

did not speak (Chaps. xxxii. 6—xxxiii. 33); (β) that God is just, though Job had charged Him with injustice (Chap. xxxiv.); (γ) that the righteous man is the better for his righteousness, though Job had argued that he was not (Chap. xxxv.); and (δ) that the mystery of Providence, though it must ever remain a mystery, is not so utterly inscrutable as Job had alleged (Chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii.).

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

THE LAST WORDS OF ST. PAUL.

WHATEVER views prevail with reference to the termination of St. Paul's historic captivity in Rome, all writers who admit the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy agree that *that* document contains the last recorded utterance of the great Apostle. These are words dictated by him either towards the conclusion of the first and the only imprisonment, or of the second and final one, and in full view of the headman's axe. Even Ferdinand Christian Baur, whose assault upon the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles was of prime importance to his system, in one of his later works seems to admit the possibility of the genuineness of the *Second* Epistle to Timothy.¹ It may be readily conceded that there are sundry real difficulties besetting the *First* Epistle, such, *e.g.*, as the mention of ecclesiastical orders and Church organiza-

¹ "In the great sea of possibilities it may perchance be possible to find a calm spot for the Epistle to Titus and the Second to Timothy; . . . but their entire similarity to, and their intimate connection with, the First to Timothy involves them all alike in the same condemnation."—*Paul, his Life and Works*. By F. C. Baur. Edited by E. Zeller. Translated by Menzies. F. T. L., 1875. Vol. ii. pp. 104, 105.

tion of which we find no entirely satisfactory trace in any other book of the New Testament; references to a development of Gnostic speculation, which suggest a date later than the Asiatic ministry of St. Paul; the adoption by the writer of a style and vocabulary which unquestionably differ from those of the well-known Epistles; and, not least, the chronological perplexities which cannot easily be reconciled with the events recorded in the Acts. These difficulties, with the exception of the last, are capable of a satisfactory solution;¹ but our readers should remember that the *Second* Epistle is comparatively free from their incidence. With marked ingenuity, Wieseler has endeavoured to harmonize the references in this Epistle to the imprisonment of the author with other references to his prison life, and has urged that all difficulty consequent on the doctrinal tone of the Epistle disappears on close inspection, and after comparison with the other letters of the captive Apostle. On the other hand, it is generally conceded by conservative critics that *that* portion of the assault on the genuineness of these Epistles which turns on the extreme difficulty of finding the true chronological opportunity for the composition of both Epistles to Timothy during the period covered by the Acts, has been completely successful, and that the only way of apprehending the numerous references to time, place, and person, is to regard them as having opened a new page in the biography of the Apostle, one entirely untraversed by the Acts or by any other of the Epistles.

If the Second Epistle to Timothy be a genuine document it furnishes historic testimony of first-class

¹ See THE EXPOSITOR, vol. ii.

authority to the traditional belief of the early Church concerning Paul's release from his first captivity. The renewal of his evangelistic work under altered circumstances then becomes certain, and his apprehension on a new and perilous charge historic. Moreover, this Epistle furnishes biographical detail down to the latest period of the Apostle's life. If, however, this precious document, by itself, and from its intrinsic excellence, and because of its Pauline teaching and its historic verisimilitude, can be credited to *this* extent, it accomplishes for us *a great deal more*. If St. Paul's ministry was indeed prolonged to the close of the reign of Nero, time is then left for the development of those ecclesiastical changes and doctrinal eccentricities to which reference is made in the other two Epistles. More than that, ample time is provided for the occurrence of such missionary journeys as are suggested by the First Epistle to Timothy and by the Epistle to Titus. Moreover, the linguistic difficulties are greatly diminished. Words and phrases that are peculiar to the three Pastoral Epistles mutually confirm each other, and are not more numerous than those terms or turns of expression which are peculiar respectively to the other three groups of the Pauline Epistles.

