§1.] AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [ixrropuction.   
   
 21. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil the Great (died 395), cites   
 Rey. iii. 15, as said by the Evangelist John.   
 22. Didymus (died 394) says, “ And in the Apocalypse John (the   
 writer of the Epistle, from the context) is often called a prophet.”   
 23, Ambroso (died 897) constantly cites the Apocalypse as the work   
 of the Apostle Jolin.   
 24. Augustine (died 430) uses every where the Apocalypse as a   
 genuine production of the Apostle and Evangelist John.   
 25. Jevome (died 420) speaks of the Apostle John as also being a   
 prophet, “for he saw in the island Patmos, to which he had been   
 banished by the Emperor Domitian, on account of his testimony to the   
 Lord, the Apocalypse, containing infinite mysteries of future things.”   
 We shall have to adduce Jerome again in treating of the canonicity.   
 And now that we have arrived at tho beginning of the fifth century,   
 the latter question becomes historically the more important of the   
 two, and indeed the two are henceforth hardly capable of being treated   
 apart. :   
 26. Before we pass to the testimonies against the authorship by the   
 Apostle and Evangelist St. John, let us briefly review the course of   
 evidence which we have adduced in its favour. It will be very instruc-   
 tive to compare its character with that of the evidence for the Pauline   
 authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as collected in the Introduc-   
 tion to that Epistle.   
 27. There we found that, while there prevailed in the great majority   
 of the more ancient Fathers a habit, when they are speaking loosely, or   
 ad populum, of citing the Epistle as the work of St. Paul,—on the one   
 hand, all attempts fail to discover any general ecclesiastical tradition to   
 this effect: and on the other, the greatest and ablest of these writers   
 themselves, when speaking guardedly, throw doubt on the Pauline   
 authorship, while some of them set it aside altogether. In course of   
 time, we there also found, the habit of citing the Epistle as St. Paul’s   
 became more general: then sprung up assertion, more and more strong,   
 that it veritably was his: till at last it was made an article of faith to   
 believe it to be so. So that the history of opinion in that case may be   
 described as the gradual growing up of a belief which was entirely void   
 of general reception in the ancient church.   
 28. We are not yet prepared to enter on the whole of the corre-   
 sponding history of opinion in this case: but as far as we havo gone, it   
 may be described as the very converse of the other. The apostolic   
 authorship rests on the firmest traditional ground. We have it assured   
 to us by one who had companied with men that had known St. John   
 himself; we have it held in continuous succession by Fathers in all   
 parts of the church. Nowhere, in primitive times, docs there appear   
 any counter tradition on the subject. We have nothing corresponding   
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