§ vi.J ITS GENUINENESS. [inrRopUcTIoN.   
   
 Nisan, by what he had learned from John and the other Apostles.   
 But, say the opponents, John himself in his Gospel clearly relates that   
 our Lord instituted the Lord’s supper on the evening of the 15th of   
 Nisan, and was crucified on the 14th. Therefore either Polycarp falsely   
 appealed to John’s authority, which is not probable, or John did not   
 write the Gospel which bears his name. But, as Liicke has shewn, this   
 argument is altogether built on the assumption that the Christian pass-   
 over must necessarily coincide with the time of the institution of the   
 Lord’s supper ; whereas such a coincidence docs not appear to have   
 entered into the consideration of the litigants in this case, but merely   
 the question, whether the Churches should follow the Jewish calendar,   
 or an arrangement of their own. Even in the later dispute between   
 Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, and Victor, on the same point, this ques-   
 tion was not raised, but the matter was debated on other grounds.   
 9. The last historical objection which I shall notice is, that this Gos-   
 pel was first circulated by the Gnosties, and therefore is to be looked on   
 with suspicion. But Liicke has shewn that this was not the case: that   
 unquestionable traces of catholic reception of it are found before it was   
 received by them: and that, at all events, Irenzus recoguized and used it   
 contemporaneously with the Valentinians. The known opposition be-   
 tween the catholic Fathers and the Guostics furnishes a sure guarantee,   
 that had these latter first promulgated the Gospel, it never would have   
 been received into the Canon of the catholic Church.   
 10. The modern opponents of the genuineness and canonicity of this   
 Gospel have raised two arguments against it upon internal evidence.   
 The first of these rests upon the assumed radical diversity between the   
 views of the Person and teaching of Christ presented to us by John,   
 and by the other three Evangelists. On this point I have said nearly all   
 that is necessary in § ii.; and I will only now add, that supposing the   
 diversity to be as unaccountable as it is matural, it would of itself serve   
 as a strong presumption that the Gospel was not the work of a forger,   
 who would have enlarged and decorated the accounts already existing,   
 but a genuine testimony of one who was not an imitator of nor de-   
 pendent on those others. .   
 11. The second endeavours, by bringing out various supposed incon-   
 sistencies in the narration, to show that the Apostle John cannot have   
 been the Author. Such are,—imagined want of connexion in certain   
 parts (ch. iv. 44; xiii. 20; xiv. 31, where see notes);—an imputed in-   
 consistency in the character and development of the treachery of Judas   
 (see note on ch. vi. 64);—the not naming once m the Gospel of his own   
 Lrother James (which, as Liicke remarks, is far vasier to account for on   
 supposition of its genuineness than on that of its spuriousness 5);—the   
 5 James, the son of Zebedee, though one of the favoured Three, comes forward no   
 where personally in the Gospels, nor in the Acts; and vanishes the first of all the   
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