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 tion, it is surely when it mounts up to those who saw and conversed   
 with him respeeting whom we wish to be informed.   
 96. It may be said indeed, that Ireneus does not mention the exile in   
 Patmos. But this would be mere trifling: he does not, simply because   
 he had no oceasion to do so: but his own date of the seeing of the   
 Apoealypse, at the end of the reign of Domitian (sce above, par. 7),   
 would, in combination with other notices, be sufficient to imply it: and   
 besides, he admits it by inference from his unhesitatingly adopting the   
 book as written by the Apostle.   
 97. It seems then to me that the course of primitive tradition, even   
 among those who did not believe the Apocalypse to have been written   
 by the Apostle, asserts of him that he was exiled in Patmos under   
 Domitian: and that we have no reasonable ground for supposing this   
 view to have arisen from any confusion of persons, or to have been   
 adopted merely from the book itself, Persons are appealed to, who   
 knew and saw and heard the Apostle himself: and those who thus   
 appeal were not likely to have made a mistake in a point of such vital   
 importance.   
 98. We now come to a weighty and dificult part of our present   
 enquiry : how far the matter and style of the Apocalypse bear out this   
 result of primitive tradition. The reader will have seen, by the previous   
 chapters of this Introduction, that I am very far from deprecating, or   
 depreciating, such a course of criticism. I do not, as some of those who   
 have upheld against all eriticism the eommonly received views, cha-   
 racterize such an enquiry as presumptuous, or its results as uneer-   
 tain and vague. It is one whieh the soundest and best crities of all   
 ages have followed, from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria down   
 to Bleek and Liicke : and, as I have elsewhere observed, is one which   
 will be more esteemed in proportion as biblieal science is spread and   
 deepencd.   
 99. In applying it to the book before us, certainly the upholder   
 of the primitive tradition of its Authorship is not encouraged by first   
 appearances. He is met at once by the startling phenomena so ably   
 detailed by Dionysius of Alexandria at the end of his judgment. The   
 Greck construetion of the Gospel and Epistle’, though peculiar, is smooth   
 and unexceptionable, free from any thing like barbarism or soleeism in   
 grammar: “not only faultless according to the Greek Language,” says   
 Dionysius, “but very skilful its words, its reasonings, and the putting   
 together of its meaning.” When however we come to compare that   
 of the Writer of the Apoealypse, we find, at first sight, all this reversed:   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 $ I speak in the course of this argument of the first Epistle as undoubted; not   
 that I do not believe the second and third to be genuine and: characteristic also. See   
 above, ch. xx, § i   
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