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The Greek of the Apocalypse is marked by a series of most striking peculiarities which, as has long been recognized, are due in large part to the influence of the Hebrew idiom. They appear in passages imitating the style of the Hebrew Prophets (with whose writings the Apocalyptist was so familiar) or in sentences or phrases transferred directly from the Hebrew of the Old Testament or from its Greek translation—the LXX. The following pages present the evidence of this Hebrew influence in sufficient volume and with sufficient discussion of detail to make, it is hoped, a complete demonstration. The solecisms will be considered under three heads.

1 Ebrard, in speaking of the more glaring solecisms of the Apocalypse, says, that "dieselben nicht unwillkürlich, sondern in halbabsichtlicher Nachahmung des Colorits der a. t. Sprache entstanden sind. Der Autor der Apokalypse wollte offenbar hebraisirend schreiben; die Sprache und der Stil der a. t. Propheten waren, die ihm allein in ihrer grossartigen Schlichtheit genügte, das Ungeheure wiederzugeben, was er geschaut hat." ("Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte." Dritte Aufl. Frankfurt a. M. 1868, S. 1106.)

2 Ewald, "Die Johanneischen Schriften." Bd. II., S. 52.

3 The LXX translation is more Hebraic than the N. T. and does not represent a type of Greek established and in actual currency at the time it was made, but "its distinctive character is due rather to the translators' exaggerated deference to the Hebrew sacred text and their mechanical reproduction of it." (Thayer on "Language of the New Testament" in Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible," Vol. III, p. 40.) It is not surprising, then, that solecisms are found in the LXX nor in the writings of those who quoted or made use of that translation.

4 There are no less than 460 O. T. passages made use of in the Apocalypse. Westcott and Hort give a list of these in their "N. T. Greek," pp. 612 ff. and under the heading "Quotations from the O. T."; but the Apocalypse contains no quotations proper, although a great part of its language is taken from the O. T. (Toy, "Quotations in the N. T.," p. 253. Cp. Swete, "An Introduction to the O. T. in Greek," pp. 392 and 404.)
I.

PECULIAR WORDS.¹

1. ἰδοὺ.² It is often followed by a Nominative without verb. The LXX of the Old Testament prophecies invariably uses ἰδοὺ (1) as a translation of the Hebrew word הָנֵה (behold, lo). Thus, for example, in such passages as Gen. 12:19 הָנֵה, the LXX of which is καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἢ γυνὴ σου (ἐναντίον σου). Gen. 16:6 ἴσχυρος ἡ γυνὴ σου, the LXX of which is εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς Σάραν Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου (ἐναντίον σου). Gen. 18:9 οὐδέν, the LXX of which is εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ. Gen. 19:2 ἐλθεῖτε κύριοι, the LXX of which is καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ. Ps. 134:1 οὐδέν, the LXX of which is καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κύριοι. (2) ἰδοὺ is the LXX translation also of the Hebrew word יד (behold), which is from the Chaldaic, in such passages as Dan. 7:5, 6, 7 and 13. It is the translation (3) of the Hebrew יד (behold), which is also from the Chaldaic, in Dan. 2:31, for example. The LXX translation of each of these three words (נָחַם, יד, and יד) is always ἰδοὺ.

(a) Many passages in the Apocalypse contain ἰδοὺ direct from the LXX as, for example: Rev. 1:7 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. This follows Dan. (LXX) 7:13 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, which follows the Aramaic original (Toy) and the Heb. יד (behold). Rev. 14:14 καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ (νεφέλη λευκή), καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενον ὄμοιον νῦν ἀνθρώπου. This follows the LXX of Dan. 7:13 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς νῦν ἀνθρώπου, the Hebrew of which is יד (behold). יד (behold).

¹ These can scarcely be called solecisms in strictest sense, yet they are peculiar especially to the Apocalypse, whose author quotes them from the LXX.

² Ebrard, in refuting Hitzig, who regards the Gospel of Mark and the Apocalypse as written by the same author, speaks of ἰδοὺ in the Apocalypse as “Nachahmung des Prophetenstiles . . . . wer möchte da das oftmalige ἰδοὺ c. ptc. für ein unwillkürliches, zufälliges halten”? (“Evangelium Johannis,” S. 166.)
and the LXX of Dan. 10:16 καὶ ἰδοὺ ὡς ὁμοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου, the Hebrew of which is יְהֹנֵי חַדִּים בָּרַץ (Cp. also Rev. 21:3 ἵππος ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ which follows Ezek. 37:57). Rev. 12:3 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνω κυρίων ἐκτὸς καὶ κάτω κατά δέκα, which follows direct the Hebrew יְהֹנֵי of Dan. 7:7 and ἰδοὺ of the LXX of Dan. 7:8.

