§1] AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. [ixtrovucrion,   
   
   
 2. This view rests on external, and on internal evidence. I shall first   
 specify both these, and then pass on to other views respecting the author-   
 ship. And in so doing, I shall at present cite merely those testimonies   
 which bear more or less directly on the authorship. The most ancient   
 are the following :   
 3. Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew (written be-   
 tween A.D, 139 and 161): “And... among us a certain man named   
 John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in the Apocalypse which was made   
 to him prophesied that those who have believed in our time shall spend   
 a thousand years in Jerusalem, and after this the universal and in a word   
 eternal resurrection and judgment of all together shall take place.”   
 We may mention by the way, that this testimony of Justin is doubly   
 important, as referred to by Eusebius, himself no believer in the apostolic   
 authorship: “Justin has made mention of the Apocalypse of John,   
 plainly stating it to be by the Apostle.”   
 The authenticity and value of the passage of Justin has been dis-   
 cussed at considerable length and with much candour by Liicke. He,   
 himself a disbeliever in St. John’s authorship, confesses that it is a   
 genuine and decided testimony in its favour.   
 4. Melito, bishop of Sardis (died about 171), is said by Eusebius to   
 have written treatises on the devil, and on the Apocalypse of John. It   
 is fairly reasoned that Eusebius would hardly have failed to notice, sup-   
 posing him to have scen Melito’s work, any view of his which doubted   
 the apostolic origin: and that this may therefore be legitimately taken   
 as an indirect testimony in its favour.   
 5. Of a similar indirect nature are the two next testimonies. Theo-   
 philus, bishop of Antioch (died about 180), is said by Eusebius to have   
 written a book entitled “ Against the heresy of Hermogenes,” in which   
 he uses testimonies from the Apocalypse of John,   
 6. And similarly Eusebius says of Apollonius, who flourished in Asia   
 Minor at the end of cent. ii, and wrote against the Montanists, thereby   
 making his testimony more important: ‘He also uses testimonies from   
 the Apocalypse of John: and he relates that a dead man was raised   
 miraculously by John himself in Ephesus.” From this latter sentence   
 there can be no doubt that Apollonius regarded the Apocalypse as the   
 work of John the Apostle.   
 7. We now come to the prineipal second century witness, Irenzus   
 (died about 180). Respecting the value of his testimony, it may suffice   
 to remind the student that he had been a hearer of Polyearp, the disciple   
 of St. John, And this testimony occurs up and down his writings in   
 great abundance, and in the most decisive terms. “ John the Disciple of   
 the Lord,” is stated by him in four places to have written the Apocalypse,   
 —and “John” in two places. And this John can be no other than the   
 Apostle: for he says, “John the Disciple of the Lord (as above), who   
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