§1] ITS AUTHORSIIP. [ixrropuctiox.   
   
 tion (to say nothing of the varying mode of citing); the totally   
 distinct mode of arguing; the rhetorical accumulation; the equi   
 brium, even in the midst of fervid declamation, of periods and clause:   
 the use of different inferential and connecting particles. All of these   
 great and undeniable variations may be casily indeed frittered down   
 by an appearance of exceptions ranged in tables; but still are indelibly   
 impressed on the mind of every intelligent student of the Epistle, and   
 as has heen observed, are unanswerable, just in proportion as the poiuts   
 of similarity ave detailed and insisted on ‘,   
 118. It is again of course easy enough to meet such considerations in   
 either of two ways ; the former of which recommends itself to the mind   
 which fears to enquire from motives of reverence, the latter to the   
 superficial and indolent.   
 119. It may be said, that the Ifoly Spirit of God, by whose inspi-   
 ration holy men have written these books of the New Testament, may   
 bring it about, that the same person may write variously at different   
 times, even be that variety ont of the limits of human experience: that   
 the same man, for instance, should have written the Epistle to the   
 Romans and the First Epistle of St. John. In answer to which we   
 may safely say, that what the Holy Spirit may or can do, is not for us   
 to speenlate upon: in this His proceeding of He has given   
 us abundant and undeniable examples of what He has done: and by   
 such examples are we to be guided, in all questions as to the analogy of   
 His proceedings in more doubtful cases. As matter of fact, the style   
 and diction of St. Paul differ as much from those of St. John as can   
 well be conceived. When therefore we find in the sacred writings   
 phenomena of difference apparently incompatible with personal identity   
 in their authors, we are not to be precluded from reasoning from them   
 to the non-identity of such authors, by any vague assertions of the   
 omnipotence of the Almighty Spirit.   
 120, Again it may be strongly urged, that the. same person, writing   
 at different times, and to different persons, may employ very various   
 modes of diction and argument. Nothing can be truer than this: but   
 the application of it to the question of identity of authorship is matter   
 of penetration and appreciation. Details of diversity, which may be   
 convincing to one man, may be wholly inappreciable, from various   
 reasons, by another. As regards the matter before us, it may suffice to   
 say, that the incompatibility of styles was felt in the earliest days by   
 Greeks themselves, as the preceding testimonies from Clement of   
 Alexandria and Origen may serve to shew. Further than this we can   
 say nothing, which will be allowed as of any weight by those who   
 unfortunately fail to appreciate the difference. We can only repeat   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 4 Sce this carried out further below, § v. parr. 9, 10.   
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