

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

IV.

Armageddon—Double ending of the Apocalypse—The Ezekielic ending and its date—the New Jerusalem.

Riddell. I fear I may tax your patience and attention to-day, Mason, but *à propos* of our discussion of Babylon being Rome, I have been trying to make out something of "the true inwardness"—as Matthew Arnold would say—of the last two chapters of the Apocalypse, which are a counterpart to the Elegy, or elegiac diatribe, on Rome.

Mason. You mean, I think, that the picture of the New Jerusalem is a counterpart to the picture of Rome in chapter xviii.

R. Yes, you remember there is a terrible battle in chapter xix., which I suppose we may call the Battle of Armageddon, though the name has not been mentioned since xvi. 16. Did you ever hear the striking suggestion of Hausrath that "Armageddon," while it means of course "City Megiddo" in Hebrew, sounds also very like Ha-Roma-haggedôlah, "Rome the Great," in Hebrew? Westcott and Hort in fact prefix the Ha—Harmageddon.

M. That is remarkable. Can you tell me what the LXX. puts for Megiddo?

R. It spells it *Μαγεδώ* or *Μαγεδών* or *Μαγεδδών* or *Μαγεδδώ*. The LXX. has all sorts of ways of spelling the same name.

M. Nothing however corresponding to the last syllable of Gedôlah?

R. No; we have to start with the name of Megiddo—as we call it—that famous field of more than one battle. Why

the seer should call it *Ar*-mageddon, instead of simple Mageddon, is rather a puzzle, unless he means the *city* of Rome; for *Ar* means "city," and there is no *city* worth mentioning of *Megiddo*. But if you ask why it should be written Har-mageddon, with the H, the answer is much the same, namely, that Har means (high) "mountain" as distinct from a "hill," and *Mount Megiddo* is a misnomer for the plain near Esdraelon: there is no Har at Megiddo. If then the H is correctly read, there was probably meant to be some suggestion of *the city* of Rome in the syllable prefixed. However that may be, this bloody battle is one of the most awful things in the Revelation. The idea of the fowls of the air being invited by the angel to the feast of carrion flesh of kings and chiliarchs (who *must* of course be Romans, for no other chiliarchs existed) and strong men, is very dreadful. It is a token of the uttermost loathing felt by the author for his country's foes.

M. Yes, it is inconceivable that he can have meant the apostate Jews of his own country, who after all were mostly patriotic. But I am eager to know what you have made out.

R. I submit to your notice, with some misgiving as to the details alone, a rearrangement of chapters xxi. and xxii. concerning the New Jerusalem. Whatever else you may think about it, I feel sure you will agree with me that enough is here said to show who are *not* included in it, and that it will never do to identify the picture of *Babylon* which we have discussed (*EXPOSITOR*, March 1902) with the picture of those who are *not of the new Jerusalem*. The two pictures can only be set over against each other as of two diametrically opposed cities, not as two forms or aspects or divisions of the same city or people. In other words, Babylon is not Jerusalem, nor Jerusalem Babylon. First of all, then, I will ask you to read the two accounts, which I call A and B, and which are here made out of what I

always had supposed was one account, though it was bewildering enough, indeed I think more so than any other portion of the book. Here they are :—

A

xxi. 9. And there came one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls, who were laden with the seven last plagues; and he spake with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the *bride*, the Lamb's wife.

xxi. 10. And he carried me away in the spirit to a mountain great and high, and he shewed me *the city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God*, having the glory of God.

[xxi. 11. Her luminary was like, etc., to xxi. 22, And I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof.

For these verses xxi. 11–22, which may be called the Ezekiel passage, see below.]

xxi. 23. And the city hath *no need of the sun*, neither of the moon, to shine upon it, for the glory of God *did* (doth) *lighten it*, and the *lamp* thereof is the Lamb.

xxi. 24. And the nations shall walk by the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.

xxi. 25. And the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day: for *there shall be no night there* :

xxi. 26. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it.

