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 and of what He did for us by “ Saviour :” and without the former, or both   
 titles, He never appears.   
 21. Another objection has been found in the apparent anxiety of the   
 Writer to shew that he is the Apostle Peter, thereby betraying that he   
 was not that Apostle. But here again, we may surely say just as fairly,   
 that this is in manifest consistency with the character and design of the   
 Epistle, which cautions against, and stigmatizes, false tenchers, Thus we   
 find St.Paul, in those Epistles where his object is the same, most strongly   
 asserting his Apostleship, and his personal qualification as a teacher and   
 ruler of the church. Were the Epistle genuine, this is just what we   
 might expect.   
 22. The supposed objection, that in the reference to an apostolic   
 command, ch, iii, the Writer seems to sever himself from the Apostles,   
 loses all weight by the reflection, that the words most naturally mean,   
 as explained in the note on the passage, the Apostles who preached to   
 you, much as in 1 Pet. i. 12: the Writer himself forming one only of that   
 class, and thus preferring to specify it as a class’, Besides, I submit   
 that such an objection is suicidal, when connected with that last men-   
 tioned. If the object of the (apocryphal) Writer was, elaborately to   
 represent himself as St. Peter, how can the same view of the Epistle be   
 consistent in finding in it a proof, by his own deliberate shewing, that he   
 is not an Apostle? Forgers surely do not thus desiguedly overthrow   
 their own fabrics.   
 23, The last objection which I shall notice is, the reference to St.   
 Paul’s Epistles, in ch. iii. 15, 16, as indicating a later date than is con-   
 sistent with the genuineness of our Epistle. They are there evidently   
 adduced as existing in some number: and as forming part of the recog-   
 nized Scriptures. No doubt, these undeniable phenomena of our Epistle   
 are worthy of serious consideration ; and they present to us, I am free to   
 confess, a difficulty almost insuperable, if the common traditions respeet-   
 ing the end of St. Peter’s life are to be received as matters of fact. But   
 we are not bound by those traditions, though inclined to retain them in   
 deference to ancient testimonies : we are at all events free to assume as   
 great a latitude in their dates as the phenomena of the sacred writings   
 seem to require. All therefore that we can say of this reference to the   
 writings of St. Paul, is that, believing on other grounds this Epistle to   
 be written by St. Peter, this seems to require for it a later date than is   
 consistent with the usually received traditions of his death, and that our   
 reception of such traditions must be modified accordingly.   
 24, At the same time it must be borne in mind, that it is an entirely   
 unwarranted assumption, to understand by “‘ all Epistles” here, an entire   
 collection of St. Paul’s Epistles as we now have them, seeing that the   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 9 See also note op Jude 17, 18.   
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