in which Christians in the early church interpreted the Bible unless we develop some picture of the roles that tradition played in the process. At this point Eastern Orthodox Christians, whose holistic view of Scripture and tradition has not suffered from the polemical split which afflicts Western Christians, have much to teach us. In Eastern Orthodoxy, tradition is understood as a living reality illumined by the presence of the Holy Spirit. Tradition does not add anything to the truth found in the Scripture, but instead shapes the context of Christian community and provides a hermeneutical principle for interpreting the Bible as God's truth": Charles J. Scalise, \textit{From Scripture to Theology: A Canonical Journey into Hermeneutics}, (Illinois: IVP, 1996), 74.
Appendix:
Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG™) Search Results

Introduction

In searching for sources for the Apoc's traditional usage in early patristic literature, it soon became apparent that previous inquiries offered only scattered evidence.\(^1\) Whilst the list of sources presented in this appendix is by no means exhaustive, due to both technical and logistical limitations which will be discussed below, they offer compelling support that the Apoc was received by the Early Church community as an authoritative and sacred text.\(^2\) This appendix should be used in supplement to the qualitative evidence provided in the main body of the thesis. Chapters 7-9 especially serve to highlight dominant ecclesiastical figures in the Early Church that cited the Apoc in their writings, whilst this appendix serves to highlight also minor writers, spurious writings and previously undiscovered references. In brief, the inquiry is unique in so far that it brings together into the one database, sources that testify to the Apoc's early circulation and reception.\(^3\)

Summary of Inquiry

The main result table, at the end of this appendix, presents a concise list of Early Church literature that either strongly allude to or directly quote the Apoc. It is possibly the most comprehensive inquiry of this type conducted to relate Greek Patristic sources to the Book of Revelation. To indicate the depth of the study, over 100 early church writers were searched and some 1,000 different works. Of these, 35 ecclesiastical authors were found either to allude to or quote the Apoc in 123 different works. Over 600 words and phrases were searched from the Apoc, generating some 10,000 pages of raw data; around 370

---


2 "At that point when sacredness had been superimposed by the communities", as James A. Sanders writes, "then the survival power of the sacred literature as canon was assured without its having always to prove itself", *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 34.

records spanning some 56 pages were brought together. The universal and indirect allusions numbered in the thousands. The goal of the investigation, however, was to be as strict and concise as possible and not all-inclusive. And so, indirect allusions were all deleted from the original list of results. A subsequent study could focus on providing a range of results from direct references to probable allusions, but this was not within the scope of this search. Accuracy and clarity, as far as possible, were chosen over quantity. Research into traditional usage is not about achieving a large record count to prove that 'so many' church writers or historians said 'x' or 'y'. Reducing the Book of Revelation or any other NT book to such mechanical tests would be, among other things, to diminish and confuse both the history of interpretation and the criteria of canonicity that were outlined and discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation. Both the qualitative and quantitative approaches have their place in this type of research, but they should complement one another without tending to unwarranted extremes which would falsify the results.

Source

This part of the inquiry was conducted using the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*™ (TLG) disk E CD, compiled and developed by the TLG research centre at the University of California, Irvine. See the centre's web site at the following address [http://www.tlg.uci.edu](http://www.tlg.uci.edu):

[f]ounded in 1972 the TLG has already collected and digitized most literary texts written in Greek from Homer (8 BC) to the fall of Byzantium in AD 1452. Its goal is to create a comprehensive digital library of Greek literature from antiquity to the present era... it contains 76 million words of text (6,625 works and work collections from 1823 authors).

---

4 A record in a database is "[a] group of related items, or fields, treated as a single unit of information" Brad Hansen, *The Dictionary of Computing & Digital Media: Terms & Acronyms*, (Oregon: ABF Content, 1999), 261. A "record" as understood in the context of this appendix should be distinguished from a "hit". Several hits (based on different word searches) may appear in the same text and because of their proximity to one another, may be shown within one individual record. "Hits" or "hit rates" are terms often used with computer matching programs which mostly rely on basic parsing algorithms. The terms have been adopted for this investigation given the principles used are similar.

5 Creating rules to classify a record based on the relevance of the 'hit' to the Apoc using, for instance, a Likert scale from A to D (A being a direct reference and D being a possible allusion) is a time consuming task which is certainly a major work in its own right. See William M. K. Trochim, "Likert Scaling," [Online] 25 June 2002, [http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb/scallik.htm](http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb/scallik.htm).
The TLG was deemed to be among the most complete library of writings, with the obvious limitation that it contained sources only in Greek and not in Latin. Complementary programs, such as TLG Workplace developed by Silver Mountain Software, grant researchers the ability to search the digitised ancient texts and to automatically locate sources based on an exact key word or phrase match. The end user is also able to perform boundary and proximity searches if required. The TLG group is to be commended for their work in this area. Without the TLG project such exacting inquiries of this type would not be possible. One need only consider how long it would take one person to read large portions of Migne, searching manually for over 600 words or phrases in each column. The manual task could take years compared to this automatic inquiry that took about 14 months to complete. In the future such inquiries may even take less time, given that a team of software engineering students from the University of Wollongong in Australia is attempting to refine the search process by allowing for batch inputs and the reporting of results straight into a database instead of a rich text format (RTF) document.


7 Latin Fathers such as Tertullian and Cyprian, for instance, have been dealt with in ch. 7-9 of the thesis.

8 A word boundary search is when the user identifies that only an exact word match value should be returned by the search engine. For instance, if searching the word "lock" only exact word matches would be returned (i.e. "lock"), excluding other potential matches like "flock" or "locks" or "blocks". A proximity search is when the "default exactness of a phrase is set by modifying the interval in words in the search dialog". See TLG Workplace™ User Guide by Silver Mountain Software 1998, [Online] 21 April 2002, http://www.silvermnt.com/wpinfo.htm.

9 Maria Pantelia, professor of Classics at the University of California, Irvine, has been the TLG Director since January 1998. The team responsible for the ongoing development of the TLG product can be found at http://www.tlg.uci.edu ([Online] 21 April 2002) by selecting the hyperlink on the left frame titled: "The TLG® team". The team is incredibly responsive to feedback, suggestions and the future vision of the product. Projects like TLG are revolutionizing many aspects of textual research in biblical studies and beyond.

Alternative Sources

Other well-known CDs containing digitised texts were considered for this inquiry like the *Patrologia Latina Database* based on Jacques-Paul Migne, published by Chadwyck,\(^{11}\) and also the *Nicene and Ante-Nicene Early Church Fathers* database based on Eerdmans published by Logos,\(^{12}\) but the TLG was deemed to exclude fewer works overall. For instance, the greater part of the post-apostolic writings are in Greek and some of the signpost writings within our scope like those of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus,\(^{13}\) Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius are also in Greek or have come down to us in Greek. The Latin writings which are not included in the appendix, but discussed and analysed in the body of the thesis, contain such writers as Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, and Lactantius. The hard-copy *Migne Patrologia Graecae* (MPG), although a standard source used by theologians worldwide, was not included in this specific inquiry as it would have prevented some of the discoveries that were made with the use of the TLG. In addition, the MPG is now being superseded by newer editions of writings that are emerging, most of which TLG have utilised.\(^{14}\) While MPG or *Clavus Patrum Graecorum* can be considered the standard as far as sources and where references to critical editions are concerned, there is much to be gained by using newer and less 'type-cast' publications. However, having stated these points, it should be noted that the TLG is not as complete nor as exhaustive as the MPG, nor does it claim to be, given its focus is more universal and it is a project very much in progress.\(^{15}\)

---


\(^{13}\) While Irenaeus wrote in his native Greek, most of his extant work is not in the Greek original but in Latin translation, and obviously only what remains in the Greek is digitized in the TLG database.

\(^{14}\) "As new editions emerge, the MPG text will normally be superseded in the data bank. For example, when data entry of the works of John Chrysostom was begun in the late 1970s, the only accessible editions for the seven homilies De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli were those of Savile (1612-1613) and Montfaucon (1862). The Montfaucon text (via MPG 50.473-514) was deposited in the data bank, but it has subsequently been replaced by Piédagnel's new and superior edition": Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works* 3rd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), xxiv.

\(^{15}\) For the latest texts added to the online TLG version visit [http://www.tlg.uci.edu](http://www.tlg.uci.edu) and select the hyperlink on the left frame titled "Post-TLG E (web only)."
Methodology

Scoping the Inquiry- Fathers and Works

The methodological process used for this investigation is documented in the flowchart in Exhibit 1. The same approach could be replicated to study any NT book, using any available digitised texts. Before beginning the process the researcher should have performed an extensive manual literature review. This important step allows the researcher to discover the more prominent writers of the specific period under consideration and to be able to conclude later whether the inquiry has been successful. At least this would

\[\text{Exhibit 1 The methodological process}\]

\[16\] Currently a researcher who wishes to search both Greek and Latin texts (e.g. using the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and the Patrologia Latina Database) finds himself/herself in the predicament of having to replicate the entire research process twice, effectively doubling the effort exerted and time taken to obtain results from both sources. The ideal search program would have the ability to interface with multiple sources of evidence (independent of language) from different supplier databases. One search term could be entered, querying as many relevant available digitized texts as were stored on the hard drive of the user (or multiple disks for that matter). Results would finally be exported into a standard format containing a tag field that would identify the source. Global cooperation between data suppliers would be required for such a project to be successful. Each supplier would have to ensure that they complied with global standard software principles. Such important issues as citation referencing systems would also have to be discussed to ensure unique identification of authors and works.
highlight and reveal the important works and respective corpus of writing that is well-known through the efforts of other investigators. Scoping the number of Fathers (see Exhibit 2) and works (see Exhibit 3) to search, perhaps based on a date or some other criterion, is of course vital. In this inquiry authors identified with the following epithets on TLG were searched (among others): Scr(iptor) Eccl(esasticus), Theol(ogus), Apol(ogeta), Epist(olographus). The "Date" constraints were set in TLG Workplace™ using the "Select Century Dialog CE 1-4". However, the main content in the dissertation scrutinizes the canonical adventure of the Book of Revelation between AD 95 and AD 367. On a purely practical level this also allows for the potential publication of smaller papers on diverse aspects of the topic after the completion of the thesis without having to redo the inquiry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TLG ID</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>&lt;Date&gt;</th>
<th>Date &gt;</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>Acacius Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caesariensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>Acta Barnabae Incertum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>Acta Et Martyrum Apollonii A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>Acta Ioannis A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>Acta Thomae A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>Adamantius Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2669</td>
<td>Alexander Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lycopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>Alexander Scr. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hierosolymitanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2724</td>
<td>Ammonius Scr. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Amphilochius Scr. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iconiaisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>Anonymous Presbyter Scr. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>Anthologia Graeca</td>
<td>Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7052</td>
<td>Anthologiae Graecae Appendix</td>
<td>Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2807</td>
<td>Antonius Hagiographus Scr. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Adam A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Baruch ante A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Eliae ante A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Esdræ B.C./A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Joannis A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Sedrach Incertum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Sophomæus ante A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Apocatalepsis Syriacus Baruch A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>Apolinaris Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landiciensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>Apollonius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephesius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Arethas Philol. et Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Patensis, Constantinopolitanus, Caesariensis (Cappadociae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Aristides Apol. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atheniænsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>Ariston Apol. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pellaicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>Asterius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amasianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>Asterius Sophistæ Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antiochenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Athanasius Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>Athanasius Apol. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atheniænsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>Barlaam Math., Thol. et Epist. A.D.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calabrius, Constantinopolitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Barnabæ Epistolæ A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Basilius Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caesariensis (Cappadociae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>Basilius Med. et Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>Basilius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seleuciensis, Isauricus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>Claudianus Apollinaris Apol. A.D.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexanderius Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexanderius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>Clemens Romanus Theol. et Clementina A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Concilia Oecumenica (ACO) Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2894</td>
<td>Constitutiones Apostolorum A.D.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Cyrillic Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierosolymitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>Cyrillic Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexanderius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>Didache XII Apostolorum A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Didymus Caecus Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexanderius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>Diodorus Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarsianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Dionysius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2798</td>
<td>Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita Sac. A.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fort. Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>Ephraem Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chersonensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephraem Symus Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Epiphanius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinos, Constantinienisch (Cypri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Eusebius Sac. Eccl. et theolog. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caesariensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4124</td>
<td>Eusebius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eumesianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4083</td>
<td>Eustathius Philol. et Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theassalianensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4117</td>
<td>Eustathius Sac. Eccl. et theolog. A.D.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Evagrius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ponticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>Evagrius Scholasticus Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epiphaniensis (Syriae), Antiochenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>Evangelium Bartholomaei A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Evangelium Ebtirionum A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>Evangelium Evæ ante A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>Evangelium Marcæ ante A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Evangelium Petri A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>Evangelium Philippi A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Evangelium Secundum Hebraeos A.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Evangelium Thomas A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>Flavius Justinianus Imperator Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0572</td>
<td>Gaius Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>Gennadius I Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constantinopolitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nazianzenus, Constantinopolitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gregorius Nyssenus Theol. A.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyssenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>Gregorius Thaumaturgus Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaeaciensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Hegesippus Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palaestinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Hermes Sac. Eccl. A.D.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 2** The list of authors searched in the investigation (1-73).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TLG ID</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>&lt;Date Date &gt;</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0331</td>
<td>Hermias Apol.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>Hesychius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0315</td>
<td>Hippolytus Scr. &amp; Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 3</td>
<td>Romanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Ignatius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 1</td>
<td>2 Antiochenus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>Irenaeus Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Lugdunensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>Joannes Gramm. et Theol.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>Joannes Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 8</td>
<td>Hierosolymitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5 Antiochenus, Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>Joannes Damascusus Scr. Eccl. et Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 7</td>
<td>8 Dascamenus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Julianus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0645</td>
<td>Justinus Martyr Apol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Samatitanus, Romanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Leontius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>Marcellus Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Anconanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>Marcus Diaconus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Martyrium Agapae, Irenae, Chionae Et Sodalicum</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Martyrium Cononis</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0657</td>
<td>Martyrium Ignati</td>
<td>post A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Martyrium Polycapri</td>
<td>post A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Maximus Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Severianus Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 6</td>
<td>7 Chrysopolitanus, Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Miltio Apol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Sardianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Montanus et Montanistae Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Phrygicus (Montanus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0743</td>
<td>Nemesius Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Emesienus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>3066</td>
<td>Nicophorus I Scr. Eccl., Hist. et Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 8</td>
<td>9 Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3094</td>
<td>Nicephoros II Scr. Eccl. et Rhet.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>Nicolaus I Mysticus Theol. et Epist.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>Olympiodorus Diaconus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>0311</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum New Testament</td>
<td>A.D. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>0342</td>
<td>Origines Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>3 Alexandrinus, Caesariensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Palladius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5 Halicopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>0568</td>
<td>Papias Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Hierapolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>0691</td>
<td>Petrus Scr. Eccl. et Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 3</td>
<td>4 Alexandrinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>Phileas Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 3</td>
<td>4 Thmunitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>0561</td>
<td>Philostorgius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5 Cappadox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>Polycarpus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 1</td>
<td>2 Smyrniana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>0362</td>
<td>Polyaeres Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Epesius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>0464</td>
<td>Pseudo-Julianus Martyr</td>
<td>A.D. 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>Pseudo Macarius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Mosopontiani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>0481</td>
<td>Salisbury Hermalis Sozomenus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>0664</td>
<td>Seniores Alexandrii Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Seniores Apud Irenaeum Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Serenaigii Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>3 Antiochenus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Septuaginta</td>
<td>Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0139</td>
<td>Severianus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Gabalantis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>2961</td>
<td>Sextus Julius Africanus Hist.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>3 Hierosolymitanus, Alexandrinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>0776</td>
<td>Tatianus Apol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Syris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>2879</td>
<td>Testamentum Salomone</td>
<td>A.D. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Testamentum XL Martyrum</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>0409</td>
<td>Theodoretus Scr. Eccl. et Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5 Cyrenensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>0410</td>
<td>Theodorus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Heracleensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>0415</td>
<td>Theodorus Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5 Mopsuestianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>0476</td>
<td>Theodorus Heraclensis vii Theodorus Mopsuestianus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Theodorus Stiltes Scr. Eccl. et Theol.</td>
<td>A.D. 8</td>
<td>9 Bithynius, Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Theophilus Apol.</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>Antiochenus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>Theophilus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td>Alexandrinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>0201</td>
<td>Martyrium Agapae, Irenae, Chionae Et Sodalicum</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0309</td>
<td>Martyrium Carpi, Pagyi Et Agathonicae</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>0308</td>
<td>Martyrium Cononis</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>0101</td>
<td>Martyrium Dasi</td>
<td>post A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>0487</td>
<td>Martyrium Et Ascensio Isaiæ</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>2657</td>
<td>Martyrium Ignati</td>
<td>post A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Martyrium Marinii</td>
<td>post A.D. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>0305</td>
<td>Martyrium Pioni</td>
<td>A.D. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>0207</td>
<td>Martyrium Polymniae Et Basiliæ</td>
<td>post A.D. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>0485</td>
<td>Martyrium Potamiaenae Et Basilidæ</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Scholia In Clementem Alexandrinum</td>
<td>Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>0833</td>
<td>Scholia In Dionysium Byzantinum</td>
<td>Varia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>Scholia In Maximum Confessorum</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Testamentum Abraham</td>
<td>A.D. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Testamentum Job</td>
<td>A.D. 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>4291</td>
<td>Verba In Scripturis De Christo</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 2 cont. The list of authors searched in the investigation (74-147).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TLG ID (Work)</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>TLG ID (Author)</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Transmission</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>In ocursum domini (orat. 2)</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Amphilochoi Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Problematet a eeginem</td>
<td>7052</td>
<td>Anthologiae Graecae Appendix</td>
<td>Q, Epigr.</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>Epigr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Fragmenta ex libro adversus Cataphrygas ss 1171</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Apollonius Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>Eccl., Inver.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Is 2035</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Athanasius Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>19971</td>
<td>Epist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Epistula festalis xxxix (fragmentum in collect) 2035</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Athanasius Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>Epist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Homilia de passione et cruce domini 2035</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Athanasius Theol.</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>12729</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>Qaestiones ad Antiocchum ducem 2035</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Athanasius Theol.</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>20206</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Barnabae Epistula</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Barnabae Epistula</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>35834</td>
<td>Homilet., Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Homiliae in hexaemeron</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Basilii Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>73031</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Homiliae super Psalmos</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Basilii Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>47346</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>Liturgia (recensio brevior vetusta)</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Basilii Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>5378</td>
<td>Liturg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Protopreaticus</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>23716</td>
<td>Phil., Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Paedagogus</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>57864</td>
<td>Phil., Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Stromata</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>16607</td>
<td>Phil., Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Elogiae propheticae</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>5098</td>
<td>Phil., Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Qvis dives salvetur</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>9411</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Excerpta ex Théodoto</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>7691</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Fragmenta</td>
<td>0555</td>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>Q, cod</td>
<td>5959</td>
<td>Exeget., Homilet., Epist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Epistulae ad Corinthios</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>Clemens Romani Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>10302</td>
<td>Epist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Concilium universale Chalcedonense anno 455000</td>
<td>2894</td>
<td>Constitutiones Apostolorum</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>161939</td>
<td>Concil., Theol., Epist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Catecheses ad illumandos 1-18</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Cyrilus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>75549</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1-30)</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>Cyrillus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>21263</td>
<td>Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>Cyrillus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>Cyrillus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>32070</td>
<td>Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Commentarius in Lucam (in catenis)</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>Cyrillus Theol.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>99418</td>
<td>Exeget., Caten.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Thesaurus de sancta consubstantialitatem (in catenis)</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Cyrilus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>134452</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Didache XII Apostolorum</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>Didache XII Apostolorum</td>
<td>cod</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>Eccl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Commentarii in Ecclesiasten (11-12)</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>16666</td>
<td>Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>De trinitate (ib. 1)</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>23675</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>In epistulas catholicas brevis enarratio</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>6448</td>
<td>Exeget., Caten.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Sermo de virtutibus et vitis</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5441</td>
<td>Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Sermo compunctiorius</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Sermo asceticus</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>10900</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Sermo compunctiorius</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Sermo in secundum adventum domini nostri</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>Sermo in adventum domini, et de consummatione</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>6156</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Sermo de communi resurrectione, de paenitentia</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4633</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Interrogationes et responsiones</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>Ephearem Synus Theol.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5527</td>
<td>Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3: The list of works that returned successful matches in the investigation (1-56).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TLG ID (Work)</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>TLG ID (Author)</th>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>071</td>
<td>De paenitentia et patientia 4138 Ephraem Syrus Theol. Q 1191 Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>De panoplia, ad monachos 4138 Ephraem Syrus Theol. Q 5466 Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Fragmenta evangelii Bartholomaei 1366 Evangelium Bartholomaei cod 2462 Evangel., Apocryph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>De filio (orat. 29) 2022 Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol. cod 4901 Theol., Orat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>Supremum vale (orat. 42) 2022 Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol. cod 5797 Orat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>In sanctum pascha (orat. 45) 2022 Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol. cod 6819 Orat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>In inscriptiones Psalmo 2017 Gregorius Nyssenus Theol. cod 36066 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>031</td>
<td>Refutatio confessionis Euromii 2017 Gregorius Nyssenus Theol. cod 23674 Apol., Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>De virginitate 2017 Gregorius Nyssenus Theol. cod 20454 Theol., Phil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Contra haeresin Noeti 2115 Hippolytus Ssc. Eccl. cod 4564 Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>De antichristo 2115 Hippolytus Ssc. Eccl. cod 10616 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Fragmenta in Genesis 2115 Hippolytus Ssc. Eccl. cod 2433 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Adversus haereses (1br 1-2) 1447 Irenaeus Theol. Q 22657 Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>Fragmenta deperditorum operum 1447 Irenaeus Theol. Q, cod 3763 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>Adversus haereses (iber s) 1447 Irenaeus Theol. Q 4581 Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Apologia 0645 Justinus Martyr Apol. cod 15239 Apol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Dialogus cum Tryphone 0645 Justinus Martyr Apol. cod 53732 Apol., Dialog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Fragmenta 1495 Melito Apol. Q 1553 Apol., Exeget., Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Contra Celsum 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 165590 Apol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Commentarius in evangelium Joannis 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 96316 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Exhortatio ad martyrum 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 12657 Eccl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>De oratione 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 28725 Theol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>In Jeremia (omiliae 1-11) 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 24992 Homilet., Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Fragmenta in Jeremia (in catenis) 2042 Origenes Theol. Q 8308 Exeget., Caten.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>Homilias in Lucam 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 12366 Homilet., Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>Fragmenta in Lucam (in catenis) 2042 Origenes Theol. Q 20706 Homilet., Exeget., Caten.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>Philocallia sive Ecloga de operibus C 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 65752 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>Homilias in Ezechielem 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 1384 Homilet., Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>030</td>
<td>Commentarius in evangelium Matthi 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 95260 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Scholia in Apocalypsem (scholia 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 1888 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Selecta in Ezechielem 2042 Origenes Theol. Q 11987 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>Commentarius in evangelium Joannis 2042 Origenes Theol. cod 61431 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fragmenta 1558 Papias Ssc. Eccl. Q 1676 Exeget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Sermones 64 (collectio B) 2109 Pseudo-Macarius Ssc. Eccl. cod 142336 Homilet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3 cont. The list of works that returned successful matches in the investigation (57-113).
Choosing the Words and Phrases to Search

Choosing the list of words and phrases to search requires careful consideration. Failing to search a term like <<xc²§>> in all of its variants will probably lead to the accidental omission of key sources showing the Apoc's transmission. In this inquiry the aim was to search at least some portion from each chapter of the Apoc. It was so thorough in part that in some chapters multiple words and phrases were searched within each verse. Exhibit 4 provides a list of these terms. It should be noted that many of these terms appear multiple times throughout the Apoc. If time does not permit for a great number of words to be searched, the structure of the particular NT book should be studied, and the appropriate key chapters and verses drawn out. For instance, if this researcher was under time constraints not allowing for wider investigation, he would have chosen to look at ch. 1 of the Apoc where there is the proclamation of <<Iwannhj>> (apostolicity and other elements of the criteria of canonicity), and ch. 13 a major focus of the Apoc in the context of its overarching eschatology. In this instance, additional attention was placed on chs 1, 2, 12-14 and 19-22, especially in the context of worship. The repetition of words and phrases in the Apoc allow for the potential of a greater hit rate. For example, the boundary search ">qhrion<" returns 16 result matches in the Apoc. Using the TLG search engine, the researcher need only look for the word <<qhrion>> once, not 16 separate times, as the search will return all values that match the word <<qhrion>> from the writings contained on the disk.