B

xxi. 2. And I saw *the city the holy Jerusalem new descending out of heaven from God*, prepared as a *bride* adorned for her husband.

xxii. 3. And the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall do him service :

xxii. 4. and they shall see his face: and his name shall be on their foreheads:

xxii. 5. and *night shall not be* any more; and they *need no light of lamp*, and (there is) *light of sun*; for the Lord God shall *lighten* them, and they shall reign for ever and ever.

xxi. 3. And I heard a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them.

xxi. 4. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, nor shall sorrow nor crying nor pain be any more.

xxii. 1. And he shewed me a river of *water of life*, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb

xxii. 2. in the midst of the street thereof. And on this side of the river and on that was a tree of life, bearing twelve crops of fruit, yielding its fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

xxii. 6. And he said to me, *These words are faithful and true.* And the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets sent his angel to shew his servants what must shortly *come to pass.*

xxii. 12. *Behold, I come quickly,* and my reward is with me to render to each as his work is.

31. *I am the A and the Ω, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.*

xx. 8, 9. [Homage offered to the angel.]

14. *Blessed* are they that wash their robes, that their power may be upon the tree of life, and by its gates they shall enter into the city.

15. Without are the dogs and the *sorcerers* and the *adulterers* and the *murderers* and the *idolaters*

xxii. 3a. And all that is accursed shall be no more.

xxi. 4. The first things have passed away.

xxi. 5. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.

xxi. 5. And he saith, Write, for *these words are faithful and true.*

xxi. 6. And he said to me, They have *come to pass.*

xxii. 7. and, *Behold, I come quickly.* *Blessed* is he that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book.

xxii. 10. And he saith to me, Seal not the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is short.

xxii. 11. He that is unrighteous let him be unrighteous still, and he that is filthy let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous let him do righteousness still, and he that is holy let him be holy still.

xxi. 6. *I am the A and the Ω, the beginning and the end.* I will give to him that thirsteth of the fountain of the *water of life* freely.

xxi. 7. He that overcometh shall inherit these things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son.

xxi. 8. But to the cowardly and unfaithful and *abominable* and *murderers* and *adulterers* and *sor-*

and every one that doeth and maketh a lie.

xxi. 27. And there shall not enter into it anything common and he that maketh *abomination* and *falsehood*: except they who are written in the Lamb's book of life.

cerers and *idolaters* and to all the *false*, their part is in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

The first point that must occur to the reader is the repetition of several phrases in these two chapters, a repetition which is wholly unlike any that we find in the rest of the book.

M. Yes, if I remember right, in Revelation i.—iii. there are some cases of repetition, but that repetition was made upon a definite plan, and here there is no such plan. Will you just tell me which the repeated phrases are?

R. The repeated phrases are: "The city the holy Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God," as "a bride," having "no need of sun," for "God lightens it"; "water of life," and "no night." "These words are faithful and true." "Behold, I come quickly." "I am the α and the Ω , the beginning and the end." "The abominable and murderers and adulterers and sorcerers and idolaters and all liars" are excluded from the city. Besides these ten expressions there are others which appear to be in correspondence; the sentences beginning "Blessed," the expressions "what must shortly come to pass" and "it hath come to pass," and those which refer to the temple and the tabernacle respectively. These repetitions would be intelligible enough if we had two separate visions first described separately and then combined into one account, but they are not intelligible in the form and in the order which our Apocalypse presents.

M. I wish you would tell me what the difficulties are in the present arrangement of our chapters xxi. and xxii.

R. They are very clear. First of all, (1) chapter xxi.

begins with the statement, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth had gone away, and the sea is no more. And I saw the city the holy Jerusalem new, etc." Then it proceeds: "And I heard a loud voice out of the throne." Where is the throne? It will be said that "the great white throne" has been already mentioned in the previous chapter (xx. 11) with "Him that sat upon it." But that will not do. The difficulty is that in xxii. it is added that "the earth and the heaven fled from before His face." If after the appearance of the new heaven and new earth the throne is to be understood as being again set in the new Jerusalem, then it is more reasonable that this should be stated plainly, as it is in the fourth line of B.

M. You mean it is more reasonable so, than for us to be left to draw the inference that the one vision melts into the other and is continued by it. There is undoubtedly a great difficulty in saying that "the sea gave up the dead which were in it" (xx. 13), and immediately afterwards that "the sea is no more" (xxi. 1). It is a question of how close the chronological sequence is meant to be, for although the phenomena are those of eternity, they are represented here, as throughout the book, under the terms of sense, "I saw," "I heard."

