

## THE RELATION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL TO THE APOCALYPSE

THERE are not a few theologians who would consider the discussion of our subject an unprofitable use of time. If it were attempted, the relationship between the two books in question would be stated in a series of contrasts, those elements being noted which the Apocalypse ought to contain but does not, and others which it contains and ought not, the standard of judgment being the mature presentation of Christianity which we find in the Fourth Gospel. The fact is that the Apocalypse appears to have fallen into disfavour. Professor Dodd, for example, holds that whereas the Fourth Gospel is a mainstream development of the primitive Kerygma, more truly so than even Matthew and Luke, the Apocalypse is the putrid extremity of a backwater, created through the introduction of Jewish apocalyptic into the Kerygma by disappointed disciples. A. M. Hunter in his excellent little book, *The Unity of the New Testament*, excludes from his synthesis of New Testament Christianity the Apocalypse of John. He states as his reason, "This book, despite its occasional splendour of imagination and expression, is in many respects (its eschatology, its conception of God, its picture of the Messiah) more Jewish than Christian, and may therefore for our purpose be excluded" (p. 18). Hence, the Apocalypse is not only severed from the Fourth Gospel but from the New Testament as a whole. This conforms to the practice of the early Reformers and, as is well known, of the early Syriac Church.

Modern commentators dwell at length upon the differences of language of the Gospel and Apocalypse. It is unjustifiable to minimise these differences as some evangelical scholars do. W. Hendriksen, in his recent commentary on the Apocalypse, ascribes them to "the transcendent nature of the subject-matter, the deeply emotional state of the author when he received and wrote these visions, and the fact that John makes abundant use of the Old Testament".<sup>1</sup> Westcott argued in a similar fashion. It seems to me that such reasoning cannot touch the evidence adduced by Charles in his *Short Grammar of the Apocalypse*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *More than Conquerors*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Revelation (I.C.C.)*, Vol. I, pp. cxvii ff.

Certain phenomena may conceivably be accounted for by the nature of the subject and the emotional state of the seer, but not the absence of the attracted relative, of the genitive absolute, of *μή* with the participle, of narrative *ὁδῶν*, etc., all of which are present in the Gospel. An excited speaker might occasionally make a grammatical blunder, but an educated man would not make a sustained speech in ungrammatical language in whatever mood he was. Torrey avers that "the grammatical monstrosities of the book, in their number and variety and especially in their startling character, stand alone in the history of literature".<sup>1</sup> In saying this, Torrey but echoes the verdict of nearly all the great exponents of the Apocalypse. If one adds that the book is not the hastily written work of an emotional ecstatic but a carefully compiled letter of a literary artist, one is compelled to agree with those who hold that the Gospel and the Apocalypse could not have issued from the same author in their present dress. Unfortunately, or otherwise, the matter cannot be left at this stage. The results of Charles' investigations led him to believe that the author of the Apocalypse *thought* in Hebrew and *wrote* in Greek; Torrey has reconsidered the question and has concluded that the book was originally *written* in Aramaic and *translated* with the utmost fidelity into Greek. That the syntax of the Apocalypse is Semitic cannot be questioned and that it is Aramaic rather than Hebrew is *a priori* much more likely. The point at issue is the nice one, whether the author translated mentally as he wrote, or whether he wrote in Aramaic and someone else translated the book. Torrey, Aramaic expert, maintains the latter; H. H. Rowley, equally expert in Aramaic, is inclined to the former. If Torrey is right, there is the slenderest possibility that the Fourth Evangelist wrote the Apocalypse, for the Greek would be someone else's; if he is wrong, then it seems the Fourth Evangelist could not have written the Apocalypse. In this paper I have deemed it best not to attempt to cut this Gordian knot but to turn from it. Our subject is not the *authorship* of these two works but their *relationship*, and to that more profitable matter we now turn.

