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 words can only represent as many of them as the Writer had seen: and   
 that it is equally unjustifiable to gather from what follows, that the sacred   
 canon of the New Test. was at that time settled. ‘Those words cannot   
 imply more, than that there were certain writings by Christian teachers,   
 which were reckoned as on a level with the Old Test. Scriptures, and   
 ealled by the same name (see note there). And that that was the ease,   
 even in the traditional lifetime of St. Peter, it would be surely unreason-   
 able to deny.   
 25. The diversity of style in the two Epistles has been frequently   
 alleged\*. But on going through all that has been said, I own I cannot   
 regard it, considerable as it undoubtedly is, as any more than ean well   
 be accounted for by the total diversity of subject and mood in the two   
 Epistles, and by the interweaving into this second one of copious remi-   
 niscences from another Epistle. Some of the differences we have already   
 spoken of, when treating of the titles and names of our Lord appearing   
 in the two Epistles ; and have found them amply accounted for by the   
 above reasons. The same might be said of the terms used for the coming   
 of our Lord,—\* revelation” and “revealing” in the first Epistle, pre-   
 sence,” “ day of the Lord,” “ day of judgment” in this?: the same again   
 of the prevalence of “hope” in the former Epistle, and of “ knowledge”   
 in this. Some of the objections adduced on this head are without foun-   
 dation in fact, e. g. that which Davidson admits, that whereas “in the   
 first Epistle the Writer makes considerable use of the Old Test., incor-   
 porating its sentiments and diction into his own composition; in the   
 second there is hardly a reference to the Jewish Scriptures.” What then   
 are we to say of ch.i.19—21; ii. 1, 5,6,7f, 15f, 22; ii. 2,4, 5£, 8,   
 13? May not it be said that although the second Epistle, from the   
 nature of the case, does not require so many references to the new-   
 begetting word, yet the mind of the Writer was equally full of its facts   
 and sentiments ?   
 26. Some of the points of resemblance between the two Epistles have   
 been very fairly stated by Davidson and by Briickner: and the latter   
 writer has corrected the over-statements of Dietlein. Of these coinci-   
 dences, “virtue,” as applied to God, has been already noticed. Others   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 1 See note on the place. 2 See Jerome, above, par. 12,   
 3 Davidson, p. 433, treats this as insufficient, “because the phraseology is not   
 confined to that part of the Epistle which is directed against the false teachers, and   
 the Epistle was not wholly or chicfly written to threaten the enomics of the truth with   
 the dreadful day of the Lord. It was the writer’s object to establish and comfort, as   
 well as to terrify.” But surely we may fairly say, that the spirit in which the Writer   
 set himself to compose his Epistle, which is evident from the ruling tone of it being   
 warning and denunciatory, would of necessity modify the terms in which he intro-   
 duced those doctrines and expectations which formed the ground of his exhortation or   
 prophecy.   
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