R. Exactly so. Now, I would ask you to tell me which you think is the more likely sequence of the two following: (a) The great white throne; the disappearance of heaven and earth; the dead standing before it; the books opened; the judgment; the sea and death and Hades having rendered up their dead; death and Hades being then cast into the lake of fire; the same sentence on those who are not found written in the book; a new heaven and earth without sea; and the new Jerusalem descending, etc.: or

(b) Two visions: One of judgment before the throne, in which the sea still figures after the heaven and earth have

fled, until it melts into the lake of fire which swallows up death and Hades: the other, separate from it, in which there is a new heaven and earth and no sea?

M. I do not think there can be any doubt that the supposition of two visions is more reasonable.

R. But if so, the throne of God should be described as present in the new Jerusalem. No more is required than the mere mention that it is there. The great white throne and He that sat thereon had previously been such that from His face the heaven and the earth fled, and *there was no room found for them*. Surely some word is required to inform us that the throne is now in the city, which is therefore large enough to contain it, in such a way that "the tabernacle of God is with men." But there is no such word given us.

M. Well, I admit that we may feel that something is required.

R. Then again (2), we have had nothing to connect "men" (xxi. 3) with those whose names are "written in the book of Life" (xx. 15).

M. But I should be inclined to argue that since all other men but these have been cast into the lake of fire (xx. 15), there is no need to characterize "men" any further.

R. And my reply would be that against that lies the grave and insuperable objection that the author does carefully state what becomes of the rest of men when in xxi. 8 he says, "But for the cowards and unfaithful and abominable and murderers and fornicators and sorcerers and idolaters and all the false, their part is in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." This is quite intelligible if only we do not suppose it to be a repetition of what was said nine verses before *in the same* vision, but it is not reasonable to think that the author would say in xx. 14, 15, "This is the second death, the lake of fire; and if any was not found written in the book of life, he

was cast into the lake of fire," and would then proceed, eight verses later to include *in the same vision* the words just quoted from xxi. 8.

M. I see your point. You are opposed to the idea of repetition in a literary work, except for just cause. But is the Revelation a literary work?

R. We will deal with that question later. I proceed to another reason. (3) The course of the paragraph has now run on to the end of xxi. 8, "the second death," without interruption, unless we admit the insertion of the words, "And all that is accursed shall be no more" (xxii. 3a) after the words, "pain shall be no more" (xxi. 4). Upon this possible insertion something will be said later. But when we come to xxi. 9 we have an almost insuperable difficulty, unless we assume it to be the opening of a distinct vision. For otherwise it is an insipid repetition of what has been said only seven verses before. And yet it is described as if it were something entirely new, introduced by the agency of another angel. "And there came one of the seven angels that had the seven bowls of them that were full of the seven last plagues, and spake with me, saying, Come hither; I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he brought me away in the spirit to a mountain great and high, and shewed me the city, the holy Jerusalem, descending," etc. By what straining of language can we possibly suppose that the former statement, "And I saw the city . . ." (xxi. 2) is a mere brief anticipation of this fuller picture?

M. I think with you that it would be a straining towards an insipid *réchauffé*. So far as I observe, the seer's usual method is here followed, by which he opens every fresh successive stage of vision by the words, "And there came . . . and he spake, saying . . . and he brought . . . and he shewed me." The freshness of the original vision is not reproduced by any description which purports to describe

something freshly seen when it has been seen before. And so you ask, Why should we make the seer his own mar-plot when we can adopt the simple solution that two parallel visions, seen at different times, and differently treated by the seer as parallel, have been suddenly merged into one by a copyist or editor, possibly through some accident to the original manuscript?

R. That is what I ask. I hope I am not exorbitant, though I am sorry to tax your patience. Now, will you (4) follow this vision, which commences at xxi. 9? You will find that it contains a gorgeous and elaborate description of the new Jerusalem very closely based upon Ezekiel, a point to which we will return presently. Meanwhile we pass on to xxii. 6, "And he said to me, These words are faithful and true," and we must here ask, Which words are meant? There have been no words quoted as the angel's ever since xxi. 9. From that point onward the description is the seer's own. Nor can "these words" mean "the following," because the next sentences both begin with "And": "And the Lord God," "And, behold, I come quickly" (xxii. 6, 7). We are entitled to hold that, as in other cases where the expression "These words are faithful and true" occurs (xxi. 5; xix. 9), so here also it must refer to words in the immediate context. As there are none in the present arrangement to which they can refer, we must find some other arrangement, and such is found in column A, where they refer to xxii. 12: "Behold I come quickly . . ." The very fact that this is almost the same as "*and* Behold I come quickly . . ." may well have seemed to the copyist who is responsible for the present arrangement to serve as his justification for making the change.

