

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

control as the guardian of freedom and the limit of indulgence. It is thus the Christian Gospel trains us to deny our worldly desires that we may lead, not outside of this present world, but *in it*, a life that is sober, righteous and godly. Thus Christ, who redeemed us from all iniquity, purifies us to Himself as a people of his own, zealous for good works. Whereas to make a virtue out of things indifferent is to debauch men's sense of right and wrong. To drill unregenerate nature into refusing some innocent pleasures or starving natural propensities leads to development of evil in less coarse but no less perilous forms. To enforce abstinence on a large scale from things innocent or permissible is a violence upon nature which avenges itself in the long run by an outburst of license. Regeneration by force of law must therefore prove a failure. From the heart are the issues of life. Begin there : of what use will it be to scour the cup and the platter ?

J. OSWALD DYKES.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN THE APOCALYPSE.
HER UNIVERSALISM.

No inquiry connected with the light in which the Church of Christ appears in the Apocalypse is more important than that before us in this Paper. Upon the manner in which we answer it must to a large extent depend our view of the book as a whole, our estimate of the position of its author in the development of early Christianity, and the conclusion to which we come upon the question whether he may or may not be identified with the writer of the fourth Gospel. If, on the one hand, the book is so Judaic as many suppose it to be, it will not be easy to vindicate its

right to the place held by it in the Christian canon; its author cannot have risen above the narrow and limited views of the Jewish portion of the first Christian community; and we shall have great difficulty in believing that, even if it was written nearly thirty years before the fourth Gospel, the two books could have proceeded from the same pen. If, on the other hand, we have reason to conclude that its spirit, so far from being Judaic, is fully marked by the spirituality and universalism of the rest of the New Testament, we shall escape many questions, otherwise hard of solution, that are suggested by it; it will so far be justly entitled to the esteem in which the Church has always held it; and, at least as regards its thoughts, it may have been the composition of St. John.

That the book is in a true sense Jewish, if not Judaic, every one, of course, must at once allow. Its descriptions are founded almost wholly upon those contained in the prophets of the Old Testament; its figures are Jewish; its mode of expressing thought, more especially by the use of numbers, is essentially Jewish; its deepest Christian truths are presented under forms, and in expressions, familiar to the Jewish mind. If not more truly, it is yet at first sight more obviously, the work of a Jew than the fourth Gospel. These things, however, do not of themselves make it Judaic. The ripest Christian conviction, the deepest Christian feeling, has delighted in every age to express itself in language and in figures drawn from the Old Testament Dispensation. We cannot separate ourselves from the Church of God as she was then gathered out from among the nations of the world, protected amidst her trials, and conducted in safety to the rest which had been promised her. There is in her history a visible presence of the Almighty with his people upon which the mind delights to dwell. Her joys and sorrows, her difficulties and temptations, her struggles and triumphs, admirably represent our own.

“These things happened unto them by way of example; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come” (1 Corinthians x. 11). When we identify ourselves with God’s ancient people, we have all the encouragement afforded by the thought that we are treading a path over which multitudes of believers in earlier times have victoriously passed, and that we have with us the presence of Him who in all his power and love was also with them, who is “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” The history of the Old Testament Church is surrounded with our holiest and most heart-stirring associations, and we cannot avoid speaking of ourselves as that Church is spoken of in Scripture. But all this does not make us Judaic. In the midst of it we may fully recognize the truth, that now “there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for we are all one *man* in Christ Jesus” (Galatians iii. 28). We may confess that we occupy in relation to God the same ground as that occupied by our brethren in Christ of every country and every age; we may allow the all-embracing nature of that spiritual bond which is found in the worship of “spirit and truth;” we may glory in the universalism of the Christian Church. The figures of the Apocalypse, therefore, to whatever extent they may be Jewish, do not on that account necessarily exhibit traces of a Judaic spirit. We shall have occasion to notice that other Apostles, that even St. Paul, used some of the most important of them in a precisely similar way. Abundant as they are, the employment of them is thoroughly consistent with the clearest perception and the firmest grasp of Christian universalism.

