§rv.J AUTHENTICITY. [yrropuction.   
   
 the identity of the Writers, Besides which, it halts in two essential   
 points. For 1) it is not altogether correet in its statement. We do find   
 tho Writer’s view of prophecy continued from one Epistle (1 Pet.   
 i. 10—12) to tho other (2 Pet. i. 19—21; iii, 2) :—the new birth by   
 the divine word, whieh in the first Epistle is alleged as a motive for put-   
 ting off worldly lusts and passions (i, 22—ii, 2), reappears in the second   
 ini. 4: the “virtues” of Him who hath called them, 1 Pet. ii. 9, reappear   
 in the same peculiar form, 2 Pet.i.3: if we read, 1 Pet. iv. 17, that   
 judgment is beginning at the house of God, and will proceed on to the   
 disobedient, we read of the deccivers in the second Epistle, 2 Pet. ii. 3,   
 that their judginent is not idle. Other instances might be and have been   
 produced, showing that the allegation will not hold. And 2) it is for-   
 gotten by the objectors, that it would be only in a spurious Epistle   
 imitating the first, that we should find such reproductions carefully car-   
 ried out: tho occasion and object of a second genuine Epistle being totally   
 different, forms a very sufficient reason why they should not be found to   
 any considerable extent.   
 20. It is again objeeted, that whereas in the former Epistle the   
 sufferings and death and resurrection of Christ were brought forward   
 frequently and insisted on,—in this, these facts of Redemption are alto-   
 gether put into the background, and only the exalted Christ is in the   
 view of the Writer. But it is to be remembered that 1) in that first   
 Epistle we found the exalted Person of our Lord mainly before the   
 Apostle’s eyes®: that 2) the differing occasion and object would tend to   
 produce just the diversity. found here, where there is no longer any pur-   
 pose of comforting under persceution, but only of warning against error   
 and building up in knowledge ; that 3) in the first Epistle, where « sal   
 vation” was so conspicuous with its facts and consequences, our Lord is   
 commonly found as “ Christ” simply (i. 11, 19; ii. 21; iii. 15, “the Lord   
 Christ”), or “ Jesus Christ” (i. 1, 2, 3, 7, 13; ii. 5; iii, 21; iv. 11), or   
 “ Christ Jesus” (v.10) ; whereas in the second, where “ salvation” hardly   
 appears (iii. 15), He is ordinarily “ our Lord” (or God?) “and Saviour   
 Jesus Christ” (i. [1,] 11; ii, 20; iii. 18), or “our Lord Jesus Christ”   
 (i. 2 [Jesus our Lord”], 8, 14, 16): but never simply “ Christ,” “ Jesus   
 Christ,” or “ Christ Jesus.” This, which has becn also alleged asagainst the   
 identity of writers, is, I submit, strikingly characteristic of the different   
 -ealmsofthoughtofthe two Epistles. In the first, it is community of suf-   
 fering and glorification with Him, which is to give encouragement : His   
 lordlyand glorious titles ave dropped, and his office (“Christ”) or combined   
 Person and office (“ Jesus Christ,” or “ Christ Jesus”) is ever brought   
 forward. But in this second, where warning, and caution against rebel-   
 lion are mainly in view, we are ever reminded of lordship by “Lord,”   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 8 See above, chi.   
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