M. You will tax my patience, Riddell, if you say too much about a copyist. I confess he is a *bête-noire*.

R. (5) Proceeding with xxii. 6, we find that the angel was sent to show God's servants (who are in any case the

Christian Prophets (xxii. 9 ; xix. 10), including especially the writer himself) things which *must shortly come to pass* ; and you recollect that in xxi. 6 we had, "And he said to me, They (the words) have come to pass" : the words referred to being the words, "Behold, I make all things new," which immediately precede.

M. Is there anything contradictory or otherwise objectionable in saying that some things have come to pass, and then that other things must come to pass ?

R. Certainly ; a contradiction it is, upon the supposition that the present arrangement is authentic. First we read that all things have been made new ; then, a chapter later, in the same description, *ex hypothesi*, that certain things—which can only be the same things, the details of the new Jerusalem, since no others are mentioned before the book itself comes to an end—must come to pass. Had the order been reversed in our present arrangement, so that the "must shortly come to pass" preceded "they have come to pass," we might have understood the two statements as the opening and the close of the description ; but as the order stands, this solution is out of the question, and we are compelled to conclude that we have two parallel accounts, which, however, so far from being identical, exhibit a difference in the time of their composition, A being earlier than B, along with other contrasts of some importance which we shall presently see.

M. Hold hard : you overwhelm me, Riddell, with your conclusion that A is earlier than B. I am not prepared to have all these crushing results hurled at me so fast.

R. Sorry, Mason, but I am sometimes carried too far for the moment. My point is that there are two accounts, and you will admit that two accounts cannot possibly be quite simultaneous, and that therefore one is prior to the other. Never mind, then, just now, which is the earlier.

M. Good. But you seem to have more to say in proof of your point that there are two.

R. (6) It is not easy to see how xxi. 8 can be followed in the same vision by xxi. 27; for if all the specified kinds of evil persons have their part in the lake of fire, into which they were actually cast in xx. 15, it is quite unreasonable to add shortly afterwards that two of these specified kinds "shall not enter into the city."

M. I agree that it is superfluous.

R. I will be content for the present with your bare agreement, and I am now coming to my "seventh and lastly."

This last point (7) to notice is the parenthetic passage xxii. 8, 9, followed by another (xxii. 10, 11) which may perhaps belong to it. The homage offered by the seer to "the angel who sheweth him these things," that is, the angel of the seven plagues (xxi. 9), might belong to almost any stage in the vision, and be recorded at any part of the description. It is in accordance with the usual practice of the Prophets. We have already had it in almost the same language in xix. 10. We shall see homage offered by Cornelius to the Prophet Peter at Caesarea in Acts x. 25, 26, in very similar terms, and we shall see a reference to it in 1 Corinthians xiv. 25. There is no great difficulty connected with the occurrence of this passage where it does occur, except indeed that it cuts off the verses xxii. 12-15 from the preceding part of the narrative.

M. Yes, but allow me to offer a probable explanation of their present order, one which commends itself to most readers, namely, that the several momentous expressions, "Behold I come quickly . . ." "I am the α and the ω . . ." "Blessed are they . . ." are placed here as echoes, "lingering on and loth to die," of the preceding description. Will this not satisfy you?

R. I do not think that such an explanation is quite satis-

factory, because, to mention only two reasons, (1) they are not simply echoes, but each one, while it begins like a previous statement (xxii. 7, xxi. 6), ends in a different way of its own; and (2) there is no introduction to them. In xxii. 10 the subject meant in "*he saith to me, Seal not . . .*" may or may not be the angel as the passage stands. But if it be the angel, the subject of the solemn expressions which immediately follow, "*Behold I come . . .*," "*I am the A and the Ω,*" is certainly not the angel, but the Lord Jesus, as in verse 16. Consequently the best that can be said in favour of the present arrangement is that here in xxii. 12-15 there are many disjointed statements.

M. Disjointed, yes: no one can deny that.

R. But may we not boldly say that they are *dislocated*, and by a slight readjustment arrange them all as the columns A and B exhibit them above?

