§x] ITS AUTHORSIIL. [antropuctioy.   
   
 In | Thess. iv. 17,—where see note,—there is no such figure, for the   
 Apostle is merely giving expression to the expectation that he himself   
 should be among them who should be alive in the flesh at the coming of   
 our Lord.   
 In Jude, ver. 17, there is no such figure. St. Jude, in writing thus,   
 is giving us plain proof that he himself was not one of the Apostles.   
 135. Much stress has been laid, and duly, on the entire absence of   
 onal notices of the Writer, as affecting the question of the Pauline   
 authorship. This is so inconsistent with the otherwise invariable prac-   
 tice of St. Paul, that some very strong reason must be supposed, which   
 should influence him in this case to depart from that practice. Such   
 reason bas been variously assigned. And first, with reference to the   
 omission of any superseription or opening greeting. It has been sup-   
 posed that he would not begin by designating himself as an Apostle,   
 because the Lord Himself was the Apostle (ch. iii. 1) of the Jewish   
 people (so Pantenus, above, par. 11). Or, because the Jewish Chris-   
 tians in Palestine were unwilling to recognize him as such, only as an   
 Apostle to the Gentiles (so Theodoret, and others). But to this it   
 might be answered, Why then not superscribe himself “a servant of   
 Jesus Christ,” or the like, as in Phil. i. 1, Philem. 1, or simply “ Paul,”   
 asin 1 and 2 Thess.? But a further reply has been given, and very   
 widely accepted : that being in disfavour generally among the Jews, he   
 did not prefix his name, for fear of exciting a prejudice against his Epistle,   
 and so perhaps preventing the reading of it altogether. (So Clement of   
 Alexandria, above, par. 14. So also Chrysostom, iii. p. 871.) But this   
 cannot have been the purpose of the Author throughout, as is sufficiently   
 shewn by such notices as those of ch. xiii. 18, 19, 23, which would have   
 been entirely without meaning, had the readers not been aware who was   
 writing to them. Yet, it is said, these notices do not occur till the end   
 of the Epistle, when the important part of it has already been read   
 through. Are we then to suppose that St. Paul seriously did in this   
 ease, that which he ironically puts as an hypothesis in 2 Cor. xii. 16,   
 “being crafty I caught you with guile”? And if he did it, how   
 imperfectly and clumsily! Could he not as easily have removed all   
 traces of his own hand in the Epistle, as those at the beginning only ?   
 And how are we to suppose that the Epistle came to the church to   
 which it was addressed ? Did he put in at a window, or over a wall ?   
 Must it not have come by the hand of some friend or companion ?   
 Mast it not have been given into the hand of some that had the rule ?   
 How happened it that the qnestion was never asked, From whom does   
 this come ? or if asked, how could it be answered but in one way ?) And   
 when thus answered, how could it fail but the Epistle would thenceforth   
 be known as that of St. Paul ?   
 136. It may be said that these last enquiries would prove too much ;   
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