sence, to have somewhat declined: certainly  
he is now stimulated to greater efforts”),  
**which is in thee by means of the laying on  
of my hands** (these words, especially when  
compared with 1 Tim. iv. 14, mark the  
sense of the word gift to be as above, and  
not the general gifts of the Spirit which  
followed the laying on of hands after baptism. Any apparent discrepancy with that  
passage, from the Apostle here speaking of  
the laying on of *his own hands alone*, may  
be removed by regarding the Apostle as  
chief in the ordination, and the presbytery  
as his assistants, as is the case with Bishops  
at the present day. As to the attributing  
the gift to the *laying on of hands* as its  
agent, we can only appeal, against the  
Roman-Catholic expositors, to the whole  
spirit of St. Paul's teaching, as declaring  
that by such an expression he does not mean  
that the inward spiritual grace is operated  
merely and barely by the outward visible  
sign,—but is only asserting, in a mode of  
speech common to us all, that the solemn  
dedication by him of Timothy to God’s  
work, of which the laying on of his hands  
was the sign and seal, did bring with it  
gifts and grace for that work. In this  
sense, and in this alone, the gift came  
through *the laying on of hands*, that laying  
on being the concentrated and effective  
sign of the setting apart, and conveying in  
faith the answer, assumed by faith, to the  
prayers of the church. That the Apostle  
had *authority* thus to set apart, was necessary to the validity of the act, and thus to  
the reception of the grace:—but the authority did not *convey* the grace. I may just  
add that the ‘indelibility of orders” which  
Mack infers from this passage, is simply  
and directly refuted by it. If the *gift*  
*which was in him* required *stirring up*, if,  
as Chrysostom says, ‘it is in us to quench  
it, and to re-light it,’—then plainly it is  
not indelible).

**7.**] **For** (‘and there is  
reason for my thus exhorting thee, seeing  
that thou hast shewn a spirit inconsistent  
with the character of that *gift*.’ The particle is passed over by Ellicott) **God did not give** (when we were admitted to the  
ministry: not, ‘*hath not given*,’ as A. V.,  
which loses the reference) us the spirit  
(not “*a spirit*:” see my Greek Test.) of  
cowardice (there is doubtless a touch of  
severity in the use of this word, putting  
before Timothy his timidity in such a light  
as to shame him); **but** (the spirit) **of power**  
(as opposed to the weakness implicd in  
cowardice), **and love** (as opposed to that  
false compliance with men, which shrinks  
from bold rebuke :—that lofty self-abandonment of love for others, which will even  
sacrifice repute, and security, and all that  
belongs to self, in the noble struggle to do  
men good), **and correction** (the original  
meaning of the word ‘admonition of others  
that they may become **sound-minded**,—  
must be retained, as necessary both on ac-  
count of usage, and on account of the  
context. It is this bearing bold testimony  
before others, from which Timothy appears  
to have shrunk: compare ver. 8. The  
word in after times became a common one  
for *discipline* or *ecclesiastical correction*.  
The making the word mean *a sound mind*,  
as A. V. and many Commentators, is surely  
not allowable, though Chrysostom puts it  
doubtfully as an alternative. The only way  
in which it can come virtually to that, is by  
supposing the *correction* to be exercised *by  
ourselves over ourselves*. But this does  
not seem to me to suit the context so  
well as the meaning given above).

**8.] Be not then** (seeing that God gave us  
such a Spirit, not the other) **ashamed of**  
(for construction see reff. The caution  
would not of necessity imply that Timothy  
had already shewn such a feeling: but it  
would be just in keeping with the delicate  
tact of the Apostle, to use such form of  
admonition, when in fact the blame had  
been already partly incurred. See note on  
ver. 1) **the testimony of our Lord** (i.e. the  
testimony which thou art to give concerning our Lord, genitive objective: not ‘*the  
testimony which He bore*,’ genitive subjective. The **our** in “*our Lord*” is  
inserted because being about to introduce