M. Lead on then, and help me to examine this arrangement, which is yours.

R. We have seen already that A is earlier than B. It is also very much fuller. The angel takes the seer to a high mountain to show him the bride, while in B no angel is mentioned throughout. In A the lines of Ezekiel's description of the restored Jerusalem are followed so closely by the seer that I have ventured to draw up a list of the original passages of Ezekiel (LXX.) for your convenience in comparison.

M. I begin to wish very much that the whole LXX. were available in an English version.

R. Certainly you would be astonished very often if you had one. Here is my list of the passages, from Ezekiel alone, which the author of Revelation has used in his A account:

Ezek. xl. 1. "*He led me . . . and set me upon a very high mountain.*" (Rev. xxi. 10.)

Ezek. xvi. 8, 11. "*I entered into a covenant with thee*

(Jerusalem), saith the Lord, and thou becamest Mine . . . And I adorned thee with adornment." (Rev. xxi. 9.)

Ezek. xliii. 2. "And behold the glory of the God of Israel was coming (into the city) . . . and the earth shone forth as light from the glory around." (Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. xxviii. 16. "The cherub led thee out of the midst of stones of fire." (This illustrates the comparison of "her luminary" to "jasper stone." Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. i. 22. "The appearance of crystal." (Rev. xxi. 11.)

Ezek. xlvi. 31. "The gates of the city by the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; to the north three gates . . . and the eastern side . . . three gates . . . and the southern side . . . three gates . . . and the seaside . . . three gates." (Rev. xxi. 13.)

Ezek. xl. 3. "And in his hand was a builder's line and a reed measure." (Rev. xxi. 15.)

Ezek. xliii. 16. "And Ariel (Jerusalem) is of twelve cubits by twelve cubits, foursquare upon its four parts." (Rev. xxi. 16.)

Ezek. xlvi. 8. foll. "Length twenty-five thousands, and breadth twenty-five thousands." (The reading in Rev. xxi. 16, "furlongs," is very doubtful, and it may very likely not be original at all.)

Ezek. xliii. 13 appears to give the standard of the cubit. (Rev. xxi. 17.)

Ezek. xxviii. 13. "Thou (Prince of Tyre) hast been clothed with every precious stone, sardius and topaz and emerald (and jacinth) . . . and sapphire and jasper . . . and amethyst and chrysolite and beryl." (Rev. xxi. 19, 20.)

Ezek. xvi. 24. "Thou (Jerusalem) madest thyself an eminent place in every street." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xliii. 5. "Behold, the house was full of the glory of the Lord." (xxi. 23.)

Ezek. xliii. 7. "Thou hast seen, son of man, the place of

My throne . . . , where My name shall tabernacle." (Rev. xxii. 1.)

Ezek. xlvii. 7. "And behold, upon the margin of the river very many trees on this side and on that." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xlvii. 8. "And the waters shall heal." (Rev. xxii. 1.)

Ezek. xlvii. 9. "And whithersoever the river shall come (things) shall live." (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. xlvii. 12. "Neither shall its fruit fail : it shall bring forth new fruit according to its months (Heb.), and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and its increase for health." (The whole passage is much perplexed in LXX. and appears to have been much discussed. There is probably much more in the various readings than has been hitherto shown.) (Rev. xxii. 2.)

Ezek. ix. 4. "Go through Jerusalem, and put a sign upon the foreheads of the men who groan." (Rev. xxii. 4.)

Ezek. xlv. 17. "And it shall be that when they enter the gates of the inner court, they shall put on linen garments." (Rev. xxii. 14.)

Ezek. xliii. 7. "The house of Israel shall no more profane My holy name by their fornication and their murders." (Rev. xxii. 15.)

M. That is a good long list.

R. Remember that the above citations are not the only passages on which the A description is based by the seer. But they suffice to show how largely his mind was affected by Ezekiel in the portraiture of this particular vision.

M. Do I understand you to say that in his B account he avoids the use of Ezekiel ?

R. No, he quotes (Rev. xxi. 3) a passage from Ezekiel xxxvii. 27 rather closely: "And my tabernacling shall be amongst them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And the nations shall know that I am the Lord who sanctify them": although Zechariah ii. 10 is another text which may here be laid equally under contribution.

Further comparison of the features of A and of B shows that while A contains no temple, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple thereof," B declares that "the tabernacle of God is with men."

M. Do you mean then that the tabernacle is to be understood as part of the holy city ?

R. No. We have been told that the "throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it," but we are not told of any other visible contents. "The fountain of the water of life" may be supposed to be in or near it; but it does not seem to require to be specially localized, and as far as this detail of B is concerned it may as well be part of the Paradise of God as of the City of God.