17 Note "666" can be represented in an alphabetic notation <<xc²§>> or possibly in written form, for example, <<etakoëia ethkonta ed>>. Searching <<xc²§>> alone will not return the commensurate values of <<etakoëia ethkonta ed>>. For example Ephraim Syrus "Prwthn wóðhase toloAmma par' ebut% kalieia ouωkh ej twm stoixeign sumsal wòtob aðiqmoh eðh, oði etakoëia ethkonta ed ekei taístoikeib thn sumplhfin": De paenitentia TLG 75.10. For further discussion, see M.G. Michael, "666 or 616 (Rev. 13:18)", BBS 19, (Dec 2000), 77-83.


20 For the composition and structure of the Apoc, see Elisabeth Schüessler Fiorenza, The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment, (USA: Augsburg Fortress, 1998), 159-180.

21 According to the TLG canon, the word count for the Apoc is 10,224. It is estimated that the number of words and phrases searched on TLG in this investigation covered about 10 per cent of the total word count in the Apoc.
Performing Searches

The example screenshot below (Exhibit 5) shows a sample result match list for the term "<a class="search-term" href="" apokaluyij">apokaluyij</a>". On the bottom left of the exhibit can be seen a list of authors; the numbers following the author name represents the total count that the search term appears in the works of that author. For instance, in the works of "Athanasius Theol.", the exact term "<a class="search-term" href="" apokaluyij">apokaluyij</a>" appears 6 times according to the TLG. Note, however, "<a class="search-term" href="" apokaluy">apokaluy</a>" returns 47 matches. On the top right can be seen the actual instances that the term "<a class="search-term" href="" apokaluyij">apokaluyij</a>" appears in the works of Athanasius. Each work ID (first three digits) relates to a work that has been ascribed to the author, and it is followed by a TLG reference for that work. For example, the third work "071 28.293.41" is the work "Synopsis scripturae sacrae" which has an ID of "071" attributed to Athanasius but which is spurious. Drilling down a further level shows the block quotation showing the term "<a class="search-term" href="" apokaluyij">apokaluyij</a>" in its context starting at the reference "28.293.41". This step of the process is repeated for each individual search term.

Exhibit 5 The TLG Workplace™ environment.
Limitations of Searching for Key Words and Phrases

It is important at this point to raise what may appear to be obvious, but what is, in fact, a potentially fundamental error in survey research of this type. Keyword searches ensure that potentially direct quotations in literature are identified, but cannot guarantee that literature containing strong allusions is identified. For instance, even if every word in the Apoc were to be checked for matches in the literature of the early ecclesiastical writers, some strong allusions might be excluded because the exact words or spelling were not used. An example of this can be found in the Apostolic Fathers. The *Shepherd of Hermas* might not contain exact facsimiles but it is held by some that the text offers links to the Apoc. For this purpose some degree of manual refinement in the database is required. One explanation for this phenomenon could be that oral transmission of the Apoc meant that writers knew about its contents and paraphrased its teachings for the early church community. As copies of the Apoc proliferated over time, Fathers started to quote it more precisely, that is indicated by those writings included in the appendix between the middle-second and early-fourth centuries.

Exporting the Results

Each search has to be entered separately, categorised, and analysed. Exporting the information into a rich text file is one way to permanently store the results, however, it is difficult to analyse a large number of results in this way due to the default formatting. Search results can either be read online or printed out. Because a search has been

---

22 For a deeper understanding of the pitfalls of searching programs, see SearchSoftwareAmerica, *The Math, Myth, & Magic of Name Searching and Matching* (Connecticut: SearchSoftwareAmerica, 1999). While the focus here is on address matching, many of the themes discussed are relevant to any word search problem including "undermatching", "overmatching", "word order variations and missing words".

23 cf. Hermas *Pastor* TLG 1.4.1 "προσευχηθέν δε/μοι ἡποίχ οὗταν οὖν, καλίβεπθε τὴν γυναίκα έκείγνη η ἐπεχείμασα απαζομένην με έκ τού=ουτανου=ελέγουσαν:" with "Καίλισμείν μέγα ύθει λέγων έκ τού=ουτανου=περιεβελήμενον τόλαώντα", *Apoc* 12.1.


25 Already Saint Irenaeus (AD c. 130-200) during the course of his writing of *Adversus Haereses*, will make mention of the "fault of the copyists" concerning the wrong inscription of the number of the beast. Instead, he argues, that "the most approved and ancient copies" contain "six hundred and sixty six" (*Adv. haer. 5.30.1*).
conducted based on a *string*, common words appearing in the Apoc may appear in many works of the same author on many pages. Result hit counts may grant the researcher a false security in the contents of the hits. A high hit count does not necessarily mean that all the hits are linked to the book you are trying to match against. The ability to remove irrelevant entries and continually refine the results is painstaking, but very necessary. Removing duplicate hits and/or records is another complex problem. For instance, the same hit may appear multiple times, dependent on different words within the same verse of the Apoc being searched. E.g. searching "<Alfa kai to W>" and "<own kai o hn>" may return the same paragraph (i.e., the same hit) twice. This is counted as one search result not two in this investigation.

Exhibit 6 File size analysis of words extracted.

---

26 In programming a sequence of characters is called a "string". See Brad Hansen, *op. cit.*, 296. "Strings are data and... can be manipulated and stored in much the same way that numbers can." See Eric S. Roberts, *The Art and Science of C: An Introduction to Computer Science*, (Readings: Addison-Wesley, 1995), 35.

27 Searching the word "<Q hri on>" for example returns 820 matches. Over 36% of these hits are reckoned to the corpus of Saint John Chrysostom who not once connects this term to the number of the beast. More generally the word is used for wild beasts, base appetite, and diverse metaphors.

28 For about 75 out of the 623 words searched in this investigation, the file size analysis (see Exhibit 6) indicated that the word was so commonly used by the early church writers that the chances of finding a successful hit related to the Apoc was lower in probability. Some researchers may choose not to print these words as they are several hundred pages in size. It is highly recommended that in these instances the search be repeated with the additional word preceding or proceeding that word.
Appendix

Building the Database

Building the database\(^{29}\) to store these results can also be complex. Each field should contain a primary key that can uniquely identify that record, perhaps for no other reason than the researcher should have the capacity to keep track of changes during the refinement process.\(^{30}\) Knowing what fields you want to use for the database before embarking on the exercise and the purpose of each field will assist to produce the most accurate results and save time as the study develops. For example, accidentally leaving out an important piece of information may mean that you need to go back and re-read and include that specific piece of information for every potential entry in the database. Correctly sorting the author, work, date, epithet, or any other criteria is vital in being able to present the sources in the most logical way. Each record should use the standard indexes from the TLG canon of Greek authors and works. Each author has a four digit ID and each work a three digit ID.\(^{31}\) Concatenated together these indexes offer a unique referencing capability. Noting the texts

\(^{29}\) A database refers to a collection of data that is stored in files. It is composed of fields and records. There are many different types of database applications on the market that can be used to store information. A simple Microsoft Access database was constructed to store the TLG results, after each search was exported into the default RTF files. The hits were transferred manually between Microsoft Word (which is where the RTF files were viewed) and the Microsoft Access database (where further analysis was conducted). The CSCI 321 software project at the University of Wollongong is attempting to automate this process. Thousands of hits take literally days to transfer in this manner and are prone to human error. If the TLGdb group successfully complete this software project, it will save researchers thousands of hours of tedious work.

\(^{30}\) Researchers should always be able to identify an individual block hit by a unique number throughout the study. Depending on the depth of the study a researcher may have to physically review and revise a candidate list of hits up to one hundred times or more. Whether a particular hit meets the required criteria or for some reason the criteria undergoes changes, it is important that previous efforts are not wasted. Reconciliation is paramount and can become increasingly difficult if the correct version control is not used, including a date and time of review. Even keeping an ongoing list of additions of records or omissions is important. For future researchers conducting this type of study in a collaborative mode and across countries, primary keys must be used. How the results are finally presented aesthetically on hard copy for instance, may differ to how they are stored electronically.

\(^{31}\) TLG have created their own unique identification numbers for authors and works. These do not relate to numbers or references outside the TLG environment. "Each author in the canon is assigned a permanent four-digit number meant to permit rapid identification in the computer environments" p. xiv. E.g. the author number of Athanasius Theol. is 2035. "Each discrete work ascribed to an author bears a three-digit identification number... Works that are part of a larger collection may or may not warrant consideration as separate works belonging to a given author. Epigrams in the *Anthologia Graeca*, for example, are regarded as though they are independent works assigned to specific authors. However, the *Anthologia Graeca* has also been given the status of 'author' with its own author number (7000)" Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier, *op. cit.*, xxii.
transmission, whether it is dubious or spurious, the number of words and latest publication details is also necessary.  

**Shortcomings of the TLG™ CD**

A difficulty with performing textual searches, such as those generated from TLG, and then attempting to build a database out of the results is to define what actually constitutes a "record". From the point that a match is found on a keyword and the researcher checks for relevance, knowing how much of that text to quote and how much to omit can be a challenge in itself. For instance, in referencing Hippolytus' *De antichristo*, there are large sections which use the Apoc. Does each separate passage constitute one record? Do a certain number of sentences before and after the exact keyword match constitute a hit? What if multiple terms are found within a particular section? Is this counted as several independent records or one larger one? This is a difficult problem to solve. In this inquiry there was no strict definition for what a record constituted. Rather, whatever happened to fall naturally within the context of the key word or phrase match appearing in the allotted section was taken to determine the individual record. Thus it should be noted that while 370 records were included in the main table of the appendix, literally thousands of exact hit matches to the Apoc can be found in sum total within the records (see Exhibit 7).

**Exhibit 7** The difficulty with defining what a record constitutes. In this example, numerous key words hit matches (exact quotations and strong allusions) are found in the passage yet the text only occupies one record in the database.

This is why records vary in length; some may be only one line in size, others may be a whole paragraph in size. Other obvious limitations include the exclusion of Latin writings.

---

32 Reference to critical editions such as Clavis Patrum Graecorum (ed. M. Geerard, Brepols-Turnhout, 1983), are essential and should be used in partnership.
which has been already explained. In addition, it must be emphasised that not all of the writings on TLG contain the complete works of a particular writer (note our reference to Irenaeus). Furthermore the TLG does not include all Greek texts throughout the centuries. Such important figures like Methodius of Olympus and Andreae Caesariensis who either cite or have written a commentary on the Apoc were not on TLG disk E. Arethae Caesareae Cappadociae Episcopi, however, who is cited in the TLG canon, does not have his commentary on the Apoc digitised to this time. Of course these will be probably added to the CD by the TLG group as time permits. A breakdown of the Fathers searched by century can be found in Exhibit 8 below.

Exhibit 8 Proportion of Fathers searched by century.

Overall Conclusions
The use of the TLG for investigations as the one conducted in this present research is manifestly an invaluable resource, and an approach very much suitable to all books of the NT. However, at all times the goals must be carefully set out, the methodology clearly defined, and any limitations of the program accounted for and set down from the start. Also any such research, for truer and more accurate results, must be considered
complementary to the other available resources. Finally, in connection to the purposes of this dissertation, the results of the search permitted for at least four critical responses: (i) the conclusions of Chapters 7-9 that the Book of Revelation circulated widely and authoritatively at an early stage of its publication history were not exaggerated; (ii) the tradition of the connection between John the Evangelist and the Book of Revelation was a strong one; (iii) traditional usage and commendation of a text as sacred from succeeding generations of the believing community was fundamental for the Apoc's elevation to canonical recognition (see Exhibit 9); and (iv) ecclesiology and eschatology were major themes of the Book of Revelation that specifically appealed to the early generations of Christian writers. To conclude, as George S. Bebis has plainly said, "…everything goes back to the primitive apostolic tradition."

Exhibit 9 Proportion of total records found, relevant to the Apoc, by author. This graph should be considered in conjunction with table 1- Early Church Apocalypse Sources.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acta Thomae [2038]</td>
<td>Acta Thomae</td>
<td>119.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphilocheus Scr. Eccl. [2112]</td>
<td>Iambi ad Seleucum</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthologiae Graecae Appendix [7052]</td>
<td>In occursum domini (rat. 2)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonius Scr. Eccl. [1171]</td>
<td>Fragmenta ex libro adversus Cataphrygas seu Montanistas</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This table has been sorted by author name (alphabetical order A-Z), and thereafter by work reference sequentially.
2 Works titles that appear with [Sp.] equate to spurious texts and with [Db.] equate to dubious texts as stipulated in TLG.
3 The numbers appearing after the author name and work title are the allotted TLG author ID and respective work ID for that author.
4 The work reference is the TLG citation ID for a particular section of a work of an author. This may not necessarily be the same code used by other publications such as MPG.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius Theol.</td>
<td>De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria</td>
<td>49.2.1</td>
<td>[2035] [010]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[014]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[070]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[117]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[28.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[28.24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[28.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistula festalis xxxix (fragmentum in collectione canonum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>(Sp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homilia de passione et cruce domini</td>
<td>28.240.18</td>
<td>(Sp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oratio quarta contra Arianos</td>
<td>26.196.20</td>
<td>(Sp.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orationes tres contra Arianos

26.33.40

En alvqvar hÅ v Loj, kalil v Loj hÅ pro tov Qeo, kalil Qeo hÅ v Loj. Kalil h Å v Apokal v eila aedilegei: O wÅ kalil v kalil v xomenen. Tou dolo kalil v hÅtil a v aleoito tov a eidoneion. Tou dolo gat kalil v (Pavhoj eî tw pro) xwmaigov toulaigov mev hÅ veg ev grafen: Ec wÅ O Kristoj tolkata' asakata, olwepilaptwv Qeo euloghtoj ejj touj, al v wÅ: Bil nhaj delhtrpewv Êgev: Taqg abapat aubtwv potkiwig vo ko mou toij poihmasi noumena kaqora hÅ te aeiij 26.36 au tov duhmai kalilqeqthoj. Tij dethlitov Qeov duhmai, aij tov psan dinaqkeilegei: Kristoj = Qeov = duhmai, kai Qeovemosi.

26.244.2


26.413.27

Aqrmpos, aqrmposwj legei, taum tvêhrov-pothlit dikajon aqatiqehai. Toun meh gat Logov idioj estin elqbehai taip e polihmena, kaliltowun thb athbxh kai totelqoj mhâqneoi: aiotowgu fqtin aqaj: kalilqoiten oqaj, kalil ejtij th th sustas a aujetwqaja.

[077] Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem [Sp.]

28.663.39


28.700.11

nhvredq toqtrijqij kailaqwefo, kailolswma autow uqeqh ejj kausvin poroj." Prqdh oj dej oqj toqtrijqij oq Antqristoj ejtij.

[071] Synopsis scripturae sacrae [Sp.]

28.293.41

Epitojoiq estiqkaiij A qokalvij f j hqanv tovqelq oqeq, deqevqaj ejj ejqiqaj kaiqelqeriqelaiq ojpolalai aqqoj qailj peumatoforwn Patherwn, ouvh (aoqij: "A qokalvij f jhouv Kristovhwn xewqen autovj Qeovj ejj toij doulq oj autow delqenqai ejh taelq, kaiqeh qanmen, aqposteqaj diaqtolqefouv ojautov% Doulqv oj autowuqainwv." Tosaumaj kaiqilthijj Kailqelijj Diaqhj bija thj toqtrijqij toqanizomena, kaiqilthijj piqtejw hjmhoqoiqelaiqeroqijj hÅ kurqal kaiqelqejmata: ejj pár aqautmv xewqen autqalv kaiqelqeqenmenoj ekqeq% qaiqijaj aqautqaj qautmolqeqtentqen, grafetai qaij ekteqeta. Epelpoiijq ejkteron qatalnh ejqev qaiq aloliqenaiq kaiqsumwqenj naq Â r muqij kaiqalaiaghnta bija bieponhqhaj an upotlwkwkwkataqkaiqouj megajjwv qaijofleaqwv qeoforwn Patervn ejj marturijaj twkktwelotqewn kaij diafwlqsij.
Κελεύεται δε πρώτον γράφει εκαστός 28.429 αγγέλιον των προέρχεσθαι ἐκκλησίων κατὰ τὰ αὐτόπαροι πράξεις. Πολλά μεν οὐκ εἴρθασε καλοπαράδοτον ὄρθωσιν, εἰ δὲ ἐλέγχατο λυγρά ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ. Καλεῖει ἐρήμωσιν ἐπιπλένται αὐτός, καὶ ἐπὶ ὑπατοῦ καθημερινής ἐγκαθίστασις, εἰς τὸν εὐφράαν αὐτοῦ. Εἶπε αἰγαρθόν αἰχμημένην ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ κελεύει ἐρήμωσιν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ καθήμεραν, καὶ γραμματικοῖς ἐπιτάσσεται, καὶ συνεκτιμάτων τῆς τοιοῦτος ἀναίρεσιν, ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ, τὰ ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰν, καὶ ἐπίμενι ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς αὐτόν. Εἶπε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰ προσφατὰ τῆς ἐπίσκοπων λαθασμοῦ, καὶ τὰ καθημερινὸν ἐρωτηματικὸν, καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ παρακλήσεων. Εἶπε καλεῖει ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδόματος τοῦ Κυρίου.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>Synopsis scripturae sacrae</td>
<td>28.433.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabae</td>
<td>Barnabae Epistula</td>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.13a.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9b.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.11b.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.11b.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilius</td>
<td>De vita et miraculis sanctae Theclae libri</td>
<td>1.14.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilius</td>
<td>Adversus Eunomium</td>
<td>29.600.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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καὶ εἰς τὸν χιλιονν. Παρακολουθήσατε τούς άλλους λόγους καὶ τοὺς προφητικοὺς κοσμοὺς τῆς θεοῦ γραμμάτων, καὶ ἔσχατην τῆς συνετελούσης τῆς εἰς τὸν αὐτόν κυρίον εὐφημίαν καὶ τῆς θεοῦ μνήμης.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemens Alexandrinus Theol.</td>
<td>[001] Protrepticus</td>
<td>1.7.5.1</td>
<td>Ọ goun pohnroj, outos ilurannoj, kailidra jwn, ouk aAhij te elb ek geneth sfeteriagasqai, ligoj kailicujolij kail a gl masin kailioi oujoi tisin elwi elj prossfigaj tisqis idaimonij a glij des mihoubo dhlitol egemon, zwiaj ejepfwrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quis dives salvetur</td>
<td>42.1.3</td>
<td>I agon periil wanno sou pote polou para dedemenon kailimynw pefu-l a gmeon, epeidhigat touk uranno sou tel eutha antoj apolthj Pafmou thp nh sou metw gen ejplth Befoson, aypai para kal oumenoj kailipitalpi lhos kwra twm qegn, aShou meb epis pojouj kata sthwn, aShou eloAaj ekkihsij ajmodwn, aShou dekl hon eAAa gentina klhrwswn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromata</td>
<td>6.13.106.2.1</td>
<td>Kwh leij thh ekloghj twma pote wjw en qegra fmalai, oujaj presbuteroj ekto qmAj thp ekkihsij aj kailidagkonoj ajhqj thp touqueouhj, eShb poiv ekialida skv ta toukourigu, ouk up,aaporwpon xeirotoumenoj ouu, aIj presbuteroj, dikaioj nomizomenoj, ali, aShi dikaioj, eh presbuterijj kalal egemonoj: ka Akhtauq ejplhgj prwtoka qedjgj mhlmhmpjnh toij ejwos i kailidesarsjkaqedeltai qrohij tol laob krjgwn, w邝fhsin ejte tpokalui ej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens Romanus Theol. et CLEMENTINA</td>
<td>[006] Homiliae [Sp.]</td>
<td>3.72.2.3</td>
<td>Xaraqj, prosdokij, anaqausj, sunel w邝 ejnq yshij tehj tapanta, proq alwhion uAharcin stwtrij sunqghson, tuwai, tufacon, panta dupsai, sulqat aXwn aXontwn kalikurij kuirgj, despohj balsil ejnq, suwdoj ekuosij qm proa qezomeqj lueqin aAeijl uen kailides meih, aAeijlides meih, suwsofisn: suwllj diorganou diatoutheb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutiones Apostolorum</td>
<td>[001] Constitutiones apostolorum</td>
<td>7.22.11</td>
<td>Agiuj P unahotoj, toldejuwar sbojol on touqnaqou, toldejujon sfragij twm unqhkmw EIdelijmhj eAAaion vmAehj muron, artelitouladwv kailiproj xirlik kailiproj sfragida kailiproj omoloqij touq ponoqanotj hoil su panphokskontoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrilus Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>[003] Catecheses ad illuminandos 1-18</td>
<td>1.3.8</td>
<td>Pithdeoin: eldeijalijon ka depabv, touq ejgjsin etoiqwv thb xafin. Ouuuidjai taladja tolj kusip: all aShou blpej etb thb aAqebh proaiqesin, ekeltisw stwtrijw ejdjsi sfragja, thb qouaquisign, hA.tmoujai daijegj kailinwisQ kousin aAgel eli: faa om, meh fuqgswin elasqnete, oj deliperqswin ejwi oikeijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16.16</td>
<td>KailieAa tolj unuma tolaqon, tolpanwj agiastikoh kailigepqivi, toleqnomk kailiprofifi, palai#e kailinaqadnwa qkv lal hman. Tauntheke thb sfragja eh twdia noqj sou pahtote, haj j num meb kat'a kafekelaiqes in kroiqgjmsoi ejlihtai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TLG Search Results

Appendix
Cyrillus Scr. Eccl.
[2110] Catecheses ad illuminandos 1-18
15.15.21 fhsigaf: egei efoun, kaitoltefaj ekelhbo efqoj peremon metaf tkagijn, kalipaj in allaxounetai kairoj qlig ejw, qligi oia oujegonen an f'hagogen eanoj epli fhj ejewj touk kai roumejig, deinob tolqhrijn, drakwn meqaj, abhorwpoj akatagwistoj, efaimoj ejf tokalapielh, periuapleigna ekontej laaliek tkqagijn grafwtk toufioj atkoumeqaj tejw summetrijaj eake
17.35.12 %proswp% touj anomenouj, allamehns o touj pneumatetoj touj touj touj, perloumsoll ologoj, touo gat eidojmon paetesi sfraqija sou thy uyxej, kalidigqis sfraqiga, h'treomouj daignnej, epourfhnin tina kailqegiqn, kaqikoj kaillgegraptae: eb %kailpisteusanetaj egfragqhtet %pneumati

Cyrillus Theol.
[4090] Commentarii in Lucam (in catenis)
72.500.10 gat o(peritemnomenaj, ejf laoh Qeou dajthx sfra-gidoj palai ekhrhmasen: oueij o baptizomenoj sfraqida toxristob eh eubh %nupiasmenoj, ejf uigeisgin Qeou ehagraqetai.