Two considerations, however, must be first dealt with. The first is that the *totally different purposes for which the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse were written inevitably lead to different emphases*. The Gospel was written to give a historic basis for faith, whether

<sup>1</sup> *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 158.

it existed in the minds of the readers or was yet to be awakened; with this the First Epistle is intimately connected. The Apocalypse was intended to inspire hope and courage in believers who were about to face fearful distress. That the former work should take the form of a Gospel it is easy to comprehend; that the latter should take the form of an Apocalypse is equally to be expected. The first Apocalypse, that of Daniel, was written for a similar set of circumstances to that of the Asiatic Christians for whom John wrote; the same could be said of most other Apocalypses. The aim of the seer was, therefore, not to awaken terror in unbelievers, as some of its modern readers allege, but to quicken an unflinching faith. One reads the book with deeper sympathy when this is borne in mind. It is to be noted that the recent expositors of the Apocalypse have, without exception, repudiated the disparaging verdicts that from time to time gain currency in the Church.

A further consideration to be noted is that *in comparing the Gospel with the Apocalypse we are not comparing a Christian work with a Jewish book*. It is high time this boggy of the Judaism of the Apocalypse was laid once and for all. It is significant that Charles, in the first edition of his Jowett lectures on eschatology, characterised the thought of Revelation as "unadulterated Judaism" (p. 347). That remark does not appear in his second edition of the lectures, although he does say that the writer's attitude to the world reflects the temper of Judaism rather than of Christianity (p. 403). In his commentary on the Apocalypse, however, he castigates those who allege that its doctrine of God is Jewish (Vol. I, p. clx) and extols the virtues of the book, which he now regards as in some respects the greatest book of the New Testament. It seems that first impressions of this book may need to be corrected; the longer one meditates on it the more attraction it has. Undoubtedly the chief cause for the characterisation of it as "Jewish" is due to the author's use of Jewish terminology; he can hardly write a sentence without quoting the Old Testament. His teaching is set forth with the aid of the traditional symbols of apocalyptic. He may even have freely drawn on images used by earlier and contemporary apocalyptists; if so, by consent of all, he has utterly transformed them. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that in no other book is it so necessary to distinguish between the thought of the writer and the means adopted to embody it. When that is

done, it is seen that, despite the consistent use of the language of Judaism, the writer's standpoint is at the opposite pole to the Judaists; it is thoroughly universalistic. The only reference in the Letters to contemporary Jews is to designate them as the Synagogue of Satan. Jewry's only hope is to be gathered into the Church. The book is Christocentric, to a degree surpassed by no other New Testament writing. Its soteriology is rooted in the Atonement, the place of "works" occupying a similar position to that which it has in Paul. If the Apocalypse is contrasted with the Letter of James, a curious phenomenon is observable. The seer has soaked himself in the literature of the Jews—he has taken the form of writing least adaptable to Christian theology and has produced a Christian work of the first order; James has read the popular literature of the Greeks as perhaps no other New Testament writer has done, he has borrowed certain forms and even terminology of the Greek dialogue, and yet has produced a work which has more in common with the Old Testament Wisdom Literature than with the thought of the Fourth Evangelist and of Paul. So little has the form affected the thought of these respective writings.

In considering the theological relationship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, we shall discuss first the more general theological conceptions of the two works and then their specifically eschatological ideas, the latter being the more controverted point at issue.

#### I. THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL IDEAS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE APOCALYPSE

1. *The Doctrine of God.* At first sight there appears to be little in common between the two presentations of this doctrine, apart from the basic assumption of the ethical monotheism of the Biblical revelation. In the Gospel God is defined as Spirit, revealing Himself to spiritual eyes through the Son, and through the Spirit who continues the work of the Son; His characteristic name is "Father". In the Apocalypse God is depicted in terms reminiscent of the Old Testament prophets, and the determining conception appears to be that of the transcendent Judge. It is alleged by some that the conception of God in the Apocalypse does not rise to the height of the best of the Hebrew prophets. Such a contention is rejected by Swete and Charles, who insist

that the Doctrine of God in the Apocalypse has to be interpreted in the light of its Christology, for the Son is the revelation of the Father, and that which is predicated of the Son applies equally to the Father. Since the Atonement holds a prominent place in this work, it cannot be legitimately held that there is no room in its theology for the Doctrine of the love of God.

