InTRODUCTION.] ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. [cn. x.   
   
 speak, no longer any mooring-place in the permanence of the old law,   
 and thus, rapidly drifting away from it, soon lost sight of it altogether,   
 aud learned to despise it as a thing gone by. Then the oriental and   
 Grecian elements, whieh had before been in a state of forced and un-   
 natural fusion with Judaism, cast it out altogether, retaining only those   
 traces of it which involved no recognition of its peculiar tenets.   
 21. The false teachers then of our Epistles seem to hold a position   
 intermediate to the Apostle’s former Judaizing adversaries and the sub-   
 sequent Gnostic heretics, distinct from both, and just at that point in   
 the progress from the one form of error to the other, which would suit   
 the period subsequent to the Epistle to the Philippians, and prior to the   
 destruction of Jerusalem. There is therefore nothing in them and their   
 characteristics, which can cast a doubt upon the genuineness of the   
 Epistles.   
 22. (b) [Seeabove, par. 12], The ecclesiastical order subsisting when they   
 were written. Baur and De Wette charge the author of these Epistles   
 with hierarchical tendencies. They hold that the strengthening and   
 developing of the hierarchy, as we find it aimed at in the directions here   
 given, could not have been an object with St. Panl. De Wette confines   
 himself to this general remark: Baur goes further into detail. In his   
 earlier work on the Pastoral Epistles, he asserts, that in the genuine   
 Pauline Epistles there is found no trace of any official leaders of the   
 Churches (it must be remembered that with Baur, the genuine Epistles   
 are only those to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans) : whereas   
 here those Churches are found in such a state of organization, that   
 bishops, presbyters, and deacons are significantly put forward: pres-   
 byters according to him being the name for the collective body of   
 church-rulers, and bishop for that one of them who was singly entrusted   
 with the government. In his later work, he maintains that the Gnosties,   
 as the first heretics proper, gave the first occasion for the foundation of   
 the episcopal government of the Churches. But even granting this, the   
 very assumption would prove the earlier origin of our Epistles: for in   
 them there is not the slightest trace of episcopal government, in the   
 later sense. Baur’s own explanation of bishop differs entirely from that   
 later sense. F   
 23. The fact is, that the form of Church government disclosed in our   
 Epistles is of the simplest kind possible. The diaconate was certainly,   
 in some shape or other, coeval with the very infancy of the Church:   
 and the presbyterate was almost a necessity for every congregation. No   
 Church could subsist without a government of some kind: and it would   
 be natural that such an one as that implied in the presbyterate should   
 arise out of the circumstances in every case.   
 24, The directions also which are here given, are altogether of an   
 ethical, not of an hierarchical kind. They refer to the selection of men,   
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