[108] Commentarii in Isaiam prophetam
70.257.23 th*e hanqorwshewj toh kairoj a pojgmsi, legwn: "O zhkajj Kurigu Sabawq poihhej tuab. Poiqj delzhkajj kailepligtij haqkaqin elpej. O meb gat Drakwn [a]postathj h'apse thh up ouqanob, kailtoij idijj upheqke skhtpiroj tok k'ti ekoha Qeou egenomenon

[06] De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate
68.433.16 [KUR.] Aristdiaojw Taj deltwagjyn yuxaj swmaajnaphilagmenaj parerfiqai nomioumaj, kalilo ogo meb atiowqaj mhdenoj, haekin delhajn proj touj talaiwrijaj, wj kaliponhroij kalikapotoj upokeilqaj pneumaqaj, kal aheqel hfwj akolougeij peritrepous in eukolwj oiper aekipto touxoj. Kalitoj tolthj Apokaluf ejwq bilihng hmih suntiqej ossof twahnij, okailtaij twm. Patelwntelghtai y hfoij, taj tkagijyn yuxaj up autoltgqiebneq awqaj giasistrhion, diebeb loubo safsij

[032] Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1-30)
77.980.33 All'ouk htemeij tolbdel utoj kalibaskanon, kalalhiosion qhrqin, toutesdtn, o(Satanaq, o)lapwapan upoxelata lebfwthv upqoutanob etqpaizj kalipoleoniqaj, kaailtoj thhematqaj

[109] Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate
75.252.1 75.252 (La poleijaj ejt epitphtskewn grafikwq, olji WQej oudeh twMKismakwn prosqumetai: oukhe mn prosqumetah aheketai prosqumetai hagoldoqelqaj.) O makaiqaj Petroy prosqumetau toh Kornhshion, diaakwli ei legw: "Hmiqoj: kaqigat egwkaqapoj eimi." Ekw Islam aqelj prosqumetau toh twahnq ej twvutou = A pokalujj ei. I legw: "Ora mhisundoulj sou eimi kalitwqabel twmbs sou twmprohtwq kalitwqful lasontwn touj logoj toumibiligu toujouj.
Cyrillus Theol. [4090]

Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate

75.37.8t

1. Oti aliqoj o( tou=Qeou=Logoj, marturiqaj.1. "En atxv=Ma o( Logoj, kai( Logoj h( proq toh Qeoh, kai( Qeoj h( Ao( Logoj." "En tv=Ma poka uy ej tv=Ma hmon tou( tle( legei, "O wv, thv, oh, leqmenono, o( otuxmenono, o( Logoj esti( kq( ouko( h( wq, kai( Q h( ytekatqaj.1. "Iou(ugat, fsih, eWv=Uxqomaa, kai( kai( tskhnw e<h meh ms( sou, legei Kurqaj.1. Safwjsd( kai( Fwa(, hqjtv=Logoj thqj toh Qeoh." "Eto(uy, fsih, o( Logoj proq toh Qeoh." Proseihai delpawtj deiltqajj ton t% kq( ouko( Wn kai( toh Qn ytekatqaj.

Didache XII Apostolorum [1311]

Didache 4.13.1

Ow mh( egkatalqj entola( kurqaj, fulaquej de( a( parelah, mh( te prostiqe( mh( te afairw.

9.4.2

ouw( sunaqhtw( sou( ekki hsq( apoltw( perafw( thw( ghq( ej( thwsh( basilqej.

10.5.2

kalisunaj aouth( apoltw( tes sajw( aehwn, thw aqiasqej, ej( thwsh( basilqej, h( hq( toq( saj a( autw(.

10.6.2

Eidqj ajqoj estq, etqsw qw( ekk ou( esti, metaqej:

16.4.2

kailote fanqetaj oikos mpianh hj wj uiq( qeou=kalqo( ej( shmeb( kai( qeuf( kai( hq( paraqh( etqaj ej( xeiq( autou( kalqo( ej( shmeb( aqej, wa( akqeye( gegovn e( aehw).

Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl. [2102]

Commentarii in Ecclesiasten (11-12)

328.23

auto( ouw( I hswl( legei ejai( "atkh( kalqetaj": ..."egw", fhsip(, elmi( tqaapia( fai( tou=klqoj D(wh( h( xqh( kai( tsetoj", "ol( prw( kai( klqoj( axtoj", ...aWk( kai( qeufna( h( ntrko( [klqoidou( zmwi( ej( tou( ai( wh...]. Oa( pwj( ...a(uit( al( ytqomata aqthkeqej(] kai( proteta( katf( te329 ra( auto( ejai( legei(...legei gowm ohi( "egw(ol( prw( kai( qeuf( e( axtoj", hq( prw( ...egw(ol( klqoj( egw(ol( ...aqtln( grammata, a( karaqte( toijp( eum( fai( toq( ej( tv( kardig( tv( ouw( aw parekua( mehwn.

Commentarii in Job (in catenis)

64.5

Tad( qora( de( omo( tou=diabolou(, eheregi( autow( deforqaj, ouk ouqij, dhi( ol( Diaboloi( gaj( kai( aqthkeqej(, kai( pnonqaj, kai( ejm(, kai( drakn(, kai( hqeig, kai( kq( hqoj, diaq( tropon( leqetaj, diaq( efow( autow( hq( kai( qen( eheqmnaj: oher( haqetipqoj( esti( tou=manix( kai( wou( diqmatoj.

Commentarii in Psalmons 20-21

55.28

wj eh( Apokaluj ej leqetaj: ..."tvq( uq( me( autow( drakwn( totrij( tw( wq( efow( tou( oufou( e( uq( e( ...", eilaha( gaj: eh( didaqaj kalqo( efow( ..."didaq( aqma(, ouqoj hqou(.

Commentarii in Psalmons 35-39

280.18

ekkaq( uqetaj tajkakaleipqoj( kai( kqo( hqoj( th( ghw(, ouk( ehipqoj( parqkomataj", kai( leq( twv( apo( klquj ej( Fwa( hmun( trij( ejh( ej( leqetaj(, "ouk( ouq( ilou( kaleipqoj( kai( kqo( hqoj( th( ghw(, ...". Ahi( hmun( ouk( kalo( koiqaj, ouk( aq( eiqej(, "mh( parqsw( hq(, 13 kai( parq( pio( aj( kq( mpq( paqte( ej, ope( te(, oufou(.

Commentarii in Psalmons 40-44.4

306.19

eh( t% ouqij hq( as( th(, kai( ejux( ilou( peleq( kqej mehwn( diatth( marturiqaj I hsw(ou( par( autow( efow(, dhi( ol( ol( ou( Logoj, ouk( aq( ej( peleq( kqej mehwn( diatth( marturiqaj hsw(ou(.
551.1

Dikaiosunh fhs i th sb dila gipte wj. fhs ou = Xristou ej. panta ej pisteuta ej suni stam mehn. au dh deih dikaiosunh aha foral kai iol oka utshkata pneumatika iotugxhi kai iol. Qusate qis qan dikaiosunh ej; la kalai epi tol pneumatikoh qis iasthion ahoi qusi moxousou gewpouhou ekkonta ej achora yuxaj ouk aalaj tuxanousaj twys yuxxwthm martawun olqeqaj para tolo to parloun qis iasthion aha foro mehn ej "auctor iat wsh fhs dina. ej yax iow tis iow fhs tou iow. twy pepel ekis mehn yax ahi dila tolto Ama. fhs oukai iolth marturj na kai iolupoloiqis iasthion tolo to parloun teqewshnta.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didymus Caecus</td>
<td>Fragmenta in Psalms e commentario altero</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scr. Eccl. [2102]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didymus Caecus Scr. Eccl. [2102]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragmenta in Psalms e commentario altero</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scr. Eccl. [2102]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[021]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[030]</td>
<td>In epistolas catholicae brevis enarratio (in catenis)</td>
<td>89.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[041]</td>
<td>In Genesimi</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[029]</td>
<td>Beautitudines, capita quinquaginta quinque</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[076]</td>
<td>De paenitentia</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus</td>
<td>Theol. [4138]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[029]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[076]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[029]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[076]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLG Search Results Appendix 360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
74.1 Ephraem Syrus
De paenitentia 74.1

75.1 Ephraem Syrus
De paenitentia 75.1

76.2 Ephraem Syrus
De paenitentia 76.2

78.2 Ephraem Syrus
De paenitentia 78.2

Author Name: Ephraem Syrus
Work Title: De paenitentia
Work Reference: 74.1, 75.1, 76.2, 78.2
Citation: [4138]
All and all. Our givion at the night, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. A hole in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. P. 79.5

1. All and all, the one who is as a mark in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.

81.1

All and all. The one who is as a mark in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.

[076] De paenitentia

Author Name Work Title Work Reference Citation

Ephraem Syrus Theol. [4138]

[076] De paenitentia 79.5

All and all. Our givion at the night, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. A hole in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. P. 79.5

81.1

All and all. The one who is as a mark in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.

[071] De paenitentia et patientia

Author Name Work Title Work Reference Citation

Ephraem Syrus Theol. [4138]

[071] De paenitentia et patientia 317.4

T and all. The one who is as a mark in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. A hole in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.

[074] De panoplia, ad monachos

Author Name Work Title Work Reference Citation

Ephraem Syrus Theol. [4138]

[074] De panoplia, ad monachos 14.6

All and all. The one who is as a mark in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. A hole in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.

[055] In adventum domini (sermo i)

Author Name Work Title Work Reference Citation

Ephraem Syrus Theol. [4138]

[055] In adventum domini (sermo i) 180.t

[1] All and all. Our givion at the night, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead. A hole in the night and the day in the second century, and all of us have a last name for all in the stead.
Ephraem Syrus  

In adventum domini (sermo i)

182.4

An katekousan thn makairan thn diastomon; Dusilag qanaqoij deinoi\ ah\li\-skoi\, gunaikeij tou\ pro\ autaj\ ei\kion\, tou\mu\s\qj\, kai\lporneu\wai\, Toun\ de\la\utou\ to\ t\rop\on\ e\k\,\u\b\en\,\o\in\,\i\r\on\,\a\,\pa\te\j\ th\b\l th\q\ri\g\u\,\s\ra\-\g\i\a\ b\a\s\ta\-\z\ou\s\in, o\\n\,\\e\q\,\a\p\a\th\w\a\i\, ta\ls\u\mpa\ta\ e\sh\me\q\j\; e\h\th\%\k\a\r\%\k\i\q\i\j, ej\ t\l\op\h\w\m\a\ w\m\k\b\k\air\w\m, k\a\l\e\i\q\j\ ou\q\w\j\ a\g\ra\s\a\i\ t\al\b\r\w\m\a\ta

182.9

In acu\-\ntum domini  (sermo iii)

192.2

Qi\l\j\, in a p\a\rm\a\u\g\u\n\h\t\h\b\p\e\k\i\r\k\a\n\s\a\n\, kai\l\o\n\h\b\a\l\i\,\mu\e\u\t\i\g\k\h\j\ konte\j\, e\p\h\i\l\s\h\m\a\i\ w\m\b\ b\r\w\ma\w\a\n; dh\m\a\r\x\o\j\ g\a\p\a\l\o\m\i\j\ s\t\q\h\i\q\o\j\, k\a\l\t\o\j\, t\q\e\f\e\j\, e\m\q\e\\b\u\l\t\h\h\b\s\q\i\d\a\g\l\w\a\n, a\g\q\a\l\e\i\, br\a\k\u\b\r\w\m\q\, e\k\i\p\w\n\h\b\w\m\b\a\n t\w\b\w\b\r\w\ma\w\a\n, e\l\ko\s\h\m\e\n\h\w.  

194.9

Ah\q\ri\w\p\w\n.  E\b\d\e\f\u\k\a\\i\l\i\m\e\g\i\s\h\j\i\a\l\i o\t\k\a\j\l\j\ th\b\b\q\ri\g\u\k\w\w.  M\e\n\a\f\a\n\t\a\i\ pa\sj\h\ s\a\r\k\j\ o\q\p\i\q\i\m\u\j\ w\v\e\q\e\i\g\j\ t\w\b\b\b\r\w\ma\w\a\n,  

195.3

Aut\o\j\ a\mu\q\o\j\, o\k\,\u\q\w\j\ e\p\q\o\m\u\j\%\m\h\q\i\j\ e\p\q\i\g\e\u\j\,  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name Work Title Work Reference Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus In aduentum domini (sermo iii) 195.6 Drakontoj ek touodemou kaitoumeis mouk kaitou mou akou thph qalaasjh thph megali hj kail dhmaw thwqhiryn oih pantai oih la-bontej thb sfragida tou xantriqtag tou kail proskunh santej au ulw5j t%10e%9e%5 9i% je, ouk ekousi merigia etu kristsparousig aila mete autow mou. Drakontoj bi hqhsontai eif geannan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.6 kail oj emlepousi touw umiguj. Kaimufiaia mirada ej Aggefwn, kailixiladej aha-riqhtoi stratialitwm Arxaggejwn xaiqontaixarabmekalfin aigojte kaidikaioi, kailpatej oih mhli la-bontej thb sfragida tou tou anawnoi kail saebouk. Kaila ketaitoi (utuannoj dedemenoj upo) Aggefwn sub pazoi toij daipoisin exwpiion touwhma toij. Kaila kontaia aha awh%5%k, labontej thb sfragida, kaila qontaia aha martwloliakilaqebiej dedemenoi. Kailidqswin o(Basileuj thb kaatw akofas in thaiwigniku laqew je t%0le%9%k%k% kede%9%k. Pantaj deeloi mhli la-bontej thb sfragida tou xantriqtag, kail pantaj oikrubej ej sphilaiqij kaijeb opaij, aqallontai sun t%9%mumij ej past%0uaniqij xarab ahek-lafhtoj metapantwntw akign ej pantaj touj aikaraj. Amlh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[051] Interrogationes et responsiones 78.12 Tofe, filokristoi, eieuna bai eihilkeast% h[sfragij touxristiasismouh eai heben ekastoj etu vqegij Ekkihiqej dia touwaptiagmatoj. Kaila kaitelatai ekastoj thb pigg in aignjnto kaila hepiagiktont pashj aipewj, kaili hqhsida aqaruston kailtob xitwaj aholjntoj, kail taldogrameiegoj nek> t%kbede meh%kke%emp% yal%k%ki pantaj oj, kuki akouloqousi dwa t%kober% |

[004] Sermo compunctorius 106.8 neirwaij boulaj twxkardwv. Kailijsutomoj ejollew: Bwetai apo-doumai ekast% katatalejga autow Bwetai oukeli aighqj, kaqwj toitproforon, all' ejl' outawamej metalunewn kailodoh ji polih. Tote ejl saipgej saipqous in ek twxoutanwev kaila, dunaheij auitwej al euhqontai, highpawa, wij toludewr thq qalaasjh, tremei aipotih kochi aoutopota moj. puroj protekai |

[012] Sermo compunctorius 389.5 Perilwopqymatoj monon toupodoumai, xijaj ejhk heij aqzwmen epilthghj, oujdnawmaq apo-doumai t%0e%e mej aqobaj thjkafej. Egywouwo foboomai, teknaj mou aqaphtaj ginwsk squareaj thb hehm kumeiaj, mhlpantej oj, qetaiakaiioi, ma karizontej thb yeudhmonou eulabelian, ekelimoj ehtupswsin, okan me qeasontai ehtupkalomenon. |


59.13 outanoilkaiajpoqkaiufqhwetaij o(twfbasilejwBasileuj) kail Arxwn twxkaj-oxonten, wij aktraphtiberajmetalunewn polihjikaioldohj aheikatou. Kailohj etai autob pajeqal noj, kailoiheiej autob eektenthsan, kailiyojontai ehpaut%paiai aj fulaihqghj. Tote olouanoj kaililathjej ej fughtrapsontai, kaqjw0 o(Iwannhj) proedhjwse, leqewn: elidon qronon leukob megan. |
Ephraem Syrus
Theol. [4138]
[Sermo in adventum
domini, et de consummatione
saeculi, et in adventum
antichristi

115.1

καὶ δὲ ἡ καλιτεγεσεν. ὅμως ἑταὶ ἔσχατος ἡμῶν ἐκ ὑπὸλοιπον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου, καὶ εἰς τὸν ναόν τῆς ἱερατικῆς. Οὐκ ηταὶ ἐν τῆν καιρὶ ἐκείνην, όσο νὰ ἀνασκοιμήσει τῆς ἐμῆς ζωῆς, τὸν πολλὸν καὶ τὸν στρατον, ἵνα πάντες ἴσοι καὶ ἀληθείς ἀνακοιμηθῶμεν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καταραμένῃ παράθυρῳ, ἵνα συνάντησομεν τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρί ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

116.2

Εἰκὼν ἐκεῖν ἀνακριμάνας τῆς μεταμορφώσεως, ἐν τῇ πνεύματος τῆς συνεργίας. Αἱ τρίταις ἀνακοιμηθεσσον πάντες καὶ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ πνευματικῇ ἀνακοίμησις, ἵνα συναντησοῦμεν τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρί ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Καὶ ἐγὼ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάξωμεν ἑνὸς ἐκ τῆς συνεργίας. ὧν ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ ἀνακοίμησις, ἵνα πάντες τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρί συνάντησομεν, ἵνα συναντησοῦμεν τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρί ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.
Ephraem Syrus

Theol. [4138]

121.10 y in a para mu hton, thh peri ekousa n autou nuktoj kalithera j, kaloudha mou eufigousin emplh hsmai twmbrowma jen.

123.13 A pantej deloi peis gentel t%wein%hrij kaila a bohtej thh ekejgou sfragida, toh dus ebehwarakthma toumi arou pro strekonej aub%kail egoj su met%0douj: doj hmi fagei kailipeij, ohi pantej ekejgmen ektou = 124.1 immou = sfirgomeno: kailapelas a son af hmu%telibbola aqrija. Kailaporwka lajioj a pokrigetai eh poliv%petomij, ilegwn: pojen epywujwu umih fagei kailipeij, wQ Agrowpoj; o outanoj oubouj eai doumai tyvywetoij: high delapin ouj dedekken

124.7 Ekeihoj gat oaijioj ouk iku to oubelebj%bohqmawai: kalipwia autouj elewai; En ekigai taj hmeraj edai a hajk megafh ekqleywi polih touj Drakontoj kailitouj eboj kai leisimouj kalithj qal assj touj kailitwouj immou kalithj dij h kailitwetdgmatw twc qrigen. Pantej deloj, abohtej ths sfirgida touj Antixristou kail prosoukunhantej aub%kaj Qe%kaj%haj%touj ekousijwma meriga eh tvasileij ektouj Cristovouj a lajmetalotovj Drakontoj bl hqhsontai eh tvgeemn.

127.11 I doj bujjen oj Numfij. A noigontai delaihmawma, kailij ehi lijfyq fajloumou eiqigontaipai paiwaij fulaisij kalibili epousin eiij tolka lij tolalij touj Numfiou. Kailumufjai muraijij kailij taj xilaij a Adagwewn kal Ai xagwewn, a harigmtjoi stratiai xajgousij xarax megajh. Agloj kalidjazoi kalipantej oi, mhla abohtej ths sfirgida touj Drakon- 128.12 toj <toumiarou> kalisia bewolf a jalontai. Kailaetaj oituranoj, dedemehoj upol Afgewj, sub paai toj doimogsn, ekhipjij touj hmatotaj, kalai, labohtej thh autow sfirgida, kalipantej oj, asebeij kailamartwl olidemehoj. Kailidgwosin oj Basilij ejh thkat auwja taposin thjaiwjik griewm ejh %purijt%bedt%. Pantej deloj, mhla abohtej thh sfirgida touj Antixristou, kalipantej oj, ehi phaigij, a jalontai sub t%numwij ehi past%aikij kaliojtauaj, metaj pahtwv twc Agign, eij a paerajtouj ai wij twmbrowma. 