Let it freely be admitted, however, that the presentations of this doctrine in the Gospel and the Apocalypse widely differ. A good deal of the divergence may well be due to the fact that in the Gospel the relation of God to the believer is mainly dwelt upon, whereas in the Apocalypse the relation of God to an unbelieving and rebellious world holds first place. That the *ὁργὴ θεοῦ* has a decided position in the theology of the Evangelist is seen in John iii. 36, a statement by no means isolated in the Gospel.

2. *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* is difficult to compare in our two writers, partly because of the obscurity of the symbolism relating to the Spirit in the Apocalypse. Charles denies that there is any doctrine of the Spirit given by the seer, the Holy Spirit not being clearly mentioned in the book; the insertion of a reference to the Holy Spirit in i. 4, he maintained, is a clumsy attempt by an editor to concoct a trinitarian formula. "The Seven Spirits which are before the throne" appear in four passages (i. 4, iii. 1, iv. 5, v. 6). Some conjecture that the number "seven" is due to the primitive worship of the planets, or the Seven Angels of Jewish theology, or the Spirit conceived as inhabiting the Seven Churches. Whatever the origin of the symbol, the placing of the "Seven Spirits" between the Father and the Son in i. 4, and their mission as being sent into all the earth in v. 6, seem to make it clear that the Holy Spirit himself is being portrayed. Indeed, the designation of the Spirit in v. 6, as "Seven eyes of the Lamb, which are the Seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth", is regarded by Swete as a remarkable parallel to the teaching on the Paraclete in the Johannine discourses, both as regards his being sent by the Son and the universality of his mission. If the formula in the Seven Letters, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches", appears to identify the Spirit with the Son, this would accord with the previously mentioned teaching. Paul has the habit of doing the same thing; cf. his dictum, "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17). The other

teaching on the Spirit in the Apocalypse is more akin to the Old Testament than the Fourth Gospel; John receives his visions "in the Spirit" (i. 10); the Spirit that calls for the return of Christ in xxii. 17 is the "Spirit of prophecy", the prophetic Spirit of Old and New dispensations. The intimacy of fellowship with the Spirit, so characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, and the joy of his possession, which so clearly marks the presence of the Kingdom of God, are both absent from the Apocalypse. But note that these conceptions are prominent in the Gospel only in the Last Discourses of our Lord; there is nothing to correspond with the latter in the Apocalypse. Whether he knew these conceptions or rejected them is more than we can certainly say from the records we possess, but the latter conclusion is highly dubious.

3. *The Christology* of the Gospel and that of the Apocalypse are closely related. The community of the Son with the Father is fully asserted in both books. In the Apocalypse it is especially noteworthy how the predicates of God are applied freely to the Messiah. His pre-existence is fully acknowledged in both books, in the Gospel especially in the Prologue, but equally in the Apocalypse; He is the First and Last and the (absolutely) Living One (i. 17), the ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ (iii. 14). He is the Word of God, both in the Gospel and Apocalypse (xix. 13). He is the Lamb of God, a term applied to Christ, by the Evangelist twice, by the Seer twenty-eight times. He is the central figure in both books. The similarity of these Christologies is without parallel in the New Testament. Charles minimised the coincidence of the term "Logos" in the two books by attributing it to Hellenic sources in the Gospel but Jewish in the Apocalypse. No one will agree with him to-day, for the Jewish background of the Johannine Logos is fully established. Zahn felt this one fact over-rode all objections to the identity of authorship of the two books. Not all will agree with him, but at least the importance of the fact will not be overlooked.