Still further, however, the strictest acceptance of the truth that *all* believers, to whatever portion of the human family they belong, are equal before God, no class having pre-eminence over another, could not preclude St. John,

in the historical circumstances in which he was placed, from paying more attention than we do to the fact, that the Church of Christ was composed of converts from the two great divisions of the race, or from feeling, with a power hardly possible to us, that the salvation which is in Christ Jesus had been prepared among the Jews, and had from them passed over to the Gentiles. That was simply God's own plan, a recognition of which could not fail to be attended with the most important consequences both to the Jew and to the Gentile. Even in his Gospel, the universalism of which is admitted without hesitation by all, the Apostle shews his sense of the value of this plan by preserving (and alone of the Evangelists preserving) the words addressed by our Lord to the woman of Samaria, "for salvation is from the Jews" (John iv. 22). There was nothing Judaic in that utterance of our Lord. It is immediately followed by words which may be said to constitute the great charter of the freedom, spirituality, and universalism of the Gospel spirit: "But an hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father also is seeking such, them that worship Him" (John iv. 23).¹ It simply relates a fact, and that, too, one of which it was necessary to see the fulfilment in Jesus before He could be acknowledged as the promised Messiah for either Jew or Gentile. St. John could not be insensible to this. In his days, also, the two divisions of the Church had not had time to become so completely blended into one that the national origin of each might be unthought of. It was indeed a most powerful argument in favour of her Divine origin and mission that she was making progress among the Gentiles *as such*, that those who had been so long without the covenant were

¹ For a defence of the translation here given of the last and difficult clause of this verse, see the *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, by Proff. Milligan and Moulton. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)

“no more strangers and sojourners,” but “fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God,” that Christ had broken down the middle wall of partition, and had created in Himself “of the twain one new man” (Ephesians ii. 15, 19). At such a time the distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians could not be lost sight of without diminishing the power of Christian argument and lowering the tone of Christian triumph. It need not surprise us, therefore, if traces of the distinction are to be found in the Apocalypse, as when in Chapter xi. verse 18, we read of “the saints and them that fear thy name,” the first appellation being the name for all true Israelites, the second the name constantly applied to Gentile proselytes. But there is no distinction between a Jewish and a Gentile Church. There is no preference given to the one class over the other. Both are parts of the same Church; both stand upon an equal footing within it; and both received the same “reward.” There is thus again nothing Judaic in such an acknowledgment of the facts of history. If we do not dwell so much upon them, it is only because we are far removed in time from the moment when they were so palpable and striking. It may even be a question whether we do not often lose a great deal by not keeping the historical development of the Church of Christ more fully before our eyes.

The question, then, with which we deal is not affected by the two considerations now mentioned. We have to ask, not whether St. John in the Apocalypse is Jewish in his language and figures, or whether he is alive to the fact that two distinct classes of Christians have been gathered into the one Church of Christ, but whether he makes such a distinction between the two that the Gentile section is subordinate to the Jewish. While salvation is bestowed on all, have the Jews a preference in the Divine thought now, and in the Divine plans for the future? In God’s cove-

nant they were first in time; are they also always first in honour? Have they, throughout the whole Book of Revelation, such a pre-eminence over the Gentiles as is inconsistent with the true idea of Christian universalism; or such as, at all events, secures to them the leading part in the carrying out of God's economy of grace, until the last stage of it has been reached in the perfected glory of the eternal world?

Both allegations have been made, although from very different quarters, and with very different intentions.

On the one hand, we have Baur, followed by many both in his own country and in England, alleging that, "although the heathen are not excluded from participation in the heavenly Jerusalem, yet those of them who are received into the community of that city are really nothing more than an appendix to the 144,000 sealed out of all the tribes of the sons of Israel. The latter alone are the 'virgins' who 'follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth,' the 'first fruits to God and to the Lamb,' the special stem of the heavenly congregation. Those of the heathen who cast in their lot with them are simply such an enlargement of Judaism as was contemplated even by the spirit of the Old Testament, and rendered necessary by the progress from Judaism to Christianity" (*Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanon. Evang.*, p. 348). Others again, of whom Füller and Auberlen may be selected as the representatives, find the Jewish at least so far distinguished from the Gentile Church, that it is dealt with in an altogether different manner and reserved for an altogether different destiny. The contests and the struggles described in the Revelation really concern the Gentile Church alone. The Jewish branch, the history of which seems for the time to have terminated when the Apostles of our Lord turned to the Gentiles, has at present no part to play in the development of the Christian scheme of Providence. It is quietly sleeping in the

Promised Land, awaiting as a Church a resurrection from the dead. But when the times of the Gentiles have been accomplished, the prophecy of Ezekiel shall be fulfilled: "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord" (Ezek. xxxvii. 12-14). In other words, at the beginning of the end, immediately before the three and a half years or twelve hundred and sixty days spoken of in Revelation xii. 14 and xi. 3, the members of God's ancient people, long scattered but kept distinct among the nations, shall be converted; all Israel shall be saved; the blessed period alluded to by St. Paul, when he says, "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what *shall* the receiving of *them* be but life from the dead" (Romans xi. 15), shall arrive; and the Jewish Church, reinstated in its long lost privileges and summoned anew to its former work, shall become the great messenger of grace to those who have not hitherto received its now joyfully recognized Messiah and King (comp. Füller on Revelation xi. xii.).