M. In fact I might urge that the picture of B is a city without foundations, without walls, without gates, without temple, without food to eat, perhaps without a fountain to drink.

R. Yes. Whereas A says that people shall enter the city by the gates, and that nothing common or evil shall enter into it, B is very different, for no entrance or exclusion is mentioned at all; the evil are said to have their part already in the lake of fire. Yet B has a royal throne, citizens, light, joy, refreshment, promise of inheritance, freedom from sin. B is an entire contrast to the old Jerusalem. The presence of God and the union of His servants with Him—for they shall serve, shall see Him, shall bear His name, shall reign for ever—seems to be the grand feature of B.

M. I see that you make B to be a very great contrast to A. A is glorious and complex. B is simple, almost *jejeune*.

R. My last observation leads to another in reference to Revelation i.-iii. These three chapters, as I have endeavoured to show elsewhere, were written at Patmos, after the bulk of iv.-xxii. was written at Ephesus. But B contains the promise: "He that overcometh shall inherit

these things, and I will be his God and he shall be My son." Along with this must be set the recurring promise, "To him that overcometh will I give . . ." in ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21. There is a striking resemblance of form.

M. You refer to a part of the ending of each of the Epistles to the Seven Churches?

R. Yes. Moreover it is very remarkable that of these seven passages in Revelation ii., iii., no less than five refer directly to the two endings of the book arranged in A and B.

ii. 7. To eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God (A).

ii. 11. To be not hurt of the second death (B).

iii. 5. To be clothed in white garments, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life (A).

iii. 12. To be a pillar in the temple of My God, and he shall not come forth out of it again, and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, which descendeth out of heaven from My God, and My new name (A) (B).

iii. 21. To sit with Me in My throne (A) (B).

The other two refer to passages very late in the book, which, equally with A and B, appear to me to have been written before ii. and iii.

ii. 17. To partake of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he who receiveth it. This is based upon xix. 12.

ii. 26. To have power over the nations, and he shall shepherd them with a rod of iron, as the potter's vessels are broken in pieces. This is based on the same passage as the preceding, xix. 15.

M. The last text is rather terrible in its import. It hardly breathes a Christian spirit at all. It is the remnant of Jewish patriotism. But what do you infer?

R. The inference appears to be justified, that xix., xx., xxi., xxii. were written *before* ii. and iii., and therefore *before the greater part of* i.; and it seems probable that the form of the promise in xxi. 7 has suggested the recurrent form of it in ii. and iii. The question arises whether we can find in ii. and iii. any clue to the date of this composition. We are dealing just here in probabilities only, perhaps shadowy probabilities, but it is always worth while to see which way the probabilities point, and I am much mistaken if we have not such a clue in ii. 5, "Repent and do the first works: otherwise I come to thee and I will *remove thy candlestick out of its place*, unless thou repent." After the destruction of Jerusalem it would be known that the Golden Candlestick had been removed to Rome. The Prophet warns "the Ephesian Angel of the Church" that a similar fate awaits it unless it repents.

M. Whom do you understand by the Angel of the Church?

R. I look first at the Synagogue, and I find that the position of the angel in the synagogue was partly that of a churchwarden and partly that of a vice-chaplain. I infer then that the angel's office was analogous to that of the synagogue angel. For the Jewish complexion of the Epistles to the seven Churches is visible in almost every verse. You may well say that some of their contents are hardly Christian.

M. Your clue to the date of this part of Revelation is interesting. Have I heard it before?

R. I do not know. Probably not. One other clue is almost certainly to be found in iii. 12, "The name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, that descendeth out of heaven from God, and My new name." Is it possible, let me ask you, that a new Jerusalem could be contemplated as coming into existence or into sight as long as Jerusalem stood intact? This is a question which any reader can put to himself.

M. St. Paul knew of two Jerusalems, did he not? both existing at the same time.

R. Of course he did, but the difficulty is rather about the *descent*. When St. Paul says "the Jerusalem which is above is free," he is indeed using the language of a Prophet, into which a long disquisition might well be made; but he does not speak of that Jerusalem descending direct from God *out of* heaven, it remains *in* heaven. The time for its descent would be when the earthly Jerusalem was about to disappear or had disappeared.