(b) Many other passages in the Apocalypse are imitations of the LXX usage. Rev. 6:2, 5 and 8 καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὡς ἵππος λευκὸς; ἦλθεν ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ which follows direct the Hebrew δ of Dan. 7:8. and ἰδοὺ of the LXX of Dan. 7:8.

2. Παντοκράτωρ. The influence of the LXX explains the use of this word. It is found in the following Apocalyptic passages. Rev. 1:8 κύριος ὁ θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 4:8 ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος, ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 11:17 κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 16:7 κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 16:14 (ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης) τοῦ θεοῦ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 19:6 ᾿Αλληλουϊά, ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν κύριος, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 21:22 καὶ ναὸν οὐκ ἐν αὐτῇ ὁ γὰρ κύριος, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναός αὐτῆς ἐστίν. Cp. also, 2 Cor. 6:18. In every one of the passages just specified, the expression ὁ κύριος, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ is direct from the LXX of

1 In other books of the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels, ἰδοὺ is found in quotations from the LXX. of the Old Testament as, Matt. 1:23 ἰδοὺ ὡς παρθένοι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσωσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἴμμανουήλ. This is the LXX from Isaiah 7:14 (Cp. Matt. 12:18; 21:5; Matt. 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἔγω ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, &c., which is the LXX for Mal. 3:1. Cp. Mk. 1:2; Lk. 7:27; Jno. 12:15; Rom. 9:33; Heb. 2:18; Heb. 8:8; Heb. 10:7, 9; 1 Pet. 2:6.)

2 Παντοκράτωρ is not found in John’s Gospel and only once elsewhere in the New Testament, i.e., 2 Cor. 6:18, where it occurs in a quotation from the LXX.
Amos 4:13 κύριος ὁ θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ (ὄνομα αὐτῷ), which, in turn, is the translation of the Hebrew of the same passage, i.e., Amos 4:13 ( présence) תָּהוּ דָּלְתָּ הָיָה (םומז).

3. In the Apocalypse, we always find the word “Jerusalem” written Ἰεροσολύμων (indeclinable), but in the Gospel (and Acts, &c., where quoted) it invariably has the form Ἰεροσόλυμα. (Cp. Thayer’s Winer, p. 68.) But this difference is easily accounted for when we note that the writing of the word in the Apocalypse is the same as that of the LXX (from the Hebrew ירושלים) from which the Apocalyptist so often quotes. The Apocalyptic passages in which the word appears and the LXX passages from which they are quoted follow: Rev. 21:2 καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἰεροσολύμων καινὴν εἶδον. This is quoted from Isa. 52:1 καὶ σὺ ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου, Ἰεροσολύμων, πόλις ἡ ἁγία. Rev. 21:10 καὶ ἐδειξεν μοι τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἰεροσολύμων, &c., which follows the LXX of Isa. 52:1 καὶ σὺ ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου, Ἰεροσολύμων, πόλις ἡ ἁγία. Rev. 3:12 καὶ γράψω τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καινὴν Ἰεροσολύμῳ. Cp. Ezek. 48:35.2 Thus we have:—Jno. 1:19 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἰεροσολύμων. Jno. 2:18 καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς ἐν Ἰεροσόλυμα. Jno. 2:23 ὃς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἰεροσολυμοῖς. Jno. 4:20 καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἰεροσόλυμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τότος. All the other instances in John’s Gospel show the declinable Ἰεροσολυμα. If John wrote the Apocalypse, direct and conscious use of the LXX form is the only possible explanation of the variation of this word.

4. Ἀλληλούια. In Rev. 19:1, 3, 4 and 6 we have the word Ἀλληλούια. This word is taken from the LXX of Pss. 106:1; 146:1; 147:1; 148:1; 149:1; 150:1 and 6. Ἀλληλούια is the Greek translation of the Hebrew עליון.

1 For examples of Ἰεροσολύμων in the LXX, cp. Zech. 3:2; 9:9; Josh. 10:1; Ezek. 1:2; 2:8; 2 Chron. 12:2, 9, 13; 19:1, 4, 8; 20:18, 27, 28, 31; 21:5; 13:20; 22:1, 2; 23:2 et al.

2 In view of the possible common authorship of the Apocalypse and John’s Gospel, it may be noted that in the Gospel the word is always written in its declinable form Ἰεροσόλυμα.
5. In Rev. 12: 5 we have καὶ ἔτικεν νιόν, ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμανεῖν πᾶντα τὰ ἐθνη. Cp. Isa. 66: 7. Here νιόν is masculine and ἄρσεν is neuter. The word for "male" is either ὁ ἄρσην (masc.) or τὸ ἄρσεν (neut.) (Cp. Thayer’s Greek Lex.) In this verse, the writer uses the neuter form while in vs. 13 of the same chapter he employed the masc. (i.e., ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα ἥτις ἔτικεν τὸν ἄρσενα). Since he did not use the neuter form in both sentences, we should rather expect the masculine in the first instance in connection with the masc. νιόν, of which it is an appositive (although an appositive need only agree in case). But as Ewald suggests, "νιόν, ἄρσεν," (i.e., the masc. and the neut. together) is "bloss Nachahmung von Λαος ein Sohn ein männliches." ("Die Joh. Schriften." Bd. II. S. 53).*

II.

