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 backsliders to punishment and torment . . . that it may be known to   
 all that the double-ininded and doubters about God’s power are for   
 condemnation and for an example to all generations.”   
 38. Neither the Epistle of Barnabas, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus   
 of Antioch, nor Irenwus, ean be fairly adduced as citing or alluding to   
 our Epistle. ‘This assertion may surprise the reader who is acquainted   
 with the strong assertions and casy assumptions of Dietlein. But let   
 him take them one by one and examine them strictly and impartially,   
 and he will find them all in succession prove worthless, except as   
 shewing that primitive Christianity had a Greek vocabulary of its own   
 to express its doctrines and convey its exhortations, which the Apostles   
 and their immediate successors used in common. Neither does the   
 ancient fragment known as the canon of Muratori make any mention   
 of our Epistle. Neither does Tertullian, nor Cyprian, nor Clement of   
 Alexandria in any of his extant works,   
 4. There is a passage in Hippolytus on Antichrist, which seems to be   
 an amplification of 2 Pet. i. 21;—speaking of the prophets, he says:   
 “For they epoke not out of their own strength, nor did they proclaim   
 what things they themselves would, but first of all by means of the   
 divine word they reasoned correctly, and then by means of visions they   
 foretold future events rightly, and then with their persuasion they said   
 the things which were revealed to them by God, but hidden from other   
 men.” Still, striking as the similarity is, we cannot venture to affirm   
 that the inference is really a sound one, any more than in the ease of   
 that place in Theophilus of Antioch : “But men of God, being spiri-   
 taally borne on by the Holy Spirit, and becoming prophets, inspired   
 and gifted with wisdom by God Himself, were taught of God.”   
 5. Eusebius reports of Clement of Alexandria, “ that he in his   
 book called Zfypotyposes, made short expositions of all the canonical   
 Scriptures ; not passing over even the disputed books, such as that of   
 Jude, and the rest of the Catholic Epistles, and that of Barnabas, and   
 that called the Apocalypse of Peter.” And so also says Cassiodorus,   
 who however seoms to assert, in another passage, that these expositions   
 were only of 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and James.   
 6. The judgment between these conflicting testimonies must apparently   
 be given on the side of Eusebius, and Cassiodorus’s first assertion.   
 For Eusebius mentions expressly the Epistle of Jude, as one of those   
 on which Clement commented, whereas by the last-cited statement of   
 Cassiodorus it is excluded. Still even thus we have no express mention   
 of our Epistle, but can only include it by inference among the disputed   
 books of which Eusebius speaks.   
 7. The testimotiy of Origen appears somewhat ambiguous.   
 Eusebius reports it thus: “Peter, on whom the Church of Christ   
 is built, over which the gates of hell shall not prevail, has left ono   
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