ixTRoDuCTION.| ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. (om. x.   
   
 5. From their time to the beginning of the present century, the   
 authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles remained unquestioned. At that   
 time, Schmidt (J. E. C.) first, and afterwards Schleiermacher attacked   
 the genuineness of the first Epistle to Timothy: which on the other hand,   
 was defended by Planck, Wegscheider, and Beckhaus. It soon began   
 however to be seen, that from the close relation of the three Epistles, the   
 arguments which Schleiermacher had used against one, would apply to   
 all: and accordingly first Eichhorn, and then not so decidedly De Wette,   
 denied the genuineness of all three.   
 6. The latter Commentator, in his Introduction (1826), combined the   
 view of Schleiermacher, that 1 Tim. was a compilation from the other   
 two, with that of Eichhorn, that all three were not the genuine produc-   
 tions of St. Paul: but at the same time allowed to the consent of the   
 Church in all ages so much weight, that his view influenced only the   
 historical origin of the Epistles, not their credit and authority.   
 7. This mere negative ground was felt to be unsatisfactory: and Eich-   
 horn soon put forth a positive hypothesis, that the Epistles were written   
 by some disciple of St. Paul, with a view of collecting together his oral -   
 injunctions respecting the constitution of the Church. This was adopted   
 by Schott, with the further conjecture that St. Luke was the author.   
 8. The defenders of the Epistles’ found it not difficult to attack such   
 a position as this, which was raised on mere conjecture after all: and   
 Baur, on the other hand, remarked, “ We have no suflicient resting-   
 place for our critical judgment, as long as we only lay down that the   
 Epistles are not Pauline: we must have established some positive data   
 which transfer them from the Apostie’s time into another age.” Ac-   
 cordingly, he himself has laboured to prove them to have been written   
 in the time of the Marcionite heresy; and their author to have been   
 one who, not having the ability himself to attack the Gnostic positions,   
 thought to uphold the Pauline party by putting his denunciations of it   
 into the mouth of the Apostle.   
 9. This view of Baur’s has been, however, very far from meeting with   
 general adoption, even among the impugners of the genuineness of our   
 Epistles. The new school of Tiibingen have alone accepted it with   
 favour. De Wette himself, in the later editions of his Handbuch (I   
 quote from that of 1847), though he is stronger than ever against the   
 three Epistles, does not feel satisfied with the supposed settling of the   
 question by Baur. He remarks, “‘According to Baur, the Epistles were   
 written after the middle of the second century, subsequently to the   
 appearance of Marcion and other Gnostics. But, inasmuch as the allu-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 1 Hug, Bertholdt, Fielmoser, Guerike, Bohl, Curtius, Klug, Heydenreich, Mack.   
 See Huther, Einleitung, p. 88, from which many of the particulars in the text are   
 taken.   
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