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 “but chiefly,” le returns to the particular characters here under de-   
 scription, and takes up the two traits which form the main subject in   
 St. Jude, ver. 8; so that we have the original “ In like manner neverthe-   
 less these dreamers also defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of   
 dignities,” vepresented by “but chiefly them that go after the flesh in   
 the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous, self   
 willed, they are not afraid to rail at dignities :” where again I submit   
 that none ean doubt fora moment which sacred Writer preceded the   
 other.   
 10. The next example even more strikingly shews the same. St. Jude   
 cites at length from some apocryphal book, probably that called the   
 taking up or ascension of Moses, an instance of the different conduct   
 of mighty angels in contending with God’s adversaries. St. Peter (ver.   
 11) merely asserts generally that such is the conduet of mighty angels,   
 but gives no hint of an allusion to the fact on which the general assertion   
 is based ; nor does the great Adversary appear in his sentence, but in   
 his stead are substituted these heretics themselves ; “ whereas angels,   
 though they be greater in strength and might, bring not railing judgment   
 against them.” This, standing as it does thus by itself, would constitute,   
 were it not for the original in St. Jude being extant, the most enigma-   
 tical sentence in the New Testament.   
 11. Ishall not treat at length every separate verse, but shall only   
 remark, that as we pass on through 2 Pet. ii. 12 #f, while this view   
 of the priority of St. Jude is at every step confirmed, we derive some   
 interesting notices of the way in which the passage in our Epistle has   
 been composed: viz. by the Apostle having in his thoughts the passage   
 in St. Jude, and adapting such portions of it as the Spirit guided him to   
 see fit, taking sometimes the mere sound of St. Jude’s words to express   
 a different thought, sometimes, as we saw above, contracting and omit-   
 ting, sometimes expanding and inserting, as suited his purpose. ‘Thus   
 while in St. Jude we have the comparison “ as the irrational animals”   
 simply introduced with reference to certain things which the persons   
 under description know naturally and use corruptly, in St. Peter it isthe   
 heretics themselves who are “ as irrational animals,” the additional point   
 of comparison is introduced, that they are born naturally for capture and   
 destruction, and the are corrupted of St. Jude is made to serve a very   
 different purpose,—\* shall even perish in their corruption.” So in 2 Pet.   
 ii, 13, in the reminiscence of the passage, rocks (spilades) of Jude 12   
 becomes spots (spilo’) and blemishes,—\* in your love-feasts” (agapais)   
 of St. Jude becomes “ én their deceits” (apatais). So in 2 Pet. ii.17, we   
 have somewhat similar figures to those in Jude 13, but whereas originally   
 it was “waves of the sea foaming out their own shame,” and “wander-   
 ing stars, for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever,” in the   
 latter text it becomes, more suitably to St. Peter’s purpose of depicting   
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