

a man accustomed to great cities,—Philo, in spite of these and other noticeable affinities, is nevertheless sharply contrasted with St. Paul. We can perhaps formulate the contrast by saying that Philo, the Platonist and man of letters, stands at the last stage of the ancient culture, unconnected with the masses. St. Paul, the practical man and witness to Christ, stands at the beginning of the religious transformation, surrounded by the non-literary inhabitants of the great city.

The result of our observations so far is this: Primitive Christianity, alike in its leading personalities and in the preponderating number of its adherents, was a movement of the lower classes. The water of life did not filter down from the upper level to the many and the insignificant, but came welling forth from the depths of a soul of Divine simplicity. The first to drink of it were fainting stragglers from the great caravan of the unknown and the forgotten. Again it was a simple man who led forth the waters of the unquenchable spring into the world, for simple men and women to drink at. Let two or three generations pass away, and then the wise and prudent will be thronging to the well-spring.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

WELLHAUSEN AND OTHERS ON THE APOCALYPSE.

THIRTEEN years ago it looked as if the analytic, literary method of investigating the Apocalypse of John had almost exhausted itself. Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, published in 1895, opened up a fresh method of research, which promised to solve the problem of the book by exploiting the hypothesis of different eschatological traditions ultimately derived from oriental cosmology and current in the writer's

age. The searching analyses which had been started during the preceding ten years had reached no common goal. Some of them were critical eccentricities, and others were critical outrages. In part, they had been ultra-literary. In part, they had not been conducted upon the principles of genuine literary criticism. In any case, it was argued by the exponents of the newer method, they had failed to take account, or at least proper account, of one vital factor in the Apocalypse, viz., the time-honoured conceptions of Jewish eschatology. This contention was urged in the flush of a critical reform with more ardour than accuracy. It was not difficult to predict that the next advance would be along the lines not of an internecine but of a co-operative relation between these two methods. Instead of one method suppressing the other, both would require to adjust themselves to the special data of the Apocalypse itself, bearing in mind not only its resemblances to previous apocalypses but its intrinsic qualities. As a matter of fact, the newer method has not killed the older. Since 1895, several previous adherents of the literary method have re-adjusted their views to the fresh conditions of the problem, while one or two others have come forward for the first time with independent attempts to exploit the principles of source-criticism.

Of the former class, Charles Bruston, von Soden, and Daniel Völter are the most outstanding. The veteran French scholar had already published an essay on the Number of the Beast (1880), in which (like Gunkel, pp. 352 f.) he attacked the idea of *Nero redivivus*, and denied that such a legend could be present to the mind of the prophet John. This was followed by *Études sur l'Apocalypse* (1884) and *Origines de l'Apocalypse* (1888). The main results of these studies, partially revised in the light of recent research, are now re-stated in his *Études sur Daniel et l'Apocalypse* = (1908). Bruston is quite undeterred by the pretensions of

the newer school. He believes still in his source-criticism. The Apocalypse, according to him, consists of one apocalypse (introduction=i. 4-end, letters=ii.-iii., visions=iv.-ix., x. 1, 2*b*-7, xi. 14-19, xiv. 2-5, 12-13, xix. 4-10, xxi. 1-8, epilogue=xxii. 6-13, 16-17, 20-21) into which an earlier apocalypse (introduction=x. 1-2, 8-11, vision of Judaism=xi. 1-13, 19*a*, vision of the Roman Empire and the world=xii.-xiii., xiv. 1, 4*f*., xv. 2-4, xvi. 13-16, 19*b*, xvii.-xix. 3, xix. 11-xx.) has been dovetailed by an editor or compiler who added a few passages like xv. 1, 5-8, xvi. 1-12, 17-21, xxi. 9-xxii. 5, and probably xxii. 14-15, 18-19, besides i. 1-3. The earlier apocalypse was composed during the reign of Nero, the sixth emperor (xvii. 10). The second must be dated after the death of John the apostle; it was written by one of his disciples, possibly with the authority, and upon the basis of the visions, of his dead master.