Some of our critical opponents, while they admit that if the documents were genuine, they would in themselves prove the release and the second imprisonment of St. Paul, maintain that unless their authenticity can be established on independent grounds, this very circumstance invalidates their authorship. The objection comes with rather bad grace from those who attribute no historic value to the Acts of the Apostles, and who, as in the case of Baur, reject the Pauline

authorship of the Epistles to the Philippians and the Ephesians. But it should be remembered that, granting the authenticity of Acts and Philippians, neither the one nor the other of these documents asserts, or implies, that Paul's imprisonment was terminated by his death; on the contrary, they alike suggest the hope and the prospect of acquittal.¹

The same is true of the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon.² The existence of other documents, such as the Pastoral Epistles—which demonstrate the release of Paul, and yet confirm the tradition of his cruel death—does not in the least degree clash with the existing literature, but confirms the accuracy of the hints which are suggested by it. If the Acts, the Epistles to the Philippians, or Philemon, gave us hope of deliverance; if the statements of the Acts compelled us to believe that St. Paul fell a victim to Jewish malice, that the appeal to Cæsar³ against the bigotry of the Pharisaic party proved a failure, and that Paul fell a martyr to the cause of Christian liberty, then, however unlikely this issue would have been—considering the temper of the Roman courts on all such matters—the Pastoral Epistles would have challenged serious suspicion; but we may confidently assert that the earlier literature does nothing of the kind, and therefore does not, on that ground, create even a *primâ facie* case against the authenticity of these documents. Apart from the references furnished by the Second Epistle to Timothy, we should know no more of the termination of St. Paul's life than we do of the closing days of St. Peter, and we should have had to

¹ Acts xxviii. 30; Phil. i. 25; ii. 24.

² Philemon 22 compared with Epistle to Colossians iv. 7-9, obviously written at the same time.

³ Acts xxv. 11, 12.

depend entirely upon traditions. In this case however, certain highly respectable traditions, of which we obtain early trace, coincide in a remarkable degree with the suggestions of the Second Epistle to Timothy. Yet the relation is not so close as to justify the suspicion of adverse critics that the tradition was altogether created by the spurious document. Eusebius had too sharp a scent for supposititious works first to accept a story which had been mendaciously created by a writer in the second century for no clearly assignable reason, and then to appeal to that identical forgery in confirmation of the story.

Clemens Romanus¹ alluded in a well-known passage to the sufferings and death of St. Paul. "After wearing," says he, "bonds seven times, after being scourged and stoned, he by reason of envy obtained the reward of patient endurance; having preached the Gospel in the East and West, he received the glorious renown due to his faith; having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the boundary of the West (*τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*), and having borne his testimony before the governors. Thus he departed out of this world," &c.

The "boundary of the West" was a phrase used to describe the "pillars of Hercules" and the western limits of the empire.² If so, Clement sustains the

¹ *Epistle to Corinthians*, chap. v.

² Great difference of opinion has prevailed as to the precise meaning of the phrase. Lardner, vol. vi. 295; Matthies (*Erklg. d. Pastoralbriefs*, p. 186), Baur (*Tübing. Zeitschrift*, 1831, iv. p. 150, and *St. Paul, his Life and Works*, vol. i., translated by Menzies), Davidson (*Introduction to New Testament*, vol. ii.) all conclude that the phrase refers to Italy or Rome; but Neander, Pearson, Guericke, Hug, Olshausen, Bishop Lightfoot (Clement, *Eps. to Cor.* p. 50), Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, &c., all agree that a more distant line, drawn either through the pillars of Hercules, or Britain itself, may be referred to. THE EXPOSITOR, vol. i. 382.

impression that St. Paul was known to have fulfilled before his death the intention (expressed in Rom. xv. 23, 24), of continuing from Rome his missionary journey into Spain. Lardner, Tate, Davidson, and others, think that ἐλθών, "having come," rather than "having gone," is fatal to such an interpretation; and that the phrase "east and west" would not have conveyed to *Corinthians* the idea that Clement was writing from the meridian of Rome; further, that by the "west" he meant what was west to them, and not to him. To my mind, a writer in the metropolis of the empire would be very *unlikely* to project his consciousness of the relative terms "east" and "west" to the longitude of a provincial town. The geographical relation of Rome to "the whole world" would render the phrase "very hyperbolic" indeed, if Paul had never travelled or "taught righteousness" *west* of the port of Ostia. The use of ἐλθών, moreover, is not always limited in the strict way suggested.¹ It is not impossible that Clement may have travelled with Paul to Spain, and, if so, remembering his own experience, he was abundantly justified in thus expressing himself.

