

at defiance all the mouths that were ever fashioned. Neither a Roscius nor a Garrick could pronounce it effectively. Let the speaker see to it, and strive for these high and emphatic qualities of style; and, in connection, let the voice be trained to give execution to what the brain may conceive, or the pen put down. We say, again: Beware how you put your trust in matter alone, even though it be of Demosthenic stringency and power. Intense, prolonged, and painful labor alone can make the orator; but how amazing the power gained as his reward.

ARTICLE VI.

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

BY REV. E. P. BARROWS, D.D., LATELY PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LITERATURE
IN ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

NO. VI.

SEQUEL TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

By the Sequel to the Gospel History we mean the collection of writings known as the Acts of the Apostles, the apostolic Epistles, and the Apocalypse. We apply to them the epithet "sequel," not as implying that they were all written after the Gospel narratives (for the fourth Gospel, at least, is later than most of them), but as indicating that they followed naturally from the *facts* recorded by the four evangelists. The genuineness, integrity, and credibility of the Gospel narratives have been shown, in preceding Articles, to rest on an immovable foundation of testimony. We are thus prepared beforehand to expect not only a record of the labors of the apostles, and writings emanating from them, but also a record and writings resting on the same *basis of supernatural facts* as that which underlies the evangelic narratives. If the truth of the Gospel narratives can be denied, or the supernatural element eliminated from them, then the truth of the supernatural events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and

implied in the Pauline and catholic Epistles, becomes of itself improbable. But if the reality of the facts recorded in the four Gospels is admitted, there is an antecedent probability that the bright train of miraculous events inaugurated in connection with our Lord's ministry will flow on, in greater or less measure, into the history of the primitive church, and also that we shall find written discussions and instructions, relating to the doctrines and duties of Christianity, such as those contained in the apostolic Epistles. It is very important to remember that the Saviour established his church only in its fundamental principles. He left to his apostles the work of publishing his gospel, and organizing churches among Jews and Gentiles. Some truths, moreover, of the highest importance, he gave only in outline, because the time for their full development had not yet come. Such were especially the doctrine of his atoning sacrifice on Calvary, with the connected doctrine of justification by faith; and the divine purpose to abolish the Mosaic economy, and with it the distinction between Jews and Gentiles. It must be obvious to all, that, for the accomplishment of the work thus committed to them, the apostles needed the *supernatural illumination* of the Holy Spirit, and also a *supernatural seal* of their authority. The Acts of the Apostles show us how both these wants were supplied.

First, in respect to the supernatural illumination of the Spirit, the Saviour had taught them, in plain terms, that the Holy Ghost could not come (that is, in his special and full influences as the administrator of the new dispensation) till after his glorification: "It is expedient for you," he said, "that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you."¹ And again: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."² Compare, also, the same

¹ John xvi. 7.

² John xv. 26, 27.

apostle's comment on the Saviour's words: "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he," adds the evangelist, "of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."¹ In accordance with the tenor of these words, the Saviour's promise and direction to the apostles was: "Behold, I send the promise of the Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."² Now we have, in the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, a record of the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise that he would send the Holy Ghost. This is a sequel to the Gospel record so natural and necessary that it could not be wanting from a book professing to give even the briefest summary of the labors of the apostles.

Secondly, as to the supernatural seal of their divine commission, the same book shows us how it was given, in connection with the descent of the Holy Spirit. He communicated to them not only the inward illumination which they needed for their high office, but also the gift of speaking with tongues, and working stupendous miracles. This was to the world the outward and visible proof of their apostolic authority. They derived it from Christ, as they were everywhere careful to state, and it was Christ's seal to their commission. To affirm that they needed no such divine attestation, would be to say that they had no new truths to communicate by revelation of the Holy Spirit. The reader need not be told that this would be in direct contradiction of the Saviour's declaration, that he had many things to say to his apostles, which they could not then bear, but which should be afterwards imparted to them by the Spirit of truth.³ The divine seal of their commission which the apostles received on the day of Pentecost, was, then, in full harmony with the Saviour's plan as previously developed — a consistent sequel to the facts recorded in the Gospels.

¹ John vii. 38, 39.

² Luke xxiv. 49.

³ John xvi. 12-15.

The narrative itself of the apostolic labors, contained in the Acts of the Apostles, is simple and natural. It bears throughout the stamp of reality, not of fiction. Its very incompleteness is a testimony to its authenticity; for it is an incompleteness easily explained from the author's position. He does not profess to cover the whole field of primitive church history, but follows down the main line of apostolic labor to the time when Paul commenced his missionary tours. To a history of these the last half of his work is exclusively devoted. How naturally this grew out of the fact of his personal connection with the great apostle of the Gentiles, every one understands.

Of the apostolic Epistles we remark, in general, that, along with the unfolding, as circumstances required, of the peculiar doctrines of grace, and the solution of various difficult and delicate questions growing out of the introduction of Christianity as a new power in society, they give the practical application of the gospel to the manifold relations of human life, in a way so natural, and taking its shape so directly from the particular historic circumstances of the churches addressed, that they carry on their front the proof of their genuineness and truthfulness. We cannot conceive of any more natural sequel to the Redeemer's work as recorded by the four evangelists. What we have further to say will be given under the three heads of the *Acts of the Apostles*, the *Acknowledged Epistles*, and the *Disputed Books*.