A special feature of Bruston's position is that both of these apocalypses are held to have been not only Christian but originally written in Hebrew.¹ This helps to explain the comparative uniformity of the Greek style² as due to a later editor or translator. It also clears up the problem of the Hebraistic idioms which occur throughout the book. But, while one or two passages in the Apocalypse are certainly to be referred to a Hebrew or Aramaic original (e.g. chap. xi. and xii.), it is extremely difficult to understand how a scrip-

¹ A curt, unconvincing statement of the Hebrew original of John's apocalypse was printed by an anonymous critic in the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wiss.* (1887), pp. 167-171.

² Dr. Abbott's (*Notes on New Test. Criticism*, p. 113) recent protest, which tallies with Harnack's verdict on the author of Acts, is both timely and sound: "From a grammatical point of view the hypothesis of the compilation of documents is most unlikely. Differences of style undoubtedly exist in different portions of Revelation, but not a tenth part of such differences as separate *The Tempest* from *Richard II.*" The analogy is not on all fours, however. Allowance must be made here and there for John's use of earlier sources, especially of Hebrew or Aramaic ones, if the data of the book are to be cleared up.

ture intended for Christian readers in Asia Minor should have been written in Hebrew. Bruston admits this obstacle to his theory. His solution is that it was at once translated into Greek for the purpose of transmission and circulation. But this only solves one difficulty by raising another.

The hypothesis of a Jewish source (or sources), upon the other hand, has not yet faded from the field entirely. Thus Von Soden, who had already analysed the Apocalypse in the essay which he contributed to the *Theologische Abhandlungen* (p. 115) seventeen years ago, returns to the subject in his *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte* (1905, pp. 171 f. ; Eng. Tr. *The History of Early Christian Literature*, 1906, pp. 337 f.). He finds a Jewish apocalypse in chap. viii. f., with Christian editorial additions in the references to the Lamb, to Christ (e.g. xi. 15), and to the apostles (xviii. 20, xxi. 14), in passages like xii. 11 (xiv. 1-5 ?), xvii. 14, and elsewhere. This first Christian editor, John, is to be distinguished from a second who put John's original apocalypse into its present form. The argument, in short, is that this original apocalypse of John, beginning with i. 4, was subsequently revised (i. 1-3, xxii. 18-21) by another editor who interpolated short notes (e.g. in v. 6, 8, ix. 19, xx. 2, 14, xix. 8, 10, xxi. 8, etc.). The Jewish apocalypse thus incorporated by John was composed between May and August of 70 A.D. John himself wrote under Domitian; he was the presbyter of Asia Minor, not the son of Zebedee. Von Soden rejects the hypothesis of pseudonymity (p. 444).

The twelve criteria (pp. 372 f.) of style and thought which distinguish the Jewish source from the Christian apocalypse are far from adequate, however. One cardinal flaw in Von Soden's analysis is his failure to recognize that even in Jewish and Jewish-Christian eschatology there was seldom any homogeneous view of the future. He neglects the results of

the "traditional" method almost entirely, and this vitiates his adroit hypothesis with an ultra-literary bias.

Much more justice is done to the time-honoured traditions of current eschatology by Völter, though his literary analysis of the Apocalypse is more complicated and violent than that of Von Soden.¹ Völter's latest volume (*Die Offenbarung Johannes neu untersucht und erklärt*, 1904) represents a certain modification of the unwieldy theories which he had previously floated in *Die Entstehung d. Apokalypse* (1882, second edition 1885) and *Das Problem der Apokalypse* (1893). He now postulates an apocalypse written by John Mark (about 65 A.D.: = i. 4-6, iv. 1-v. 10, vi. 1-vii. 8, viii.-ix, xi. 14-19, xiv. 1-3, 6-7, 14-20, xviii. 1-xix. 4, 5-10) and an apocalypse of Cerinthus (written about 70 A.D. := x. 1-11, xvii. 1-18, xi. 1-13, xii. 1-16, xv. 5-6, 8, xvi. 1-21, xix. 11, xxii. 6), both of which were edited under Trajan² (i. 7-8, vii. 9-17, xii. 11, 18-xiii. 18, xiv. 4-5, 9-12, xv. 1-4, xxi. 22-27, etc.) and Hadrian. Völter accepts Gunkel's principle of tradition. He finds Babylonian and (especially) Zoroastrian elements in the Apocalypse, but he professes that he is unable to account for the internal data and the ecclesiastical traditions of the book without some source-analysis such as he ventures to print.