PECULIAR PHRASES.

1. In Rev. 15: 5, (Cp. Acts 7: 44), occurs the phrase "τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου," or more fully, "ο ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ." This is a very striking statement, but it is simply the Greek translation in such passages as Ex, 40: 34, the Hebrew of which is יִנָּה הָעָלְמָה; the LXX for this is, καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη θύ σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου and Rev. 15: 5 quotes it. Cp., also, Lev. 24: 3 (LXX) ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου; Num. (LXX) 17: 7 and 8 ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου; Ex. (LXX) 27: 21 is ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου; Ex. 40: 22; 40: 24 and Num. 17: 49.

It is also the LXX translation of ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς in such passages as Num. 1: 50 (LXX) ἐπὶ τῇ σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. Num. 1: 53 (LXX) κύκλῳ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. Num. 10: 11 (LXX) ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

[Note.—Another interesting word is χαλκολίβανον (Rev. 1: 15 and 2: 18). It is a compound word coined by the author, who here follows the Hebrew of Dan. 10: 6. (Cp. Toy, "Quotations in the N. T., p. 254.) Notice, also, the compound words ποταμοφόρης (Rev. 12: 15) and μεσουρανήμα (Rev. 8: 13; 14: 6; 19: 17)].
The Solecisms of the Apocalypse.

It is further the LXX translation of μαρτυρίου in Num. 18:2 (LXX) ἀπέναντι τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου. 2 Chron. 24:6 (LXX) εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

2. Strings of Genitives. Strings of genitives hanging on one noun or on one another are frequent in the Apocalypse. Rev. 19:15 τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτερος. Rev. 14:8 ἤ ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας. Rev. 18:3 ὅτι ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ.

The passages above are not only imitations of the LXX, but are all more or less directly quoted from the LXX of Jer. 25:15 which is, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ ἀκράτος τοῦτο. (Cp. also, Rev. 22:19 ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης. Cp. Rev. 21:6.)

The passages above are not only imitations of the LXX, but are all more or less directly quoted from the LXX of Jer. 25:15 which is, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ ἀκράτος τοῦτο. (Cp. also, Rev. 22:19 ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης. Cp. Rev. 21:6.)

The preposition ἐνώπιον is very common in the LXX and is the Greek translation of the Hebrew words יָפֵן and יָפָל. Thus, for example, the word ἐνώπιον in Rev. 3:9 occurs in the LXX of Isa. 66:28 i. e., ἔκ τοῦ πέπτου σώματος ἐνώπιον ἐκείνου ἐν Χριστῷ, from which it is quoted, ἐνώπιον being the LXX of יָפָל from the phrase יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָپֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן ي. (Cp. Rev. 9:21.) Rev. 7:1 ἐνα μὴ πυρήνῃ ἄνεμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μῆτε ἐπὶ τῆς βαλανίσσης μῆτε ἐπὶ τῶν δέντρων. Rev. 3:5 καὶ ὡμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρό

1 The preposition ἐνώπιον is very common in the LXX and is the Greek translation of the Hebrew words יָפֵן and יָפָל. Thus, for example, the word ἐνώπιον in Rev. 3:9 occurs in the LXX of Isa. 66:28 ο. e., ἔκ τοῦ πέπτου σώματος ἐνώπιον ἐκείνου, from which it is quoted, ἐνώπιον being the LXX of יָפָל from the phrase יָפֵן יָפָל יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן יָפֵן ي. (Cp. ἐνώπιον in Rev. 15:4, which is quoted from Ps. 86:9.) Wherever this word occurs in the Apocalypse (and it occurs thirty-one times) it is the LXX translation direct, or in imitation of the Hebrew word יָפָל.
This repetition of prepositions is in imitation of the LXX usage which shows it constantly. Note, for example, Zech. 6:10 ἀπέδεικτον ἡμῶν τῶν ἁρχαίων καὶ παρὰ τῶν χρησίμων αὐτής καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπεγνωκότων αὐτήν. Zech. 1:4 Ἀποστρέψατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν. Zech. 8:7 τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ σώζω τὸν λαὸν μου ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δυσμῆς. (Op. 188. 48 : 86.) Zech. 1:6 καθὼς παρατέτακται κύριος παντοκράτωρ τοῦ ποιῆσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰς ὅδους ἡμῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ἡμῶν.

