

*Special Study*The Status of the Book of Revelation in the
Western and Eastern Churches

OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION:

The relationship of Early Christian Chiliasm (The belief in Christ's return to earth to reign during the millennium) (Montanism, etc.) and the general attitude toward the Apocalypse in Asia Minor.

SECTION ONE:

The General attitude in the West in about the year A.D. 200
The Muratorian Canon
Tertullian
The Alogoi
Hippolytus

SECTION TWO:

The General attitude in the East during the period of Origen
Clement of Alexandria
Origen
Dionysius

SECTION THREE:

Development of General attitude within the period of the early church fathers.
The East Beyond Alexandria
Alexandria
The West in General

CONCLUSION:

Conclusions concerning the attitude of the Church both East and West concerning the Apocalypse.

INTRODUCTION

This essay is an elementary and cursory effort to trace what the early church Fathers have said concerning the status of the Book of Revelation. Many imperative issues can only be mentioned and passed over, because of the limited extent of this work.

We shall establish the general attitude of both the Eastern and Western Church. Inseparably involved in such a study is the history and development of the canon of the New Testament, the nature, function, and extent of authority involved in extra-biblical tradition.

Our purpose shall be confined to the tracing of the first explicit witness to the Apostolic origin and authoritative status through the number of voices raised in criticism of the tradition of the Apostolic origin of the Apocalypse and beyond to the more universal consensus.

What was the attitude of the early Church toward the Apocalypse? In order to give both the positive and negative positions we shall examine many of the positions extant only in Eusebius the historian and the titanic supply of Early (90-323 A.D.) Literature.

The enthusiasm latent in early Chiliasm is a vital aspect in our gaining a credible perspective to examine specific statements concerning the place of the Apocalypse in the ancient church.

I have no concern to give even a comprehensive survey of the history of chiliasm, but only to view it as it contributes to an understanding of the history of the canonical regard for the Apocalypse of John.

In the epistles of Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna there is nothing that suggests the doctrine of Chiliasm. Nevertheless, in I Clement we read¹ of a sudden coming of the Lord to judgment.

It is a striking fact that the earliest writer to use the Apocalypse with normative regard is also the first Christian Chiliasm (Papias).² It is also important to note that it is in Asia Minor where we note (to this I shall speak next) nearly all of the evidence for a use of and high regard for our work in the

first half of the second century. It was in Asia Minor where this doctrine had taken its deepest roots. Here, there was a general interest in apocalyptic and eschatological literature.

Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History*, volume III, chp. 3a vs. 3) and Irenaeus (*adv. Heresys* 5, 33, 4) provides most of our extant information concerning Papias. Though the description of Eusebius is not adequate to warrant the conclusion that Papias was completely absorbed in Chiliasm, it is the only extant information we have that Papias' millennial teaching was based on a misunderstanding of the message of John's Apocalypse. Yet, it points to his attitude toward the document under discussion.

Justin Martyr³ also appeals to the apocalypse to support his belief in the millennium. It is very apparent that he was strongly influenced not only by the prophetic passages which he quotes from the Old Testament, but also by his regard for the Apocalypse. It is not likely that in his early Christian years in Asia Minor Justin came under the influence of the bishop of Hierapolis who at that time was at the peak of his influence?

In as much as Papias and Justin were the only authors of whom it can be safely stated that they were Chiliasts, and the eschatological expressions of many others exclude the specific connotation of the assertion that Chiliasm was an essential aspect of the faith of early Christianity needs revision. Chiliastic belief is usually accompanied by a high regard for the Apocalypse, and indeed it may well have been a factor which tended to make the work popular.

We must raise a more fundamental question concerning its general acceptance as authoritative writing—what was the real ground for its early use?

Did Papias and Justin accept its testimony because they with Christians generally regarded all prophetic utterances as divine and canonical, or was apostolic origin the prime criterion?

Though the Apostolic office held great influence in the Church there were other influences, and among these the Christian prophets⁴ held a very high place of significance.