Three fresh critics have also ridden into the lists. In the same year as Völter published his latest essay, Professor Johannes Weiss of Marburg issued a monograph upon the

¹ Völter thus agrees with Spitta in attributing part of the Apocalypse to John Mark, though Spitta's John-apocalypse is different (i. 4-6, 9-19, ii.-vi., viii. 1, vii. 9-17, xix. 9b-10, xxii. 8, 13, 16a-17, 18a, 20b-21). Spitta's general view, that a Christian apocalypse has been fused with Jewish sources and subsequently edited, is reproduced by J. Weiss among recent critics.

² A Trajanic editor is required in order to explain the ten emperors which Völter finds in xiii. 1. This is even less convincing than the attempt to postulate a Hadrianic editor in order to account for the opposition of the Jews to Polycarp in Smyrna which Völter finds in chap. ii.

sources of the Apocalypse which appeared, oddly enough, in a series devoted to the interests of the "eschatological tradition" school (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, in Bousset and Gunkel's *Forschungen zur Religion u. Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Heft 3). Since then he has written, on the same lines, a brief commentary in his own *Schriften des NT.* (1907). Weiss, like Völter and Bruston, practically bisects the Apocalypse. He posits a Jewish apocalypse (Q), written in 70 A.D.; also a Christian apocalypse (68-70 A.D.), perhaps written by John the presbyter of Asia Minor, and preserved in i. 4-6 (7-8), 9-19, ii.-vii., ix., xii. 7-12, xiii. 11-18 (xiv. 1-5), xiv. 14-20, xx. 1-15, xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-5, 8 f. These were edited in 95 A.D. by a disciple of John the presbyter. The process of composition may be roughly outlined as follows. First of all we get the Jewish apocalypse (Q) contained in x., xi. 1-13, xii. 1-6, 14-17 (xiii. 1-7), xv.-xix., xxi. 4-27. This collection of small fragments is the *βιβλαρίδιον* absorbed and reproduced, according to x. 2a, 11. Its contents, though not always uniform, were a literary unity before they came into the hands of the final editor.¹ They were composed or rather put together by a Jew who had lived through the dreadful siege of Jerusalem, and seen the *καίροι τῶν ἔθνων* commence, in A.D. 70. His consolation to the saints of Judaism is that the Danielic prophecy (Dan. vii. 21) is now fulfilled; the last enemy of God's people has appeared in the person of the Romans, but the final deliverance of the saints is not far off.

The years passed, however, and the promise of relief

¹ Pfeiderer (*Das Urchristentum*, 1902, vol. ii. pp. 305 f.) also finds the contents of this *βιβλαρίδιον* in the Jewish oracles underlying the following chapters (xi.-xiv., xvii.-xix.). Another Jewish source is detected below xxi. 10-xxii. 5. The former source originated under Caligula; it was expanded under Vespasian, before it came into John's hands. This is a simplified form, of course, of the hypothesis which Weyland and Spitta had already worked out with regard to the *βιβλαρίδιον* as a special source.

tarried. The fresh peril of the Imperial cultus threatened the Church under Domitian, and the final editor took it upon him to re-issue John's Apocalypse along with the Jewish oracles; he did so, not as a mere literary editor, but as one possessed by the prophetic consciousness that the long-expected hour had now arrived. The traditional prophecies of the Dragon and the Beast were fulfilled in the contemporary attitude of the Empire to the Church.

The arguments by means of which this hypothesis is threatened on its literary side are often unconvincing in the extreme. It is also very difficult, as Weiss himself recognizes, to believe that John's Apocalypse was re-edited and issued by another hand during the lifetime of John himself. But Weiss, in contrast to most of his predecessors, is right in ascribing to the final editor more than purely literary functions. This is one of the truest touches in his theory of the book. Whoever this editor was, he was no mere compiler or redactor, but a man of genuinely prophetic spirit, who saw, as he thought, earlier prophecies on the eve of fulfilment.

