§ 1] AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [ixrropuction.   
   
 ch. i. 9 be understood: sce note there) in tho island of Patmos on   
 account of his Christian testimony.   
 We may add to these personal notices, that he takes especial pains to   
 assert the accuracy of his testimony, both in the beginning and at the   
 end of his book: ch. i. 2, x: 8. .   
 91, Now thus far we have nothing which goes against the ecele-   
 siastical tradition that he was the Apostle and Evangelist John. In   
 the latter part of his life, this Apostle was thus connected with pro-   
 consular Asia, long residing, and ultimately dying at Ephesus: sce   
 Introduction to Vol. I, ch. v. § i. 9 ff. It is impossible to reject this   
 concurrent testimony of Christian antiquity: nor have even those dono   
 so, whose doubts on the Apocalypse are the strongest.   
 92. Again, the exile of the Apostle John in Patmos under Domitian   
 is matter of primitive tradition, apparently distinet from the notice con-   
 tained in the Apoealypse: for his return from it under Nerva, of which   
 no notice is contained in that book, is stated as such by Eusebius:   
 “then” (when the Senate after Domitian’s death decreed that the   
 unjustly exiled should return to their homes) “ the tradition from the   
 ancients informs us that the Apostle John also returned from his exile in   
 the island and dwelt at Ephesus.” And again, “The Apostle whom Jesus   
 loved, yet surviving in the parts of Asia, ruled the churches there, having   
 returned from his exile in the island after the death of Domitian.”   
 93. Equally definite is the tradition, that St. John lived on among   
 the Asiatic churches till the time of Trajan: see Introduction, Vol, L.,   
 as above.   
 94. It is worth while just to pause by the way, and consider, in what   
 situation we are placed by these traditions. To reject them altogether   
 would be out of all reason: and this is not done by Liicke himself. So   
 that we must cither suppose that portion of them which regards the   
 exile to have found its way in owing to the notice of Rev. i. 9, or to have   
 been, independently of that notice, the result of a confusion in men’s   
 minds between two persons of the same name, John. Either of these is   
 undoubtedly possible: but it is their probability, in the face of other   
 evidence, which we have to estimate.   
 95. We may safely ask then, was either of these mistakes at all likely   
 to have been made by Irenzus, who could write as follows: ‘So that I   
 ean describe the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and talked, and   
 his goings forth and entrances, and the character of his life, and the form   
 of his person, and the addresses which he used to make to the people, and   
 how he related his converse with John, and that of the rest who had   
 seen the Lord, and how he told his recollections of their sayings.” Iown   
 it seems to me out of all probability that such a writer, in aseribing tho   
 Apocalypse to John the Apostle, could have confised him with another   
 person of the same name. If we ever have trustworthy personal tradi-   
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