[053] Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem, et in secundum adventum, et de caritate et eleemosyna

139.1 139 W, pwjupenegkwen, a Bel foligalj iowmen iowmen tof potinon potamoh, wBper a grign qal jassan, kat esigjta talokh kail taj napaj, kailikata kajgta pawan thh oikoumejnh kailitrau eaut den Aga. Tote, a phhpi ejk toumupoj ekeigou oj, potamokiej eiu osin, aiphaipasanisqhsontai, hqjasssa chaqndhsedai, talattra ekpesouvin ektouj outanouj nhkioj ek ejg eij kailithh hnh metabl hqhsedai eij aima, ooujnoj elis qhsedai wj bibign. Otan iowmen, a Bel foligalj Afgewjouj a pastaj mehouj kaiiperstrejta metapoudwyj kailipes jnumajtouj eki ektouj doujij touj Qeouwujp akrwn ouanouj <aj akrwn autou> iowmen tof ouanoh kaiouno kailithh ghm kaijinh, katai tolpejagell ma autovj.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus</td>
<td>Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem, et in secundum adventum, et de caritate et eleemosyna</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>Tote protrekousi stratiala iwtw Aaggelwn. Xoroi Arxaggelwn suntrekousi. Ta Xeroubeim kaiita Serafeimta, pol ouomata e ixsu Aaraouzisi: a ajioj, a ajioj, a ajioj, ol wak kailioiha kailoietxomegaioj, pantokrafwr. Tote paktigma eht 1% tukan kai lehv kvgv kailiupokaw thr gwh ehdunanei bowbain: eul ogghmenoj oletxomegaioj Basil euel ehr ohmati Kuirigu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141.12</td>
<td>sxisqhsontai ol ouanoiikakilapokal ufohsetai ol Basil eu twb basil euouwn, wj a ktra phlobera meta dunamewj pol iwh kailidoj a heika stou. Kailioketai paf oqal moj, kailiolinej auto ebekehthsan, kailikoy ontai eb' auto pawaiai, ful aithth ghj. Tote oloutan oj kaiiighghew tufgh phraphontai, kaww Iwaungh prochehws, legein: eidion grohon leukob megan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145.14</td>
<td>Tote, fil aristoi, eteunai eboj ekastou hjsfragij tou Kristiasmou maabhn eht tvejgj kailaga kolv Eveklhsi ihtm dia toubapigmatoj, kailapaiteitai ekastoj pwjth piq tinc etuacen a hiai hto kailithh sfragida aaraukton kailont xitwew anfoh upont, kailithh kai hnoi meloi ogian hawin olghsen epipol iwh wewmartwfn, legeentj: epatasseomega t1% tukan kai lapasit oj eAgolij.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Pwjsupenekwmen, a sel foi oan irwmen toh purinon potamob etexomenon metaequmonwpermep a briqan quaasan, kai kates qignta oahn kai apaj, kailikata kaiqnta pawnth ghm kailaleh autwega; Tote, abhptoi ektouphoq ekioj ou, potamoleik elogisin, ai, phgialanixi, talaktra pictousin, ohiqioj sbeshqetai, hs selhh pareketai, ol ouan oj eligsetai wj biblig, kaqw geagraptai. Tote oj, Aaggeli o parestellomeni peritekousin, epis naganj eutqj ekletj etukwtesew akejmen, wj ehn o Kuirij, a p akrn ouarnwekij aahrn autw. Etoq eassomega outanob kaiob kaiiighh kainh, kata telebaggel ma autow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius Scr.</td>
<td>Anacephalaeosis [Sp.]</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>A logoi, uf' hwmwkhli hqentej, ot, teoleuggelion Iwaunou kailont eha ut% %Alegen apolatrhoj ahiqeq Ligon parekbailontej, teoleuggelion autol(chitokata) Iwaunhnh mhdesxomegaio mwthh aiturw Apokalijyn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ancoratus

Title: Ancoratus
Reference: [001] Ancoratus 13.5.1

Index apostolorum (Sp.)

Title: Index apostolorum
Reference: [002] Index apostolorum [Sp.] 109.7

Panarion (= Adversus haereses)

Title: Panarion (= Adversus haereses)
Reference: [003] Panarion (= Adversus haereses) 1.158.14
Reference: [004] Panarion (= Adversus haereses) 1.160.16
Reference: [005] Panarion (= Adversus haereses) 1.269.17
Reference: [006] Panarion (= Adversus haereses) 1.279.1

TLG Search Results Appendix 368
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 1.339.8</td>
<td>μεταστέλλων μεν θάλασσαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς προσφορᾶς ἡ αἰεὶ διόρδωσιν ἐπέμενε καὶ ἀλήθειαν μὴ διεισαγαγούσης, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθαρότητος καὶ ἔσοδον τῆς καθαρότητος τοῦτον ἀρχήν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 2.18.11</td>
<td>Χριστὸς γραμματίων δεδεκάτορ, τοδεῖ ἐπὶ ἁγίων ὑποτευχοῦσα διὰ τοῦ προσφορᾶς ἡ αἰεὶ διόρδωσιν ἐπέμενε καὶ ἀλήθειαν μὴ διεισαγαγούσης, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθαρότητος καὶ ἔσοδον τῆς καθαρότητος τοῦτον ἀρχήν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 2.19.5</td>
<td>εἰγνθέντος, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθαρότητος καὶ ἔσοδον τῆς καθαρότητος τοῦτον ἀρχήν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 2.232.12</td>
<td>10. Πάντα τοῖον προφητεύων παράκολουσθεὶς ἐν ἡμῖν, ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθαρότητος καὶ ἔσοδον τῆς καθαρότητος τοῦτον ἀρχήν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 2.248.19</td>
<td>[1Κατὰ τὴν Ἀριστερὰν ἡ αἰεὶ σεϊς ἡ καλοὶ ἰδιοτημένης θάλασσαν ὡς ἐκεῖνος, καὶ οἱ συνάγοντες τοῦτον ἀρχήν ἐπιστήμην ἡ θύμων ἡ ἀπακριδίας. Χριστὸς γραμματίων δεδεκάτορ, τοῦτον ἀρχήν. ἐν τῇ καθαρότητος καὶ ἔσοδον τῆς καθαρότητος τοῦτον ἀρχήν. ]11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haer 2.250.16</td>
<td>3. Πάντα τοῖον προφητεύων, ἡ ἀπακριδίας ἡ αἰεὶ σεϊς ἡ καλοὶ ἰδιοτημένης θάλασσαν ὡς ἐκεῖνος, καὶ οἱ συνάγοντες τοῦτον ἀρχήν ἐπιστήμην ἡ θύμων ἡ ἀπακριδίας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haer 2.251.1

καὶ ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων ἡμῶν ἡ εἰρήνη, καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀληθὲς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, πᾶν τὸ ἐλεημονεῖ ἡ ἀληθινὰ. ἐπεί δὲ τῶν ἑκατέρων παραλλήλων παραδοσίων, π STDERR/STDOUT
34. Επίγονται δεπάλι την τελική παssονίζει τον ιερό πληρώνει ενά περιθώριον από το διάστημα της άνθρωπινής επίγοντας και της εποχής της αποστολής. 2.309 τους τεσσαρείς και την τέσσερα αγία Ευαγγελία, καθώς και την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διάδοχοι είναι οι Σωτήρ, Οσία και Ευαγγελιστής, καθώς και οι Μεσογεία Αγίων Αγίων και Ορθότονων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων.

35. Αποκαλύπτονται δεπάλι, οι άγιοι Απόστολοι, και το διάστημα της άνθρωπινής επίγοντας και της εποχής της αποστολής. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων. Οι άγιοι Απόστολοι διέθεσαν την τέσσερα αγία εννοία, ενώ η τέσσερα αγία εννοία είναι οι τέσσερις άγιων Απόστολων.
Epiphanius Scr. | Panarion (= Adversus haereses) | Haer 2.355.10 | qaumastw½<j> dihgeilai ouqoj gat o(Ô wÔ ektin epipaphtwn qeoj, epeidh<q> gat autoj dida<q> kei hmaq leqewn 'panta moi paredoêb upitoloupatroç mou', dia tautw epiqaphtwn estiêqoj, ouqô gat kaii lwanhj hmaq martureilêq 'oÔ hÔ aÔ aÔ xqhj, Ô A ḥkoua men kaii loj ofqal moiq êrakamen, kaiilaî xeîfej hmwê<j> hlaqfhsan', kaiilpal in fshih ev tw=A pokalûj ei '''o(Ô ab' aÔ atxhj kailieqojmenoj pantokrafwr

Haer 2.397.1
2.397 lhqeîq oînouj poiqejqen estergaqasqai, akouûv oôi 'kuqoj oîqojq sôu kuqojq ejî ejêqen'; ôôa deî Qristôb eferon paraîtub ej qonta oîjijô Israhîl pros dokhjûsin, akouûswin 'egeûb prwteqj kaililmetaîta twa' kaij'êqweîmi tolaqfwa kai toîpô toîlafwa toîkaqtw bleqon kailitowî qaôlîqw bleqon, îam plhrwqveîleihmenon 'okatabaj autô ej estin kaiilojahabaj uperaqf pasjî atxhj kailietousijaj kailikuroqhtoj kailipantoj ohmatoj ohomazomenou

Haer 2.415.9
6. Kekleibqai kaiilôqjigqai taj qelaj grafaj oî, qeibifasîliqoi qoj tw='kleidîlîtw=Dauig', taka deî kaiilôqjigjcul, periî hû eistêta to îektupwma srëqidôj, aûqisma kuriqjê, toutejtw tw=dunajmenî toudêkdrotw autaj qeoutvâpolîth sjrûgaqj dhojoumev, perilemheî ouj twêkî ejîqai kaiilôqjigqai oîl'wanhj 'ahadaîskiê ej tw=A pokalûj eî leqewn 'kaiit'lêq jumê'êq <r>eh Filâdelqê ekki hsijaj graqj on: tade leqei oîajaq, oîa hqjnoj, oelêmynthkleqtw Dauig, oî ahoiîlw qaiilouejî kl ejlil qaiîl lejmen kaiilouejî ahoijeq: oîâa sos taiadêga: i'douj jedwêka qurân ehwpjón sou aheqmenh, hû ouadêj duhataî kl ejîa authî

Haer 2.415.17
kaiîlmet oîlîga 'kaiilêôon epîlhth decia'h tûqkaqmenou ejîlîtôb qronon bîlîgn geqrammenon kaiilôqjicqen, katesfrqjmenon sjrûgjîq epta' kaiîlêôon ālî ijijê onîsçurob khrusq sorêta onê fwwn megajf: tij ajîoj ahoijai töl bîlîgn kaiil uwaî taj sjrûgjîqaj au tôqkaqjouejîh hûdhuq ej 1% îqûâlî%imuîl epîlîhth ghûq ouû ejîkaw tw' têmghp ejîqaij toîbîlîgn ouû qeîbeî ein autôj kaiilêkl aonî, ôô ouadêj aqjê ejîqê ahoijaij tôqÎqîm ouû bleqen aîîq tîj qaiilêôeek tw=q presbûtefemn leqej mi: mhkl aiêî, idouj eijhês en oîleq oëkej thfulhj touda, hûlîga Dauig, ahoîqaij toîbîlîgn kaiîlaj ejîlasfâ - 2.416 gigjaj au tôqk

Haer 2.416.1
perileitewûsFrqjigqai sîqhûq oîl'qaiî'êaîî ijî♠î aîbînrhûma panta tûwa wîq oîl'qoj joublîgn joutw tôqkaqmenou, oîâa bâwîîg au tôîlaqjôpô;jê epîstamehîq gramhûna, lejgonjê: aîhganîqî twa, kaiîleqij oudûmaja a hûgnwaj, ekfragîstai gaj, kaiîloqojteîj toîbîlîgn jouwêj xeîfaj aqîrqwîîmî hûtîpjestamenou gramhûna, kaiîleqij aû1%îhâhqwnqwî twowô, kaiîleqij ouq epîqj maq gramhûna'. tûwaî gat oîjouqnon periîlîgh A pokalûj ejî fwanhj kaiilouw H'saiqje nomisètên leqesqai, aiîlêkaliperîpa'hj qeîqaj gajh, môm îqôwemqjî kajîparatîoj melîqij epajiq ejîlnw qeîgndunmenoj peplhrwmejnh ajîhmâtqwîn kaiiparâbôl wêskoteînîtej leqewn kaiîlérl in poikîljîn ejî'êaîî qajeqîj, dusl hûtqwn twêhôqrpîqgj fûqêi.
Eligat haec a bigu pneumatog generating geneticaly kai apophthaij kai apostofoij memaqteumenoj, eileis el el el qonta apalxyp gene essew ej kou mou aki tweth Esqht xrow au, eheikosia ki apelteitubilqij pai laiaj diaqkhj eikosiai dsu aiplinei pneumaenaij, tefrasia de laiibij eu aqgelijij kaihek tesareskaigeka epistolaij tou me bigu apostofoij Paujoulou kaielaiij qri toulwn (kai) sub tajij eh toij autw baxrowen. Praesiti twmepofojm kaiqoliqaij epistolaij tafkrowou kaii Petromou kaii Iwanoj kaii laouda, kaij tw ouj twaunou. Apokaljijeij, eajetaij Solfajij, Solomnonoj tefhmi kalijiuq Seirak, kai paalaj aapjiggrafaij qejaij (teteumaq) kailabodoux kataqjima ojai kaijama, ojai oujamaoujhetatetajaij, hageq himefijewn, ouk a prepelej mel qe%liqall' eusebaj ejf qeoa, tolton me benniaj kaijama, mhdoujdelej qejg graf ev'heq; oulelej gat kinh memhjijj jote gennhob ekenoiq qeoj.

Haer 3.449.5
Kaioloi meqgegraptaij perilthjxi ilionta ethriqoj tajhj (oiij) etv= Apokaljij ej twaunou kaioli para AIqiet tajj ij eskihbijqoj pipisteumehj kaij paraqojqij geosebikj, dhijon, thb deblbijj on aqginwiskontj ij ij, plektaij kaij leujabaij, perilthk pneumatiqj elibotej kaij xtaq ev upvnepumatikwijjekonta =pneumatiqwijj> lambajontj alhjijmej ojata, ej baquatihj de safhizomena pipisteukasin ouomjogentouj touj touj ekblebasewij ejhijaij, allai kalaiqiaj oj poliai.

Haer 3.462.12
Peri lauqihj kaij ouq wethj thj yxh diel eusetai ronmaiq, oawj AApokalj of qwulin ej polijwekardiwdia-logis moij, ph delthj Apokalj ejw ej twaunou faskoushj oj" kaij peudenj oj drakw epilithgunaika thb qgensjat an toij ojena, kaij ebojnsa oj upvnenepufeguj baj toukaaj ejhij hijj thb ahjmon, oawj akmhj adv autb oj drakwj, takaj deluhtaitaj ej autv=plhrouswaij: oujajatij deletlqjoma tojou, kaijouj ejw ojai apanhatoj eujaiijen: alj oubiq dia-beliaoujaij eteqjewnq, uperbealaij gat higrjhidotous nouj.

Haer 3.463.16
Eligat skumnoij leonhj foua ejhiqetaj tafkijlqewn thb Xristoj qaijou ej etv= Apokalj ejw ej twaunou "Ihaju ejhiqen ollam" fhisj oieik fulhj fouda kaij eipermatoj Davijj lebnti AApaj parajekas mohouj toujurijou, oukijetakaij fujin, allaiq DJtaijaijajigma kaij diajtoj oj baslikoj eijaij totij%an, thb qa ijwek zm%an jatwafajaj ejekixuxojtajon kaij taallaj paaj xariqatatoj, aajj geq kaiiij bennjhasan al leijan aiqijemijq kajjij, poqenj gat leq gennaij baij pahtwij, ejmihj leajina hjmhrfklq hihqsetaij; alieajg deldeuteijraj oulqigetaij kujhsij: aajj oukieti kujhsin oijenijh Marijaj, oukieti sunajfijan sumweij hjlagiq pareqhoj.

Eusebius Scr. Ecc. Et Theol. [2018]
[054] Commentaria in Psalmos
23.1133.33
Taipouemj samatiqhj jerousalijaj h, ejoiq toipaqajxenoj auw kumhmaselte kaijaj qen ejiphemaj, wop per kaijijweijgone, twjw tahaiqijaj ejh. Eipimonojj gat xiiijqij ejedei sunodhjekho kalijihkrejx mtaijj ej totlij xlatriq: aAhakaij aiplineietai toubewij job tropoj, Aopolmeb the prfthjoujwekroukatasehj kaijijw Solomnonoj xrowen mekri thyj upolj Babul wjjen poliorkijaj ejh sunajgetaiulbij.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratio evangelica</td>
<td>8.2.30.6</td>
<td>mahtaij to bobouv mtekei gen epairadouj grammanwn. oden l'hoou, fhisij, ehiqhsen ollawno oek fulha touda, kalialutol. haincen taj sfragijaj teppikeimeneaj 10 bibliaj, katalith Apokalyypin Iewnou, polij delsfragibaj hakhw profhtwstaaj aposfeija; aueuma aepistamenon, akrwjskaii[hsaiij ekogen: &quot;kajekontai oio logoi oudoi wj oio logoi toumebigi tou megrigmenou&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td>Eccl Hist 3.18.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entou 1% katekei logoj tabapostolon akeialiuajgelisinth Iewnouhni eli 10% biblih eipokathitaonta, theiij toqo bibl ogekei marturijj Paqmon oikeihi katalikasqai ethnthmon. 3.18.2 graffw geloi o Elthnameij perithyf hivoj the katautob xriston prshgorijaj feromenhj ethtv=Iewnnou legomenhj Apokalyypin ai, autaiij sillaibaj ej empht% tw Proj taj airdeijj tauba perilitouswanou fiswth. 3.18.3 &quot;eideledeij akefandob eth 1% thekm kai% khrutesqaiqai toouama autovodij ekigou a aereijh toumakalith Apokalyypin ebaqoij ajh aderqoj. oudeigaj proploulourouneu epraqij, a lialas xedoj epili thnheteraj geneaj, proj 10% deieij the Dometianovuxi&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td>Eccl Hist 3.23.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Epiitoufoj katauth Asigan eliri 10% biblihpereipomenoj autotoj ekeijn o Aqhapal oihouj, autotoj oihouj oekclivaloj euvgelisnth Iewnnhj taj autuloj dielgen ekklhsijij, apothij katalith hmon metath. Dometianou oekeluth epelanejwqel fulgijj. 3.23.25 odi deijj tajouj 10% biblih perihm, apokrh dia ludu pistiwqas qai to bobouv martutewn, pistoiidh' Aqhai ouhlij, thy ekklhsistantikhp presbeuantej qroqocqijj, eipoleiptououo Elthnameij kaii Klhmhj 3.23.35 eli Aicandreuq odimehj proferoj ej deuthej tw Proj taj airdeijj Wdeipwj grafeij katauthj: &quot;kalipatej oij presbeuloi marturowanij oij katauth Asigan Iewnnh 1% touloukigaj mahtvsembehi kokej pa kadukewneij to bobouv Iewnnh, paremeinen gar aututoj mekri tw Traianovouxhewh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica</td>
<td>Eccl Hist 3.23.6.2</td>
<td>toupwpostofou para dedomenon kakimhhw pfelugmenon. epeidhigaj toutepauranou tel euthanatoj apothij Paqmon thh nhou methqgen eplith: Efeson, apveil paraqaloumenoj kaieliptilaipi hsiokwra twkeqewnq, oqou meh epirocomopoj katastawa, oqou deloaaj ekklhsijij aqmoewn, oqou delikalhmon eA geitina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TLG Search Results

Appendix

374
3.24.16.1 kai litauba meb hmeij periloutwn: oikeioteron del katakairon dia th[tw=twa]j xaijw paraqesew ta kaitloj aAl oij peri aulwmi ethmea peirasomeqa dh lwbai. 324.17 twde lthw na gramma thw proj t%ueuggel ej kaih(protefei twp epistlo wk paraloi toij nux kaitloj eAl xaijw aAmfijq23.18 lektos wmo noltai, aAl ligo taelal lopiaiud, thm d' Aparakaluyew ej eij ekaferon eij nux paraloij poloij perief katai hldoca omoij ej mebb ek thjtw]Ma xaijw marturiyj eh oikeij kai t%ueuggel ej kaijw.

3.25.1.1 3.25.1 EuAogon d' eteauqa genomehouj ahakefalaiwjas qai taq dih lwqiegaq thkailinhj diaqjkij grafaj, kai lida lktebn eh prwtoij thn ajigj twueuggeld jetraktub, oiq ejetai hitw. Pra 325.2 cewn twkabostolwn gralh meta(laautnh taj Paulou kataikeedn epistlol aj, aj ejhj thy feree hmea lthw na protefei kaijomi ej thp Petrou kurwtebn epistlol hh ejplitoutoij lktebn, eijge fjeneij, thm Aparakaluyj in lthw no, perihiyta dedanta

3.25.3.1 3.25.3 katakairon ekhsomeqa, kailas imag ejobologomehnoij: twke d' ahlili egrohomw, gnwrigw d' ouo ejw toij poloij, hj egomehh takwoubu feleta i kailih lthouda hke Petrou deufeta epistlol hkihj(oboma zomeh) deufeta kaihtrihj lthw nu, ejh twueuggel istoutugxanous a ejk kaleletetou ommuloum ejkeijqk. 325.4 ej toij nqojj katajetakow kai twPaulou Praetewn(graflhj)elegomeh)/ Poimh kaihj(Aparakaluyj Petrou kaijproj toutoi'h fereomeh Barnaba epistol hkihjwakapostolwn aij, legomehno Jidaxaile tells, wj eAhj, lthw na Aparakaluy j, ejfeneij: hA tinej, wj eAhj, agetouj eijerol deliehj rigous in 325.5 toij ajobologomehnoij. hA d' ejtoulj tinej kaijolkaq' Ebraigj ejobadgetlon katelecan, %Nafla j Ebraijn ot, tBristov 325.6 para dehmenoi kaijousin.