This hypothesis of a re-editing is independently employed by Dr. Fritz Barth in his recent *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1908, pp. 250-274), but on much simpler lines than those of Johannes Weiss. Barth recognizes the divergent time-allusions in the Apocalypse; some point to Nero, others to Domitian. He is unjustly sceptical of all source-criticism, and consequently he argues that the Apostle John, who originally wrote the Apocalypse shortly before 70 A.D., re-issued it himself under the stress of the Domitianic persecution for a wider circle of churches. In so doing he added glosses which have crept into the text as we now have it. These marginal comments, inserted for the purpose of bringing the book up to date and recommending it to the churches in view of the new situation, are to be found e.g. in i. 1-3

(and xxii. 17-21), the series of appeals in ii. 7, 11, 17, 26 f., iii. 5 f., 12 f., 21 f. (here, as we shall see, Barth and Wellhausen independently agree in the main with J. Weiss and others), xii. 11, xvii. 14, and xxi. 7, besides the interpolated appeals of xiii. 9-10, xiv. 12, 13, xvi. 15, xx. 6, and xxii. 6-8*a*, as well as the brief interpretations¹ of i. 20*b*, iv. 5*b*, v. 6*b*, 8*b*, xix. 8*b*, 10*b*, 13*b*, xx. 5*b*, xxi. 8*b*. A hypothesis like this, however, does not go deep enough. The phenomena of xi.-xii. alone demand the recognition of sources.

Wellhausen's notes, in his *Analyse der Offenbarung Johannis* (1907), are free from any such hesitation; they presuppose not only that the author worked over such sources, freely adopting and altering them to suit his purpose, but that a further revision by a later editor can be traced in one or two passages, e.g. i. 1-3, xxii. 18-19. The author, who calls himself John, wrote under Domitian. Wellhausen, like Dr. Abbott, regards that as almost beyond discussion. But the sources he used for his series of tableaux² were earlier, although most seem to have the fall of Jerusalem behind them.

Wellhausen purposely speaks of "editing" in a vague way. To distinguish the various data at every turn leads, as he observes, to dangerous subtlety. The main point in general "is to scrape off the varnish." He proceeds to distinguish the original source from the editorial colouring which overlies them, as follows. From ii.-iii. (the seven letters) he deletes, as later additions, all the promises³ to the *ὁ νικῶν*, together with some of the surrounding material (i.e. ii. 7*b*, 11*b*, 17*b*, 26-28*a*, iii. 5, 10-12, 20-21), besides ii. 9

¹ Wellhausen (p. 9) also regards the interpretations *ἀ εὖν κ.τ.λ.* in iv. 5, v. 6, 8 as glosses, with (pp. 10 f.) viii. 2, 3*b*-4, x. 2*a* (p. 14), xiii. 7*b*-9 (pp. 21 f.), xvii. 5-6*a*, 8, 14-16*a* (pp. 26 f.), xx. 5-6, 10, 14 (pp. 30 f.), etc.

² "Die Apokalypse ist kein Drama, sondern eher ein Bilderbuch" (p. 1).

³ This deletion was suggested by Vischer years before, on the inadequate ground that these phrases presupposed the Apocalypse as a whole.

(ἀλλὰ πλούσιος εἶ), ii. 10 (γίνου . . . ζωῆς), ii. 23–25, and iii. 8 (ἰδοὺ . . . αὐτήν). Similar deletions are proposed throughout the entire book, but mostly upon a small scale. The main interest of the essay lies in the treatment of the three passages, xi., xii., and xvii., in all of which Wellhausen finds two separate sources which have been welded together.

His criticism of the two former passages is not new. It was at this point, especially on the character and form of xii., that he first came into collision with Gunkel ten years ago, and the present essay re-states, in more elaborate form, the conclusions which he then advocated in his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. pp. 215–249. Thus he regards xi. 1–2, and xi. 3–13, as two separate fragments of apocalyptic tradition. The former is an oracle of the Zealots who, during the siege, refused to believe that the temple could perish. A fanatical faith in its inviolable character distinguished them as the seed of the future and the true messianic remnant. On the other hand, xi. 3–13 originally was an oracle for Rome, which has been altered by the Christian prophet into an oracle for Jerusalem. The contents of xii., again, form an oracle, not of the Zealots, but of the contemporary Pharisees, who during the siege held that the messianic hope rested not with those who clung to the Temple but with those who fled from Jerusalem. The oracle is thus a picturesque allegory of Sion besieged and delivered.

