

as the accredited representative of the papacy, his household goods and stores, as always in case of ambassadors, were entered duty free. But among his stores there was wine to such amount that the duty on it would have amounted to 6,000 florins. This, of course, was not for domestic use, but was put into the market and sold, and the Bavarian exchequer was cheated out of 6,000 florins.

ANDREW TEN BROOK.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

NOTE ON THE CANONICITY OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.

It is a well-known fact that in the second and third centuries of our era, before the necessity of a strict canon had been felt, the apocalypse of John found general, although by no means universal, acceptance in the churches of the East and West; in the fourth century, however, doubts of its acceptability were wider spread. The quarrel between the Montanists and Orthodox church tended to cast suspicion on the book in the minds of the enemies of Montanism, and the influence of the followers of Caius in the Orient was not inconsiderable. We know that the Syrian church was in doubt about 340 A. D.,¹ and the council of Laodicea in 363 A. D. failed to name the Apocalypse in the canon. The third council of Carthage, however, in 397 A. D. maintained the faith that the African church had always held by affirming the book's canonicity. Of the Christian writers of this century belonging to the church in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine, Eusebius left the question undecided (*H. E.*, III, 24, 18), while Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Gregorius Nazianzenus omitted it from their lists.² Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, on the other hand, includes it, as well as the books of Wisdom (*Her.*, 76, ed. Dindorf, III, 396).

In the light of these facts, a passage in the Homilies of St. Jerome, recently published for the first time in the *Anecdota Maredsolana*,³ Vol. III, Pt. II, by Dom Morin, the learned presbyter of the Benedictine order at Maredsous, becomes especially interesting. Jerome is speaking in Bethlehem to a body of monks, at some point in the period 401-10 A. D., and in his discourse on Psalm 1 (p. 5, 20 ff., Morin)

¹ Cf. ZAHN, *Forschungen*, I, pp. 72 f.; II, pp. 281-6.

² The latter closes his list (MIGNE, *Patrol. Græca*, XXVII, 472 ff.) with the seven catholic epistles: Ἰούδα δ' ἐστὶν ἐβδόμη. Πάσας ἔχεις Ἐι τις δὲ τούτων ἐκτός, οὐκ ἐν γνησίαις.

³ Cf. this Journal, Vol. II, p. 420.

he says: "Legimus in Apocalypsi Johannis (quod *in istis provinciis non recipitur liber*, tamen scire debemus quoniam in occidente omni, et in aliis Fænicis provinciis, et in Ægypto recipitur liber, et ecclesiasticus est: nam et veteres ecclesiastici viri, e quibus est Irenæus, et Polycarpus, et Dionysius, et alii Romani interpretes, de quibus est et Cyprianus sanctus, recipiunt librum et interpretantur) legimus ergo ibi: eqs." Again on Psalm 149 (p. 314, 6 ff., Morin): "Legimus in Apocalypsi Johannis, quæ in ecclesiis legitur et recipitur — neque enim inter apocryphas scripturas habetur, sed inter ecclesiasticas — eqs."

Inasmuch as Jerome, after the fashion of his time, not infrequently uses *iste* as a general demonstrative, equivalent to *hic*, *ille*, or *is*, a doubt might arise as to the exact meaning of the words *in istis provinciis*, if the context did not make it perfectly clear that Jerome means the country in which his auditors are living, that is, Palestine. His statement, then, accords with the evidence given by the silence of Cyril of Jerusalem, nearly half a century before. At the words *in aliis Fænicis provinciis* we may fairly think of the church at Antioch and in Syria, yet it is hard to reconcile Jerome's statement with what we know of the Syrian church from other sources. While it is true that Theophilus, bishop of Antioch about 186 A. D., drew arguments from the Apocalypse in his writings against Hermogenes (Euseb., *H. E.*, IV, 24), Chrysostom, once presbyter of Antioch, as noted above, nowhere among his voluminous writings mentions the Apocalypse.⁴ In Edessa the Peshito version continuously prevailed, and in neither class of the manuscripts of this version has the Apocalypse a place. Ephraem Syrus apparently quotes from it once in his Syrian works, but it is not necessary to suppose the book unknown because outside the accepted canon. One is at a loss, therefore, to understand Jerome's statement. We may suppose either that he spoke from insufficient knowledge, which is not impossible, or that a change had taken place, and that the church at Antioch, at least, accepted the book. Nearly a century and a half later Junilius wrote from Constantinople (*De partibus divinæ legis*, I, 4): "ceterum de Johannis Apocalypsi *apud orientales* admodum dubitatur . . ."

By his words *in Ægypto recipitur liber* Jerome must mean Alexandria, for the Apocalypse had no place in either the Memphitic or Thebaic versions. But in the second century Clement of Alexandria

⁴ According to Suidas (*s. v.*), however, Chrysostom accepted the apocalypse as well as the three letters of John.

quotes from the book (*Paid.*, II, 10, 108; 12, 119; *Strom.*, VI, 13, 107, ὡς φησιν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης); Origen accepted it (Euseb., *H. E.*, VI, 25, 9; *Comment. in Matthæum*, Migne, III, p. 1386; *Comment. in Joan.*, Migne, IV, p. 47, 117, φησὶν οὖν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου Ἰωάννης); in the third century Dionysius of Alexandria — the Dionysius mentioned by Jerome in the passage quoted — regarded the Apocalypse as the work of an inspired man, although he rejected the Johannine authorship (Euseb., *H. E.*, III, 28, 3; VII, 25, 7).

Jerome's statement in regard to the West needs little comment, for the loyalty of the western church to the Apocalypse is well known, not simply of the church at Rome, but also in Africa, as noted above (*cf.* also *Versus Scribt. Sanct. in Catalogus Clarom.*, August., *De doctr. Christ.*, II, 12); presumably in Spain as well, where, early in the seventh century, Isidore includes the Apocalypse among the canonical books (Migne, 83, p. 155), and in Gaul, as the epistle of the Christians of Vienne (Euseb., *H. E.*, V, 1) and the statements of Irenæus (*c. Hær.*, V, 35, 2) show. In direct relation with Irenæus naturally stands Polycarp. This passage of Jerome gives us the only direct testimony we have as to Polycarp's attitude toward the Apocalypse. It is more than probable that Irenæus received his views from his master.

The Latin Fathers (*alii Romani interpretes*) to whom Jerome appeals for authority were unanimous in their acceptance of the Apocalypse. Cyprian, who alone is mentioned by name, frequently used it (*De opere et elem.*, 14, "audi in Apocalypsi Domini tui vocem," et passim); Tertullian names John as the author (*Adv. Marc.*, III, 14, "apostolus Johannes in Apocalypsi"); as well as Lactantius (*Ep.*, 42, "sicut docet Johannes in Revelatione"). The testimony of the Fathers is supported by the Canon Muratorianus. In short, in the West there was no suspicion against the canonicity of the Apocalypse.

Jerome's statements in the passages quoted are welcome, although they are largely of a confirmatory character. They establish the fact that at the opening of the fifth century the Apocalypse had not found acceptance in Jerusalem, and state explicitly Polycarp's attitude toward the book. Someone more versed in these questions than the present writer may be able to solve the difficulty in the words *in aliis Pœnicis provinciis*.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.