INTRODUCTION. ] 1 PETER. (em. xvH.   
   
 10. This Epistle is also found in the Peschito or ancient Syriac version,   
 which contains three only of the Catholic Epistles. Tt is true, it is not   
 mentioned in the fragment on the canon known by the name of Mura-   
 tori, But the passage is not casily understood. The simplest interpre-   
 tation of the sentence is, “ we receive also only the Apocalypses of John   
 and Peter, which (latter) some of our brethren refuse to have read in   
 the church.”   
 11. Itis inferred from a passage of Leontius of Byzantium (died about   
 610) that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the Epistle : but the inference   
 is not a safe one, the words being too general to warrant it.   
 12. It is said, in a passage of Petrus Sieulus, that the Paulicians   
 rejected it:   
 “But the two Catholic Epistles of Peter the prince of the Apostles   
 they reject, being strongly set against him.”   
 13. So that, with one or two insignifieant exceptions, we have the   
 united testimony of antiquity in its favour. It would be superfluous to   
 go on citing later testimonies on the same side.   
 14. The first donbt in modern times was thrown on its authenticity   
 by Cindius, on the ground that its thoughts and expressions are too   
 like those of St. Paul, to have been written by the Apostle whose name   
 it bears.   
 15. ‘This was taken up by Eichhorn, and expanded into the hypothesis,   
 that some one wrote the Epistle who had been long with St. Paul, and   
 had adopted his ideas and phrases: and as this will not fit Si. Peter, he   
 supposes that St. Peter found the material, but it was worked up by   
 Johu Mark, This hypothesis is rejected by Bertholdt, but taken up in   
 another form: viz. by adopting the idea hinted at by Jerome and   
 formally announced by Baronius, that the Epistle was originally written   
 in Hebrew (so Baronins), or Aramaic, and rendered into Greek by   
 Mark (so Baronins) or Silvanus. But, as Huther well remarks, this   
 hypothesis is as arbitrary as the other: and the whole diction of the   
 Epistle and its modes of citation protest against its being thought a   
 translation,   
 16. De Wette finds reason to doubt the genuineness, but on grounds   
 entirely derived from the Epistle itself. Je thinks it too deficient in   
 originality, and too much made up of reminiscences from other epistles.   
 This ground of objection will be examined, and found untenable, in   
 treating of the character and style of the Epistle.   
 17. It was to be supposed, that the Tiibingen school, as represented   
 by Baur and Schwegler, would repudiate this, as they have done so   
 many other Epistles. The arguments on which the latter of these   
 founds his rejection ave worth enumerating, admitting, as most of them   
 do, of a ready and satisfactory answer. They are‘, 1) the want of any   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 \* Thave taken this statement mainly from Huther.   
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