The twelfth chapter has been often bisected by critics.¹ But Wellhausen's analysis is unique. He regards it as a combination of (A [and B] two independent fragments, which have been linked together with a common conclusion (C).

¹ Weyland and Baljon find the redactor in ver. 11, Spitta also in ver. 6, J. Weiss in 6 and 13, Calmes and Pfeiderer in 10–12.

(1) καὶ σημεῖον μέγα ὤφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα, (2) καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα, καὶ κράζει ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τεκεῖν. (3) καὶ ὤφθη ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἴδου δράκων μέγας, ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ διαδήματα, (4) καὶ ἡ οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἔστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν, ἵνα ὅταν τέκη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς καταφάγη. (5) καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ζῆθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, καὶ ἠρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ. (6) καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφουσιν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα.

(7) καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ πολεμήσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος. καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, (8) καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν, οὐδὲ τόπος εὗρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. (9) καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. (13) καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα ἣτις ἔτεκεν τὸν ἄρσεν. (14) καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ ἀετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμισυ καιροῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καιῶς.

(15) καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφεις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμόν, ἵνα αὐτὴν ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ. (16) ὅφει ἐβοήθησεν ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς, καὶ κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. (17) καὶ ὠργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ τῶν τηρούντων τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.

On this scheme, B (7-8, 13-14) is not the continuation of A (1-6) but a variation upon the same theme. The trouble is that B is incomplete. Wellhausen has to conjecture, e.g., that *the great eagle* (ver. 14) must have been already mentioned, while

even in A the editor must have omitted the overthrow of the dragon, without which the opening of verse 4 is unintelligible, and the persecution of the woman on earth. Finally, the entire vision is a fragment, on this hypothesis. The fortunes of the *λοιποί* are left untold. Thus Wellhausen is unable to float his ingenious theory without recourse to a series of abbreviations and omissions. Furthermore, his reference to the Book of Daniel as the source of the allegory does not work out properly. The parallels between it and Revelation xii. are too vague to admit of the former having been the basis of the latter. The originality of John's vision requires other materials, in cosmological tradition, in order to account for its final shape and colouring.

Bisecting chapter xvii. similarly into A (=vers. 3-4b, 6b-7, 10) and B (=vers. 11-13, 16b-17), which have been joined by an editor who has furnished them with an introduction (vers. 1-3a) and numerous glosses, Wellhausen gets in A an oracle, composed during Vespasian's reign, upon the Beast as the Empire (so in the nucleus of xiii.), and in B another oracle which views the Beast as *Nero redivivus*, the eighth head of the Beast (so in additions to xiii.). Verse 8 is the editorial mortar which holds the two sources together. Probably they were independent oracles, in their original form. B is to be dated after A, and is also, though less certainly, of Jewish origin. "Christians could hardly have had any sympathy with Nero or regarded him as the fulfiller of God's purposes; they could hardly have expected that he would actually overcome and exterminate Rome." This is thin reasoning. If later Christians, as we see from the Sibylline oracles and Lactantius, held this belief, why not others in an earlier age?

These are the leading proposals in the field of source-criticism. The Roman Catholic Introductions of Belser (second edition, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1905) and E. Jac-

quier (*Histoire des Livres du N.T.*, iv. 1908, pp. 311 f.) offer no help. The very suggestive work of P. Calmes (*L'Apocalypse devant la tradition et devant la critique*, Paris, 1905) is valuable, mainly, for its employment of eschatological tradition in the determinations of the various symbols and visions. Calmes admits sources used by a redactor, but he also exploits the Babylonian¹ mythology especially with acuteness and sanity.² Baljon's Dutch commentary (*Commentaar op de Openbaring van Johannes*, Utrecht, 1908) contains no introduction. Its critical basis is that already outlined in the author's Introduction (*Geschiedenis van de Boeken d. nieuwen Verbonds*, 1901, pp. 241-265), which approximates roughly to that of Bousset. Baljon, like Calmes, admits the presence of sources and primitive traditions here and there; dates the main composition of the book under Domitian; but puts the final editor in Trajan's reign. The presupposition of the commentary is that which is coming to be shared by an increasing number of critics, viz., that while Jewish or Jewish-Christian sources may be detected behind the canonical Apocalypse, these did not form any coherent apocalypse of any size, and also that it is impossible to differentiate source and editor with anything of the exactness with which Lord Hailes, for example, could point out to Boswell his additions to a law-paper composed by Dr. Johnson.

