§1] THEIR AUTHORSHIP. [1nTRODUCTION.   
   
 by the Apostles, in their special proclamation of the Son of God in this   
 character ;—we may observe that St. Jude introduces it (in the genuine   
 text) with the limitation “through Jesus Christ our Lord ;”—but in the   
 familiar writing one to another, when there was no danger of the media-   
 torship of Jesus being forgotten, this true and noble expression seems   
 still to have been usual :—profane, 1 Tim. i. 9; iv. 7; vi. 20: 2 Tim. ii.   
 16,—common only to Heb. (xii. 16),—an epithet interesting, as bring-   
 ing with it the fact of the progress of heresy from doctrine to practice,   
 as also does unholy, 1 Tim. i. 9: 2 Tim. iii. 2:—to maintain constantly,   
 1 Tim. i. 7: Tit. iii, 8:—to put in mind, 2 Tim. ii. 14: Tit. iii, 1   
 (2 Pet. i. 12: 8 John 10: Jude 5):—a word naturally coming into use   
 rather as time drew on, than “in the beginning of the Gospel :”—to   
 turn away from, or out of, 2 Tim. iii. 5: 1 Tim.i.6; v.15; vi. 20:   
 2 Tim. iv. 4 (Heb. xii. 13),—terms owing their use to the progress of   
 heresy; which may be said also of the term to miss the aim, 1 Tim. i. 6;   
 vi. 21: 2 Tim. ii. 18,—and to be besotted with pride, 1 Tim. iii. 6;   
 vi. 4: 2 Tim. iii. 4:—é&e. &e.   
 85. There seems no reason why any of the above peculiarities of   
 diction should be considered as imperilling the authenticity of our   
 Epistles. The preceding paragraph will have shewn, that of many of   
 them, some account at least may be given: and when we reflect how   
 very little we know of the circumstances under which they were used,   
 it appears far more the part of sound criticism to let such difficulties   
 stand unsolved, under a sense that we have not the clue to them, than   
 at once and rashly to pronounce on them, as indicative of a spurious   
 origin.   
 36. Another objection brought by De Wette against our Epistles   
 seems to me to make so strikingly and decisively for them, that I cannot   
 forbear giving it in his own words before commenting upon it: “In the   
 composition of all three Epistles we have this common peculiarity,—that   
 from that which belongs to the object of the Epistle, and is besides for   
 the most part of general import, the writer is ever given to digress to   
 general truths, or so-called common-places (1 Tim. i. 15; ii. 4—6;   
 iii, 16; iv. 8—10: 2 Tim. i. 9 f.; ii, 11—18, 19—21; iii. 12, 16: Tit.   
 ii, 11—14; iii, 3—7), and that even that which is said by way of con-   
 tradiction or enforcing attention, appears in this form (1 Tim. i. 8—10;   
 iv. 4 f.; vi. 6—10: 2 Tim. ii. 4—6: Tit. i. 15). With this is com-   
 bined another peculiarity common to them, that after such digressions   
 or general instructions, the writer’s practice is to recur, or finally to   
 appeal to and fall back on previous exhortations or instructions given to   
 his correspondent (1 Tim. iii. 14 f.; iv. 6, 11; vi. 2,5 {ree.]: 2 Tim.   
 ii. 7, 145 iii, 5: Tit. ii, 15; iii. 8).” In commenting on this, I would   
 ask, what could be more natural than both these phenomena, under the   
 circumstances, supposing St. Paul their author? Is it not the tendency   
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