Nor is this all. Even during the millennial reign this "economical" pre-eminence of the Jews will still continue. Auberlen sees in that reign an "earthly, Jewish, although not carnal, kingdom of God." He expresses his belief that "Israel is to be again at the head of all humanity." Looking from the standpoint of the history of revelation, he is satisfied that "Israel is, and ever shall be, the chosen people through which God executes his plans concerning humanity"; and he anticipates the coming of a time when "as Israel glorifies God, and is glorified by

God, a deep and powerful impression cannot fail to be made upon the Gentiles." The rich manifestation of God's mercy will then complete the work of missions to the heathen; and "thus, while during the Old Testament times the Jews exclusively, and during the Church-historical period the Gentiles exclusively, enjoyed the blessings of the salvation of revelation, while in both cases humanity was divided and separated; now in the millennium Jews and Gentiles are united, and all humanity, the whole organism, united under the firstborn brother, walks in the light of God, and thus the true and full life of humanity is at last realized" (Auberlen, *Daniel and the Revelation*, Clark's Translation, pp. 340, 343, 349).

The interest of this latter view is not to be denied, and it may be admitted that it is possible to hold it without being liable to the charge of Chiliasm of any objectionable kind. The simple question is, Is either it or the view of Baur previously adverted to, correct, and correct not so much in the light of general New Testament teaching as in the light of the teaching of the one book before us? This question must be answered in the negative. Fairly interpreted, the author of the Apocalypse seems to know the Christian Church only as a community in which distinctions of birth and race have completely passed away, in which the Jewish Christian neither has, nor ever will have, superiority over the Gentile, in which the Gentile Christian is admitted to the same privileges, and called to the same duties, as the Jew.

Let us look, *e.g.* at the first and leading representation of the Christian Church given us in the Apocalypse; and how is it possible to escape the conclusion that the Gentile branch of it stood to the writer upon the very same level as the Jewish, when we find that seven Gentile cities supply the materials of its embodiment as a whole (Chap. ii. iii.)? There is no mention of a congregation in Jerusalem,

or any town of Palestine, or any district of the world, in which we have reason to believe that the Jewish Christian element was the strongest. The Apostle goes to a Gentile land, and to cities in which we know from other books of the New Testament (such as the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians) that Christians were mainly converted Gentiles, for the groundwork of a delineation in which we are to see the Church of Christ as she shines like seven golden candlesticks in the sanctuary of God. Nor will it do to say that he makes this selection because he writes for Gentiles. He writes for all: "*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches.*" He is addressing all God's people; and, if he had not been doing so, if he was communicating his revelation only to the Gentile section of the Church, it would have been peculiarly incumbent upon him to remind it that there was another section of the common body to which a still greater part in the unfolding of God's economy in the future had been assigned. As it is, he not only does nothing of the kind, but he leaves upon us the distinct impression that the seven Churches represent the whole Church. They contain a picture of the one Body the fortunes of which in the world he is afterwards to describe, and there is no scene in the remaining portion of his book down to the very end which has not its germ in something said to one or other of these Churches. The richest blessings of the future are already theirs in promise. The very glory of the millennial "reign," as described in Chapter xx. 4, is assigned to the Christian of Laodicea who overcomes (Chapter iii. 21); and if, at first sight, there seems to be some foundation for the remark of Renan, as he explains Chapter xxii. 2, that "while the Jewish Church eats the fruits of the tree of life, the Gentile Church must content itself with a medicinal infusion of its leaves" (*L'Antechrist*, p. 475), the hastiness of the con-

temptuous conclusion is immediately apparent when we find these words in the blessing secured to the Church at Ephesus, "To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the Paradise of God" (Chap. ii. 7). Either the seven Epistles represent the whole Church, in which case had the object of the Apostle been, as according to Renan it is, to "flatter Jewish pride," the Church would not have been set forth under the figure of seven Gentile Churches; or they represent the Gentile branch of the Church, in which case, had the object of the writer been what we are told it was, the victorious Gentile would not have had the promise given him that he, not less than the Jew, should eat of the tree of life, instead of being limited to an infusion of its leaves. Nothing can well be clearer than that in the fundamental conception of the Church of Christ, as it is brought before us in the second and third chapters of the book, there is no trace of a distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians, or of a superiority of the former over the latter.