Wellhausen shares this presupposition. But is his application of it sound? In the first place, the hope that the temple would remain inviolate was not confined to the Zealots. In the second place, as Schürer has already pointed

¹ Cp. his article on "Les Symboles de l'Apocalypse" in *Revue Biblique* (1903), pp. 52-68.

² His fellow-Churchman, Dr. M. Kohlhofer, has written a pamphlet in Bardenheuer's "Biblische Studien" (*Die Einheit der Apokalypse*, 1902), which stoutly abjures the whole of [modern criticism upon the eschatological traditions and literary analysis of the book.

out (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1908, 41), Wellhausen has overlooked the fact that the capture of the Temple preceded that of the upper city. In the third place, there is a serious practical difficulty in the way of such a hypothesis as he suggests to explain xi. 1-2. The so-called oracle of xi. 1-2 would amount to the tiniest scrap of papyrus. How can we imagine that a diminutive fragment of this kind floated safely through all the perils of the siege and was finally preserved as a memento of the Zealots' hopes, even if we could conceive that these passionate citizens took time to write down any oracles? The impossibility of forming any reasonable explanation of this tiny oracle's composition and preservation tells heavily against all the hypotheses which regard xi. 1-2 as an originally independent source. The alternatives are: (a) to regard it as a fragment of some larger oracle, or (b) to find some links between it and 3-13. The latter seems the more probable line of explanation. Both passages are Jewish sources¹; the second has been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic.

¹ Some spiritual or allegorical significance must attach to xi. 1-2, in the mind of the final editor; otherwise it is impossible to account satisfactorily for his reproduction of an oracle which was no longer literally true. Possibly, as in the case of the eschatological predictions in the Synoptic Gospels, while the crisis of 70 A.D. had widened the horizon of Christian belief in the second advent of Jesus, the literature retained traces of the earlier view which it had outgrown. In this way, the new setting would not quite obliterate the older contour of the oracle. Wrede, in his pamphlet on 2 Thessalonians, prefers to regard xi. 1-2, like 2 Thess. ii. 1-2, outright in view of passages like Clem. Rom. xli., Diogn. iii., Justin's *Dial.* cxvii., Jos. *Ant.* iii. 6-12, *Apion.* i. 7, ii. 6, 23, etc., where the present is used of the Temple, the latter being treated as still standing. In this case, xi. 1-2 would be no proof either of the pre-70 date or of a Jewish origin. Furthermore, it would not be necessarily allegorical. The allusion might be to (a) the expectation of a re-building of the temple (cp. Wabnitz in *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1881, pp. 512 f., 1885, pp. 134 f., and Abbott's *Notes on New Test. Criticism*, pp. 48, 88), or (b) to a traditional reproduction of some feature which had lost its original reference. The former (a) is much the more likely of the two. But it conflicts with the seer's expectation of no temple in heaven, and the problem of the passage is better approached along the lines of a hypothesis which postulates a spiritual meaning superimposed upon an earlier and literal prediction.

The proposed bisection of xii. and xvii. also involves special difficulties. According to Wellhausen we are to think in each case of two sources, originally parallel or at any rate independent, which the editor has abbreviated and interpolated as he fitted them together for his own purpose. Now, it may be granted that without some application of source-criticism, the problems of these chapters remain insoluble. But on Wellhausen's hypothesis the function of the editor is not psychologically credible.¹ It is too intricate a solution to postulate abbreviated sources of this kind. Any editor would surely have either done less or more with his materials. May we not also argue that he would have covered his traces more effectively than, upon Wellhausen's theory, he seems to have succeeded in doing? In chapter xvii. a simpler hypothesis of editorial interpolation will be found sufficient to clear up the perplexities of the oracle. Here, as elsewhere, the road to a satisfactory result lies through a theory of source-composition which is at once less intricate than that of Wellhausen and more thorough-going than that of Barth.

