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 so enters and takes it up as that the end ofa former part is also the   
 beginning of that which follows.” The same style prevails in the   
 Epistle, It is not however an infirmity of age, but a peculiarity, which   
 might belong to extreme youth just as well.   
 24, The greater amount of repetition in the Epistle arises from its   
 being more hortatory and tender in character, And it may also be   
 attributed to its more Hebraistie form, in which it differs from the   
 Grecian and dialectic style of St. Paul: abounding in parallels and   
 apparent arguings ina circle, The epistolary form would account for   
 the want of strict arrangement in order, which would hardly be observed.   
 by the youngest any more than by the oldest writer.   
 25. And the appearance of uniformity, partly accounted for by the   
 oneness of subject and simplicity of spirit, is often produced by want   
 of deep enough penetration of the sense to discover the real differences   
 in passages which scem to express the same. Besides, even granting   
 these marks of old age, what argument would they furnish against the   
 genuineness ? St. John was quite old enough at and after the siege   
 of Jerusalem for such to have shewn themselves : so that this objection   
 must be dealt with on other grounds, and does not affect our present   
 question,   
 26. Fourthly, it is quite a mistake to suppose that if the Epistle was   
 written after the destruction of Jerusalem, that event must necessarily   
 have been intimated in ch. ii. 18. It cannot be proved, nor does it   
 seem likely from the notices of the coming of the Lord in the Gospel,   
 that St. John connected the “ last hour” with the destruction of Jeru-   
 salem. It does not scem likely that, writing to Christians of Asia Minor,   
 who probably from the first had a wider view of our Lord’s prophecy of   
 the end, he should have felt bound to make a corrective allusion to the   
 event, even supposing he himself had once identified it with the time of   
 the end. They would not require to be told, why the universal triumph   
 of Christianity had not followed it, seeing they probably never expected   
 it to do so.   
 27. So that Lange’s objections, which I have reported frecly from   
 Liicke, as being highly illustrative of the character of the Epistle, cer-   
 tainly do not succeed in impugning the verdiet of antiquity, or the   
 evidence furnished by the Epistle itself.   
 28. The objections brought by Bretschneider, formed on the doctrine   
 of the logos (Word), and the antidocetie tendency manifest both in the   
 Epistle and the Gospel, and betraying both as works of the second cen-   
 tury, have also been shewn by Liicke to be untenable. The doctrine of   
 the Word, though formally nounced by St. John only, is in fact that of   
 St. Paul in Col. i. 15 ff, and that of the author of the Epistle to the   
 Ilebrews i. 1 ff., was unquestionably prepared for Christian use long   
 before, in the Alexandrine Jewish theology. And though Doeetism   
 278