M. Perhaps so. I have not considered the question.

R. Yet it is not easy to think that any one, Jew or heathen or Christian, ever could bring himself to think that Jerusalem would disappear. That it should be not only encompassed with armies but captured, that the Temple should be destroyed, that vast multitudes should perish—these were disasters that could be dreaded and anticipated; but that the Saviour's words, "They shall not leave one stone standing upon another in thee," should be fulfilled in their literal thoroughness is almost more than any man could believe until the fulfilment took place, or just before it. The upholders of the late Domitianic date (95 A.D.) for the composition of the Apocalypse have no difficulty here, and they make a strong point of the probability that no visible Jerusalem was standing when xxi., xxii. were written. And yet they can make but a poor case for the Domitianic date out of the warning in ii. 5, that the candlestick of Ephesus would be removed out of its place. For what a frigid reference that would be to an event which was some twenty-five years ago! Those words must have been written *soon* after 70 A.D., when the golden candlestick of Jerusalem was removed out of its place to Rome. And can you not imagine the seer writing A in 69–70, when Jerusalem was a doomed place though still standing?

M. Yes. I can imagine how he fell back in imagination

on the bold outlines of Ezekiel's prophecy for comfort and relief in those weeks of agonizing suspense.

R. There must have been a state of fearful suspense for months before September 2, or whatever later date was required for the news of the fall of the city to travel to Asia.

M. I have looked out the place in Ezekiel, and now I should like to ask you whether it may not be plausibly urged against such a view that the prophecy of Ezekiel, on which so much of xxi., xxii. is based, belongs to a definite date, "the fourteenth year after the city was *taken*" (Ezek. xl., LXX.); and that therefore the seer was likely to have written his prophecy *after* 70 A.D., if not even the fourteenth year after that date.

R. Extremely fanciful. That the seer had before his eyes the plain statement of Ezekiel's own date, is simple fact; but he had had this date before him all his life. There was nothing occurring in 84 A.D. to evoke such a reconstruction of Ezekiel's prophecy. It is fanciful to suppose that the seer, or some pupil of his, would wait till 84 merely to produce a correspondence of the two prophecies in a particular point which is nowhere mentioned, and which would lead to nothing. Nor did he need to wait even till 71. For we have to bear in mind that the capture of Jerusalem was a gradual process. And here there is, as it happens, one stage which is worth attention. On May 6, A.D. 70, Titus became master of the outer quarter of the city called Bezetha, and in Greek *Καινόπολις*, "Newtown." Those who insist that the prophecy A must have been written *after* the capture of Jerusalem may fairly observe that this name is almost identically reproduced in the Apocalypse, "I saw the *city* the holy Jerusalem, *new* descending . . ."

M. It is a curious coincidence.

R. A coincidence, and probably nothing more, as regards the name. But as regards the capture of part of the city—

and it was a large part, the northern quarter extending from the Jaffa gate and Herod's palace on the west to the valley of Jehoshaphat and the Temple platform on the east—it is probable that the news of this partial capture would reach Asia in some exaggerated form, so that it would be reported that *the city was taken* some four months before this was true.

M. On the whole then you think there seems to be nothing adverse to the conclusion that A was written about the middle of the year 70, and that B was written rather later, when the full extent of the utter destruction was made known. Would this conclusion throw light upon the contrast between xxii. 6, "what must shortly come to pass," and xxi. 6, "they have come to pass"?

R. Yes, some. In writing A, the seer contemplates the dissolution of the city, disappearing in the storms and tumults of the seven plagues; yet he finds mental and spiritual relief by being led by one of the angels of those same plagues to the view of a brighter, holier future, in which the "Jerusalem which is above" is realized, as the wife of the Lamb. But in writing B he has pondered upon the limitations of A only to attain a simpler conception of the heavenly city. In the saying of Him that sat upon the throne, "Behold, I make all things new," there is involved a new conception of Jerusalem, as wholly distinct from the old, wholly distinct from the restoration of it by the mouth of Ezekiel or by his own previous vision. And the words "have come to pass," "the first things have passed away," imply that they are never to return, not even as the foundation of a new ideal city. The ancient watchwords still hold good, and are to him the keys of his present existence: "Behold, I come quickly." "I am the α and the ω ." "He that overcometh shall inherit these things." But now, instead of the washing of robes that they may enter by the gates into the city, the blessing is attached to the

