§1.J AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [ixtropuction.   
   
 inatter of evidence, I own I should be quite at a loss how to substantiate   
 identity of authorship between it and the Gospel and Epistle. But as it   
 is, our main reliance is on the concurrent testimony of primitive tradi-   
 tion, which hardly can be stronger than it is, and which tho perfectly   
 gratuitous hypothesis respecting a second John as the author cutirely   
 fails to shake.   
 116. Our question respecting the internal evidence furnished by the   
 book itself is thus in a position entirely different from that which it   
 occupied in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, we   
 had no primitive tradition so general, or of such authority as to command   
 our assent. The question was perfectly open. The authorship by St.   
 Paul was an opinion at first tentatively and partially held: then as timo   
 wore on, acquiring consistency and acceptance. Judging of this by the   
 book itself, is it for us to accept or to reject it ? In lack of any worthy   
 external evidence, we were thrown back on this as our main material for   
 a judgment.   
 117. But with regard to the Apocalypse, external and internal evidence   
 have changed places. The former is now the main material for our   
 judgment. It is of the highest and most satisfactory kind. It was   
 unanimous in very early times. It came from those who knew and had   
 heard St. John himself. It only begins to be impugned by those who   
 had doctrinal objections to the book. The doubt was taken up by more   
 reasonable men on internal and critical grounds, But no real substan-   
 tive counter-claimant was ever produced : only one whose very existence   
 depended on the report of two tombs bearing the name of John, and ona   
 not vory perspicuous passage of Papias.   
 118. This beiug so, our enquiry necessarily has taken this shape:—-Zs   
 the book itself inconsistent with this apparently irrefragable testimony ?   
 And in replying to it, we have confessed that the differences between it   
 and the Gospel and Epistle are very remarkable, and of a character   
 hitherto unexplained, or not fully accounted for: but that there are at   
 the same time striking notes of similarity in expression and cast of   
 thought; and that perhaps we are not in a position to take into account   
 the effeet of a totally different subject and totally different circumstances   
 upon one, who though knowiig and speaking Greek, was yet a Hebrew   
 hy birth.   
 119. Thus, all things considered, being it is true far from satisfied with   
 any aceount at present given of the peculiar style and phenomena of tho   
 Apocalypse, but being far less satisfied with the procedure of the anta-   
 gonists of the Apostolic authorship, we are not prepared to withhold our   
 assent from the firm and unshaken testimony of primitive tradition, that   
 ithe author was the Apostle and Evangelist St. John.   
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