I. *The Acts of the Apostles.*

According to Chrysostom, this book was not so abundantly read by the early Christians as were the Gospels — was, in fact, unknown to many, as respects both its contents and its author.¹ The explanation of this comparative neglect, in

¹ The words of Chrysostom are as follows: "Many are ignorant of the existence of this book — of the book itself, and of its author and composer. For this reason, especially, I have decided to undertake this work [a series of homilies on the book], in order that I may thus instruct those who are ignorant, and not suffer so great a treasure to lie concealed and hid from view. For it is able to be not less profitable to us than the Gospels themselves," etc. — Intro-

an age when the art of printing was unknown, and manuscripts were expensive, is found in the fact that it is occupied, not with the words and deeds of our Lord himself, but with those of his apostles. The peculiar interest which attaches to the book in these latter days, as containing not only a vivid portraiture of apostolic times, but also the great principles on which the Christian church is organized, did not exist for the masses in Chrysostom's day. While many, from simple neglect, were ignorant of it, others, as the same writer tells us, regarded it as too plain and simple to deserve their attention.¹ Passing by some uncertain allusions to the book in the writings of the apostolic Fathers, we have, preserved to us by Eusebius,² an epistle from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul, to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, describing a severe persecution through which they had passed in the reign of Antoninus Verus, about 177 A.D. In this they say of the martyrs: "Moreover, they prayed, after the example of Stephen, the perfect martyr, for those who inflicted upon them the cruel torments, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,'" where we have an indubitable reference to the narrative of Stephen's martyrdom.³ Irenaeus, in the last part of the second century;⁴ Tertullian, in the last part of the second century and the beginning of the third;⁵ Clement of Alexandria, about the end of the second

duction to the First Homily on the Acts. The reader will notice that it is simply of the neglect of this book on the part of many Christians, and their consequent ignorance of it and its author, of which Chrysostom speaks; not of any doubt or conflicting testimony in respect to its authorship. Compare what the same author says elsewhere. Homil. I., In principium Actorum, near the beginning.

¹ πολλοῖς γοῦν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο οὐδὲ γινώσκοντες ἐστίν, πολλοῖς δὲ δοκοῦν σαφὲς εἶναι, πάλιν παρορᾶται. καὶ γίνεται τοῖς μὲν ἡ γνώσις, τοῖς δὲ ἡ ἀγνοία βραθυμίας ὑπόθεσις. "To many this book is not even known; by many others it is neglected because it appears to be so plain. Thus to one class knowledge, to the other class ignorance, becomes the ground of indifference."—Homil. I. in Principium Actorum.

² Hist. Eccl. v. 1.

³ Acts vii. 60.

⁴ Adv. haeres. l. 3. c. 14 and 15.

⁵ De Jejunio. c. 10; De praescript. haeret. c. 22; Adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 2 and 3, etc.

century, and onwards¹—all these bear explicit testimony to the Book of Acts, ascribing it to Luke as its author; and from their day onward the notices of it are abundant. We may add the concurrent testimony of the Muratorian canon, the Syriac Peshito, and the old Latin version. In a word, the book is placed by Eusebius among those that were universally acknowledged by the churches.² The rejection of the book by certain heretical sects, as the Ebionites, Marcionites, Manichaeans, etc., rested, not on historical, but on doctrinal grounds, and is, therefore, of no weight. Though Photius mentions various opinions respecting the author of the Book of Acts, he himself ascribes it to Luke. In fact, the third Gospel, which proceeded from the same hand as this work, was never ascribed to any other person than Luke.

The internal evidence of Luke's authorship is in harmony with the external. Not to mention the fact that the writer himself, in dedicating it to the same Theophilus, expressly identifies himself with the author of the third Gospel, there is a remarkable agreement in style and diction between the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, as any one may learn who peruses them both together in the original Greek.³ Luke, moreover, as the travelling companion of Paul, had all needed facilities for composing such a work. With regard to the latter part of the book, this is denied by none. His use of the first person plural—"we endeavored," "the Lord had called us," "we came," etc.—which first appears xvi. 10, and continues, with certain interruptions, through the remainder of the book, is so naturally explained by the assumption that the writer was actually in the apostle's company, that it is worse than superfluous to go out of the way to find another and an unreasonable explanation. As it respects the first part of the book, we notice that he visited

¹ Stromat. i. 5 (p. 588 of Sylburgius).

² Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

³ See Davidson's Introduction to New Test., Vol. ii. p. 4, where he has collected forty-seven examples of "terms that occur in both" books, "but nowhere else in the New Testament."

Caesarea with Paul's company, and "tarried there many days."¹ Afterwards he went up with the same apostle to Jerusalem.² And we find him again with Paul at Caesarea when he sets out for Rome.³ Now, at such centres of Christian activity and intercourse as Jerusalem and Caesarea, he must have had abundant opportunity to learn all the facts recorded in the present book which could not be gathered from Paul's own lips.

As to the *credibility* of the book, it bears all the marks of historic verity which apply to the Gospel narratives, especially to the Gospel of Luke. To admit the credibility of this Gospel and to deny that of the book of Acts would be illogical. They who assume that no record of miraculous events can be credible must deny both. But they who admit the reality of supernatural interposition, as we have it in the four Gospels, are prepared beforehand to find the same element in the history of apostolic labor.

To some modern writers, the narrative of the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost has seemed to present an insuperable difficulty; and they have pronounced it "unpsychological," according to the common understanding of the transaction. We have no disposition to deny the stupendous and incomprehensible character of the miracle; for it was a miracle, not in the sphere of material nature, but of the human spirit. That they who received the gift of the Spirit on that memorable occasion uttered *true languages*, and not an unintelligible jargon, is plain from the words of the hearers: "Are not all these who speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born? We do hear them speak, in our tongues, the wonderful works of God."⁴ If, now, we assume, according to the view of some, that they were supernaturally endowed with the power of speaking, *in a conscious way*, languages which they had never learned, and that, too, as a permanent gift for their use afterwards in the work of propagating the gospel, it is undoubtedly some-

¹ Chap. xxi. 8-10.

² Chap. xxvii. 1.

³ Chap. xxi. 15.