Especially interesting for our present discussion of the comparative authority of the Apostles and the Christian Prophets before the rise of Montanism is the witness of the *Didache*.⁵ This volume furnishes irrefutable argument in support of the view that in the early Church Prophets were regarded as

spokesmen of The Spirit in a way the Apostles were not, and their messages were received on a par with the Old Testament. This is also the basic attitude in the other volumes in the Apostolic Fathers.

From the perspective of the preceding testimony we will examine the testimony of those writers whom we have found either to accept or reject the Apocalypse as an authority. Space forbids that we compare other prophetic works, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, with the Apocalypse of John. The Shepherd was also received in the Church as divine, but this paper is only concerned with pointing out the general attitude toward the Apocalypse of John.

In Asia and Gaul a new prophecy arose in the form of Montanism.⁶ It is during this period that we note an intensification of attack upon the authority of the Johannine prophecy.

One of the difficulties facing the investigator of Montanism is that of distinguishing the source, which describe the movement in its original form from those which reflect later modification of it. In my study I have become convinced of the vital place the rise of Montanism played in the negative attitude toward the Apocalypse of John. This could become a thesis, but I will only mention it in passing.

According to the most credible data it was about the year 156 A.D. when Montanus first came forward with his prophetic message at Ardabau in Phrygia. The leader was soon joined by the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla. The center of the movement was soon changed to Pepuza and Tymion, two small Phrygian villages, but it spread rapidly throughout Asia Minor. There is extant a more complete body of sources concerning its movement into the West, but this was in a later period. The Montanists were finally driven out and excommunicated. It is possible that the Montanist use of the Apocalypse led some to reject the book altogether and ascribe it to Cerinthus.

From the Montanists and their certain use and acceptance of the Apocalypse we turn to examine the difficult question of whether there was a second century group in Asia Minor which rejected the work under investigation. The Alogoi⁷ of Asia Minor are very difficult to examine, but we know enough for our present study.

Irenaeus mentions a group who denies both the Gospel and the book of the prophetic spirit, but he does identify them as the Alogoi. There is no evidence that the western Alogoi were

dependent for their criticism of the writings of John upon a second century source from Asia Minor.

The indirect reference in Irenaeus to certain anti-montanists is all of the specific details we have. A study of the relevant literature shows the diversity of opinion concerning this matter, but not even Zahn, Harnack, nor Bousset were certain in the efforts to make identification of Irenaeus' statement as having reference to Alogoi of Asia Minor.

Since Irenaeus is an important link between the Churches of Asia Minor and those of Gaul we shall conclude this elementary introduction by pointing out Irenaeus's positive attitude toward the Apocalypse.

Eusebius tells us of the positive attitude of both Melito of Sardes and Apollonius. Apollonius quotes the Apocalypse readily.

The Churches of Lyon and Vienne were much interested in the rise of Montanism in Asia Minor, and perhaps the earliest extant reference to this movement is contained in a letter sent by the brethren of these Churches to the Roman bishop, Eleutheros, by the hand of Irenaeus, who was then presbyter of Lyon. At the same time (ca. 177) a letter was sent to the Churches of Phrygia and Asia.⁸ The high regard which these churches had for the Apocalypse is clearly shown in the long letter to the Churches in Phrygia and Asia concerning the severe persecution they had suffered under Marcus Aurelius. Besides a number of cases of the use of the language of this writing, Revelation 22:11 is the only direct quotation in the whole letter. And it is particularly noteworthy that here for the first time the Apocalypse is cited as a book of Scripture, the formula "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" being used.⁹ As we have already stated Irenaeus was an important link between Asia Minor and Gaul, but now we turn to the situation in Rome and Carthage.

Between these two western Churches, there was fought out a battle of great significance for the future of the status of the Apocalypse. In the West Tertullian, Gaius, and Hippolytus are representative of different tendencies and attitudes. Before discussing the testimony of these prominent scholars it is necessary to note the important witness of an anonymous fragment named after its discoverer, the Canon Muratori.

SECTION ONE: General Attitude in the
West Circa Two Hundred A.D.