3.28.2.1 "aAl aAlkai Khrlnoj ol di apokalugew wj upolapostolou megafou gegeomehnoj terraj toij hA hweij di' aggel wna uA%udefigejnhay ejobologenoj ejprea gei, leewn meta lthb aA%udefu j epigel eijlai toblasis eijion toun Custow kaijpa ejepiugmaji kaihdonaj ej ebro sal hmenh bsa ka politeumenh doul eujin. kaiileqroj upaxwn twtaj grafaj joueouma ejlmob xilonta etejaj eh gA%uh ebrithj, qelwn plana, ml egei fegesai".

3.28.3.1 3.28.3 kai Dionusoij del oij thkaij K hrcrandeiranparoiqij kaiq ka hmej thh ejobpokh ejf eHw, eh deutef twb Epaagel lthw perilithyj lthw na Aparakaluyew ejphjwina wj ek thh epekajen para dosewj, towuloumenhnhai a hdroj toutoij toij rBmsin: 328.4 'Khrlnoj del oij kalithh a Ap' ekei jouj Khrlqianh eijes in susthmenon, alopiston ejplhmgai qelhanta t%ueu
Eusebius Scr. Eccl. Et Theol. [2018]

Eccl Hist 3.28.6.1

3.28.6 ταύτῃ Дионύσιοι: οδήγει Εἰθναίδι; απορρήτως εἰς ἑτεραν ἀποτελεί τοῦ μακρογνώμον καὶ τοῦ προκείμενος εὐδοκίμου ἐν οἰκοδομίᾳ τῆς παραδοσείς ἐν εἰς ὁμολογίαν καὶ ἐπὶ καλεῖ τοῦ ἄλλου προστατεύειν τὸν ἄλλον μετὰ ἀλήθειας. 

Eccl Hist 3.29.1.1

3.29.1 Ἐπίτοιχοι ἑνώ τοῦ καθίστατον οὐδὲν ἡ πρεσβυτρικὴ 

Eccl Hist 3.39.6.1

3.39.6 θυγατέραν, ἰδία δὲ τὰ τοῦ εἰς προσκύνησιν γενομένου 

Eccl Hist 3.39.11.1

3.39.11 καὶ άλλα δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ προσκυνήματος 

Eccl Hist 4.18.8.1

4.18.8 τοῖς ἐπιγραφαῖς τῶν θεοῦ 

Eccl Hist 4.24.1.3

4.24.13 γραφὴν ἐπ' ἀληθείαν ἑτοιμάζεται εἰς ὑπηρετείαν ἑκατέρου καὶ τῆς ἑστήκοντος προσφορῆς ἐν ἑαυτῷ.
Historia ecclesiastica

5.8.6  kai upokatabai perittou tou ouk apo kathunei men perittou omonatoj tou xristou apo iaimeni men bebaioth ki elgai edai apanthodo <ch> t'kaim ki hruftes tsa tou Aoma autoudi ekteigou aetrefo tou xristou apo kajmy in eorbaki tou ouklei'gar pro polli oukanou ekrarthi allais edodo ephilh hmetetaj geneij pro t' tei th Dometianon xhph'. 5.8.7 tauma kai peritth A pokaluy ejw iosthoi t'a Hedhi wmeni mehntai delkaithi Fwaou prwth ej peristoi th, marturiq ej auth xpligaj ejkefth, omoig ej delkaithi Pe'rou protefaj.

5.18.14 kai Q rase' de'ltinoj twtofe marufun mnhmeuvai e'dl delw ej ek paradou ejw ton swthma fhsin mprostetaxei toij autouj postoi ej epilwdeka e'desin mhx wrisgmay thp jeron sa lhm, kekrh tai delka imarturiq aj aposth Fwaou A pokaluy ejw, kalineko delduna mei qejj proj autou Fwaou ej tv Efex' eghqeq qai isotoir ekaila tina fhsin, die' w'ka nrwh th proeir menh aj ait' 'eij plhretata dihugunen thp plahn, tauma kaiqio A polwhi'oj.

6.25.9 ti deilperittho kai epilwth i'gein tou ths ou Fwaou, o'ugqegq rion ek kataleipj, omoig th duna sa tsa auuba polhsein a'naou' oikoiq xwri'hqai e'dhunato, e'grafy en dekali th A pokaluy in, kelaus qejj siwphwai kai'm'graj ai taj tw'mep'ta brontwmwnaj.

7.24.1 Epilotouqoi a'dasin spoudasetai aut'kaiita Perilepaggeli imhup suggra'mmata, h'du poqesij aut'Nepw h'A, e'qikopoj tw'mkat' Ai'gupnon, toudakwferon taj epilgh mehaj toij aqiqej ej hqal qejj grafai epaggelij aj apostoqhes qai didaskw kaiqina xilia da etw'kru'hsw smawthikhe epilithh chrh h gauq ejthq es qai upotiqmenoj. 7.24.2 doaj goun ou'qoj ek thh A pokaluy ejw Fwaou thh b'ijn krathunein upofhy in, e'leqon allhgoristw'kogn tina'perloi touo' suntata ej epigray en.

7.24.3 proj aci' Dionusiqoj ejh taj Perilepaggeli imhup epikhrqetai, dia' i'meb tou proterou tawthm au'gougnwnh h'A e'kiqen perill tou'kou'mgmatoj, paratiqemenoj, dilai'deloudeutou touj perilth A pokaluy ejw Fwaouin dlia'mahn h'qga tou'Nepwtoj kata'lh b'xhn mnhmeuvai sa, tauma perilau'grafai:

7.25.1 Ei'q ejh'upobaj, perililh A pokaluy ejw Fwaouin tawthm fhsin: "tinej meb ou'k tw'kprohwhm hqes'san kaii aheskeus apanthv tol'blqghn, kaq' ekaston kefa'ajon diei'qunentoj ajh'nos'to th kaii'ull logis'ton a'pofajontej u'edusqaiqej e'ti thb epigrafh hnh.

7.25.2 Fwaouin gat ouk e'kiqen mei gousin, all' ou'd'apokaluy in eikain ths sfo'dra kai'paxellekka kalummenh t'kaih aignoij para'pasmati, kalioq ou'w tw'kpostofwn tina al' ou'd'ouw tw'kqign h'kwrA'apo plthh ekklhsaij touo gego'nmai poiithh tou'gromanmatoj, Khrinjq de'tok kalithh ap' ekteigou kli'hqeiqan Khrinjqh nh's suths amenoin a'besin, ati'pis'ton epif'hmgai qel ha'anta t'k'utou'plasmis' Aoma.
Eccl Hist 7.25.6.1

7.25.6 ἐπιλαμψαὶ τὸν ὅθονθν Ἀποκαλύψεως ἡ ἡ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς προειρον ἀποδείγα ὑπολογίᾳ τὸν ἐπιστάτην, ἃς ἔπειτα ἐπί τῶν ἑπεξερευνήσεων τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀποκάλυψης ἡ ἡ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀποκάλυψης ἡ ἡ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς 

Eccl Hist 7.25.9.1

7.25.9 εἴλα ὑποβαφεὶς, ἐπιλαμψαὶ τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι ἡ ἡ ἡ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς ἡγεμονίας

Eccl Hist 7.25.9.9

7.25.9 εἴλα ἡ ἡ διελεύσασθαι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν

Eccl Hist 7.25.11.1

7.25.11 ἀκήρυκτον τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν

Eccl Hist 7.25.15.9

αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐπιλαμψαὶ ἐπιστρεφομένοι εἰς τὸν ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῷ ἑγεμόνι τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν τῇ καθ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν
Eusebius Scr. Eccl. Et Theol. [2018]

7.25.22: "Alliotath dekalkec heta para ta uka h Agofluyij, mhfe efapomeh mhfe geitniva touzw mhdeniys edon, wj epeih, mhde wj l abbe profu ukoimh ekous a: 7.25.23 all' ouwemmmnh tina touvlelelaoni ouwhe hepsitol lthp Agofluyij wj efapomeh Pualou dia tlpwkepsil hupofhantoj ti kai peritwloj Agofluyij wj autoua mou ephgray en ca autaj. 7.25.24 ekei dekalkei th fraewj thw diaforan etan tekmfhas qai toueuglgi iu kaithe hepsitol hq profh th Agofluyin.

Evagrius Scr. Eccl. [4110]

79.1184.18: To legein en tv Agofluyi komizesqai to aeggelon qumiama hna dem eiij ta proseuxa ton agion, oiais th efxaiou tou aeggelou energumehn: gnwshai eimoiithaj proseuxhaj, wiste estaiai iopoi ektoj pantoj kloanou, akhiqaj te, kaiioj igmriqaj toub noum.

Evangelium Bartholomaei [1366]

1.16-17.2: Hleqai stin HAEW WH Elegt tw proftwkeij emioiloi ouadiqaj faigetai. Hleqai eimoi HAEW WH Elegt tw proftwkeij emioiloi ouadiqaj faigetai. Oi dehaj apokai krasiqen enai einaj ouaite epakisiqen ehe eplihtwntai. Kaiqagen ouadoik qen, ... Beleiaj ekn, toulqon touqte omeqewtaaj ekn epeqewtaaj, oias eckan ekn, ... oias eckan ekn, kaiioj igmriqaj touqte omeqewtaaj, ekn epeqewtaaj.

Gaius Scr. Eccl. [0572]


Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol. [2022]

17.12: Toubon gat oj patht ekraxiges e[qeoj, kufioj, basilejoj, omoj o pantokrafort: Brece kufioj pm para kriqij: kaiq, Rabdoj euxufhaj hrrabdoj thb basileij sou: kaiq O wq, kailioq, kaiqale xoqenoj, kailopantokrafort, saij twperilw uqiwq epogena, kailod othh thw tofeloj etiduno mewj, wq oudebe epikythton, ouweluateren t%%i%%i pros genemon, H A% neumatij. Wder oudeleul t%%i%%i patriq ouga ekeq prosqheij tolteleion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzenus Theol.</td>
<td>In sanctum pascha (orat. 45)</td>
<td>36.624.11</td>
<td>Fēgoj aś traphy dierxonēmj: kai lephme th xeiia auou kathalaj, kaliebose fwn evmegalv. Fwnhla auowwj fwnhals ai pigoj: kai iikuki kai auowwj phl heoj ouanigig stratiaj, kai lejeje: Shheron swthriq 1% oμξ, oδoj te otoalj,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius Nyssenus Theol.</td>
<td>De virginitate</td>
<td>6.1.22</td>
<td>Tωμαγουλωρων καταστάτα τε έκ τουουλουουν χρειατευγ ανα τε έκ τουουλουουν κριμα κατά τουουλουουν μετατάσοντα qeiai έκ προσθήκη του AFairesewj, fuladöntej thh paraqowilen kaiin hēn hēn του θηγραφη γακολουγη ανα hæzothwai peirasomeqa thh aliné touthj hēν diay aλ matoj, hēj ekig, logizomeqa toign μοι apoloutou kaiimekrij touwmechj diay aλ matoj έκ diay aλ alma hÅn, toua αiγι ρουνημεθνη ετιqentoj 1% Dαβåd tαthj protheloq eln morma:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas Scr. Eccl.</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>pneuma/me eAkaben kaliephneghēn me di'a hējotj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>λα pros ethnoumenou deimou hēqin ououan, kalieψεω thh gunika ekeighn του Απαqumhena σεηαπαζομενην me ek touουλουουν εργοσα εήν sth xerjiaxe fe úle ευ αυv w Kuriq, tiq ulhe bojelj; hēqin pekriq, hēqin pekriq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>τελεστοη οηη ντα έραλγηκα τουρβιβλλοθη ρεγιαν kai εφηση hηpagh mou έκ thw xeirolou tolβiblηj: υποτηlηj deouk eidoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.3</td>
<td>makarjioj ụnọl oδoj upomenehto thh opqij in thh eξημενη thh megafhnh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3.7</td>
<td>lege aulj oδoj lauma pana aηiθηl hēqj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TLG Search Results
Appendix
380
23.3 aut h aithe pas a mn: Kuri a, xal f a pokri qeika kai moi legei: Ou deh soi aphi thsen: lege au ve Kuri a, thlik oubo qhriq, dunamen non l o uj dia qa fei a: ali l atv dunam ei tou kuri q tou kai l v pol ups lagxiq au tou w etu f 23.4 gon au l oj K al w ji xe te ef a, f h si q, o l th meri man sou epi l to b qe bo ephi j a kai l thh kardi q s ou haoic j p rob ton kuri q, pi steu a j oli di oude noj duh sv wgh ma i i th da ta tou me ou s kou kai lek doou omo ma toj, dia tou w okruj ou kou qe bo ephi j a tel j en ton b a a gel on au ou tou b epi l tv wghi q olin a, ou w lo lo ma ex k ti Q e r i k qai lebe fracen to lis to ma au tou pi ma mh se li ma h v, me ga sh no li y in ek pe feugaj dia l thh pi gin s ou, kai lo i thlik oubo qhriq 23.5 idw ouk e li y au kha j: u a ge ouk a kai ezhghsai tel j ek le ko j tou kuri q tou me g a l eib au tou san kai le l ebe au tij o b li toj ton qhriq tou tou poj ex ti q li g ewj thj me li l ou h j thj me ga sh: e a ou pro esto ma sh qe kai le ma no tosh te 23.5.2 q li g ewj thj me li l ou h j thj me ga sh 23.6.2 q li g ewj thj me li l ou h j me ga shj
68.2.1 ape fu sen au touj ejj teh pu rgon. kai lai Al ouj del ape fu sen ejj teh pu rgon, touj ta j ra bdou ejpi dedw ko taj ta j para fu da j eko suaj, kar po deh me lik oubo s a j, douj au toj s f rag i da 68.4.1 leu ko w se i xion a, oj, pore ouomen oj ejj teh pu rgon. kai li touj ta j ra bdou ejpi dedw ko taj xil ra j wj e a bon ape fu sen, douj au toj imati m ob leu ko kai sl iri fra g i da. me ta l to u w a e te sai tob a a gel on le gei t k per omeni: E t w w p a g w s: u de l tou ouj apo fu sen ejj tei te i g, ka q wj ti a a di oj e st i n kato i ke i kh. kato no sh on de ta j ra bdou au t he wepi meli w j kai li ou bo wj 93.5.3 si ti, f h si q, ou a di oj a po sto tal oj kai loi d i a kai loi oj, khr u z a n te j to lo w ma tou w pu r que ou skoi ml ko h qe n te j eh dun amenai kai li pi tel tou w pu r que ou skoi ml ko h qe n te j epi de koi me noj kai lai au to ile ma k an au toj s s fra g i da tou kri q tu moj ta j. k a te b h s an oua met au t he wepi tel ouw ar kai li pal in a eb h s an: a j l ou a di oj meb z w tej kateb h s an kai li z w tej a e b h s an:
3.9.10.3 eth v w ap okal e gi ei: "Kai l h Kousa e" eboj li e g o t oj: "lu w o touj te sa ra j a a gel ouj touj ka qmen ouj ejpi t t a tota m 14% me ga l j 14% Euf r at y: o i b ine h a an Pers w h M h d w n, A ss ur i gin, B ab ul w in gi n.
4.7.1.1 E pei lou i a fa sa n te j kai le ha te f e t t 1 4% le o g per i l ou w m ap o ded w k a men to b lo gon, thte tou w h at k ri x g tou par ou si j an kai loj touw he noj, kai li po ge n kai li w j pe re sa ti oj apo laj oj, kai l thh pra e in au tou w uk ek lip ha sh men, o m e j kai li n u m d il t i o g wn ej pi m hsh ch oma i, i a o kai la panta ed ra j e j edw w o a q r w poj kai leh mhen do m b a i g wnt t% hoi e t o x j kai dija j t 14% pe e sa l 14%
4.12.2.3 gow eu k e sa gai de l in h de u e f e q h ma h ma n e to j tou w ouj kai r oj, ehoi ta wa sum h se t ai, mh po de la on ha j ti a po th e q li g ewj thj me ga shj thj me li l ou h j me ga shj tep er ox me n h j t 14% mo ek pe v thj a l w i g u zwhj. En o r ma g a t xhli ti e gi o pro f h h j:
4.22.3 Ἀναγνωριστάτας τῶν εἰρήμενον ἐπί τι ἔτει, ἐν τῷ Αποκάλυψε σημεῖον ἑρμήνευεν ἐκ ἁπλῆς λέξεως. Ἐκείνος δὲ ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ὡς ἄλλην ἁγίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.22.4 Ἐν' οἷον οὖν μάρτυς προστάτης μακρομεῖν, ὡς ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.22.4.1 ἄλλην ἁγίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.22.4.4 Ἐν' οἷον μάρτυς προστάτης μακρομεῖν, ὡς ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.23.1 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.23.4 Ἐν' οἷον μάρτυς προστάτης μακρομεῖν, ὡς ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.23.5 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.23.6 Ἐν' οἷον μάρτυς προστάτης μακρομεῖν, ὡς ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.24.1 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.24.4 Ἐν' οἷον μάρτυς προστάτης μακρομεῖν, ὡς ἔστησεν τὸν κεφαλῆς ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.25.1 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.33.1 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4.34.1 ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἀλλήλων ἕνα ἐκαθιστά τις τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus Scr. Eccl. [2115]</td>
<td>Commentary in Danielem</td>
<td>4.34.2.16</td>
<td>Kálihôqen káileíxaen toû biblîgmen en tê thêxía tóu wêqandou epítô ou krhoù ou kai Íko toû biblîgmen, táleôsara zêkê kaij éikôs ëis ëarej prés buxerói éées on êwphion tou mënoug, ëkontej ëkastoj qízparan kaij Íko taj ërxusaj gemousaj gúma matm, aelêin in pros eùxa ëitwqâqjg, kaij khádousin in sêzh kaij hêll ëgontej: açíjo ëiaj abeîh toû biblîgmen kaij aholtaq taj sfragaij autoùqâqj ëis ëfhj kaij hêllorasaj hêataj têkêkê têkêkê hêkaq ou ëpaksh j felhj kaij wâshj kaij aholtaq kaij Íko toû biblîgmen ej kaij hêllorasaj hêataj têkêkêhê hêkaq ou ëpaksh j felhj kaij wâshj kaij aholtaq kaij Íko toû biblîgmen ej.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37.5.5</td>
<td>ëghovmenouj sou wj toljproferon.&quot; Kálihj (wônhj autoùj fwnhj àoui poliouj Pântej gat shmenon oj, ejj autoj peiteqontej talj ëlaqgia Kálihj ëqoggoméaj wj dialjtomatoj autoùj aoljumej talj' autj oukprostetajmena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49.2.6</td>
<td>ëlahnuj ej ytv= Kêpka ulj ej efanéwsen. 449.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | 4.50.1.2 | Kálihj hêrjousontaj thh ékdocon autoùp ou tânqparousiq, wj ëlejegia dialjprofilhhtoj: "Kálihj w tôj dusil ëmartusij mou kaij ëprofhteusij in hêmaraj xiliqj diako-siqaj ëjekonta peribeblj hêmenoj saîkouj."
| | | 4.50.3.1 | 450.3.1 | Tôfe gat "ëdaij ëqîqj megafh, ëla oujegonon toiauth apolaq tabolj hêkos mou," aÁlwna lâxvâkâlâpâwâw pol in kaij wîwan ejj tolaq kaijreih tóuj pisteoj pempehmen, kaij kaij wîwmeb foudaîg ejluj eufrainomen, kaij kaij wîwmeb ëphikaijromen kaij kaij wîwmeb gîtwj wîwmeb sunarijmen, twâkêhêlajmen aj ëjefhjwêw ejj ahatolj hê poremomen, kaij leîwn apolaq hatolj wêleij meshbriqj diâkomen, aÁlwn deiëk tôuj ëqesin kaij kaij toq spilaqgij krutuqjmen, pantaxouj autoùj tou ëdêl ejguma ejj pol emowuqej kaij diaîqalâshj kaij diaîqalâtraj tânq tânqj diaîqulwj prostaqjmen ejj ahatrouqmen kaij kaijâlpaqta trôpon ek tou wêqaj mou éqiljantoj, mhînumenm ejj autjwênteq "pwi wâjijti twêlûqj njte "agôraqaj palatâwqal jorj, xwrij ëjëb mhûtij "toljâoma tou mënoug" ej xeriqperfìv, hêkôloutouj "xafqûma" ejluj mêmêwêw basâtay. |
| | | 4.52.4.2 | gat oldiâloboij proj oljgon eòabben eòousij tan araqaj thh ghm, wj gejgraptai, "eòwken auîh%|qeoj eòousij "peiraqaj tóuj kaij toqtabaj ejluj epîlîgghm" | |
| | | 4.60.2.6 | ëwaj kaij ëwmaiîj kaij ëlîhjej kaij ëbrâibîj didaxqswqj, ëkô pros oksîwejte ejj aÁqswpoj toleîmetaj oj aâqaqj pisteoj swsinj têqekêbeg Grammoj ejj ëtha uty "twêlîj % thh zwj" tôuj kaij kaij hêxqejqem ejj ëkâ% têkêkê kosmêw ejj epexhêmena kakaj fobhêqejtej thh krîqin kaij |
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ouΔώρικον ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ λόγον Καινοῦ ἐπονομάζων, ὑποβάλλω εἰς τὸν Ποταμὸν γῆς, ᾿Απόκαλυπτε. 15.2.1 οὖν, ἀδελφοί, πώς εἰς τὸν έναν κόσμον ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ ἀπακολούθησαι τῷ αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ πάσανα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Κυρίου. 5.1 Ναῦται τῆς ἱστορίας, καὶ ἐπιτόλους συμβολές, ἀφαίρετος τοῦ πολέμου Καίρως καὶ τοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου. 6.5 Εἶπεν ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐποιήσατο ὁ Ἀνθρώπις. Βασιλεύειν ὁ Χριστός, καὶ Βασιλεύειν ὁ Ἀνθρώπις. Ἐκείνη τῆς σαφείς. 31.1 Ἡ Λαοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπισυνάγει τὰ τάξεις. Ἡ χρήσις τῶν παραβολῶν συνεχείται. 35.23
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus Scr. Eccl. [2115]</td>
<td>De antichristo</td>
<td>[2115]</td>
<td>[003]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 ouåtoj gat ek Paçmî tvhnuê wê ofõ makal av uî yîn musthriqen friktwê kâlina dihgu menojuñ afqohw¡ kailèñtouj didâkæi. iêge moi, wômakafie iwañh, a ptole e kailâmqñta tudouq kuriç, tîgièñj kailîtqhosuñ ajer peri Bâbul wînoj. grhpohs on kailîerpê kalîgat auðh ñ e wtqvisen. *kiâlhqen eiç tîwêkptâl agélj wîn tîwêkptônt haj taj épêltîaj aîfaj, kai el alîh se metê emouj eqwî: deum, deigw si òl tokîrîg tîh pohnj tîh megaf hîj thq kajqhmeñj ej pilîdbaw pôl wêq hêq hêq kôr neunse aîj balî eiç thq ghis, kalîemogq uqsa aîj oî katoîkquantj thq ghm ek tewôlou thq pornejaj auñhj, kai apnéngke/me ejf elehmon ej pneumatî kailîïëå gunàika kajqhmeñh ej pilîqhriq gkôkînîn, geomt tawômòma, ekon kefalaj ej épaltaîkalêñta deka. 

