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 else, to be introduced into our estimate of the Sacred Writings, then   
 either one saw and used the text of the other, or both drew from a   
 common document, or a common source of oral apostolic teaching.   
 2. Setting aside the supposition of a common documentary souree, as   
 not answering to the curious phenomena of concurrence and divergence,   
 no one can say that the latter alternative may not have been the case:   
 that a portion of oval teaching spoken originally in the power of the   
 Spirit, may not, in its reproduction, have become deficcted as we here   
 sce. Were the case in strict analogy with that of the three Gospels, we   
 should have no hesitation in adopting this hypothesis. But the cases   
 are not similar. For we have first to add to the phanomena of this   
 passage the remarkable coincidences elsewhere, where no sueh common   
 portion of teaching could have been concerned: and then to observe,   
 that the coincidences and divergences in the passage itself do not entirely   
 bear out the hypothesis, There is an intent and consistent purpose   
 plainly visible in them, which is altogether absent, unless the wildest   
 fancies be allowed to come into play, from the common text of passages   
 in the three Gospels,   
 3. We have then to fall back on the supposition, that one of the   
 Sacred Writers saw and used the text of the other. And if this is to   
 be so, there can be but little hesitation in answering the enquiry, on   
 which side the preference lies as to priority and originality. The   
 grounds of that answer have indeed been amplified and exaggerated,   
 beyond what we can fairly concede: but still in the main they are   
 irrefragable. We cannot see, with De Wette and others, that St. Peter   
 is less fresh or individual in his expressions and turns of thought than   
 St. Jude: but, conceding to both Writers originality and individuality   
 of thought, it is then for us to ascertain by inspection, which text bears   
 the air of being the free outflow of the first thought, which the working   
 up of the other for a purpose slightly differing.   
 4, The portion of the common matter which will best serve us for   
 this purpose is that in which the traditional and historical examples are   
 adduced, 2 Pet. ii, 1—16; Jude 4—11. In this passage the object of   
 St. Jude is to set forth the “ungodly men who turn the grace of our   
 God into lasciviousness, and deny the only Master, and our Lord Jesus   
 Christ.” The persons described by St. Peter are not the same, in how-   
 ever many common points the characters coincide. With him they are   
 false teachers, answering to the “false prophets among the people”   
 of old: like the others, they are described as “denying the Master [that   
 bought them],” with the words in brackets characteristically inserted.   
 In Peter (ii. 1) we have merely a rominiscence of the first histori   
 notice in Jude (ver. 5), consisting in his specifying the false teachers as   
 answering to the false prophets among the people, as contrasted with the   
 true ones of whom he has been speaking (i. 19—21). It was not te his   
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