INTRODUCTION. ] REVELATION. (on. xx.   
   
 to the plain testimonies, of Tertullian in favour of Barnabas, or of   
 Origen that there was an account come down that Clement of Rome or   
 St. Luke had written the Epistle. In subsequent paragraphs we shall   
 see how variation of opinion was first introduced, and why.   
 29, But before doing so, it will be well to complete this portion of our   
 enquiry, by mentioning those early writings and Fathers which, though   
 they do not expressly state who was the author of the book, yet cite   
 it as canonical, or at all events shew that they were acquainted withand   
 approved it.   
 30. Among these the very earliest have been matter of considerable   
 question. The supposed allusions in Polycarp, for instance, though   
 strongly maintained by Hengstenberg, are really so faint and distant,   
 that none but an advocate would ever have perceived them \*,   
 31. The passages which Hengstenberg brings from the Epistle of the   
 Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp, are even more uncer-   
 tain and far-fetched. Such advocacy is much to be lamented: it tends   
 to weaken instead of strengthening the real evidence.   
 32, But the next testimony produced is however of a very different   
 kind. It is that of Papias, of whom Ireneus, in adducing the traditional   
 words of our Lord respecting the millennial abundance of the earth, says,   
 “ These things Papias, having been a hearer of John, and companion of   
 Polycarp, an ancient man, testifies in writing in the fourth of his books ;   
 for there are five compiled by him.” It is well known that Eusebius   
 attempts to set aside this hearer of John by citing from Papias himself   
 his assertion that he set down in his work what he had heard as the   
 sayings of the Apostles, naming St. John among them. But there is   
 nothing to prevent his having united both characters,—that of a hearer,   
 and that of a collector of sayings: and Irenaeus, the scholar of Polycarp,   
 is hardly likely to have been mistaken on such a point. Now regarding   
 Papias as a witness for the Apocalypse, we have a note of Andreas, of   
 Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century, at the beginning of the   
 commentaries on the Apocalypse: “Concerning the inspiration of the   
 book we think it superfluous to enlarge, when the blessed men, Gregory   
 the Theologian and Cyril, and besides, the more ancient men, Papias,   
 Treneus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, have given credible testimony to   
 it; from whom we also, having taken many proofs, have arrived at the   
 same conclusion, as we have set forth in certain places.” And accord-   
 ingly, on Rev. xii. 7—9, he expressly cites Papias’s work.   
 33. There scems to be ample proof here that Papias did maintain, as   
 from what we otherwise know we should expect, the inspiration, i.e. the   
 canonicity of the book. All that has been argued on the other side   
 seems to me to fail to obviate the fact, or to weaken the great import-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 5 See them discussed in the corresponding place in my Greek Test.   
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