



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

answered:  $\Sigma\upsilon$  λεγεις, "Thou sayest." If this is taken as equivalent to "I am," some have thought it strange that Pilate should at once have dismissed the charge against him (Luke xxiii. 4). But the statements of John (xviii. 37) sufficiently explains the grounds of Pilate's action. To the charges of the accusers the Lord made no answer. To the questions of Pilate, as given by John: "Art thou the King of the Jews?" the Lord first replies by asking him, "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" And again: "Thou sayest that I am a king" (as given in margin of R.V. "Thou sayest it, because I am a king").

If we regard the reply in Mark as decisive of the meaning of the words in Matthew, we must accept  $\Sigma\upsilon$  ειπας as an affirmation. And the same meaning must be given it in other places. Thus in Matt. xxvi. 25, in answer to Judas' question, "Master, is it I?" the Lord replies,  $\Sigma\upsilon$  ειπας — "Thou hast said," or in other words, "Thou art he who shall betray me." If these words were spoken aloud, Judas must have been then revealed to all as the traitor. But there seems good reason to believe that when he left the supper his fellow-disciples did not know of his treachery.

It is to be wished that some competent scholar would further examine this matter, and determine how far the statements of Schoetgen and his Rabbinical proofs are to be relied on.

---

### *Eberhard Vischer's Theory of the Composition of the Revelation.*

BY REV. S. M. JACKSON, M.A.

IN October, 1886, the third part of the second volume of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, appeared bearing the separate title, *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine jüdische Apokalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung*, VON EBERHARD VISCHER. *Mit einem Nachwort von Adolf Harnack*, Leipzig, 1886. The object of this note is to give a brief account of Vischer's treatise.

Its title states its purport, viz. to prove that the Revelation is a Jewish Apocalypse in a Christian redaction. The occasion for this theory was the thesis Professor Harnack set at Giessen early in 1885: "The theological standpoint of the author of the Revelation of John." When Mr. Vischer, who was one of his pupils, remarked to him that

he was shut up to the theory he has since elaborated, Professor Harnack snubbed him, but after a few days invited the young man to talk to him further about his discovery, and lo! as he read the Revelation under his new guide, "the scales fell from his eyes" (p. 126), and he saw clearly what no man living, nor, we venture to say, any man ever before, had seen, that the Revelation, the despair of commentators and the terror of the feeble-minded, was in its present shape a pious fraud; that like the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" it is a Jewish book worked over by a Christian (p. 6). Is it not in order now to claim that the two books have equal value?

But what proof does Mr. Vischer offer? He begins by remarking upon the fact that Jewish Apocalypses had undergone Christian redaction, and so there is nothing remarkable in the supposition that the only specimen in the New Testament has been similarly treated (p. 2). He then passes on to speak of some passages in it which show this double character (p. 4). To the objection that a Jewish Apocalypse was a curious thing to find in the N. T. canon he replies, that the popularity of this kind of literature among early Christians is sufficient answer (pp. 8 sqq). He then comes to the solution of the problem. The first three chapters are plainly Christian, and the following seven are too devoid of traces of time, so he begins with Chapters XI. and XII., which together present a clear historical picture (p. 13). He then points out the decidedly Jewish features of these chapters—the allusion to the temple, the two witnesses, the destruction of the holy city, the great sign in heaven, etc.; also the Christian interpolations, *e.g.* xi. 8, "which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified"; v. 15, "and of his Christ"; xii. 11, "and they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony; and they loved not their life even unto death"; v. 17, "of Jesus." Having thus shown that "the examination of the eleventh and twelfth chapters has made the hypothesis extraordinarily probable that the basis of the Apocalypse is a purely Jewish writing" (p. 33), he proceeds to pick out the Christian portions and interpolations (pp. 33-76), and closes his *brochure* with the proof that the remainder is a purely Jewish whole (pp. 76-91), complete in itself without the interpolations.

How he does the two latter things can best be seen in his book. We have now fulfilled our intention of briefly outlining the book, and giving a specimen of its contents. Professor Harnack and we understand, Professors Dillmann and Schürer also, have given in

their assent to the theory. Those who wish to read brief discussions of it are referred to Mr. Robert B. Drummond's notice in *The Academy* for Feb. 12, 1887, in which he says that it "may perhaps turn out to be the most remarkable discovery in N. T. criticism of any in this century"; and to Rev. W. H. Simcox's article, "The New Theory of the Apocalypse" in *The Expositor* for June, 1887 (pp. 425-443), to which my attention was kindly called by Professor H. G. Mitchell. The intêrest the theory has already excited makes its further discussion advisable. Professor Völter's much more improbable theory (*Die Entstehung der Apokalypse*, Tübingen, 1882; 2d ed. 1885), was deemed worthy of a learned criticism by no less a person than Professor B. B. Warfield, in the *Presbyterian Review* for April, 1884 (pp. 228-265). We would that Professor Warfield might subject Mr. Vischer's book to a similarly skilful treatment. It is so plausible, and removes so many difficulties, that its discussion is much more demanded than Völter's ever was.

In closing we remark that the prompt and flattering notice of Mr. Vischer's book has stirred up Professor Völter, whose theory met with little or no approbation, as far as we know, to write a pamphlet, *Die Offenbarung Johannis keine ursprünglich jüdische Apokalypse. Eine Streitschrift gegen die Herren Harnack und Vischer*, Tübingen, 1886 (p. 49). Professor Völter teaches that the Apocalypse is made up of strata of different dates; Mr. Vischer that it is a Jewish original, prefaced and interfused with Christian matter. The one may be called the *geologic*, the other the *chemical* theory of the origin of the Revelation. For the present we hold to the old-fashioned view that John, the Beloved Disciple, wrote the book under divine inspiration from beginning to end.

---

*Notes on the Revised Translation of Certain  
Texts in the New Testament.*

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.

*Matt. xvii. 9 compared with Mark ix. 9.*

THESE texts, it will be seen, are perfectly parallel. Yet, in the former, for ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ, the revisers substitute "risen from the dead" for the "risen again from the dead" of the Authorized Version; while, in the latter, they substitute "risen again from the dead"