(the word imports a fuller and more  
assured acquaintance than mere *knowledge,*  
see 1 Cor. xiii. 12: Col. i. 11; ii, 2) **of  
(the) truth** (the expression is a favourite  
one in these Epistles, see 2 Tim. ii. 25;  
iii. 7; Titus i. 1. This realization of the  
truth is in fact identical with *salvation,*  
not only as that *salvation* is a *rescue*  
from life in untruth, but in its deepest and  
widest sense of *salvation*, here and hereafter:   
compare John xvii. 3).

**5.**] **For**  
(further grounding of the acceptableness  
of prayer for all men,—in the UNITY of  
God. But this verse is joined by the **for**  
directly to the preceding, not to ver. 1.  
Chrysostom gives it rightly,—“shewing  
that He willeth all to be saved”) **there is**  
ONE **God** (He is ONE in essence and one in  
purpose—not of different minds to different  
nations or individuals, but of one mind towards   
all. Similarly Rom. iii. 30, and, which  
is important for the understanding of that  
difficult passage, Gal. iii. 20. The double  
reference, to the unity in essence and unity  
of purpose, for which I have contended  
there, is plain and unmistakeable here),  
ONE **Mediator** (this word **Mediator** occurs,  
besides Gal. iii. 19, 20, only in the Epistle  
to the Heb., 6; ix. 15; xii. 24. There  
is no necessity that the idea should be  
connected with that of a mutual covenant,  
and so be here far-fetched as regards the  
context: the word is used as standing  
alone, and representing the fact of Christ  
Jesus being the only *go-between,* in whatever   
sense) **also of** (between) **God and men**  
(if one only goes between, then that One  
aust be for *all*), **Christ Jesus** [**himself**]  
**man** (why **man?** ‘Theodoret answers,  
“He calls Christ man because he called  
Him a Mediator: for He became Mediator  
by becoming man:” and so most Commentators.   
But it is not here the Apostle’s  
object, to set forth the nature of Christ’s  
mediation as regards its being brought  
about;—only as regards its unity and  
universality for mankind. And for this  
latter reason he calls him here by this  
name MAN,—that He gathered up all our  
human nature into Himself, becoming its  
second Head, So that the assertion that  
He is *man*, in fact carries with it the very  
strongest proof of that which he is maintaining.   
Notice it is not, as in A. V., “the *man*  
Christ Jesus:” in personality, our Lord was  
not *a man*, but in nature He was man. The  
stupidity of such writers as Baur and the  
Socinians, who regard such an expression   
as against the deity of Christ, is  
beyond all power of mine to characterize.  
In the face of the words “*one God, one*  
**Mediator between God** *and* **men,**” to  
maintain gravely such a position, shews  
utter blindness from party bias even to  
the plainest thoughts expressed in the  
plainest words): **who gave himself a  
ransom** (literally, **a payment in recompense:**   
and this expresses more distinctly  
the reciprocity which is already implied in  
the simple word in each case. That the  
main fact alluded to here is the *death* of  
Christ, we know: but it is not brought into  
prominence, being included in, and superseded   
by the far greater and more comprehensive   
fact, that He gave HIMSELF, in  
all that He undertook for our redemption;  
see Phil. ii. 5–8) **on behalf of all** (not of a  
portion of mankind, but of *all men;* the  
point of ver. 1, *for* **all men**),—**the testimony**   
(‘that which was [to be] testified”  
This oneness of the Mediator, involving in  
itself the universality of Redemption, was  
the great subject of Christian testimony:  
see below) **in its own seasons** (in the times  
which God had appointed for it). **For**  
(towards) **which** (the testifying) **I was  
placed as a herald** (this is a word used in  
these pastoral Epistles and 2 Pet. only),  
**and apostle** (the proclaiming this universality   
of the Gospel was the one object   
towards which my appointment as  
an apostle and preacher was directed.  
Those who hold the spuriousness of our  
Epistle, regard this returning to himself  
and his own ease on the part of the writer  
as an evidence of his being one who was  
acting the part of Paul. They have so far  
truth on their side, that we must recognize