Similar observations apply to the rest of the book, if, reserving for the moment one or two particular passages to be afterwards adverted to, we look at its general tone: when it speaks either of the triumphs or of the struggles of believers, we shall find it impossible to think that in the Christian Church pre-eminence is allotted to any one part over another. Thus when, immediately after the picture presented to us in Chapters ii. and iii. of the Church on earth, we are taken in Chapter iv. to the Church in heaven, that Church is set before us by the figure of twenty-four elders sitting upon twenty-four thrones; and these elders are acknowledged by all enquirers to represent the Church in her triumphant and glorified condition. But why the number twenty-four? It has been sometimes thought that this number is borrowed from the twenty-four divisions of the sons of Aaron described in 1 Chronicles xxiv. Could

the suggestion be accepted, it might seem as if it lent countenance to the idea that that portion of the triumphant Church which had been gained from Judaism was in one way or another possessed of special privileges. But it is a fatal objection to this view that the priestly classification referred to belongs to the period of the Temple, not of the Tabernacle; and, so far as we have been able to observe, it is from the latter not the former that the Seer always draws his imagery. We must therefore suppose that the number twenty-four in this passage is found either by adding together the twelve Patriarchs and the twelve Apostles, or by simply doubling, for the sake of emphasis, the twelve, the number of the Church. To this principle of doubling, although in a different form, we have already called attention in previous papers¹ as a characteristic of the style of the Apocalypse, and there would be nothing unnatural in resorting to it here. But it is not necessary for our present purpose to determine in favour of either of these views, for either sufficiently shews that the number twenty-four is probably chosen in order to represent the Church in her double aspect, as at once the Church of the Old Covenant and of the New. This is further confirmed by the language of Chapter v. 9, where we have the song of the twenty-four elders, as they magnify the Lamb who has "overcome" to break the seals of the sealed roll and to unfold the counsels of the Almighty: "And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood *men* of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation." The song is not that of a Jewish Church thanking God that the Gentiles have been brought in to share its privileges, though in an inferior degree. It is a song of the whole Church, all the members of which are equally exalted, for all are made "unto our God

¹ THE EXPOSITOR (Second Series), Vol. iv.

a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth" (Verse 10). It is indeed quite conceivable that the men of every "tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation" spoken of in Verse 9 may be only Gentile. But the song is not less, on that account, the song of all the redeemed in heaven, who behold in the great act of inviting the Gentiles into the covenant the most signal expression of the Divine grace and love,—just as St. Paul describes the very "mystery of Christ" as that mystery "which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the spirit; *to wit*, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (Eph. iii. 4-6). The Church as she triumphs in heaven, not less than as she is planted on earth, is unquestionably one; and we cannot suppose that privileges are forfeited in the one state which were enjoyed in the other.

Similar remarks apply to the Church when she is brought before us in her struggles with her enemies. It surely cannot for a moment be supposed that the great adversaries described in Chapters xii. and xiii., the devil, the beast, and the false prophet, war against Gentile Christians alone. Yet this conclusion must follow if we draw a distinction between them and Jewish Christians. The latter, as Füller consistently argues in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, will then be represented by the woman of Chapter xii., who flees before the dragon into the land where she has a place prepared for her, that is, into the land of Palestine, where she is preserved until the time when all the struggles of the Church in the world except the last shall be over, and the moment for the conversion of the whole seed of Israel shall have arrived. Only against "the rest" of the woman's seed, that is, against Gentile Christians or the Gentile Church, do the devil, the first beast, and the second beast

