§ vj AUTHENTICITY. [stRopverion.   
   
   
 bility the sentence was a mere concluding notice, and “ therefore” was   
 ouly a rounding off of what had gono before.   
 11. Eusebius says, “ One Epistle of Peter, that which is called the   
 first, is received : this the ancient presbyters use as undoubted in their   
 writings. But that which is called his second we have received as not   
 indeed among the New Testament writings; but yet, appearing useful   
 to many, it has come to be reverenced with the other Scriptures :” and   
 afterwards, “So many are tho writings which are called Peter's ; of   
 which I know only one Epistle as genuine, and confessed by the ancient   
 presbyters.” And again: “Of those books which are disputed, but   
 notwithstanding generally known, is that Epistle called James's, and   
 that of Jude, and the second of Peter \*.”   
 12. Jerome says of St. Peter, “ He wrote two Epistles, which are   
 named catholic, of which the second is by most denied to be his, on   
 account of the dissonance of its style from the former Epistle.”   
 “Paul therefore ad Titus for his interpreter, as the blessed Peter   
 had Mark, whose Gospel was composed with Peter as narrator, and   
 himself as writer. And the two Epistles which are aseribed to Peter   
 are diserepant in style and character and structure of words; by which   
 we understand that from necessity of circumstances he used different   
 interpreters.”   
 13. After the time of Eusebius, the Epistle appears to have been   
 very generally received as canonical. We have however the statement   
 of Gregory of Nazianzum, “that some held seven, some only three   
 catholic Epistles ;” and of Cosmas Indicopleustes, “that among the   
 Syrians only three were found, those of James, Peter, and John.” It   
 confirms this notice to find, that this Epistle is not contained in the   
 Pesehito, or early Syriac version. Ephrem Syrus notwithstanding   
 received the whole seven catholic Epistles, and so the Philoxenian, or   
 later Syriae version. Leontius of Byzantium says that Theodore of   
 Mopsuestia rejected our Epistle.   
 14. In the middle ages the Epistle was generally recognized and   
 accounted canonical. At the time of the Reformation, the ancient   
 doubts revived. Both Erasmus and Calvin express them. Cajetan,   
 Grotins, Scaliger, Salmasius, question its genuineness, And in modern   
 times, Semler, Neander, Credner, De Wette, Reuss, Mayerhoff, have   
 ranged themselves on the same side,   
 15. On the other hand, there have not been wanting in our own days   
 many defenders of the genuineness of the Epistle. The principal of   
 these have becn Michaelis, Pott, Augusti, Storr, Flatt, Dahl, Hug,   
 Schmid, Lardner, Guericke, Windischmann, Thiersch. The same result   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 © Sce the testimony of Philastrius of Brescia in favour of our Epistle, above, ch. i,   
 § 1. 65.   
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