Eusebius recognized the tradition, but does not refer to Clement, thus, according to Davidson, not accepting this translation or interpretation of his words. This is an unnecessary slur upon the report. Eusebius did not discuss the place or sphere of Paul's missionary labour. He was aware of the fact that Luke's narrative came to an end two years after the commencement of Paul's imprisonment. To account for this, he continues: "After pleading his cause, he is said to have

¹ ἔρχομαι, particularly in the aorist, means to come, but there are instances to the contrary—John vi. 17; xxi. 3; Mark xi. 13; Luke ii. 44.

been sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and after a *second* visit to the city, that he finished his life by martyrdom."¹ This "report" is then sustained by quotations from the Second Epistle to Timothy. Davidson suggests that these quotations shew that they were the source of the opinion, and that the confident statement above made was a mere hypothesis to explain the difficulties of the historical references in the Second Epistle. It may be said in reply that Eusebius first gives the report and *then* confirms it by numerous quotations, bearing on the presence or absence of Luke with the Apostle. The reference of Clement to a visit which Paul paid to Spain is very indirectly connected with the fact that "the martyrdom of the Apostle did not take place at that period of his stay at Rome when Luke wrote his history;" why, therefore, should Eusebius refer at all as he does to Clement's obscure allusion?

The text of the Muratorian fragment on the Canon is corrupt, but it does undoubtedly offer an independent support to the visit of St. Paul to Spain.² Epiphanius³ and Jerome⁴ refer to St. Paul's journey to Spain, although they advance no new facts.

It is perfectly true that there is not a universal acknowledgment of this tradition, and that some writers, like Pope Innocent I., are silent about it when speaking of the Apostle's end. Still, it cannot be said that independent grounds do not exist for a λόγος, which in no sense contests or invalidates the Acts, or the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. There

¹ Hist. Eccl. ii. 22.

² This is admitted by Davidson. Cf. Lewin, *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 295.

³ *Her.* xxvii. 6.

⁴ *De Eccl. Script.*, c. 5. and *Comm. Amos*, vol. v. pp. 8, 9.

are subtle points of difference between Clement's statement, the "report" of Eusebius, and the implications of the Second Epistle to Timothy, which, to my mind, prove that the sources of information from which Eusebius drew his λόγος were independent of both authorities. If Clement had merely meant to imply that St. Paul had reached Rome, he would not have adopted an unusual and gratuitous periphrasis. The phrase "before the governors" implies, if it does not assert, that St. Paul was not tried by the emperor in person, but by his infamous and ferocious delegates. This could not be inferred from the Epistle to Timothy, although the Epistle does not contradict it. After the fire and the consequent persecution, those who were arraigned before the imperial court, under the faintest suspicion of liability to the *crimen majestatis*, had no chance of ordinary justice.

Another statement occurs in the Epistle of Clement, not without bearing on the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy. "Paul," says he, "obtained the reward of patience, after wearing bonds *seven* times, after being scourged and stoned." St. Paul, in 2 Cor. xi. 23, ff., enumerates his varied afflictions, and declares that even at that period he had been often ἐν φυλακαῖς. The narrative of the Acts does not specifically refer to more than one or two imprisonments, as antecedent to the composition of this letter. Clement may have added to the imprisonment in Philippi, and perhaps one at Thessalonica, those from which Paul suffered at Jerusalem, Cæsarea (Melita?), and Rome; but the explicit "seven times" suggests even then more than one imprisonment in the metropolis.

If, then, the "report" of Eusebius, and the sugges-

tion of Clement, be accepted, the Apostle was released from captivity before the fire in Rome. If the tradition of the visit to Spain covers an important chapter in his history, he fulfilled his cherished desire, and after his release in all probability returned to the East by way of Italy. If so, he must have found great changes in the imperial precincts. The fire in Rome had roused the passions of fanatics and the murderous ire of Nero. Many critics have supposed that the news of the cruel death of James the Just, and the apostacy of the Church at Jerusalem, must then have reached and troubled him. From the circle of his followers, if not from himself, the Epistle to the Hebrews was then despatched. Be that as it may, it becomes certain that, if the Pastoral Epistles be genuine, Paul then visited Crete and Ephesus, and went thence into Macedonia, leaving Titus in the former and Timothy in the latter. If he fulfilled his intention (Ep. to Philemon) of visiting Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, this is the period during which it must have been carried out. Philemon prepared him a lodging, and Archippus gave him a welcome; and, on entering Macedonia, he would renew his promised intercourse with Epaphroditus and other friends at Philippi. His visit to Ephesus would fill him with sorrow. The "grievous wolves" had made havoc of the flock. Some of his own presbyters had begun to speak perverse things; loose and wanton ways had been sheltered by the Church; slaves had claimed immunity from service, and despised their masters because they were brethren; natural magic had been conjoined with Christian ceremonies; logomachies and Jewish traditions had been disturbing the fellowship of the Church; and Paul's great heart