make war. Not many, we are persuaded, will be able to accept such an interpretation. It is inconceivable that, if "the rest" of the woman's seed be Gentile Christians, the woman herself should be the community of Jewish believers. The word "rest," on the supposition adopted, has no meaning unless we find Jewish Christians not in the mother but in some other portion of her offspring. The expression "wilderness" is unsuitable to a land of promise, where there is no trouble, but only security and peace. No Jewish Christian community has existed in the holy land during the past centuries of the Christian era; and none is there now, except that which, having fallen asleep in Christ, is awaiting its bodily resurrection from the grave; and there is something very far-fetched in the idea that the conversion of Israel when it does take place so unites, without continuity of succession, the latest to the earliest Jewish Church that the same figure of the woman can fitly represent them both. Further, also, it will be observed that this conception of the conversion of Israel is really introduced into the text of the Apocalypse in order to comply with the supposed demands of Old Testament prophecy and of the eleventh Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; there is not a word in the book itself directly to support it. Finally, it is impossible to interpose centuries upon centuries of Christian history between the point of time when, in Verse 5 of Chapter xii. the woman is "delivered of a man child who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron;" and that alluded to in Verse 6, when the woman fled into the wilderness to be there nourished a thousand two hundred and threescore days. The interpretation is beset with insuperable difficulties, and we have no alternative left but to adopt the first and most obvious meaning of the struggle of the Church with her enemies. The whole Church, without thought of either Jewish or Gentile sections, contends with them. It is the

same with her in this aspect of her condition as it was in the representation given of her state on earth and in the description of her state in heaven. All her members without distinction have the same general conflict to maintain, and the same general victory to win.

We have dealt as yet with what may be described as the prevalent tone of the Apocalypse rather than with particular passages; but several of these are so important that we cannot conclude without making brief special allusion to them. Those most worthy of regard may probably be said to be the following:—the use of the word “Israel” in Chapters vii. 4, and xxi. 12; the sealing of the 144,000 in Chapter vii.; the description of the woman who brought forth the man child in Chapter xii.; the account of the 144,000 upon the mount Zion in Chapter xiv.; and some of the details mentioned in connexion with the New Jerusalem in Chapters xxi., xxii. Two of these passages, that of the sealing in Chapter vii. and of the 144,000 in Chapter xiv. have been already, though from a somewhat different point of view, considered by us in an earlier number of the EXPOSITOR.¹ The others demand a few remarks.

(1) As to the use of the word “Israel” in Chapters vii. 4 and xxi. 12, it is impossible to limit the meaning of that word to Jews unless there be something in the context absolutely requiring the limitation. To the writers of the New Testament books the Jews were not “Israel” but “Israel according to the flesh” (1 Cor. x. 18). The name “Israel” indeed, from the moment when it was bestowed upon the Patriarch who first received it, had been always the name, not so much of an individual personality, as of a character and a work; and, when applied to Jacob’s descendants, it denoted them, not according to that birth by which they were “Hebrews,” but according to that sacred descent in virtue of which they inherited the

¹ Vol. iv. (Second Series).

promises (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 22). It thus became a designation for the Christian Church in which faith recognized the true seed of Abraham, the true inheritors of the covenant blessing. This mode of thought marked the early Christian age in the strongest manner (Rom. ii. 28, 29, ix. 6, 7; Gal. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 3), and no person who believed in the existence of a Gentile Church could have been a stranger to it.

(2) The statements regarding the "woman" in Chapter xii. are sometimes thought to favour the idea that the redeemed out of Israel are to be distinguished from the Gentile Church. But an attentive consideration of the passage will lead rather to an opposite conclusion. The key to the interpretation of Chapter xii. appears to us to lie in the prologue of the fourth Gospel. The parallelism of the two passages, and especially of the opening verses of each, can hardly be mistaken. The same contrasts are presented to us in both—light, darkness, light shining in the darkness, the darkness trying to prevail against the light but failing to overcome it (not as in Authorized version to "comprehend," or as in Revised version to "apprehend," it). The woman is neither the Jewish nor the Christian Church. She is the ideal Church as it existed before the foundations of the world were laid. She is in heaven, and the scene described in Verses 1-6 is beheld in heaven. It will not do to say that only the Seer is in heaven, but the scene itself on earth. The whole bearing of the passage contradicts such an impression. The woman, therefore, is as yet ideal: only at Verse 13 does she become historical. She is light from Him who "is light, and with whom there is no darkness at all," light which shone before it was partially embodied in the Church either of the Old Covenant or the New. We behold her in her own glorious existence, and it is enough to dwell upon the potencies that are in her. At a later point in the Chapter she will pass from the ideal

into the actual. But, if so, the Jewish and Gentile elements of the Church must be one, without the slightest distinction between them having a place in the Divine mind. There is a sense, although we cannot pause to dwell upon it, in which our Lord may be spoken of as the Son of the Church, as the Flower of the chosen family. The Church must then, however, mean the whole Church, the whole redeemed family of God.