⁴ Chap. ii. 7, 8, 11.

thing utterly above our comprehension. We cannot, however, but think that those commentators venture beyond their depth, who speak of such an endowment as something not only contrary to the analogy of God's dealings, but self-contradictory, and therefore impossible.¹ Certainly, such of them as are devout believers in the record of our Lord's supernatural works place themselves in an awkward predicament. Had we no record of the fact, we should be under the necessity of believing that there must have been in Palestine in our Lord's day, as in all other countries, persons born deaf and dumb. Can any one suppose, for a moment, that when one of this class presented himself to the Saviour, he had, for the first time, a case beyond his immediate healing power, as it must have been if the instantaneous bestowal of the permanent gift of speech is "self-contradictory, and therefore impossible"? Faith answers, No, and so does the divine record itself, according to Alford's own interpretation of Mark vii. 32-37.

While, however, we maintain that the instantaneous communication of the gift of speech, as well as of hearing, to persons deaf and dumb from early childhood came necessarily within the sphere of our Lord's miraculous works, we wish it to be understood that we do not insist upon this view as applicable to the pentecostal gift of tongues; that is to say, we do not affirm that it gave, as a permanent possession for future use, the ability to speak in languages hitherto unknown to the recipients. It may have been, to use the words of Alford, "a sudden and powerful inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by which the disciples uttered, not of their own minds, but as the mouth-pieces of the Spirit, the praises of God in various languages hitherto, and possibly at the time itself, unknown to them." We understand the closing words of this quotation, "possibly at the time itself unknown to them," as meaning that possibly "the speakers did not themselves understand what they said," in accordance with one interpretation of 1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27, 28. It is not

¹ See Alford on Acts ii. 4.

necessary for our purpose that we decide between these different views of the pentecostal gift of tongues. Our only concern is, to maintain the historic truth of the narrative, that the tongues spoken were real languages, intelligible to those to whom they were vernacular; and not a jargon of mere sounds, like the Irvingite tongues, according to the unworthy interpretation of DeWette, and others.

Much less can any just exception be taken to the narrative of the sudden death of Ananias and Sapphira, who died not through the agency of Peter, but by the immediate act of God. His wisdom judged such an example of severity to be necessary, in the beginning of the gospel dispensation, as a solemn warning against hypocrisy and falsehood under the mask of religion. All who believe the words of Christ and his apostles, believe that the gospel, though it be a system of mercy, takes a severe attitude towards those who reject it. Why not, then, towards those who make a hypocritical profession of it? When the Mosaic economy was inaugurated, Nadab and Abihu were consumed by fire from heaven, because they presumptuously transgressed the divine ordinance in the matter of offering incense; and their destruction was a solemn warning to all, that God would be sanctified in them that came nigh unto him.¹ So in the beginning of the Christian dispensation, God gave, in the persons of Ananias and his wife, a testimony to all future ages of his abhorrence of hypocrisy, and of the doom which awaits hypocrites at the last day.²

Luke has omitted some events in the history of Paul, as, for example, his journey into Arabia, which must have occurred during the three years that intervened between his conversion and his first visit to Jerusalem.³ But this furnishes no argument against the writer's credibility. There are like omissions in the evangelic narratives, when we compare one Gospel with another. Difficulties that arise simply from a writer's brevity must not be allowed to set

¹ Lev. x. 3.

² Compare Matt. vii. 21-23.

³ Acts ix. 22-26, compared with Gal. i. 15-18.

aside satisfactory evidence of his competency and truthfulness.¹

II. *The Acknowledged Epistles*

To say that the apostolic Epistles are a natural sequence to the facts recorded in the Gospels, is to affirm only a part of the truth. Not only does the evangelic narrative, when received as true, solve in the most satisfactory way the question of their peculiar character, but, without the evangelic narrative, the existence of such a body of writings must remain an impenetrable mystery. There are some things above the power of human genius. One of these things is the production of such a body of epistles, so fresh and life-like, so historic in their dress, so practical in their character, so full of references to past and present circumstances, without such a basis of facts as they everywhere assume, and as is contained in the record of the four Gospels. Another of these things is to invent such a basis of facts in the interest of the Epistles, and adjust it to them with such wonderful naturalness and truthfulness. Let the sceptic take what ground he will, it remains true that the Gospel narratives account for and explain the Epistles, and the Epistles presuppose the Gospel narratives, not as myths, but as the record of facts which stirred humanity to the centre of its being. Intermediate between the Gospels and the Epistles, stands the record contained in the Acts of the Apostles, binding both together into one consistent whole; intertwined, moreover, if one may so speak, into the very fibres of the Pauline Epistles by the numerous undesigned coincidences between the two.²

In respect to the *external testimony* of the primitive church, it is well known that the thirteen Epistles which bear the name of Paul, with the First Epistle of Peter, and the first of John, belong to the class of *acknowledged* books (the

¹ The historical difficulties connected with Stephen's address do not concern Luke's credibility as a historian; and the discussion of them belongs to the commentator.

² As Paley has so happily shown in his *Horae Paulinae*.

ὁμολογούμενα of Eusebius); that is, books that were uniformly received from the first as of apostolic origin. To cite testimonies in their favor would be superfluous. It is only necessary to say a few words respecting the doubts raised by some critics in modern times respecting the Epistle to the Ephesians and the pastoral Epistles.

The Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians was never called in question by the early church Fathers, nor the fact that it was addressed to the church in Ephesus. But there is reasonable ground for doubting whether the words of the first verse, "in Ephesus," existed in all the early copies. They are found in all the ancient versions, and in all existing manuscripts, except the Vatican and the Sinaitic, which omit them.¹ The cursive manuscript 67 omits them, indeed, but only at second hand, by emendation. If, now, we look to the testimony of the early church Fathers, we find two passages in the writings of Tertullian, one in those of Basil, and one in those of Jerome, which have been often quoted, and we think with reason, to show that in some early manuscripts the words "in Ephesus" (*ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*) were wanting.² How is this omission to be explained? The supposition that the words in question were wanting in the original autograph, on the assumed ground that the Epistle was designed for general circulation among the churches, is inadmissible. This would make the apostle, in violation alike of his own usage and of the Greek idiom, to have written: "To the saints who are, and faithful in Christ Jesus" (*τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); and that, too, when it would have been perfectly easy and natural to say: "to the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus" (*τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); or: "to the

¹ In the work entitled "Companion to the Bible," published by the American Tract Society, on p. 466 (pp. 391, 392 of the London reprint) the Sinai codex is omitted by inadvertence. Instead of "the Vatican manuscript" (line 16), it should read: "the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts," and so in line 24. It is not necessary to notice the emendation at second hand of the cursive manuscript 67.