The fragment, Canon Muratori, purports to present a list of canonical books received in the Catholic Church through the world, and also calls attentions to certain books which were not given canonical status. The scholarly concensus concerning this document is that it originated in the West. The limits for the date of its origin are determined by its statement that Hermas wrote "very recently in our times,"¹⁰ and further identification of this with the times of Pius, bishop of Rome. This allows a choice in the period between 160 and 2???. Its attitude toward Montanism, which it regards as heretical, hardly allows a date much before the end of the century. The problem of dating the fragment is intensified by our ignorance as to whether the document was originally Latin or Greek. Wescott gives us the Latin text in his *On the Canon of The New Testament*. Without a word of comment or trace of a defense against expressions of hostility to the Apocalypse of John the author of the fragment states that the book is received. The author takes note of the opposition to the Apocalypse of Peter. It is an important factor that the author was not opposed to apocalyptic in general or he would have rejected the Apocalypse of John as he did the Apocalypse of Peter. Here we must note that, at least as far as the fragment was concerned the claim to apostolic origin was not an adequate defense nor reason for accepting documents as canonical. The Shepherd of Hermas was also rejected by the author of the fragment.

The whole attitude that at one time the Church possessed a canon of Apocalypses, which were accepted apart from any question as to their authorship and time of their origin is not grounded in fact, and particular the fragment under consideration goes against this position.

The Montanism of the West is not simply a later reproduction of the New Prophecy of Asia Minor. It made its way to Rome and Africa apparently after it became schismatic in the East. The modification of its belief and action enabled Montanism to enter into the Roman Church. Undoubtedly, the enthusiasm and rigorism as characteristics of western Montanism is due in no small measure to the fact that its history for two decades ran parallel with and often inseparable from the life of Tertullian.

In the writings which follow these stirring times Tertullian¹¹ has come out on the side of the Montanist, but as a Montanist trying to reform the Church from within.

We see accordingly that the Montanist prophecy confirmed Tertullian in his Chiliasm, and gave him the assurance that the coming of the Lord was imminent. Gaius' criticism of the Apocalypse seems to be based upon Montanist exegesis of it.¹² In Tertullian's treatise "On Modesty"¹³ he discusses in chapter 12 to 19 the teaching of the Apostolic instrument on adultery, and in the final chapter refutes objections from the Apocalypse of John. The normative use of the work is apparent from the method of utilization. Tertullian never uses extra biblical Apocalypse as normative.

We may conclude that Tertullian agrees essentially with Irenaeus and the Canon Muratori with regard to the canonical significance of the Apocalypse.

We must now take into consideration the opposition to the Apocalypse. Gaius and the Alogoi were as was mentioned in the introduction, the brilliant opponents of the Apocalypse of John in the West during the second century A.D.

It was while Zephyrinus (199-217) was bishop of Rome that Gaius, a member of the Church of Rome, wrote a dialogue which recorded the arguments he had used in a dispute with a certain leader of the Montanists named Proclus.¹⁴ This work was at the disposal of Eusebius, for he quotes from it more than once. Dionysius of Alexandria was apparently excerpting it in his criticism of the Apocalypse Hippolytus¹⁵ (*kephaleŕa kata Gaion*) and the extant source of the fragments (Dionysius Bar Salibi) agree in reporting that these opponents of the Apocalypse ascribed it to Cerinthus, and there can be no doubt that the dogmatic motive back of this act was hostility to Montanism.

Gaius was also critical of the Gospel of John, but our meager extant sources do not permit use to examine the details of his criticism of the Gospel or the Apocalypse. The main thrust of Gaius' criticism centers around the tension between the Eschatology of the Synoptics and Paul (these were his criterion) and the specific statement in the Apocalypse concerning the details of the Judgment and Coming of Christ.

The details of our knowledge with regard to the criticism of the Alogoi rest ultimately on the single work of Gaius and Hippolytus' (of Rome) answer to it is confirmed in that all these sources reveal the work of a critic who is moved by dogmatic motives.

All of these sources attribute the Apocalypse to Cerinthus, a docetic Gnostic. None of these sources point out the Jewish elements in the Gnostic heresy of Cerinthus; therefore it would be very difficult for anyone to account for his writing the Apocalypse.