4. Repetition of Other Words. Not only are prepositions repeated in the Apocalypse, but other words as well. The following examples may be given: Rev. 19:18 ἵνα φάγητε σάρκας βασιλέων καὶ σάρκας χιλιάρχων καὶ σάρκας . . . . καὶ σάρκας . . . . καὶ σάρκας. (Cp. Ezek. 39:17, 18.) Rev. 16:13 καὶ εἰδοὺ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος . . . . καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος. Rev. 8:12 καὶ ἐπλήγη τὸ τρίτον . . . . . τὸ τρίτον . . . . . τὸ τρίτον . . . . . τὸ τρίτον. (Cp. Rev. 8:9.) Rev. 18:2 καὶ . . . . . καὶ . . . . καὶ. Rev. 14:1 ἔχουσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

This recurrence of special words is “preéminently characteristic of Oriental expression” (Thayer’s Winer, p. 606). In the Apocalyptic passages just quoted, it is due to the influence of the LXX which again reproduces the Hebrew original. Cp. Zech. 6:14 δὲ στέφανος ἐσται τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν καὶ τοῖς χρησίμοις αὐτῆς καὶ τοῖς ἐπεγνωκόσιν. (Cp. Zech. 6:10.) Zech. 8:19 λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ νηστεία ἡ τετράς καὶ νηστεία ἡ πέμπτη καὶ νηστεία ἡ ἐβδόμη καὶ νηστεία ἡ δεκάτη ἔσονται τῷ οἴκῳ Ἡσύδα. Zech. 8:12 ἥ ἄμπελος δόσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἡ γῆ δόσει τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ ὑμνῶν δόσει τὴν δρόσον αὐτοῦ. Zech. 8:19 λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ νηστεία ἡ τετράς καὶ νηστεία ἡ πέμπτη καὶ νηστεία ἡ ἐβδόμη καὶ νηστεία ἡ δεκάτη ἔσονται τῷ οἴκῳ Ἡσύδα.

5. Another anomalous phrase is found in Rev. 12:14 καιρῶν καὶ καιρῶν καὶ ἡμῶν καιροῦ. Lúccke¹ speaks of this phrase as

PECULIAR CONSTRUCTIONS.

1. In Rev. 2:14 occurs the expression ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Barak in which the word "teach" is followed by a Dative of person in imitation of the Hebrew לְלוֹם. (Cp. Thayer’s Lexicon on the word διδάσκω; also Job 21:22, i. e., ἥν ἔγραφεν ἡ λαλήμ and Ewald, "gr. Hebr.", p. 588.)

2. The Preposition ἀπὸ with the Nominative. Rev. 1:4 ἀπὸ ὁ ὄν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. This solecism is striking in the highest degree. Some authors have tried to soften the expression by inserting the article τοῦ after ἀπό. But this would not explain the anomaly here, "quod scriptor omnino praepositiones cum nominativo jungere soleat."

The phrase ὁ ὄν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew name

1 Guillemard speaks of this as "an anomalous construction clearly traceable to absence of inflexion in Hebrew nouns which made such a violation of grammar less startling to a Jew writing Greek." ("Hebraisms in the Greek Testament, p. 116.)

2 Ewald, "Com. in Apoc.," p. 46.

3 Ebrard regards this phrase as intentional on the part of the writer, saying of it, "die absichtliche Behandlung der ganzen Formel ὁ ὄν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος als unveränderlichen nom. propr. wo das erste ὁ sowie das zweite und dritte als integrierender Theil des Namens betrachtet wird, liegt hier gar zu klar am Tage." ("Evangelium Johannis," S. 165-166) and Harnack, in speaking of the same phrase, says, "die gross violations of Greek grammar are not to be explained from ignorance."* ("Encycl. Brit." on word "Revelation.")

*The proper construction of ἀπό with the Genitive occurs in the same verse (i. e., 1:4), ἀπὸ τῶν ἑστα πρεσβύτεων, proving that the author did not use ἀπό with the Nominative through ignorance.
Jehovah. Lücke regards it "als ein Begriff anzusehen, wodurch nach Rabbinscher Deutung des Namens Jehovah der ewige Gott bezeichnet wird." "O ὧν is directly quoted from the LXX of Ex. 3:14 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν λέγων Ἡ ἔγω εἰμὶ ὁ ὧν. Καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἔρεις τοῖς νυών Ἰσραήλ ὁ ὧν ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, the phrase ὁ ὧν being the translation of יהוה. Thus the Apocalyptist used the expression ὁ ὧν directly from the LXX and does not change the form to the Genitive after ἀπό. Naturally the other words or parts of the phrase, namely, ὁ ἥν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, are in the same construction as ὁ ὧν "da es kein Partici des Praeteritums von εἶναι giebt, so ist schwer einzusehen, wie der Verfasser das ὁ ἥν (der war) anders hätte ausdrücken sollen." 4