4. *The Doctrine of the Church* is implicit rather than explicit in the Gospel and Apocalypse, but is fairly clear in outline. The universality of the outlook of the former is fully shared by the latter. The relationship of the Church to the Jews is also similarly regarded. In the Gospel the "other sheep together" with those of the Jewish fold form "one flock". In the Apocalypse the Church of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament

are set forth under the one figure of the woman who gives birth to the Messiah; they are the 144,000 of every tribe of Israel, the Bride of Christ. The doctrine of the Church is, if anything, more explicit in the Apocalypse than the Gospel, since it links together the conception of the Church as Catholic and as local, but there was no call for such a distinction in the Gospel.

5. *The teaching concerning the World* forms another of the bonds that link the Gospel and the Apocalypse. Charles has been quoted as stating in his Jowett Lectures that the attitude in the Apocalypse to the world is more reminiscent of Judaism than Christianity. On the contrary, it seems to me to be reminiscent of the teaching that the world lies in the grip of the evil one (1 John v. 19) who is its prince (John xiv. 30); that the world has seen and hated both Christ and the Father (xv. 24) and will hate and persecute the Church (xv. 19-20); that it lies under the Judgment of God (iii. 36). We are not surprised that Westcott should say that the main idea of the Gospel and the Apocalypse is the same, that of the conflict between the Powers of Good and evil. In the Gospel the conflict is limited to the stage of the Incarnate Life of Christ; in the Apocalypse it is viewed in the light of the ages and especially of the impending End of the ages. Had the Evangelist had occasion to treat of the theme of the Apocalypticist, I am not inclined to think their resultant thought would have been very different.

6. *The Soteriology* of our two books has much more in common than is often represented. Christ's atoning work, and faith in Him on the basis of that work, are central to both works: cf. John iii. 16 and Rev. vii. 14 ("They washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"), or contrast the conception of the Gospel as typified in John iii. 14-15 with the vision of the Lamb that stood as though it had been slain in Rev. v. Exception has been taken to the prominence given to "works" in the Apocalypse, notably in the seven Letters and in the Judgment scene of chapter xx. Certainly, faith is a distinguishing characteristic of the Gospel, which is similar to Paul in this respect (whereas the faith of the Apocalypse is more like the heroic venturesomeness of Hebrews), but the Evangelist also insists on the necessity of works. They are the criterion as to whether we know God or not (1 John ii. 3), and they are summed up in love to God and man (1 John iv. 7). A phrase characteristic of the Gospel and Apocalypse is "keeping

the word" or "the commands of God"; nineteen times does it appear in the Gospel and 1 John, nine times in the Apocalypse, and only seven times in the rest of the New Testament. Westcott draws attention to the obligation of personal witness to Christ which is demanded in the Gospel and Apocalypse; a glimpse at a concordance as to the use of *μαρτυρέω* and *μαρτυρία* in the New Testament substantiates his remark. The spiritual meaning of the terms *ζωή*, *θάνατος*, *διψᾶν*, *πεινᾶν*, *νικᾶν* in these two books is equally significant.<sup>1</sup> They point to a close relationship of the soteriology of these writings, a relationship which, as we have observed in other connections, is unparalleled in other writers of the New Testament. Any final assessment of the theological relation of the Gospel and Apocalypse must take these matters into account; the fact that some of them are mere details makes them all the more striking.

## II. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE APOCALYPSE

The characteristic of the eschatology of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles we discovered<sup>2</sup> to lie in the combination of realised and futurist eschatologies, with a stress on the former element. It may be thought that we put an undue emphasis on the futurist aspect; if so, it is because of its common neglect by the interpreters of the Gospel. Now everyone knows that the Apocalypse is a book about the End Time, i.e. the stress is heavily on futurist expectations; not all, however, are aware of the noteworthy parallels to the realised eschatology of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles. They have to be sought out, it is true, but they are there to be found, and if we seem to give undue prominence to them, perhaps we may be pardoned, in view of their constant neglect by writers on the Apocalypse.