² See Appendix A.

saints who are in Ephesus, and to the faithful in every place" (τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ τοῖς πιστοῖς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ; compare 1 Cor. i. 2).

If it be assumed, again, that several copies were prepared, under the apostle's direction, with a *blank space* after the word οὐσι, which was to be variously filled out (ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, etc.) with the names of the churches to which they were respectively delivered, this mode of procedure is too artificial and too far removed from apostolic simplicity to be admitted as credible on simple conjecture. Far more natural is the supposition that in one of the early transcriptions, *made for the use of another church*, the words were omitted by the copyist, while the rest of the text was left unchanged; and that from this copy others, again, were executed.

It is, however, entirely reasonable to assume that the apostle, in writing to the Ephesian church, had a *more general end* in view than when he penned his Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, which latter were written at the same time, and forwarded by the same agency. We may suppose that, having completed his letters to the Colossian church and to Philemon, he improved the opportunity of Tychicus's journey to Asia Minor to write to the Ephesians also, though he had not, as in the case of the Colossians, a particular error to combat. He proceeds, therefore, to unfold the same great theme of Christ's personal glory, and the union through him of both Jews and Gentiles in one holy family, but in a more placid and contemplative frame of mind. This supposition will account for both the general character of the Epistle and its remarkable agreement with that to the Colossians.

De Wette¹ urges the following objections to the genuineness of this Epistle:

First, its alleged dependence on the Epistle to the Colossians, which he thinks unworthy of an author like Paul, who always

¹ Exegetical Handbook to the New Test., Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, No. 2.

writes from the freshness of a richly furnished mind. We cannot admit the validity of this argument. There is not, properly speaking, any dependence of the one Epistle upon the other. More reasonable is it to say that there is only an expansion in both, by the same author, of the same great theme, with only such agreements as might be expected in two Epistles written about the same time, and such differences as were naturally introduced by the different ends proposed in the two writings — agreements and differences not unworthy of the most gifted author.

Secondly, the occurrence of several passages which must, as he thinks, give offence to the reader who is acquainted with the Pauline writings. That some of the passages to which he refers (iv. 8; v. 14, for example) involve exegetical difficulties cannot be denied; but this is no just ground for denying their Pauline authorship. Where in the present Epistle is there a greater difficulty of this kind than in the First Epistle to the Corinthians?¹ Yet who thinks of denying, on this ground, its Pauline authorship? As to the objections which he urges against other passages, they are fairly met by the true exposition of them, as given, for example, in Meyer's commentary.²

Thirdly, the alleged degeneracy of the style, as compared with that of Paul — wearisome spinning out of sentences, playful carrying out of allegories (that of Christ and his church³ and that of the Christian armor⁴), etc. For a sufficient answer to this argument, we refer the reader to a simple perusal of the Epistle.

As to the omission of salutations in the present Epistle, that may, or may not, have been connected with its general character. We do not find, upon examination, that the number of the apostle's personal greetings is measured by either the

¹ Chap. xi. 10.

² De Wette specifies chap. iii. 3; ii. 20; iii. 5; ii. 8-10; the apostle's demonology, chap. ii. 2; vi. 12; the characters which he ascribes to God, chap. i. 17; iii. 9, 15; the use made of the Old Testament promise, chap. vi. 2; and the admonition against stealing, chap. iv. 28.

³ Chap. v. 26 seq.

⁴ Chap. vi. 11 seq.

extent of his personal acquaintance with the several churches to which he writes, or the more or less specific object which he has in view. On the contrary, these salutations abound most of all in the Epistle to the Romans, whom he had never visited, and in writing to whom he had, moreover, a very general end. They are found, also, in the Epistle to the Colossians, to whom Paul was personally a stranger;¹ but are wanting, except in a general form, in the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and Thessalonians, not to mention that to Titus, and the first to Timothy. In a word, the insertion or omission of these salutations depended on so many considerations unknown to us, that no valid argument can be drawn against either the genuineness of the Epistle or the correctness of the address "in Ephesus."

It remains to say a few words respecting the *Pastoral Epistles*. The external testimony in favor of these Epistles need not be adduced, since, in the words of Wiesinger, "they are second to no one of the other Pauline Epistles in historic authentication, and long before the close of the second century had already obtained, in accordance with these testimonies, the full recognition of the church."² But since the beginning of the present century, they have been subjected to a series of attacks on the alleged ground of *internal evidence* against their Pauline authorship. The assault was begun by Schleiermacher, in 1807, on the First Epistle to Timothy alone, while he acknowledged the remaining two as genuine. But it was soon perceived that the three Epistles must stand or fall together as a whole. The Pauline authorship of all three was accordingly called in question by Eichhorn, as early as 1812, as it has been by various writers since; while the attacks have called out able defenders on the other side.³ The argument of Baur and

¹ Chap. ii. 1, compared with iv. 10-14.

² Pastoral briefe. Allgemeine Einleitung § 2 (at the end).

³ For an enumeration of the German writers on both sides, see Wiesinger, as above, § 3, near the beginning. To the list of defenders may be added: Huther, in Meyer's Commentary; Davidson, in the third volume of his Introduction to the New Test.; Alford, Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles, etc.

De Wette against the genuineness of these Epistles contains all that need be noticed.