In the Alogoi we have the bold and unscrupulous attempt of certain extreme opponents of the Montanists to discredit certain writings of which the Montanists were particularly fond, even though these writings had long enjoyed a place of honor among the authoritative writings which were, at least, as early as the time of Irenaeus spoken of and used in normative manner.

The last witness to be mentioned concerning Western attitude toward the Apocalypse will be Hippolytus of Rome. His dependence upon Irenaeus is unmistakable, but he was not a mere repeater of another's learning. The contact Hippolytus makes with the Apocalypse is again the indirect attack upon Montanism.

His use of and regard for the Apocalypse are easily discovered from his exegetical treatise *On Christ and Anti-Christ* and *Commentary on Daniel*. Hippolytus, when he was still a presbyter in the Church at Rome, took a very active part in the anti-Montanist struggle of the West.

We may conclude that as an exegete, apologist, and polemicist the great Hippolytus took his stand upon the canonical Scriptures among which, the Apocalypse was numbered.

SECTION TWO: The General Attitude in the East During the Period of Origen

In Alexandria and its area of influence, the Apocalypse experienced a somewhat different fortune. As early as the first decades of the third century its canonic position was very secure, it is equally clear, on the other hand, that the Alexandrian theology ultimately was a very weighty factor in lessening the regard for it in certain parts of the Church. The most important witness is Clement of Alexandria.

In a narrative recorded by Eusebius in a section devoted to the events of the reign of Trajan, Clement relates that after the death of the tyrant (Domitian), the apostle John as a very aged man passed from the island of Patmos to Ephesus; and this reference to his forced residence on Patmos suggests that

he believed that the visions of the Apocalypse were received at this time.¹⁶ That Clement and the Church at Alexandria accepted the Apocalypse as Scripture is proved in a passage where he relates that certain women appealed to its description of the materials of the heavenly city in defense of their taste for precious stones, and he declares that they failed to understand the symbolism of the Scriptures.¹⁷

This survey of the evidence shows that circa 200 A.D. in Alexandria as in Rome and Carthage the Apocalypse was accepted as canonic. But this conclusion is somewhat premature, because Clement also utilizes the Epistle of Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter. The term *paradosis* applies to the witness of the Lord in the testimonies of the gospels, but also to the latter ecclesiastical explications of them.

The age of the Apostles is sharply separated from the succeeding period. The teaching of the Lord begins with Augustus - the preaching of His apostles at least to the end of Paul's ministry is completed under Nero. In contrast to this the heresiarchs like Basilides can trace their teaching only as far back as about the time of Hadrian.¹⁸ - Clement does call the *Didache* - Scripture, but this may merely point out his ambiguous language; because he knows of only four canonical gospels but uses other records of the life of Christ. Even though Clement's statements are less decisive than the western fathers, this can be accounted for by the looseness of his language concerning apostolic and post-apostolic tradition. If this general attitude is not accepted, then the extant literature of Clement plainly contradicts itself on the matter under consideration.

The successor of Clement as head of the catechetical school at Alexandria will be the next consideration. Origen¹⁹ (c. 185-254) literary activity extended over most of the first half of the third century.

Origen perpetrates the spiritualizing method of the school at Alexandria, but his testimony to the Canonic authority of the Apocalypse is distinguished both by the frequency of his appeal and the explicitness of his classification. That the Apocalypse had a secure place among the New Testament writings (as far as Origen is concerned) is confirmed by a passage preserved by Eusebius giving Origen's explicit expressions on the canon.²⁰ (Our paper is too elementary and cursory to discuss the very apparent differences in Origen's private opinion and that which he published in his works generally concerning the Apocalypse.)

This tension in no way points to an uncertain status for the Apocalypse at this time, because Origen uses it as normative and believes John to be a prophet.

Although certain books are still spoken of as disputed, the testimony of Origen shows that the Church was conscious of having received the New Testament from the tradition of the preceding generation.

Origen's eschatological viewpoint and his attitude toward Chiliasm are important for a proper evaluation of his testimony concerning the canonical status of the Apocalypse and the last witness (Dionysius) in this section of the paper.