burned with fervent desire to expel the evils, to suggest principles and direct methods of Church discipline, to put the sexes into more Christian relations, and to provide adequately for widows who were cast on the love of Christ and his Church. It was amid these circumstances, while yet promising a second visit to Ephesus, that he wrote the first of the Pastoral Epistles. He was hoping to spend the winter at Nicopolis in Epirus; and, if he did so, he subsequently passed once more by Troas to Ephesus. Mr. Lewin conjectures a host of interesting details as to the manner and place of his arrest. All that we can gather from his last Letter is that Paul left at Troas—with a friend called Carpus, well known to Timothy and to himself—his cloak, books, and documents. Speculation has busied itself with the nature and motive of this deposit. The Letter does not solve the problem. Either for precaution, or amid the excitement of a hurried or forced departure from Troas, valuable property was deposited which at a later date he was anxious to reclaim. We learn, further, that his final departure from Timothy was distressing to them both. The tears of Timothy left a deep impression on the Apostle's mind, and brought back the thrilling memories of earlier years. Timothy, moreover, needed the stimulus of these memories, a vivid exposition of the Apostle's own example, and a careful reiteration of fundamental principles, to preserve him from temptations to laxity, and to inspire his fortitude as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

Further, the Apostle was accompanied by two, if not more, of his old friends—"Erastus of Corinth and Trophimus of Ephesus." The testimony of Trophimus, touching the original accusation which led to the

first "appeal to Cæsar," might be serviceable once more; but unfortunately Trophimus fell sick at Miletus, and Erastus remained at Corinth.¹ Notwithstanding these losses, Tychicus may have accompanied him: Luke, Crescens, Titus, and Demas must have been in his company. But at length, with the one exception of the faithful Luke, all his companions—for sufficient or insufficient reasons—had left him, a circumstance which gave much point to his passionate desire for the solace of Timothy's society in his last sad hours.

The Epistle suggests that Paul was now arrested, not for a violation of the sanctity of the Jewish temple, but as a malefactor,² a violater of the Roman law. New edicts against the abettors of unlawful religions were being put in force by the imperial procurators, and transgressors of these edicts were being accused of complicity with the fanatics of the city of Rome.³ The consequence was that Paul's position in Rome differed widely from what it had been in the earlier imprisonment. His bonds in Christ were now far from being noised abroad through the Prætorium. His former friends in Cæsar's household were absent, silent, dead, or helpless. He had no "hired house," but was languishing in some obscure almost inaccessible dungeon. Onesiphorus had much difficulty in finding him, and incurred obloquy and scorn in the search. The household of this kindly man had transmitted a

¹ The mention of Trophimus and Erastus in the Second Epistle to Timothy could not refer to their departure from him in his journey from Cæsarea to Rome, as described in Acts xxvii., and that for two reasons: first, the expressions would most inaccurately describe that journey, and secondly, Timothy, who spent much time with Paul during his first Roman imprisonment, could not possibly need the information here given.

² 2 Tim. ii. 9.

³ "Addito majestatis crimine quod tum omnium accusationum complementum erat."—Tac. *Ann.* iii. 38.

