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 the great diversity which is presented: nay, I fairly own, that taken   
 alone, they are not: and that the difficulty has never yet been thoroughly   
 solved. Still I do not conceive that we are at liberty to cut the knot by   
 denying the Apostolic Authorship, which primitive tradition has so   
 firmly established. Far better is it to investigate patiently, and not,   
 by blind partisanship on either side, to stop the way against unfettered   
 search for a better account of the phenomena than has hitherto been   
 given.   
 105. It has been shewn more than once, and in our own country by   
 Dr. Davidson in his Introduction, pp. 561 ff, that the roughnesses and   
 solecisms in the Apocalypse have been, for the purposes of argument,   
 yery much exaggerated: that there are hardly any, which may not be   
 paralleled in classical authors themselves, and that their more frequent   
 ocenrrence here is no more than is due to the peculiar nature of the   
 subject and occasion. This consideration should be borne in mind, and   
 the matter investigated by the student for himself.   
 106, Our second question asked above was, whether there are any   
 marks of identity of Authorship linking together the Gospel, Epistle,   
 and Apocalypse, notwithstanding this great and evident dissimilarity ?   
 107. The individual character of the Writer of the Gospel and Epistle   
 stands forth evident and undoubted. We seem to know him in a moment.   
 Even in the report of sayings of our Lord common to him and the other   
 Evangelists, the peculiar tinge of expression, the choice and collocation   
 of words, leave no doubt whose report we are reading. And so strongly   
 does the Epistle resemble the Gospel in these particulars, that the   
 criticism as well as the tradition of all ages has concurred in ascribing   
 the two to the same person.   
 108. If now we look at the Apocalypse, we cannot for a moment feel   
 that it is less individual, less reflecting the heart and character of its   
 Writer. Its style, its manner of conception and arrangement of thought,   
 its diction, are alike full of life and personal reality. So that our con-   
 ditions for making this enquiry are favourable. Our two objects of com-   
 parison stand out well the one over against the other. Both are pecu-   
 liar, characteristic, individual. But are the indications presented by them   
 such that we are compelled to infer different authorship, or are they such   
 as seem to point to one and the same person ?   
 109. The former of these questions has been affirmed by Liicke and   
 the opponents of the Apostolic authorship: the latter by Hengstenberg,   
 and those who uphold it. Let us see how the matter stands. And in   
 so doing (as was the case in the similar enquiry in the Introduction to   
 the Epistle to the Hebrews), I shall not enter fully into the whole list   
 of verbal and constructional peculiarities, but, referring the reader for   
 these to Liicke and Davidson, shall adduce, and dwell upon, some of the   
 more remarkable and suggestive of them.   
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