§ 1] FOR WHAT READERS WRITTEN. [inrropucttoy.   
   
 itself may haye been the growth of the second century, yet the germs of   
 it, which are opposed in this Epistle, were apparent long before. A   
 groundless assumption of Bretschneider is, that seeing the three Epistles   
 are by the same hand, and the writer of the second and third, where   
 there was no ground for concealing himself, calls himself “the elder”   
 (“presbyter”),—the first Epistle, where, wishing to be taken for the   
 Apostle, he does not name himself, is also by Johu the Presbyter. The   
 answer to which is, that we can by no means consent to the assumption   
 that the so-called Presbyter John was the author of second and third   
 Epistles : see the Introduction to 2 and 3 John, § i. 2, 12 ff.   
 29. The objections brought against our Epistle by the modern   
 Tiibingen school are dealt with at considerable length by Diisterdieck.   
 It is not my purpose to enter on them here. For mere English readers,   
 it would require an introduction far longer than that which Diisterdieck   
 has devoted to it, at all to enable them to appreciate the nature of those   
 objections and the postulates from which they spring, And when I   
 inform such English readers that the first of those postulates is the   
 denial of a personal God, they will probably not foel that they have lost   
 much by not having the refutation of the objections laid before them.   
 Should any regret it, they may find some of them briefly noticed in   
 Dr. Davidson’s Introduction, vol. iii. pp. 45+ ff : and they will there sce   
 how feeble and futile they are.   
 30. Whether then we approach the question of the authorship of this   
 Epistle (and its consequent canonicity) from the side of external testi-   
 mony, or of internal evidence, we are alike convinced that its claim to   
 have been written by the Evangelist St. John, and to its place in tho   
 canon of Scripture, is fully substantiated,   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION II.   
 FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.   
   
   
   
 1, This question, in the case of our Epistle, might be very easily and   
 briefly dealt with, were it not for one apparent mistake, which compli-   
 cates it.   
 In Augustine we read, “ Agreeable to this opinion is also that which   
 is said by John in the Epistle to the Parthians ;’ and then follows   
 1 John iii. 2, This appears to he the only place in Angustine’s writings   
 where he thus characterizes it. The inscription ‘To the Parthians ” has   
 fonnd its way into some of the Benedictine editions in the title of the   
 ‘Tractates on the Epistle : but it seems not to have been originally there.   
 It has been repeated by some of the Latin fathers.   
 2. Some, but very few writers, have assumed as a fact that the Epistle   
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