plainer and more comprehensive duty of "keeping the words of the prophecy of this book." But what a remarkable feature is this! Never before, except in i. 11, "What thou seest write in a book and send to the seven churches," have we had the idea of a book expressed at all. Each separate prophecy has been as separate as those of Isaiah and the ancient prophecies; it has embodied a separate ecstasy, a separate vision. No idea of binding them together into a volume has been expressed. But in xxii. 9 we read, "I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren the prophets and of them that keep the words of this book"; in xxii. 10, "Seal not the words of the prophecy of this book." When we come to xxii. 18 we have reached a further point in history, at which the book is destined expressly to be read in church, and contemplated as being read, and read without addition to it or diminution from it: "I testify to every one that heareth (as they are read aloud) the words of the prophecy of this book."

M. It appears to me that you take the words seriously. And so we ought to do. I thank you for it. But, tell me, is there not still a difficulty in xxii. 9? You said that "the angel which sheweth me these things" belongs to A and not to B; and you maintain that A was written previously to B, and that the first mention of the prophecies being gathered into a book occurs only in B. But xxii. 9, which is in A, also refers to a book. How do you account for that?

R. I acknowledge the difficulty. But I think it is possible that the idea of collection into a book may have been present to the seer as early as the conclusion of the great vision of the descended holy Jerusalem. Nothing is gained by supposing that it was seen early in the seer's career, or by supposing that the order of the book is anything else than the order in which the visions were seen. Let us assume then that this vision is the crown and climax of his

Apocalypse. As the Prophets of old had collected their prophecies, or had them collected for them, so should this Christian Prophet do. This supposition appears to do no violence to the conclusions obtained above. Or another is possible, namely, that the seer himself inserted the words "and of them who keep the words of this book" after "thy brethren the prophets," when he was himself combining the two accounts into one. "Keep" has the double meaning of "guard" in the sense of a guardian in office, and of "observe" in the sense of a layman; the latter being much the commoner, and very frequent in the New Testament. But it would be possible to translate, "of the prophets, even of them who guard the words of this book." "The book" cannot, I think, be any other than our Apocalypse. It would not be safe to say that it was the book of Ezekiel, from which so much of the vision of the new Jerusalem was drawn. The supposition that we have here a later insertion of the seer as editor is still easier than the other. But perhaps the easiest of all would be—

M. If you are going to resort to a copyist again, Riddell, I shall despise you!

R. Well, Mason, now that you have used the word, let me only say that after he had read that a blessing was pronounced on "him who kept the words of the prophecy of this book," it would seem to be no exaggeration of claim that such an one should be called "blessed" along with the Prophets whose fellow-servant the angel declared himself to be. You will agree that the seer's autograph was copied by some copyist.

M. I am becoming impatient, and the hour is late. Just tell me how you explain the reference in xxii. 11 to wickedness still and righteousness still.

R. It is one that appears to suit a time when persistency in set habits had not been yet awakened and overthrown by a catastrophic crisis such as had then occurred. "A little

further on" the course of the present world must travel first, before the awakening, but only a little; the issue, though deferred, is still certain, and "the consequences" of human actions "will be what they will be." Sorry to have tired you, Mason.

M. Not at all, Riddell. Now good night; and thank you for being such a "painstaking controversialist."

R. As the Greek professor said of the other Greek professor, whom he had just demolished!

M. A thousand pardons! What am I saying? I must be asleep. I meant to say that you have really worked hard at your thesis, and you make me think.

R. Thanks, old man. That is a higher compliment than to say I persuade you. Good night!

E. C. SELWYN.

HENRY DRUMMOND.¹

IN venturing to address you upon Henry Drummond, I propose mainly to consider his life as a type of modern Christianity, and to offer some reflections upon it. The world has lived too long upon its past; the Christian is still overmuch tempted to point to the sample saints of long gone days as if these latter years were barren in example of men who lived continually near to God. Why should we thus incessantly turn to the early imitators of the Lord Christ as if they, more than the noblest men and women of today, could teach and inspire us to walk worthily? It is a pagan notion that finds the Golden Age in the misty past; for the Christian it lies in the future. It is being brought nearer by the lives and labours of just such men as Henry Drummond, and it is they as nearest us whom we should study, whose work we must take up. For there is no reason apart

¹ An address delivered to the first-year students of the United Free Church College, Glasgow.