It is on chapter xii., however, that the main interest of Wellhausen's trenchant essay concentrates. Here the dual

¹ Besides, there are two points of difficulty. The résumé of the life of the Messiah as born and caught up to heaven is strange enough, upon the hypothesis of a Christian author. But is it really less remarkable in a Jewish? Again, have we any reliable evidence to prove that the sufferings of the Jews during the siege led pious Pharisees to believe that the Messiah would suddenly be born amid the crisis? It is not enough to point to the predictions of Isaiah and Micah. The Talmudic parallel (*Berachoth* II. 5a) which Vischer relies on for the former view, is not only late but imperfect. The Messiah there is born at Bethlehem and swept away by a storm-wind, just after the fall of Jerusalem. But whither? Not to heaven at all, but into vague space? Gunkel (pp. 178-179, 258, 394) develops a wild theory to prove that the child Messiah, during the interval between xii. and xix., grows into a successful and mature opponent of the heathen (xix. 15, cp. xii. 5). The natural close to xii. is thus xix. 11-xx. 3 (anticipated in xvi. 12-16). But this sort of *ἡλικία Χριστοῦ* (Eph. iv. 13) is opposed to the Johannine view (John xvii. 4, xix. 30). Besides, the rule of the Christ is already noted in ii. 27.

nature of the cosmological traditions which have been applied to eschatological ends is accepted by most critics. The only question is whether John employed a source (tradition) which already contained the twofold aspect of the woman's flight, or whether he dovetailed two separate sources together. Even in the latter event, it is more likely that the two sources represented different conceptions (the birth of the Messiah in heaven and in the Church on earth) than parallel statements of the same idea. Both Gunkel and Wellhausen fail to link xii. to xiii., and this isolation of the former passage helps to invalidate their respective hypotheses. Even if the two chapters had an originally independent position (Gunkel, 329 f.), they are united by the Christian editor, and the question which the prophet John is answering is one started by the urgent circumstances of the age. Why is Jesus, the true Messiah, absent from the scene? What is he doing whilst his people suffer down below? What is the divine purpose underlying and controlling this exposure of Christians to persecution for refusing to worship the Emperor? John's answer¹ is that the Christ is in heaven, where the Evil Power has been already defeated. The trouble on earth is not merely foreseen but limited; it is only a guerilla warfare carried on by an opponent who has been beaten out of heaven and whose days of power are numbered. *Moriturus mordet*. With dramatic point, John introduces Satan as one who has been already beaten and foiled. The Imperial cultus, which is the acme of his devices, is a last and ineffective resource. In xiii. John describes this at work on earth, but not until he has described the heavenly victory in xii., and the latter description is couched in terms of antique, cosmological tradition. The light of the revelation filters through the lower air. It takes on tints of alien

¹ The Messiah also has been exposed to the persecution of the Evil Power. His triumphant deliverance is a prototype and pledge of his people's.

colour. But it would be absurd to neglect the sunbeam for the motes which dance within its ray.

These motes can be analysed by aid of research into the primitive, Oriental conceptions which are familiar to us in early religions. However far-fetched many of the astrological interpretations of the Apocalypse's imagery may be, yet in view of the ancient recognition of astronomy "as nothing less than a phase of religion"¹ and of the wide-spread use of the constellation figures, e.g. in the Gilgames epic, it is difficult to deny that the pictorial language of chapter xii. does not reflect a transcript which is coloured by the planisphere,² where Cetos,³ the aquatic dragon in the southern heavens, which astrologically is a watery region, cast forth the river of Eridanos (Euphrates). It is too much to say with Mr. Collingwood (*Astrology in the Apocalypse*, 1886, pp. 79 f.), that "a person familiar with constellations may recall St. John's vision on any starry night in the figures of Cassiopeia, Draco, and Hercules," but the dragon of the chaos had once had the signs of the zodiac as his monster allies, in the Babylonian mythology, and the Babylonian traits reproduced in the imagery of chapter xii. in all likelihood are coloured by such primitive conceptions. Even in Bundahis xxxiv. (cp. *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. v. pp. 149 f.) the millennia of the world are calculated by means of the zodiac, and the eighth is that of Scorpio, i.e. Dahak the adversary. As the Pyramid texts also prove, astro-theology lay far back in Egyptian religion. The association of deities and spirits with constellations and the connexion between stellar cults and popular religion are patent in Egypt as well

¹ Cp. R. Brown, jun., *Semitic Infl. in Hell. Mythology* (1898), pp. 162-194.