The first point made by Baur, according to Wiesinger's summary, is that the *heretics* of the Pastoral Epistles are the *Gnostics of the second century*. The correctness of this position is, with good reason, denied by De Wette, who would place the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles somewhere towards the end of the first century. The Gnostics of the second century, whom Valentinus and Marcion represent, were essentially anti-Judaistic, separating the God of the Jews from the God of Christianity, and placing the two in antagonism to each other. But the false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles were mainly Jews,¹ of a speculative turn of mind, who introduced into Christianity the semi-oriental philosophy of that day, which contained, indeed, the seeds of Gnosticism, but not Gnosticism in its fully developed form. Everything that is said of these men in the Epistles now under consideration agrees with the supposition that they had the elements (at least, some of the elements) of Gnosticism, only *in a germinal form*, such as must have preceded the full development of the system.

The next position taken by Baur is, that the references in these Epistles to the government and institutions of the church point to a later age. In respect to *church government*, he affirms that they reveal a *hierarchical spirit* foreign to the character of the apostle Paul. A candid perusal of the writings in question is the best refutation of this assertion. The churches had from the first their officers — bishops, or elders,² and deacons. It was natural that the apostle, in writing business letters (as two, at least, of these Epistles may be called) to men expressly appointed by him to “charge some that they should teach no other doctrine,”³ and “to set in order the things that were wanting, and

¹ See 1 Tim. i. 7; Titus i. 10, 14; iii. 9.

² It is admitted on all hands that in the Pastoral Epistles, as in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts xx. 17, compared with xx. 28), the terms *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος* are convertible. See Titus i. 5, 7.

³ 1 Tim. i. 3.

ordain elders in every city"¹—and this, too, in an age when false teachers were beginning to abound—should dwell abundantly on the importance of sound doctrine, on points of church order, and on the qualifications of elders and deacons. This he does in an earnest tone; but no trace of a hierarchical spirit is discernible in his precepts. If one would see the difference in this respect between the Pastoral Epistles and the spirit that had already developed itself in the beginning of the second century, let him read together the Epistles to Timothy and Titus and the seven acknowledged epistles of Ignatius.

As to the *institution of widows*, which is the other item under this head specified by Baur, there is some difficulty in determining the exact position of the *enrolled* widows.² But, whether the enrolment simply placed them on the list of those entitled to receive relief from the funds of the church, or whether (as is more probable) they were also set apart for special service in the church—performing for their own sex duties analogous to those which the presbyters performed for the church generally—there is, upon either supposition, no difficulty in admitting the existence of such an arrangement as early as the latter part of Paul's life.

Baur's third argument is drawn from the impossibility of finding a suitable place for the composition of these Epistles in the *known history* of the apostle, that is, his history as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. This we freely concede.³ But we are not shut up to the assumption that the apostle's life was terminated at the close of his recorded imprisonment in Rome. We are at liberty to assume, and we do assume, that he was released from this imprisonment, resumed his apostolic labors, and was subjected to a second

¹ Titus i. 5.

² 1 Tim. v. 9-16. *Χήρα καταλεγέσθω*, let a widow be enrolled, are the words of the original.

³ The arguments for the composition of the Pastoral Epistles *after* the apostle's recorded history may be seen in the Introductions of Wiesinger, Huther, Alford, and other commentators. For a very full presentation of the arguments on the other side, see Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. iii. p. 3 seq.

Roman imprisonment, which was terminated by his martyrdom, 67 or 68 A.D.; further, that he wrote, during the interval of his freedom, the Epistle to Titus and the First Epistle to Timothy, and near the close of his second Roman imprisonment, the second to Timothy.¹

The final argument of Baur, which De Wette also makes especially prominent, is drawn from the *peculiarity and alleged un-Pauline character* of these Epistles, in respect to diction, style, and ideas. The objection from the alleged un-Pauline ideas of the Pastoral Epistles can be readily disposed of. There are no passages which, legitimately interpreted, contain un-Pauline ideas. The universality of the gospel, as a way of salvation provided for the whole human family, is strongly asserted in these, as in Paul's other Epistles. If he does not do it by way of contrast between Jews and Gentiles,² it is because he has no occasion for such a contrast. The great doctrine of salvation by grace is stated in its fulness;³ and he nowhere teaches the merit of good works. If he earnestly insists on the necessity of good works, and sets forth the glorious reward of fidelity to Christ, this is what he does in his other Epistles also.⁴

The peculiarity of *diction* and *style* which prevails in these Epistles, and which marks them, as a whole, in contrast with the other Pauline writings, cannot be denied, and it is worthy of serious consideration. Here the following suggestions are in point:

1. The apostolic age was one of intense activity and rapid

¹ See Appendix B.

² As, for example, in Rom. i. 16; iii. 29, 30; iv. 9-12; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. ii. 11-22, etc.

³ 1 Tim. i. 15, 16; ii. 5, 6; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; Titus iii. 4-7—passages in which salvation by grace is set forth, and the merit of our works is denied, in the clearest terms.

⁴ The true Pauline doctrine is, that good works are the *stream* which flows from the *fountain* of faith: *No stream; no fountain*, and consequently no approval at Christ's bar. This is the position alike of the Pastoral Epistles and of the other acknowledged writings of Paul. Rom. ii. 6-11; vi. 21-23; viii. 6-8; 1 Cor. vi. 9-11; ix. 24-27; Gal. vi. 7-9; Eph. vi. 8; Phil. iii. 18, 19; iv. 8, 9; Col. iii. 5-14, 24, 25. Compare 1 Tim. iv. 10, 16; vi. 11, 12, 17-19; 2 Tim. i. 18; ii. 19-22; iv. 7, 8; Titus ii. 11-14; iii. 8.

development within the sphere of Christendom. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the church passed rapidly from a formative, towards a more mature, state of organization. In the course of this progress, new questions were continually arising, and new phases of social Christian life. We may add, also, that towards the latter part of the period especially, errors and vain speculations had also a rank and rapid growth. Of this we have clear indications, when we compare the Epistle to the Colossians, about 62 A.D., with the Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, 57 A.D. It is not surprising that, within the space of three or four years more, there should have been, in Asia Minor and the adjacent islands, still further developments of error and profitless fables, and these, too, of a very marked character.