3. The Genitive and Accusative joined by καὶ, instead of two Genitives, after a Word of Fullness. The use of the accusative after the idea of fullness is a Hebrew idiom. Thus, Rev. 17: 46 ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμον βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς. (Cp. Jer. 51: 7). τὰ ἀκάθαρτα instead οἵ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, imitates the Hebrew. A capital illustration of this usage is found in 2 Sam. 23: 7

Even the LXX translation of this passage has followed the Hebrew entirely, namely, καὶ πλήρες σιδήρου καὶ ξύλου δὸρατος. Again, the LXX of Ezek. 39: 20 has the accusative after the word "filled," thus: καὶ ἐμπλησθήσεσθε (ἐπὶ τῆς πραπέζης ποτηρίου) ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην καὶ γίγαντα. The same thing is found in Ex. 1: 7 πλήθυνεν δὲ ἡ γῆ αὐτούς. The accusative is the usual construction after a word of fullness in Hebrew. "Wörter wie ἐμπλησθήσεσθε gewöhnlich mit dem Accusative ....... sich verbinden." (Ewald, "Die Joh. Schriften," S. 58.) In further proof of this, cp.
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Gesenius' "Hebrew and Eng. Lex." on the word מָלֵךְ, p. 473. Also Lücke, "Einleitung u. s. w." S. 461. Rev. 17:4b, then, (the passage in question) is a mixture of Greek and Hebrew constructions, the Genitive βδελυγμάτων after γέμον being a Greek construction while the accusative τὰ ἀκάθαρτα is Hebrew.

4. A Double-Gender. The word ληνός (wine-press) is given a double gender in Rev. 14:19 and 20. Thus, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν [the great wine-press] καὶ ἐπατήθη ἡ ληνὸς ἐξωθεν τῆς πόλεως; the feminine τὴν ληνὸν and then the masculine τὸν μέγαν [ληνόν]. This construction is found in Isa. 63:3, from which this verse is suggested; thus

Here מַלְאֵךְ is feminine and מַלִּכֵּךְ is masculine. Thayer remarks that this is a variation in gender which can hardly be matched in Greek though not rare in Hebrew.1

5. Disagreement in Gender. Feminine nouns are frequently followed by an adjective or participle in the masculine. Rev. 4:1 καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἣν λέγον; φωνὴ is followed by the masculine participle λέγον. Rev. 9:13 and 14 καὶ ἐκ τῶν κεράτων . . . λέγοντα τῷ ἑκτῷ ἀγγέλῳ; λέγοντα instead of λέγονταν. Rev. 11:4 αἱ δύο ἐλαιαί . . . . ἑστῶτες instead οἵ ἑστῶσαι follows the feminine noun ἐλαιαί. Rev. 11:15 καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, λέγοντες; λέγοντες following φωναῖ. Rev. 17:3 καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα καθημένην ἐπὶ θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας. Rev. 17:3 καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα καθημένην . . . . γέμοντα ὀνόματα . . . . ἔχοντα κεφαλᾶς ἐπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα. (Cp. Dan. 7:7.) Such neglect of agreement in gender, as above described, follows the Hebrew structure. On this Green remarks: "Masculines are often used in Hebrew when females are spoken of or when the nouns to which they refer are feminine, from a neglect to note the gender where no stress is laid
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upon it.” (“Heb. Gram.,” p. 359.)¹ The Apocalyptist imitates this Hebrew construction in the passages just given. His defiance of grammar in those instances was intentional. He knew, for example, that the feminine adjective should agree with the feminine noun, as a number of texts show. This is seen in Rev. 6:9 and 10, where there is a feminine noun followed by a masculine participle and also a feminine noun followed by a feminine adjective, namely, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. The same expression occurs also in Rev. 7:2; 14:7 and 18. Cp. 16:1, 3, 17; 18:2, 4, &c. The disagreement in gender is clearly due to Hebrew influence and Lücke in speaking of such constructions says, “Diese Anomalien lösen sich grösstenthils durch die Annahme einer constructio ad sensum, wie sie auch den besten Schriftstellern nicht fremd ist.”²


(2) An Accusative replaced by a Nominative. Rev. 5:6 καὶ εἶδον . . . . ἀρνίου . . . . ἡχή κέρατα ἐπτὰ . . . . Rev. 14:

¹ Neglect of gender is very frequent (a) in pronouns referring to females. Thus Ruth 1:8 Ἡ τε κυρία ἡ θυγατέρα τοῦ Πύρ τοῦ Πουλίου τοῦ Πόλεμου, ὅπως ἢ ἡ θυγατέρα τοῦ Πύρ τοῦ Πουλίου τοῦ Πόλεμου. The word Πόλεμος (masc.) is used although the reference is to Ruth and Orpah; also Πύρ (masc.), reference still being to Ruth and Orpah. This is illustrated again in Exodus 1:21. ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ Ὀλίβιου τοῦ Πύρ τοῦ Πουλίου, the word μαῖα (fem.) being feminine and Ὄλιβιος masculine. Cp., also, Ex. 2:17; Num. 36:6; Jud. 11:34; 19:24; 1 Sam. 6:7; 2 Sam 6:22; Jud. 21:12.