(3) Some of the details mentioned in connexion with the New Jerusalem in Chapters xxi. xxii. deserve notice. We refer especially to what is said of "the nations" in Chapter xxi. 24, 26, and in Chapter xxii. 2; and we frankly confess that the statements there present difficulties which it is not easy to surmount. It would certainly seem at first sight as if these "nations" stood in a different relation to the heavenly city from that occupied by its other inhabitants; and, as the term "nations" is almost always, if not always, used in the Apocalypse of the heathen, we appear to be forced to the conclusion that the proper inhabitants of the city are Jewish Christians, while outside, although walking "by its light" and "bringing their honour and glory into it," are the converted Gentiles. Yet such an interpretation must be wrong. (a) If we are to adopt the meaning of "nations" usually borne by that word in the Apocalypse, we must apply it not to converted, but to unconverted, Gentiles; and, at this point in the development of the plans of the Almighty, it is hard to say where these are to be found. We heard of them last at Chapter xx. 9, where they were destroyed by fire from heaven. (β) If, again, the "nations" are converted Gentiles, we have already seen in this paper that they are not confined to the enjoyment of the "leaves" of the tree of life. They eat of the tree itself, *i.e.* they have the Lord Himself for their nourishment, and more cannot be said of the most privileged believer. (γ) Nor can any stress be laid upon

the word "healing" in Chapter xxii. 2. In the language of St. John words like this, such as "believing" in John xx. 31, are used not only of the initiatory act which they describe, but of the repetition, the confirmation and the deepening, of the act. The nations are "healed" not merely when they are first converted, but when they are continually confirmed throughout all eternity in the joy of their salvation. (δ) It appears to us, therefore, that we may be justified in interpreting the word "nations" in the passages now before us in a wider than its common sense, and as inclusive of Jewish as well as Gentile converts. That St. John knows the Jews not only as God's people but as a nation, is clear from Verse 51 of Chapter xi. of his Gospel. There were circumstances, therefore, which at times justified his application of the term "nation" to those within as well as to those without the covenant. A much more remarkable consideration, however, is afforded by the use of the other term "people" in Revelation xxi. 3, where the true reading is not that of the Authorized but of the Revised version, "Behold, the tabernacle of the Lord is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his peoples." The use of "peoples" in the plural number, which certainly includes the Gentile nations of the earth, is much more striking than the application of the word "nations" to Jews as well as Gentiles. Besides this, it is "by the light" of *the city* that the nations walk, it is into *the city* that they bring their gifts, and the city is not the same as the inhabitants. It is the "Tabernacle of God with *men*." It is first of all the Lord Himself, and by his light Jewish Christians walk, to Him they bring their gifts, not less than their Gentile brethren. (ε) Even if this interpretation be not allowed, the passages with which we have been dealing mean no more than the words of St. Paul in Ephesians iii. 4-6 which have been already quoted.

We have exhausted our space ; but what has been said may at least go far to shew that the Apocalypse, instead of being marked by a Judaic as distinguished from a Jewish tone, is pervaded by a spirit of Christian universalism as decided and clear as any other book of the New Testament.

WM. MILLIGAN.

THE EXEGESIS OF THE SCHOOLMEN.

THEIR FUTILE SPECULATIONS AND DISPUTES.

“*Convertuntur ad vaniloquium.*” Johan. Sarisbur., *Metalog.* ii. 7.

WE have thus far noted those defects of Scholastic exegesis which arose from its second-handness ; its undue subservience to authority ; its essential want of courage ; its failure to define the nature and limits of inspiration ; its consequent vagueness as to the objects of exegesis ; its neglect of philology and history ; and its abuse of parallel passages. We must now glance at its frequent tendency to minute and unprofitable triviality, which perhaps we may be allowed to sum up in the one term, its Micrology. This defect arose from the fact that the methods of Scholasticism were mainly dialectic, and dealt more with form than with matter. The Scholastic theologians did not *define* doctrine but they refined upon it. They were not *Patres Ecclesiæ* but *Doctores*.¹

Bacon says that there are three distempers of learning—fantastic learning, contentious learning, and delicate learning ; vain imaginations, vain altercations, and vain affectations. Scholastic exegesis was infected with all three dis-

¹ Baur, *Versöhnungslehre*, p. 147.