36.10 kalâphnegke/me ejf ënhon ej pneumatî kailîeiâ gunaika kajqhmeñh ej pilîqhriq gkôkînîn, geomt talôkômah, ekon kefalaj ej épaltaîkalêñta deka. kaiîlîqgunhîj ëpêlîbaîlîmehj porfûrcouw kailîkôkînîn, kôr xerûs meñh xurs îkailîîgû%
timîjs kaiîmargariqaj, ekoua pôthfjîon xrus oum ej tûwemîlîaîthêm ej gêmnu bdel ugmawîn kailalakqânj thq pornejaj thq ghis, kalîëpîbîlîmtîwpon auñhj ôkôma ñegra mmehon: mus thfîon, Bâbul wûhmgaj, hîmthhr tîwpørnuw kailîmtw, bdel ugmawîn thq ghis, 37. kailîdîdon thh gunaika megûsûsan tewâmatoj tw glamîgnîn kaiîk tôwâmîmatoj twîmrstuwn fhsoum kailîéqnas sa itwî auñh ñquama megà, kailîéqne/moi oîaîgel aj: diatîjéqnas sajs; eqwîwûh wîoî toîmstrthôn thj gunaiqoj kailîwqhrigu toubastazontoj auñh, tewâmîntoj taj épaltaîkalaj kilaîalêñta kefa. 

37.6 tîoqhriq oîalîej hâ kailîouq daîj kailîmêlî ei aîbâîgæiîn ek thp bàbus sou kailîej apwîlean upajegî: kailîqumazoumîn oî, katoîkquantj épîlîthî gihq, wôoulîgqrapj ðîloamîna épîltîbîlîbîlîgn thq zwhzp apôlîkab olhîj kômou, bîl epontej toîqhriq oîhâ kailîouq eàti kailîparêtnj, 38. wôeîmîn ôleåwîn sôfîqan, aî épêaltaîkalîaleîthô ejïq, dôqîq hîgunhîqkôhtaj ép'auwîkî karîbasel ejî aj, épêaîêjîn: oî pêntj eçées, oîlîaj ejîn, oîlîoj ouûh hûqen, kailîânêh ejîq ejîg oîgôn aoñb delî melhîj, kailîtoqhriq oîhâ kailîouq eàîtn, kailîalôj oîdôqej eàîtn, kailîk tôwêmîtêjîn, kailîj apwîlean upajegî, kailîîa kefata talêdeaj, aîlîêj, deka bîslî ejîn, oîlînjîq basîleîn ouûh xhâbon, aî lalêt$$u$$q iaj wî bîslî ejîn mîg$$u$$n, ûla$$b$$qhosîn metawîq$$u$$qhrîgu maîgn gênûnêh ekûosîn kailîth bûdûmîn kailîthb eçousîn auît$$w$$hêqrîh õiçdûsîn. 

38.9 ouûoi meîl$$u$$wîq$$u$$qnujînîg pol emh$$u$$sînîn, kailîtoqhriq nîkh$$h$$$$u$$eî auñjî, oûî kûrijîn kuriqen ëstîkîlî basîleîqî ba$$l$$îewnîn, kai$$i$$j oî, me$$t$$ aîbouq kîhotoîkîleîkîq eñtîkîlîpîstîj 39. - kailî $$e$$;îgî moî: tawâmîa aîelîej, ouûkâstâî hîpohnj, lôaîkîlîkoî oî$$i$$lîksîkaiîleñhîn kaiîlîwâsîq, kailîdeaj kefata aîelîej kailîtoqhriq, ouûoi mishû$$h$$$$u$$sîn tîw pohnj kaiîlîhwmeñhîn poîh$$u$$sînîn auñh$$b$$îlîgumîjn, kaiîtaj ñâl$$j$$$$a$$k ajûth$$f$$q$$o$$n$$t$$îj, kailîal$$h$$bî kata$$k$$a$$u$$sînîn eñh$$p$$ù$$r$$î$$q$$îg$$a$$t$$j$$ qeq, ëdwênen ejj thh kardijn auîwîpoîhwhiî tîh gênûnîn aoñbîkîlîpîhwaî mîg gênûnîn kailîdouaîthî basîleîqî auît$$w$$hêqrîh õîçqî, aîrî tel eçq$$h$$sontai oî, loqoj tewo$$m$$u$$q$$u$$kîhîqgunhîj aîelîej eàîtn hîpofîj hîme$$g$$alîh hîêqûosa basîleîqî ejîpîtîtî basîleîqî thq ghis. 

40.1 metawâ$$w$$u$$a$$ el$$õ$$n$$a$$îlîn $$a$$îgel on kata$$-$$bâîpontaj$$ê$$ tewo$$m$$u$$q$$u$$ $$a$$î$$ê$$v$$q$$a$$ñ$$ê$$ $$m$$a$$ê$$ñ$$q$$a$$ñ$$ê$$ $$e$$$$t$$ $$q$$ $$i$$ $$s$$ $$q$$ $$a$$$$i$$ $$s$$ $$j$$ $$ê$$ $$n$$ $$a$$ $$f$$ $$q$$ $$h$$ $$q$$ $$ê$$ $$q$$ $$ê$$ $$d$$ $$o$$ $$h$$ $$ê$$ $$j$$ $$h$$ $$a$$ $$k$$ $$l$$ $$ê$$ $$f$$ $$u$$ $$l$$ $$a$$ $$h$$ $$k$$ $$ê$$ $$f$$ $$u$$ $$l$$ $$a$$ $$h$$ $$k$$ $$ê$$ $$f$$ $$u$$ $$l$$ $$a$$ $$h$$
εἰς ὃσεν ἐπεξέφηβησεν διότι ἐκ του ἀνθρώπου ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἰσοτίθης. ἐν ἀσημένιος ὑμῖν ἐξερήμωσεν ἀπὸ τῆς σκωρείας καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τῆς κληρονομίας. Ὅσοι δὲ ἤρθαν καὶ ἤρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν, ἐπιτίθεντο ἀπὸ τοῦ συμμετοχοῦ καὶ ἦρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν, ἐπιτίθεντο ἀπὸ τοῦ συμμετοχοῦ. Ὅσοι δὲ ἤρθαν καὶ ἤρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν καὶ ἦρθαν, ἐπιτίθεντο ἀπὸ τοῦ συμμετοχοῦ.
47.11 kalìðoì an telîswi toì dromon auûhw kai lîthb marturîgn auûhw tîghs in oû proîth; 'tòlqghrîgn tolà hàbaîhon ek thîp aûbsu sou poîhiò meti' auûhw poî emon kaiînikhsîi kaiî oujî kalaî pokteînà aûtouj 'dîaî tolqîmiqelî ein aûtouj doçàn dòumai tî% tî hîkîgnî tî' touçeî tîlôhaî fûnh mikroû keraî 8ê àpàrgeiî ligoî tî hîkîgnî và kardîgnî àxêtai àb autob uûôm kaiî dòum aûnv kaiî dòum aûnv wî qeônh, dîwîw n oujî àgiguj kaiîbî às fûhmuûtob Xristhî, kâqûlî iîgei Daniîl 'pôsen oûbûnt tî% keraîî kaiî dòumîlîqîfôlî gôlî moî wîsîlî hîqômpûw eû tî% tî keraîî kaiî lîstômaî laîlôm uûhmàûf; kaiî hânîcîîceî cîstômaî aûtoupîî biîs fûhmuûn prôj pôb qeônh, kaiîtôl keraî jekîhî eîpôgî poî emon meûtîw kâîjîgn kaiî bâhîsîîx prôj aûtoupîî, âwî ouîh bôrêgîî tolqîgrîgn kaiî bôfêto, kaiî tôlîswûma aûtoupîîdôbh eîj kauwîn prôj.'

48.1 4âî l' 'eîpîlîdeîlî eîptômèrêstôrîn pêriî aûtoupîîdîwîghhsasqîî, pwjîstolîbîjîon pênuma dî'âîqômouûkaiîlîtôlôôma aûtoupîîmusîkîjî pêmîshw, sàfêkîterôntaîlîpêriî aûtoupîîdîwîghhsomêqa. iîgei gatî oî lônànhî oûâmîj: 'kaiîlîbônhîlîlo qhîgnî aûnàhîbîhôn ek thîpîghî, kaiîlîbôhî keraî dàb ôôôîa aînîj kaiîlîbî fêjî aîjîf wî drakûn, kaiîlîbî eîtpêmîgîn toupîprûtôw qhîrûgî pawan eîpôgî èpmîôîîn aûtoupîî kaiîlîpôlîîîthhî bûm kaiîlîtôj eîj aûtûvîkôîkûmtajî làbâ pôsîkônhîwîsîi tîlqîgrîgnî tôlpîrûwên, ouêhêrêpûgh bîplîhÎîitônqŒn ànàtôtî tôlûmkûîlîpôlîîîhêmîlîf meûfàûfî, làbâ kaiîlîpûm katebîvêk tôoupûn àwûwÎîfîf wûh bûm katënwëîipîntmâkî àbhôwûñwên, kaiîlïplànbîwîtouj kôîkôîkûmtajî eîplîthîgîgîhî dîlât îsîhêmîlîkê bûmûbôgh aûlîpôlwai eînwûînhwîpîmîôw quhîrîgûlîgêmîsÎî jîtôîkôîkôîwûn èplîthîgîgîhî poîlwai eîkîtôhî tî% thîqîrîgnî, ôkàsèîîfî wîth bîplîghhî thîpîmàxîgaj kaiîlîhûn.'

48.13 kaiîlîbôqûnh aûlîîdoumîj pênuma tvûìkôhî tôlpîrûgû, làbâ kaiîlîbaîsîîhîhîtikôwîtîlqîrûgû, kaiîlîpôhîwî sôb ôôîeîbîmîhî pôsîkûnhûwîsîi tvûìkôhî tôlpîrûgûhuîpôkôntanqûmîn, kaiîlîpôlîîîpthatăjî, tôujî mikrouj kaiîlîtôjî meûfàûfîjî kaiîlîtôjî pûsîqûjî kaiîlîtôjîtîwûxîwîj kaiîlîtôjî ëƯëqûfîwîj kaiîlîtôjî dûflôîjî, làbâ dôwûn aûtôiîsaxăgûm eîplîthîxîeîrîj aûlîmîhîsîdîcîj hûêplîlômêmîwîsîi aûlwîkîlîîlàîîfîjî duhhtîîj àgôrêjî hûèpîhîwàîj ôîlîkûnmî tôlàsaxăgûm, tôlûmkûîlîqôhûmîhôîtôb àîlîqômb tôlàsômatojî àlîtoûmûhîûhîsîatôw tôb àîlîqômh tôlpîrûgûqû: aîlîqômîûgîh àbhôwûn eîwîgîtîj, ôîlîkûnmî ôôûmîhîsîatôw tôb àîlîqômh tôlpîrûgûqû: aîlîqômîûgîh àbhôwûn eîwîgîtîj, kaiîlîlôîîqûmjî aûtoupîîstîn 88ô.'

49.1 49 tôlmêhî oûû 'qhîgnî tôlà hàbaîhôn ek thîpîghî thîb sîlîbîgîn thîb tôlpîrûgûxîtîgîqûsîmênîhîi iîgeî, tôlêlêdûkîfêto kaiîlîtôhî mêsî aûtoupîî eûdôpurôfîhûn, tôléîlepîhî 'tôðûkîfêto kaiîlîtôhî àlîtoûmûhîaînîjî, oûî èpîmîîîîôûîsîîîqîîfôlî eîjî êîhîjîhîjîqî tî% tî fôumoukûkaiîlîtôjî eûtôb bûmîlîeîepîkûnmî, tôléîlepîhî 'tôðûkîfêto kaiîlîtôhî dîlôjîjîf wî drakûnîî, oûî bîplôhjî eîstîkîlîtôjî àlîhîijîfî, tôlêlê kaiîlîbî eîtpêmîgîn toupîprûtôw qhîrûgî pawan eîpôgî kaiîlîpôlîîîthhî bûm kaiîlîtôjî eîj aûtûvîkôîkûmtajîî, làbâ pôsîkônhûwîsîi tôlpîrûwêmûn, ouêhêrêpûgh bîplîhÎîitônqŒn ànàtôtî tôlûmkûîlîpôlîîîhêmîlîf meûfàûfî, làbâ kaiîlîtôjî Âûgôstônuîmôun, aûlîqômhîîhîîlaîjîîsûnêsîtîh, ôûwîkàîlîÎîtojî kêlêûseîîkaiîlîdàtajîeîjî, kûrwûmàhûjîaîntaî, dîlêtoujî dòum êûbûtîîpli eîgnîpêrîpoiûmîjômôjûnô.'
49.13
touēo gar esti tolòqhriqen tolòtefartono, ouēpw hígh (kefal hikaipaín eígēra peugh dial tome toalquihmai aúth kaili aímas qhmai kai léj deka dia dhmata ahal qhmai, wîte panoumgoj mōwج perigera peugh ein aúth kai hianewsein. touēo gar esti tolòtefmon upòlòqoukh hou, ouēpw "dswei pneuma twéikhi kai lâei hiekw tòqheticuí:" egerhsie eī gat kaili tâ xûei paiîn dial twëoup' außou toutosmēnnon nômen, kailipôikéi oðoi a ònhprosunkhâsw twéikh tòqheticuí apoktanâswin. "wîhe hípiştij kaihih (upominh twâqgïen) fin hphâstai. fhsîgat "kaiipoileîpantaj, touj mikrouj kaiîtouj megajouj kaiîtouj plousîiguj kaiîtouj ptuxjouj kaiîtouj eleuqerîjouj kaiîtouj doujouj, iâa wîswin autoj xaragmâ eîpi touj úxqei touj úxqei touj hêpîlòloméswpon, iâa mhîtij duñatai aîgorásai mhfe pwlîhmi eiêunl(éwÅntoixaragmâ hâ tob aîqnomh toumîxhâtoj autoj autoj." 49.26
dolîoj gat wôkailieîpomenoj kataîtwâdoujwn toumêçoumou omênoj eklîqîein kailiekîmkeîn auîtoj ek toukôs mou dialîtomhâdîhôaî auîtoj auî%ôdan, kaiueûl páhtaîj pantaxounqmiam athfia tîqenaî, iâa mhîtij duîntaî twâqgïen mhfe aîgorâsai mhfe pwlîhmi, eêô mhîjprîwîn êpiqûwv. touēo gar esti tolxaragmâ tolêpitîlthj xeiroloj thj decaîj didomenon, toî de\(l\)èpîlòloméswpon) eîbeîhî, iâa paijtej wîin estèfâwmenôi, purînîn kaiîloujwêj aîliaqânaîtouj stefânon meçîq eubûw\(w)k perîfeîntoj, ouwâw gat eîtxnâsato kataîtwâ loudaîqen kaili Antigqoj o\( Epîfanh) o\(the)h Suriq genomenoj basileîw, wô ek gehouj Aîleacdrâoi tou\( Makedonôj. 50.2
menon eîoumen. touâka gat ouwâw kaili auîtoj toutxenâetai, kaiâlpâta qîlîqîen toutj aîgiqûj qeîwn lêgeî gat (oprhîfhtij kaiî aîpostotolj: "wôq oîlîouj, oêêûn solîqj y fhîsîtw tob aîqnomh tòqheticuí: aîqnomj gat eîstîn aîhîwpoj, kaili aîqnomj auîtoj eîstîn 800\(, perîleîmbe ouwâtoumîxhâtoj auîtoj ouwûk eîstîn hîhî tosoubôn toalxkribêj. 50.11
wij fere eîbeîj toî Teîtaîn eûstîn, aîkaiûn kailieîdokcon oàomà, hâ\(Eîubh-qaj: kaiîgat auîtolwâtswv hîf qexperîketai, kaiî eîbera plîqîna eutqehmai duâmena, aîlî eîpeîlhiproefqhmen leqentêj, ouêpwak-aepèhgh (hîhîtòqheticuí tuaîrwîfj twâqgîj kaili psîhâeîlaleîh thîh eîkôa, tûntêînîâkuse, tanerôb délpamîq eûstîn ouwâî, kraitoumeîj eêîi numeiîh Latihiôi, eiî eêôôj ouwâ hîwpojou oàomà metagomenon gigêtaî. 50.1
60 perîleîmbe ouwâtouîwîmoun wâalîthj plîqewj thîh qinomeîhj epîlthj eîkklîhîsîg ouwîpoltîwâhtkelîmîhj kaili twânîhj fhîqj, "kaiieîbiôn hîmêînmg eîga kailiâqumastòn, gunîlka periêbîh mehnîn thôb hîôn, kaiîh (elîhîh ouwîpôtaw twâqîdôwâk aûîhj, kaiîleîpitîlthj kefâîhj aûîhj hîstefqoj aîkîtwfâw dââêê, kailiîh gastrîkousa a kῆqei wîgousa kailîbaînanîmomeîhj touîteîhj, kaiîloîdrâkwj eîthken eîphqîn thîh gunaikoj thîh melîhîsîg hteîhj, iâa ouwâî tekkv, tolteknon auûhj kaiîfagij, kailîeîkêen aûhîp aûsena, ouwî melîi eîpsîmîqen pinata tâênhj, kaiîhîpâqôh tolteknon auûhj prôj thôb qekî prîqoj thôb qrohôna ouwîouk hîlîgûnûhêkugîen ejîî thîh eûhôm, ouwî ûkîteîkeîj thôb hîtîmamh eîpôtîwâwîjîka eêîhel eîktreîwswîn auûhj hîmeîaj xîliqîj diakosijîh eûkhînta. \"kailîoîhel eîhêîoldrâkwj, eîçêêce thîh gunîlka hîjîi eêêêkeîj thôb aûsena.}
καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἵππον ἑαυτοῦ ἔχῃ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυπτε τὸν ἄλλον πόλεμον ὑπ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνατιθέμενος. ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυπτε τὴν ἐρμήν, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκείνην περιοχὴν καὶ περιοχήν περιοχῆς τοῦ ἄγνοιαν τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα προβάλλεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. ἔκβαλεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ ἑαυτοῦ πομπῇ, ἵνα ἐπιβιβάσῃ τοὺς ψυχικοὺς πολέμους τοῦ ἄνθρωπον τῆς ἣμας ἐν αὐτῷ πρᾶγματεῖ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας. ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυπτε τὴν ἐρμήν, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκείνην περιοχὴν. ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυπτε τὴν ἐρμήν, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκείνην περιοχὴν.
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| Hippolytus Scr. Eccl. [2115] | (029) De consummatione mundi [Sp.] | 21.21 | "kai lielijj qe / ei a u / toj a dik h maw, po mek porme / s u / e ta e ka toj touj au t h / ma k a t e s qgi touj e k qrouj a u t h / ma ou d o / e kous i n e to us i qn ki li e ka t h ouan, i a a mhi le t o b br e / v / tj taj h meraj th ma / porous i qj toum / a xi r g toj kai / la u / da st a stre jaj e i j a i ma kai pata t a aj thi g h meh pa sy v ly / g v / s a kij e e h qel h / ws in", kai li o m a n h / w rou t si / ta u / ma panta, para / toul m i d a bo f ou e h r o m fai / j p es ou t a i, ka i li p h r w / sou i thi b ma / tu r i q j an a u t h / ma k a w i j f hi / s hi kai h / rou tu / m t i. Da ni h / i, pro e w r ak / w w / o i t / o i the / ri qj n t o la / babai h en k e t h thi a b u / s ou p o l h / se i m e ta / au t h / ma f elo m en, h / g o u n meta / En / w, H / li q kai / l i w / a w n k, kai / n h se i a u / toj kai / la p o k te ne / i la u / toj dia / to / mi h qe / le i au / toj do / kan dou ma i t h / ma / b o f % tout e / sti t o / la h / fa / na e m m i k / ro b ke / ra j, o e / e pa r qei / j t v / k a r di / j lo i p o h a / x e t a i e au / toj ou / m kai / lo c a / ze i w j qe / on, di w / kw m touj a / di g i j kai / li a s f h m a / t o b / r X / r i s t o n.

