INTRODUCTION. } JOHN’S GOSPEL. (cx. v.   
   
 Eusebius gives his testimony entire, appears not to recognize Luke's   
 Gospel, but only those of Matthew and Mark. It is remarkable, how-   
 ever, on the other hand, that Papias recognizes the First Epistle of John,   
 which, as remarked in § iv., was probably written after the Gospel. This   
 would seem to make it probable that we have not in Eusebius the whole   
 testimony of Papias given ; for it would certainly seem from internal   
 grounds that the First Epistle and the Gospel must stand or fall   
 together.   
 5. It is evident that too much stress must not be laid on the silence   
 of Polycarp, from whom we have one short epistle only. He also   
 (apparently) was acquainted with the First Epistle of John. But he   
 wrote with no purpose of giving testimony to the sacred books, and what   
 reason therefore have we to expect in his Epistle, quotations from or   
 allusions to any particular book which did not happen to come within   
 his design, and the subject of which he was treating ?   
 6. The same may be said of the silence of Barnabas, Hermas, and   
 Ignatius. Had any intention existed on the part of the primitive Chris-   
 tian writers of informing posterity what books were counted canonical   
 in their days, their silence would be a strong argument against any   
 particular book :—but they had no such intention; their citations are   
 fortuitous, and most of them loose and allusory only. So that we cannot   
 argue from such silence to the recognition or otherwise of any book,   
 unless it be universal and continuous, which is not the case with regard   
 to this Gospel.   
 7. Again, the kind of testimony furnished by Irenezus is peculiarly   
 valuable. He does not relate from whom he had heard that John wrote   
 a Gospel, but he treats and quotes it as a well-known and long-used   
 book in the Christian Church. What could have induced Irenzus to   
 do this, except the fact of its being thus known and used? So that this   
 character of his testimony virtually carries it back farther than its   
 actual date. Besides, when one who has had the means which Irenus   
 had of ascertaining the truth in a matter, asserts things respecting that   
 matter,—the ordinary and just method is to suppose that he draws his   
 information from his superior opportunities of gaining it, even though he   
 may not expressly say so: so that when Irenzus, who had conversed with   
 Polycarp himself, the friend of the Apostle John, quotes this Gospel as   
 the work of that Apostle, we may fairly presume that he had assured   
 himself of this by the testimony of one so well capable of informing   
 him.   
 8. Another historical argument used against its genuineness is,—that   
 in the dispute about the time of keeping Easter between Polycarp and   
 Anicetus bishop of Rome, about the year 160, the former defended the   
 practice of the Asiatic Churches,—which was to keep their Christian   
 passover at the time of the Jewish passover, the evening of the 14th of   
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