1. *The Parousia.* The dominating theme of the Apocalypse is the speedy advent of Christ in glory and power. Nevertheless, incredible as it may appear, it is easier to point out in the Apocalypse instances of the present experience of a spiritual coming of Christ than it is in the Fourth Gospel. We showed beforehand

<sup>1</sup> Charles points this out as one of the connections between the Gospel and Apocalypse. Consider the following passages as examples of their use: (a) John x. 10: Rev. ii. 7-10; (b) John v. 24: Rev. ii. 11 and xx. 14; (c) John vii. 37: Rev. xxii. 17; (d) John vi. 35: Rev. vii. 16; (e) John xvi. 33 and 1 John ii. 13: Rev. ii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel* in the April number, pp. 97-108.

that it is doubtful whether John xiv. 18 and 28 refer to Christ's coming to the believer by the Spirit; it is possible, but not indubitable. The one unquestionable reference is that which speaks of a "coming" of the Father and Son together to the believer, John xiv. 23. Every commentator refers the reader of this verse to Rev. iii. 20, where Jesus "comes" to the heart of any man willing to admit him. Rev. ii. 5 speaks of Christ's "coming" in Judgment to the Church of Ephesus: "Remember . . . and repent and do the first works, or else I come to thee, and will move thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent." Rev. iii. 3 may have a similar meaning. As to a future Parousia, even if it be admitted that the Evangelist did teach such a doctrine, could the homely and gentle promise of John xiv. 3 be reconciled with the awe-inspiring picture given in Rev. xix. 11, where the Word of God rides at the head of the avenging armies of heaven? A little reflection surely leads to the conclusion that they may be united. After all, both representations are pictorial, the one showing what the Parousia means to the believer, the other what it means to the rebellious world. That the Evangelist believed in a coming of Jesus to Judgment is seen in John v. 25-29, in which Jesus refers to a resurrection to life and one to Judgment. What did the Evangelist think would happen to the prophets of Antichrist, and to the world reposing in the arms of the evil one, when the Lord came back again? He does not say. It is absurd to imagine that John xiv. 3 means that there is a place for Antichrist and company in the prepared *μορὰ* at the Second Coming. His teaching elsewhere gives no room for doubt that for the unbelieving world there will be *δολογία* at the Parousia. That time is seen to be impending in 1 John ii. 18, as well as in Rev. i. 1; for which reason it is very possible that John xiv. 18 and 28 and xvi. 16-22 may refer to the Parousia; the coming of Jesus to the disciples is in but "a little while".

2. *Tribulation* is expected by the Evangelist to herald the Parousia; see, for example, xvi. 1: when "their hour", the hour of the persecutors, is come, the disciples will remember what Jesus said. But tribulation is also the lot of the believer at all times; "in the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (xvi. 33). The same teaching is given in the Apocalypse; the two strands are woven together in Rev. ii. 9-10: "I know *thy tribulation and thy poverty* . . . and

the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and they are not, but are a synagogue of Satan. *Fear not the things which thou art about to suffer*; behold the devil is about to cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried, and ye shall have tribulation ten days. Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the crown of life." See also i. 9 and vii. 14.

3. *Judgment*. In the Gospel it is both a present fact (iii. 18) and a process of separation (iii. 19-21). As to the Apocalypse, we have already quoted Jesus coming at this present time to his Churches in Judgment (ii. 5; iii. 3). There is also a separation among men which, to the mind of John, was shortly to be revealed; Rev. xiii. 16 tells of the false prophet causing all that dwell on earth to receive on their hand or forehead the mark of the beast; immediately after, in xiv. 1, a vision is given of those standing with the Lamb, having on their foreheads his name and the name of his Father. This is not a representation of the Last Judgment, but a picture of the separation that takes place prior to it, and to John this *ἔσχατος* was imminent. It is therefore a clear parallel to the supposedly unique teaching of the Gospel in iii. 19.

