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 1. It would enlarge this Introduction too much, to give a detailed   
 history of the recognition of this Gospel, and its impugners, in ancient   
 times. It may suffice to refer to such works as Liicke’s, where this   
 history will be found. ‘The result of his researches on the subjects, that   
 down to the end of the second century the Gospel was by all recognized   
 and attributed to the Apostle whose name it bears, with the sole excep-   
 tion of the Alogi, an unimportant sect in Asia Minor, who, from exces-   
 sive opposition to the heresy of Montanus, rejected both the Apocalypse   
 and Gospel of John, as favouring (according to them) some of the views   
 of that heretic. Such an exception rather strengthens than weakens the   
 general evidence of ancient Christendom in its favour.   
 2. Equally satisfactory is the testimony of the fathers after the close   
 of the second century. The citations by Irenwus from this Gospel are   
 very frequent, and express, both as to its canonicity and the name of its   
 author. And his testimony is peculiarly valuable, because (1) he was an   
 anti-gnostic : (2) his acquaintance with the whole Church, Eastern and   
 Western, was greater than that of any other ecclesiastical writer : and   
 (3) in his youth he had conversed with Polycarp, himself a disciple of   
 the Apostle John. Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Clement of   
 Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius,—   
 the ancient Syriac version, the Peschito,—the adversaries of Christianity,   
 Porphyry, and Julian,—all these refer to the Gospel as without doubt   
 the work of the Apostle John.   
 3. We may then, as far as antiquity is concerned, regard its genuine-   
 ness as established. But there is one circumstance which has furnished   
 many modern writers with a ground for doubting this. Neither Papias,   
 who carefully sought out all that Apostles and apostolic men had related   
 regarding the life of Christ,—nor Polycarp, who was himself a disciple   
 of the Apostle John,—nor Barnabas, nor Clement of Rome, in their   
 Epistles, nor lastly Ignatius (in his genuine writings), makes any men-   
 tion of, or allusion to, this Gospel. So that in the most ancient circle of   
 ecclesiastical testimony, it appears to be unknown or not recognized.   
 4. But this circumstance, when fairly considered in connexion with   
 its universal recognition by writers following on these, rather serves for a   
 confirmation of the genuineness of this Gospel. It confessedly was written   
 late in the apostolic age. As far then as silence (or apparent silence)   
 can be valid as an argument, it scems to shew that the recognition of   
 this Gospel, as might have been expected, was later than that of the   
 others. And it is some confirmation also of this view, that Papias, if   
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