contribution to the Apostle's comfort, and Paul's heart had yearned over the young people to whom he now sent his dying benediction. The visit of Onesiphorus must have been short, as he, like Crescens, Tychicus, Demas, and Titus, had left him before his trial; and now that the hour of his deeper peril approached, there was not a solitary *patronus*, *amicus*, or *procurator* to aid his defence, or to deprecate the severity of his sentence. He stood alone before iniquitous judges to answer the first counts of the indictment laid against him. He had no counsel, no witnesses, to aid him, and was compelled to meet the cruel animosity of his old enemy, Alexander the brass-founder, who brought serious charges against him. Though he was deserted by all his Asiatic friends, he yet conducted his own cause with such ability and success that the whole court for once heard the gospel of Christ. Just as in earlier days, in presence of Agrippa, Bernice, and Festus, he found opportunity to proclaim Christ, so now he made all the Gentiles hear the story of the Cross and of the Crown. The issue of this first "apology" was that the judges acquitted him. "The Lord stood by him and strengthened him," and for the moment he was "delivered out of the mouth of the lion." Still it was a temporary respite; he was not a free man; heavier charges remained behind; and he felt that he was already being "poured out as a libation" on the great sacrifice. "The time of his dissolution was at hand." He had "run the race" with Jewish exclusiveness, with Rabbinical pride; he had run the race with imperial jealousy; he had run the race, and a hard race too, with physical infirmity, with heartless treachery and ingratitude—and he had *won*. He saw the "crown" and glory of the

first "appeal to Cæsar," might be serviceable once more; but unfortunately Trophimus fell sick at Miletus, and Erastus remained at Corinth.¹ Notwithstanding these losses, Tychicus may have accompanied him: Luke, Crescens, Titus, and Demas must have been in his company. But at length, with the one exception of the faithful Luke, all his companions—for sufficient or insufficient reasons—had left him, a circumstance which gave much point to his passionate desire for the solace of Timothy's society in his last sad hours.

The Epistle suggests that Paul was now arrested, not for a violation of the sanctity of the Jewish temple, but as a malefactor,² a violater of the Roman law. New edicts against the abettors of unlawful religions were being put in force by the imperial procurators, and transgressors of these edicts were being accused of complicity with the fanatics of the city of Rome.³ The consequence was that Paul's position in Rome differed widely from what it had been in the earlier imprisonment. His bonds in Christ were now far from being noised abroad through the Prætorium. His former friends in Cæsar's household were absent, silent, dead, or helpless. He had no "hired house," but was languishing in some obscure almost inaccessible dungeon. Onesiphorus had much difficulty in finding him, and incurred obloquy and scorn in the search. The household of this kindly man had transmitted a

¹ The mention of Trophimus and Erastus in the Second Epistle to Timothy could not refer to their departure from him in his journey from Cæsarea to Rome, as described in Acts xxvii., and that for two reasons: first, the expressions would most inaccurately describe that journey, and secondly, Timothy, who spent much time with Paul during his first Roman imprisonment, could not possibly need the information here given.

² 2 Tim. ii. 9.

³ "Addito majestatis crimine quod tum omnium accusationum complementum erat."—Tac. *Ann.* iii. 38.

contribution to the Apostle's comfort, and Paul's heart had yearned over the young people to whom he now sent his dying benediction. The visit of Onesiphorus must have been short, as he, like Crescens, Tychicus, Demas, and Titus, had left him before his trial; and now that the hour of his deeper peril approached, there was not a solitary *patronus*, *amicus*, or *procurator* to aid his defence, or to deprecate the severity of his sentence. He stood alone before iniquitous judges to answer the first counts of the indictment laid against him. He had no counsel, no witnesses, to aid him, and was compelled to meet the cruel animosity of his old enemy, Alexander the brass-founder, who brought serious charges against him. Though he was deserted by all his Asiatic friends, he yet conducted his own cause with such ability and success that the whole court for once heard the gospel of Christ. Just as in earlier days, in presence of Agrippa, Bernice, and Festus, he found opportunity to proclaim Christ, so now he made all the Gentiles hear the story of the Cross and of the Crown. The issue of this first "apology" was that the judges acquitted him. "The Lord stood by him and strengthened him," and for the moment he was "delivered out of the mouth of the lion." Still it was a temporary respite; he was not a free man; heavier charges remained behind; and he felt that he was already being "poured out as a libation" on the great sacrifice. "The time of his dissolution was at hand." He had "run the race" with Jewish exclusiveness, with Rabbinical pride; he had run the race with imperial jealousy; he had run the race, and a hard race too, with physical infirmity, with heartless treachery and ingratitude—and he had *won*. He saw the "crown" and glory of the

