§ 1] 1TS AUTHORSHIP. [anrropuction.   
   
 ance of aught which might seem unlike him whose name it bears ;—con-   
 struction, if you will, out of acknowledged pauline materials, but so as to   
 shun every thing unpauline. .   
 9. Now, as has been seen above, the whole of De Wette’s reasoning   
 goes upon the exact opposite of all these phenomena. The Epistle is   
 unpauline: strange and surprising in diction, and ideas. Granting this,   
 it might be a cogent reason for believing an anonymous writing not to be   
 St. Paul’s: but it is no reason why a forgery bearing his name should   
 have been successful,—on the contrary, is a very sufficient reason why it   
 should have been immediately detected, and universally unsuccessful,   
 Let every one of De Wette’s positions be granted, and carried to its   
 utmost; and the more in number and the stronger they are, the more   
 reason there will be to infer, that the only account to be given of a   
 writing, so unlike St. Paul’s, obtaining universal contemporary accept-   
 ance as his, is, that it was his own genuine composition. Then we   
 should have remaining the problem to account for the Apostle having   
 so far departed from himself: a problem for the solution of which   
 much acquaintance with himself and the circumstances under which   
 he wrote would be required,—and, let me add, a treatment very far   
 deeper and more thorough than De Wette has given to any part of this   
 Epistle.   
 10. But I am by no means disposed to grant any of De Wette’s   
 positions as they stand, nor to recognize the problem as I have put it   
 in the above hypothetical form. ‘The relation between our Epistle and   
 that to the Colossians, I have endeavoured to elucidate below (§ vi. and   
 Introd. to the Col., § iv.). The reasonings and connexions which he   
 pronounces unworthy of the Apostle, I hold him, in almost every case, not   
 to have appreciated : and where he has appreciated them, to have hastily   
 condemned. Here, as in the instance of 1 Tim., his unfortunate pre-   
 judgment of the spuriousness of the Epistle has tinged his view of every   
 portion of it: and his commentary, generally so thorough and able, so   
 fearless and fair, is worth hardly more than those of very inferior men,   
 not reaching below the surface, and unable to recognize the most obvious   
 tendencies and connexions.   
 11. De Wette’s arguments have been met in detail by Riickert and   
 Hemsen; and touched upon by Harless, Neander, and Meyer (Einl.).   
 Davidson also treats of them in full, and Eadie very slightly.   
 12. Baur’s argument consists, as far as it is peculiar to him, mainly in   
 an attempt to trace in our Epistle, and that to the Colossians (for he   
 holds both to be spurious), expressions and sentiments known to be those   
 of Gnosticism and Montanism: and in some few instances to shew that   
 it is not probable that these heresies took their terms from the Epistles,   
 but rather the Epistles from them. This latter part, on which indeed the   
 conelusiveness of the whole depends, is very slightly, and to me most in-   
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