§ 1] THEIR AUTHORSHIP. [iyrropuction.   
   
 of it, which led downwards to destruction of the moral sense and of   
 practical virtue.   
 389. When however in his same paragraph he assumes that the writer   
 gives a validity to moral desert, which stands almost in contradiction to   
 the Pauline doctrines of grace, and cites 1 Tim. ii. 15; iii. 13; iv. 8;   
 vi. 18 ff; 2 Tim. iv. 8, to confirm this,—I own I am quite unable to sce   
 any inconsistency in these passages with the doctrine of grace as laid   
 down, or assumed, in the other Epistles. See Rom. ii. 6—10: 1 Cor.   
 iii. 14; ix. 17, 25; xv. 58: Phil. i. 19, and many other places, in which   
 the foundation being already laid of union with Christ by faith, and   
 salvation by His grace, the carrying on and building up of the man   
 of God in good works, and reward according to the measure of the fruits   
 of the Spirit, are quite as plainly insisted on as any where in these   
 Epistles.   
 40, De Wette also finds what he calls “an apology for the law, and   
 an admission of its possessing an ethical use,” in 1 Tim. i. 8. In my   
 notes on that passage, I have seen reason to give it altogether a different   
 bearing: but even admitting the fact, I do not see how it should be any   
 more inconsistent with St. Paul’s measure of the law, than that which   
 he says of it in Rom. vii. And when he objects that the universalism   
 of these Epistles (1 Tim. ii. 4; iv. 10: Tit. ii 11), although in itself   
 Pauline, does not appear in the same polemical contrast, as e. g. in Rom.   
 iii. 29,—this seems very trifling in fault-finding: nothing on the con-   
 trary can be more finely and delicately in accordance with his former   
 maintenance against all impugners of God's universal purpose of salva-   
 tion to all mankind, than that he should, even while writing to one who   
 did not doubt of that great truth, be constant to his own habit of   
 asserting it.   
 41. There are many considerations pressed by the opponents of the   
 Pauline authorship, which we can only mention and pass by. Some   
 of them will be found incidentally dealt with in the notes: with others   
 the student, who has hitherto followed the course of these remarks, will   
 know how himself to deal. As usual, the similarities to, as well as dis-   
 erepancies from, the other Epistles, are adduced as signs of spuriousness\*®.   
 The three Epistles, and especially the first to Timothy, are charged with   
 poverty of sentiment, with want of connexion, with unworthiness of the   
 Apostle as author. On this point no champion of the Epistles could   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 6 Huther gives a list parallels agaiust which this objection has been brought, and   
 I transcribe it, that the reader may judge and refute for bimself: 1 Tim. i. 12—14, as   
 compared with 1 Cor. xv. 9,10: 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35: 2 Tim. i.   
 3—5, with Rom. i. 8 ff.: 5, with 1 Cor. ix. 24: ii. 6, 1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.: ii. with   
 Rom. i. 3: ii. 11, with Rom. vi. 8: ii. 20, with Rom. ix. 21: iii. i, with Rom. i.   
 29 ff.: iv. 6, Phil. ii, Tit. i. with Rom. i. 1 ff   
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