2. The great apostle to the Gentiles had a mind of intense activity and flexibility also. The "many-sidedness" of his character, as it has been called, is wonderful. His style has, indeed, certain grand characteristics, which belong to the essence of his character; and these appear alike in the Pastoral Epistles and his other acknowledged writings. Nevertheless, it is of no cast-iron stamp, but is marked by marvellous variety. He knows how to adapt himself, in the twinkling of an eye, to the circumstances in which he is placed, and the work to be performed. If new forms of argument, or new terms, are needed, to enforce new duties, or refute new errors, we are sure that they will be forthcoming. Compare, for example, his Epistle to the Romans with the two to the Corinthians. All three are alike "Pauline"; but who that had read only the Epistles to the Corinthians would have expected, *a priori*, that an epistle like that to the Romans would almost immediately follow? Or who would have judged, from his two Epistles to the Thessalonians, that, within a few months, he could deliver an address to the philosophers on Mars' Hill, like that recorded in the Acts of the Apostles? All that is "Pauline" does not lie in two or three or half-a-dozen of the apostle's writings. Every new Epistle adds something to the "Pauline"

vocabulary and style; and nothing can be proved to be "un-Pauline" in which he says what the circumstances require him to say in the way in which it ought to be said, even though the particular expression occurs nowhere else.

3. The defenders of the Pastoral Epistles have, with reason, laid stress on the two considerations that they are addressed, not to churches, but to trusty friends and fellow-laborers, and that they are mainly "business-letters," pertaining to their office and the duties connected with it. In such letters we ought to expect a peculiar range of topics and peculiar freedom of communication.

4. The apostle's age may well be taken into account. Some time before, in writing to Philemon, he had described himself as "Paul the aged." Reminiscences of the past are natural to men in advanced life; and they are apt, also, to embody the gathered experience of years in the form of proverbs or commonplace sayings. The Holy Ghost sanctifies old age, as it does youth and manhood, but does not abolish what is purely natural to it.

If, now, we examine the Pastoral Epistles in the light of these principles, we find in them nothing, in respect to diction, that can reasonably give offence. They contain many new terms—"fables," genealogies," "vain talk" and "vain talkers," "profane vain babblings," "strifes about words,"¹ etc.; but this is because such terms are needed to meet the errors of the time. No one can deny that the errors referred to may have actually existed in the apostle's lifetime, or that these terms appropriately describe them. Why, then, take offence at them?

Peculiar to these Epistles is the designation of the gospel as "the mystery of godliness," "the doctrine according to godliness," "the truth which is according to godliness," and the frequent use otherwise of the term "godliness";² also,

¹ μῦθοι, γενεαλογίαι, ματαιολογία and ματαιολόγος, βέβηλοι κεροφωνίαι, λογομαχίαι, etc.

² The term εὐσέβεια occurs once in the Acts of the Apostles (iii. 12), four times in the Second Epistle of Peter, and ten times in the Pastoral Epistles. It manifestly came into current use in the latter part of the apostolic age, when

the forms "sound doctrine," "sound words," "being sound in the faith"; these latter in opposition to those who are "sick about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth."¹ These forms exhibit the practical side of Christianity as a healthful doctrine, producing a healthful life, in opposition to the "profane vain babblings" and profitless speculations of the false teachers, which the apostle regards as a moral disease. They are, therefore, entirely in place.

As regards the *general style* of the Pastoral Epistles, critics have noticed the peculiarity that the writer frequently digresses into general remarks, from which he returns by way of an exhortation or application to the person addressed.² Such remarks are often introduced by the formula: "Faithful is the saying," by which they receive a sort of proverbial character. They may, in truth, be regarded as maxims treasured up in the apostle's soul, on which he dwells with increasing fondness as he draws towards the close of his ministry; and that he should immediately make an application of them to Timothy or Titus is entirely natural. If there be, further, as is alleged, a summary character in the precepts of these Epistles, and, as naturally connected with this, a certain looseness of structure, the explanation is, that he is writing confidentially to fellow-laborers, trained under his own supervision, who need not so much details as hints of the several points that require their special attention

III. *The Disputed Books.*

The *disputed books* (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) are those respecting the apostolic origin and authority of which doubts existed, to a greater or less extent, in the primitive church before the fourth century; viz. the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle the necessities of the time required a sharp distinction between the substance of a holy Christian faith and the empty profession of it.

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 4, 5.

² Among other examples may be specified: 1 Tim. i. 15-18; iv. 9-12; Titus ii. 11-15; iii. 5-8.

of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse — seven books in all. The discussion of the grounds on which each of these books has been received into the canon of the New Testament belongs to the department of Particular Introduction. We shall here restrict ourselves to some general suggestions, which apply to them as a whole.

1. The question about the reception or rejection of these books concerns only the *extent of the canon*, not the *truth of Christianity*. Some persons, when they learn of the existence of doubts in the early churches respecting certain books, are greatly troubled, as if a shade of uncertainty were thereby thrown over the whole New Testament. Not so. They should understand that its several books were written, one after another, as occasion required, and that the churches received each of them *separately*, on the evidence they had of its apostolic origin. At last *collections* of these books, that is, *canons*, began to be formed, each of which represented the prevailing judgment of the churches in the region where it was made. The Eastern churches, for example, omitted from their canon all of the disputed books but the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of James. On the other hand, the Western churches omitted these two books, but received the Epistle of Jude, the Apocalypse, and apparently, also, the second and third of John.¹ Now, this diversity of judgment in regard to particular books does not, in the least, affect the remaining books of the New Testament, which are sustained by the undivided testimony of the ancient churches. The Christian church has received the seven books in question on grounds which she judges adequate. But, if any one feels under the necessity of suspending his judgment in respect to one or more of them, let him follow the teachings of the other books, which are above all doubt; for in them he will find all the essential truths of Christianity.