“righteousness” of God; and it was well. Christ-like, patient, and forgiving, joyous and hopeful, he was about to place all his great deposit in the hands of Him who first entrusted to him the solemn charge. In a tone quite unlike that of the Epistle to the Philippians, this final Letter, written in the interval of the two hearings, reveals no expectation of further release, except that which would be effected by admission into the heavenly kingdom. He is, however, human, and yearns to see once more his beloved son, his “very own” Timothy. This exquisite trait of character is actually brought forward by some of the impugners of the Epistle as a sign of unworthy weakness. Paul, say they, would have been willing to die alone, and would not have whined for sympathy. On the contrary, we see no stoical repression of human tenderness in St. Paul; nor can we fail to be reminded here of Him who said to his slumbering disciples, “Could ye not watch with me one hour?” Obviously, one reason for the composition of this Epistle was his intense desire to see Timothy once more. For Timothy’s sake, as well as his own, he wished for this last interview. Nothing could be more natural. The visit was, indeed, one which might imperil Timothy’s safety, and therefore it would demand courage and faith on his part. Timothy must be ready to suffer affliction with Paul; ¹ nay more, to suffer and die with Christ.² This simple fact is enough to explain the tone of subdued remonstrance which pervades the Epistle. Paul is arguing in anticipation of the natural timidity which he, who knew Timothy so well, foresaw would be aggravated by the summons to come to his side. With characteristic zeal he takes the last oppor-

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 3.

² Ibid. ii. 11.

tunity of lavishing on his "own beloved son," a reiteration of the fundamental ideas of the gospel; a summary of the obvious duties which devolved upon him as an evangelist, and a prophetic judgment upon the moral evils which were afflicting the Asiatic Churches. These summaries of truths and evils have been regarded as suspicious. Some of the opponents of the genuineness of this and of the other two Pastoral Epistles describe them as "commonplace," "shallow teaching." It is said that neither Timothy nor Titus would have needed under the circumstances such elementary instruction as that St. Paul was "an apostle and teacher of the Gentiles."¹ This seems to be gratuitous and arbitrary criticism. Let it be remembered that Paul's apostolate was frequently called in question, even by his own converts; and that his doctrine and commission were angrily disputed by Judaizers on the one hand and by Gentile heretics on the other. If so, it was like the veteran Apostle to reassert his conscious claim to the dignity in the very jaws of death.

Paul, say our hostile critics, would never have uttered anything so jejune as the eulogy on Holy Scripture contained in this epistle.² But if he had been accused of insufficient respect for the Old Testament, what could be better calculated to assist Timothy to fight his battle at Ephesus or elsewhere, than the written testimony of the Apostle to the incomparable value and Divine authority of the Sacred Books? The impugnors of the genuineness of the Epistle confidently affirm that the expectation of seeing Timothy and Titus very shortly, expressed in all three Letters,

¹ 2 Tim. i. 11.

² Ibid. iii. 16.

precluded the necessity for the composition of any one of them. But, on that supposition, why should an ingenious forger have made such a mistake as to blend these inconsistent elements in his work? In answer to the allegation, we observe that if we suppose that the young Evangelists were eager in their request that their master should put on record for them the burden of the teaching they had often heard from his lips, we find all the explanation of this peculiarity that we need. The references to the youth of Timothy¹ are perfectly compatible with the relative ages of the two men. Timothy need not have been more than thirty-five years of age when the second Letter was penned. He was timid, invalided, and disposed to shrink from anxious duty. He probably needed stimulus and encouragement. He may have been peculiarly susceptible to certain influences to which Paul refers, and from which he advises him to "flee." Though he was not, strictly speaking, a youth, he may still have required a fatherly warning against some of the temptations which are the ordinary snares of youth. Paul's age may, to his own consciousness, have easily been exaggerated by his hard life, his cruel sufferings, his varied experiences, his approaching death.

"The ethical tone," says Dr. Davidson of these Epistles, "savours of a good man who does not think deeply. The pervading spirit is flat, sober, sensible, without vigour, point, depth, or spiritual righteousness. Faith is dethroned while godliness, good works, and piety take its place. It is filed off into practical precepts."² And further, he avers that "the writer professed to refute false doctrine, but he does not do it;

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 22.

² Davidson's *Introduction*, vol. ii. p. 171.

he simply opposes to false doctrine certain vague hints of the 'form of sound words.'