(b) Neglect of gender is most frequent in pronouns (masc.) referring to feminine nouns, as Ex. 11:6 ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ ἢ ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ. Here the word ἡ γυναῖκα is feminine and ἡ γυναῖκα (referring to the ἡ γυναῖκα) is masculine. Levit. 27:9 ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ . . . . οὐκ ἔχει ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρχοντοῦ κιβωτόν. Here the word ἡ γυναῖκα is feminine and οὐκ ἔχει is masculine.*

² "Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes," S. 463.

6 and 7a καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἀγγελον .... λέγων .... Rev. 19:14 καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα .... ἱκολούθει αὐτῷ .... ἐνδε- δυν ἔνοι βύσσινοι λευκὸν καθαρὸν. Cp., also, Rev. 13:1; 14:14; 17:3 and 20:4. This neglect of agreement in case is common enough in Hebrew. Especially when clauses intervened, accurate constructions were thus neglected.¹

7. Anomalous Use of Apposition. The well-known rule that an appositive agrees with its noun in case, is broken many times by the language of the Apocalypse.

(1) Nominative in Apposition with Genitive. Rev. 1:5 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός. The phrase ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός is directly quoted from the LXX of Ps. 89:37. (Cp. Prov. 14:5). Ebrard says of this, “das scheint mir beabsichtigt, scheint mir Manier zu sein,”² and Lücke (speaking of this and similar anomalies) says, “sie scheinen ihren Grund .... in dem rhetorischen charakter der Apokalypse zu haben.”³

This occurs again in Rev. 3:12 τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; ἡ καταβαίνουσα, instead of a Genitive, in apposition with τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Another instance of this is found in Rev. 14:12 διε ἴπτωμα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς, &c., οἱ τηροῦντες where we should expect τῶν τηροῦντων in apposition with τῶν ἁγίων.

(2) Nominative in Apposition with Dative. Rev. 9:14 λέγουντα τῷ ἐκτῷ ἀγγέλῳ. ὁ ἔχων Σάλπιγγα.


(4) Nominative in Apposition with Vocative. Rev. 16:7 Ναύ, κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. (Cp. Rev. 16:5). Rev. 11:7. Ew-
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χαριστοῦμέν σοι, κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Rev. 15:3 κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, as in the LXX of Zech, 3:8 ἄκουε δή, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἱερούς ὁ μέγας, σὺ καὶ, &c. In the above examples, we find the Nominative in apposition with every single oblique case. In each of these examples (except Nominative in apposition with Vocative), the connection between the preceding substantive and the adjective clause describing it, is a loose one. This is especially true of the first two examples under (1) and the second, under (3). Of these constructions Ewald writes, “Cujus dictionis causa licet in hebraismo casus non distinguente quae sit.” In regard to the examples under (4), we may say that the name Jehovah appears in the Nominative as in apposition to the Vocative κύριε perhaps because it is a direct translation of a Hebrew proper name, the author having in mind the appositive construction of the Hebrew, where a more extended use is made of it than in occidental languages; or, again, this construction may have been used because the Greek article has no form for the Vocative case. This is Ewald’s view who says “denn da die Hebriär keine Interjection für den Vokativ haben, so steht das Nomen in Anredeton ganz ungeändert;” or, further, the writer in these two instances may have had in mind the Aramaic construction which has no case endings.


1 “Commentarius in Apocalypsin,” p. 44.
5 Cp. Thayer’s Winer, p. 536.
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9. In Hebrew, very often the emphasized word stands at the beginning of a sentence without any grammatical connection with any word in that sentence. The accustomed order is restored by a demonstrative pronoun placed later in the sentence. Examples of this are numerous, as in Gen. 47:21 ὁ ΥΠΟΔΗΜΟΣ ἙΥΔΗΜΟΣ αὐτῆς ἔνδοξεν ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔνδοξον ἔ


10. Sentences Joined by καὶ. Rev. 11:3 καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν μάρτυσιν μοι καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. (Cp. Rev. 20:4; 9:4, 5.) Rev. 3:9 has the same kind of a sentence, but with ἵνα and a καὶ following. Thus, ἐδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἥξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. This follows the Hebrew of Isaiah 44:14 which is ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὃ

11. καὶ (Hebrew י in the Apodosis. It is similar to the German "so." The following examples may be given: Rev. 10:7 ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὃ

1 A similar example of the use of ἵνα is found in Rev. 13:12 καὶ τοιοῦτος ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦσιν ἴνα προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ θανάτῳ τῷ πρῶτῳ. Also, Rev. 18:16 καὶ τοιοῦτος πάντας, τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγαλοῖς . . . . . ἴνα δώσει αὐτοῖς χάραγμα. (Cp. Rev. 22:14.)