Origen's allegorical hermeneutics plays an important part in his understanding of the Apocalypse. His viewpoint could be nothing but offensive to many of his contemporaries. His utter lack of sympathy with the Chiliastic expectations which were based primarily upon the Apocalypse, gives his unequivocal testimony to the canonical status of the Apocalypse.

The age of Origen was a time of tensions and persecutions under the policy of the Roman emperors and Egypt received its share of hostility.

Eusebius²¹ relates how the opponents of Origen's hermeneutics found a spokesman in an Egyptian bishop, Nepos of Arisinae. In a work entitled, *Refutation of the Allegorists* Nepos defends the literal exegesis of the Apocalypse against that of Origen.

Dionysius,²² bishop of Alexandria, who had been a pupil of Origen, settled this tension by a visit to the district where the difficulty was most intense and showed how the literalistic exegesis was untenable, and thus through his efforts restored peace.

The discussion is somewhat nubilous, but Dionysius has a pious regard for the work. Dionysius provides the framework of the critical analysis of the difference between the language, character, etc., of the Gospel and the Apocalypse. Dionysius did not believe John of tradition wrote the work, but he did not commit himself to another John as author.

There can be no doubt that Dionysius was first of all interested in destroying the influence of this writing which had given consolation to the Chiliasts.

He insists that the writer was holy, inspired, saw a revelation, etc., but at the same time his whole aim was to weaken the regard for it. In other words, no matter how much he affirms

that his remarks have nothing to do with the canonicity of the Apocalypse, he shows that this is his first concern. Origen's canon included the Apocalypse, and his student Dionysius realized that if his opinion that the Apocalypse was less worthy of respect was to gain ground effectively against the peculiar love for it on the part of the Chiliasts, its position in the Canon would have to be shaken. How successful he was remains to be considered in the next section.

SECTION THREE: Development of the General Attitude Within the Patristic Period

In this concluding section I shall trace in a summary manner the history of the acceptance or rejection of the Apocalypse as having canonical status until circa the end of the fourth century, when the influence and authority of Athanasius in the east, and Augustine and the African councils in the west, the development of the canon came to a conclusion in the Catholic Church.

The fact that Eusebius championed the basic criticism of Dionysius caused certain eastern Churches to sustain their criticism concerning the Apocalypse.

Methodius²³ was an opponent of Origen's theology. His frequent use of it as Scripture shows that the criticism of Dionysius and Origen had made no impression upon him. The criticism of Dionysius therefore failed to take root in Asia Minor, and as we shall see in Alexandria, but we must look to Palestine as the soil where it first bore fruit.

Caesarea, in Palestine, had stood under the sway of the Origenist Theology. Here Eusebius came under the spell of this Theology. Of all the men who were in a position to carry to an effective conclusion the criticism which Dionysius had begun, none enjoyed greater advantage than Eusebius. Emperor Constantine commissioned him to prepare fifty Bibles for the Church. This points to the general esteem the Church had for Eusebius. It is also vital that we recall his place at Nicea.

The prominence which Eusebius gives the criticism of Dionysius upon the Apocalypse by devoting to it a whole chapter in his *Ecclesiastical History* is motivated by more than historical interest. Eusebius is strongly inclined to the view of Dionysius that the Apostle John did not write the Apocalypse and

believes that the double mention of John by Papias makes up in part for the deficiency in historical foundation under which this hypothesis suffers.

We have already mentioned Eusebius' three categories of literature recognized, disputed, and heretical. It is interesting to note that he lists the Apocalypse under both Recognized and Spurious.²⁴ Now this hesitating attitude can only mean that Eusebius was at odds with the Church. Personally he is quite ready to classify it with spurious works, but in deference to its acceptance as canonic not only in the west, but also by the leading teachers of the east, including Origen, he places it among the undisputed books. Although it may not be overlooked that Eusebius does not fail to mention testimonies to the use of the Apocalypse as authoritative.

