INTRODUCTION. ] 1 JOHN. (ou. xix.   
   
   
 1 Peter and 1 John, as apostolic, “ but others do not even acknowledge   
 them as coming from Apostles, but from the elders: for a first, and   
 second, and third of John have been written, making evident shew of   
 being the work of one person.” But it is evident from the chain of testi-   
 monies given above, that Cosmas can have been but ill informed on the   
 subject.   
 15. It is probable that the Alogi, mentioned by Epiphanius as rejeet-   
 ing the Gospel and Apocalypse, included the Epistles in this rejection.   
 Still Epiphanius docs not assert it ; he only says, “Perhaps also the   
 Epistles ; for they agree in sense with the Gospel and the Apocalypse,”   
 But their repudiation of the Epistle would be of no account.   
 16. Tis rejection by Marcion is of equally little consequence. He   
 excluded from the canon all the writings of St. John, as not suiting his   
 views.   
 17. Liicke closes his review of ancient authorities, which I have   
 followed and expanded, by saying, “Incontestably then our Epistle   
 must be numbered among those canonical books which are most strongly   
 upheld by ecclesiastical tradition.”   
 18. But the genuineness of the Epistle rests not, as already observed,   
 on external testimony alone. It must remain an acknowledged fact,   
 until either the Gospel is proved uot to be St. John’s, or the similarity   
 between the two is shewn to be only apparent. Liicke has well ob-   
 served, that neither Gospel nor Epistle can be said to be an imitation:   
 both are original, but both the product of the same mind: so that con-   
 sidered only in this point of view, we might well doubt which was   
 written first.   
 19. However, its genuineness has been controverted in modern times.   
 First we have a rash and characteristic saying of Jos. Sealiger’s : “ The   
 three Epistles of John are not by John the Apostle.” The first who   
 deliberately and on assigned grounds took the same side, was S. Gottlieb   
 Lange: who, strange to say, receiving the Gospel and the Apocalypse,   
 yet rejected the Epistle.   
 20. His argument, as reported by Liicke, is as follows : The entire   
 failure in the Epistle of any individual, personal, and local notices,   
 betrays an author unacquainted with the personal circumstances of the   
 Apostle, and those of the churches where he taught. The close cor-   
 respondence of the Epistle with the Gospel in thought and expression   
 begets a suspicion that some careful imitator of John wrote the   
 Epistle. Lastly, the Epistle, as compared with the Gospel, shews such   
 evident signs of enfecblement of spirit by old age, that if it is to be   
 aseribed to Jolin, it must have been written at the extreme end of bis   
 life, after the destruction of Jerusalem; whereas, from no allusion being   
 made to that event even in such a passage as ch. ii. 18, the Epistle   
 makes a shew of having been written before it. The only solution in   
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