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 he says, he that biddeth them good speed partaketh, &c.” (2 John   
 10, 11.)   
 And in another place, already cited (ch. xix. § i, par. 4), he quotes   
 2 John 7, 8, supposing it to be taken from the first Epistle: but this   
 very circumstance shews him to have had no suspicion that the two   
 were written by different persons.   
 ‘4. Clement of Alexandria, in a passage already cited above (ch. v-   
 § i. par. 5), cites the first Epistle thus, “Jobn, in his greater Epistle,”   
 ... thereby shewing that he knew of more Epistles by that Apostle.   
 And again in the fragments of the Adumbrations, ed. Potter, p. 1011,   
 he says, “The second Epistle of John, which is written to virgins, is   
 most simple: it was written to a certain Babylonian lady named   
 Electa.”   
 5. Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage quoted at length below in   
 the Introduction to the Apocalypse (§ i. par. 48), noting that John never   
 names himself in his writings, says, “Not even in the current second and   
 third of John, though they are short Epistles, is John manifestly named,   
 but is signified anonymously under the title ‘the presbyter? (elder).”   
 Whence it appears that Dionysius found no offence in the appellation   
 “the presbyter,” but rather a trace of St. John’s manner not to name   
 himself, No argument can be raised on the expression “current” that   
 Dionysius doubted the genuineness of the two Epistles. Eusebius calls   
 the first Epistle “the current first of John.” All we can say of the   
 expression is, that it gives the general sense of tradition.   
 Alexander of Alexandria cites 2 John 10, 11, with “as the blessed   
 John ordered.” And the subsequent Alexandrian writers shew no   
 doubt on the subject.   
 Cyprian, in relating the opinions of the various bishops in the council   
 at Carthage, relates that one Aurelius quoted from “John the Apostle   
 in his Epistle,” the words “If any come to you, &e.,” 2 John 10.   
 Ile does not in his own writings cite either Epistle, nor docs Tertul-   
 lian, But the above testimony shews that they were received as   
 apostolic and canonical in the North African church,   
 6. The Muratorian fragment on the canon speaks cnigmatically, owing   
 partly to some words in the sentence being corrupt: “The Epistle of   
 Jude and two superseribed ‘Of John’ are held among catholic Scrip-   
 ture, and ‘ Wisdom,’ written by friends of Solomon in his honour.”   
 Liicke, Huther, and others, find here a testimony for the Epistles :   
 Diisterdieck on the contrary understands the sentence as meaning that   
 they were not written by John, just as the Wisdom was not written by   
 Solomon.   
 Most probably the Peschito, or ancient Syriac version, did not contain   
 either Epistle. Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cent. vi.) says that in his time   
 the Syrian church acknowledged but three catholic Epistles, 1 Peter,   
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