3 Cp. Thayer's "Greek Eng. Lex.", p. 316f.
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The use of καὶ in the apodosis is exactly similar to ἢ in such Hebrew passages as Gen. 3:5, Ps. 78:34 Judges 4:8 This use in Hebrew may be seen in the following examples:

Isa. 41:8 ἰέων τοῦ ἀναστάσεως τῆς δύναμες ἡγούμενος ἐν τῇ ἡράλδῳ τοῦ κόσμου ἀκαλλήλων μετὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 3:8 ἢν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν. Rev. 7:2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν κ. τ. λ.

Examples of this redundant use of αὐτός in relative sentences are found in the following Apocalyptic passages: Rev. 3:8 ἢν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν. Rev. 7:2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν κ. τ. λ.

2 This LXX passage is directly quoted in Acts 15:17, thus proving that the writer of Acts employed Hebraisms when quoting from the LXX.
4 Cp., for example, Ex. 3:5; Eccl. 10:17; Deut. 4:7, 8, 19, 32; Deut 14:9; 19:17; Josh. 2:10.
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13. **Pleonastic ἐκεῖ.** Where a preceding adverb (or relative pronoun) has "already attracted the verb, ἐκεῖ is added to this verb pleonastically."¹ Examples of this in Hebrew may be found in Deut. 4:5 ἡ ματισμένη ἱππαρχον πᾶς τὸν ἐξελέγχον τοῦ βασιλέως, the LXX translation of which is εἰς ὑμείς εἰς πορεύεσθε ἐκεῖ κληρονομεῖν αὐτὴν. Deut. 4:14 ὡς ἡ ματισμένη ἱππαρχον πᾶς τὸν ἐξελέγχον τοῦ βασιλέως, the LXX of which has εἰς ὑμείς εἰςπορεύεσθε ἐκεῖ κληρονομεῖν αὐτὴν. Deut. 4:26 ὡς ἡ ματισμένη ἱππαρχον πᾶς τὸν ἐξελέγχον τοῦ βασιλέως, and the LXX is εἰς ὑμείς διαβαίνετε τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἐκεῖ κληρονομεῖσαι αὐτὴν.

Examples of this Hebraism in the Apocalypse are: Rev. 12:6 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἐκεῖ τὸν τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 12:14 εἰς τὴν τόπον αὐτῆς, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ κ. τ. λ. (Cp. Rev. 17:9.)

14. **The Present Tense Passes into the Future.** The present and future tenses are found coördinately in the same clause or sentence where, according to the usage of the language, we should expect the future of both verbs. Rev. 1:7 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὁ ψευτήρων αὐτῶν τὰς ὀφθαλμάς. Ewald remarks "oratio continuata in futurum tempus abit, ut ἐδοὺ ἔρχεται καὶ ὁ ψευτήρων πρὸς hebraeaum αὐτῆς."² Rev. 2:5 εἰ δὲ μη, ἐρχομαι σοι, καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνιὰν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς. Rev. 2:16 εἰ δὲ μη, ἐρχομαι σοι ταχύ, καὶ πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν κ. τ. λ. Rev. 2:22 ιδοὺ βαλλω τὸν θανάτον τῆς κληρονομίας . . . . καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ἀποκτενω ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ. Cp. Rev. 3:9; 17:13–14. Examples of this breach of grammar in LXX passages are: Zech. 2:9 διότι ιδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ τῆς κληρονομίας μου ἐπὶ αὐτούς, καὶ

¹ Thayer, "Greek Eng. Lex.", p. 194; Bousset, "Offenbarung Johannis," S. 184.
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15. Neuter Plural Subject with Plural Verb. In the Apocalypse, neuter plural nouns are very frequently followed by plural verbs.1 Rev. 4:5 ἅ εἰσὶν τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. Rev. 4:8 καὶ τὰ τεσσεραξῴα..... γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν. Rev. 4:9 καὶ ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῷα κ. τ. λ. Rev. 5:14 καὶ τὰ τέσσερα ζῷα ἐλεγον Ἀμήν. Rev. 9:20 ἅ οὕτε βλέπειν δύνανται κ. τ. λ.