These judgments of a distinguished Biblical critic deserve serious consideration. If they were accurate delineations of the facts of the case, they would shake our confidence. The mere epithets here applied are matters of taste, and cannot be refuted. If any critic chooses to assert that Milton is wordy, Shakespeare cloudy, and Wordsworth feeble, in style or thought, we cannot answer such vague accusations. Each reader must judge for himself whether productions which have secured an almost universal homage deserve such characterization. Now, from Chrysostom and the Apostolic Constitutions down to Calvin, Bengel, Wesley, and Mack, a very different judgment has prevailed concerning the force, suggestiveness, and practical power of these Epistles. No authentic Epistles of Paul have been more frequently or more lovingly quoted than the promises, summaries, and appeals which abound in them. "Stale," "flat," "common-place," and the like, are strange epithets to apply to the profound theological suggestions of all these Epistles, to the estimates of complicated forms of error and vice which they contain, to the "faithful sayings" which sparkle like the jewelry of heaven amid these golden sentences, and to the almost unique exhibition of the spirit in which a Christian saint can face and conquer death. More than this, the prominence given to "faith" in all St. Paul's Epistles is conspicuous in the three Pastorals. Thus, in the starting-place,¹ "love" is based on "faith," and faith is the characteristic and appropriation of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Chap. i. 14-16, 19; and Chap. ii. 4);

¹ 1 Tim. i. 2-5.

“recognition of the truth” is only a fuller expression of the nature of faith: while in Chapter ii. 15 there is a new and striking exhibition of the mystery of the incarnation when accepted in faith and love.

The doctrinal passages in the Epistle to Titus are intensely Pauline, from the interweaving of a multitude of accessory thoughts with which the writer illustrates the main idea of salvation, first from the standpoint of practical obedience, and afterwards from that of God's grace.¹ In the Epistle now under consideration, Timothy's “unfeigned faith” fills the dying Apostle's heart with joy and his eyes with tears; and faith in Christ's own work is the sustaining power with which he anticipates his own dissolution. If, as Pfeleiderer² says, “faith is occasionally represented as one of the graces of the Christian life, and not as the radix of all virtue and sole condition of justification,” still to faith is assigned a position of lofty importance. The occasional adoption of the term as an integral element of moral character, in the sense of trustworthiness rather than trustfulness, is not peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, but is found in 1 Corinthians xiii., and in Galatians v. 22, where there is precisely the same treatment of it. “The Apostle,” says Davidson, “never elsewhere associates *hope* with the eternal life as he does in these Epistles;” but surely Romans viii. 24; 1 Thessalonians i. 3; 1 Corinthians xiii. 13, compared with Titus ii. 2, iii. 5, are mutually confirmatory of their common authorship. Even the doctrine of the universality of divine favour, irrespective of all distinctions of class, as well as the dawn of the idea of humanity, and of the divine philanthropy, have been

¹ Titus ii. 11-14; ii. 4-8.

² *Paulinismus*.

said to savour of a time when Gnosticism had divided mankind into the "pneumatic," "psychic," and "Hylic," and when a more developed Christianity assailed it with assertions of the equality of men before God. Seeing that Jewish exclusiveness, Pharisaic guile, philosophic cynicism, and Greek self-complacency had been the evils against which Paul's whole career was a protest, no adequate reason exists for rushing on to the second century in order to find occasions for such teaching. These divine words forewarn and forearm the reader against Gnostic speculations and pretensions, but they do the like for the class-spirit of feudalism, for the assumptions of mediæval mystics, of modern sacerdotalists, and hyper-Calvinists. Arguments similar to these might easily be advanced to shew that the Epistles must have been written in the tenth, the fourteenth, or the nineteenth century. Dr. Davidson's statement that the writer does not refute the false doctrines or conduct which he condemns can hardly be sustained in face of such arguments as follow: (1) those which relate to the use and abuse of the law in 1 Timothy i.; (2) the appeal to first principles in giving the advice concerning prayer in Chapter ii.; (3) the manner in which the beauty of Christian profession and service are illustrated in a long, continuous, compacted argument in the Second Epistle; (4) those profound principles of Christian obedience which are first based upon the eternal love and purpose of the Father, then on the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, and finally on the redemptive work of the Lord Jesus, as we find them expounded in the Epistle to Titus and the laborious and compacted arguments of the last words of the Apostle. There is special

“recognition of the truth” is only a fuller expression of the nature of faith: while in Chapter ii. 15 there is a new and striking exhibition of the mystery of the incarnation when accepted in faith and love.