It is particularly in Cappadocia of Asia Minor and in Syria that in the course of the fourth century, we meet with expressions of a hesitating or wholly negative attitude toward the Apocalypse. Two of the Cappadocian theologians, Gregory of Nazianzum (c. 389) and Amphilocius of Iconium (after 394), in giving lists of the New Testament books do not list the Apocalypse.²⁵ These witnesses make it apparent that among the influential theologians of Cappadocia the canonical position of the Apocalypse was insecure.

Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 386) held certain catechetical discourses as early as the middle of the century in Jerusalem, in the course of which he gave a list of the books of the Old and New Testaments which were read in the Churches should not be read in private either.²⁶ He is no doubt following Dionysius and Origen in their attitudes toward the Apocalypse.

Already in the second century the Apocalypse was accepted as an authoritative book in the Church at Antioch, but at the end of the fourth century it was evidently absent from the Bible of this Church. We must notice that in Antioch the Apocalypse was accepted (c 2nd century), because Theophilus uses testimonies from it in his writings.²⁷

How are we to evaluate this rejection of the Apocalypse as a New Testament book in these eastern Churches? There are so many factors involved which could never be satisfactorily answered we can but contrast the eastern attitude with the Western acceptance of the Apocalypse.

There was no more commanding figure in the Egyptian (Alexandrian) Church during the fourth century than Athanasius,

who was bishop of Alexandria from 329 until his death in 373. In one of his annual Paschal Letters Athanasius included a list of the writings of the divine Scripture.²⁸ In distinction from Eusebius, Athanasius no longer speaks of anti legomena - there are only canonical books and he has no hesitation in listing the Apocalypse with the other New Testament writings. Sharply distinguished from these canonical books are those which were appointed by the fathers to be read for instruction. This unhesitating acceptance of the canonicity of the Apocalypse is characteristic of the Alexandrian Church, also in its later history.

After Hippolytus' refutation of Gaius there is no clear evidence of doubt as to either the Apostolicity or the authority of the Apocalypse. This seems to be the general attitude in the West, at least from the fourth century.

In the course of the fourth century the same high regard for the Apocalypse continues. With the reign of Constantine the Church entered upon a new period of development being no longer disturbed by persecutions.

Jerome (c. 419) was acquainted with doubts expressed with regard to the canonicity of the Apocalypse in the east, but is convinced that it has canonical and ecclesiastical authority. Jerome's translation of the Bible makes it apparent what his general attitude toward the canon was, because he included our present list including the Apocalypse.

Augustine (d.c. 430) cites the Apocalypse often in his *City of God*. In a passage in his work on *Christian Doctrine* he gives a list of the works in our present canon. The conformation of the Canon of the rest of the Church to that of Athanasius and Augustine was only a matter of time.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions concerning the attitude of the Church both East and West concerning the Apocalypse.

Our main concerns have been to point out some of the positive and negative attitudes towards the Apocalypse and the circumstances under which the attitudes arose.

The factor of the nature of the Apostolic, Prophetic Offices are vital for understanding Montanism and Chiliastic thought in general.

It is also imperative to note how the above influences affected the attitude of various national Churches. The political forces involved in persecution gave impetus to the use of the Apocalypse and the distorted use created much of the negative thought. Since it is impossible to discover empirically the process of canonization we can only compare attitudes and the national Churches and their major theological emphasis.

We also noted that general apocalyptic²⁹ was not categorically compared with the biblical apocalypse.

But with all our historical investigation we cannot say that the development of the N.T. Canon and the history of the Apocalypse as a member of it, has been fully explained. For we cannot but recognize that behind and through this historical process there was a guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Note: The use of The Book of Revelation in the Apostolic Fathers. See *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers: A Committee of Oxford Society of Historical Theology, Oxford Press, 1905.* This book discusses the text of *Revelation*:

- 1:7, 13 - p. 16
- 7:14 - p. 110
- 21:5 - p. 16
- 22:10 - p. 17
- 22:12 - p. 17, 58

A brief, broad outline might be helpful. Dr. Merrill Tenney has provided such an outline in his *Interpreting Revelation*.

