§1] AUTHORSHIP. [iyrropucrion.   
   
 1 John, and James. Still, Ephrem Syrus quotes the second Epistle, as   
 also 2 Peter (see Introduction to 2 Pet. § iv. 13) and Jude: possessing   
 them probably, as he did not understand Greek, in another Syriac   
 version.   
 7. Eusebius reckons both Epistles among the disputed books : saying,   
 “ Among the disputed books are . . . . that named the second, and third   
 of John, whether they belong to the Evangelist, or to some one else of:   
 the same name.”   
 Still, Eusebius’s own opinion may be gathered from another passage,   
\_ where he says of St. John, “In his Epistles he does not even make   
 mention of his own name, or calls himself presbyter (elder), but never   
 Apostle or Evangelist.” Whence it would appear that he received the   
 two smaller Epistles as genuine.   
 8. Origen mentions them with a similar expression of doubt.   
 9. Theodore of Mopsuestia, if we are thus to interpret Leontius of   
 Byzantium (see above, ch. iii. § iv. 11), rejected these in common with   
 the other catholic Epistles.   
 10. Theodoret makes no mention of them.   
 11. In a Homily on Matt. xxi. 23 aseribed to Chrysostom, but written   
 probably by some Antiochene contemporary of his, we read, “But the   
 second and the third the fathers exclude from the canon.”   
 12. Jerome says, “‘ John wrote one Epistle which is approved by all   
 ecclesiastical and learned men; but the other two, of which the begin-   
 ning is ‘the elder,’ are ascribed to John the Presbyter, whose tomb,   
 besides that of St. John, is to this day shewn at Ephesus.”   
 13. In the middle ages there seems to have been no doubt on the   
 authenticity of the Epistles, till Erasmus revived the idea of their being   
 the work of John the Presbyter. This view, grounded on the fact that   
 the Writer names himself “the Presbyter,” has been often maintained   
 since: e. g. by Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, and others.   
 14. If we take into strict account the import of this appellation, it   
 will appear, as Liicke, Huther, and Diisterdieck have maintained, to   
 make rather for than against the authorship by St. John. For in the   
 first place, assuming, which is very doubtful, the existence of such a   
 person as John the Presbyter, this name could only have been given   
 him by those who wished to distinguish him from the Apostle, and   
 would never have been assumed by himself as a personal one, sceing that   
 he bore it in common with many others his co-presbyters.   
 15, Again, such an appellation is not without example as used of   
 Apostles, and might bear two possible senses, either of which would here   
 be preferable to the one just impugned. In the very fragment of Papias   
 from which the existence of the presbyter John is inferred, he several   
 times uses the term presbyter of Apostles and apostolic men as a class.   
 He tells of “the things which he had learned from the presbyters   
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