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 is evidently to be supplied at the end of Briickner’s notices, though he   
 himself hesitates to affirm it. From what has already been said of   
 Dietlein’s book, it will be readily believed, that it is hardly worth quoting   
 on this side.   
 16. If we now come to review the course of ancient testimony, we shall   
 find its tendency to be very much the same as we found it respecting the   
 Epistle of St. James, with which indeed our Epistle is often classed   
 among the disputed books. And as far as this portion of the subject of   
 our present section is concerned, we might append to it the same con-   
 clusion as that with which we terminated the corresponding section on   
 that Epistle, ch. xvi. § v. 15.   
 17. But another department of evidence in this case requires con-   
 sideration. Weighty objections have, and that from early times’, been   
 brought against the Epistle on internal grounds. Some of these I have   
 already dealt with by anticipation, in speaking on its occasion and object,   
 —on the probability as to the same readers being partly in view as those   
 in the former Epistle,—on the kind of use made of the Epistle of St.   
 Jude. If our preceding remarks, which I have endeavoured to make   
 fairly, and not in the spirit of a partisan, have been warranted by fact,   
 then on all these points we have been gathering reasons by which those   
 objections to its genuineness from supposed internal disqualification may   
 be so far met.   
 18. But they extend to several other points besides those above men-   
 tioned. For instance, it is said, that the kind of mention of the coming   
 of our Lord in the two Epistles could not have proceeded from the same   
 person. In the former Epistle it is simply introduced as one of the   
 great comforting assurances for God’s persecuted people: in the latter,   
 it is defended against cavil and unbelicf. Now would it not have been   
 more just in this case to say, that the circumstances and persons in view   
 cannot be the same, rather than that the Writers cannot? For surely   
 there is nothing in this Epistle shewing a belief, on the part of the Writer   
 himself, inconsistent with that professed in the other. Nay, it is evi-   
 dently shewn by such passages as ch. iii, 8, 10, that the firm persuasion   
 expressed in 1 Pet. iv. 5 was that of our Writer also.   
 19. It is said, that the peculiarities with regard to certain uncommon   
 points which we find in the first Epistle (e. g. iii, 19, iv. 6, iii. 6, 21) are   
 not found reproduced in the second. But, as Briickner has well ob-   
 served, the very fact, that it was characteristic of St. Peter to adduce   
 these mysterious and outlying points, would also account in some measure   
 for their appearing, not always, but in a seattered and irregular manner,   
 as illustrations by the way: just as they do appear in this second Epistle   
 also (e.g. iii. 5,10). So that this is rather an argument for, than against   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 7 Compare Jerome, above, par. 12.   
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