2. The primitive age of the church was one of *free inquiry*.

¹ The Muratorian Canon, which represents the judgment of the Western churches, is here very obscure and of doubtful interpretation.

General councils were not then known; nor was there any central power (such as unhappily grew up in later ages) to impose its decisions authoritatively on the churches. In the essential doctrines of the gospel there was everywhere an agreement; but this did not exclude differences on various minor points in the different provinces of Christendom; and in respect to these the churches of the several provinces were very tenacious, maintaining obstinate and heated controversies over them. As a specimen of these may be named the controversy which the churches of Asia Minor had with the church of Rome respecting the festival of the passover, which finally proceeded to such an extremity as to break the bond of fellowship between them. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find also in the different provinces of the Roman empire a diversity of judgment in respect to certain books of the New Testament.

3. Although we cannot account for the universal and undisputed reception of a given book, except on the assumption of its genuineness, the reverse is not true; that is to say, the non-reception of a certain book by some of the early churches is no conclusive argument against its apostolic origin. From the influence of circumstances unknown to us, it may have remained for a considerable period of time in comparative obscurity. We have good ground for believing that some apostolic writings are utterly lost. To deny the possibility of this would be to prejudge the wisdom of God. The question is one of fact, not of theory. The most obvious interpretation of 1 Cor. v. 9 and Col. iv. 16, is, that Paul refers in each case to an epistle which has not come down to us. And, if an inspired epistle might be lost, how can one reasonably deny that the knowledge and use of such an epistle might be for some time restricted to a comparatively narrow circle of churches? When such an Epistle — the Second of Peter, for example — began to be more extensively known, it would encounter many difficulties in obtaining a general circulation; because, in this matter, the churches of one region were slow and cautious in receiving what came from other regions.

4. The caution and hesitation of the early churches, with respect to the books in question, is to us a satisfactory pledge that, in settling the canon of the New Testament, they acted deliberately and conscientiously. Did the history of the canon present no such phenomenon as the distinction between acknowledged and disputed books, there would be ground for the allegation that they received, without discrimination, whatever claimed to be of apostolic origin. But now, their mature and final judgment in this matter is entitled to profound respect. The judgment of the early churches, let it be remembered, was not simply *affirmative*, but *negative* also. While it received the seven books now under consideration, it rejected others that were highly valued and publicly read in some of the churches.¹ On this ground, though not of binding authority so as to exclude our free investigation and examination of the facts on which it is based, it is worthy of reverential regard. While we earnestly protest against that blind spirit of reverence for antiquity which would exalt the judgment of the early church Fathers — not theoretically, but *practically* — to a place co-ordinate with scripture, we think it no less necessary to lift up a warning voice against the narrow self-complacency which contemptuously rejects the mature decisions of the primitive Christians on historic points, for the determination of which they had better data than we of this nineteenth century can hope to find.

It was our original intention to finish the subject of REVELATION with the present Article. But we find it necessary to add another before proceeding to the momentous question of INSPIRATION.

¹ The first epistle of Clement of Rome, with a part of the second, is appended to the Alexandrian Codex. The epistle of Barnabas, with part of the Shepherd of Hermas, is attached to the Sinai Codex. The explanation is that these three books were read in at least some of the churches when these codices were executed.

APPENDIX A.

ON THE WORDS "IN EPHESUS."

The passages from Tertullian are the following: "Fraetereo hic et de alia epistula, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos"¹—"I pass by here another epistle also, which we have inscribed to the Ephesians; but the heretics, to the Laodicenes."

"Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistulam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulam aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam," etc.² "According to the truth [that is, according to the true tradition] of the church, we have that Epistle sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodicenes. But Marcion some time pleased himself with foisting upon it a title,³ as if he had been in this matter also a very diligent investigator. Titles, however, are of no importance; since the apostle wrote to all when he wrote to some," etc.

The *title* (*titulus*) to which Tertullian refers is, apparently, not the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, which belong to the text, but the title πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, prefixed to the Epistle, which, however gathered, was not a part of the text, but was properly represented as belonging to "the verity of the church." This title Marcion, and the heretics who sided with him, changed. But there must have been some ground for the change; and the question is: What ground? If we may judge from the words of Tertullian, it must have been the absence from some of the manuscripts of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; for, first, Tertullian appeals, not to the uniform testimony of the manuscripts, but to church tradition; secondly, he accuses Marcion, not of falsifying the apostle's words, but of affecting to be in this matter a very diligent investigator; thirdly, he puts by the whole question with the remark that "titles are of no importance," which he would hardly have done had the testimony of the manuscripts been uniform.

Basil's words are more decisive: Ἄλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γηρῶσις ἠγομένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν εἰπὼν· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ὄσδοι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντι-

¹ Adv. Marcionem, v. 11.

² Ib. v. 17.

³ Du Cange, in his Glossary, defines *interpolationes* to be "adjectiones vel immutationes, quae in transumptis occurrunt vitio librariorum, . . . sive id de industria fecerint, sive non." Interpolare is, then, very nearly equivalent to corruptere. Marcion foisted upon the Epistle a title unknown to church tradition.

γράφων εὐρήκαμεν.¹ "But writing to the Ephesians also, as to those who have a genuine union through knowledge with him who is, he called them, in a peculiar sense, those who are, saying: To the saints who are and faithful in Christ Jesus. For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies."

Much useless labor has been expended to show that the point made by Basil is the insertion, before the participle οὔσι, of the article τοῖς, not the omission of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Basil does, indeed, regard the Epistle as written to the Ephesians; but this he rests, like Tertullian, on the tradition of the church. The words which he cites — τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὔσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ — agree exactly with the text of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and it is plain that he means to give in them what he regards as the true text. His argument for calling the saints those "who are in a peculiar sense," falls to the ground the moment the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are admitted, and they become simply "the saints who are in Ephesus." His language ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων, in the ancient among the copies, implies that this was the reading in the ancient copies generally. See further in Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. ii. p. 328 seq.