² On Sabaism, see Sayce's *Gifford Lectures*, 1902, pp. 234 f., 479 f., and Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 389 f.

³ Cf. Aratus, *Phaen.* 45, followed by Vergil (*Georgics*, i. 244-246), on the μέγα θάσμα of the ὄφικων or snake with its winding 'coils or streams. Cp. Dr. Abbott's *Notes on New Testament Criticism*, p. 101.

as in Babylonia. It was an Oriental phase of speculation which left many phrases and conceptions lingering on in popular religion long after their original meaning had been lost.¹

The astro-theological elements which here as elsewhere are made the vesture and vehicle of deeper truths are probably to be ascribed to the character of the Babylonian religion² from which such eschatological conceptions were in part adopted by the later Judaism. Babylon, however, will not by itself explain the data of the vision. Wellhausen is right in urging this against Gunkel. The latter has to read the ideas of Revelation xii. into the scattered Babylonian allusions, in order to get his Marduk-myth, and the Etanamyth is too fragmentary to be relied upon as a basis here, though it may have some connexion with Isaiah xiv. 12-15 (cp. Zimmern in Schröder's *Keilinschriften*,³ pp. 564-566). The story of a divine child or hero menaced at his birth is in fact an international myth of the ancient world; it is a favourite topic, which reflects the danger run by the seed sown in the dark earth, and its Egyptian and Hellenic forms are at least as relevant to the imagery of the Apocalypse as its Babylonian (Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 80 f., 22 f.) or Zoroastrian (Völter). The local spread of the Leto-myth is as likely³ as any, if a particular phase of the myth is to be assumed as having furnished the colours for the palette of the seer.

¹ Thus the origin of the phrase *ten days* (cp. Rev. ii. 10) seems to be astro-theological. It denoted the period after which the constellations changed (cf. Diod. Sic. ii. 30). The historical use of *δεχήμερον* among the Greeks was different.

² Cp. Hugo Winckler's *Geschichte Israels*, ii. pp. 275 f., Anz's paragraphs in *Teate u. Untere.*, xv. 4, pp. 65-68, where the influence of astro-theology upon the later Babylonian faith is discussed adequately.

³ It is no argument against this to speak, as Gunkel does, about the Palestinian Judaism of apocalyptic tradition. The Apocalypse of John is as much Asiatic as Palestinian, and elsewhere Gunkel himself (p. 286 note) admits the connexion between early Christianity and the Orphic or Pythagorean circle of religious tenets.

When the myth was employed for the purpose of religious politics, the *θήριον*¹ became the Roman Empire or its head, while the dragon became the world-opponent of God,² and further applications to contemporary history, e.g. in the present case to Herod's persecution of Jesus and to the flight from Pella, were natural. Upon the other hand, no attempt to explain chapter xii. has much chance of success, if it does not recognize that the oracle is more than an allegorizing version of history or an exegetical construction of Old Testament texts or a free composition of the author, and also if it does not recognize the danger of modern scholarship attempting to give an unnatural precision to what in the nature of the case was often vague and undefined tradition.

JAMES MOFFATT.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

IV. THE NEED OF SALVATION.

(1) IN the *First Study* an endeavour was made to present the whole experience of Paul as the basis of his theology. In the *Second Study* the object of his faith—Christ—was described. In this *Third Study* we ask, and seek to answer the question, What need did Christ so fully meet as to become the object of his faith? It was from *sin* that Christ saved Paul. But sin is presented to us in two aspects in his teaching, as it affects a man's own nature, and as it affects his relation to God. While for modern thinking there can be little doubt the former is most important, for Paul's thought it is certain the latter held the foremost place.

¹ *Bellua* (*θηπιον*) was not an uncommon term for a tyrant in ancient terminology.

² The Dragon became the symbol and embodiment of the Babylonish spirit just as *renardie* in the thirteenth century stood for the depraving and cruel influences abroad in human society. Cp. Oesterley's *Evolution of the Messianic Idea* (1908), 177 f., for an admirable statement of the relation between *Tehom* and Satan.