inTRoDuUcTION.] THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. (cn. v.   
   
   
 And in ch, ix.,   
 ‘I have been counted worthy to hold communication by my writings   
 with ‘the saints that are in Ephesus, the faithful in Christ Jesus.’ ”   
 5. As we advance to the following centuries, the reception of the   
 authorship of St. Paul is universal. In fact, we may safely say that   
 this authorship was never called in question till yery recent times.   
 6. Among those critics who have repudiated our Epistle as not written   
 by the Apostle, the principal have been De Wette and Baur. The ground   
 on which they build their reasoning is, for the most part, the same. De   
 Wette holds the Epistle to be a verbose expansion of that to the Colos-   
 sians. He describes it as entirely dependent on that Epistle, and as   
 such, unworthy of a writer who always wrote in freshness and fulness   
 of spirit, as did St. Paul. He believes he finds in it every where ex-   
 pressions and doctrines foreign to his diction and teaching. This being   
 so, he classes it with the Pastoral Epistles and the first Epistle of Peter,   
 and ascribes it to some scholar of the Apostles, writing in their name.   
 He is not prepared to go so far as Baur, who finds in it the ideas   
 and diction of Gnostic and Montanistic times. On this latter notion, I   
 will treat below: I now proceed to deal with De Wette’s objections.   
 7. First of all, I would take a general view of their character, and   
 say that, on such a general view, they, as a whole, make for, rather   
 than against, the genuineness of the Epistle. According to De Wette,   
 a gifted scholar of the Apostles, in the apostolic age itself, writes an   
 Epistle in imitation, and under the name, of St. Paul. Were the imita-   
 tion close, and the imitator detected only by some minute features of   
 inadvertent inconsistency, such a phenomenon might be understood, as   
 that the Epistle found universal acceptance as the work of the Apostle:   
 but according to our objector, the discrepancies are wide, the incon-   
 sistencies every where abundant. He is found, in his commentary,   
 detecting and exposing them at every turn. Such reasoning may prove   
 a passage objectively (as in the case of Mark xvi. 9—20, or John vii.   
 53—viii. 11) to be out of place among the writings of a particular   
 author, all subjective considerations apart: but it is wholly inapplicable   
 when used to account for the success of a forger among his contem-   
 poraries, and indeed acts the other way.   
 8. Let us view the matter in this light. Here is an Epistle bearing   
 the name of St. Paul. Obviously then, it is no mere accidental insertion   
 among his writings of an Epistle written by some other man, and on   
 purely objective grounds requiring us to ascribe it to that other unknown   
 author; but it is either a genuine production of the Apostle, or a forgery.   
 Subjective grounds cannot be kept out of the question: it is a successful   
 forgery: one which imposed on the post-apostolic age, and has continued   
 to impose on the Church in every age. We have then a right to expect   
 in tt the phenomena of successful forgery: close imitation, skilful avoid-   
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