Jerome, in commenting on the words "Sanctis omnibus qui sunt Ephesi,"² remarks as follows:

"Quidam, curiosius quam necesse est, putant ex eo quod Moysi dictum sit: *Haec dices filiis Israel: Qui est misit me, etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos. Ut quomodo a sancto sancti, a justo justus, a sapientia sapientes; ita ab eo qui est, hi qui sunt appellentur. . . . Alii vero simpliciter, non ad eos qui sunt, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur.*"³

"Some, with an over-refined subtilty, conclude from the words addressed to Moses — 'Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: He who is hath sent me' — that also the saints and faithful who are at Ephesus receive an appellation denoting *existence* — that, just as they are called holy from him who is holy, just from him who is just, wise from his wisdom, so from *him who is* they are called *they who are*. . . . But others think that the epistle was addressed simply, not to those who are, but to those who are saints and faithful at Ephesus."

Jerome regards the reading "to the saints who are in Ephesus" as settled; but his condemnatory notice of the interpretation "to the saints who are," taken in connection with the words of Tertullian and Basil, and also the further fact that the words "in Ephesus" are wanting in two very

¹ Against Eunomius, ii. 19 (p. 254 ed. Garnier).

² Eph. i. 1, according to the Vulgate, which agrees here with the reading of the Alexandrian manuscript.

³ Commentary, chap. i. 1.

ancient manuscripts, is best explained by the assumption that the reading without the words "in Ephesus" existed in his day, although he disallowed both it and the subtle interpretation based upon it.

APPENDIX B.

ON THE QUESTION OF A SECOND ROMAN IMPRISONMENT.

The *historic testimony* on this point, which may be seen in the introductions to the Pastoral Epistles, is scanty, but all on the side of a second Roman imprisonment. Eusebius, after a reference to the two years' imprisonment at Rome, recorded by Luke,¹ goes on to say: τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπολογησάμενον, αἰθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος διακονίαν λόγος ἔχει στείλασθαι τὸν ἀπόστολον· δεύτερον δ' ἐπιβάντα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν τελειωθῆναι μαρτυρίῳ· ἐν ᾧ δεσμοῖς ἐχόμενος τὴν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δεύτεραν ἐπιστολὴν συντάττει, ὁμοῦ σημαίνων τὴν τε πρότεραν αὐτῷ γενομένην ἀπολογίαν καὶ τὴν παραπόδας τελείωσιν· δέχου δὴ καὶ τούτων τὰς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας. ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου, φησὶν ἀπολογία οὐδεὶς μοι συμπαρεγένετο, κ.τ.λ.² "It is reported that the apostle, having at that time made his defence, went forth again to the work of preaching; but that, having come a second time to the same city, he suffered martyrdom under him [Nero]. At which time, while held in chains, he composed his Second Epistle to Timothy, referring in it to both his first defence and his speedy death. Hear, if you please, his declarations concerning these: 'In my first defence, says he, 'no man stood with me,' etc.'" He then proceeds to give his judgment that this tradition is correct, on the ground that the apostle's "first defence" must be understood of the hearing at the close of his first imprisonment, which had a favorable issue; while a second trial awaits him in this his second imprisonment, which will result in his condemnation. Here we must distinguish carefully between the *tradition itself*, and the *reason which Eusebius gives for his adhesion to it*. The reason is undoubtedly false; for it rests on a wrong interpretation of the apostle's words. But this does not affect the reality of the tradition. It is reasonable to suppose that the interpretation owes its existence to the tradition, not the tradition to the interpretation. We further remark that the expression λόγος ἔχει is naturally understood, not of an uncertain rumor, but of a current tradition.

Clement of Rome represents the Apostle Paul as "having been a herald of the gospel in the East and in the West," as "having taught the whole world righteousness, and having come to the limit of the West, and having testified before the rulers," and "so having departed from the world."⁴

¹ Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

² Hist. Eccl. ii. 22.

³ 2 Tim. iv. 16 seq.

⁴ The passage of Clement, filled out according to the text of Cotelierus, reads as follows: κῆρυξ [γερό]μενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν [τῇ] δύσει, . . . δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, κ[αὶ] ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἑλθὼν, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπαλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου. Ad Corinthios, 5.

Whatever of hyperbole there may be in the passage, "the limit of the West" can be fairly understood only of Spain; not of Rome, where Clement himself resided. The reference will then be to a tradition that, after his first imprisonment, he accomplished his purpose of visiting Spain, hinted at in his Epistle to the Romans.¹

Coming now to the testimony that can be gathered from the *other writings of the New Testament*, we have, in the first place, the apostle's declaration to the elders of the Ephesian church: "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more."² The weight of this passage against the position which we advocate, we are not disposed to deny; for the fair interpretation of the apostle's words, "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia,"³ implies, upon the supposition that the Pastoral Epistles were written after his first imprisonment, that he did again visit the Ephesian church. But they are fairly balanced by his equally strong declaration to the Philippians that his present imprisonment should have a favorable issue.⁴ Such declarations, when no doctrine or fact of Christianity is concerned, are not to be taken as authoritative revelations of the Spirit.

We are left, then, to the full weight of the *internal evidence of the Pastoral Epistles*, which preponderates greatly on the side of a second Roman imprisonment.

¹ Rom. xv. 24, 28.

² Καὶ νῦν, ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι, κ.τ.λ. Acts xx. 25.

³ 1 Tim. i. 3.

⁴ Καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθὸς οἶδα ὅτι μὲν, κ.τ.λ. Phil. i. 25. See also chap. ii. 24; Philemon 22.