The doctrinal passages in the Epistle to Titus are intensely Pauline, from the interweaving of a multitude of accessory thoughts with which the writer illustrates the main idea of salvation, first from the standpoint of practical obedience, and afterwards from that of God’s grace.¹ In the Epistle now under consideration, Timothy’s “unfeigned faith” fills the dying Apostle’s heart with joy and his eyes with tears; and faith in Christ’s own work is the sustaining power with which he anticipates his own dissolution. If, as Pfeleiderer² says, “faith is occasionally represented as one of the graces of the Christian life, and not as the radix of all virtue and sole condition of justification,” still to faith is assigned a position of lofty importance. The occasional adoption of the term as an integral element of moral character, in the sense of trustworthiness rather than trustfulness, is not peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, but is found in 1 Corinthians xiii., and in Galatians v. 22, where there is precisely the same treatment of it. “The Apostle,” says Davidson, “never elsewhere associates *hope* with the eternal life as he does in these Epistles;” but surely Romans viii. 24; 1 Thessalonians i. 3; 1 Corinthians xiii. 13, compared with Titus ii. 2, iii. 5, are mutually confirmatory of their common authorship. Even the doctrine of the universality of divine favour, irrespective of all distinctions of class, as well as the dawn of the idea of humanity, and of the divine philanthropy, have been

¹ Titus ii. 11-14; ii. 4-8.

² *Paulinismus*.

said to savour of a time when Gnosticism had divided mankind into the "pneumatic," "psychic," and "Hylic," and when a more developed Christianity assailed it with assertions of the equality of men before God. Seeing that Jewish exclusiveness, Pharisaic guile, philosophic cynicism, and Greek self-complacency had been the evils against which Paul's whole career was a protest, no adequate reason exists for rushing on to the second century in order to find occasions for such teaching. These divine words forewarn and forearm the reader against Gnostic speculations and pretensions, but they do the like for the class-spirit of feudalism, for the assumptions of mediæval mystics, of modern sacerdotalists, and hyper-Calvinists. Arguments similar to these might easily be advanced to shew that the Epistles must have been written in the tenth, the fourteenth, or the nineteenth century. Dr. Davidson's statement that the writer does not refute the false doctrines or conduct which he condemns can hardly be sustained in face of such arguments as follow: (1) those which relate to the use and abuse of the law in 1 Timothy i.; (2) the appeal to first principles in giving the advice concerning prayer in Chapter ii.; (3) the manner in which the beauty of Christian profession and service are illustrated in a long, continuous, compacted argument in the Second Epistle; (4) those profound principles of Christian obedience which are first based upon the eternal love and purpose of the Father, then on the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, and finally on the redemptive work of the Lord Jesus, as we find them expounded in the Epistle to Titus and the laborious and compacted arguments of the last words of the Apostle. There is special

sacredness in the last words of any great teacher. A peculiar and unique value appertains to this expression of the personal faith of the great Apostle, when to all human appearance his work was a failure, when the bright sun of his hopes was setting in lurid storm-cloud, and when, amid detraction, misapprehension, desertion, and treachery, he was going into his Gethsemane, and taking up his cross. H. R. REYNOLDS.

*ZION THE SPIRITUAL METROPOLIS
OF THE WORLD.*

PSALM LXXXVII.

THIS short Psalm attracts notice by its touches of lyric beauty, as also by the exceptionally enigmatical character of its style. The last sentence contains a fine sentiment most poetically expressed, and throughout the sacred ode snatches of sweet melody fall on the ear. Yet we are puzzled at first to know what it is all about, and fail to recognize the connection of thought which gives unity to the whole. The mere English reader, ignorant of Hebrew, and conversant only with the Authorized Version, is at a special disadvantage; for our translators have been almost as unhappy in their rendering of this Psalm as in many of the most striking passages in the Book of Job. Perplexed, apparently, by the obscurity created by a bold abrupt style, in which thoughts superficially unconnected are hastily hinted at in pregnant suggestive phrases rather than fully expressed, the authors of our English Version have given us a translation which is, in some places, almost meaningless and unintelligible. Even