*exhortations to Timothy* (18—20).—On  
these repeated digressions, and the inferences

from them, see Introd. ch. vii. § i.  
36 f.

**3.**] The sentence begins **As I  
exhorted thee**, &c., but in his negligence  
of writing, the Apostle does not finish the  
construction: neither verse 5, nor 12, nor  
18, will form the conclusion to it without  
unnatural forcing.

**besought thee**]  
Chrysostom lays stress on the word, as implying

great mildness—“ Listen to his  
kind consideration, how he does not make  
use of the force of a master, but rather of  
a servant: he says not ‘I enjoined, nor ‘I  
commanded,’ nor ‘I recommended,’ but ‘I  
besought thee.’” See the whole subject  
discussed in the Introd. ch. vii. § ii.

**some**] so constantly in these Epistles, see  
vv. 6,19; ch. iv. 1; v. 15; vi. 10, 21;  
2 Tim. ii. 18: sometimes the *gainsayers*,  
Tit. i. 9, or *many*, ib. 10. Huther infers  
from this word that the number at this  
time was not considerable: but this is  
hardly safe, “The indefinite pronoun is  
more probably *slightly* contemptuous: see  
Jude 4, and Gal. ii, 12.” Ellicott.

**4. fables**] We can only judge from the other  
passages in these Epistles where the word  
occurs, what kind of fables are alluded to.  
In Tit. i. 14 we have “ *Jewish fables*.”  
In our ch. iv. 7, they are designated as  
“ *profane and anile*.” In 2 Tim. iv. 4,  
they are spoken of absolutely, as here. If  
we are justified in identifying the ‘fables’  
in Titus with these, they had a Jewish  
origin: but merely to take them, as Theodoret,

for the Jewish traditional comments  
on the law, does not seem to satisfy the  
*epithets* quoted above. And consequently  
others have interpreted them of the gnostic  
mythology. It does not seem easy to define

them any further, but it is plain that  
any transitional state from Judaism to  
gnosticism will satisfy the conditions here  
propounded without inferring that the  
full-blown gnosticism of the second century  
must be meant, and thus calling in question  
the genuineness of the Epistle. On the whole  
subject, see Introd. to ch. vii. § i. 8 ff.

**endless genealogies**] De Wette, in his note  
on Tit i. 14, marks out well the references  
which have been assigned to this expression:  
“**genealogies** cannot mean 1) *properly  
genealogical registers*,—either for a pure  
genealogico-historical end, or for a

dogmatico-historical one, to foster the religious  
national pride of Jews against Gentiles,  
see Phil. iii. 4 f., or to ascertain the descent

of the Messiah, least of all genealogies  
of Timothy himself,—for all this does not  
touch, or too little touches religious interests:  
nor are they 2) *gentile theogonies* ; nor again  
3) *cabalistic pedigrees*, which will hardly  
suit the word *genealogies*: nor 4) *Essenean*

*genealogies of angels*, of the existence  
of which we have no proof: nor 5) *allegorizing*

*genealogies*, applications of psychological and

historical considerations to the  
genealogies contained in the books of  
Moses: as in Philo,—a practice too peculiar  
to Philo and his view: but most probably  
6) *lists of gnostic emanations*.”—But  
again, inasmuch as **genealogies** are coupled  
in Tit. iii. 9 with “*strifes about the law*,”  
it seems as if we must hardly understand  
the ripened fruits of gnosticism, but rather  
the first beginnings of these genealogies in  
the abuse of Judaism.

**endless** may  
be used merely in popular hyperbole to  
signify the tedious length of such genealogies.

**the which**] i.e. **of the kind  
which**.

**minister**] ‘*afford*,’ ‘*give  
rise to*,’ ‘*furnish*.’

**rather than**] is a  
mild way of saying “*and not*: see John  
iii. 19; Acts xxvii. 11; 2 Tim. iii, 4.

**God’s dispensation. . .**] This has been  
taken two ways: 1) objectively: the

*dispensation of God* (towards man) *which is*