28.13 | do u leu / se i kai / li me / no i a e h au / t h / h / ouk e / a t i n, a / la / lo / (to / ou j) e / p a / fi / to kai / la po / le / ou kai / la po / la / h / r w / p w n kai / li d / se i au / toj o / (pl a / ho j) bra x e a / br h w / ma / dia / l i b / thi / s f r a gi / b a au / to / k h m i a r a h, h i / d i e i s f r a gi / j au / to / u / p / li t o / m / e / t / w / p o u kai / li e / l i t h y / de c i a / x e i roj est / i / y h / ho j x c / . kai / li w / j o / bai ou / s e / kri / b w / j e / pi / t a / m a i t o u / m, e h t v / g r a / f v / g a t po / l i a / leh t h / h / f h / f t h / h t / ou t h / ma / o / x o / n e / a / u / x h n ta l, a la / li e / g o m e n i a / w / gra fe / i n |

30.6 | ba si / le / j h / m w / me / h s / o / w / K / r i s t o / w a a / l i / e / p i / t o / p r o / ke i / g e / m o n e / p a / n e / i / q / w / m e / n. o / b a n g a / t a / a / b / w / s i to / f e / o i, a / d / r w / p o i w hi / s f r a / gi / b a kai / l / o u x eu / w / s i tro / f a / j ou / de / u / a / w, po r / se / s h / o n t a i a u / t h / h / me / t a / lo / o / u / n / r a / j / f / w / h / w / me / i / g e / n / t e / d o j h / m i / f g a / i / h o / kai / p i e / i / h / o / p a / t e / j e / k / t u / o / m / i / o u / w |

33.3 | e t h / v / w / p o e i kai / k i x / w / h / o j / o i a / j x a / le / poj / kai / roj / kai / li h / me / r a i / g e / n s / h o n t a / i. [to / f e / a / po / l a / h / o / t o / w / l / k / w e i / j] / d u / m a / a / k / o / x / s / h o n t a / i] kai / l / a / p o l / d u / m w / k w / j a / h a / t o / i / w / p a / r a / g e n / s / h o n t a / i kai / li k a / x o / s i / me g a / w / j kai / k o / p o / n t a i i / x / u / r / w / j / kai / l / i h / me / r a j / d i a / f / a / s / k o / s / w / j / e i / d e / t / o / n t a / t h / h / n / k / t a, i a a / a / p a / u / s / i / m / t a / i e / k / t w / e / a / g w / n au / t h / w / |

37.9 | khr o / n. ta / la / ei / e / ste / o u / p a / n / o / y / w / o / k e / ou / p h / o / u / s / o u / m a i, "o / b / a / h / o j me / t a / s t r a / f h / s e / t a / i e / j / s k o / o j / kai / li / h / s e / l / h / h / e / j / a / i / ma", o / o / u / n a / n o j w / b i / l / i / g / e / j / s / e / t a / i, h / g h / p a / ma k / a / ta / k / a / u / q / h / s / e / t a / i d i a / l / t a / e h a / u / v / w / e / g a / j, a / h e r / d i / e / g / e / r / a / n o / j, a / a / q / r w / p o / e i h / p o r / n e / i j, e / h / m e / i / e / j / a / j kai / k / h / y e / u / d e i / s i kai / li a / k a / r / s / i / j kai / leh / e / d / w / i / o / l / a / t r i / j kai / leh / f o / h o j kai / leh / m a / k a / j.|

48.11 | th / h / g / h / g e / n e / h / q / h / m e n. kai / li e / g e / j / "ou / k o / i / a / u / n / h, a / p / e / f / e / t e / a / p / e / m / ou / k / t e / f a / p / o / k / r i / h / s / e / t a / i kai / l / a / u / o / j / i / e / g w / h / m o / l / g / s / a / t e / me / d / e / p / o / t h n, a / l / l / a / j / o / j / l / o / g / o j / m o u ou / k e / p / e / i / q / a / r / x / h / s / a / t e / j, thi / s f r a / gi / b a / t o / u / m / a / r t o / u / m / o u / m / e / m / h / w / q / h / t e / n, a / l / l / a / j / a / u / t h n a / s / p / a / g / x / n i / j h / f / a / n i / g / a / t e, to / b a / p / t i s / a / t o / m / o / eu / b / a / t e, a / l / l / a / j / e / t / o / l / a / j / m o u ou / k e / f u / l / a / z / a / t e.|

[052] Fragmenta in Psalmos | 19.2 | p r / w / b o j / ge / n e / s i a / u / t o / u / o / v / o / d e / d e / u / t e / r o j / p a / d o / j, kai / l / o u / k h / a / a / h / g / a / k / h / b / n / ep / i / g / r / a / f / e / i n a / u / t o / j, o / p o / te / d i / a / p / a / t h w / t w / e / pro / f t h w / t w / o / l / o g o j/ e / k / h / r / u / q / h q / x / h / i / a / u / j / o j / o / u / d w / j g a t b / ô / k / a / i / l / e / g e / j: x"< / E / g / " e / i / m / i / h / a / x / h / k / a / l / o / t / o / f / e / j, kai / l / i / o / t / o / A / kai / l / i / o / t / o / W / >. O / p o / te / t o / i / g / u n / o / m / a / k / a / r o j / D / a / u / i d / p / a / n / e / m / a / t i / d i / g / h / s / a / t o, ou / k a / h / g / k / h / n / a / x / e / n / e / p / i / g / r / a / f / h / p / o / h / s / a / s / q / a / i.
Hippolytus Scr. Eccl. [2115] 6.49.4 6.49.4 tv½s stoixei¿n a²ndeicakan, kai litañ tou= Swthmoj <de> rhton oÂma < lh=soup> graamma½n upa²xein e½, tol=dei< Ârhton autou=te< e> b' a²rijm½n akra¿ta cane stoixei¿n <de> graamma½n touteti< Ârhton autou=te< e> stoixei¿n a²tikoi to= ekois tes sa=vn: Uig del X< Ârhton> < de> graamma½n da¿eka, tol=dei< Ârhton> gr m SMS triaka< Ârhton autou<> epi= toj< Ârhton> to< Ârhton> triaka< Ârhton autou<> epi= toj< Ârhton> graamma½n a²tikoi to= ekois tes sa=vn: 6.49.5 to= gar X< Ârhton> e=tri stoixei¿n oktw=te< Ârhton> de xei=trik½< Ârhton> kai< Ârhton> kai< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> penti< Ârhton> tol< Ârhton> s< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> to< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> to< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> to< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârhton> te< Ârthon
Irenaeus Theol. [1447]

[001] Adversus haereses (libri 1-2)

1.8.11.18

1.8.11.24

1.8.12.10

[008] Adversus haereses (liber 5)

22.13

24.1

24.1
Irenaeus Theol. [1447]

24.23 dia le th a post as ian kai lo (ph is mo) t h e el ko noj to t ba riqmo no, ei li ja el g e fa ale i a t i a t o k i laq i ki q k ai lo pi on h r i a. Tou tw vo de lo u oj ek ho n, kai le h p as i t o j sp ou da i q ji kai la ta x a i q ji a bi tra fi oj tou triq mou o t ou fe k i ne mo no, kai ma ta tu r o u tw n a ut w we ke eg i n t w ak a t' o ki to t l w am h n e e r a k o t w n, kai lit ou w e oj do i a s k on to h j ma te a o l a ri q mo no to j tou tro mou h ri g t h i a.

24.32 tw h E l i h m y h r o m dia le th w e a u t h g r am m a f w n, ou k o i a p w o j e k a f h s a n t i e j e p a k o lo u q h a n te n t i o b w i x is m h k a i li t o m e o s n q e h s h s a n a q ri q mo no tou ro mou to j, n s y h f o u u fe l o n te n kai la x a li t il w m e w e de k a d w n mi a n de k a d a b o u lo one n i e i a.

26.1 h me i g g' ou k ou k a po ki di ne un b e n peri l tou ro mou to j tou mou h ri g t h i a tou po la no me no i e be i a bi ti w ki w e e i g a t e dei a e a f an do h e h % k u m k a i r h r u t i e s q ai tou to k o a u to u n d i e k e i g o u a e a tre g h tou kai le h a po ka j u y e n e r a k o t o j. Ou de g a t pro po li ou n kro h ou e w ra q, a li a is do e ep i th h me te s a j g e n e a j, pro j t % fei e t h d o me ti a n o u m el h j.

[005] Fragmenta deperditorum operum

36.3 Di o i a po la h a to l w e h l i gu kai le kj dus mw m to to k o m ou do de do z a s t a i e h to j i e d e n s i, kai le h p a n ti l o p % q u m i a ma pro sa ge ta i t % o k o ma ti q mou kai li q is q a k a ra j w e per kai lo l w am h n e e h t w e a po ka j u y ei le i g e i: Ta l qi ma ma ta e i k i n a i, pro so eu xai lat h q a i g e n: kai lo l P a u lo j para ka i le i h m a j para st ha t i a t i a t s w ma h m m e k a i q is q i n z w a n, a g i an, e u a f e st o n t % % Q e h % h lo g i k h i t a t re i g h h m w w. K a i la pi f i n: a a k a f e w n w e n q u i s a i n a i k e s e j tou te st i k o a p o b e l e e k e n. A u a f i e h a i, pro so fa r o u k a t a l o to h mo n o m e i h, ou k o x e i o r g a f o n e t a l e i g a j o l K u fo j e k t o m e o s o v w a n, a l l a k a t a l p i e ne u ma, e h p e u m a t i g a kai a h j e q e i d e i l p r o s k u ne i h t o b Q e o n.

[003] Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae (lib. 1-3)

47.325.41 e k e i g w n de in o j i l p a r i s w h m a i s u m fo ra n. P r a te i g a t ou k o k a i le h mo noi t w k w h f ' h l i p t w n h m t r o w w t o a u b a e a qa o n, o i a ou e i j e a r o j. K a i lit ou t w n m a t u j a k t o p i st o j o (X r i s t o j, ou k w e g w n: E s t ai q li j i j me ga j h, o i a ou u e g e n o j e a p' a f h x j h j k o m m o u e k j t o u m u m)

[382] In Joannem theologum [Sp.]

59.610.18 59.610 A na g k a h b te k ai lo uj a g h a j au to u e j m e o s n a b a g ei h, o d o n h m h d u n a t o h, e t w w e b o l b o l i g a: p a n t a g a ut o u t e k a t o r o m h a ta ou k e t a r e k a i p a p o k a i r o j p r o j d i h g h s i n. Ta l me b g a t p i le e i t k o u a m e n e k e t h j e i g i o w ou t w w P r a de c w n, o i a s u m u w t o j a p o s to l o i j kai w j h w j n i a t o. U s te r o n e t o f i s t o j u p o l D o me ti a n o u t w w % R h w i a j n b a s i l e j e i j t h nh w o n t h kai o u m e h n. P a f o n g i g e t a i d i a t o b o l o g o n t o w Q e o u k a i l o t h k u m a t h e e v e je ai j, kai E k k l h s i a n s u g g ra fe i, h h e de i e n a u t h % Q e o n, kai a P o ka j u y i n u m st h r i g h a t h h w k a i fo b e r e % e i k o k a i la j a g i a j a u t o u t e r e i j. E p i st o l e j. S k o pe i e d e t h a a to n t o w Q e o u qa o q h ta, p a n t a xo u e u g e n u e n te s u n to j t o j a p o k w n a u t o h: a a e h h u l a k v k a t e k w n t a i, k a a e h e t o r i g a j t u g x a h s i n, i e l e e h b u q % k a l a s h j, e i l e e h l a k k % k a t a k l e i s q w s i n, k a a o j o u d' a A p a r a ri f w k i n, o u x w r i z e t a i t o u t w n, s u m ma x w w k ai le h i s x u w n, kai lit w o w o n e p i k ou f i g w n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justinus Martyr</td>
<td>Apologia</td>
<td>28.1.1</td>
<td>28.1 Par' h'mh meb gat o(ax'hge)hj tw'mk kaw'kaw daimo'nw oðij kai leita kai isatana kai diabol, wj kai lek tw'm hmetr ewn sug ramma fwn ejanunsa ne'te meaqi duha sa: oðij tolup pemf çh'es qai metal thy autouostratiaj kai tw'm epome'nw a h'pawwn kol as qhs omeno'w ko tou pe'ton a'mh w, proemh wus en o'i Kristoj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5.1</td>
<td>80.5 egw'de'kailiel'(kinef el'kin o'qogwnw'he'ne'j katal'pahta Kristianoj'kails'arko') a'has'tas in genh'd es qai epi'stam'ea kai x'ila qai e'nh e'h a'rhos au h'mkodom'hqeisv kai'k o's mh'qeyv kai'pal a'tunq eve'g, wj o'i pro'h'mai fezehikl kai H'sai'j kai'oi Al'oi om'gouw'in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.3.1</td>
<td>81.3 toloua eithmenon ehtoi l egoij toutoi, e'nh: Kat'la gat taj h'mefaj toucufou ai h'mefai toucufoumou e'ontai, ta sa ga twmpowtouw au'twkm &lt;pa'(al i'w'sousi &gt;), enoch'wmen o'di x'ila qa e'mh e'h muthriq'kh mnwu'ej, wj gat t% da'm eiahto, o'di vAd a'akh her'ed fagv a'poloucufou, e'k ek eigv a'poga neita, eg'wmen au'tob mh'la e'plhr'w'santa x'ila e'nh, su'hk'am en kail'oi eithmenon, o'di H'mefu kuriu wi'xi'ila e'nh, eij toubo su'nagein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.4.1</td>
<td>81.4 ka'i'lekeptaj kailpar'h'mh ahrh' tij, %b'Aoma Iwa'nnj, ej' twmpa'posta'lwnt wouc'trou'whe'nh apoka'lu ej' genome'h a'uw'kqi'jia qa e'mh po'h'ein e'h a'rhos au h'm h'm ouj t% de'm%h%e'xe'ntaj proefh'weus, kai'meta'la'ub ha th'k qoolik'kh kai'sun e'nl sht' fa'nhai, ak'wq'wq qnuo'oud ak'w sht'pa'h'tun a'has'tas in genh'd' es qai kai'kriq'gin. o'der kai'kulu'lqjo h'mw'e'j'en, o'di Ou'ke'ga'mh'oujsi i'uqke'ga'mh'qouj e'ontai, a'l'la i'sagg'ej o'i e'ontai, te'kna touc'qewu'wha a'has'tawj ou'de'j.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116.2.1</td>
<td>116.2 ka'i'lwkep'per kai'poi'prouj ete'pas meh'oi e'men, a'polo'w twma'hari'twkm twmp'proterw el'kaq'a ris'qentjt, apofilde'hk hj'k'igw' ej'kai'lwkep'purwsw'ej, h'pou'wouj w'ha'k o're dia'bol oj kai'oli au tuo'wh'refata pante'j, e'j'w o'ki'kalipaj in apo'sn#h#jouj touc'qewu'whu'de'wai ha'mtaj (to'ismas mehe e'douma'ê, e'nh prac'wmen au'tou'kaj) ehtolaj, upe'xeto, kai' ai'lw'he'n bas'iejs prono'hwai ep'hejge'jai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melito Apol. [1495]</td>
<td>Fragmenta</td>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>5.1 [Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou]j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j 5.1 'Meli'lw'wenoj Per'li'touw=Diabofou kai'li'hj' Apokal u'hejw Iwa'nou'j.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origenes Theol. [2042]</td>
<td>Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis (lib. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13)</td>
<td>1.1.1.1</td>
<td>1.1.1.1 1.1.1.1 1.1.1.1 1.1.1.1 Ώn tropoj oðai o'pa'jaj &quot;l'aoj&quot; epi'ki hqeij 'qou'wouj'fujal di'v h'to do'ushqekaj kai'li'hj' upe'tj aj taj'lo'paj fujal taj'la'ni eui'kikh, kai'la u'jth katal'pi eignaj ta'gmata irjatikaj kai' eui'kikh to'leiqh' qe'pe'dusaj, ou'aw'j nomi'maj kai'tal &quot;to'b kruptoj th'k kardi'j aj'gor'pon&quot; pahta tote kri'toj a'w'purwsw'aj x'hamet'zonta e'h krupt%'fouda'bi kai'lej pneu'mati peritet'mhmenon, e'k'wq'wq ehtolaj j b'lloj' aj mus'tik'fjeron tw'm'fu'w'm wj o'jek'gumo'feron apro'w'wanou ej'ujh' Apokal u'hejw maq'eqh, ou'k e'k'wil'koi'j pro'fht' twm'lo'jaj a'koue'j epistame'hqaj ta'loj a'ubha apo'si'wpsa'hwn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.2.1  1.1.2

 hs il de lu oj e o (l a w n h j): "Kai le i o n a a o l o n a æ g e l o n a æ h a b i g o n t a a p o l a h a t o l h p æ h l i g u, æ k o n t a sp ra g i ß a q eu = zw æ o j, kai le i e k r a c e f w n m e g a f v t o j t e s a s i n a æ g e l o i j, o i j æ b o ß h a u t o i j æ æ k h w a i t h g h m k a i l t h q a f a s a n, l e g e n: M h l a æ k h æ h t e m h æ t h g h m h æ t h q a f a s a n m h æ t h t a i l d e n d r a, æ æ r i sp r a g i ß w m e n t o u j d o u ß o j t o u q e u o û h m æ e p i l t w æ m e t w p æ n a u t w æ . K a i l h æ ß o u s a t o b æ l i g o n t w æ sp r a g i ß m e n æ w n, æ k o t o b t e s s æ r a k o n t a t e s s æ r æ x i l i æ d e æ sp r a g i ß m e n æ o æ k p æ s h æ j f u l h æ u i æ æ s r æ h æ æ : æ k f u l h æ t o u d æ d æ v é k e x æ æ x i l i æ d e æ æ x æ f r a g i ß m e n æ æ o æ k f u l h æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ æ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origenes Theol.</td>
<td>Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis (lib. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13)</td>
<td>[2042]</td>
<td>ou)deiìj ga) ekei¿nwn a)kra/twj efa)neres en autou= th qeo=sh ta wj fwa=nhj, para sth=saj auto= bo= le=go=nta: &quot;Egw=ei=mi to=twj tou= kou= mo=mou&quot;: &quot;Egw=ei=mi h(to)daj kai=lh=saj kai=lh=zhf;&quot; &quot;Egw=ei=mi h(aha) stas=ij&quot;: &quot;Egw=ei=mi h(quta):&quot;); &quot;Egw=ei=mi o( poimh=n o( kai= o=&quot;: kai=lh tv= A pokal u= ei &quot;Egw=ei=mi to= A kai=loit W, h(a)xh=kai=loit= o=tio, o(prw)boj kai=lo(e)xato=&quot;:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.4.22.9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.14.84.1]</td>
<td>¹Fhsiì gou=n e)n tv= ¹Apokal u= ei o(tou= Zebedai¿ou ¹Iwa=nhj: &quot;Kai=lh=saj a=ggel on peto=mnen e=ke mesoura=n, mati, ek=onta eu=ggel ion a=kh=saj eu=ggel ig=sai ep=itouj kai=qh=me=usai e=phi=th= ghy= kai=lep=il=pa=me= noj kai=lf il=th= b= kai=li= g w=s= an kai=li= o=, l egwn= fh= nvm= mega= l v: F ob=h=e=ht e=tb q=eq= o=ka=il=do=ze aut=H=do=can, ou=I=eg=e=h= w(Ba th=h= kri=q= e=wj au=to=ka=il= pro=skun=h=s= a=te= t=eb= po=h=s= an=ta= t=eb= ou=fan=bo= kai=il=th= b= gh=m=kai=il=th= b q=al=sa=n kai=l=ph= gaj &quot;udafwn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.19.116.1]</td>
<td>¹O u=xal= e=po= bo= me= ou=A pa=xu= te=ro= n e=be=ih a=xh=th= tw=ko=At= m= e=I=ai= t=eb= u=q=ih= t=ou= qe=ou=pl= e=go=nta: &quot;Egw=ei=mi h=a)xh=kai=l= to= l= o= j= to= , t= o= A kai=loit= W, o(prw)boj kai=lo(e)xato=&quot;: An aga=k= ap= de= lei=de=hai= o=I= ou=I=ka= t=al= pa= o= le=ho= ma= z= e=ta= a= xh= le=kt= in= a u=t= o=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.22.132.1]</td>
<td>Ali=ka= kai=le=vt= fwa=nh= m= A pokal u= ei le=gei: &quot;Egw=ei=mi o(prw)boj kai=lo(e)xato=&quot;: Kail=pa=lin: &quot;Ge=go=na e=gw=U= A kai=loit W, kai=loit W, o(prw)boj kai=lo(e)xato=, h= a)xh=kai=loit= o=tio=&quot;:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.31.209.1]</td>
<td>Pr= o= t= ou= f= o= j= t= e&lt;epi=sta=te= o= n= t= ℃=pm= bly=pw=boj kai=le=xa= xo= t= o= &lt;ei=ai= i= e&lt;tv= A pokal u= ei a= ha= ge= grpa= t= a=, e= xeroj= kai==la= to= prw=boj ei=ai= i= t= u= g= xa= nh= m= t= o= A kai=il=th= b= a=xh= j, kai=ka= il= to= lex= xo= t= o= ou= k= o(auto= t= ℃=p= W= kai=lt= ℃= m= e= le= f=&quot;:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.38.278.6]</td>
<td>E= n= de=tv= A pokal u= ei e= pli= e= u= ko= mw= õ= p= ou= k= æ= q= e= s= q= e= s= i= qi= l= e= g= e= tai= li= o= logo= p= i= sto= jo= kai= a= qa= hi= q= no= j= wj= oI=d=ai=, pa= r= i= st= aj= t= o= l= sa= fe= j= th= f= w= n= h= j, o= k= æ= k= e= i= al= o(= t= m= õ= ep= i= dh= m= w= kai= h= qa= e= i= q= j= l= o= go= j= O u= j= t= o= u= p= a= r= o= n= t= o= de= k= i= a= ro= u= me= i= al= o= õ= e= pli= e= th= f= w= n= h= j=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.5.42.1]</td>
<td>Ø a u=t= o= de= f= w= sa=h= h= j= e= h= tv= A pokal u= ei kai=met= a= l= th= b= pros=qh= kh= j= au=to= bo=ma= s= e= th= t= ℃= eo= u= m= e= g= w= n=&quot;Kai= lh=saj ou= fan=bo= t= ab= a= l= she= mh= me= n= o= kai=lh=to=pj= boj= le= k= ki=lo=kai= leh= sh= meno= ep= au=t= bo= k= ou= men= no= p= i= sto= j= kai= lh= qa= n= no= j=, kai= leh= dik= al= os= u= l= v= k= r= i= ge= kai= lip= li= e= m= e= l= jo= de= le= jo= t= o= m= a= ou= to= wj= f= l= ot= p= ro= j=, kai= lei= p= l= th= b= ke= fa= li= b= au= t= ow= di= a= d= ma= t= a= pol= a= e= km= an= kai= me= gr= a= m= me= n= o=, o= k= ui= e= j= oI=d=ai= u= to= j=, kai= li= pe= ri= bel= mh= me= n= o= i= ma= t= i= o= n= r= a= n= t= is= me= h= no= a= in= m= ai= ma= ti=, kai= le= ke= l= to= to= a= ma= au=to= u= ℃= o= go= j= t= ou= qe= ou= k=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.5.42.14]</td>
<td>pat= e= li= th= b= h= no= h= to= ow= u= o= th= ℃= o= th= h= j= tou= qum= mou= o= tou= qe= o= u= to= m= o= n= to= ka= r= a= ro= t= o= j= kai= le= ke= l= ei= pil= i= o= ma= t= i= o= n= ka= i= le= p= il= to= m= h= roh= au= t= ow= o= ma= ge= gr= a= m= me= n= o= i= ℃= b= a= l= se= u= j= b= a= s= li= e= w= n= kai= lu= k= i= fu= jo= k= kri= en= A n= ag= ka= i= e= j= de= k= i= a= la= pol= u= t= wj= ei= ht= t= a= kai= ℃= go= j= kai= l=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Name</td>
<td>Work Title</td>
<td>Work Reference</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Origenes Theol. | Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (lib. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13) | 2.5.45.1 | 2.5.45  

Kal eilai de "pistoij" o ileitou = eukou = ouddial to lopisteuin o kon dia lopisteuetoj eilai, tou, toou, tou =  

pistueus qai a.aiij = kurioj gat kata toh M ws =a pistoj kailaiai hqinoj = kailaiai hqinoj = gat proq ahtidiasi toh bsi kaij kaii 
tupou kailikoioj, epeilouioj oijei % hegeqoi oufan %  

2.6.49.1 | Kal eilai de "pistoij" o ileitou = eukou = ouddial to lopisteuin o kon dia lopisteuetoj eilai, tou, toou, tou =  

pistueus qai a.aiij = kurioj gat kata toh M ws =a pistoj kailaiai hqinoj = kailaiai hqinoj = gat proq ahtidiasi toh bsi kaij kaii 
tupou kailikoioj, epeilouioj oijei % hegeqoi oufan %  

2.8.58.4 | eilai a toupolia diadhma. Ei meb gat =a ha kail memoidej toly eudij, kaq' ouk o stefanon htw mehou el a mbanen o( 
nikh'saj = "pistoij kailaiai hqinoj" = lqoj, kaij e diadhma perikeiqai eulogij <a> a hagrapto o(epik rathsaj tw =  

ekantign qeou = lqoj.  

