§1.] AUTHORSHIP AND CANONICITY. xntropvucrion.   
   
 his name, put the name, wishing to gain eredit for his own composi-   
 tion. For that this was a doctrine of his, that the kingdom of Christ   
 should be on this earth: and being himself a gross person and altogether   
 carnal, he denied that future blessedness would consist in things of this   
 kind.”   
 43. Ihave considered it important to quote this passage at length, as   
 giving an account of the earliest opponents to the authenticity of the   
 Apocalypse, and of the reason of their opposition. These Alogi have been   
 very lightly passed over by Liicke (p. 582) and others, who are not will-   
 ing that their procession of opponents to the apostolic authorship should   
 be led by persons whose character is so little creditable. But the fair   
 enquirer will not feel at liberty thus to exclude them. They were per-   
 haps more outspoken and thorough, perhaps also less learned and cautious   
 than those who follow: but their motives of opposition were of the same   
 kind; and it is especially to be noted, asa weighty point in the evidence,   
 that, being hostile to the authority of the writings commonly received as   
 those of the Apostle John, they in their time conecived it necessary to   
 destroy the credit of the Apocalypse as well as that of the Gospel.   
 44, The Roman presbyter Cains, a very learned man according to   
 Ensebius, who lived in the Episcopate of Zephyrinns (i.e. 196—219),   
 wrote a polemical dialogue against the Montanist Proclus, of which a   
 fragment has been preserved by Eusebius speaking out still more plainly,   
 and saying that Cerinthus forged revelations in the name of a great   
 Apostle, and pretended them to have been received from an angel, saying   
 that after the resurrection there would be a kinglom of Christ upon   
 earth, and that the flesh would again dwell in Jerusalem, and be subject   
 to Insts and pleasures: and that he being an enemy to the Scriptures of   
 God, and wishing to deceive men, introduces a thousand years as the   
 term of the marriage festivity.   
 45. Some have in vain endeavoured to persuade us that some other   
 book is here meant, and not the Apocalypse of John. No such work is   
 to be traced, though we have very full accounts of Cerinthus from Ire-   
 nus and Epiphanius: and neither the plural “revelations” (which is   
 also used by Dionysius, as cited below, of our apocalyptic visions), nor   
 the exaggerated account of the earthly Kingdom as promised (see the   
 same in the objections of the Alogi as cited by Dionysius above) can   
 have the least weight in inducing us to concur in such a supposition.   
 46. When Liicke scts aside Caius in the same eategory as the Alogi,   
 as having equally little to do with ecclesiastical tradition, we cannot   
 help seeing again the trick of a crafty partisan wishing to get rid of an   
 awkward ally.   
 47. Undoubtedly the weightiest objector to the canonicity of the   
 Apocalypse in early times is Dionysrus, the successor next but one to   
 Origen in the presidency of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and   
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