The Evangelist reports Jesus as pronouncing the suffering of the Cross to be the supreme time of Judgment for the world (xii. 31). The seer has a clear reminiscence of this teaching in Rev. xii. 7-12. This is part of the vision, or series of visions, which do not relate specifically to the End Time but survey the course of events from the point of view of the End. There is war in heaven between Michael and Satan, with their respective hosts. Satan and his angels are cast out of heaven to earth. Was this through the strength of Michael? No. "*Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the Kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accuseth them before our God day and night. And they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony.*" The atoning work of Christ and the victory of the saints gained through it cause the overthrow of Satan and his hosts. This is thorough-going realised eschatology. The overthrow of the demons was a proof given by Jesus, according to the Synoptists, that His Kingdom had come in power. Paul exults in this teaching in Col. ii. 15, "Having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over

them in it". The same thought appears in Heb. ii. 14, "Since the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil".

The teaching of the Gospel and Apocalypse on the Last Judgment needs no comment; as in most other respects, the Evangelist gives bare statements, e.g. in John xii. 48 and 1 John iv. 17, while the seer paints a picture that is dreadful in its majesty, Rev. xx. 11. Both depict a Judgment consequent on the Parousia and both insist on the importance of works.

4. *Resurrection*. The most characteristic conception of the Gospel is that resurrection occurs on the sinner turning to Christ; this results in his immediate enjoyment of "eternal life". See, for example, John v. 24-25. There is no mention in the Apocalypse of a present, spiritual resurrection, so far as I am aware, but there is presented an exhortation to possess the life of God now: "He that is athirst, let him come; he that will, let him take the water of life freely" (xxii. 17). This is a reminiscence of John vii. 37-38, and must refer to the bestowal of eternal life through the gift of the Spirit. It is therefore clear that though this feature is only subordinate in the Apocalypse, but dominant in the Gospel, the seer truly grasped it, and it must not be glossed over as though it was not present in his work. If he had had occasion to enlarge on this conception, we have a suspicion that the exposition would have had a strangely Johannine tinge about it.

The future resurrection at the Parousia is anticipated in John v. 25 and vi. 39, etc. In the Apocalypse the doctrine is given an unusual turn, in that the millennial Kingdom is interposed between the first resurrection and that which occurs at the Day of Judgment (Rev. xx). It is a difficult conception and much discussed. I cannot think, as most moderns, that the first resurrection of xx. 4-6 refers only to the martyrs; the promise is given, in ii. 26-28, to the overcomer that he will share Christ's authority and rule over the nations; in iii. 12, that he will be a pillar in the temple of God and take the name of the city of God that comes down out of heaven from God; it seems most unnatural that John teaches that the only people who overcome in the Christian life are the martyrs. The matter appears settled by v. 9-10, the song of the four living creatures

and twenty-four elders; they ascribe praise to the Lamb for the redemption of His Church, that they may be "a Kingdom and priests", "*and they reign upon the earth*". That seems a proleptic reference to the millennial reign and therefore to the first resurrection. It only increases the difficulty of the conception, for that means that the Church as a whole participates in the first resurrection at the Parousia, while the rest of the dead wait until the close of the millennial Kingdom to be raised. It does not seem legitimate to identify the millennium with the present dispensation and the first resurrection with the "spiritual" resurrection taught in the Fourth Gospel. One can only hazard the suggestion that the seer has attempted to clarify the teaching of Jesus concerning the progress of the eschatological Kingdom, in accordance with expectations widely current in the primitive Church. Whether this development comes within the scope of the promise given by Jesus, in John xvi. 12-13, as to the guidance of the Spirit into the truth concerning "things to come", it is no purpose of the present paper to discuss. It may suffice to remark that this is not the only doctrine in the New Testament in which development by the apostles of the teaching of the Lord is discernible.