2.8.63.6 | Tauba dhleipileibnh ek thh A pokal qeuj ej didakoushj perililqou qeou = mihtai, ina a kribesteron talperiuatou =  

nokhmen.  

5.3.1.8 | Tiqdei lperi touton hapesohtoj epeitols thqoj legein tou = ths ouw = twannou, o( eukgeliqion e(a kataleloipen, omol ogw, =  

duhs qai tos auba polhs ein, a(oudiolo(koq moj xwrwqai edwqato, egray e deka lithh A pokal uyin, kel euqegj siwphwai 

kailmhgraqaiai taj twkeptatai brontfwnaj = kataleloipen kailepistolh bpaou olign stignon, etw deka lide te fan kaij 

triqhn, epeiloupantej fasilqhsigni qej eilai taufajh: plhb ouk eikistiignon anmodteraikaton.  

5.6.1.23 | Tiqdekai lito biblijq ekrwqai upolou = twannou gegeqmenon e(a pros qen kailqisqen, kaij kaitkes fragisqen, oqer 

oudeij hdujato a(hagnwqi kaili usai taj = fragisqai autoumeimholonen e(ek thf hulh toudua, hirqa Daibidi elekwn thh 

klei touqoabig, kaij aholign kaijoulieij kleijei  

6.53.273.9 | agomenon touquesqai. Dioper kailenh = A pokal - lyg ej ajign otabai =e(sthkoj wj e( fagmemon. Ou deq doh(oamnoj 

stageij kaqafion gennehtai katalinaj aporrhojou = olign toumenu kosmou, upet oukatalthh thh toqatoj  

10.42.295.8 | dhven o( perilotb noah tugafrontej pota oliajmai meqgentej kailapi in eki(e epaneil euqantai a hoikedomhhs qmenoi, 

timutaij = genneqmenoi ligivn: nikwgarq tij kailaparal % dwannh evh =v = A pokal qeuj = epaqeigian eki = stujaj ekesqai =  

% hegeqai oufan %  

13.32.199.1 | Dia ltoj =e( thkei =h tws hpeilth quara kailkrouin, la heh tij ahiqv thh quaran eiselqv proq autoh kaiideiphav meta 

ekigou, wde u(ateron dhunqenta toh deipqjanta ahtideipnqj qhmai = apoloudeipnhqjastojj lqoj paral % =hiqwp, %  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Work Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origenes Theol. [2042]</td>
<td>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (lib. 19, 20, 28, 32)</td>
<td>32.2.17.5</td>
<td>niy a menoi de egenw&gt; ei'igthn dia[lo]t&gt; fduolw&gt; eukaththa epilithq qur'ạn &quot;kaulikrouw: ean tiq ahoi&gt;g moit thb qur'ạn, eis el eu'soma i pro aut'bo kai depeinw&gt; met' a tuq'kaiai au'tol&gt; met' eemo&gt;uh mhpo te o[ lq's]ou ou'a ei'ast#t meta[t]ino ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei (lib. 12-17)</td>
<td>16.6.125</td>
<td>pothřion kaitol'baptisma eebaptiqgh s an o l ou=Zebedaigu uiq'qebelger Hrvd'hj me apektenein &quot;fak wbon toh &lt;a)delfo&gt; iwa'nuu maxa'q&gt; w&lt;e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contra Celsum</td>
<td>6.23.1</td>
<td>6.23 Ei' de/ tij bou/loito mhia'f' hā pareqeto a i'keshw a'kho'tas'f hj a]l]a ala'polbij'q hj pveb i'budiskw kai lehtaij sunaqganij au'tomaginw suk'omehn, aker' kri ti anoil'prios'ntai, pu del' kri ti ww'mo'n la'beih aforma maj' mustikwte'aj peril'eis'odou j uwx'mei t talqeib qewriaj, a'agwnlw tal'epilitef ei thp tou=fezekih'prontaij ejr'a meha t%iprof hv, eh o'lj dia'foroi pul a' ka tagagegrammehai eikig, a hi sos'menaj'ina perith'dia'foro ei'sodou twkh'qeloiwitwn j uwx'mei'pitaikrejtona: a'agwnlw del'kai leik' thp iwa'nou Apokalui uy'tal'perith'hj pof ewj touqmeanal'Jerusalim'hqkai ttw'wne'qemel'q kai tt'wne pu'ma'ajhj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De oratione</td>
<td>11.3.8</td>
<td>ma'kλon tw'kapos'wos su'nerqei'k tw'mathk' kai li'tti'k hq'wsw mh'k≡kli/hisaj, wj kai li'proswtwaj[nai twmekkli'hswi kageln o'jleg'qaj paral'li'whanw eht=tw= Apokalui uy'ei ougat ma'thno a'jagel o'i toumeqo'ka hahb'gousi kaii kata'agousi &quot;epiloh uip tw'maqwpwou,&quot; atwmenoi toij t%wi'lwj'k'énu&quot; pefwi'tis me'noij of'qal moij.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excerpta in Psalmos [Dub.]</td>
<td>17.116.16</td>
<td>Wi'] a'kona del'stratopedwn, dunamew na'kejas en Kuri'oun, oqer ek t%'k≡Ebraik% Sabawqei elhtai. Tou del'kai Kuri'oun strati twt'wθo, Ἐβδομ'kona kaii Panton kor'wθ ehtaij Grafalij er mu'ntusi. Kaitolou na α'la lexqeb, pantokra tora toh Swthma dhi o l Ouqwa l egei Kuriqj pantokrattrw: Opij dwoj ajpe'teelme proj selj Pantokrattrw gat wοj Patht, toh Uipj ajpe'tei e pantokrattrora. Kail iwa'nhj dele'h tw=Apokalui uy ei, Ta'de l egei, fhsin, o'martuj ol'pistoj kaili al hqinj, o'hkakaiolw kaili kotx'menoj: periloulou=Swt'hoj mol'ogoumenj ejbwn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Name</td>
<td>Work Title</td>
<td>Work Reference</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Origenes Theol. [2042] | Exhortatio ad martyrium | 30.11 | wijgatol,1,1%kataltob. Mwsewijnonomqiaistrhiaiprosedreuontejdiekoneih
ekooundaiamtoj"tragwnkaitaurw"aÌ§isa
amarthamewnkegieij,ouwajaiyuaxaltwmpopelekismwhej"ekeken
thmarturijthsuuymhmathtn10%en
outanoijqiaistrhiaiparedreuasai,diakonoswitoijeuementoij
aÌ§isa
amarthamewn. |
| [084] Fragmenta in Jeremiam | Fragmenta in Jeremiam (in catenis) | 68.15 | kapaqgat
Iawnhjeh Apokaluj ei
fhsij"qumiamata/eisainai,proseuxalitwmaigm"aÌli"elim
logismoiotauS
molwumenponhroij,sumberjeto"hiprosequhlaautwgenicwnejwjejamartijh,
hoei
tolehantijen,eabapolikaisouhj
eutwhomej:epeiletwedi
amartijlegohtwn:"proswzasan
kailekapshanoimwifwejmouapojproswpouhimaj
frosouhj
mou",giqetai
toqumiamada
usej,disper
jisaijeiej:
ebfehrthesemigalin,matiaion:qumama,bedelugamolqektin. |
| [017] Fragmenta in Lucam | Fragmenta in Lucam (in catenis) | 209.18 | toldeo"oukeousinahtapodoumaiisiiln
onetinh10%oukbasiproj
ewthsinhapokrisindiecaqen
logonkail
dialektikw\"aÌ§iston"megatatoi,
eikagwiquerologoiraq
kaiwpalaialaopia,"dei.DIS
en
doio,ekprokpanyogoi
mustikoiraiot hymeb2
_diaqkhj."aIaIa"asint
del"dikaigm"ektaugalegei,hIawnhj
prwthne<jtv>Apokalujei
fhsip. |
| [044] Fragmenta in Psalmos 1-150 [Dub.] | Fragmenta in Psalmos 1-150 [Dub.] | 23.10.10 | PANTOKRATWRLEGETAI:AUTOWGOUETNING
PROSWPONLOGENEH
Zaxarij:Ou\wujlegeiKurijopONTOKRATWR:Opi
w
doijapostenelme,kaiqwvsoKurijop
ONTOKRATWRapostelkeime
projjePONTOKRATWRGATOUP
PANTOKRATOROJ
apostelomenojo(Uiiqestein,upolPatriop
pemomenoj).
ArhidhiserjostelektvIawnuuApokalujei,PONTOKRATWR
OJ
SWLHTLEGETAI.
TadedategalegaiKurij,o(omatujo(pistojkaiaJ
hqinoj,o(\akaiolo(\akaiol(\exomenojuKurij,o(Qeo)
o
PONTOKRATWR.
Anamfisbhtwjtawumperilou=Uigumei\athai. |
| [027] Homiliae in Ezechielem | Homiliae in Ezechielem | 452.29 | Telaiouteltou"biblignlkeukotewjeuhutelij
etvApokalujiejIawnuu
kaijperlilatoulougegrammenakaipwuj
h\aijmeno(ekfulhpopoqo"toukoila
lezionej.
Mekrijouagat\hageno(Kurijh\wkehsou\j(o
Xristoj,"ekkeleisto"o
nomoj,o\logojopohrikoj. |
| [016] Homiliae in Lucam | Homiliae in Lucam | 13.80.20 | Gepraptai
goume<jtv>Apokalujiej
Iawnuu:"caj1jlekehomoatamiga,alinaooukehnoj
unaj.<kailla
fin:<ekaei
ekeladama
amartmata
poloumtaj,"kaiimendetaitoij
ageloi. |
| [009] In Jeremiam (homiliae 1-11) | In Jeremiam (homiliae 1-11) | 9.2.27 | Kalihatameghangen(oujoe)"ekghh
AiAgouco,etkthkamigmjthsindrjaj,"ma
LIsakataltob
noh\atantatoulgegrammene
etvApokalujiejIawnuu,odiottaj:"ouko(oukijoua
utwke斯塔urw\hjkaleitaipneumatikwij
SodomaIai
\Agouchoj.
Eigat"pneumatikwjskaleitaiaI\Agouchoj,ouk
ektitilakaih(AiAgouco)h(pneumatikwjskaioume\h
AiAgouco. |
2.1.1  Κεκλείσκαι καλεῖς φραγίζῃς ταῖς ζειμεὶς γραφῶν οἱ, χειρὶς αὐτῶν λόγοι, τῷ κελεύϑῃ διὰ Θεοῦ. 

2.1.12  Καὶ εἰδοὺς ἐπιλίθες δεκατὸν τοῦ καθῆκεν μενεὶ ἐπὶ ὁμοίαν βιβλίαν γραμμῆς ἐκεῖνον καὶ τοὺς ἀνάξιους τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄρχονταν ἐπὶ διδάσκαλον ὑποστολὴν παντὸς τοῦτος ὑπεντάνετο εὐαγγέλια. 

3.6  ὃς ὑπολογίζῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ Ἱουνίου, ὑπολογίζῃ τὸν ἔθεσαν ἐν τῷ ἱστορίαν ἔγγραφον εἰς τὸν ἱστορικὸν Σωτῆρα, ὁ Σωτὴρ ὑπολογίζῃ τὸν ἑαυτὸν ὑπερβαλλόντα καὶ τὸν ἀνατίθημαν ἀληθείαν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτόν.
Author Name

Work Title

Origenes Theol.
[2042]

[042] Scholia in Apocalypsem 15.11
(scholia 1, 3-39)

Work Reference

Citation
kti¿smasi sugkatabai¿nein: eiåxon poieiÍn e)piporeuo/menon diegertiko\n tw½n koimwme/nwn kata\ ta\j pronohtika\j kinh/seij.
¹Epi¿sthson, mh\ e)farmo/zv to\ oÃnoma th=j ¹Ieza/bel tv= gnw¯mv kaiì ai¸re/sei tw½n Nikolai+tw½n dia\ to\ ta\ eÃrga th=j gnw¯mhj e)kei¿nhj
prosh=fqai tv= ¹Ieza/bel ei¹j pornei¿an kataspasa/sv kaiì xrh=sin ei¹dwloqu/twn peirwme/nv: oÀqen kaiì gunaiÍka au)th\n dia\ to\
e)mpaqe\j kaiì e)kteqhlume/non eiåpen.

19.1

¹Epeidh\ h( nu=n e)paggellome/nh didaskali¿a pro\j e)kklhsi¿aj e(pta/, ta\j dhloume/naj, gi¿netai, e)pi¿sthson, mh\ ta\ z§ pneu/mata
ai¸ metousi¿ai tou= pneu/matoj wÕsin, e(ka/sthj e)kklhsi¿aj metoxh\n e)xou/shj

a)suntro/xaston pro\j ta\j tw½n loipw½n.

sumfw¯nwj toiÍj e(pta\ pneu/masin e)klh/yei kaiì tou\j e(pta\ a)ste/raj, e(ka/stou a)ste/roj shmai¿nontoj to/n tinoj e)kklhsi¿aj
fwtismo/n. dunato\n a)nafe/rein tou\j e(pta\ a)ste/raj ei¹j tou\j e(pta\ a)gge/louj tw½n e(pta\ e)kklhsiw½n.
21.16

para\ qeou= e)k tou= ou)ranou=. auÀth e)stiìn h( e)kklhsi¿a tou= qeou= tou= zw½ntoj.>

< ¸O pisto\j kaiì a)lhqino\j> o( swth\r u(pa/rxei ou)

dia\ to\ pi¿stewj kaiì a)lhqei¿aj mete/xein, a)lla\ dia\ to\ be/baion kat' ou)si¿an eiånai: a)lh-qino\j ga\r o( au)to\j e)p' au)tou= dia\ to\
<a)lh/qeian> kaiì <a)lhqino\n
28.1

Meta\ to\ e)gnwke/nai me/ fhsin, oÀti h( r(i¿za Daui¿+d, o( nikh/saj le/wn e)k th=j fulh=j ¹Iou/da, eiãlhfen to\ bibli¿on e)piì to\ lu=sai ta\j
sfragiÍdaj au)tou=, eiådon e)n me/s% tou= ou)ranou= kaiì tw½n tessa/rwn z%¯wn kaiì tw½n presbute/rwn a)rni¿on e(sthko\j e)sfagme/non.
meta\

th\n a)na/stasin kaiì a)na/lhyin o)fqe\n to\ a)rni¿on ou)ke/ti e)sfagme/non wÓfqh kaiì e)piesto/j, toute/stin ou)ke/ti

a)lloiou/menon. ei¹ ouÅn kata\ kainh\n sta/sin eÃxei loipo\n e(pta\ ke/rata, a(gi¿an basilei¿an
38.14

tou= qeou= de\ kata\ th\n i¹di¿an pro/gnwsin proeido/toj ta\ pa/nta kaiì a(rmo/zonti kair%½ to\n toiou=ton me/llonta eÃsesqai e)pa/gontoj <ei¹j to\ pisteu=sai au)tou\j t%½ yeu/dei,> ouÂ th\n parousi¿an ¹Iwa/nnhj e)ntau=qa ouÀtwj e)mh/nusen. iàna ouÅn mh/ tij au)to\n
qei+kv= duna/mei do/cv poieiÍn ta\ shmeiÍa, a)lla\ magikv= e)nergei¿#, eÃfh: <kaiì plan#= tou\j katoikou=ntaj e)piì th=j gh=j.> kaiì ou)de/n
ge kaiì qaumasto\n ei¹ tw½n daimoni¿wn kaiì a)postatikw½n pneuma/twn u(pourgou/ntwn au)t%½ di' au)tw½n poiv= shmeiÍa, e)n oiâj
planh/sv tou\j katoikou=ntaj e)piì th=j gh=j. kaiì to\n a)riqmo\n de\ tou= o)no/matoj au)tou= fhsin kaiì aÃlla tina\ kaiì eiånai to\n
a)riqmo\n xc²§, oÀ e)stin e(katonta/dej eÁc kaiì deka/dej eÁc kaiì mona/dej eÁc ei¹j a)nakefalai¿wsin pa/shj th=j e)n toiÍj
e(cakisxili¿oij eÃtesin gegonui¿+aj a)postasi¿aj. oÀsaij ga\r h(me/raij e)ge/neto oÀde o( ko/smoj, tosau/taij xiliontaethri¿sin [cod.
xiliontae/tesi] sunteleiÍtai: kaiì dia\ tou=to/ fhsin h( grafh/: <kaiì sunete/lese/n> fhsin <o( qeo\j e)n tv= h(me/r# tv= eÀktv ta\ eÃrga
au)tou=, oÀsa e)poi¿hsen.>

38.49

kaiì dia\ tou=to e)n t%½ te/lei a)qro/wj e)nteu=qen th=j e)kklhsi¿aj lambanome/nhj <eÃstai>, fhsi¿n, <qliÍyij, oiàa ou)k e)ge/neto a)p'
a)rxh=j ou)de\ mh\ ge/nhtai.> eÃsxatoj ga\r a)gwÜn ouÂtoj tw½n dikai¿wn, oÁn nikh/santej stefanou=ntai tv= a)fqarsi¿#: kaiì dia\ tou=to
ei¹j to\ qhri¿on to\ e)rxo/menon a)nakefalai¿wsij gi¿netai pa/shj

th=j a)diki¿aj kaiì panto\j do/lou, iàna e)n au)t%½ sunreu/sasa

pa=sa du/namij a)postatikh\ ei¹j th\n ka/minon blhqv= tou= puro/j. katallh/lwj ouÅn kaiì to\ oÃnoma au)tou= eÀcei to\n a)riqmo\n xc²§,
a)nakefalaiou/menon e)n e(aut%½ th\n pro\ tou= kataklusmou= pa=san th=j kaki¿aj e)pimici¿an e)c a)ggelikh=j a)postasi¿aj
gegenhme/nhj:
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Scholia in Apocalypsem
(scholia 1, 3-39)

38.58 Nωμωγάτης ἡ ἀποκάλυψις καὶ καὶ τίνης εἰς αὐτὸν τοῦ λαοῦ ἁσθμα τῇ γῆς διάλθει ἐπιλτό ἡ δαμα κιδρόν γενη. ἀνακεφαλαιομενον δελκαλαίον. 39 Αριστομάθης γατά ἀπορρώπου ἐκτός ἡς τίνης τοῦ περιμένειν τῆς εἰδίκες ᾔρον ἡ ἀκταστοξεῖς καὶ καὶ πολλὰ μενετευμένις καὶ καὶ οἰωνοτικα χρονοῦ. πολιθρόμον, καὶ λουκου ἀναστολήν αὐθανός χζήσις εἰς ἐκεῖνας ἀλήθειας. ὡς δεδομένη ἐκκαλήσεις τὸ προειρήματος. πολλὰ τῶν όνομάτων εὐρίον ὧν εὐκόλου ἐπιμήκη οὐκ αἰνητουμένην ἀπασχολοντος. 39

Scholia in Apocalypsem
(scholia 28-38)

Καί ἑκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγει μοι: Μὴ κλαίη, ἵνα ἔνθηκεν οἱ λέων οἳ ἐκ τῆς φύλας Ἰουδα, ἡ ἱλία Δαυὶδ, ἀνοίγατο τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ τὰ ἐπτά σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ.

Περιληπτουμένως σφραγίζεται μονὸν οἱ Ἠσαίας οὕτως: "Καί ἐσται χωμᾶ ταῦτα πάντα, ὅτι οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ανοίγασθαι, εἰσπέτασον τὰ πανταχοῦ καὶ οὐκ θάυμασθήσῃς: 2.6 ὥστε τῇ κλίτε ἐκτελεῖ τὴν χείρα τῆς, ἔφων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρῶτου, τῇ δὲ τῆς δύον πρὶν ἔχωτε ὑπ' ὅνομα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐκκινῆσαι.
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