- The Prologue: (1:1-8)
- Vision I: The Seven Churches of Asia (1:9-3:22)
- Vision II: The Process of World Judgment (4:1-16:21)
- Vision III: The Climax of Judgment (17:1-21:8)
- Vision IV: The Eternal City (21:9-22:5)
- Epilogue (22:6-21)

This framework was used in dividing our more extended outline into four sections in order to make study easier by dealing with a broad section at a time.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Johannes Quasten's *Patrology*, Vol. I, The Beginnings of Patristic Literature, Newman Press: Westminster, Maryland, 1950, pp. 84-89-152-219-289-312; Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. III, Loeb Classics, Harvard University Press.

2. Ned B. Stonehouse, *The Apocalypse in The Ancient*, Oosterbaan, and Le Cointre Goes (Holland) 1929. This is the finest statement in English on this problem.

3. See Theron's, *Evidence of Tradition*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan, p. 89; Wescott's, *On the Canon of the New Testament* (Macmillan Co.: New York, 1889); F. W. Grosheide ed., *Some Early Lists of the Books of The New Testament* (Brill's: Leiden, 1948) pp. 20-24; *The Interpreter's Bible*, Volume 12 (Abingdon Press, pp. 351-354).

4. See for a good basic discussion H. A. Guy's *New Testament Prophecy*, Epworth Press: London, 1947; pp. 90-118.

5. See K. Lakes, *Apostolic Fathers*, Volume I, Loeb Classics, Harvard University Press.

6. For a good survey of this movement and how it is related to our problem see Knox's, *Enthusiasm* (Oxford University Press, 1950) pp. 25-49; and *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Volume 15, article Montanism, pp. 750-751, 1957 edition.

7. For an excellent survey of the Alogoi and bibliographical literature see F. Cayre's, *Manuel of Patrology*, Vol. I Society of St. John the Evangelist, Desclee and Co., Paris, and Rome, pp. 106 and 132f., 1927.

8. This information is found in Eusebius, Vol. V, chp. 8:4, *ibid*.

9. *Ibid*. Vol. 1:58.

10. Johannes Quasten's, *Patrology*, Vol. II, The Ante Nicene Literature After Irenaeus (Newman Press: Westminster, Maryland, 1950) p. 208.

11. For this material see, *Ante-Nicene Father's*, Vols. III and IV - gives English translation of writings of Tertullian. In all this paper I shall merely give sources in which I did research. The essay is so short that I do not give many quotations because that would take up too much of the paper.

12. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book III 28:2 (Loeb series: Harvard University Press).

13. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III - Tertullian's "Against Proxean."

14. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book II 25:6f; VI 20 (Loeb series, Harvard University Press).

15. See Quasten's, *Patrology*, Vol. II, p. 197.

16. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III 23:5f Loeb series, Harvard University Press.

17. See *Anti-Nicene Fathers* for Clement's statement - II 12, 119.

18. *Ibid*. *Stromata* VII 17, 106.

19. An adequate statement on Origen concerning our problem would require a volume, but the essence of the relation of his concept of tradition and the place the Apocalypse plays in this tradition see the *Patrologies of Quasten and Cayre* (directly mentioned) Hanson's,

Origen's Doctrine of Tradition, S.P.C.K., London, 1954; Danielou's *Origen*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1955.

20. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI, 25, where he states that the New Testament books were divided into recognized and the disputed, and the Apocalypse is listed in the former group.

21. *Eusebius* VII 24:1f.

22. The information here given is found in *Eusebius, ibid.* 24:6f. As far as I know this discussion is only preserved in *Eusebius*.

23. H. E. W. Turner's, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (Mowbray's: London, 1954) pp. 131, 143, 444, 450.

24. Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* III, 25:2ff.

25. See Westcott's *History*, *op. cit.*

26. *Ibid.*, and *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, extant works of Cyril of Jerusalem.

27. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* IV, 24.

28. See the *Patrologies of Quasten and Cayre'*, *op. cit.* for extant materials of Athanasius' Paschal Letter.

29. See H. H. Rowley's, *The Relevance of the Apocalyptic* (Lutterworth Press, 1955 reprint - for the literature involved).