5. *The Kingdom of God and the Consummated Life.* In the Gospel the presence of the Kingdom in the ministry of Christ is taken for granted (iv. 23). The death of Christ is a crisis of liberation for the Kingdom, as is to be inferred from xii. 31, etc. All this, be it noted, is merely alluded to and is not made matter of explicit teaching. A similar phenomenon is observable in the Apocalypse. John is a partaker with his brethren in the "tribulation and kingdom and endurance in Jesus" (i. 9); the redeemed are made by Jesus "a kingdom and priests unto God" (i. 6). In the vision of Rev. xii. 7-12, already referred to as demonstrating the connection of the Cross with Judgment, it is probable that the seer also connects the Cross with the Kingdom, as in the Fourth Gospel: "*Now is come the salvation, and the power and the Kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ . . .*" This may be a proleptic description of the future triumph of Christ, but in view of the undoubted reference to the present Judgment of Satan by means of the Atonement, the other explanation seems preferable. The salvation and power and kingdom have become God's and the authority Christ's because of the redemption wrought on the Cross. Hence, the

"taking of the water of life freely" is John's equivalent to the "tasting the good word of God and the powers of the age to come" of the *auctor ad Hebraeos*.

It may be inferred from 1 John ii. 17 ("the world passeth away, and the lust thereof") that the Evangelist shared the expectation that the age to come will be enjoyed in new heavens and a new earth. The description by the seer of these new heavens and earth is too well known to need comment (Rev. xxi. 1-5). We have already noted his interposition of the millennial kingdom, which has no counterpart in the Fourth Gospel; probably the seer expected the 1,000 years to precede the *παλιγγενεσία*, though some deny it. The life of the age of consummation is alluded to in John xvii. 3 as the knowledge of God and of Christ. Perfect knowledge of God presumes a perfect fellowship with Him; the Apocalypse expresses this in the cry, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his peoples, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God" (xxi. 3). We cannot but recall John i. 14, in this statement: "The Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory . . ."; the temporary pitching of the tent of God among men is to become an eternal experience for the people of God. At that time "His servants shall serve him, and *they shall see his face*", says the seer (xxii. 4); "We know that if he shall be manifested we shall be like him, for *we shall see him even as he is*", writes the Evangelist (1 John iii. 2). Just as the city has no need of sun and moon, so is there no need for a temple; "For the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof" (Rev. xxi. 22). The Evangelist similarly reports Jesus as telling the woman of Sychar that the hour is coming when men will need neither the ruins of the temple of Gerizim, nor the temple at Jerusalem, but will worship God in a communion of spirit (John iv. 21). If that is experienced in this age, much more will it be in the age to come.

### III. CONCLUSION

The minimum conclusion to which this investigation leads us is that the theologies of the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse, far from being mutually exclusive, are harmonious. We cannot say that it drives us to conclude that the two books are of identical

authorship. I find it difficult to believe that an Apocalyptist would express his ideas in such an utterly unapocalyptic fashion as the Fourth Gospel. This Gospel, the Synoptic teaching generally, the Eschatological Discourse, and the Apocalypse of John, form a series in which eschatological ideas are expressed with an increasing amount of apocalypticism. The Eschatological Discourse is not strictly an Apocalypse ; it is largely devoid of the traditional machinery of Jewish apocalypses. The Apocalypse of John stands alone in the New Testament as expressing by means of this peculiar form the faith shared by the primitive Church as a whole. If not of the same authorship as the Fourth Gospel, the striking connections between the two books show an intimate link between the two authors. Charles follows Abbott in conjecturing that the seer must have been a disciple of the Fourth Evangelist. Whatever be the truth of the matter, though the writings contain different emphases, it is one Spirit that has actuated their authors. If He has led two men by devious paths to set forth one Truth, perhaps He will lead us the better to comprehend it if we seek His guidance with humility.

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY.

*Ilford,  
Essex.*