Ezek. 39:7 καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἔθνη ὄντι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος. Nahum 3:10 καὶ τὰ νήπια αὐτῆς ἐδαφιοῦσεν. Cp., also, LXX passages quoted by Justin Martyr in “Πρὸς Τρύφωνα Ἰουδαίον Αρδοῦσ.” (Otto’s Edition, Vol. I, pp. 408, 426, 434, 444, 480, &c.) But what is of special interest here, is the fact that this anomaly often occurs in passages quoted directly from the LXX. This is true of the following: Rev. 15:4 διὰ τὰν καὶ τὰ δικαίωματα σοῦ ἐφανερώθησαν—an direct quotation from the LXX of Ps. 86:9 τὰν καὶ τὰ δικαίωματα σοῦ ἐφανερώθησαν (quoted from the LXX of Ps. 86:9 τὰν καὶ τὰ δικαίωματα σοῦ ἐφανερώθησαν). (Cp. Isa. 66:26.) Rev. 18:3 πέπωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (or πέπωκαν) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. This is LXX of Jer. 51:7 (28:7) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνου αὐτῆς ἐπίσκυσεν ἐπὶ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς. Rev. 21:24 καὶ περιπατήσει τῶν συνιστῶν τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς. This is from the LXX of Isa. 60:3 καὶ περιπατήσει τῆς ἡμέρας τὸ φως τῆς αὐτῆς.

1 The neuter plural is often found, however, with singular verbs, as in Rev. Rev. 2:27; 8:8; 13:14; 14:13; 16:14; 18:14; 19:14; 20:3, 5, 7, 12; 21:12.
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LXX of Ps. 46 (45): 6 is ἐταράχθησαν ἔθνη, ἔκλιναν βασιλεῖαι. Cp. Ps. (LXX) 2:1, i.e., τῇ ἐφρυάξαν ἔθνη. Rev. 19:21 καὶ πάντα ὄρνεα ἔχορτάθησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν. This is from the LXX of Ezek. 39:17–21, i.e., εἶπον παντὶ ὄρνεῳ πετεινῷ καὶ πρὸς πάντα τὰ θηριά τοῦ πεδίου ἄχθητε καὶ ἔρχεσθε... ... φάγεσθε ... πίεσθε ... ἐμπλησθήσεσθε ... Such passages show conclusively the influence of the LXX upon the writer.

This completes our examination of the Solecisms of the Apocalypse,¹ which, as we have shown, are clearly due to the influence which the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, either in their Hebrew form or in that of their translation into Greek—the Septuagint—exerted upon the Author.

¹See Corollaries on next page.
We present the following corollaries which grow out of the preceding discussions:

1. Since the solecisms of the Apocalypse are to be accounted for in the manner just described, they form no argument in favor of the "Early Date" for the composition of the Apocalypse as maintained by Westcott, Lightfoot and Salmon.

2. The Solecisms of the Apocalypse do not invalidate the testimony of Irenaeus as to the composition of the Apocalypse.

3. Those writers who hold that John's Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same author, need not infer that an interval of from twenty to thirty years intervened between the two compositions.

4. Viewing the evidence as a whole, the impression is strong that the author of the Apocalypse made use of the LXX and Hebrew idiom in a conscious effort to reproduce the manner and spirit of the ancient Prophets; it was not through ignorance of correct Greek usage.

Note.—The difference between the language of John's Gospel and the Apocalypse, due mainly to the solecisms of the latter, has

---

1 About the year 68 A. D.
5 Cp. his treatise entitled "'Ελέγχω καὶ ἀνατρόπης τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως," (the more familiar title of which is, "Contra Haereses"), where he says, "Εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανῶν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύσσει πολλὰ ματαιομανοὶ, δὲ εἶκενον ἂν ἐρρήθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωράκων. Ὁδὲ γὰρ πρὸς πολλοὺς χρόνους ἐδόθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενέσθαι, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομιτιανοῦ ἀρχῆς." Lib. V. 30, 3.
6 The Irenaeus date (about 96 A. D.) is usually spoken of as the "Late Date" for the composition of the Apocalypse.
7 Referred to in corollary 1.
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led to very different opinions as to the Authorship\(^1\) of the two writings. Thus besides Dionysius\(^2\) of the third century A.D., the following writers, Schleiermacher, Credner, De Wette, Neander (David Mendel), Lücke, Bleek, Ewald and Düsterdieck, hold that the Apostle John wrote the Gospel, but not the Apocalypse; other writers, such as Köstlin, Zeller, Schwégler, Baur, Davidson and Hilgenfeld, maintain that the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse but not the Gospel.\(^3\)

\(^1\) The Authorship of the Apocalypse is discussed at length by Bousset in "Die Offenbarung Johannis," SS. 33–51 and by Milligan in his "Discussions on the Apocalypse," pp. 148–179.


\(^3\) Still other writers, for a different reason, or reasons, such as Keim, Volkmar, Scholten, Lipsius, Harnack, Pflieger, Weizsäcker and Bousset, regard the Apostle John as the author of neither the Gospel nor the Apocalypse.*

* Cp., for example, Bousset, in "Die Offenbarung Johannis," SS. 33–51.